



---

**CITY OF**  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

---

**OFFICIAL  
MINUTES**

---

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **1ST DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2006** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Potter, Presiding; Commissioners Adams, Leonard, Saltzman and Sten, 5.

Commissioner Adams was excused to leave at 11:41 a.m.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Ben Walters, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and John Holly, Sergeant at Arms.

On a Y-5 roll call, the Consent Agenda was adopted.

<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>		<b>Disposition:</b>
<b>1447</b> Request Thomas Mullen to address Council regarding Graffiti Removal Project complaint (Communication)		<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>1448</b> Request Bruce Broussard to address Council regarding Portland Public Schools and the budget (Communication)		<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>TIME CERTAINS</b>		
<b>1449 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM</b> – Accept report of Inter Bureau Problem Solving Task Force (Report introduced by Mayor Potter)  <b>Motion to accept the Report:</b> Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman.  (Y-5)		<b>ACCEPTED</b>
<b>1450 TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM</b> – Operation HOME/Minority Homeownership Campaign briefing (Presentation introduced by Mayor Potter)		<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>

<p><b>1451 TIME CERTAIN: 10:30 AM</b> – Adopt changes to the City New Transit Supportive Residential or Mixed Use Development property tax exemption program (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter; amend Chapter 3.103)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendment to Section 3.103.040, Public Benefits, between 3.103.040.D.10 and D.11, by adding the following: “3.103.040.D.11. Transportation improvements above those required by development standards approved by Portland Office of Transportation and the Planning Commission”:</b> Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-5)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendment to require that every year the project submit a financial statement:</b> Moved by Commissioner Leonard and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman. (Y-5)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendment to require that an applicant provide three public benefit options for the public benefit options list instead of one:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-5)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendment to add a public benefit option to the lists of public benefit options that an applicant must provide in exchange for the tax exemption that reads: “An agreement to sell off-street parking spaces separate from condominium units so that a unit can be purchased without a parking space”:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Sten. (Y-3, Adams, Leonard absent)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendment to add the area around SW Barbur and Terwilliger Boulevards that includes the Burlingame Fred Meyer site to the TOD program boundary and add the Hillsdale Town Center to the TOD program boundary:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Sten. (Y-4, Adams absent)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED NOVEMBER 8, 2006 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1452</b> Limit the cumulative value of new projects applied for under the New Transit Supportive Residential or Mixed Use Development tax exemption program to limit the amount of property tax revenue foregone to the City of Portland and other taxing jurisdictions (Resolution introduced by Mayor Potter)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>36453</b></p>
<p><b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b></p>	

November 1, 2006

**Mayor Tom Potter**

**Bureau of Planning**

**1453** Approve annexation of property to the City in case number A-2-06 at intersection of SE Powell Boulevard and SE 124th Avenue (Ordinance)

**PASSED TO  
SECOND READING  
NOVEMBER 8, 2006  
AT 9:30 AM**

**Police Bureau**

**\*1454** Accept a \$60,000 grant for DUII program enforcement from the Oregon Association Chiefs of Police (Ordinance)  
(Y-5)

**180551**

**\*1455** Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Washington County to adjust the fees for access to the Portland Police Data System (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 51817)  
(Y-5)

**180552**

**1456** Delegate authority to the Chief of Police to execute Intergovernmental Agreements in support of law enforcement training (Second Reading Agenda 1421)  
(Y-5)

**180553**

**1457** Delegate authority to the Chief of Police to execute Intergovernmental Agreements to provide other law enforcement agencies with access to the Portland Police Data System (Second Reading Agenda 1422)  
(Y-5)

**180554**

**Commissioner Sam Adams**

**Bureau of Environmental Services**

**1458** Authorize a contract and provide for payment for the construction of the South Airport Sanitary Sewer System Phase 3 Project No. 6792 (Second Reading Agenda 1424)  
(Y-5)

**180555**

**1459** Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Education Service District 112 for Enviro-Corps crew revegetation services for the Watershed Revegetation Program (Second Reading Agenda 1425)  
(Y-5)

**180556**

**November 1, 2006**

<b>1460</b> Authorize a contract with Brown and Caldwell for engineering services for the rehabilitation of the Multnomah section of the Fanno Basin Pump Station pressure main Project No. 8294 (Second Reading Agenda 1426)  (Y-5)	<b>180557</b>
<b>1461</b> Authorize a contract with Kennedy/Jenks Consultants for professional engineering services for the Balch Consolidation Conduit Project No. 5510 and provide for payment (Second Reading Agenda 1427)  (Y-5)	<b>180558</b>
<b>Office of Transportation</b>  <b>1462</b> Authorize a competitive bidding process for construction of street improvements to portions of NE 117 <sup>th</sup> Avenue from Halsey Street to Holladay Street (Ordinance)	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 8, 2006 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b>  <b>Parks and Recreation</b>  <b>1463</b> Accept a grant from Multnomah County in the amount of \$243,516 for operation of an integration program for senior citizens who have developmental disabilities (Second Reading Agenda 1432)  (Y-5)	<b>180559</b>
<b>1464</b> Authorize Master License Agreement with LCW Wireless, LLC for wireless communications antenna sites (Second Reading Agenda 1433)  (Y-5)	<b>180560</b>
<b>1465</b> Authorize Individual Site License Agreement with LCW Wireless, LLC for their use of a portion of the Children's Museum in Washington Park for wireless communication purposes (Second Reading Agenda 1434)  (Y-5)	<b>180561</b>
<b>Commissioner Erik Sten</b>  <b>Bureau of Housing and Community Development</b>	

November 1, 2006

<p><b>*1466</b> Extend contract with Herbert &amp; Louis, LLC and increase payment by \$10,000 to expand evaluation services for the Economic Opportunity Initiative (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 35655)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p><b>180562</b></p>
<p><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b></p> <p><b>1467</b> Accept bid of J.P. Contractors, Inc. for the Holly Farm Park Improvements for \$703,245 (Purchasing Report – Bid No.105333)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept the Report:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Sten.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT</b></p>
<p><b>*1468</b> Amend the FY 2006-07 budget to appropriate \$165,000 to the Bureau of Housing and Community Development to provide a grant for women's shelter services (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter, Commissioner Leonard and Commissioner Sten)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendment to add a clause that says granting documents prepared by the Bureau of Housing and Community Development for this purpose must include language consistent with the City of Portland civil rights policies and non-discrimination code:</b> Moved by Commissioner Sten and seconded by Commissioner Leonard.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>180563</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>Mayor Tom Potter</b></p> <p><b>Office of Management and Finance – Purchases</b></p> <p><b>*1469</b> Approve a contract specific special procurement authorizing the City to execute an agreement with Sempra Energy Solutions to purchase electricity using the open access shopping credit as permitted under Code Section 5.33.220 (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>180564</b></p>
<p><b>Office of Management and Finance – Technology Services</b></p> <p><b>1470</b> Amend contract with MetroFi, Inc. to change utility charge provision for operation of WIFI components (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 52700)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 8, 2006 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>

**November 1, 2006**

<b>1471</b> Amend contract with Structured Communication Systems, Inc. to provide equipment and software required to implement an enterprise Storage Area Network (Second Reading Agenda 1441; amend Contract No. 40890)  (Y-4)	<b>180565</b>
<b>Commissioner Sam Adams</b>  <b>Office of Transportation</b>  <b>1472</b> Assess benefited properties for street improvements in the NE 148th Avenue Local Improvement District (Hearing; Ordinance; C-10008)	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 8, 2006 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>1473</b> Vacate a portion of SW Broadway Drive east of SW Davenport Street, subject to certain conditions and reservations (Second Reading Agenda 1442; VAC-10026)  (Y-4)	<b>180566</b>
<b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b>  <b>Parks and Recreation</b>  <b>1474</b> Direct Portland Parks and Recreation to work with the Office of Management and Finance to provide analysis and funding strategies for the service zones facilities development as directed by the City Council and to return to Council with recommendations (Resolution)	<b>CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 8, 2006 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>1475</b> Portland Parks and Recreation Feasibility Study for the Development of Services Zones Facilities Report (Report)	<b>CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 8, 2006 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>*1476</b> Authorize payment to Pacific Talent (Ordinance)  (Y-4)	<b>180567</b>

At 1:51 p.m., Council recessed.

**November 1, 2006**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,  
OREGON WAS HELD THIS **1ST DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2006** AT 2:00 P.M.

Due to the length of the morning session, the meeting was rescheduled to start at 2:15 p.m.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Potter, Presiding; Commissioners Adams, Leonard, Saltzman and Sten, 5.

Commissioner Leonard arrived at 2:32 p.m.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Linly Rees, Deputy City Attorney; and John Holly, Sergeant at Arms.

	<b>Disposition:</b>
<b>*1477 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Authorize a contract with Ariston Consulting and Technologies, Inc. to provide systems integration and implementation services for the Enterprise Business Systems Project Phase 2 (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter)  (Y-5)	<b>180568</b>
<b>*1478</b> Amend contract with SAP Public Services, Inc. to provide Enterprise Resource Planning system software and implementation training services for the Enterprise Business Systems Project team (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter; amend Contract No. 36718)  (Y-5)	<b>180569</b>
<b>*1479</b> Amend contract with Pacific Consulting Group, Inc. to provide Quality Assurance services for Phase 2 of the Enterprise Business Systems Project (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter; amend Contract No. 35627)  (Y-5)	<b>180570</b>
<b>*1480</b> Approve pay rates for a classification for a specific period of time during which the classification will be designated a controlled class as provided by Human Resources Administrative Rules for Enterprise Business Systems Project Manager (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter)  (Y-5)	<b>180571</b>
<b>1481</b> Reaffirm Council support for the Enterprise Business System Project and direct City bureaus to continue to support and give high priority to the successful completion of the project (Resolution introduced by Mayor Potter)  (Y-5)	<b>36454</b>

At 2:44 p.m., Council recessed.

**November 2, 2006**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,  
OREGON WAS HELD THIS **2ND DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2006** AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Potter, Presiding; Commissioners Adams, Saltzman  
and Sten, 4.

Commissioner Adams arrived at 2:08 p.m.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Kathryn  
Beaumont, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and John Holly, Sergeant at Arms.

<b>1482 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Accept the report on Natural Areas Acquisition Strategy (Report introduced by Commissioner Saltzman)  <b>Motion to adopt the Report:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Adams.  (Y-4)	<b>Disposition:</b>   <b>ACCEPTED</b>
---	--

At 3:02 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER  
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love  
Clerk of the Council

For a discussion of agenda items, please consult the following Closed Caption File.



**November 1, 2006**  
**Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting**

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast.

Key: \*\*\*\*\* means unidentified speaker.

[ The following text is the byproduct of the closed captioning of this broadcast. The text has not been proofread, and should not be considered a final transcript. ]                   \* \* \*

**NOVEMBER 1, 2006                   9:30AM**

**Potter:** I always ask the community the question, how are the children? And the reason I ask that is that we know that when our children are well, when they're housed, when they have full stomachs, caring adults in their lives, a good education, we know they'll be successful and so will the community. I notice we have some young folks up here. What school are you from?

\*\*\*\*\*: [inaudible]

**Potter:** This morning we do have three young people to talk with us. So could you please come forward? This is in the david douglas school district, and shelly is their teacher, and she's here this morning. Thank you for bringing them. With seem to have some microphone problems. Why don't you go ahead and begin.

**Cameron May:** My name is cameron may, i'm a 12-year-old seventh grader at ron russell middle school. It's an honor for me to speak to the city council. I live in outer southeast Portland between two very busy roads. Southeast division street and southeast powell boulevard. Both of these streets have hit and miss sidewalks and people are constantly running out in front of cars instead of using crosswalks. In my neighborhood there are a lot of kids that play in the street. They have no yards to play in due to the high infill in the area. The other reason is there are no nearby park facilities. The closest one is 20 blocks away. As you probably know, ron russell middle school just opened last year. We had kind of a rough first year but with the positive behavior support or p.b.s. program, we have seen a drastic decrease in the amount of behavior problems around the building. Students are more aware of the expectations and teachers seem happier and more comfortable since the start of the program. However, our school is very crowded. Every classroom is in use and we even have classes in the staff room and on the stage. Ballot measure 2685 proposes to add classrooms on to the neighboring middle school to relieve overcrowding. Some things that would make my neighborhood safer would be to create more park facilities to kids that play on my street have somewhere to government another thing would be to make powell more pedestrian friendly with continuous sidewalks, more frequent crosswalks, and easier accessibility around bus stops. The area around my school could also use some improvement. The intersection of southeast 112th and powell is scary around school dismissal times. Left turn signals at powell and crosswalks at southeast 112th and bush would ease congestion and make getting to ron russell safer. Thank you for allowing me to speak to you today.

**Potter:** I notice the background says you're a transportation fan a phil mickelson.

**May:** M-hmm.

**Potter:** And your special interest is trains? Good. We have a commissioner who's a transportation fanatic as well. This is commissioner sam Adams.

**Adams:** Hi, how are you?

**May:** I'm fine, how are you.

**Adams:** We have an internship in our office. Could I stretch your interest to maybe include trams?  
[laughter]

**November 1, 2006**

**May:** Maybe. I can probably go there.

**Adams:** We'll talk later.

**Leonard:** Shameless.

**Katherine Westmoreland:** My name is catherine, and i'm an eighth grader in the leadership class at ron russell middle school. Our district has been going through many positive changes. We went from two middle schools to three and we changed from having seventh and eighth graders in the building to 6-8. I live in the parkrose area but transferred into david allowing has -- douglas last year because of all the great classes offered. I love to play sports. Our school is get can on its feet after a rough start. David douglas is one of the fastest growing districts in Oregon. So one problem is overcrowding. The problem is also affecting the high school elementary schools, and the other two middle schools. Our school has been making improvements every week. One thing that would make our school more successful, however, would be if we had more money for music and sports scholarships and also for field trips. I think it would -- kids would be more excited about learning from we could have more happened-on experiences. It would also help if we had more after-school activities to keep kids occupied and out of trouble. All in all, our school is in a very safe community. The main thing that would help to keep our school secure would be to expand the area of the school speed zone. Many students walk to and from school and there are quite a few busy streets around it. Thank you all for letting me come and share my thoughts with you today. Hopefully now you have a better understanding of just how the children are doing today.

**Potter:** Thank you very much.

**Adams:** Thank you.

**Thu Pham:** Hi. My name is thu, and i'm an eighth grader at ron russell middle school. As you may know, ron russell is a new school. Our school is a great one with awesome teachers ready to help every kid when they need it. One good thing about a new school is everything in it is brand-new like new desks, library books, and what I love most, the photography equipment. Last year ron russell had a bumpy start. This year we have improved very much with a new pbs program which stand for positive behavior support. P.b.s. Is a program that supports positive behaviors from students choosing to dot right thing and consequences for students not following the rules. Some problems we have at school is that sometimes the buses come late, which causes kids to be tardy for home room. Also, I think our school needs more money for field trips and scholarships for students who want to play sports but can't afford the cost. I live in the david douglas district in the southeast area of Portland. My neighborhood is a safe and quiet one but with houses and apartments being constantly built. I think the houses being built is both a good and bad idea. A good idea because more people will have a place to live but a bad idea because more families will be moving in with kids which will make our district more overpopulated than it already is. As I have said before, my neighborhood is pretty safe but we barely have any street lights. Even at 5:00 p.m. In the winter, it would be pretty dark to walk in without much light to see. With students like me coming home from sports practice or after-school activities, I think it would be safer to put up more street lights. I want to you know, mr. Mayor, it is an honor to talk to you and thank you very much for listening to me.

**Potter:** Thank you. Thank you all. You're very articulate and stated the issues very clearly. I don't think our city council missed any of it. So thank you for being here.

**Adams:** Well done.

**Potter:** Can we give these young folks a hand? [applause] ron russell must be a good school, because you have certainly proved it is. Thank you.

**Adams:** Here's my card. [laughter] [gavel pounded]

**Potter:** City council will come to order. [roll call] prior to offering public testimony to city council, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent. Sam,

**November 1, 2006**

i've been saying this for a long time. Has anybody actually ever said anything at these council meetings where they've declared --

**Adams:** They say i'm an attorney for x.

**Potter:** Ok. Good.

**Adams:** They never say i'm a lobbyist, it's always a consultant or attorney.

**Potter:** Let's start with communication.

**Item 1447.**

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Good morning, sir.

**Potter:** Please state your name for the record.

**Thomas Mullen:** Thomas mullen, i'm a private entity --

**Potter:** Could you please sit down, sir?

**Mullen:** Yes.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Mullen:** I'm a private entity. I got into the graffiti program after seeing you on the news saying that the city had more funds to clean up graffiti that's all over the state of Oregon and stuff that had gotten so out of hand, that the city raised more funds and stuff to attack this program. So therefore, I went out and started looking at the city and seeing that there was a big need for it, to clean up graffiti, where major trucks and equipment was getting vandalized. The equipment had been sitting there, wasn't being used, and should have -- instead of repainting it we should put it back in the recycling system where it should go to, therefore it would be done and fixed once and for all. So that's what we did. I went out and talked to the owner on 122nd, I left a letter for you last week that you should have received stating that -- made an agreement I could go in and clean up the graffiti and cut up the trailer and get it off the property, removing it, and it does meet the criteria, I brought a picture for you showing that it was all graffiti up, and they had homeless people living under it, and you can see the pictures. All the businesses around it, it was adjacent to five other businesses, sporting -- sporting goods, a texaco station, and then there's a detail shop, and then there's also aron tonkin auto that had been vandalized too. So -- but they was all willing to sign an agreement saying they did want that trailer out of there, they had been trying to get it out, and the new owners had not removed it, so therefore he told me to go ahead and remove the trailer and stuff, and he would work with the city, and whatever the city didn't reimburse me for, he would reimburse me for, and that I could have all the scraps, anything I wanted to, and at that time it was the trailer and two cars there. This time I have not received any money from anybody, everybody in this agreement, even though we made it orally and stuff, i've now put it in writing, no one wants to pay me my money. They said that you was wrong for saying it on the news, and they was wrong for not retracting it, and I should have came down and talked to someone. But that was never be indicated on the news, they was saying go ahead and clean it up and that the city would reimburse for the work and labor to make the city more livable.

**Potter:** Who did you talk to at the city?

**Potter:** I --

**Mullen:** I talked to the graffiti coordinator, marjorie somebody, I got her name on one of the letters I brought down to her. At this time she told me to file -- to come back and that graffiti bill does not cover this removal of the truck and stuff, so therefore I should come back and bring it to the board, have it -- have the graffiti bill amended where it do -- where you do offer that services. And I do have the 20-page print out of the graffiti bill, and it does not cover that. And the record wrote -- the director wrote me a letter saying they would like to give that service to the state of Oregon, but we would have to work with the insurance commissioners and stuff and see how we go about writing that off on their insurance and stuff. So therefore, it is in the makings, but they're moving it slow, i'm going down in debt, I have not received any money. I have been working on this since the 2nd of june, and my -- a lot of those tools was rented and I even got burglarized when I was working on

**November 1, 2006**

the site. So now my bills are coming back to me, they want their money now, and they don't want to wait on the city any longer. That's why the urgency for someone to speed this process up. I do want to give that service to the city. I'm trying to work with the schools and the churches and trying to give this statewide service for anybody that wants anything cleaned up, we'll go out and remove it off their property where we won't have to go back and redo that again. But at this time I do have the letter here. I'll get it to you in a second. Mr. King. That's where he told me to go to the small grant organization, also that they might be willing to give me money where the city gave the school so much small money that would help the communities and stuff, where they're -- I attended their meeting also at september 28, and they all like my proposal, and they think it would help the city and stuff, but since they only got 10,000, and they say 200,000, but each section only got 10,000, the biggest lump they got. So they don't have that much money that the city made it out to be. So they're very clifford helm on -- slim on giving me monies, and to ask them for 30,000 or 40,000 to start out is -- that's considerably a lot.

**Potter:** I will look into it, mr. Mullen.

**Mullen:** How do I get back to you sir, once I leave?

**Potter:** We'll get back to you. We have your phone number here, and it's on your sign-up communication request sheet, and i'll look into it and we'll get back to you.

**Mullen:** Thank you, sir.

**Potter:** Please call the next item.

**Item 1448.**

**Bruce:** Bruce broussard, Portland. Mr. Mayor, council, city council men. Again, it's a pleasure giving me the opportunity to speak before you today. In regards to public Portland schools and the like, i'd like to give kudos to cynthia, I notice she's going to be leaving the foundation, and we've not had the opportunity to meet, so I -- at one point I was thinking we could meet, a buffalo soldier and her. So I think she was quite a -- she was quite a contributor to the efforts of trying to counter the gaps, if you will, and some of the educational issues. The point you just recently made in terms of appointing someone on the Portland p.d.c., Portland development commission, someone from the home builders, the trades, the building trades. I thought that was very good. And how this relates to the Portland public schools is that many times we have been trying to duplicate a building trade concept, an apprenticeship, like a grant to other schools, like roosevelt and jefferson high school, maybe there might be an opportunity to put together a piece where some of that work could be dedicated if you will to some of those kinds of programs with kids that have reached the age and gotten into the apprenticeship program, if you will, because that's been a struggle, if you will, trying to develop blue collar work for these kids within this -- within the Portland public schools. So I thank you for being able to acknowledge the fact that you've got someone of that kind of a background on the deal, and it would be a benefit to the other members of the board along that particular line. The other thing i'd like to acknowledge is the fact that don strong came before you the other day, and he was very upset n. All due respect he has a right to be, he loss his job, and so that's still an issue, and at the school system as you know, they've only hired about 100 or so of these people that they fired about 300 or so of these individuals. But you still haven't acknowledged the fact they lost four years of a lot of things, their retirement and things of that nature. So I still think that's on the table so hopefully the school will acknowledge that. That was one of the reasons I was very interested in the new levy, school levy that's coming around. I thought maybe they would have included some sense of a negotiated settlement, and that would have been part and parcel of solving this problem so we can go on. Because we definitely need those specific services and dollars to make sure we get into those classrooms and the cleanliness of the schools. So again, I thank you again for giving me the opportunity to be before you and have a good day.

**November 1, 2006**

**Potter:** Thank you, bruce. Move to the consent agenda. Do any commissioners wish to pull any items from the consent agenda? Does any member of the audience wish to pull an item from the consent agenda? Hearing none, please call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [gavel pounded] please read the 9:30 time certain.

**Item 1449.**

**Potter:** The interbureau task force was formed by council resolution last winter. This was modeled on a program commissioner Leonard started several years ago. What we wanted to do is make it more formal because it really is a problem-solving activity, and the resolution responds to ongoing concerns we had with single room occupancy buildings in the central city. These concerns included crime issues, housing code violations, fire and safety issues. The single room occupancy properties were addressed through a separate process. We decided the task force model that included community and government stakeholders would work effectively in areas that also experience complex and persistent crime and livability issues. By engaging government offices that may not normally see issues from a public safety perspective, and including the neighborhood and finding solution, ibtf breaks down silos and improves safety for everybody. Council directed they give an annual report, and this is the first ibtf report.

**Jeremy Van Keuren, Mayor Potter's Office:** I'd like to introduce carolina, who lives in the cully neighborhood, and also eva, who also lives in the cully neighborhood. And stephanie and I are the cochairs of the ibtf. As the mayor explained, the purpose of the task force is to improve livability and reduce crime in areas of the city where these issues have had a significant impact and have resisted more traditional problem-solving methods through regular police work, participation by o.n.i. Crime prevention, and public safety action committees. The task force itself has nine members, including stephanie and i. Our report will explain in detail how we receive recommendations and on which crime problems are geographic areas the task force decides to work in once an area is selected, we work with government and community stakeholders to get to the root causes of the issues of these neighborhoods. And then we form action plans to abate those nuisances. At this time we are currently working in two areas in the vicinity of northeast failing and garfield, and the vicinity of northeast cully and killingsworth. And the cully projects is the larger of the two the task force is working on right now. Both in scope and in area. The map can give you an idea of the location, the area inside the red line is the ibtf project area. The report includes action plans for both ibtf areas and they are exhaustive. The cully action plan, for example, includes 34 different strategies. The strategies themselves are diverse in terms of their objectives and their scope. In some instances where -- we're working with property owners to improve public safety and in other cases we're trying to improve access to city services for the residents of those neighborhoods. We'd like to point out a few highlights of some of our strategies and what we've accomplished and what we're attempting to accomplish.

**Stephanie Reynolds, Office of Neighborhood Involvement:** On the eastern end of the ibtf area are the ara vista apartments. In the past was a source of livability complaints such as housing code violations, crime issues such as gang and drug activity. The apartments have recently come under new ownership and the owner has been very cooperative in working on these issues with us. The police and the bureau of development services. Over the past four months he has evicted tenants who were dealing drugs, has improved the lighting and made other safety improvement was crime prevention's help and has agreed to screen future tenants, and additionally has agreed to attend landlord training. He also allowed our partners at the Oregon council for hispanic advancement to bring the youth community together to paint a mural on the wall at the apartments facing killingsworth. And this is a picture of that mural.

**Potter:** Where is this located?

**November 1, 2006**

**Reynolds:** It's on killingsworth at about 70th, and maybe 69th, and it's on the south side of the street. It's a beautiful mural.

**Van Keuren:** Very close to the ortiz center. Also as part of our crime prevention strategy we have been looking to improve street lighting in the cully area. For example, we've worked with odot to secure better lighting at the intersection of northeast cully and Portland highway. We would like to begin working with pdot to find solutions for this particular stretch of northeast 65th. The problem with this stretch of northeast 67th is that there's no street lighting along this very underdeveloped road, and this attracted significant crime activity. In fact, stephanie and I when we've been out on night patrols with the police have witnessed firsthand suspicious activity and drug -- what appear to be drug transactions. Fairly persistently. Also as a major part of our strategies we're working with hacienda c.d.c.

**Reynolds:** Hacienda c.d.c. owns most of the rental property in this neighborhood. They own two apartment complexes within the ibtf area and just outside of the ibtf area to the west is another apartment complex that has sort of by default be wrapped into the project. On the west end of the of ibtf area and on the east end of the ibtf area are the two that we've worked with the most. Probably the most important collaboration the task force has is with hacienda. We're working on a partnership with them that will outline expectations between themselves and our emergency responders, teaming with them time prove public safety and security on these properties and to help their residents access government services. We're still in the discussion stages of this partnership agreement but we expect to have it completed by the end of this calendar year. At this time i'd like to go ahead and reintroduce our special guests who are here to talk about life in the cully neighborhood and what it's like there. So on the far end we have car lena -- carolina, and eva. We invited them here today to talk to you about their experiences living there.

**Potter:** Thank you for being here. When you speak, please state your name.

**Carolina Gomez:** My name is carolina, and I work with income property management and hacienda c.d.c. And with the management company, and we are trying to solve all the problems with the laws we have, and we can handle, law and regulations, and all the landlord things we are already trained. But there are things we can't cover. That's the crime prevention and the police issues. So we are doing as much as we can, but we still have gang activity, and it includes graffiti, drugs, prostitution, and we are trying to evict and do whatever we can do to have the problem solved. But there are some things we can't do, and that's why we're here trying to ask for your help to do prevention, that these will solve a lot of our problems. And eva, i'm going to translate for her because she doesn't speak english, she's one of our first residents, and she -- and all the residents are helping us because we are work can with them, the neighborhood watch program with crime prevention, trying to help the community, trying to involve the community to call the police when they have to do it, or to inform the management, and we are trying to solve all the issues. And eva is one of our residents, and she is been living there and she's been -- she's -- all the problems we had and she is trying to help us help us fix this problem.

**Translator:** My name is eva, it's the first time i'm here in these kind of meetings. One of the big issues I want to solve to my community is the gang activities and the drugs that come with it. One of the big issues that she wants to talk about is the graffiti, the gangs are doing graffiti all around the neighborhood, apartments, even cars, they break the windows and they are doing a lot of vandalism, even if they don't have things to -- they are just breaking windows, just because. And one of the issues is that they are trying to get more people involved and they are talking to our kids, including her kids. She has two kids. These gang members are trying to invite some of their kids to their gangs, and that's one of the issues she's having. And they are selling drugs, and they are offering drugs to the kids. And that's the problem, she snows. -- knows. She is always in her -- in their bags so she's trying to look for things, and that's why she knows all these problems. And these gang members came angry with her because she's always taking care of the kids, but she doesn't

**November 1, 2006**

care, she's looking for her kids. And they -- she wants to know if we can do something about it, and -- because some of these kids don't want to go back to school, and they are missing school, they don't want to go back. And they just don't go to school, they want to be with the gang members and they want to be involved with those activities. So they are supposed to be in school, and when she comes, they are not in school, they are with the gang members. That will be all.

**Potter:** Could you ask her how old her children are?

**Gomez:** One 14 and one 11.

**Potter:** Is the 11-year-old also -- do they try to get the 11-year-old into gang activities?

**Gomez:** : He is still going to school, but he wants to avoid it. But she's trying to handle -- he's easier than the other one. One girl was trying to get him in drugs yesterday, in the complex in northeast Portland.

**Potter:** Is this the 11-year-old?

**Gomez:** The 11-year-old. And she knew about this yesterday. [cell phone ringing]

**Gomez:** [Eva] She wants to know if the mayor can do something about those kids, to not miss school and to try to tell them not to go to gangs.

**Potter:** Go ahead, jeremy.

**Reynolds:** I just wanted to take this moment to emphasize that the residents themselves are doing a great deal to try to combat the problems that exist in the neighborhood. They've started neighborhood watches, they meet on a regular basis, they talk a lot to management. They're just tremendously energized around this issue, so it's nice to work with them.

**Potter:** Are there any youth activities in that area, clubs, after-school groups?

**Van Keuren:** Unfortunately there's not enough. The ortiz center is there, and I do believe they provide some services. We did recently obtain some funding for ibtf, and we'd like to spend some of that money on youth programs, but there is a real derth of youth programs in this particular neighborhood. We're hoping that if we can get cully park open, we've heard from a lot of residents they need a place to play soccer, I think that would be a great contribution just for an example.

**Potter:** I know that river school is one of the s.u.n. Schools, so they have programs there to work with parents. I don't know if ---- I think that probably is not the school that her children go to.

**Van Keuren:** I don't believe that river is. Hacienda also just recently hired someone -- recently just hired someone on their team to work on youth outreach programs as well. So moving from cully, there are two areas that we're working in. Aside from cully we're also working in the --

**Potter:** Before we continue, I just wanted to let eva know that i'm also the commissioner of police and I will convey her concerns to the police chief about what gangs are doing in your apartment complex. So thank you for coming in today. Now go ahead.

**Van Keuren:** After -- we were asked to take on northeast failing and garfield, in that vicinity, and after we took this recommendation we actually recognized several community initiatives that were ongoing through neighborhood groups and o.n.i. Crime prevention that were already very effectively addressing some of the problems in the area. So we decided to offer more of a support role to the groups that were working here instead of the more direct intervention role we've had inside of cully. As with the cully plan, our action plan does appear in the report for failing and garfield mostly what we've been doing to support these efforts has been to fight drug dealing in the area. So give you an example of what we've been doing, the district attorney's office came to us with a state statute that permits them to get tougher penalties for drug dealers if they deal within 1,000 feet of a school. There is a school in this particular ibtf area which is mccoys academy. The trick with the statute is that the drug dealer has to know he or she was dealing within 1,000 feet of a school before the district attorney can obtain the tougher penalties. So to -- to facilitate that we've been working with the police, and any time they pick up a drug dealer within this area to convey to them they were within 1,000 feet of a school and to document that conversation, and then if they're picked up a second time, the district attorney can obtain the tougher penalties. And also to help this

**November 1, 2006**

move forward with the district attorney's advice, we're -- we've asked pdot to install signs like this one around the school of the this is to duplicate a similar strategy that the police have done with one of the parks in the area.

**Reynolds:** The task force has been working in the cully -- in cully neighborhood and around failing and garfield since early april. And we will continue to work in these areas until the action plans are completely implemented. And we expect to take new recommendations in spring of next year, spring of 2007. At that time we will also review what we did and consider what work and what did not work. By the time we report to council next year, we will revisit cully and failing and garfield and evaluate the results of the action plans we're implementing now.

**Van Keuren:** That's what we have to report terror now. If there are any questions or comments, we'd certainly like to hear from you.

**Potter:** Could you talk about what your outcomes are for your activities? Has it reduced calls to the area, is it to ensure children such as eva's children are not going to be gang affected? What are your goals?

**Reynolds:** We certainly want to see numbers go down, though one of the things we found especially in the cully areas, people are reluctant to call the police. So we actually expect to see numbers go up for a little while and hopefully in the long run come down. I'm interested in fear of crime going down in the neighborhoods, so we're looking on to do a survey to determine how residents in the neighborhood feel about things as they are around the time we're done as compared to before we started.

**Adams:** Is there a way to get the transportation-related items pulled out, sent to me, and I can advocate with pdot?

**Van Keuren:** Certainly. And we've also been talking with your staff. I'll follow up with her more after this.

**Saltzman:** Are you also in contact with parks people?

**Van Keuren:** I've been talking with the mayor and the mori know has also been -- talked with you about thomas cally park and zari. There's no community center nearby, unfortunately in this area, and that's sort of an obstacle that we're grappling with at the moment.

**Saltzman:** Does the ortiz center offer any afternoon-evening activities?

**Reynolds:** I don't know the exact schedule, but they do have a computer lab and a homework club that meets there.

**Gomez:** I think they do only meetings for the community. So if they can schedule I think they will -- they have to schedule with time.

**Saltzman:** One of our budget conversation assist to provide more programming for kids, particularly teenagers throughout the city. So this seems like an area that we should definitely be looking at if the council approves that.

**Reynolds:** I think that would be great. One of the things that's been surprising to me in working in this area is how young some of the teenagers are that are getting involved in the gangs. So I think it would be especially important to have great really appealing programming for kids, you know, 11 to --

**Saltzman:** It's not all homework clubs, but it's things they like to do.

**Potter:** Commissioner?

**Leonard:** I'm a little worried about this report. I want to explain why. The origin of this was a property that was multihousing piece of property in northwest Portland that had been to describe it as a nuisance is unfair to the word nuisance. A center of crime and variety of ill lisit activity housed people who in the middle of a very stable northwest neighborhood in two house that's were connected by a breezeway people who were subsidized from the state and county because of a variety of mental illnesses, the police came to me, this has been three years ago, I think that this happened, so before -- the neighbors are frustrated, people in the house routinely urinate on the



**November 1, 2006**

roofs of the houses next door. They victimize the people, steal their medications, they sell drugs. I went to the fire bureau and they had unusually high calls at this place. We looked at the records from b.d.s.'s perspective, and they had been ongoing with fines and liens for a number of years, and we did some analysis of the income of the property owner and determined he found it in his financial best interest to pay the fines and because of the high rents he was getting off these poor souls that were living there who were having their checks signed right over to the residents from the county and he found it in his best interest to pay the fines and not fix the problems. We formed a group that was a little broader than what this January 24 memorandum includes. It did include a person from the mayor's office, the police bureau, o.n.i. But also very importantly the fire bureau. Was left out of this mix. And the idea was to target that property and make life so uncomfortable for the owner he found that it was in his best interest now to fix the property or sell it. I could bore with you the ongoing six months of activities that occurred there, but they were aggressive, they were on the edge, and often times the city attorney had to leave the room because they were uncomfortable with the direction they were giving inspectors to take to in property. Six months later the property owner sold the house and resolved the problem for the first time in nearly 30 years. We had a similar issue in northwest Portland with three different properties owned by a single resident occupancy properties that -- of some of the most challenged people in our community, not unlike this other property I'm talking about, but these were in old town. We took the same kind of approach, very aggressive, includes having the attorney come in to my office meeting with myself and the police bureau and said, we have three properties that it feels like you're picking on us because it doesn't seem to be happening to us, and I said, you figured it out. We're picking on you. And we'll continue to pick on you until you either fix these problems or sell the property. And they decided to fix the property. So they invested tens of thousands if not hundreds of thousands of dollars because they were tired of basically us targeting them. What I'm worried about is this has -- is my greeting to more of a -- migrating to folks, a committee that meets -- so, for example, historically a police officer goes into one of these buildings, and this is something I'm familiar with from my days in the fire bureau. They have very limited access into some of the areas of the buildings that are not common areas because of fourth amendment issues. The fire bureau does not. They can gain access for fire code violations that the police can't. And then you add to the mix the housing inspectors that increases the eyes of the city inside these buildings. So when we team them together, and I'm speaking of Jeff Meyers, I don't know if he's here today about this, but he was kind of central in making this thing work, it gave him authorities and abilities that he hadn't had up to that point, because of this kind of synergy of all these various agencies working together. So I'm a little worried we've lost that in this.

**Van Keuren:** There was a mini-mart across from one of the properties in the IBTF area that was consistently selling drug paraphernalia, and folks at Hacienda had tried to talk to the owner of this place, and they refused to stop selling drug paraphernalia. There were gangs, they were holding barbecues on the parking lot and attracting crime activity. So our response to that, our initial response was to work with the OLCC and the OLCC visited this gas station every single week, walking in there saying, you need to stop selling drug paraphernalia, you need to do this, you need to do this, and by the time the OLCC was finished, we walked in and he instantly -- he instantly decided to cooperate with us and now we have a partnership agreement with him. Our perspective on this is not only should we obtain compliance from enforcement, but also through cooperation and partnership agreements and by working with community. Because once we leave we need to make sure the eyes of the community are on these places and are making sure that they keep the ground that we gain with all the compliance we've received.

**Leonard:** Ok. This idea -- everything you said is a good idea, and you should do that whether this task force exists or not. There's nothing that limits our offices from development strategies to deal with particular problem places. But this group got together for however specific addresses that

**November 1, 2006**

were place that's people lived that there was criminal activity associated with. And there's a list of them throughout the city. In are more than we can possibly do. And the idea was to go from address to address to address, employing these same folks, fire and others, and you're describing a different situation, more of a commercial retail. That was not how this was set up. It was for places where people lived that had become eyesores and neighborhoods that the government has put up its hands and said we have done everything we can. This task force was charged with going toll property to property, whether they're apartments or -- we had a similar incident on holgate with a single family dwelling that ended up for the first time in I think 10 years being the house shut down, the man put in jail, board up and I think the house is in the process of being sold. That was the idea. So I like what you're describing, but that's not what i'm worried about having the mission be so broad it loses -- loses the potency.

**Gomez:** Can I answer that? One of the things is not only the commercial part of it, our problem was all the kids and all the gang members were just in the gas station all day and in front of the gas station there's tri-met bus station. So the traffic in between those two was awful. So nobody wanted to rent it, so it became our problem. The community problem. So if we called in to fix a problem, the problem was going --

**Leonard:** Don't misunderstand what i'm saying. Everything that happened in that instance should have happened. There should be strategies other than this group had a very specific focus and a very specific task and everything that happened there should have happened as it did. I agree with that. What happens in these task forces is sometimes they get -- their mission gets so broad they sometimes lose the focus of what created them in the first place.

**Reynolds:** I don't think that's what's happening here. I think the time limits of this presentation haven't allowed us to go into detail about how terrible things were in this area, and it wasn't just a single specific location in the cully area. As we looked into it there would be times there would be graffiti on the sidewalks, in the bushes, people's cars, some people had not slept in their beds because they were afraid of being shot through the walls. Parents wouldn't let their children out --

**Leonard:** We're having a problem here. You're putting me in a position that I don't agree. All of the things do you to abate those problems you should continue doing. The idea of this group was not to deal with those issues, they should be worked on, focused on, but what happens is the focus becomes this broader mission that other agencies shut focus on and not these really horrible house that's are in neighborhoods or operates -- apartments that this was designed to go in and fix for the first time sometimes in over two decades. That's what i'm hearing that's bothering me, not that I disagree with one thing you're saying.

**Reynolds:** I hear that. What i'm trying to say is when we first went in, when we first started taking nominations for place that's were problematic, what initially came to us was the specific apartment building clara vista. What we heard is the things I was just describing, people being very fearful, lots of property damage, a lot of problems. When we looked more into it we realized this doesn't exist only at this complex this, is part after broader problem in a bigger geographic area, and yes, it has been more complicated to focus on a larger area to solve the problems, but we're going to have a more lasting solution than we would if we had only focused on the one location. So I --

**Leonard:** I think you should do exactly what you're doing, but I think you've lost the potency by not holding the property owner accountable at those apartments, and forcing changes on the property -- that was the whole idea behind this, is to focus in on one person is say, yeah, but there are other problems in the neighborhood, because they always say that, and there's graffiti, and you should deal with that. And it's ease I to lose the focus on who you're going after.

**Potter:** I'd like are terror say something. I disagree, commissioner. I think this group is using the same principles in terms of problem-solving versus just going after it within your particular sphere of responsibility, and applying as many resources to the problem. I don't think it's losing focus, I think it's understanding that this problem is perhaps bigger than a single house, and that in order to

**November 1, 2006**

really fix the problem at that particular house, you have to really address the issues that are going on in the neighborhood. In this particular instance, what we heard is that these gang members are hanging out at a store, but they're also going after eva's children. And this is a much larger social issue than the issue that you initially started off with. Your program works very well on single houses. In terms of how we look at a neighborhood, a different approach is required, but the same principles apply. Do you in to solve a problem and you use different bureaus to work together in order to create a solution. So it's just two different ways of doing the same thing.

**Leonard:** I'm saying they shouldn't be mutually exclusive. It can be two separate efforts doing the same thing with the same time, but not losing the focus that -- everything you're saying I agree with, and should happen, and it should happen with the same people. It shouldn't be under this heading of this group. It should be a separate charge to do that broader issue. I'm afraid of losing -- the reason we did pass this resolution, mayor s. Because we were successful on properties that had evaded cleaning themselves up for 20 years or more. That's why we did this. And so we're now kind of changing the mission. I'm just worried of losing that focus.

**Van Keuren:** I also wanted to add, i'm sorry if I misunderstood your original question, there's a component of that problem solving in our mission. For example, when we first came in here we spoke with the police and we asked them, what are the problem properties? Where are the focal points in this neighborhood? And they gave us a list and we asked them, please flag these properties any time you get a police call. The reason why we did that is because we -- through ibtf we've been helping to repair the chronic nuisance process, and if we get to a point where there's a particular property, a specific address that other problem-solving methods don't work, through collaboration or what have you, we refer to the chronic nuisance process. And we have a list of those properties and we're keeping an eye on them. We don't include them in the report for -- just so we -- with don't like to be explicit about picking on anyone necessarily, but they know that we're in the neighborhood and that we're working.

**Leonard:** I guess to finish this up, that's where I disagree, that's how it became effective, because we acknowledged we were picking on them.

**Van Keuren:** We acknowledged to them we're picking on them. We just don't like to broadcast it.

**Leonard:** I do. [laughter] it helps create pressure for them to do different behaviors than what they've been doing.

**Potter:** Were you folks through with your presentation?

**Van Keuren:** Yes. If there's any --

**Potter:** Are there any questions from the other commissioners?

**Adams:** I think it's very impressive, and I want my folks at b.e.s. And r.a.c. And transportation to do everything we can to support your efforts. So through jane I look forward to following up on the ideas that are in my area of responsibility.

**Sten:** Are we voting on this?

**Potter:** We have to accept the report.

**Saltzman:** I just wanted to -- I think it's great, and I wanted to thank carolina and ava for being here to provide firsthand perspectives. I did want to echo the mayor's comments. Are you intending to stay with these two focus areas for now, and then how do we know when we're successful?

**Van Keuren:** That's a good question. As the mayor, one of the questions the mayor asked, are we looking to reduce calls to the police in the area. And the answer is that is one way we would like to measure success. At least a year from now. Because also stephanie explained, we expect calls to spike at least initially and then the strategies that we have in place will show that those calls level out. The other thing we would like to do with our partners at hacienda is survey the residents and get a sense from them how they feel about crime in the area and their fear of crime in the area. And we believe we'll be prepared to give those results next year.

**November 1, 2006**

**Saltzman:** You're going to focus on cully and the failing-garfield area.

we're going to stay there until we feel satisfied our action plans have been implemented. We're hoping to be done at least with those action plans i'd say spring, next year, and then we'll move on to other areas.

**Gomez:** And to add to this, as we are working on education, we are trying to educate our residents to call the police, that's why they are saying that the calls may increase in a little bit, because this problem is being growing, because the people is not calling police. They see crime and they don't do anything about it. They're just afraid of calling, because a lot of our residents are hispanics and there's a lot of things involved with this that they don't call the police. So we are trying to tell -- train them and tell them it's ok to call the police, if you see that something is happening, call the police, and that's what we are working right now with the neighborhood watch program, and we are having training for 9-1-1 calls. So we are trying to handle all the issues in the -- people call the police, and they said, in the future we want those calls in lower level, but not because they don't want to call, is because of crime has stopped.

**Van Keuren:** I spoke with the police two days ago, and I asked them how the calls were looking, and they said they're higher because we've been doing -- because of ibtf, we've been doing directed drug missions in these neighborhoods. So your drug offenses are up, but it's because we've been working on it harder.

**Potter:** Other questions? This is a report to council. I need a motion to accept the report.

**Adams:** So moved.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Potter:** Call the vote.

**Adams:** I want to thank you for your good work. I can imagine sometimes tedious, frustrating, and exacting, but I think it's very important. I live in a neighborhood that is one of the poorer neighborhoods in the city that when we get true lasting results it's that we've gone after both the problems and the opportunities from a variety of different angles. And I think that's in keeping with that spirit. I want to thank commissioner Leonard for some of the inspiration and congratulate mayor Potter for continuing to pursue this, and thank all of you. Aye.

**Leonard:** Aye.

**Saltzman:** This is good work. I thank the mayor for forming the ibtf. Following commissioner Leonard's model. I think it does provide a great way for us to try to get all of our bureaus, and I hope we're working with county and state resources to really focus in on areas. That was -- I served on the county commission when one of the complexes was first launched, and a lot of the same principles that we thought of then are very much at work today. And so this is good work. Thank again to both of you, and pleased to vote aye.

**Sten:** I also want to thank, and thank mayor Potter and commissioner Leonard. This is very good. I was staffing the project by the galaxy apartments about 12 years ago, and I think this might be an area, there's quite a few, there's a lot of needs and I think the work you're doing isn't position without hacienda buying those projects. You can't even start -- the galaxy apartments that hacienda took over got 1% of the police calls in the city the year before hacienda bought it. I think mayor Potter was chief at the time, so he was probably on some of those calls. In one way or another. But I think the next step there to make this work, and I completely agree with the sense that the commissioner Leonard is making, we have to poke on every house and push, but you don't do the big picture stuff and solve the problem. You make solving the problem possible. But this is an area where it strikes me after last council retreat, commissioner Saltzman is working on strategies for -- for more after-school programs, i'm working on strategies around tying schools and housing policy together better as well as development, and we're about to have a presentation on minority homeownership. It seems to me this is an area where we now need to do the next I think big strategy. Maybe it's more dispersed, but this area is crying out for thinking like what happened at

**November 1, 2006**

new columbia, where you try and bring all the pieces together, get more homeownership in place, focus on making sure the schools have the resources and tie it to the work that you guys are doing. And it wouldn't have been possible if we had not done the acquisition with the community of the apartments, but I think the next step is almost to see this as almost a broader campus in which we need to do a couple of more physical strategies to then back up the organizing and human strategies that are going a and they're tied with the parks bureau. This is something i'd like to see if we could build on as a council initiative, and show how you get to the next level which again, couldn't be possible without your work. So I thank you. Aye.

**Potter:** Thanks, folks, for all the hard work you're doing. To you folks who live in the cully neighborhood, we want you to know that we are going to be looking at cully, we are going to be focusing resources there. I know that commissioner Adams has had meetings out in cully regarding transportation. I know sidewalks and streets are an important issue. I know having recreational opportunities there instead of having to take a bus to some other place to play soccer is important. That's why I place a lot of hope in supporting commissioner Saltzman's effort to try to create more opportunities in some of the communities that are park deficient and service deficient. So thank you for bringing this to our attention. Thank you for working on it, and I look forward to hearing the next report. Aye. [gavel pounded]

**Item 1450.**

**Potter:** Commissioner Sten and I are happy to be bringing an update to council on the efforts of the operation h.o.m.e., it stand for homeownership and minority equity. There is no council action required on this, it's just a briefing to inform you about the progress on this issue. We all know that homeownership is part of the american dream, and is connected to family and neighborhood stability, educational success, and wealth creation, and that this dream has been out of the reach for many people in Portland, especially in our african-american, latino, asian pacific islander and native american communities. They have been left out of the homeownership opportunities. So we know we can do things better here in Portland, and that this is one step that we can take to work specifically with groups of people who are underrepresented in homeownership, and assure they have a chance to achieve the american dream. With that, p.d.c. is the lead agency and go ahead and begin your presentation.

**Andy Welch, Portland Development Commission:** Good morning, andy welch, Portland development commission. I'm pleased to have two of our key partners, michael sorensen, antoinette, i'm going to do a really brief overview for you all and turn it over to michael to take the next steps. Two goals of today is provide you with the information, the overview on the operation home program, and then to share the activities to date and move forward into the next steps. The operation h.o.m.e. is a citywide community action campaign. Focused exclusively and actively on creating strategies to reduce barriers to homeownership for minority communities and individuals of color, so they can experience the opportunities of asset ownership, wealth creation in our community. This effort is being chaired by cochaired by mayor Potter, commissioner Sten, their leadership along with a steering committee of 32 business and industry leaders. Specific goals of the operation h.o.m.e., 10-year community and industry supported business plan to close the gap or working on creating that. Inclusion of broad political industry and community ownership and commitment to a sustainable plan that creates the wealth for individuals. And finally, the most concrete goal I mentioned, 13,000 new minority homeowners by 2015. No report clearly identified a distinct and pervasive homeownership gap between white residents of Portland and community individuals, community of color. That gap ranges from 59% for white Portland residents to 40% on average and in many communities of color lower than 40%. That's the issue, that's the problem, that's the problem that we're working to solve, and with that i'm happy to turn over to michael to give us information on the communications they've had, what we're learning, the actions we're taking, I know in your packet of information you have a single sheet of a range of actions that are

**November 1, 2006**

concurrently underway. We're expanding our marketing, we're expanding our production, we're expanding our mandatory inclusion of marketing strategies of communities of color to ensure that those publicly financed for sale units of housing are accessible and open for all minority communities and all individuals in the city. With that, please --

**Antoinette:** Thank you. I know you will read along with me while -- I think it's important to share with you why this was such a valuable process in the community report. It gave an emotional response to all of the intellectual data that's been gathered and read, heard, trashed, thrashed, we've talked with folks that had the real life experiences, community leaders, we had the town halls for the communities that have been addressed, and they had answers, and they were willing to creatively come together to work to have a solution for this very important issue. And I think that what we gained from that was that people are on board, they're excited, and i'll just end because I know time is valuable with this quote. It's a paraphrase, actually. The strength of a nation is in the intelligent and well ordered homes of the people. And I think the strength of this city, and we have this charge and we are excited about this opportunity to work with you.

\*\*\*\*\*: In this process the next slide show is --

**Potter:** State your name for the record.

**Michael Sorenson:** Michael sorenson with community solutions and on operation h.o.m.e. Team today. I believe -- i'll be leading you through the next couple slides before we get to community testimony. This next picture is kind of a bureaucratic wonky picture of how information flows. It specifically addresses the fact we have many folks who are working on this issue at different levels.

We have the steering committee, we have four content committees, and these -- the work will be accountable to the homeownership advisory committee, which has been established long ago. A little bit more about the steering committee, as andy had indicated, there are 32 high-level community and industry leaders participating under the leadership of mayor Potter and commissioner Sten. To hear and thrash through some information that will come from four content committees. Specifically their charge is to hear and review the information that comes from the committees, the good work that comes from those folks on the ground. Next we chose folks to participate here because of their ability to create change, whether it's systems change or bring resources to the recommendations that come forward from the content committees and really folks who have a commitment to addressing the homeownership gap. The next slide talks about the content committees that we've established. We're conducting a parallel process. The steer committee is meeting for six times. The first meeting was an orientation meeting in october, the next meeting will happen at the end of november. But the next meeting will specifically address the issues of marketing and outreach and how we're approaching communities of color from that perspective. The other content committees that will also be occurring, again with this parallel process will be a content committee around education and counselling, one around loans and underwriting and one around affordability. The order here is not necessarily the order that our parallel process will follow. But what we found in our data gathering as well as in our -- the initial parts of our content committee meetings is that as antoinette said, people are exciting about this issue. It's an opportunity to address a concern that is happening across the nation in cities larger than Portland and smaller than Portland, minority homeownership is an important topic, very rarely do you get an opportunity to talk about something as happy as buying a home. So i'm kind of excited about it from that perspective. It's not child abuse and it's not crime, but it's actually creating some permanence for a community and a leg up for folks. And some of the things that the city and p.d.c. have already started with-to-do with regard to this issue, is to increase the investments in homeownership education to increase the investment in community-based marketing. We've been working to target direct and indirect financial assistance. As andy had indicate the we're requiring in the r.f.p.'s that there be specifically some response to how the community-based organizationless address through marketing their -- what's available to the

**November 1, 2006**

communities of color. So they'll be looking both at a general population marketing strategy and then likely focusing on specific communities, trying to do it differently. Which addresses some of the information that we heard before, that people just don't know what's available. The information just isn't reaching communities of color at a credible level. So further financial assistance products, home buyer assistance tools have been created or are in the process of being created, and then looking at increased earning opportunities by requiring women and minority-owned business subcontractors and the contracts that go out for the city as well as through p.d.c. And enforcing that. So we're starting to do some things internally, getting our own house in order in order to be the example for folks out who -- for other industry folks who are also interested in working this issue. With that, I hope that was a good enough overview of where we've been and where we're going, really looking at the unit to -- opportunity to create community swell around this issue. And part of that swell is inviting community testimony, folks who believe in this process and believe in this issue. I'd like to pass it on. The first individual we'd like to bring forward is nicole, the executive director of the native american youth and family center. Also a participant on this steering committee for operation h.o.m.e.

**Sten:** If it makes sense with you, senator margaret carter may be here for. This i'd also like to introduce senator carter and have her come up.

**Potter:** As soon as margaret sits down --

**Margaret Carter:** Good morning. Mr. Mayor, members of the commission. I'm actually here in my role as vice-president of corporate affairs for the scanner newspaper. So the presentation i'm bringing to you today actually the words of mr. Foster, would you care for me to go forward?

**Adams:** Can we say no?

**Potter:** We were having a presentation by the group --

**Saltzman:** In that case --

**Potter:** So do you know how long it is, senator carter?

**Carter:** He might be upset with me, but maybe we can edit it a little.

**Potter:** Please proceed.

**Carter:** Mr. Mayor, I really don't mind waiting until an appropriate time, if this will take too much of the council's time.

**Potter:** Well, as long as you're here, we're always happy to hear from you.

**Carter:** Thank you. I'm margaret carter, and vice-president of corporate affairs for the scanner news group. I live on northeast 10th avenue, Portland, Oregon. I'm here to represent our president, bernie foster, chairman of the african-american alliance for homeownership. Six years ago this organization adopted the -- among african-americans resulting in some 3500 first-time home buyers. And we took at that time what was then considered a bold step not because we believed we could stop this -- solve this problem, but -- a charge for what is right for african-american home buyers, parity and equity. While there are many here who argue for affordable housing, black citizens in this town carry an even greater burden of affordability, discrimination and being ignored by p.d.c., public and private housing sectors. Portland's own homeownership advisory committee report shows the following of black home buyers. And mr. Foster was referring to past relationships because he is now speaking with the president of p.d.c. Director and moving forward on some activity that hopefully will bring these two organizations, this public entity, and african-american home buyers together. Among white and black households -- as much as twice as high for black applicants. I'll just read his first statement, mr. Mayor and commissioners, so that I won't prolong the time. That is why even in a new high end community like south waterfront, low-income renters whether have far more opportunity than upper -- discriminated by race from getting a mortgage. Minority consensus tracks in north and nests Portland have a color line, and it is called subprime lending. The city report noticed of the african-americans that receive loans the vast majority originated by subprime loans compared to white mortgage originations. Subprime loans

**November 1, 2006**

were created to allow high-risk borrowers to buy a home but the racial distortion of the market indicates african-americans can only get ghetto 0 loans without regard to having good credit. One of the examples he sites is a young man, you remember his father, charles cruise who worked so hard as an advocate he has bought a home through the african-american home buyers association, and he's now ready to buy a second home, and he's just 27 years of age. But they have had, through cheryl, who is here today, and if you have any technical information, she's here to give that. I'm just here to bring you mr. Foster's notes. Over the past five years our city has realized historically black communities in Portland paid higher and unequal price for development. African-americans have paid the ultimate price -- gentrification. If you want to stop the forced relocation of african-americans, help them to bay home, homeownership is the only proven tool that can combat gentrification. Mayor Potter and commissioner Sten have launched the operation homeowners and minority equity committee. Its stated purpose is a 10-year initiative to close the gap for communities of color by putting citizens of color in 13,000 homes by 2015. However, the home committee must find resources from grants to loans, to achieve both homeownership and affordability goals. Given this challenge and the goal success isn't likely. Why? The logistics of the plan simply do not pencil out without more resources f we are committed to doing it effectively, he would like for to you consider the following. The goal is 12,600 first-time minority homeowners by 2015. Assuming you have to contact them, screen at least 3,000 families to get the 12,600 goal. Assume it costs \$1,000 per family to provide marketing screening homeownership, education and counseling over the next decade. That's approximately \$60 million. Let's assume the 12,600 successful families will require another \$2500 to get to the closing. That's another 31.5 million over the decade. Lastly, let's assume one-third of the 12,600 families require down payment assistance to chief affordability at a cost of \$15,000 per family. That total is another \$63 million over 10 years. One of the key issues is where to get the estimated 120 million needed to put 13,000 minorities in homes. There are few available resources and source of of grant operating funding for p.d.c. So based on these assumptions, what it might cost to achieve operation home goals is to set out in the chart below. I'm sure have you that before you and I leave that to your reading. But his proposal is something that he would like considered, so the council ignored aaah recommendationing for a dedicated funding for minority homeownership. The council should go on record requiring p.d.c. to death indicate homeownership monies for minority homeownership equity. P.d.c. should focus its housing resources on three broad areas. Down payment assistance, homeownership counselling, predevelopment, and partnership support for african-american development developers. Lastly, cdfi has announced \$3.5 billion allocation of new market tax credits. P.d.c. should go after dedicated new markets fund for minority for sale housing, supporting minority development and small businesses. In closing, the scanner news group supports the goals of for minority homeownership equity. We look forward to working with you to close the racial gap in homeownership. My editorial point, mr. Mayor, and members of the commission, is that I am sure after having nine kids and 26 grandkids who are basically grown in this community, that if I -- their mother was not helping them with down payments on housing, there would be no way even my own children could be homeowners in this city. Somewhere along the line red lining is one of the issues that I started working on in the 1980's. It is still a reality, gentlemen, and I think it's something that you can look at that you can help and you can encourage banks and other mortgage lenders to look at. One of the things we did at the state, what we've developed what we call a baby loan program. Not in housing, but in economic development. And maybe that is something that you might want to look at in terms of with p.d.c. and that is having baby loans. These loans were designed that if a person came and wanted to start a new business, we could go as low as \$5,000 in allowing that to happen. Maybe if somebody want to get into a home, we could look at opportunities that would low in price, because there are, believe it or not, homes as low as 60,000 in northeast Portland, but the issue is having the money to go in and remodel these



**November 1, 2006**

buildings, and some of that should be an area we look at as well. Thank you very much. If there are any questions of me or technical points regarding the organization that I can bring Cheryl up.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Carter:** Thank you.

**Nichole Maher:** Good morning. My name is Nicole, and I'm a member of the central council from southeast Alaska and I also serve as the executive director of the Native American Center. Today I'm here to talk about homeownership in the Native American community. As you may be well aware, the Family Center is the primary housing organization that serves the Native American community. We're the only organization working on housing issues for our community. Portland is home to 31,000 Native Americans. We're the ninth largest Native American community in the United States.

However, Native Americans have great disparity in their homeownership opportunities. A 2004 HUD Report indicated that urban Native Americans experience the highest degree of discrimination in bank loans and housing opportunities. In addition to that, only 17% of Native Americans own their home in Portland, Oregon. We need to think about a deep process that really builds strategies that addresses each of the community barriers. I also want to really compliment community solutions and say that the process that I've engaged in thus far has been one of the most respectful and thoughtful. One of the reasons the process is so important is that we need to have deep institutional change. We need to work our banks to eliminate discriminatory practices.

**Dave Nielson:** Good morning. Dave Nielsen with the Home Builders Association. My comments will be very brief. At the steering committee which I feel privileged to serve on as well as the testimony that's been given, you're hearing from those representing minority communities most important thing that you can get out of this testimony out of the steering committee. My comments are just twofold. We have been working with several organizations within the city of Portland and in the surrounding suburbs on the issues of homeownership and affordability, very proud to have a relationship with the Portland Housing Center and working on this for the last few years. And it is something that is not new to us. And since my time in running the Home Builders Association takes over their five years ago is something that I'm very passionate about and that our industry has gotten behind and worked on, even with some issues that have come before the commission with the affordability. It is also something our national association is very committed to as recently announced a partnership with NAACP. Nationwide minority homeownership is about 25% less than what it is for the national averages. Certainly the African-American, Hispanic American and Native American communities are hit the hardest with that and those are the ones that we need to specific focus and attention on. And the second part of my comment is just to state that we -- very pleased to hear at the steering committee the fact that a lot of this work is dealing with education and one of the things the lending community can bring to bear and what can we do from an incentive-based approach to help the building community address some of these issues? There's good examples of that that have been brought to play, including what was done in New Columbia. We had a couple members that were proud to help address some of the issues and create affordable housing in that area. Creating that affordable housing in the first place will also go along with the lending things that we're dealing with to helping minorities get into homes. Thank you.

**Linda Navarro:** Mayor Potter, commissioners, I'm Linda Navarro, and I'm pleased to be here today and more importantly I'm pleased to be a part of Operation HOME, along with I believe it's at least six representatives of our Mt. Tabor financial institutions that serve on the Operation HOME Committee. On an individual basis they're attempting to address the minority homeownership gap in Portland and throughout Oregon. But what we're committed to in this process is working collectively on issues that can have a more meaningful impact -- meaningful impact. In the end I think for us and for the success of Operation HOME, it requires that safe, affordable, and sustainable financing options are available to the people we're hoping to reach. And we're committed to doing whatever we can through the association and in working directly with our members as well as the

**November 1, 2006**

entire financial services community, because I think we all know that the kinds of financing that people -- that people are able to access is varied in the -- in mortgage lending, and banks are one component of that, but it's important that we look at -- when we talk about issues of predatory lending or subprime lending, that we look at the financial services industry as a whole and consider the education and collaborative efforts that we need for -- among the entire financial services community. So thank you for letting me abpart of this and on behalf of our membership and the entire financial services community, we look forward to having a meaningful impact.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Sorenson:** What you've heard today is I think at a high level a discussion about community issues and industry issues that need to be addressed. And the appropriateness of bringing both sides of the problem to the table at a steering committee as well as in content committees. We have a november 30 steering committee meeting which will be focus order outreach and marketing. Our work groups will continue to work through may of 2007. And then between may and april there will be a final steering committee meeting where all of the information and input that has been brought forward, the recommendation that's have been vet the by the steering committee will be put into a final business plan for implementation ongoing. The call to action here I think might have greater force if there were further comments from commissioner Sten and mayor Potter, but I think at a high level i'm hoag that you'll be open to hearing some updates from our operation over the next several months that you'll be willing to provide the political support for this effort, that you'll openly consider the steering committee's recommendations for city action as you heard the testimony from mr. Foster and from others, there's a resource issue as well as community and systems issue, and I think although the city is not probably prepared to come up with those millions of dollars, the estimate, I think the folks that are at the table at the steering committee are the right people to be able to identify those resources that could be brought to bear on this issue for the next 10 years. But I do ask you to consider the commitment of resources both time of staff as well as your brain trusts and the potential that the city has resources, financial resource that's could be committed further. And then finally as a good marketer we always want folks to be able to share this information, and we ask you to spread the word about operation homeownership you come in contact with community constituents, leaders as well as consumers, and the opportunity to lead folks back to this operation, I think is an important one coming from credible witnesses such as yourselves. Thank you. If there are questions, bring the team back forward and go from there.

**Sten:** We're very much getting this project running publicly, though we've been after it for some time. I guess my sense and i've been working with the consultant and staff team as well as the community leaders, there's a lot of historic issues as to why the homeownership rate is so much lower, and they're very real and important. We've had issues with lending in the past, and other things. At this point I really believe that there are plenty of good lenders, there are plenty of builders out there that -- to supply the products and the mortgages and things we need, and this needs to be an action item. And this -- we probably will not solve the national inequities that have led to this very destructive and disparate situation, because this is how people make their nest egg, how they move forward, it has to do with self-esteem, your place in the community and all sorts of issues that are critical. I think our job is to go out and help people buy homes. And I think the tools are there to do it if we do i.t. Properly, and i'm looking at nicole who is right on the process. If we can get out there, these are very ambitious numbers, but i'd like to see us meet them and i'm prepared to help in all sorts of ways. It's not a coincidence we have the home builder in the front row, and the people that need to take this on are ready to go.

**Potter:** Thank you. Any further questions? Thank you for the work that you folks do. It's so important, and we really appreciate your effort. I think as some of the specifics come down the road in terms of how council can assist, i'm sure we're going to be to the extent we can, be helpful

**November 1, 2006**

and obviously look at p.d.c. as a strong partner. Thank you all. Please read the 10:30 time certain. Please read items 1451 and 52 together.

**Item 1451 and 1452.**

**Potter:** We have before us a package of recommended changes to the transit oriented development tax exemption program. The transit oriented development program is one of several local tax exemption programs designed to provide an incentive for new multifamily and mixed use development near max light rail station and other transit oriented areas such as lents, hollywood, and northwest Portland. The recommended changes before us today adapt program to be more responsive to current needs and priorities and are changing housing market. Staff from my office and the bureau of planning here to present the recommendations and respond to our inquiries and suggestions for changes. Commissioners Leonard and Adams have amendments they would like to propose on this package. I'd like them to bring those up and -- after the staff presentation before the public testimony. Commissioner Adams has to leave, but I have his proposal and will be submitting it on his behalf. At this point --

**Sten:** Can I make a comment? We've work order this quite a bit from all the housing policy folks as well as community groups, and this is I think responsive, I want to be very explicit to the council's change in policy of being basically much more cost conscious when we give a tax bait. We've scaled back the programs, I think they're good programs, but they're not as necessary as they used to be to make things happen. We're also putting a cap on how much can come in each year so it's predictable. We get to that cap we'll be seeing a lot of housing, and it's also citywide to the fact these are -- I want to underscore, 10-year property tax abatement that's can only be extended for the affordable units, not for the mixed income units. The first of these abatements which I saw happen in a different capacity is about to come back on the rolls next year. So it does really sometimes sounds like what we're doing is trying to take things off the tax rolls for good when in fact what we're trying to do is spur them to happen. I think if you do the math, if you get more affordability and more units, you actually probably over 30 years get more taxes than if you do it this way, because you get a much more robust program. I was going to make a friendly suggestion, I want people to toss around maybe we ought to change the proposed name of this to something like the neighborhood based, or the neighborhood transit program, because one of the things the transit thing implies, there is no more transit friendly area than the central city. And this is not being offered in the central city. So this if -- if this title could be changed, I think this is about the neighborhoods outside of the central business district. It's transit oriented, but we're still working on downtown.

**Sarah Culp, Portland Development Commission:** I'm going to give a brief overview of why we're here. You've seen several changes, so this is responding to concerns that we've heard from council since january work session on our local housing tax abatement programs. We have since put a moratorium on new indications for the new multiple using housing program for the central city, and we're keeping that on hold for at least another year through the central city assessment, which is part of the updates to the 1988 central city plan and the west side u.r.a. study. So that assessment is going to look at the central city conditions, trends, opportunities and challenges. And see how we're doing on meeting with central city plan goals from the 1980's and as part of that we'll be looking at the housing stock downtown to see what's getting built, what's not getting built and what council and the community might want to start putting incentives into again. But that is a conversation for next year. In the meantime, we're continuing the transit oriented development program out in the neighborhoods outside of the central city to encourage more dense development around transit lines in areas that reflect the 2040 growth concept. This is something I think we should just remind ourselves of with a million more people coming into our city, or into our region over the next few years the importance of the central premise is to encourage dense housing development close to employment centers and retail centers to cut down on car commuting,

**November 1, 2006**

pollution, and to support our investments in public transportation. It could potentially limit the number of projects.

**Barbara Sack, Bureau of Planning:** i'll just give a background on the todd and go over the main points of planning commission's recommendation. The purpose of the todd is to support public and private investment near public transit. The program was adopted to support our light rail station, system, our light rail system in the region. And this program has also been used in town center to support other kinds of frequent transit service such as frequent transit bus service and streetcar. This program will help us accommodate new population growth in areas that are well served by transit so traffic congestion won't unduly result from the growth in population. And also this program provides housing near frequent transit service and this is harmful to lower income households so they can reduce their transportation costs which allows them to reduce their overall living cost by living in an area where they can use transit instead of driving. Since the program was adopted in 1996, over 900 housing units have been built in 15 projects. Most of this housing has been rentals. And most of the projects have been built in gateway but they've also been built in areas like 60th and glisan on the old odot site and hollywood. This recommendation is trying to respond from what we heard at the january 11 joint meeting between city council members and the Portland development commission. That was a meeting where we discussed the tax exemption programs. Four things we heard at that meeting were the people would like to see the city's multifamily tax exemption programs be transit oriented, we wanted to see an increased emphasis on affordability. We wanted a provision made for family housing and the council wanted greater program oversight. The changes to the boundaries are very transit oriented. If you look at the map here, the areas in green are the areas that are already in the program, that's basically the east-west max, light rail corridor, lents, gateway and the northwest plan district. The areas we're proposing to add are the interstate corridor light rail station areas, the planned and existing areas along the i-205 corridor, and three main streets that also have frequent transit service. These include m.l.k., the portion of sandy boulevard that was included in the hollywood and sandy plan, in addition to the albina fuel site which is adjacent to Broadway main street, and an area of foster road between holgate and 79th, which is the beginning of the lents town center and also the urban renewal district.

There's one area that we're proposing to take out of the program and that's the area in green and white stripes on the east max corridor. The area between the light rail stations is mostly zoned for low density development and we don't feel we really need the program there. This is the 2040 growth concept for Portland. Our proposal supports the 2040 growth concept which plans for accommodating new population growth and jobs. Another transit oriented change is that we were going to increase the minimum project size from eight units to 10 units. We went -- we want dense development in these light rail station areas so more people will live close to transit and so we increased the project size to be the same as the project size in the central city program. We have increased emphasis on affordability. We're going to make affordability a minimum requirement for rental housing projects and we're going to recommend that existing low-income housing projects that are subject to a low-income housing contract such as a project-based section 8 contract be able to receive the tax exemption and that they be able to receive a tax exemption for the term of the public contract. The city of Portland lobbied for this change to the state statute that's would allow this, I believe the thinking was at the time there were various section 8 projects in private o.s.p. That have expiring contracts. This would be something the city could offer the owners of those contracts to extend their contract. We don't see this being used a lot, but in some specific instances this would be -- this would help us preserve affordable housing. This and private ownership.

Another change we have made to the affordability requirement is that an applicant can provide a certain percentage of affordable units or a percentage of the residential building square footage of their project. Devoted to affordable units. If you just have a percentage of the number of units, there's incentives to provide very small units. We want to make sure that developers can provide

**November 1, 2006**

larger size units so they would be able to provide a fewer number of units but larger size in order to meet this retirement. And the requirement is a 20% of the units or building square footage that are 10% for extremely low-income households, that's 30% of median family income or below. Another thing, another change we're going to make is require that the affordable units mirror the unit mix in a project. This is something both planning commission and council has wanted to see. And this would allow larger units, this would require that larger units if they're are in the project, be also provided as a portion of the affordable units. The planning commission also updated the public benefits option list. I'm not going to go through all these options. Some of them are reinforce the program's emphasis on transit oriented development, providing housing and amenities that are attractive to families, promote higher density, some of these items were suggested as part of the public involvement process we went through the spring structure parking or dedicated car share space. Also there's some items that were added to the new model of affordable housing program, such as an option for leeds silver certification. Also increased affordability can be used as the second public benefit option, or other benefits proposed by the developer and approved by the planning commission. The planning commission added in this option because if a developer had a particularly creative public benefit that we hadn't thought about, this would allow planning commission to approve that. We will also have an additional public benefit option that is proposed by commissioner Adams' office which is for transit improvements above those required by the code that would be approved by pdot and the planning commission. Lastly, the changes to the program regulations provide greater program oversight. We would require that the planning commission and city council review the program area boundaries at least every three years. If there is some reason would you want to add or subtract an area before every three years, you always have the option to do that, but we thought the boundaries ought to be looked at on a periodic basis, three years at a minimum. Staff would continue to review individual applications for determining that the tax exemption is necessary for the financial feasibility of a project. We -- one change is we would have the planning commission instead of the Portland development commission hold hearings on individual cases so they could monitor the use of the program, since they are the organization that would have policy oversight. Another thing that we heard on January 11 is that city council members would like to be able to compare the amount of revenue forgone due to the tax exemption programs to other items in the budget. This year for the first time there is a section in the budget that gives the figuring for forgone revenue due to the housing tax exemption programs and the enterprise zone tax exshelly miano shun programs, and it's recommended this information be provided every year. For the council. As Sara said, we have a staff proposal to set a cap on the maximum annual improvement value of all projects. We heard on January 11 that the council was concerned about the amount of forgone revenue due to the tax exemption programs. Staff was originally going to propose a cap on forgone revenue, but since tax rates change from year to year, we decided instead to have a cap on maximum annual improvement value. City council would set this cap every three years so staff and applicants to the program would know what the amount is, but it would be an annual cap of \$20 million. And the way we arrived at this cap is that this is about double the average amount of improvement value that has been added to the program every year. There's been about \$10 million in improvement value added to the t.o.d. Program since its adoption. However, this program is only 10 years old and starting next year projects are going to start going back on the tax rolls that have had this 10-year exemption. So the number of properties with an exemption won't always go up. One or two projects will start becoming off the rolls in 2007. You will probably hear testimony on the cap, we received one letter that this cap is too low. And that concludes my presentation. I wanted to add that commissioner Leonard will also have an amendment that improves program oversight. He would like to add the provisions that apply to the new multiple unit housing program to the t.o.d. Program, and this would require people to get the tax exemption to report on their rate of return every year and if they go over the 10% internal rate of

**November 1, 2006**

return they would repay some of the property taxes that have been exempted. So this is another tool that council can use to have more control over forgone revenues. We have a number of people who have signed up to testify, including David Bragdon from Metro. I'm wondering if you want to ask questions, or if you'd like to hear the testimony first.

**Potter:** Other questions for Barbara?

**Saltzman:** Could you describe in a nutshell how this encourage family friendly housing? As well as affordable housing? I understand the affordability. I'm not sure I understood the family friendly part of it.

**Sack:** If you remember when the South Waterfront case was before you, the developer provided only studio units for affordable housing, and I know that members of the planning commission were concerned that there be some affordable units that would be provided for families. And council also had that concern. So by saying that you can provide a percentage of residential building square footage instead of a percentage of units, which would be number of units, then a developer would have the option of providing some larger units, fewer of them, most likely, but some larger units in order to meet the affordability requirement.

**Saltzman:** And there's also a list of public benefit options you showed us, and one of those options I believe was larger units, three-bedroom units?

**Sack:** Right. There's a public benefit option is for providing 10% of the units that are three or more bedrooms. Developers have to meet the -- have to meet the affordability requirement and then they have to meet -- provide one public benefit option off that list.

**Saltzman:** Just one, ok.

**Sack:** They can provide more.

**Potter:** We should have a lot of them?

**Saltzman:** Maybe at least two or three. Was there a lot of discussion about simply one option from that list? It's a pretty long list. There's like 13 items on it.

**Sack:** There was some discussion about whether certain items would be more expensive to provide than others. But they were actually concerned that there be the possibility that somebody could come in with a different public benefit option that wasn't on the list, that they hadn't thought of. It was planning commission that suggested some of those public benefit options.

**Saltzman:** Ok. Thank you.

**Potter:** Is Metro president David Bragdon -- I didn't see you hiding. Please come forward. Please go ahead and provide your testimony.

**David Bragdon, President:** Thank you for having us. Metro council and the city of Portland share a lot of objectives in terms of planning for the future. I'm happy to be here today to support the work that your staff and planning commission have done on this issue, and I know you've had work sessions on it. From what I've heard of those I think your objectives are very similar to ours. So I'm here to support the direction you're going. City of Portland is a regional leader as well as a national leader in trying to accommodate growth. And we have the 2040 concept, Barbara mentioned that. And carrying that out really is a local responsibility. So having the financial initiatives and work that you do is very important to us. We're the envy of a lot of other parts of the country, other core cities in their region are losing market share and are losing families. The city of Portland continues to attract and capture growth and resite lies existing neighborhoods rather than forcing growth to the edge of town as happens elsewhere. This is one of the financial mechanisms you have to continue that momentum. And to continue attracting growth that's both affordable and livable, and has less and less of an impact on the traffic congestion situation. This program helps to attract revitalization and good new investment into existing urban areas along transit lines where people can live a life with a variety of transit options. It's a public-private partnership tool, the options list, the menu approach that you have now. I think allows to you provide reasonable incentives and measure how those are being provided in exchange for benefit that the public sector want. We have

**November 1, 2006**

seen examples coming to life here recently. The Merick project on m.l.k. near the lloyd district make 47% of their trips without use than an automobile. 20% have been able to sell their automobile out of choice because they no longer need to it get around. Center commons at 60th and glisan, ridership is 27% above what the expectations were. So definitely has an impact on the trace network. That's very important for air quality, traffic congestion, as well as the movement of goods around our region. We think the proposed changes your staff has worked on make this a better program, gives you more tools, gives a little more flexibility, and discretion to have this program be tailored in different areas. You're adapting it as the geographic needs change, and I imagine you would continue to do that. Over time with the review that's built in. The increased emphasize on affordable housing adds a good dimension. So in closing we do share a lot of objectives, the 20/40 concept is shared -- really bringing it to life is a local matter, how you do, your financing, and how you do the zoning and how you actually make projects come to life. We think this program helps you to do that and we salute your staff and you for the consideration. [cell phone ringing]

[Caption file was corrupted. Remainder of meeting was transcribed.]

**Potter:** Questions for the president? Thank you, President Bragdon. We appreciate you coming over to support this effort.

**David Bragdon:** Thank you.

**Potter:** Before we get to the public testimony, there are two amendments to be offered. Commissioner Adams has to leave, so I'll allow him to introduce his first.

**Adams:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This amendment to Section 3.103.040, Public Benefits, between 3.103.040.D.10 and D.11, by adding the following: "3.103.040.D.11. Transportation improvements beyond the development requirements as approved by PDOT and the Planning Commission." What this does is it gives flexibility to -- the City Council and myself as Transportation Commissioner are often confronted with situations where a developer is willing or able to go beyond the basic requirements of this legislation, but we don't have actual language in the ordinance that allows us to negotiate with the developers to the benefit of the neighborhoods transportation system. So this amendment would allow us to do that.

**Leonard:** Are you moving your amendment?

**Adams:** I hereby move the following - precious amendment.

**Leonard:** Second.

**Potter:** Call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel sounded.] Commissioner Leonard?

**Leonard:** As Barbara Sack alluded to, this is an amendment that actually takes some prior language in another abatement program and puts it in this. And what it requires is that every year the project submit a financial statement, so we can assure ourselves that the financial submitted by the developer to qualify for the abatement in fact are what is happening after the project is completed and rented. So we know that we're not giving abatements for a project that is much more successful than what was -- than what the preliminary financials indicated. This is a protection for taxpayers and kind of a check and balance, and I urge Council to approve it.

**Potter:** Do you move?

**Leonard:** Moved.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Potter:** Please call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel sounded.] Did we have a sign-up sheet?

**Clerk:** We did. We have 14 people signed up.

**Potter:** Okay. I'm going to ask people to limit their testimony to 2 minutes when they come up to

**November 1, 2006**

speak, so please call the first three people.

**Clerk:** Chris Smith, Lynn Coward and Andy Loos. They'll be followed by John Gould, Rick Seefort and Don Bock.

**Potter:** Okay. What's the third name?

**Clerk:** Chris Smith, Lynn Coward and Andy L-o-o-s is the last name? Andy? Is that you? I'm sorry, okay. Lynn? {unintelligible}.

**Potter:** Thanks for being here, folks. When you speak, please state your name for the record, and you each have two minutes.

**Chris Smith:** Good morning, Mayor Potter, members of Council. I'm Chris Smith. And while I am the authorized representative, I also hate to say lobbyist, for the Portland Streetcar CAC, I am not here on their behalf today. I am here representing myself. {Laughing} I'm here today to suggest an addition to the public benefit list. And I think like Commissioner Saltzman, I feel like maybe we should ask people to pick two or three off that list instead of just one, but the idea I'd like to add is that of unbundling parking. And I'm thinking specifically of condo units, but it might also apply in rental situations. And the idea is that if you're buying a condo in one of these developments, you can buy your condo, you can buy your parking space, you don't have to buy your parking space with your condo. And there are several benefits to that approach. One is that it may reduce auto ownership if now one of the costs of owning an auto is more explicit if, you know, you now have a let's say \$170,000 condo and a \$20,000 parking space as opposed to just having a \$190,000 condo. You might think about whether you really want to have a place for your car, if, you know, life without a car would save you \$20,000 up front. So one impact is on auto ownership, the other is on affordability, because suddenly you now have \$170,000 housing option instead of a \$190,000 housing option. So I think this is a win-win. It will probably take a little while to shake the market dynamics, because right now lenders often require one parking unit per living unit. But I think that would take care of itself over time as we got experience in what this did to parking sales.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Lynn Coward:** I'm Lynn Coward, the Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association. And we are in general support of this legislation. We {unintelligible} about supporting it at our last board meeting. We are particularly interested in the addition of the Albina -- former Albina Fuel site in this. This has been something that has been in the works and actually the piece is now in design review. So it's becoming an actuality. And being outside of an urban renewal area, we have not had tools to work for goals that are really important to this project. This project is catalytic. It's five acres. It's 319 housing units. The transportation that abuts it: we have bus lines, the potential of a Max stop, we are told -- we were not told "no" by Tri-Met to getting a Max stop at 28th; and we're looking forward some day to have the street car up Broadway, not to mention the Gulch Trail, which will go by this project and which the developer has actually built into their proposal. So this is a very critical site. What is really important to us, too, is the affordability issue in this site. Housing in our area is becoming very unaffordable, and we've had a good mix of people. And we want to be able to keep them in the area. And finally I would like to say the issue -- we are fairly close to two schools, two high schools. And we would like to see more of an impetus in here to support family housing to make it viable for the developer. They're being told by their market that these larger units are not viable on this site or that this is not a family-type place, and we feel that we would like some tools to be of help to them to bridge this gap. And I just want to say one thing about this cap. I just heard about it now. I was not -- didn't get informed. I think we ought to look at not just this site, but this site is so catalytic that we have to look at what's happening around it. The area around it is right, and if we do the right development here, we will be getting a lot of other redevelopment, and we'll be getting taxes from that. So I don't want to look at a site in isolation. Thank you.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Andy Loos:** My name is Andy Loos. I work for SRM Development and represent the ownership



**November 1, 2006**

and the developer for the Albina Fuel site. We've been in the process for several years on redeveloping this property. We've met with the neighborhood groups and City staff. As Lynn said, we're -- been through design review. Probably have one more meeting with design review, and we're very excited about the project. The project is a mixed-used development of, as Lynn said, 319 units. We're envisioning 169 of those units to be for-sale product, another 150 of those to be for-rent product in a true, mixed-used development. We designed the project to make it pedestrian friendly. As Lynn said, we've incorporated into the design open-space areas that will front onto the proposed Sullivan Gulch Trail and to encourage bike traffic. Also {unintelligible} being on Broadway, a transit-oriented development. We would appreciate the opportunity to review options and incentives that a program like this might come forward for us, that might give us some areas that we can revise our design to meet the goals of the City. So we would propose that you -- that you approve the amendments to this program. Thank you.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Clerk:** Next we have John Gould, Rick Seifert and Don Baack. They'll be followed by John Charles, Jane Olerdeny and Gillian Detwhiler.

**Potter:** Thanks for being here folks. When you speak, please state your name for the record. You each have 2 minutes.

**John Gould:** Mr. Mayor, Commissioners, I'm John Gould. I'm a Hillsdale resident for 36 years, and current secretary of SWNI. I want to address one area that we would like to have for geographical expansion in your program. It comprises the area now inhabited by Fred Meyer Burlingame. We've talked to several of you in the recent past about the opportunities available to the City to get housing on that territory. It's big a land. It's five acres, three of which will be a parking lot -- stacked parking -- and on top of which easily can be housing, as many as -- well, I don't know, Fred Meyer said as many as 200 units. They've looked at the proposal, but found it didn't pencil out. We think an opportunity like this would allow it, maybe, to pencil out. And we gravely need a program in Portland, when there's a major redevelopment of that kind, to take advantage of the situation and bring in housing. And we just are aching to find a way to do it, those of us who live in Hillsdale. This area, if you would be -- if you follow my approach, would be the area between SW Terwilliger and SW 13th Avenue. That's the area that needs to be included in this program. It would help.

**Rick Seifort:** My name is Rick Seif0rt. As you probably know, the three of us are from Hillsdale, so you're going to get a heavy dose of Hillsdale here. I'm a member of the Hillsdale Business and Professional Association, and I'm on the board of the Hillsdale Neighborhood Association, and have gotten involved in a number of other things in the area. As you know, we have a Hillsdale town center plan. We are a town center. And we also are an area that has more bus lines going through it than any other part of town save the transit mall. We are intensive area for this. But we also have some -- and we also have a Turning Point housing project -- transitional housing project. We have a new watershed senior housing project, and as you probably all know, we also have Hillsdale Terrace, which is the largest public housing project in the state, in Hillsdale. But we also have some strange anomalies going on. A block away from where all these busses run is a tree farm in a town center. And we have -- we need some real proactive help from the City in making this compatible with the transit in the area and with the whole town center concept. We have problems with CCRs in that area, which restrict how we can proceed. We need to get a majority of people in that area to vote to have the up-zoning that we have in our plan go into effect. So we definitely need some help. And I know Don is going to talk about that. We also have Rieke Elementary School. We have three schools in the town center: Wilson, Robert Gray and Rieke. Rieke is under the gun to increase its enrollment, and they've identified that the best way to increase enrollment is to do exactly what this measure would do, which is increase housing in the town center so that we can keep three schools in a town center, which is very consistent with a town center concept.

**Don Baack:** I'm Don Baack, also from Hillsdale. Basically I think the picture is this: We've got

**November 1, 2006**

great transportation, we've got a very support neighborhood. I think we've said we've midwived the birth of the watershed. Worked with them extensively over a number of years, and we're very interested in seeing this kind of thing happen in Hillsdale, both in the town center and at the Fred Meyer site. We would propose that the town center in its entirety, or as you judge appropriate in the central business district area as a minimum, be included in this boundaries. In Hillsdale, we just -- because of the economics of these things, it's really difficult to get affordable housing in the kind of thing we have. And so I think these would be very positive kinds of moves. I want to make one other comment related to -- last week I spent a couple three hours with seven Canadians from the planning department in Canada. Now the planning department they represented was not the one that does the plans like the Hillsdale plan and so on. They're the people that actually take the plan and implement it. And I raise that, because this didn't get on our radar screen until about two days ago, so we didn't get into the Planning Commission to propose these changes, not because -- possibly because we weren't paying attention. We've been kind of busy on lots of other things as well. But these -- this group of folks in Canada basically have the responsibility of helping town centers and other people that have plans adopted by the City to then figure out where the funding comes from and how to put together schemes to make things happen. And I think that's a piece that we're missing in this city is that way of working with those of us -- we've got lots of energy, but we need direction sometimes to say "gee, you know, there's something over here happening you don't know about," and if you're not plugged in, you're not really going to be capable of addressing it in the proper time. There's a lot of things happening in the city. You guys keep a lot of people busy. Thank you very much.

**Clerk:** John Charles, Gillian Detweiler, and Brody Hilton. They'll be followed by Ed McNamara, Brad Perkins and Ross Cornelius.

**Potter:** Thanks for being here this morning, folks. When you speak, please state your name for the record. You each have two minutes.

**John Charles:** Thank you. My name is John Charles, Cascade Policy Institute in Portland. My comments today are mostly summarizing a little handout that you will be getting soon. I've spent a lot of time studying transit-oriented development over the last five years, and one of my concerns is that a lot of assertions are made by people with very little data. First, the little handout there just shows that in terms of actual market share, light-rail, despite two new lines opening in the last five years, has actually lost 3% market share for its primary market: people in the city working downtown. Driving alone has gone up. Buses sort of holding steady. I guess the good news is the streetcar hasn't lost market share, but that's only 'cause it doesn't have market share. The next slide goes to this point as well is of the Center Commons project that Councilor Bragdon talked about. I've spent a lot of time studying that development. It was under-built for parking, and the people there respond. They're heavy car users. So for the last five years they've been parking illegally there on what is a 20'-wide fire lane where it is illegal to park at all. It's a fire disaster waiting to happen, which I've suggested to the Fire Bureau several times they should do something about. So my point is, there are very few planners in town, if any, who actually know how transit-oriented developments function in terms of transit use. Third point is, on the next slide, assertions made about the environmental benefits of TOD, especially energy consumption, are mostly out of date. What was true in 1970 is false in 2003. The typical auto trip now on a passenger mile basis is actually more energy efficient than a transit bus, and the trends are all in the wrong direction for transit and actually in the right direction for automobile use. So the environmental energy benefits of transit are typically overstated. The fourth slide shows that density costs a lot of money, and the fifth is the numbers behind that. Mixed-use development is the single most expensive way you can build housing, so if affordable housing is your goal, this program is completely -- cannot even theoretically ever succeed. You doom yourself to massive subsidies over an infinite horizon. I think instead of expanding this program, you should be considered repealing it and moving in another

November 1, 2006

direction.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Jillian Detweiler:** Good morning, I'm Jillian Detweiler. I'm a land-development planner at Tri-met, 710 NE Holladay Street. I guess I can agree with John on one point that TOD development is expensive. There are, you know, additional costs of steel-frame construction, of the separation between the commercial space and residential, possibly going to structured parking. And what we found is that in neighborhoods like the Pearl people value TOD development, and they're willing to pay for it. What the program you're considering today is about is markets where TOD is not established, and the people don't have the money to pay. So its offering a TOD option to households with lower incomes and in neighborhoods where currently there's not a Pearl-like real estate market. And I brought with me today a report that was conducted for the Federal Transit Administration that shows that the households with the demographic and the consumer preference attributes of people who choose to live in transit-oriented development is growing very steadily. And by 2025 it would increase to about 300,000 households in the Portland area that would like to live in TOD. So I think we have a looming demand issue, and we need to respond with supply. And I wanted to comment real quickly on the menu of additional benefits. It struck me that the Carshare space would be by far the cheapest option on that list, if you're just making one surface parking space available. And it may be that that's the options that is always chosen or chosen most often perhaps to the exclusion of some of the other benefits you'd like to achieve.

**Brody Hylton:** Good morning Commissioners, Mayor. My name is Brody Hylton. A nice segue. I'm here representing Flexcar. I wanted to speak in favor of the car space. It's nice quite as simple as simply providing a CarShare space. What we'd be looking for from developers is more of a commitment to provide this transportation option to residents of these mixed-use developments, especially to the extent that it would serve lower income populations. According to AAA, the average annual cost to own a car in America is \$8,000 per year. You can see that that's a pretty significant percentage of income, especially if we're talking about a low income -- lower income family. When you compare that to the average cost of a FlexCar member's monthly cost is about \$85-90 per month to use the service. To the extent that these developments are on transit lines or well-served by transit in mixed-used communities, pedestrian-oriented, etc., it will allow people to live without a car, yet still have access to one when they need it. When we talk about specific commitments from developers, potentially we'd be looking for 1-2 year commitments to establish some sort of subsidy to make that vehicle available to lower income individuals. So the details of that we haven't yet worked out, but I'm happy to answer questions about what that might look like.

**Potter:** {unintelligible}. Thank you.

**Brody Hylton:** Thank you.

**Clerk:** Next we have Ed McNamara, Brad Perkins and Ross Cornelius. And they'll be followed by Kevin Kavanaugh.

**Potter:** Thanks for being here, folks. When you speak, please state your name for the record, and you each have two minutes. Ed, why don't we begin with you.

**Ed McNamara:** Mayor Potter, City Council members, thank you. Ed McNamara with {unintelligible} Allen Development. I've been in development since 1983 in Portland. About half of that time was with nonprofits, and I was quite skeptical of the tax-abatement programs during that time. I've been in the private sector for 11 years, and I've only used a tax-abatement once. So I'm not a big user. I'm here today because actually the staff asked me to come, probably because I make them read {unintelligible} written comments. But also I think this is a good policy, and I think these are good changes. And I'll briefly tell you the elements that I think make this a good policy. One, dense development does cost more. I don't think there's any argument about that. You've heard it from opponents and proponents. Second, outside of the central city, the rents and the sale prices often aren't high enough to support that added cost of the dense development. Third, this tax

**November 1, 2006**

abatement can make that project financially feasible {unintelligible}. So fourth, what this kind of policy does is it lets us build for the future that we want in those neighborhoods, rather than what the market will support today. So I think it's a real forward-thinking program. It's thinking about what we can do for 20 or 50 years down the road, rather than what we should do today. And a fifth, I think, this is actually a program that has a very low cost to the City in the short run, 'cause you still collect taxes on the land, which probably come close to paying for the services that the City provides to it. But in the long run, over the fifty- or hundred-year life of that building, it will generate a lot more property taxes. So I think there's really an increased value to the City to doing this. So I think it's a terrific example of long-term thinking. And I hope you'll support the program.

**Brad Perkins:** Good morning. Brad Perkins, Land-Use Chair of the Irvington Community Association. I'm here to bring up two main points regarding this TOD, tax credit districts. First of all, it's a good program. I think it should be mandatory, though, that the -- there should be a minimum housing component within this district depending on the size of the project. And also, on remodels, that using the 25% rule for accessibility that if the development is more than 25% of the value of the property, then its mandatory also to put in housing. Giving example of a failure in the Hollywood District is where Trader Joe's is going in right across the street from a major transit station. The one-two punch never occurred. The 24-Hour Fitness project across the street {unintelligible} well, but the second punch of getting housing next to it across the street, which would have been a perfect mixed-used development, did not happen. There should have been more push to make that happen. I think a mandatory housing rule would be important to do that. Integra is another example. They were to build housing there. Walgreen's, Safeway in Lloyd Center is another example. Number two, what Dan Saltzman had raised earlier regarding "okay, what about family housing for these developments?" Albina Fuel, they have a minimum 319 -- a maximum 319 units that they have to put in and nothing about family housing. Three-bedroom units should be mandatory in projects of that scale right now. There's only 11% of that developments going for just 2-bedroom units there. So I encourage you to make that a mandatory component of this up and above the other 13 alternatives that developers can choose from to be a part of this program. One -- last point is that the demographics in and around the Albina Fuel site is the best in the city that I can imagine. If it doesn't work here, I don't know where else it could work for family housing. Thank you much.

**Ross Cornelius:** Hi. My name is Ross Cornelius, 812 NW Summit in Portland. I'm here on behalf of myself and the next fellow is going to testify, Kevin Cavenaugh. We have identified a site and have control of the site that sort of falls through the cracks of the program right now. We're pursuing a workforce housing project of 33 units. We're targeting Gold LEED standard construction and trying to keep our rents down as low as possible but also get as much density as we can on the site. We are within a half-mile and a 10-minute walk of the lower term traminal stop. We're about a quarter-mile from the streetcar stop at River Place. We are in the North Macadam Urban renewal area, but we're outside of the South Waterfront development district. We are outside of the central city by about 300 feet, and we are looking for inclusion of our site in the program. We have been working closely with PDC, and we really appreciate their help as well as the help of the staff putting together the TOD program. But we would respectfully respect inclusion of our little sort of knuckle in the TOD abatement program area. We are just south of the Ross Island -- or the I-5 Marquam Bridge where it comes across, and we're north -- we're west of the freeway, but we're east of the Nato Parkway on-ramp. And we're ready to go. We think we can get financing. If we're not able to work -- because we're not part of the development agreement down in South Waterfront, we are pursuing other ways to try to get it financed, and we think we can. But we need help with the TOD abatement to get there. We're real close, and we think with the inclusion of the TOD district, we would be able to get this thing built. So we'd appreciate your help reviewing that and hopefully including it in the area. Thank you.

**November 1, 2006**

**Clerk:** Our last speaker is Kevin Cavanaugh.

**Kevin Cavanaugh:** Thank you. My name is Kevin Cavanaugh, and I'm at 3435 NE 45th in Portland. Piggybacking with Ross, I'm the designer and co-developer of the {unintelligible}-Candy project that he just talked about, 33 units. We're a quarter mile from a light- -- the streetcar stop and one-half mile from the lower tram site. And we are asking that you would include us in the TOD boundaries. We are ready to break ground on a product that has no subsidies whatsoever. We tend to do what are called gorilla developments. We -- if {unintelligible} people get in our way, we can go in there and prove that the private sector can get this done and bring something to market. In this case, between 60-70% of MFI rental units, not condos. And there's a huge need and demand for both workforce housing and just straightforward apartment units in a town -- the central core where condo conversions and condo towers are taking a large bite out of the rental market. The product is TOD by definition: comically underparked—eight parking spaces for 33 units—and as Ross mentioned, designed to LEED Gold standards. So we would for those reasons alone and to the fact that we can start breaking ground tomorrow, we would hope that you would consider this in the zone. Thanks.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Clerk:** We have a request for one more person to speak.

**Potter:** Okay. Please state your name for the record. You have two minutes.

**Jim Carlock:** My name is Jim Carlock, and it looks like I made here just in time. I wanted to present two aspects of TODs that I didn't hear the PDC, I believe it was, presenter talk about. I have two prints I made from a Metro PowerPoint. This one talks about nonauto market share, which goes up with TODs, and in essence 78% of the auto trips region wide are made by car. But in a TOD, only 58%. That means of a 100 trips in a TOD, 58 of those trips are still made by automobile. That means that traffic congestion is going to increase wherever you put a TOD, because 58% of the new people are still going to be driving. Interstate Avenue is a good example. It is already almost gridlocked with the subtraction of two lanes of traffic. The light rail, I understand, is fairly close to full, and Metro's 20-40 recommendation is to put 5,000 people within a quarter-mile of each of those stations. How are they going to travel? The road is full. Light rail is probably -- at least half full. There's no way for them to travel. The other thing, it's a matter of cost. I heard quite a bit about low-income housing. Here's an example of the Crossings project data. Once again, this is Metro data. Eighty-one housing units, and there's a cost premium for the TOD of \$2.9 million. In other words, had this not been built as a TOD, basically high density, extra cost per story, that kind of thing, it would have been \$2.9 million cheaper. That's \$35,000 per living unit extra cost to build this type of construction. Thank you.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Jim Carlock:** Any questions?

**Potter:** Any questions from Commissioners?

**Saltzman:** I guess I wanted to propose a number of amendments. And maybe Barbara should be up here just to -- or Sara both just to keep me technically on track here.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Okay.

**Saltzman:** I guess my first amendment would be to require a development to include at least three of the public benefit options rather than just one.

**Leonard:** What are --

**Saltzman:** {unintelligible} move that.

**Leonard:** Can you specify what those are?

**Saltzman:** Well, there's a list of like 13.

**Leonard:** So you don't care which three?

**Saltzman:** {unintelligible}

**Sara Culp:** So pick three off the list?

November 1, 2006

**Saltzman:** Right.

**Barbara Sack:** There will be 14.

**Saltzman:** So that was -- that's one amendment. I guess can outline all of them right now and see where the Council is. The second would be to add Chris Smith's suggestion about adding a benefit that unbundles parking from the units as a public benefit. And then I guess third and fourthly, I am interested in including the Burlingame area between Terwilliger and 13th as a transit-oriented development. I will declare the conflict of interest of Burlingame Fred Meyer as my second home, but I think that it's a good area.

**Leonard:** I actually been there once in 10 years. When I went there, he was there. {Laughing}

**Saltzman:** As I said, it's my second home. And then I was also interested in adding the area that Kevin Cavanaugh and Ross Cornelius spoke about, the knuckle, as part of the -- in the TOD. That's kind of --

**Sten:** I didn't have the exact friendly amendment would be. I don't have the exact geographic, but I'm interested in Hillsdale as well.

**Saltzman:** {unintelligible} they were suggesting Terwilliger to SW 13th.

**Sten:** Does that get everything?

**Barbara:** Did you want to include Hillsdale?

**Sten:** Is the Terwilliger to 13th get Hillsdale?

**Sack:** No. Or just the Fred Meyer site?

**Saltzman:** Well, I think if you used Terwilliger as an eastern border and 13th as a western border, that does pretty much include Hillsdale.

**Culp:** One thing I might suggest, and --

**Saltzman:** Might need some clarification from the Hillsdale folks on that, but --

**Culp:** Barbara could -- I was just gonna say maybe the amendments to increase the public benefit options could go as part of this package and then Council request that the Planning Commission look at specific new areas to add in as an next step to come back with. So that we can get the exact areas and do some analysis on that. But, I would --

**Saltzman:** Well, {unintelligible}

**Culp:** refer to Planning on some ideas {unintelligible}.

**Saltzman:** Yeah, I guess I'd just prefer to add it in and the same with the knuckle area. I mean it sounds like their ready to go.

**Leonard:** What was the knuckle area again, I'm sorry?

**Saltzman:** It is S.W. Arthur and S.W. Water Street, near where the old Greyhound Bus Terminal is.

**Leonard:** Okay. Oh.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Right about there.

**Saltzman:** Yeah about there.

**Leonard:** Okay.

**John Gould:** Commissioner, if I may? John Gould. Just on the boundaries of Hillsdale, that would be the street from the Fred Meyer Burlingame -- the Fred Myer Burlingame would be Terwilliger to 13th Ave. on Barbur. Hillsdale would be Cheltenham to S.W. 18th Drive on Capitol Highway.

**Saltzman:** Well, if Commissioner Sten is interested in including all of Hillsdale, I'll support that --

**Sten:** {unintelligible}

**Saltzman:** as a friendly amendment. So should I just {unintelligible} now?

**Potter:** Yes.

**Saltzman:** I guess the first amendment would be to require a development to qualify by choosing at least three of the public benefit options.

**Potter:** Just a point of clarification. Is this -- is this to encourage developers to have several different community benefits that they provide?

**Saltzman:** Right. Exactly, rather than just having one.

**November 1, 2006**

**Potter:** Well, this have the affect, though, of them trying to choose the cheaper of the ones rather than perhaps additional units or whatever would be perhaps more expensive?

**Saltzman:** Well, right now the list requires that they choose only one {unintelligible}.

**Potter:** Yes, I understand.

**Saltzman:** And I'm saying choose at least three of the thirteen or fourteen {unintelligible}.

**Sten:** But they have to meet the income guidelines period.

**Sack:** Right. That's in addition.

**Saltzman:** That's a given, the income guidelines. So that would be my first amendment.

**Potter:** Do I hear a second?

**Leonard:** Second.

**Potter:** Call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye.

**Leonard:** I'm always a little reluctant to expand abatement programs, only because they cost money to the City. I think this is a good program, and I'm going to vote for it, because I am comfortable that we have this check and balance with the prior amendment I proposed, so if a developer comes in and develops something that would otherwise have been developed -- for instance, I'm a little focused on the S.W. Arthur site, and it's proximity to the South Waterfront. I'm not sure an area like that needs an abatement to have something built. But if it is built and it ends up that we see, because of these financial statements we get every year, that the return is greater than what they projected, I think this gives me a level of comfort to be able to support this. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye.

**Sten:** Well, I am gonna support -- I just want to point out to Commissioner Leonard's point that this does not amend the cap on the annual amount, which is actually not all that much development when you do the math. It's \$20 million in assessed value. If you assume construction costs on a family-size unit are closer to \$200,000 than a \$100,000, you're talking about a 100 units. So I mean one of the things, if this is wildly successful, the Council is going to have to grapple with, is whether or not that -- it's an annual cap, but whether or not that needs some looking or not. And that would be my -- I am gonna support it. My only reservation, and I think it may need some more discussion with Planning about, Mr. Cornelius' project, as it would take, I'm sure, just doing my math, more than the cap to do that project. And so this is not designed to grab large downtown buildings. And so that's -- I think that's the issue on that one. So I'm gonna vote yes. Aye. But I think we better know that if we're making that vote. Aye.

**Potter:** I'd like to have the Bureau of Planning return to the City Council and also provide to interested parties the boundaries for the new areas, so that it's clearly defined and that people know what is included and what is not. Aye. [Gavel sounded.]

**Saltzman:** The second amendment was to add the unbundling of parking from units as a benefit option.

**Sten:** I'll second that.

**Potter:** Okay. Call the vote.

**Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. [Gavel sounded.]

**Saltzman:** The third was to add Hillsdale as a transit-oriented development area.

**Sten:** Second.

**Potter:** Call it.

**Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel sounded.]

**Saltzman:** And then the fourth and final one was to include the -- I wish there was a better name for this, but the knuckle property between SW Arthur and Water. I guess just in responding to Commissioner Leonard and Commissioner Sten's statements, I am concerned about how much of the TOD this would use up, but I do note that this project is intended solely focused at people

**November 1, 2006**

earning 70% MFI or below. And I believe they said it would not have any parking.

**Sten:** And I guess in this I'm going to push on Ross a little bit. You don't need this amendment if you reach 60%. And we're not gonna be able to discuss this now, but 60% affordable housing in the central city, you get the tax abatement, so we're basically saying don't reach that, but we'll give you a tax abatement if you go a little bit more expensive. So I think this one needs some study to be honest. I think -- I'm totally with working this group to figure it out, but I don't want to give the entire amount to one project in downtown when a project isn't designed for downtown -- this is not a downtown package. Did you want to make a comment?

**Ross Cornelius:** Yeah, we would love to do a 60% MFI project. We're in Macadam -- we're in the Macadam URA, but we we're not eligible for any funding. The funding appears to be tied up in the South Waterfront development agreement. And so we would be more than happy to do a 60% deal, but because that funding is not available, we believe the market is available at 70. And we think we can get it funded without any other public financing.

**Sten:** How much is this project?

**Ross Cornelius:** I'm sorry.

**Sten:** What do you expect the construction value of this to be?

**Ross Cornelius:** About \$4 million --

**Sten:** About \$4 million.

**Ross Cornelius:** About \$3 million in construction, not including the land.

**Sack:** This is a -- this is an area that would have been considered under the new multiple-unit housing program. I would think an alternative would be to accept an application under that program for this project. It wouldn't be a low income -- it wouldn't be a 60% project, but it would be a 70% project.

**Sten:** And that would come directly to the Council or something or we'd --

**Sack:** It could -- I would think that it would be okay to just have it go through the regular process.

**Sten:** We'd allow an exception to the 60%, 'cause I'm not interested in moving the 60% up.

**Ross Cornelius:** We're outside of the Central City Plan, so we don't really qualify for that even though we're close.

**Sten:** Well, it sounds like you're -- is just gonna have to come back for a second reading?

**Leonard:** {unintelligible} we don't have five votes today?

**Barbara:** You're in an urban renewal area, so --

**Ross Cornelius:** Yep.

**Sten:** I would --

**Leonard:** Yeah, we are doing {unintelligible}.

**Sten:** This is gonna come back for a second reading. I would ask, you know, that the Council's intent would be to work with Ross and come up with a solution, and maybe you guys could come back with one rather than -- I'm just a little nervous to do this much on the fly.

**Saltzman:** Okay. That sounds good. I'll withdraw my amendment but with the intent of trying to work something out --

**Sten:** Have staff bring back a proposal for this -- for the knuckle.

**Potter:** Other amendments? {No audible response.} Okay, item 1451 is an ordinance. It's nonemergency. It moves to a second reading. Item 1452 is a resolution, requires a vote. Would you please call the vote?

**Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Good work. Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel sounded.] I'm glad to know we're now moving to the regular agenda. Please read item 1467.

**Item 1467.**

**Potter:** Please proceed.

**Christine Moody, Bureau of Purchases:** Good afternoon, Mayor Potter and members of City



**November 1, 2006**

Council. My name is Christine Moody, and I'm the purchasing manager for the Bureau of Purchases. Before you is a purchasing agent report recommending an award on Bid #105333 for Holly Farm Park Improvement for the Bureau of Parks and Recreation to a local firm J.P. Contractors in the amount of \$703,245. Parks and Recreation, along with our bureau, identified 15 divisions of work for potential minority, women and emerging small business participation. Participation for this project represents 81% of the identified subcontracting dollars. And I'm gonna pause here and turn it back over to the Council if there is any questions regarding the selection process.

**Potter:** Any questions? Thank you. Was there anybody -- was there a sign-up sheet on this?

**Clerk:** I didn't have a sign-up sheet.

**Potter:** Anybody here wish to testify on this matter? [No audible response.] Okay, this --

**Saltzman:** But we did get a bid lower than the engineer's estimate?

**Potter:** Yes, almost \$200,000.

**Moody:** It was negotiated down.

**Saltzman:** Great.

**Potter:** Need a motion to accept.

**Saltzman:** Vote. So moved.

**Potter:** Is there a second?

**Sten:** Second.

**Potter:** Please call the vote.

**Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel pounded]. Thank you. Please read the next item.

**Item 1468.**

**Leonard:** Commissioner Sten and I could both address this. I'm gonna do a more general global view. Commissioner Sten really knows much more about the details of this entire issue of homelessness. But my intent in bringing this forward wasn't anything but my concern that there are homeless women in this community who, for a variety of reasons, will not end up in permanent housing, refuse to go to permanent housing. And the result is that we have homeless women oftentimes that have a number of issues that have no place to stay on a cold, rainy night. And I understand there are other concerns about this particular shelter. I share those concerns, but this may fund. However, in the balance of concerns that there are about this proposal, it weighs in favor of me providing a warm, dry bed for homeless women in the winter. And that's my only purpose for bringing this forward. It isn't to endorse, you know, the Salvation Army program per se or their philosophy per se. All I am doing is trying to fund some beds that they have there, and if its not those beds, that maybe some other beds. But my only concern is starting tonight or as soon as we can cut the check, we have women that slept out on the street last night but will have a bed to sleep in.

**Sten:** Thanks for sharing. I appreciate you and the Mayor and the entire Council's attention to this issue. I'll just say very briefly, Mayor, 'cause we're short on time, is that we're almost two years into this 10-year plan to try and end chronic homelessness. And part of the things that we have done over this two-year period in which we've had over 900 individuals who were living on the streets for more than a year move into housing, we have about an 80% success rate at keeping them there so far. So it's working. One of the things we've had to do is make some pretty choices, to defund some things that were not as long-term focused. And we've really been using a housing first model, which was not what this particular program was using at the Salvation Army. And so we actually moved that money into permanent housing. I think we do have a hole in terms of just pure emergency shelter for people as it gets very cold, and that's what this money would be used for. At this point, I would -- I'm going to take the ordinance, which does not specify where the money goes, and come back, probably just informally to the Council offices, with an actual plan on how to do it.

**November 1, 2006**

There's one issue that's arisen that I think is very serious from Commissioner Adams that the Salvation Army is actually in many places not in compliance with the City's ordinances that -- we have an ordinance that says that if you offer health benefits, you have to offer it to domestic partners in order to do business with the City. And we also have an ordinance that says you have to have a nondiscrimination toward gay and lesbian employees in hiring. And at least to my knowledge at this point, it's brought to my attention that that criteria is not met. And so I feel that we need to contract with groups that meet that criteria. There's a possible couple of ways to go about this, including the Salvation Army changing its position on this contract. They won't do it nationally or internationally. That's beyond the Portland offices. So I'm gonna pass that amendment that I work with Commissioner Adams to put together, and it essentially just says -- adds a clause that says granting documents prepared by the Bureau of Housing Community Development for this purpose must include language consistent with the City of Portland's civil rights policies and nondiscrimination code. So I think we do need to meet those policies. And I will find a way to do that and get at the urgency that Commissioner Leonard has raised.

**Leonard:** So, I obviously share concern, but as I said, I have a greater concern at this point that tonight there may be women that are on the street, because we have this -- I don't know if you call it dispute, or problem. Is there a way for us to use this money or will it -- would it require more for us to even contract with, I don't know, motels or something where we can actually get people off the street.

**Sten:** Well, as you can imagine, I would like to do this as cost-effectively as possible. There's -- it just -- we've just been moving this week literally since Monday. There's a couple of possibilities, including one of the churches that meets this criteria. There's also the West Women's Shelter, which is an affiliate of the Salvation Army and actually has a different set of policies. And they may be -- that may be a way to not avoid the policy but say we will contract through them. And that's something we're talking with Salvation Army about. And so there's two or three things. None has emerged by this morning as the answer, but I think -- I think we need to enforce our policy, and we need to get the shelter open. And I think we can do that by the end of the week.

**Leonard:** Okay, so it's your sense that the staff -- and I appreciate hearing your -- you understand the sense of urgency, but your sense that the staff understand that every day they spend on this is one more night that we have women sleeping on the street, so --

**Potter:** Is that telephone? What's that noise? Everybody check their telephone and make sure it's not on.

**Sten:** Yes, and I will get something --

**Leonard:** Thank you.

**Sten:** Okay.

**Potter:** So do I hear a second for that.

**Leonard:** Second.

**Potter:** Call the vote.

**Leonard:** Aye **Saltzman:** Aye **Sten:** Aye

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel pounded.] And then the ordinance.

**Clerk:** We have one person signed up to testify.

**Potter:** Okay.

**Clerk:** Teresa Teeter.

**Teresa Teater:** Good morning, gentlemen. Mayor. I'm downtown homeless advocate. I tried to bring you some folks earlier from the Sisters of the Road Café as I usually do, but they didn't want to get out of line. They needed that hot meal. And there was some serious concerns raised by many of them about the Salvation Army and how they operate and the stores that they run and the money used in their store program should have been filtered over to the Harbor Lights program, which I agreed with. Not understanding why they're using the women -- and this was said to me this

**November 1, 2006**

morning: “Why are they using the women to intimidate you to get money out of instead of the men's program?” That was an exact quote from a homeless woman down by Street Roots. And she says, “I have to go get in line to get this hot meal, because I was freezing all night.” And yesterday I downloaded a settlement agreement between the United States of America and Deschutes County about the Americans With Disability Act on emergency services, and there's all kinds of stuff in here about contracts that the city had down there with shelters, Red Cross, etc. and emergency preparedness programs and things. And maybe you might want to look at it. It's more like if there's a flood and things like that. But there are specific disability rights guaranteed to people, contracts, etc., and things. So I thought I'd pass this on. But my concern is also, I was told by a Tri-met bus driver last year when the Katrina first thing happened that he was a CPA for the Red Cross years ago, and when things were going on down in the South, he knew who was at what hotel, 'cause he paid the check for it. And he knew what the Red Cross paid the Salvation Army for, etc., and who was getting what and what. And he said that somebody is listed on the stock market under American Salvage and that would be the company we're discussing today. You might want to check that out. And if they have stock, then why aren't they selling it to fund these projects or something. I'm just kind of concerned that there's a lot more to this. And why did this ship just suddenly go down when it's been in operation for years? And I don't want this to come back and bite you folks, because, you know, nonprofits are supposed to be nonprofits. There's not supposed to be some rich CEO sitting somewhere in a million-dollar home while people possibly could die on the street tonight in Portland, Oregon. So just wanted to bring this to your attention. And also one more thing. There's a store across the street from Schumacher's that's set up just for Christmas to fund -- the money they raise there funds 35 agencies regarding children and women. And the Salvation Army is listed on the door out there with the list of CASA and everybody. And I specifically went in there again Saturday and asked them, “can you not get this money right now to help Harbor Lights?” And they said “no, they have to wait 'til the season is done. They divide everything sold at the store by 35, and everybody gets an equal share.” And I said “well, couldn't you do it this year? Give the Salvation Army a little bit like right now to help -- to help cut down on the City giving out money that's needed for other things.” So anyway, they said no, they have to do that way. So I want people to know there is a store in downtown Portland -- a Christmas children's store that funds 35 nonprofits in this town, so please shop there, too. Thanks.

**Potter:** Teresa, your times up. Is there anyone who didn't sign, who wishes to testify in this matter. This is an emergency vote. Please call the vote.

**Leonard:** I greatly appreciate on cases like this having -- working with the folks that I do here at the City Council. It's really wonderful for all of us to be able to all agree on issues like this and swiftly come to a solution that is such a really a basic human need to have housing, particularly for vulnerable women. Aye.

**Saltzman:** I appreciate Commissioner Leonard continuing to bring this issue to our attention. I understand larger context in which this is operating in terms of our 10-year plan to end homelessness, and I hope we can reconcile all this. But it is important, in my estimation, too, to always have a shelter available for the women. Aye.

**Sten:** We'll, I just got a couple little clarifications, and I {unintelligible} this will make sense. Our fastest that we can get the actual full shelter open is the 22nd, given some of the -- this is their problems at the shelter, but I think what we can do with this infusion is expand the motel voucher program as of tonight. And that will --

**Leonard:** Excellent. Thank you.

**Sten:** The nice thing about that, too, is it only scales to the need. So we just do what needs to get done. So we'll move on that immediately. Aye.

\*\*\*\*\*: Thank you.

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel pounded.] Please read the next item.

November 1, 2006

**Item 1469.**

**Potter:** Folks, if you could make your remarks brief, it would be appreciated.

**Christine Moody:** Christine Moody, Bureau of Purchases. And before you is an ordinance to approve contract-specific special procurement. Oregon law and City code requires City Council to approve contract-specific special procurements. The findings required to approve the special procurement are that there is a potential for cost savings up to \$300,000 by applying the open access shopping credit. The City will seek competitive rate quotes from PGE, PP&L and Sempra Energy Solutions that will be unlikely to encourage favoritism or substantially diminished competition and that this will promote public interest by seeking rate quotes during the open enrollment November 13th through the 17th. And the Office of Sustainable Development will report back to Council within 45 days on the actions taken as a result of this special procurement. Now I will now hand this over to Dave Tooze from OSD who can speak to you about the open access shopping credit if you have any questions.

**Dave Tooze:** Mayor Potter, Council members, Dave Tooze from OSD. I'll try to make this brief, but would be glad to answer questions that you might have. The objective of this exercise is to authorize the Office of Management and Finance to participate in purchasing electricity from the open marketplace as opposed to the electricity that's supplied by our local utilities. The electricity would continue to be delivered by those local utilities. We're just talking about the generated part of our electricity product. The ultimate purpose here is bill savings to our City bureaus. We will not participate in the process unless there are demonstrated savings to be had through the price quote that we get from Sempra Energy Solutions. So we're in a good position. If we have energy savings, then we enroll. If there are no bill savings, then we pass on the opportunity and stay with the local utilities.

**Potter:** Any questions?

**Saltzman:** I would just add that this is -- as you know, the City is in ongoing negotiations about purchasing all of our City electricity from wind power in Eastern Oregon, and Sempra is one of the companies who are involved in those talks. And while we're still talking with them about the longer term deal, this was an idea that they came up with that could save us money right now. So it was an excellent idea, and I think we should move on it.

**Potter:** Other questions. Thank you. Is there anybody signed to testify on this matter?

**Clerk:** No one signed up.

**Potter:** Is anybody here who wishes to testify on this matter? {No audible response.} It's an emergency vote. Please call the vote.

**Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel sounded.] Thank you, folks. Please read the next item.

**Item 1470.**

**Potter:** Staff? Please keep your remarks as brief as possible.

**Matt Lampe:** Yes {unintelligible}. Matt Lampe, chief technology officer, Bureau of Technology Services. This amendment is really just clarification of the method for billing of the electrical power for MetroFi's WIFI service. The contract as approved by Council calls for MetroFi to pay for all its electrical service. In working with PGE and working through some of the issues with their tariff structure with the PUC, we found that it was far simpler and would work much better, since we're attaching to power sources that are feeding city traffic lights and city streetlights, if it would bill through the City as opposed to PGE trying to set up separate accounts under their tariff for each of 2500 devices. So we worked with PGE and PUC to come up with this modification that basically still retains the same structure of MetroFi paying for all their power.

**Potter:** Thank you. I understand that we're gonna be kicking off the first phase end of November, about a 2-square mile area --

**Matt Lampe:** Yes.

**November 1, 2006**

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Yes, {unintelligible} that is true.

**Potter:** Any questions from the Commissioners? Is there anyone signed up to testify on this matter?

**Clerk:** I didn't have a sign-up sheet.

**Potter:** Is there anyone who wished to testify on this matter in the audience? This is a nonemergency and moves to a second reading. Thank you, folks. {unintelligible} the next item.

**Item 1471.**

**Potter:** This item was not discussed last week, because there were no staff and Council to present the item. Does Council have any questions in regards to this contract?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Thank you.

**Potter:** This is the second reading. Please call the vote.

**Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel pounded]. Please read the next item.

**Item 1472.**

**Andrew Aebi:** Andrew Aebi, local improvement district administrator. There were no objections received to final assessment.

**Potter:** Is there any questions from the Commissioners?

**Leonard:** Model presentation, Andrew. {Audience laughing.}

**Potter:** Is anyone -- do we have a sign-up sheet?

**Clerk:** I do. I have Curt Fuller.

**Potter:** Okay. Please come forward.

**Leonard:** Take note of my comment to Andrew. {Audience laughing}

**Curt Fuller:** Good afternoon. My name is Curt Fuller. I'm with ProLogis. We are the property owner on the west side of 148th. I just want to take a moment to thank the City of Portland and the LID staff and Andrew Aebi for the work they did on this project. It is exceptional. We billed 15 million square feet of industrial space across the country, and this is one of the smoothest processes that I have been through. When we began the project, I wish I had a before picture, but 148th was narrow, it didn't have any sidewalks, it was steep, it was unsafe. The slew was overgrown. It was steep. It wasn't even a slew. It was a pond. It didn't drain. We had done the 158th LID several years prior. Internally I was strongly advised against proceeding with an LID process, because of the experience that we had on 158th. We met with Andrew Aebi and his staff, and they assured us the process had changed, and they stuck to their commitment. The project came in under budget, ahead of schedule, and the coordination between the City staff and our engineers, between our contractor and the City's contractor was exceptional. So I would encourage the process to continue. I will hope to take advantage of it again in the future. The results are that we have a beautiful street. It has trees. It has improved the environmental area around it in the slew. The Portland Development Commission was involved. Their contribution towards the culvert under 148th allowed this project to proceed early as well as make the entire project competitive with surrounding industrial areas and certainly areas outside of the city of Portland. So thank you to the City of Portland and to everyone on the staff.

**Potter:** Thank you. We'll relay that to Commissioner Adams' office as well. It's a nonemergency. Moves to a second reading. Please read item 1473.

**Item 1473.**

**Potter:** Second reading. Call the vote.

**Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel sounded.] Please read the next item.

**Item 1474.**

**Potter:** Mr. Saltzman.

**Saltzman:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor, members of the Council. Let me start right off by categorically stating that the passage of this resolution and acceptance of this report in no way whatsoever

**November 1, 2006**

commits this Council to selling or leasing parkland on Mt. Tabor. What it does do is it responds to a budget note that the Council approved in its last year's -- in this year's budget to allow -- this report fulfills the budget note requirement, and it does allow the release of \$650,000 from the general fund contingency for much-needed life and safety improvements in maintenance facilities throughout the parks system. Expenditures of these funds will not be used for future disposition of the City's property at Mt. Tabor Maintenance Yard, and we have members today from our Parks workforce to express to you the importance of jumping on these improvements. There has been plenty of angst and concern expressed to the Council regarding the Mt. Tabor Maintenance Yard. And as Commissioner Leonard and Commissioner Adams, I think, as I told them last week, I heard them loud and clear on another matter. We need an extensive public outreach process to best determine what the public envisions for the land, this land that is currently not included in the Mt. Tabor master plan. The 2000 master plan for Mt. Tabor excluded the maintenance yard and nursery. In 2003 when the Water Bureau did its public process around the future of the reservoirs, again the maintenance yard and the nursery were specifically called out as needing an open public process. SE Uplift has all written us a letter— well, they wrote me a letter. I presume {unintelligible} got it too, yesterday—that specifically says “we encourage you to consider using the opportunity that this report presents to enter into an open community engagement process to discuss the recommendations and to determine disposition of publicly held lands the Parks currently uses as part of its facilities maintenance service infrastructure.” And that's exactly what we will do is we will subject any question around the Mt. Tabor maintenance facility to a process that takes in Bureau Improvement Project #9, which are the public involvement tools that the Mayor has led the City in developing, to determine the best use of this property. I think its an excellent idea, and I support this outreach effort. And everyone who has an interest, needs to be around the table, including Warner Pacific College. A memorandum of understanding between Parks and the college was developed, and this needs to be brought into the conversation. The Parks Bureau and Warner Pacific College admittedly got ahead of themselves, and it contains deadlines in there that it should not have contained. And for that, as commissioner in charge of Parks, I apologize. But we do need to make sure that the college is -- I believe the college is an important asset to Portland, and as the memorandum of understanding was intended, it was simply to be a reflection of our desire to work with the college to pursue opportunities that may provide public benefits, both to the college and to the citizens of our city. But there are other potential public benefits as well. I'm also interested in more off-leash areas. I'm also interested in more community gardens, and the nursery and the maintenance yard could present opportunities for those as well. So with so many needs and opinions out there, a sound public process is needed. But now back to the issue at hand. We have a report before us that lays out six options for making our Parks maintenance facility safe and efficient. The price tag on this work is big, and it varies from approximately \$8 million to \$41 million. But most importantly, we need to utilize \$650,000 that the Council held in reserve to immediately address the life safety issues in these facilities. There are immediate worker safety concerns that must be addressed and remedied quickly. By accepting this report, Council authorizes Parks to spend the appropriate dollars on these safety-related needs. I've toured some of these buildings, and the conditions are not pretty. I do want to thank some of employees today -- Parks employees and their representatives for highlighting and working with management on this issue. Parks employees are out in the community every day making sure our parks are clean and in good condition. We need to allow the release of these funds to show our commitment to their safety. The resolution directs Parks and Office of Management and Finance to develop a funding strategy for this work. And we need people from outside of Parks to give us those ideas and come back to Council next year with their best options. In the interim, as I said, we should commit to a public process using Bureau Improvement Project #9, on the future of the maintenance yard and nursery. That would be a parallel process that would be underway, and all of the Council can be secure in knowing that the

**November 1, 2006**

public is being heard and the funding strategy has been appropriately vetted. Now there may be issues that we'll hear about today about who owns Mt. Tabor, whether it's the Water Bureau, the Parks Bureau, and frankly I think that's, you know -- I'll stipulate one thing: The property is owned by the City of Portland. Decisions about City of Portland property are made by the City Council. We have reaffirmed that last year by creating a Council Committee of the Whole to review all infrastructure bureaus: Water, Parks, Environmental Services, and Transportation. So any decision, regardless of who owns the property, is going to be made by the City Council. So I'd now like to invite up Parks director Zari Santner, senior manager Robin Grimwade, and Labors 43 representative Richard Beetle with a very short presentation on the report and the needed improvements. And then we can have questions. I did also want to ask the Council if they would indulge. We have several other Parks Bureau employees who are here to testify here on this item, and I'd like to be able to have them come up first. They've taken important time away from their jobs at Parks, and we'd like to get them back to their jobs. So if that's something the Council would indulge, we have I believe six people from Parks that I'd like to have come up after this panel.

**Potter:** And just as a reminder folks. I know this is an important issue, but brevity is certainly appreciated.

**Zari Santner:** We try {unintelligible}--

**Leonard:** I wonder if I might help a little bit by starting off just the last comment you made, Commissioner Saltzman, with respect whether its Water or City of Portland property. There is a distinction that even the Council can't override and that is ratepayer funds used for water facilities come along with them restrictions that even the Council can't override. So I need for you to -- I need for everybody to understand that. It isn't a matter of "I own this or you own that." It is water facilities have very strict covenants and restrictions placed on the bonds, how property and their money can be used. So we can't take just x Water Bureau facilities, sell it and give it to the general fund of the City. It has to go back to the ratepayers. So just as long as we understand that about this discussion.

**Zari Santner:** {unintelligible} that clarification, Commissioner. Good afternoon. We'll do our best to be brief but give you adequate information so that you could decide on which direction to go. Today we're bringing for your consideration -- I'm sorry. Zari Santner, Director of Portland Parks and Recreation. We're bringing for your consideration a comprehensive report about our maintenance facilities as was directed by Council during the budget process last year. The report describes what can be done to address the inadequacy of the current facility in order to meet the needs of our staff working in and from those facilities and for a more efficient delivery of service to the public. For many years, as Commissioner Saltzman eluded to, Park staff -- Parks field staff, their supervisors, the officials of the bargaining units representing those staff, have expressed extreme concerns about the poor and in many cases unsafe conditions of the many buildings that house our field staff. Needless to say, that regardless of the condition of the workplace, Parks staff has consistently done a great job of taking care of the City's vast park system for the enjoyment of the community. Their valid concerns and needs made it very, very clear to me that addressing those concerns should be a high priority for the bureau. Commissioner Leonard may recall that three years ago I invited him, and he graciously agreed, to tour our central facility at Mt. Tabor. And he saw firsthand the substandard conditions of those facilities. Earlier this year, as Commissioner Saltzman mentioned in his remarks, I gave him that tour as well. And he was truly surprised by what he saw. Those visits meant a lot to our staff. It really boosted their morale, that you cared enough to take time from your very, very busy schedule to come and see where they work and what they have to work with. And I want to thank you for that. Today you'll get a report on the magnitude of those problems and what options are available to address them. You will also note from the report that we will gain efficiencies, which means saving money, by investing in our workforce. But what will be hard for I or the report ti describe are frustrations that Dan, our very

**November 1, 2006**

capable plumber, feels when he finds himself working on fixing a leaking pipe in one of those buildings only to see it pop up again in another section a few months later. And he has to continue to use this band-aid approach to provide water to the facilities so that the staff can carry out their duties. Or the frustration of the female gardeners and utility workers when they have to share a single, small and dilapidated restroom with their untidy male coworkers—{audience laughing} sorry, my bias here—and a sundry of tools and cleaning materials. They deserve to have a washroom that is clean and provides them with privacy. The resolution before you today asks that you allow us to use the \$650,000 that was set aside last year, and we thank you for that, so that we could address these issues. They will be used to deal with immediate life safety and code problems at facilities in Gabriel Park, at SE 136th Avenue site and the barn at East Delta Park, that you will see -- you get a good understanding of its condition. I have to be honest with you. I was really looking forward to bringing you this report, which outlines how we can begin to address this long-awaited needs of our field staff. But unfortunately and regretfully, this effort has been clouded by a separate issue, which the bureau and I commit to address to the community's satisfaction through the process, an approach suggested by Commissioner Saltzman. Now Robin will be even briefer than I if I can be done -- will present to you the findings of that report, and we're obviously will be available for questions afterwards.

**Robin Grimwade:** Thank you, Zari. Thank you, Mayor, Commissioners. Robin Grimwade, manager of strategy financing and business development. As Zari indicated, we're here for you today in response to a Council budget directive where we were required to report back to Council in terms of an overall plan for facilities. What you see here in this photograph is the various storage units which we have had to assemble, and they range from a Home Depot storage garage to metal shipping containers, which houses our facilities on a day-to-day basis. The goals of the study were to assess health and safety conditions, determine the space needs to make the overall park maintenance and recreation needs of the city, to investigate real estate options, analyze operational efficiencies and analyze energy efficiencies. Parks currently has some eight facilities scattered throughout the parks of Portland, and one of the goals of this study was to look at how we may consolidate those or consider whether they were appropriately located into the areas which they are required to service. At the hub of our maintenance facilities is Mt. Tabor Yard. It was built in 1912, and it serves as the operations and maintenance focal point in terms of machine and welding shops, carpenter and paint shops, irrigation services, turf services, equipment and vehicle maintenance, recreational supplies and parts of our community garden program. The key issues associated with this facility include aging overall condition of the facility, the inadequate electrical and plumbing systems, inadequate workshop and storage space. And what we see here in two of the photographs is illustrating that our welding is often undertaken outside of a building or a covered area due to the inadequate interior conditions and the general lack of interior space, which requires staff to work in cramped quarters. Washington Park maintenance facility was built in the 1930s. Overall the storage building facility is in good condition, but it lacks adequate work space and secure vehicle and equipment storage facilities. {unintelligible} the current site is inadequate to accommodate the overall needs of this service unit, and the photograph on the left illustrates the tight office space of an assistant design manager with barely enough room to get to their desk. While the photograph on the right shows there is a lack of adequate surface paving material to provide all-year-round site access. Gabriel Park maintenance facility. Built in the 1960s, it has little to no physical upgrade in nearly 50 years. The current facility is inadequate to meet overall service delivery needs. The staff office area also serves as the break room, the locker room and has a small adjoining bathroom. The photograph here on the left shows that there is no space to store equipment without moving materials around for access to get to anything stored at the back. The photograph on the right shows the lack of adequate secured service vehicle and equipment areas. Another major concern in relation to Gabriel Park is the lack of secured vehicle and equipment parking and storage space for tools.



**November 1, 2006**

And a metal container storage {unintelligible—feedback} house tractors and lawn-mowing equipment. And one thing you'll find at all of our sites, the lack of secured storage facilities for our vehicles and our equipment is a major issue. Staff leave at the end of the day. They return the following morning to find someone has drained their motor vehicles of petrol or have removed the tools, which are essential for their day-to-day duties. And they then have to seek out other tools and equipment. McLoughlin facility. Located at 8545 McLoughlin Blvd. This is a leased facility until 2010. The site also houses a trailer, which is used by our City Nature staff. While the building is adequate to serve design needs, the site is too small for securing service vehicles and equipment. The provision of adequate facilities and site conditions would necessitate the acquisition of adjacent parcels of land, and the photograph on the left, again illustrates the cramped quarters for staff, lockers and equipment. And we also show a service trailer, which is used to house the staff for City Nature, which has inadequate storage space and operating space. Zone 4 at 136th Avenue and Springwater Corridor. Built in 1965, the staff workspace also serves as a break room, contains a small restroom, which is used for storage, and locker areas for the drying of field gear during wet weather. There is no secured vehicle and equipment storage space, and the storage of noxious chemicals is inadequate. The photograph on the left shows the lack of adequate restroom facilities, which are combined with a shower and are generally located in a closet in a 5x7-foot space. The photograph on the right illustrates the chemicals and flammables that are often stored in difficult-to-access space that is not properly ventilated. Service Zone 5. Service Zone 5 is supported by two maintenance facilities, one at East Delta Park and the other at 920 NE 21st and I-84. The Delta Park facility is located in part of an old 1940s grocery store that served the Vanport development. There, there is an adjacent trailer, which is used to house its staff. The NE 21st Avenue building is adequate for office space but lacks sufficient site area for service vehicles and equipment. The photograph to the left shows the poor office conditions, which also have to service as a breakroom at NE 21st. The photograph on the right illustrates cramped materials and equipment storage space without the proper ventilation. The first floor level is used by the general services—and this is at NE 21st—for the storage space, and it contains remodeled artifacts such as door trims and doors for City Hall. The fragmentation of Zone 5's facility creates an inefficient work environment and operational efficiencies. City Nature North and South Zones. City Nature is located across four different locations within the city. City Nature North is housed at East Delta Park in the Urban Forestry Complex and at Hoyt Arboretum. City Nature South is housed in a trailer at the McLoughlin facility and in a 1908 residence at Mt. Tabor Yard. The Urban Forestry Complex is comprised of three buildings: a 1940 barn, a new trailer, and a 1940 residence. The barn is in a significant state of decay as shown in the left-hand photo, and what you're seeing there is a major horizontal roof beam seriously flawed with a major crack. And it is being held up by a 2x4 piece of timber. On the right, what you're seeing is the foundation of the forestry barn breaking apart, because of subsidence. And what is happening in relationship to the forestry barn is the whole foundation is settling and moving in different directions, and it is pulling the barn over. What this table indicates is the overall issues—health, safety and other—that is involved with our maintenance facilities. These concerns reflect ongoing deferred maintenance, emergency conditions, review and comments by the Parks Safety Committee, and observations by professional consultants. Note that Mt. Tabor, Service Zones 2, 4 and 5, represent the most critical situations in terms of health and safety. Having said all that, the study then went on to look at the proposed options. And through an exhaustive analysis process that resulted in six options outlined in the study documents before you, three options are presented here. Option 1 reflects the cost and health of life safety issues. Approximately \$8 million. Options 2, 3 and 4, which are not shown on this slide, are slight variations to Options 1, in that to varying degrees, they also seek to address the mitigation of capacity issues. Options 5 and 6 fully address life safety and code issues as well as capacity issues. In other words, these two options reflect best practice in that they provide the best

**November 1, 2006**

solution to our maintenance service needs. Furthermore, they can create a higher level of efficiency in the delivery of maintenance services to the community. The important thing here in the relation to Options 5 and 6 is that these figures are what I would call medium to low confidence. What Options 5 and 6 figures say to me is that you need to do further examination to work out which of those options has the greater benefit to City Council and the delivery of services to the community.

**Leonard:** I'm sorry to interrupt you, and I want to get to the people that Commissioner Saltzman has here, but just on that narrow point, the budget note of which I was very involved in writing that you reflected accurately in the resolution, says that "that the contingency will include \$650,000 for the Parks maintenance facility. To be eligible for the funds, Parks must submit to the Council for consideration a final maintenance facility plan showing site acquisition and facility construction requirements." So I remember distinctly us discussing this issue in terms of you bringing back to us a specific plan. And one of the questions I was going to have, but because of your presentation, I think it might be quicker if I just ask you now is, how can you come back with options for us to choose from to use the \$650,000 for, when it was so clear to me that the direction in the budget note was for you come back with a specific plan?

**Robin Grimwade:** We have come back with options. We have identified that there are two options, very, very close.

**Leonard:** I understand. I don't disagree with anything you're saying, but I'm asking, the budget note is specific, and this -- and you're asking for us to use the money for a purpose that was not contemplated in the budget note.

**Robin Grimwade:** The money that we're asking for does not affect the long-term strategy. The money that we are seeking to be released is to address immediate life safety issues. What this study identified towards the end was that there is a major policy issue, which needs to be addressed by Council --

**Leonard:** Why didn't you just come in and ask for that money? That's not what the budget note contemplated. I mean you wrote it in your own -- I mean I've just read back to you what you wrote, so what you're asking for doesn't fit the budget note. I don't disagree that we shouldn't give you the money, but what's concerning me is -- and I don't want to get too far ahead of myself -- is this isn't as straight forward as it should be. I mean I don't think anybody disagrees with any of your requests. Anything you want, I'm there. But it's how you're going about it. And this is an example of that. I mean, it's disturbing.

**Zari Santner:** Commissioner, we --

**Leonard:** Were you {unintelligible}?

**Zari Santner:** We may have -- no we're not, but --

**Leonard:** Okay.

**Zari Santner:** let me please answer that. We may have understood the Council's intent. We thought that what we had heard—and this was in discussion with Office of Management and Finance—that they want to know what you ultimately are going to do with your facilities. And where is this money going to go? Are you -- if you're going to spend it here, is it going to get wasted? And we wanted to make sure that you have a -- and as you will see, that this \$650,000 would go toward those facilities that under any of these options are going to be there, but they; have immediate public safety --

**Leonard:** That's not what the budget note says, Zari. It's not what it -- I mean I would agree. If you came in and said "on an emergency basis, we need X amount of dollars to do these improvements, I'd vote for it." But the -- you're tying this to the budget note. It's not what it says. I was very focused on this particular one --

\*\*\*\*\*: {unintelligible}

**Leonard:** plan that we knew what the plan was and the \$650,000 to help you develop the plan, and then we'd release the money once we knew what the specific plan was. And you're laying out

November 1, 2006

options here. It's just --

**Zari Santner:** Well, I think it would be -- I guess what I would say is perhaps it would be ambitious of us {unintelligible} three months, four months since passage of the budget, for us to come to you with complete detailed plan with all cost estimate. What we are presenting to you here that there are two options that are very close, but it really depends on financial and phasing strategy, and that's what we want to study further to bring back to you. And that would require more than three months.

**Robin Grimwade:** This slide just highlights the length of time that this issue of maintenance facilities has been raised and that early in the period they requested a capital review committee, have not resulted in the necessary funds being delivered to facilitate the life, health safety issues. And that's why we're in the situation today in terms of the amount of life, health safety issues that we need to do -- address. The next step is that we would like Council to authorize the \$650,000 to address the most critical health and safety code issues that we have in relation to our maintenance facilities: \$70,000 in relation to Gabriel Park, \$220,000 in relation to the SE 136th Avenue facility, and \$360,000 to the north Urban Forestry Barn. In particular, the Forestry Barn is a major concern, having received now reports indicating the structural integrity is inadequate at that facility. The other next step we would like Council to approve is that they authorize Parks and the Office of Management and Finance to develop the detailed funding and phasing reports for City Council review and approval. And the other step is that Parks and the Office of Neighborhood Involvement would develop a public process for the future of the Mt. Tabor Yard for City Council review and approval in early spring.

**Saltzman:** Thank you. Richard?

**Richard Beetle:** Mayor Potter, Commissioners, my name is Richard Beetle. I am business manager of Laborers Local 483, and I'd like to join with my members and speak in favor of this resolution. Portland faces many challenges in the 21st century, and one of the most daunting ones is the issue of more families moving to the Portland area every year. This will increase the stress on our services, on our roads, our schools, our public transportation, our affordable housing, threatening to turn the Portland dream of livability into the Portland nightmare of overpopulation and congestion. In this period of increased urban density—and we're gonna have urban density whether we like it or not with all the problems that involves. And it's in that context that our parks and public spaces take on an increasing importance for our citizens. They need to exercise. They need to recreate. They need a place to have cultural and civic events. You'll be hearing testimony from a truly dedicated and professional workforce struggling to provide high levels of service that the public expect and desire and deserve while working out of 19th- and 20th-century facilities that have serious maintenance problems that are inadequately sized and are not located to provide efficient services. Our buildings don't meet ADA or OSHA requirements, and do not meet the current building code for fire and safety hazards. Many of the sites do not have adequate restrooms, showers or lockers for the number of employees. Nowhere in the city do we ask public employees to provide services in these kinds of inadequate and outdated facilities. The question in front of us today, Mayor Potter, Commissioners, is do we invest in the maintenance of our parks, do we bring our maintenance structures and buildings into the 21st century, or do we continue to allow our parks to decay and decline along with Portland's livability? Thank you.

**Saltzman:** As I said, there are several employees here who work in many of these maintenance facilities. I'd like to invite them up here to testify.

**Leonard:** Commissioner, you know it is five after one. We have a 2 o'clock session. We're supposed to eat between -- sometime in there, and there are a number of people in the community. So I obviously don't want to discourage anybody from talking, but --

**Saltzman:** Well, many of them have been waiting here since --

**Leonard:** Okay.

**November 1, 2006**

**Saltzman:** since -- 11 o'clock. So.

**Leonard:** Well, I have to leave at 3 o'clock. So --

**Saltzman:** How many Parks employees wish to testify? Is that 3 or 4? Maybe -- four, five. Can you all come up at once and be brief? Pull some extra chairs up?

**Potter:** And please do be brief. We've got community folks to be heard, so. I know what you have to say is important, and we want to hear it, but make it as quick as possible.

**Jane Lacey:** My name is Jane Lacey. I'm a certified arborist, and I climb trees at the Urban Forestry Division under City Nature's bureau. How many of you have worked in a building that is falling apart? Myself and my colleagues work in a building that is falling apart. The foundation is sinking. Supporting beams and posts are cracked due to the shifting of loads. There's dryrot. We have tarps in the attic to keep water out of our crew room and away from electrical equipment. Sections of the roof have blown off due to strong winds. Urban Forestry Division is a first responder during emergencies. We provide essential city services to the community. The barn houses essential tools and equipment used in responding to these emergencies. If the barn were to fail, our equipment would not be accessible. Please consider our request to receive these monies to repair our facilities. Thank you.

**Cindy Wright:** Cindy Wright, City of Portland Parks, 20-year employee. Several of our facilities we store pesticide gas and paint in those metal containers. They're all unvented. At Gabriel Park, the lunchroom is a 2-car garage. And then you have a tiny little space next to it. In case of fire or earthquake, you have to go through the same room the paint, the chemicals, and the gasoline is stored. There is no other exit. I'm currently out of the trailer park there on McLoughlin. Same thing. Unventilated storage cabinets. We are the most patient of your City employees. We put up with everything in all weather. We're asking for our safety. We're not asking for luxury, just safety. Thank you.

**Leonard:** And can I say before you leave, I want to make sure you understand about this discussion. It's very important before you leave. That this is not about the issues you raised. This is --

**Cindy Wright:** I know.

**Leonard:** not at all. I have been to your facilities more than Mt. Tabor. Your point is right on. I would in a heartbeat vote to do what needs to be done to improve it. This is not about your working conditions or safety by any means. And I resent a little bit that you may have been led to think that.

**Cindy Wright:** Well, I'd like to invite any of you that want to tour -- who haven't toured some of our other facilities that are not as prominent as Mt. Tabor, come on out. We'd love to show you around. We'd love to see your faces.

**Leonard:** Thanks. I will do that again.

**Cindy Wright:** That's why we're here today as employees.

**Potter:** Thank you very much and thank you for your 20 years.

**Paul LaCroix:** Honorable Mayor Potter and City Commissioners, my name is Paul LaCroix. I'm also a 20-year employee of Portland Parks and Recreation. I've worked in many maintenance districts, including the Mt. Tabor Yard during my 20 years. I have a good understanding of the condition and the history of the maintenance facilities in use in Portland Parks and Recreation. As a union steward and a former executive board member of Laborers 483, I've been on somewhat of a personal crusade to call attention to the poor condition of our Park's maintenance facilities. The Portland Park's Bureau is not in compliance, I feel, with contract language, in particular under article 21.9 of our DCTU labor agreement that addressed safety sanitation. This may be the first time that I've been here giving testimony to City Council on this issue, but it's not the first time that I've talked to City Councilors, the former mayor, the director, managers at all levels about this issue. Parks needs a major capital investment in its maintenance facilities, so our Parks employees can continue to provide the quality services the citizens of Portland have come to expect. Parks

**November 1, 2006**

employees need 21st-century facilities to work out of so we can be as productive and as efficient as possible. Also, it would be nice to see a little respect for the working conditions of Parks employees. Our maintenance facilities should have adequate restrooms and showers for our co-ed workforce at 10-50 people, depending on the particular site. There should be lunchrooms with sinks separate from the restrooms. The contract language I referenced before—21.9—states that “employees that handle garbage or are exposed to sewage will have adequate time to take a shower before the end of your shift.” Park's employees routinely handle garbage including trash cans full of dog poop. They're routinely exposed to human feces, blood and various body fluid in the process of cleaning restroom facilities. Some of the stories I could tell of what I've personally encountered and what my co-workers have encountered would take up too much time and not be suitable for polite company. My point in this is that Park's facilities don't provide these basic amenities in many locations. And I feel that the City does have a contractual obligation to provide them, if not out of respect for our employees. Parks has made some effort to provide new maintenance facilities, but there never seems to be enough money to address everything that needs to be done. And community centers have priority over maintenance buildings. I'm here today to strongly encourage you to vote in favor of giving Portland Parks & Recreation \$650,000 that we need as a starting point towards much-needed improvements. Also, we currently -- Portland Parks & Recreation {unintelligible} currently have facilities that it needs to implement the new service zone structure it has been working towards. And considering the condition of our current facilities, I think it says a lot about the dedication and hard work of our employees that is shown by our consistent high rating in auditor's office reports with citizen satisfaction of service delivery. Investing in improvements to our maintenance facilities is just like buying new trucks. Without them, we're not able to do our jobs well. You can stretch out the purchasing rotation, cut back on maintenance during lean times, but eventually you have to buy new trucks because the old ones wear out. And so have a lot of our buildings. It is way past time that the City invested in maintenance facilities in Portland Parks. Thank you.

**Potter:** Thank you, Paul.

**Bill Daniels:** I will be quick. My name is Bill Daniels. I've worked with the City of Portland Parks for over 20 years, and in my tour, I've been {unintelligible} on the east side of the river {unintelligible} those facilities suffer more than perhaps some of the other areas of town as well as the parks themselves. I'll be quick. My point was about lack of space, storage space facilities for equipment, vehicle and tool storage. We are so spread out, that we end up using broom closets and pipe chases in restrooms to be able to find adequate storage spaces just for tools. We don't have a central facility that's large enough nor safe enough to store those tools to be able to organize our day efficiently. We're backtracking several times during the day to pick up equipment or actually having to go to Tabor Yard to purchase new inventory just to be able to save time. I would like to say also that we've experienced a fair amount of theft on the grounds, because we have inadequate storage facilities to have people put the vehicles inside. Typically, ideally would be a secure steel buildings where theft isn't so prominent. We've had gas siphoned, hoses cut, batteries stolen out of vehicles. I just want to let you know again that if we can do this right, and you look at those six options, and you come up with the option that's gonna work for us so we can efficiently perform our work. Thank you.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Dan Forner:** Good afternoon, Mayor and Commissioners. My name is Dan Forner. I am the maintenance plumber in Portland Parks & Recreation. I handed you a maintenance facility plan. If you want to know what's on the front, it was in 1999, we can briefly go through there. I can tell you from that survey that they did, nothing has changed. It has only gotten worse. We can jump to page 10, and it says {unintelligible} “overall rating, critical.” They are critical. And as you go back to the last page there, they give you somewhat of a score thing -- summary of everything as you go down

**November 1, 2006**

there. But this was in 1988 or 1999, triple that. Since I have been there or since this has come out, to the best of my recollection, we have added one new restroom in that facility. That was put in there for ADA access. In doing so, we eliminated one restroom with a shower. Instead of having three showers, we now have two showers. Thank you.

**Potter:** Thank you, {unintelligible}. Thank you very much.

**Saltzman:** Thank you all, and --

**Potter:** Is that it?

**Saltzman:** -- that's it.

**Leonard:** I'd like to have Zari and Robin come back up. So what I've tried to do is break this down so that we can have a really coherent, concise discussion into the topics that I think apply here. And I've broken it down into three subject areas. Please tell me if you think there should be more or don't agree with these. But the three I've broken it down into is what I've discussed earlier, Robin, when you were testifying as to whether or not the resolution itself reflects the direction of the fiscal year '06-'07 budget note. And just to remind you, it says "To be eligible for the funds [the \$650,000], Parks must submit to the City Council for consideration a final maintenance facility plan showing site acquisition and facility construction requirements." I mean just on a technical level, that's what the budget note said. What you've come back with is projects that don't fit that. They're projects that I agree need to be done, and I agree we should fund, but I am not -- I'm less than pleased that you've -- you appear to be attempting to get the \$650,000 released for projects that were not contemplated when we did the budget note. It was specifically for you to come up with a final maintenance plan that included showing site acquisition. So I have just a fundamental concern with that. Second issue that I've identified, that notwithstanding Commissioner Saltzman's comment, I think it is important who owns all of the property at the Mt. Tabor Yard. And, not, as I said—I want to be real clear—not because I have Water, and he has Parks, and he can't sell Water property 'cause it's Parks. It's not that. It is that those assets owned by the Water Bureau can only be used for water-related functions. So if somebody says, well what about your hydroparks idea, Randy, how is that connected? You will notice that in every place where we're taking a facility and improving it for public use, there is a water-related -- active water-related facility on that site. So it might be like a Texas tax. There is an active water-related facility. They were just simply using what's there already that we have to maintain at --

**Saltzman:** Hazelwood.

**Leonard:** at Hazelwood. Thank you. Hazelwood, there is a active well there that we have to have and maintain. We test the groundwater that openly comes out of our pumps on Columbia Blvd. there. So we have to have it. We can't sell it. Where there was -- where there is truly surplus Water Bureau property, we cannot use that for a hydropark. It is an inappropriate use of public funds. So that's -- that applies here as well. We cannot -- and if Commissioner Saltzman was under the impression that the Council as a group had the ability to decide to sell that kind of property, you know, a utility-owned property, that's not correct. We don't have that latitude to do that. That's the second issue, who owns -- that's why it's important to decide who owns the property. And finally, and more globally, is the process that's been used up to this point, has it been transparent? Those are the three issues I've identified. I guess I'll go to the first point first. Do you have a sketch of the property that is under consideration at Mt. Tabor? Do you actually have boundaries of what that is?

**Potter:** Did you say "under consideration"?

**Leonard:** I'm sorry.

**Potter:** Did you say "under consideration"?

**Leonard:** Yes.

**Potter:** It's not under consideration today.

**Leonard:** Well, the Mt. Tabor Yard is under consideration for improvement, so there has to be --

**Potter:** It's not -- for the \$650,000 it's not. There are three properties that they've asked for.

**November 1, 2006**

**Saltzman:** What we're saying is that anything around the Mt. Tabor Yard and the nursery will be subject to a public involvement process.

**Leonard:** Well --

**Saltzman:** We'll just look at issues that could include selling or leasing or it could include keeping it or it could include using it for off-leash areas or community gardens.

**Leonard:** But isn't that part of what this money is going to be used for?

**Saltzman:** No, it's all for facilities other than Mt. Tabor.

**Potter:** Would you name those three facilities?

**Zari Santner:** Gabriel Park, SE 136th Avenue, and the Forestry Barn in East Delta.

**Leonard:** And so you're saying that -- when the "whereas" that says that the \$650,000 is to be used for a final maintenance facility plan, wasn't that contemplated when we wrote that to include the Mt. Tabor facility, relocation of that?

**Zari Santner:** We did not use any portion -- first of all, we don't have the money yet. You haven't authorized it. No portion of the \$650,000 is going towards this study or towards whether Mt. Tabor Yard would -- our central facility would stay Mt. Tabor Yard or not.

**Leonard:** You're talking about if we passed this.

**Zari Santner:** If you passed this --

**Leonard:** That's not my question, Zari. Listen to my --

**Zari Santner:** Or even before that. yes..

**Leonard:** Okay, listen to my question. My question is: When we did the budget note back when we adopted the '06-'07 budget, we had a budget note that said -- and I remember this one. Some of them I don't remember as clear as other. This I remember it very clearly. We said that "to be eligible for the funds—this is a quote—Parks must submit to the City Council for consideration a final maintenance facility plan." A final maintenance facility plan. Did that not include the disposition of Mt. Tabor?

**Zari Santner:** We have two options. That final -- you saw -- what you saw is one option that deals with only with the safety issues. It's a policy decision that the Council has to help us decide.

**Leonard:** You're not hearing me. You're fast-forwarding to this resolution. I'm back in May when we adopted the budget. May 15th or so.

**Zari Santner:** Right.

**Leonard:** We put in a budget note, because most of us recognized in our minds that the facilities -- and as you point out, one of the facilities I toured that you took me to was Mt. Tabor.

**Zari Santner:** Right.

**Leonard:** And your argument at the time, as it was in this last budget cycle, we have to replace this. We all agree with that.

**Zari Santner:** Right.

**Leonard:** I agree with that. So when I voted for this and helped draft this budget note, what I knew I was voting for was for you to come back with a plan that would either -- that would include all your -- not just Mt. Tabor, but all of the one's that you just talked about, but would include either replacing them, rebuilding them, whatever needed to be done. But we would have a report that we would get that we would vote on that would be the final report of what you want to do with all those facilities, including Mt. Tabor. Did you not -- was that not your thought at the time?

**Zari Santner:** It was our thought at the time. After we did this study, we recognized that there are two very viable final options.

**Leonard:** {unintelligible}

**Zari Santner:** The two options—#5 and #6. They are -- the only difference between them are the fact that one would be complete replacement of our central facilities at Mt. Tabor Yard, and the other is a brand new central facility at a separate location.

**Leonard:** That's what you've brought to us today, right--

November 1, 2006

**Zari Santner:** Yes.

**Leonard:** -- is the options?

**Zari Santner:** That's what I have brought to you.

**Leonard:** So I have to get back -- circle back to the Mayor's concern. This is not part of the discussion. Yes it is. It's one of the options you're looking at, right?

**Zari Santner:** Right, but we have to further study it, Commissioner --

**Leonard:** No, no, oh --

**Zari Santner:** to give you some --

**Leonard:** Please. Listen. This is going to go a lot quicker if you listen to my questions and just answer them. And I don't need to be sold or handheld. I know where I'm at, and I know where I want to go. But my understanding is, from reading everything I have on this subject, that it is incorrect to say that this -- that we're voting on today doesn't affect Mt. Tabor. It may. It may not. But what you're proposing is to look at what to do with Mt. Tabor as part of this study, right?

**Zari Santner:** That's an accurate statement.

**Leonard:** Okay, so I want to get back to my question. The point is that I was asking was, do you have boundaries of Mt. -- the Mt. Tabor facility. Do you actually have a legal description or a map that shows what that is in context of Mt. Tabor Park?

**Zari Santner:** We have a map that were provided to us by Water Bureau staff that shows where specifically are the properties that are owned by Water Bureau's, where are -- what specifically the properties that are owned by City, which could be Parks. And as you, Commissioner, mentioned, there is uncertainty about that. And that's something that we need to check into. And there isn't the clarity.

**Leonard:** Okay. If that's -- that was actually what I was trying to get to, and you answered that. So I appreciate that. So then I'm gonna jump to #3 about the process. Had you contemplated, as part of your discussion, selling the Mt. Tabor site?

**Zari Santner:** Commissioner, we have looked into an interest that was presented to us by Warner Pacific College in seeing if there could be a partnership between that college and us in developing athletic facilities on that site if we conclude, and that means the City Council concludes, that that piece of property is no longer needed for a central facility for our maintenance yard. And when they came to us with this idea, we said "well, we're willing to entertain this idea if there is going to be a win-win-win. Win for the college. Win for the community and win for the Parks staff -- Parks field staff if we can get facilities there. So, yes, we did say, if there is this three-way win, we are willing start a conversation with you.

**Saltzman:** That would be sale or lease. That should be clarified.

**Zari Santner:** Right.

**Leonard:** Okay. But as of late yesterday, we were told by your office that you had not seen the memo that has been the subject of some discussion until yesterday that was a -- I think it's entitled a memorandum of understanding. However, today, I have a signed copy—signed by you August 24th and J. Barber on August 24th of this year. And I'm not gonna read the whole thing, but I am going to read the parts I'm interested in hearing your reaction to in the context of what you just said.

**Zari Santner:** Commissioner, I signed that letter, that MOU, and I thoroughly read it before I signed it, so I don't think --

**Leonard:** It seems a little bit out of context with what you just said, so that's why I want to read for the record to give you an opportunity to maybe take the remarks you just made and square them with what you signed and apparently, as you said, thoroughly read. One of the provisions says "expansion by Warner Pacific on the Mt. Tabor Maintenance Yard may require historic design and demolition review. Warner Pacific and the City agree to work together to effect the necessary changes." And further down it says "the City and Warner Pacific will negotiate a mutually acceptable purchase price at which Warner Pacific will purchase the area known as the Mt. Tabor



**November 1, 2006**

Maintenance Yard from the City.” And then further down, it says “determination of the purchase price, the City and Warner Pacific agree to make best efforts to negotiate a purchase price for the Mt. Tabor Maintenance Yard on or before 15 September 2006.” And then finally, “execution of a purchase and sale agreement, the City and Warner Pacific will make efforts to enter into a purchase and sale agreement no later than 15 November 2006.” Now admittedly I am not an attorney. I've made that clear. I mean I -- there may be nuances in here that an attorney would recognize that I as a lay citizen do not. But it seems pretty clear to me that you're more than just sitting down asking to talk about options. You've agreed on a purchase date. You've agreed on a sale agreement date of when it's to be signed. And I might also add, since I'm asking and since you're both here, Robin, so you don't feel alone, you wrote an email on July 7th saying that from the Parks' perspective, we have an appraisal. They, Warner Pacific, will get another, and then enter into negotiations. Negotiations will be handled by Jo and I if Council signs off on the proposal.” Now that sounds a little bit more like that you're just thinking about it and looking at ideas. And I want to make sure you understand. I don't -- had this been handled different, I don't necessarily disagree with what you were doing. In fact, I don't know that anybody would. But it is trying to square some of your public statements, things I was told in the last few weeks that I learned yesterday were not true, Zari. And things that the community were led to believe, and what you just said, Zari versus what a document that you signed. And --

**Saltzman:** If I can just add. As I said in my opening remarks, the memorandum was overly ambitious, should not have contained specific dates.

**Leonard:** And I appreciate that.

**Saltzman:** And I apologize for that. I think the point is not so much to look at what was done, but for us today decide and commit to a process of going forward to getting to the issue about the future of the Mt. Tabor yard.

**Leonard:** And I wish that was -- I wish that was --

**Saltzman:** And do that {unintelligible}.

**Leonard:** I wish life was that easy. As we've learned at the Water Bureau, we've had to dig in and make up for a lot of poor process decisions that cost us credibility. And ultimately the point you're making leads me to my final point: If you really want to get a new maintenance facility built and you want Council support, this is the exact opposite way to do it. This is going to prolong the process. It has -- if you treat people as though you mistrust them, guess how they behave? They {unintelligible} the people that are mistrustful. And what's happened now, and I'm unfortunately one of them, is I'm having a hard time with the credibility factor on what I'm being presented here today. And that is part of how I decide things, Dan, on this Council. It isn't just what I read. It's what I'm told, and my experience. And as you know, Zari, I've worked very hard -- and we went through a couple budgets that were hard that I didn't -- that I had not dissimilar reactions that I'm having today about the presentations you made. At the request of Mayor Potter, I've worked very hard to try to get over those. And I have to say, I've slid back to my original kind of perception that all is not what it appears to be when dealing with the Parks budget. And it's from the perspective of a person who grew up and in next to a Portland park from the time I was born. And I would -- if I hadn't grown up where I did and had the feelings I do about Parks, I might just not say anything. But I care too much about these folks that were up here testifying, I care too much about the park system to just sit here and allow what appears to me to be an attempt to dispose of some property in a less-than-straight-forward way. And it bothers me not a little bit.

**Zari Santner:** Commissioner, I understand your feeling, and I am very sorry that I have disappointed you. And we have made our best effort to develop a process, a proposal that would be a great benefit to this city. I just want to articulate the purpose of the memorandum of the understanding. The pages that you read before that, there were paragraphs and statements that this is a nonbinding, unenforceable and can be cancelled due to various circumstances. It was -- this

**November 1, 2006**

memorandum of understanding was a way for Warner Pacific and the Park Bureau to determine whether this idea had any leg to stand on, whether it was feasible. And if that was feasible from perspective of value of the land, from the perspective of obstacles related to zoning, obstacles related to historic preservation, environmental hazard -- if there was all of those things were obstacles which were surmountable, then we would engage the community, including Warner Pacific, to talk about the options for this facilities, including theirs. They did not want to proceed until they knew that there was even -- Parks Bureau was willing to entertain this. And the idea of memorandum of understanding was suggested to them by some members of the community that then they brought to us. And so I am very, very sorry that it is viewed as a done deal. We did not -- we did not view it that way, but now that you -- I'm listening to you and Commissioner Saltzman is absolutely correct, we've been too overambitious about the timeline, and I'm sorry.

**Potter:** Okay. Thank you very much. I want to proceed to the testimony phase of this.

**Leonard:** And I just make one request. Robin you referenced an appraisal you've had done in your July 7th email. Can I get a copy of that --

**Robin Grimwade:** Certainly

**Leonard:** -- at your convenience. Thank you.

**Potter:** Thank you, folks.

**Sten:** Mayor, as you're calling people, could I just kind of ask a question, maybe, or have a little Council discussion? I guess I would be interested in just saying explicitly, and I want to hear from people today, of course, but that you should bring back to us something explicit that's filed on this agenda that we can take testimony on describing exactly what you're going to do and what the timeline is going to be for any discussion of Mt. Tabor, so we don't have to troubleshoot it today. I mean people are tired. It's been a long day.

**Saltzman:** Okay, that's --

**Sten:** And I want to hear from people, but I'd like to actually just take off the table and say, you know, let's have a time certain where people can come in and testify on an actual process. So the question isn't even "is there gonna be a process?" It's "there's going to be a process. There's no decision made." And people will get a copy of that process through their -- you know, it gets around pretty fast before we have a Council hearing, so we can kind of start from scratch and kind of not spend today trying to -- you know, try to .

**Saltzman:** Yeah, and that's what I was proposing.

**Sten:** I don't remember {unintelligible}.

**Saltzman:** {unintelligible} come back. Yeah. To come back -- work with ONI. And, you know, Water Bureau wants to work on this, too. To come back with a process that the Council can air and then hopefully endorse on the Mt. Tabor Yard.

**Leonard:** Okay and that's fine, but one week ago we had a resolution before this Council, not -- a discussion, not unlike today. And one of the things thrown at me was "well, you know, you voted a year ago to create the study that was the basis for this. So how can you vote 'no' now?" What I'm reading into this in that context now is somehow I am being backed into a corner. If I support this, then later to come and say "well, you voted for these various options, and we picked this, and it was part of what we discussed, and how can you vote 'no' now?" you know, six months from now or whenever.

**Saltzman:** What will come back will be a process. No decision on Mt. Tabor Yard, and, you know, if the Water Bureau wants to participate, Parks, ONI.

**Leonard:** Well, the Parks Bureau -- the point is Parks Bureau should have been participating, you should have had them involved in this. {unintelligible} there should be a map. There shouldn't -- I mean I shouldn't be having to come to you and say, you know, "please don't sell our property," you know. That's not how it works. I mean the whole point of this discussion is these processes don't work, and there is a pattern of these happening. And we are wasting our time here today. This

**November 1, 2006**

should not have happened today. This should -- six months ago sat down with me or whoever and worked out a process so we avoided this. This was completely an avoidable problem.

**Potter:** Yeah, I want to ask the folks who have been patiently waiting here to testify. What you've heard is that the Council has said we're -- that the Mt. Tabor facility, the central facility, is not a point of discussion in this resolution. Or in the long-term it will be considered, but for today's discussion, would you folks be willing to come back and be part in-between of the initial discussion about what is the proper process. One has been offered, both by SE Uplift and Commissioner's Saltzman's Office. Are you willing to come back and talk about that or do you want to be heard today?

\*\*\*\*\*: {unintelligible}

**Potter:** Are you speaking for the group or are you just --

\*\*\*\*\*: {unintelligible}

**Potter:** We're gonna vote on this resolution today. Okay. Thank you folks. How many people are signed up to testify?

**Clerk:** We have eleven people left.

**Potter:** Eleven people.

\*\*\*\*\*: Could I offer a suggestion?

**Potter:** Yes.

**Sten:** Why don't you come? Is that okay, Mayor.

**Potter:** Please come forward. State your name for the record.

**Cascade Anderson Geller:** My name is Cascade Anderson Geller. I wanted to offer -- we asked that this be pulled off the agenda, because of a lot of confusion about it. We got the document -- we looked at the document the first time on Thursday, this past Thursday. We were told it was coming onto the agenda in later November. We made an appointment to talk with Commissioner Saltzman at his earliest convenience, which was November 17th, so that we could sit down, look at the document, bring in our concerns, hope that there could be some different changes in there, because we saw right away there were problems in this document. And that was a "no." So we -- we would request that this -- if you want to vote "no" on it, that's great. If you don't vote "no" on it, it's gonna be a big fight. That's, you know, to sum it up. We want Parks to have money, and we are in a terrible bind here, because we are as supportive of Parks as anybody. I'm on the environment committee at Mt. Tabor Neighborhood Association on the board, I work for Parks constantly, and my family works for Parks. There's no way in the world I or any of these people in this room would stand in the way of Parks getting good facilities, but this is a piecemeal plan. It was strategized to meet a deadline. That is very obvious. We have papers that give you -- to show that, and I think you've seen some of them already. But it's not fair to Parks what's going on here. It crucifies them, it's demeaning, it's demeaning to all of us.

**Sten:** Could I ask you a question on -- are you -- and I don't know the answers. I'm really asking. Sometimes you ask a question you know the answer to. This one I have no idea.

**Cascade Anderson Geller:** {unintelligible} lawyer {unintelligible}.

**Sten:** Yeah, well I'm not a lawyer either, and I'm not presuming you speak for everyone, but I presume that you have a sense of where the community is. Is there opposition at this point to spending the \$650,000 on the short-term improvements at the three yards outlined: the Gabriel Park, and Delta Park and the other one?

**Cascade Anderson Geller:** Well, I think that's an excellent question, and that's what we should do at a table is ask those questions. I mean the document before you originally on Thursday, I think it's been altered. I went down and tried to get the document that you have today from the Clerk, and there's lots of confusions we have about the document. We got what was presented. It's just confusing. But it just needs to be looked at. And I think this is not -- Commissioner Leonard has pointed out some problems, and it doesn't mean -- it doesn't make sense to vote on this, because

**November 1, 2006**

originally that whole \$650,000, if you read the feasibility study, is to address a lot the central yard, which is Mt. Tabor's yard. So now all of a sudden is it not to address the central yard, and why isn't it to address the central yard, because you're gonna demolish the central yard? You know what I mean? It just doesn't look --

**Sten:** I know what you mean, but I also -- I was with you until that last part where you jumped, 'cause like what I see in front of me, and I'm open to being told by the different sides I don't see it right, is I see \$650,000 set aside by the Council that's in our budget to help our maintenance yards. That was tied to a request for a comprehensive study. I'm not particularly trying to take either side on that, what that request said. I don't remember it as detailed as Commissioner Leonard did who helped develop it, but I did vote for it. I see the Parks Bureau coming forward at this point saying basically we have a lot more work to do on the master plan, but we'd like to spend the \$650,000 on specific improvements on these three yards. I do not see those answering the question or implying an answer to the question of what happens to Mt. Tabor. And I think it's pretty clear to Parks at this point that they're not going to answer that question without a pretty {unintelligible} process.

**Leonard:** Well, Commissioner Sten, I can help if --

**Sten:** So I would support spending the \$650,000 from what I know today, and I would support a longer process on the bigger piece. And I don't think you can get to the longer process on the bigger piece 'til you do a specific community process with Mt. Tabor. I think that citizens all throughout the city care about the maintenance of parks, and I think your neighborhood cares more than the other neighborhoods, 'cause it affects it about how this maintenance yard gets treated. I don't hear huge city-wide interest in the maintenance yard question. So I think there has to be a very focused, targeted public discussion that happens with the groups around Mt. Tabor. The thing comes back to us before we can move on the bigger picture. So that's how I kinda see, but I'd be personally supportive of moving on the \$650,000 as long as it's just clearly shown to go specific improvements that need to be done for our workers who I really was moved by their testimony today as well as those pictures. And as long as it's explicit. And maybe this should just be rewritten up and brought back to us. I mean that's one thing {unintelligible} --

**Leonard:** I was going say -- I was going say -- I can vote --

**Sten:** {unintelligible} that -- I just want to be clear that that \$650,000 does not prejudice any bigger answer to the facility study. And that may be a little inconsistent with what the Council was hoping to get back this month. I mean I recognize that the study isn't far along as Commissioner Leonard would like, but I'm not willing to hold up the \$650,000 based on that.

**Cascade Anderson Geller:** But, you know, we don't really see what it's being used for.

**Leonard:** What I'm -- let me -- if I can just help here a second. Just -- please. I am willing to take \$650,000 in the one-time money that {unintelligible} now over and above it, this \$650,000, to pay for these improvements. I'll co-sponsor that with Commissioner Saltzman as long as this language pulls out, as long as that six-fifty that's referred in this "whereas" here is used for what we voted to use it for, and that was to come back with a final facility plan. That's what it was for. It's not for these purposes. So in other words, if you want to -- if you come back next week with six-fifty request to fund all of the maintenance requests that we've heard here today, I will -- I will co-sponsor that with you, I will vote for it. But this six-fifty was designed and put in there and large part, to be very honest with you, by me to have a specific plan to avoid this discussion we're having here today. And it just dismays me that they have circumvented that entire discussion to come back here with this resolution that I would be happy to vote for with you Commissioner Sten to fix the problems {unintelligible}, but hanging their hat on language I wrote, and I know what I meant when I wrote it. So --

**Saltzman:** But, yeah, you know, I hear what you're saying. I guess the point is to me, anyway, is, you know, the six-fifty, you know, we want to see it go right now to meet the immediate needs of {unintelligible}.

**November 1, 2006**

**Leonard:** Then bring up a resolution that says that.

**Saltzman:** But also, no, the options and studies presented to you deal with the longer term issue {unintelligible}.

**Leonard:** It deals with Mt. Tabor Park. That's the point. It deals with the Mt. Tabor Yard.

**Saltzman:** But we're taking Mt. Tabor -- the report doesn't mention the Mt. Tabor Yard. We're taking that, and we're {unintelligible}.

**Leonard:** Option -- according to Robin -- Option 5 includes the disposition of the --

**Potter:** A number of them include the central facility, 'cause it says the central facility.

**Saltzman:** {unintelligible}.

**Leonard:** But hey, you can't have it both ways. If you want to have a --

**Saltzman:** I don't think you can -- you can abort the discussion on health and safety of our workers by doing \$650,000, saying "thank you for your other work" {unintelligible}.

**Leonard:** Right, and then you take the six-fifty here that you referenced and use for what it was we passed it to be used for to come up with a final plan.

**Saltzman:** {unintelligible} plan here --

**Leonard:** I'm offering you a extra \$650,000.

**Saltzman:** You have a plan that gets here, you know, to at least two or three options, and it's gonna take time {unintelligible} to refine those options.

**Sten:** I guess I'm confused.

**Saltzman:** But Mt. Tabor Yard will be subject to an entirely public process.

**Sten:** Hey, I'm not of the mind set—which is where you lost me—that I want to ask these guys to spend \$650,000 on a plan. I think these are professionals who have, one way or another, flubbed this last round of the public process. But I think they know what the different options are for the facility plan. They have to go out with the community and work on it. It's not a \$650,000 planning study that's needed. It's a decision --

**Leonard:** That's what we passed, though.

**Sten:** That's --

**Leonard:** You can vote -- you can vote to do something different. That's fine. You have that right. But that's what we passed in the budget note. That's what it said.

**Sten:** That's not what it says. I mean what it says is that the six-fifty will be released upon presentation of a final maintenance plan.

**Leonard:** Facilities plan.

**Sten:** I would never vote for \$650,000 for facility plan.

**Leonard:** Showing site acquisition and facility construction requirements.

**Sten:** Are you saying your intention was that they spend \$650,000 to write that plan?

**Leonard:** Absolute -- to show a plan. Where -- I mean we're talking a huge master plan for the maintenance -- future maintenance needs of Parks, their facilities. It would take all of \$650,000 to do that.

**Potter:** Would that plan include the disposition of the central facility?

**Leonard:** It could. It's the -- it is the plan -- they come back -- the intent of this language was for them to come back and say "here's our plan for what we're going to do," and then we vote on that plan. That could include the disposition, that can include acquisition of more -- that can include raising all the old buildings and building new buildings on the site. It's a plan that they were intend - - this was intended for them to come back with.

**Sten:** I don't want to go round and round this, but I don't understand how that could be true, when your budget note says -- and that may have been what you intended, but it said they'd be eligible for the funds once they wrote the plan. So the funds can't be to write the plan if you don't get them until after you write it. It doesn't make any sense, Randy. You get the funds to write the plan or you get the funds after you write the plan.

**November 1, 2006**

**Leonard:** But it also doesn't say the money is to be used to do maintenance upgrades to existing facilities. It does not say that, Commissioner Sten. It's not what it says. It says -- I mean maybe it's not worded exactly right, but the intent was to come back with a plan that we vote on that is a master plan for the improvement of Parks maintenance facilities.

**Sten:** And this is where -- I mean this is where -- I mean the Mt. Tabor thing, I get. I'm with you on it. As I see what they said to me was we have narrowed it down to two options. We need to do a bunch more work on those. Meanwhile, we want to spend the six-fifty on immediate problems. And that to me is a reasonable response.

**Leonard:** I'll vote for that. I'll vote for that, but that's not what this says. And that's not what Commissioner Saltzman himself just said it says. He said it also includes analyzing the options for Mt. Tabor. I will not vote for money to do that right now until we do what you suggested, which is {unintelligible}.

**Potter:** This resolution doesn't call for that.

**Saltzman:** I said that[

**Potter:** And I will --

**Leonard:** {unintelligible} Parks Bureau.

**Potter:** {Gavel sounded.} Excuse me. I will allow testimony on the resolution as prepared and stated today. It does not include the discussion on Mt. Tabor. If you have something to say about it minus Mt. Tabor, you're more than welcome to come forward and make your comments.

**Leonard:** I have a point of order with you, Mayor. I mean --

**Potter:** Please.

**Leonard:** I'm hearing two different things here. I've just clarified one. Commissioner Saltzman, does this \$650,000 and what is being asked for in the resolve, does it or does it not include any consideration of what to do with Mt. Tabor facility?

**Saltzman:** No. The \$650,000 will be spent at three other maintenance facilities.

**Leonard:** It doesn't include money or authorization to do any kind of analysis of the options Robin just laid out?

**Saltzman:** No.

**Potter:** {Gavel sounded.} It does not include any money for Mt. Tabor. It has three separate sites. The sites total \$650,000. None of those sites are Mt. Tabor.

**Cascade Anderson Geller:** Could I offer --

**Saltzman:** The Parks wants to continue to work with OMF on these options to refine them, and as I said in my opening remarks, we should take the Mt. Tabor Yard question and subject it to bureau improvement process #9, public involvement: have a process around the future of Mt. Tabor. You know, take it out of the further refinement of the other aspects of {unintelligible}.

**Leonard:** I mean the "now, therefore, be it resolved," the first one says "The City Council hereby directs Parks and Recreation to work with the Office of Management and Finance to prepare a detailed funding and phasing plan for the options and the service zones facilities report that will address capacity, life, health safety issues and report back to the Council." {unintelligible}

**Saltzman:** Maybe what we should do is add a resolve that just says what I said earlier that we take the Mt. Tabor Yard and subject that to --

\*\*\*\*\*: separate process.

**Saltzman:** process #9. So it's running in parallel.

**Leonard:** Okay, but I think -- but I think it's unfair to say we can't -- the public can't talk about this subject here if you're even acknowledging you have to write some amendment to exclude that out, 'cause it clearly --

\*\*\*\*\*: Wait, wait.

**Leonard:** It does include that.

**Potter:** I understand it excludes it.

November 1, 2006

**Leonard:** {unintelligible} he just said it. I mean if it says -- if its part of the facilities {unintelligible} --

**Potter:** Well, he's trying placate you.

**Leonard:** {unintelligible} up further than this.

**Potter:** What it -- he said -- it says very specifically -- he said very specifically the \$650,000 is for those three areas. It does not include -- he said he's pulling that out, have a public process. I'm not sure how much more clear it can be than that, but if you want it in writing, then we'll do it.

**Leonard:** Take out Item 1. Take out "Therefore, be it resolved," item 1, and just do #2.

**Saltzman:** I'm reluctant to do that, 'cause I don't think we should abort the need to work on long-term worker safety issues and {unintelligible}.

**Leonard:** Does that include planning a maintenance facility, long-term safety --

**Saltzman:** {unintelligible} includes looking at the two options that were presented today. One of which --

**Leonard:** Which includes --

**Saltzman:** Yea, includes that. But I'm saying, take that part out—the Tabor yard—and put that under a subject {unintelligible}.

**Leonard:** Maybe I'm just having a sugar low here. Maybe I'm just {unintelligible} stop and eat, because I'm hearing two different things. I'm sorry.

**Sten:** I'm having a protein low, but let me -- and caffeine -- I mean first of all I'm going to mull what I'm gonna do once you make your decision, 'cause this is your resolution. I would personally be more comfortable, if it's amenable, if you and Parks would pull this and bring back next week a resolution that clearly says what you said today as opposed to amend it on the fly. Because I just think this is -- I've been on the other side of arguments with some of these great citizens, and have thought that I communicated clearly, and it turned out I hadn't. And I just think the Council will be well served to take this document, rewrite it to say exactly what you said today under testimony about you've got two options left. The six-fifty is going to x. Detail where the six-fifty is going and say exactly what people should expect on the Mt. Tabor process and then have us vote that through.

**Leonard:** {unintelligible} good about that.

**Sten:** I would feel much more comfortable. I'm not saying I'll vote no and block this if you choose not to do that. I'll think about it, but I don't know yet. I'm gonna listen to the testimony before I make that decision.

**Potter:** Well, I would also, then, you know, if we made it an emergency, and everybody agreed to vote for it, that particular part, the \$650,000, it actually expedite the whole process rather than waiting a month.

**Leonard:** Yeah, no that's -- I'm --

**Potter:** Is that -- is that okay, Dan?

**Saltzman:** It's a resolution, so -- are you talking about like a second reading in 30 days? When you say waiting a month, I'm not sure {unintelligible}.

**Potter:** Well, we're trying to get this through as fast as possible.

**Saltzman:** I'm amenable to taking it back, adding in a specific amendment that talks about the process around Mt. Tabor, commits to a process.

**Leonard:** Well, I hope you -- we can work together on that in the next week, 'cause I'd love to vote for this. I mean, if you do as Commissioner Sten suggests, I probably will vote for it.

**Saltzman:** Oh, again, what I'd come back with was an amendment speaking specifically to a process around the Mt. Tabor Yard {unintelligible}.

**Leonard:** I think we should discuss that in the next week. How best to do, that's the point. It's not to try to do that on the fly here but sit down and work it through. I'm happy to do that {unintelligible}, to get you where you want to get, where Zari testified she wanted to be, but addresses the larger concern at Mt. Tabor.

**November 1, 2006**

**Saltzman:** Okay, but I just want to underscore again, there's real stuff here. It's a real life safety improvement --

**Leonard:** Yeah, we get that.

**Saltzman:** It's not academic, as you saw in the pictures.

**Potter:** So are you withdrawing 1474 and 1475?

**Saltzman:** Yes.

**Potter:** Both?

**Saltzman:** Yes. Set them over a week.

**Potter:** Okay. Both are set over a week. Not quite. Too fast. We have one more to go. And its Commissioner Saltzman's again.

**Saltzman:** Oh.

**Potter:** Please read 1476.

**Item 1476.**

**Clerk:** Authorize payment to Pacific Talent.

**Saltzman:** This is a pretty straight forward thing.

**Cascade Anderson Geller:** Thank you.

**Saltzman:** {unintelligible} approval.

**Potter:** Okay. Is anybody signed up to testify on this matter, Karla? Karla?

**Clerk:** Sorry. I did not have a sign-up sheet set out for this.

**Saltzman:** Just to explain. It involves paying a Parks employee who performed in the Washington Park concerts, and it requires City Council action to pay a City employee for a performance of a City-sponsored event.

**Potter:** Okay. Does anybody wish to testify on this matter? Karla, please call the vote.

**Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [Gavel pounded]. Recessed 'til 2 p.m. take your time.

**Sten:** Do you want to say 2:15 {unintelligible}.

**Potter:** Okay. 2:15.

**Sten:** Thank you.

**Potter:** Recessed until 2:15 p.m.

**Sten:** Some of us define "take our time" differently.

**Potter:** {unintelligible} a little sarcasm in there.

{End of transcript}

At 1:51 p.m., Council recessed.



**November 1, 2006**  
**Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting**

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast.

Key: \*\*\*\*\* means unidentified speaker.

[ The following text is the byproduct of the closed captioning of this broadcast. The text has not been proofread, and should not be considered a final transcript. ] \* \* \*

**NOVEMBER 1, 2006                      2:00 PM**

**Potter:** Please read the 2:00 p.m. time certain.

**Items 1477, 1478, 1479, 1480 and 1481.**

**Potter:** Today we're going to be hearing four ordinance and one resolution. We've reached a very important milestone in our enterprise business system project. This is the major initiative to replace our aging financial system with the state of the art integrated management information system. Our 16-year-old system does not meet our management needs. Financial, human resource, payroll, and purchasing information is maintained in over 300 separate side systems that add cost and extra work. We often have to wait for reports to run or compile them from several different sources. The new system using s.a.p. software will provide real time information and increased efficiency by reducing the side systems. Most local government and businesses moved to new system to avoid the y2k problem. We are behind the curve in replacing this technology, in fact, Multnomah county implemented s.a.p. in 1999. This new system will have far-reaching impact on our business processes. It will touch every employee, including our time keeping system. Most important thing for all of us to remember is that this effort involves significant change which can be challenging. We must continue to express our support for our project teams and goals. This effort will require the highest level of collaboration as we work to streamline and improve our business processes. It would be a mistake to think this is a technology project. It is instead a business improvement initiative with the opportunity to create operational efficiencies and improved decision-making at all levels. I strongly support the goals of this project such as increased accountability for managers and accurate information for decision making. I'm sure that each of the commissioners will appreciate the more timely information and results the e.b.s. Project will deliver. I have ken rust and jennifer simms. Just you? We're doubly lucky. [laughter] we did have a conversation about brevity.

**Jennifer Sims:** Yes. Mayor Potter and commissioners, for the record i'm jennifer simms, the city's interim chief financial officer. And the project director for the enterprise business system project. Before I begin, i'd like to introduce some guests which i've asked to stand as they are named. Joe chaffey with -- who is the ariston president. Tim mccormick, ariston vice-president, luke, who is the ariston project manager for our project, steve hill, i.b.m. account executive, and he's a subcontractor to ariston. And tim easton, who is the president of pacific consulting group serving as our quality assurance contractor. You'll notice that I believe that the -- all of these five agenda items are the only remaining things you have on your agenda right now for this window.

**Potter:** Correct.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I believe the rest of the people who are here in the audience are here to show their support for the project or actually working on it. We have five actions. With your permission, i'd likes to explain all of the items if I could.

**Potter:** Why don't we read them into the record.

**(Items 1478, 1479, 1480 and 1481 titles were read)**

**November 1, 2006**

**Sims:** I'd like to walk through all of these items, give you a quick background and I think I can do that in about five minutes. I know you've had a full schedule today. The first item is an ordinance with ariston consulting and technologies incorporated. This contract is for 13.76 million dollars and ariston will serve as the integrator and the primary contractor to assist the city in implementing the s.a.p. Software providing end user training and change management services. The scope of work includes 14 modules to be implemented, including general ledger, purchasing, and project costing, as well as payroll, position control, and time collection. They were selected through an extensive solicitation and evaluation process. We had three qualified proposals and the project team leads, bureau representatives, and a representative from Multnomah county participated in the ratings. We conducted two-day interviews for the top two qualifiers, and did extensive reference checks, and this contract is recommended by the project executive steering committee. And i'm also pleased to report that ariston is able to bring through their subcontracting work 29% minority and women-owned businesses in this contract. They also have of that \$4 million, \$2 million will be local contract. The second ordinance amends the existing contract with s.a.p. Public services incorporated. This is called the preferred card training program. We've previously amended this contract for end user training software and level one team training, and now we're getting ready for the level two and three team training. Basically it gets successively more detailed. So this contract is for \$483.6 thousand, and it gives us the opportunity to buy 10% more. We have to get a premium, so this amount will buy actually more -- it's like a discount program. You pay a lump sum in advance and you get an additional amount for what you've paid. We've already estimated all of our requirements and this gets us a bargain. The next ordinance is with pacific consulting group, whose name may be familiar because they also served as our quality assurance contracts on the recent project. This amendment adds \$274.6,2 the -- to the existing contract for additional quality assurance work and for phase two start-up assistance. The next ordinance is for a controlled class designation. The administrative rules for human resources allow a temporary pay increase to a classification to attract and retain a qualified candidate. The h.r. Director needs to apply this to the project manager class, and finally, a resolution of support reaffirming the council's continued support for the project limiting new i.t. Projects, requiring the chief administrative officers' advisory council to review new projects to not interfere with the s.a.p. Implementation. This requires the chief administrative officer and the chief financial officer to bring to the council significant project developments. So that's all part of that final ordinance. So I recommend and encourage the council to approve the four ordinances and the resolution as presented to you. Thank you.

**Potter:** You mentioned women minority, emerging small businesses with the first ordinance. What about the following three?

**Sims:** There are no subcontracts with those.

**Potter:** Is there a reason for that?

**Sims:** Well, the nature of the contracts don't call for any. The first one is with s.a.p., which is a very large international company for the software services and the pacific consulting group as far as I know has no subcontractors. Under this contract.

**Potter:** So does the council have any questions for staff?

**Adams:** I guess --

**Potter:** I think this has been taken to all of the council offices, and --

**Sims:** Yes, i've had the opportunity to meet with the council members present.

**Adams:** So we're behind in implementing this technology, and what have you contemplated in terms of needed changes to protocol and procedures that will need to be I guess above and beyond what a business who had contemplated or implemented this change, like five, six years ago? How do we get the benefits out of it quicker given that we -- in terms of procedures and practices, given that we start behind?

**November 1, 2006**

**Sims:** I think the first thing is that we have established with ariston a fairly aggressive implementation schedule, so we can get the benefits of it sooner. We have very -- we have a project structure that very thoroughly engages the bureaus in the project through loaned staff from the bureaus, and through what we will have as subject matter expert participation. The challenge -- the biggest challenge I think we have relative to having sort of a little later start is that we have developed these numerous side systems out of need, and out of everybody trying to achieve something for themselves. The good news, though, is that as the systems have been in existence longer, they are easier to implement because there are better tools for implementation, and there are more experiences with them that we can get lessons learned. So our plan is to draw on all of those things to make this go smoothly and successfully for the city, and as you've heard, there are -- it does require everyone to be engaged and fully participating. So I think having each of you be very aware of the project as it's in progress, support your bureau directors and your bureau staff in their participation, and be ready to support the changes that are needed to make it work.

**Adams:** I guess the other obvious question that I know you and the mayor and everyone has contemplated, but just sort of so it's on the record, how -- the level of confidence of this estimate is high? In terms of this is the amount -- have you before us the amount of money you think it will cost to implement, and is that a high confidence estimate a. Low-confidence estimate?

**Sims:** I talked to ken about this, because I thought you'd ask.

**Adams:** Am I that transparent?

**Leonard:** Yes. [laughter]

**Sims:** That's what we like about you, commissioner. [laughter] the project -- as with all projects, there are three things that you can control. The time, the cost, and the scope. So I have explained to everyone, and I will say this to you as well, that the variable that I am working from is the scope. So committed to the time frame, committed to the dollars, and we'll have to work with the scope if we can't make it fit the dollars.

**Adams:** Is this project scalable?

**Sims:** Yes, because it has 14 modules and it has decision points as we go through. The first major decision point is after blueprinting. And that is where we assess our gap analysis for -- taking the products and applying it to our requirements. So the major expenses of this project are this contract today, the cost of the software, the quality assurance contract, and the staffing. And we -- and the training. So we have nailed all of those items down pretty tight, so depending on your definition of what high confidence is --

**Potter:** Could I take it one step further? Could you explain the function purpose of the pacific consulting group and their past history with us? That goes to the issue of quality assurance, which addresses part of your issue.

**Sims:** Yes. They serve as oversight and advisors on the project. And their purpose is to help ensure that we are successful in our implementation. Successful in achieving what the purpose of the implementation is and in addressing budgetary scope and time line issues. They provide us a monthly report that has indicators of areas of concern, or actual danger, they have color coded system, red is like needs immediate attention, and green is everything is going smoothly. They report that to our project steering committee each month, and to the project sponsor and me as project director. And then they previously to my knowledge, were involved in the same capacity with the recent cayenta project, doing the same thing -- monthly reports, participating with the executive steering committee, reporting to the project sponsor and director, and providing input and advice where there were bumps in the road about how those things might be worked out.

**Potter:** How did the cayenta project work in terms of time lines and staying within budget?

**Sims:** I believe it was considered a successful implementation.

**Potter:** Did it stay within budget?

**Sims:** I don't know if it did. It did.

**November 1, 2006**

**Potter:** It has the quality that is needed in order to carry out its functions.

**Adams:** So we do have a policy that projects get ranked in terms of their confidence level of the estimates.

**Sims:** I've seen that policy, actually. It was emailed to me. I'll say that we have a high level of confidence in this --

**Adams:** Thank you. That's all I wanted to know. It seems like very common sense disclaimers, and that is, you know, you're pretty confident -- you are highly confident in the unit cost that you budgeted. Right? For the modules.

**Potter:** Other questions for the commissioners? Thank you, jennifer. Do we have sign-up sheets on these?

**Moore:** I set out one and no one signed up.

**Potter:** Ok.

**Saltzman:** I have one question. That is, so to avoid the scenario of shadow systems, you mentioned there's going to be a council that will have to approve any new shadow systems, is that correct?

**Sims:** In the resolution before you now, we have proposed that during this implementation, which is a 14-month window, I believe it's the -- the resolution goes a little beyond, that but for a limited period of time we want to restrict the number of new projects that i.t. has to support or get involved with. And some of the kinds of projects that would be of concern would be changes to side systems that we will be keeping, but that will be interfaced with s.a.p., so we don't want those changing while we're trying to interface them. We also don't want bureaus to come up with new things that would actually be duplicative or contrary to the purpose of the s.a.p. project, and then finally we don't want some huge new thing to come up that would draw resources away from our ability to support the enterprise business system.

**Saltzman:** So we don't want bureaus to come up with new things, but this sounds like you're saying there's really not a check, a veto authority there, or is there?

**Sims:** The review process would be for them to -- for those projects that could threaten the success of the enterprise business system project, would go to the chief administrator officer advisory council, and that includes bureau directors to review and set priorities so that we can be sure that all of those things that I was mentioning are taken into account.

**Saltzman:** Does that include the ability to say no?

**Sims:** Yes.

**Saltzman:** Ok.

**Sims:** Yes, they can say no.

**Potter:** Is there anyone here who wishes to testify on these four ordinances and single resolution? Please call the vote on the first ordinance.

**Moore:** 1477 --

**Adams:** Aye.

**Leonard:** My silence shouldn't suggest i'm not interested in this, but i've been adequately informed against my will, I might add, by jennifer and nancy hamilton from the mayor's office, and really given little option but to vote yes. Aye.

**Saltzman:** I want to congratulate ariston. We have high expectations for you to perform this well. It's a lot of money, there's a lot of important changes ahead of us, and you'll learn the culture of our city, but I understand you've done this in about 14 other municipalities or counties, so we have great expectations you'll deliver this in the 14 months necessary. Aye.

**Sten:** We need to do it, and I think the whole team is doing an outstanding job of going about it right, and I think it's an am bushes time line. I hope that you will keep to it and i've been part of a big software debacle where we kept to a time line when we shouldn't have, so I hope you'll push the and get it right and make sure you use your judgment, and getting it right is most important. Aye.

**November 1, 2006**

**Potter:** I want to thank all the folks at o.m.f. who developed this, brought it to us this year, and now have brought back the final product. Even though this is going rather smoothly through council, I would hope that the folks who are receiving these contracts are aware that there will be close oversight both by the managers in the organization as well as by city council. So i'm really pleased with where we are with this, and it's about time. So I vote aye. [gavel pounded] please read 1478.

**Adams:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [gavel pounded] 1479.

**Adams:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [gavel pounded] 1480.

**Adams:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [gavel pounded] 1481.

**Adams:** I want to thank jennifer, matt -- [laughter] my close personal friend matt. Sorry. I forget my staff sometimes. Sue, the public and private team that came together on this. This is such --

**Leonard:** The parks people, the water people --

**Adams:** No, not the water people. I want to thank you -- I have a lot of concerns about this project because it is so big, and it is replacing a set -- a system and a set of practices that are so far behind the curve, so I think you've done everything that my staff and I and my bureau manager think that's can be done to guard against some of those liabilities, and sort of lower the risks, but -- so I thank you for that, and I vote this last one a nervous yes. Aye.

**Leonard:** Aye.

**Saltzman:** I'm pleased to reaffirm my support for this project, and we keep an eye on any cropping up of shadow systems and other things that would deter from the goal of a new enterprise business system. Aye.

**Sten:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [gavel pounded] that's it. We're adjourned until tomorrow.

At 2:44 p.m., Council recessed.

**November 2, 2006**  
**Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting**

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast.

Key: \*\*\*\*\* means unidentified speaker.

[ The following text is the byproduct of the closed captioning of this broadcast. The text has not been proofread, and should not be considered a final transcript. ] \* \* \*

**NOVEMBER 2, 2006                      2:00 PM**

**Potter:** Council will come to order. Karla please call the role. [roll taken]

**Item 1482.**

**Potter:** I'd like to remind folks that prior to offering public testimony to city council, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent. Commissioner Saltzman.

**Saltzman:** Thank you mr. mayor, members of the council. I'm very excited about the natural area acquisition strategy. The vision of a connected system in portland and throughout the region is a critical part of our vision of sustainability for our community. One of my priorities as parks commissioner has been land acquisition to meet future needs. The strategy before us today clearly lays out a map of where we are headed is based on science and understanding of what it will take to maintain our natural areas in the face of increasing population pressure. Development of this strategy is a shining example of collaboration among the bureaus in the city with an aim to what the residents of portland need for their future. The strategy also ties in with metros planning for natural areas acquisition. If metros natural areas ballot measure 26-80 passes. I urge all citizens who have not yet cast a ballot to vote in support of 26-80. Portland has committed to invest over 8 million dollars of that money to spend on locally significant areas. So with that I would like to invite up, is it ..were going to start with zari and dean and gil. Why don't you come up. Zari Santner, gil Kelley and dean Marriott. And deb lev, I think deb lev is also going to present.

**Zari Santner:** Good afternoon mayor, commissioners. I'm zari santner, director of parks and recreation. I'm very pleased to present another in a series of Parks and recreation acquisition strategies. You may recall that last summer we brought you our trail acquisition strategy. We are also working on a larger analysis of park deficiency areas and identifying gaps in access to open space, as well as series of system plans for a variety of services, such as community gardens, and playgrounds. We will be sharing those with you in the future months. Today, however, we're focusing on our work in collaboration with other bureaus, our regional partners, and stakeholders to protect a sustainable system of natural areas that will improve watershed health, increase livability of wildlife, and people, and maintain Portland's reputation as a green city with access to nature as a density increases. Natural areas are an important element of our park system, and majority almost two-thirds of our parklands are in natural areas. The system provides protective wildlife areas and nature recreation such as hiking and bird watching. Today deb, our own very, very capable senior planner, will present to you our strategy for a sustainable natural area. But I would like to thank our close partners, planning bureau gil kelley and dean marriott, who their leadership and support, and particularly their staff work in collaboration with my staff, has made -- they have made an immense contribution in coming up with this strategy that is achievable. And I would like to have deb to present you to the strategy, and that will be followed by dean and gil's remarks.

**Deborah Lev:** Thank you. We'll go to the powerpoint here. The parks 2020 vision, which came before the council in 2001, has as one of its guiding principles is that the city and region have an interconnected system of trails, parks, natural areas, streams, and rivers that are well protected and healthy. That's part of our long-term vision for our park system and for the city. And today the

**November 2, 2006**

piece that per going to talk about is what you see here in dark green, which is what we envision as the area that we're looking at to house our protected system of natural areas. But i'm showing you this larger vision that includes some of these other aspects. A regional trail system, what you see in lighter yellow stripe there is green opportunities that would involve improvements to the urban forest canopy some tree plantings along the river, because we need to have these other important elements of nature in the city in connectioning between our protected system of natural areas. But today we're just going to talk about what's in the dark green natural area and how we're going to get there. So we have 7,000 acres that we're managing in parks as natural areas in the city of Portland. That's primarily forest, but also meadows. And wetlands, and streams and rivers. Natural areas serve many functions. Native wildlife habitat, preserving biodiversity, nature-based recreation and tourism. Providing ecosystem services such as water quality, storm water management, economic benefits, enhanced property values, nature-based tourism, and reductions in storm water and public health costs. They serve as an opportunity for education for stewardship and service learning, and you can see that we get all sorts of types coming out to help in our natural areas.

**Adams:** Who is that? Can you go back one?

**Potter:** No. [laughter]

**Adams:** Oh, wow:

**Lev:** Our natural areas -- if anybody else want to come out to our natural areas and volunteer, we'll be happy to take pictures. Natural areas serve as research laboratories, and just as open space in the city. We have a lot of demand for natural areas as well. This is from state parks. Oregon recreation activities, and the top four outdoor recreation activities mentioned in state parks plan, the top four of them are all supported in our natural areas. That's running, walking, walking for pleasure, bird watching, and other wildlife observations. Within parks we did our own surveys, and asked people in various facilities and parks what we had enough of, what we needed more of, and the top vote-getter that we needed more of was natural wildlife areas. And our open space opportunities to protect are disappearing quickly. This is from our city g.i.s. system, what was vacant land shown in light green in 1996. In 1998, and in 2002. So our last remaining natural areas are quickly disappearing. If we want to secure any -- the rest of them we need to do it soon. We have a distinguished history. John charles olmstead back in nainoa 03 urged a comprehensive park system that would include these rougher, wilder, less artificially improved parks as part of a comprehensive system. He recommended acquiring land in the west hills above downtown for a natural park. In 1948 we actually got over 4,000 acres as forest park. And we've made strides since then. The most recent chapter in natural area acquisition was spearhead by the 1992 metropolitan green spaces regional look from metro, and since 1990, we've acquired 750 acres that we manage. That was acquired from the 1995 metro bond from phoebe mattera fema after the 1996 floods, from system development charges, and donations, which actually have been significant in recent years. So we set out to do a sort of more scientific more comprehensive and organized approach to how we're going to focus on natural area acquisition. And we didn't want to start from scratch, so we looked at some other adopted systems, and we adopted our guiding principles from the Oregon watershed enhancement board's land acquisition priorities for the willamette valley. And the ones we adopted for Portland are protecting large intact areas, protecting sites with exceptional biodiversity values, those species and habitats that have been identified as rare or of concern in the region. Improving connectivity within a regional system of natural areas. And buffering our current natural areas. So that's what we're going after. Those are the highest priorities in our plan. We're also relying on other city work that's been going on. The watershed planning spearheaded by b.e.s., and the 2005 watershed -- Portland watershed management plan. Bureau of plan can's recent work, adapting metro's natural resource inventories to focus in on the city of Portland and where we have remaining natural resources. Current interbureau efforts to develop a terrestrial enhancement and wildlife strategy. And some other elements as well, urban forest canopy research from p.s.u., a

**November 2, 2006**

regional trails plan, and our parks natural resources inventory. We also looked at the regional picture, not just how our natural areas in Portland connect to the rest of the region, but also all the way out to mt. Hood, the coast range, and down to the clackamas river. So we put that together and we come up with this is what we'd like to see as elements of our future scenario for natural area protection. It's a conceptual network. We wouldn't want to buy every acre that's shown in green, but this is the elements of it. It features areas along the river, like up at kelley point park, along -- we want to protect a whole green area along the west hills from forest park in the north, i'm missing some of our pictures -- along the columbia slough, we'd like to protect the floodplain wetlands. Along johnson creek, we'd like to protect a corridor of connected protected floodplain wetlands there, and we also want to -- a sis 10 of natural areas, sustainable requires some large hunks. And we have 5,000 acre hunk of natural area in forest park, and we think that ideally we would have a large forested chunk on the east side as well. And this is just an opportunity of where we could still protect remaining natural areas south of powell butte park, where some of the tributaries to johnson creek and some of the steep forested slopes there. And also we'd like to protect the east buttes areas. So there's the elements of the system. We think the unique flora of the buttes as well as what we have in the rest of the city put together will give us a long-term sustainable natural area system. This is the -- what you saw in green before, but showing you what's already protected natural area. Not necessarily managed by us, maybe by metro here, state parks here. So this is a focus area of acquisition, would be what you're seeing in orange. We obviously can't buy it all, so we're looking for other tools as well. Conservation easements that would allow us to help protect and better manage sites that are already being used for resident or industrial, but have an opportunity to enhance the resources. We looked at each watershed and we did this with our bureau of partners to identify in each watershed some of the objectives and some of the special habitat areas in those water sheds. We then in each watershed identified our first priority parcels. Those are ones that improve management connected to current holdings, secure large tracts, protect currently functioning habitat, protect identified conservation needs, and we also considered the threat of development. This list is constantly changing. It's not set in stone. It's just something to guide us about if we have money in our pocket tomorrow, what we would buy. And it changes with surrounding land uses and new information that we have about resources. Our accusation priorities we'd like to -- our first is to -- let's go after those priority parcels we know in each watershed. Large parcels such as that acquisition potential in southeast Portland. Those are our first priorities. We have 20 and 50-year here, but realistically what we don't buy in the next 10 to 20 years might not be there for longer term acquisition. Cost estimates, natural area in the city of Portland can range from \$5,000 an acre to \$500,000 an acre. But we've pulled out just for budget examples a level of 80,000 an acre. And if you looked at that, what was on our list when we put this together included 160 parcels over 500 acres, that would be in those dollars \$43 million. If we were to get as much land as possible, another 500 or so acres in the buttes natural area near powell butte, that would be another 40 million. And to complete the system, I don't know, maybe another thousand acres over time. How can we fund this? This there is metro or local bond measures. System development charges. Private donations, and perhaps some day we'll figure out how to do a cost -- recoup some of the cost savings on storm water infrastructure, which they've been able to do in other communities. We do have some issues and next steps we've identified. We know that it's expensive to manage land, and if we want to buy it now, we might not be able to control all the invasive species on that land, but we think it's important to acquire it now and land bank it even if we can't do every restoration project that we'd like to on it right now. Is it worth buying land that's already environmentally zoned for protection? We think in many cases it is, because to have a coordinated restoration and management effort we need to be able to go in and control invasive species and stuff that isn't necessarily possible on private land. Does protecting wildlife encourage nuisance -- encouraging natural areas encourage nuisance wildlife? And we need to work with the



**November 2, 2006**

community, educate people about how to live with wildlife, wildlife aren't an issue just in our natural area parks, but in our developed ones as well, and parks and recreation staff are participating in several efforts that I think are going to get us to better understanding of how to manage our wildlife. And the last one is equity that we always consider. And in other kinds of parks acquisitions we're looking for equity of access around the city. In natural areas more similar to trails, we have a system we're talking about, and we have to look for natural areas where they are. There are other kinds of programs that can help link these natural areas with all the neighborhoods, and trails, and we do also understand that when we have a good system of natural areas all our residents are going to benefit. So in the end, we're looking at this vision of our long-term system that will provide better efficient -- better fish and wildlife habitat, more sustainable parkland, more nature-based recreation that are open space, cleaner water, stewardship opportunities, and better quality of life leading to healthy park, healthy watersheds, for a healthy Portland.

**Gil Kelley:** Good afternoon, mayor, council, gil kelley, planning director. I would be to say a couple words. We were very happy to collaborate with zari and deb on this project from -- and I want to thank roberta and her staff for doing a lot of work on the natural resource inventory and making sure there was a match here in our mapping and in our aspirations for accusation and protection. I just want to say that I think we're in the midst of creating or continuing to create a great city in Portland, and that's being recognized around the world, and it's being recognized by people voting with their feet and moving here. That's the blessing and the curse that we're dealing with. And as the -- one of the reasons the region is so attractive is because we have green space protected within it, and that was a vision created over 100 years ago that we're continuing to implement, and I would submit there are people you have in the room today, jim, mike, and of course zari who are carrying on in that tradition. But that really makes a wonderful place for people to live. That's even more important as we look forward and see another million people arriving in the region sometime in the next 15 to 20 years and probably another million in the 15 to 20 years beyond that. We believe it's to the city's future. We also want to laud the effort to match the notion of open space that's publicly accessible with high habitat value open space, where we're getting multiple objectives in terms of water quality and species preservations there. Having that unique resource in the city, in the urban environment is I think one of our core and probably highest objectives here in terms of our own livability. So we really want to support the work that zari has been doing, and encourage you to accept this strategy and urge its implementation, and to as commissioner Saltzman has done, on the forefront of the effort to get funding and be creative about how we actually acquire this space for the long-term good of all the citizens here, because it will disappear otherwise.

**Dean Marriott:** Dean marriott, environmental director for Portland. Certainly want to emphasize how much of the slides you saw today had water in them. And the importance to maintaining a healthy watershed, protecting our natural areas, the relationship is there and critical to us. So the why, why do this, is certainly -- if you're interested in clean water, there's a big reason to do it just for that. Not to mention all the other great reasons that were cited here. The how to do it, we've proven already that we can work as teams and develop partnerships, relationships between parks and planning and b.e.s., and the nongovernment organizations and metro have really been wonderful and we will pledge to you to continue that relationship. It's one of the key things to maintaining the livability in the city of Portland, and I just want to thank deb, who you heard from a moment ago, as well as zari and gil and our other partners that we've worked with so closely. You can count on our continued support. Thank you.

**Santner:** We will be available if you have any questions after testimony. Unless you have questions right now that you would like us to answer.

**Potter:** Via couple. I really appreciate what you're doing and I support this. I did have questions in terms of how do you establish priorities about first things first in terms of the purchasing? I know

**November 2, 2006**

there are areas of east Portland very underserved, and I was looking specifically at the map of some of the areas. And I didn't see in your criterias sort of a social criteria in terms of ensuring that people in all parts of Portland are served by the park system itself, and the natural habitat.

**Santner:** Mayor, as you may recall in my remarks, I mentioned that we will be coming back to you with a series of other strategies that specifically addresses your concern. Natural areas are where they are right now, what's left. We can't create natural areas, but we could through our public open spaces start developing areas that have native vegetation, which will encourage wildlife coming back to those areas. So our priorities right now are areas that already have resource values. But we are very, very cognizant of the fact that there are deficiencies. Particularly in outer east. So we'll come back to you and show you what our strategies will be for acquiring land for park purposes, open space, and then when we do master plan for them, we will create spaces, small spaces that we'll have those kind of values.

**Potter:** And the second question, I noticed in outer southeast, johnson creek area is a fairly large tract of land. Is that land actually available?

**Santner:** Some of them are. In fact, one of the maps that deb showed, which is in the area south of powell butte, extends all the way to johnson creek, and there -- we -- with the help of metro and bureau of environmental services, we bought some big chunks of land, but there's still some more available, which those are within our first five years priority.

**Potter:** I know that fema is helping with some of the johnson creek properties, but what are some of the areas you're looking at for funding for some of these properties?

**Santner:** I think -- again, we're hoping putting a lot of our hope in metro, and as well as our system development charges, this is something that we will come back to you again. We are revising our system development charge and including commercial system development charge. And that may help us with additional funding. And there are state funds, so we're going, we're becoming very, very aggressive going after those funds as well. So it's going to be sort of a multi-pronged objective in terms of property acquisition.

**Marriott:** I have information to add on to that. As zari mentioned, I was down talking to the oweb director yesterday to continue that relationship, some of the properties we've acquired in the johnson creek -- it's really a mix and match as you try to assemble not only do you try to assemble parcels, but the money from a different pot. We're very hopeful people will support the bond measure for metro, because that will be the next big infusion of money available.

**Santner:** Another thing that again was mentioned, the opportunity for donations, you may the property we brought to you was a huge property, there was some sensitive areas, we worked with b.e.s., and we got a huge track of land. So there are still opportunities for partnership and donations from both businesses and private.

**Potter:** Good job.

**Adams:** I have a few questions. I'd like mr. Houck's answer to one of the questions when he comes up as well. We've found it foss achieve the same results in terms of access and management are we're easements, buying easement as as opposed to buying the property. And the presentation just talked about buying the property where easements can potentially be sort of a win-win for the property owner, tax advantages given the financial position of the owner and the easements are a lot cheaper for us to have virtual control of the property. I didn't hear that in the presentation, I wanted to see if that was part of our tool kit.

**Santner:** Absolutely. Conservation easement, one of the slides I think deb was going through them very fast, perhaps you missed them. One of the tools are conservation easements, particularly in industrial areas and private residents, where it would be a tax break for the property owners, but also will give us the opportunity to secure them. Absolutely commission.

**Adams:** The other thing is hayden island. It shows the port has long had plans for the tip of hayden island. I'd be interested in mike's thoughts. But even if one was to accept their plans, there seems

**November 2, 2006**

to be real opportunity to add natural areas to the north shore. What are your thoughts on that. It doesn't show up as a priority.

**Santner:** As I mentioned before, right now the priority for us are the areas that have value and are disappearing fast. But we are definitely interested in talking with any property owners, whether it's private or public, when there are opportunities to do that. Commissioner Adams, you may recall that our bureau is very, very opportunistic. We do have a plan this, is a guide for us, but when opportunities arise, we definitely jump on it.

**Kelley:** I think that particular parcel is outside the city limits. So if it does develop it would need to be annexed into portland. That may be one reason it doesn't.

**Adams:** We can still pine for it, though, can't we?

**Lev:** I'd was going to point out that it doesn't show up [inaudible] because those were just in the city.

**Potter:** Let's don't forget the north end of ross island.

**Santner:** Ross island, absolutely. That definitely is a high priority.

**Adams:** Thank you for the clarification.

**Potter:** Do you have some other speakers?

**Saltzman:** I think there are people signed up to testify.

**Potter:** Please call people up.

**Mike Houck:** Good afternoon mayor Potter, commissioners. Mike houck. I'm here today representing the urban green spaces institute at 6903 post office box 6903 Portland. Bob salinger could not be here today from Portland audubon society and asked me to convey his support for adoption of this plan as well. In fact, he gave a comment to me that i'll pass on at the end of my comments. 36 years ago when I was a graduate student at Portland state university, I was recruited to have conversations with the city council who at the time and the park bureau at the time, contemplated filling oaks bottom wildlife refuge, what now is oaks bottom and because there was basically a lack of appreciation for the role of natural areas, in my opinion in a comprehensive park system. Some people say i'm not a patient man, i've been waiting around for moments like this for the last 36 years, and I can't tell you how exciting it is to have somebody like zari, who has been brought at the top level of Portland parks and recreation who actually created a new division within Portland parks, the city nature program, of which this is a part. It's a pretty phenomenal transition over the intervening 36 years, and i'm excited to be here to support the does of this plan. The reasons for supporting this, it does adhere to the park's 2020 vision and in fact it goes back to and recognizes what olmstead as deb pointed out said, 103 years ago. It specifies that it is part of a larger regional system. I see jim desmond is with us today. He'll address that. I think that's critical. And by the way, it's not if 2680 passes, it's when it passes we'll -- this will provide funding to the city of Portland as well as metro to build on this plan. It's incredibly important that the bureau of environmental service and parks has already been working together, about you the potential for doing even more in the future is huge. In -- it addresses the acquisition needs for natural areas, habitats. It's very scientifically and ecologically based. It's a pure document and I think we can thank deb, who was brought on as a staff ecologist, moving Portland parks and recreation in the direction of truly being stewards of the natural areas. The last thing I think i'll mention by the way is that this plan does not explicitly address actually an issue that mayor Potter raised, and that is some of the equity questions throughout the city. It doesn't address an issue that I hope we're here talking about in another six months to a year, and that is the potential for another city nature program, the urban forest canopy, and the contributions that it can make to storm water management dealing with urban heat island effects and biodiversity that the natural areas plan is addressing. And I think we have some incredible opportunities. In fact, the sustainable development commission has selected the urban forest canopy has three of the indicators of sustainability that the commission will be putting forward to the city and the county. So i'm hopeful

**November 2, 2006**

we'll be back here to consider another program that will be a compliment to this natural areas program.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Adams:** I ask you a question, you can go longer. What are your thoughts on the west end of hayden island.

**Houck:** I'll speak now on behalf of bob salinger, because he's the one that's been bird dogging this for a long time. I of course spent many, many years when I was at Portland audubon society working on west hayden island. We have long urged the port of Portland to consider donating, as a matter of fact, west hayden island to become part of the regional natural area system. It's a very high list, very high on our list of priorities, the nature conservancy and other groups feel similarly. So to the extent we're able to figure out a way to bring all or a portion of west hayden island into the public domain as part of the regional natural area system, we very much support that. We also understand the limitations of Portland parks and recreation to plan for that when it's not technically in the city at this point. I would like to address the issue of conservation easements as well. Easements are incredibly -- an incredibly important tool, but they do have limitations. First of all, conservation easements generally do not include any kind of public access. It's true that many of these natural areas, we don't want necessarily them to be run over -- overrun with people, but we do anticipate, and in fact both metro and the city of Portland have made provisions through the regional trails plan and other mechanisms to provide access where it's appropriate. Conservation easements normally do not include public access. They can be very difficult to monitor and to enforce over time, and in fact there is a movement in the land trust community across the country to reassess, to reevaluate the efficacy of conservation easements as a tool. They're important, but they're not a pan sea. A lot of times people will point to conservation easements as the solution for protecting the landscape, and in all cases I would have to say owning it, owning it, in my opinion, is usually the best strategy. Using conservation easements strategically where they can be of assistance where you can't acquire land.

**Adams:** One we just did on tryon creek area provides for both access and monitoring, so I understand your point, but if the conservation easement includes monitoring public access, you overcome those obstacles, at least it's not the only thing, but it is -- can be useful?

**Houck:** Absolutely.

**Potter:** One of the things I thought about is using easements to connect wildlife areas. And not for humans, but for the habitat that would want to go between them and humans.

**Houck:** Absolutely, for corridors. Absolutely. I'm not saying we shouldn't use them, i'm just saying there are concerns and we should be aware of that. And regarding equity, I really would like to comment and perhaps mr. Desmond will as well, we were -- we worked very hard on the regional bond measure to ensure that equity was an issue, that was addressed, and that is in fact why there's a \$15 million pot of money for grants for neighborhood associations and nonprofits to apply to regreen more inner city areas that are nature deficient at this time. In addition, the city of Portland's share, 20% of it will be used to acquire neighborhood parkland in cully neighborhood. So we're very cognizant of the issue of equity, the coalition for livable future f. You've not seen the report, you may want to bring them to a work session one day, has mapped the entire region and has created an equity atlas that shows where there is inequity of access to parks and inequities of access to natural areas. And it's fascinating information. I think we can use that as a tool to start targeting where we address those issues of inequity.

**Adams:** I guess I should have also asked about the golf course in cully that we've heard about that - in cully that is seeking to, collwood golf course, go to industrial. Does this address this? I'm sorry, maybe we should just let you talk.

**Santner:** After they testify I'll come back.

**Adams:** Thanks. Sorry.

November 2, 2006

**Houck:** Thank you very much.

**Thomas Bruner:** Good afternoon. Mayor and commissioners, i'm thomas bruner, i'm here today to represent the Portland parks board of which i'm a member. And we're excited to be here today, and enthused about this acquisition strategy, and are here to encourage you to support it. This is the kind of planning and visioning that makes this city the incredibly great visionary livable place that it is today. And it is a great example of the kind of thing that brought my family here eight years ago from fort worth, texas. We're pleased to support this great example of strategy planning that implements an important part of the Portland parks 2020 vision. We know that equity of access is a critically important guiding principle of 2020. We understand that natural areas are also a large part of parks and recreation's mission, and that all residents in the city benefit from their protection, you and i, we all know that some children and adults in our city won't, wouldn't, or don't have the opportunity to experience nature without natural areas, and for those men, women, and children, their lifelong respect for nature is forged in urban natural areas. And the environmental and social benefits of that lifelong respect are far-reaching for all of us. This plan is solid, it's science-based, it's very collaborative, and it's an incredibly important step towards securing that open space system, and we hope very much you support it. Thanks. Do you want to ask me any questions so I can talk longer?

**Adams:** No. [laughter]

**Bruner:** says my former boss, sam Adams.

**Potter:** Who taught you how to emote?

**Bruner:** You did, sir. [laughter]

**Adams:** Like he needed teaching.

**Potter:** Please.

**Jim Desmond:** Mr. Mayor, members of the council, jim desmond, the director of regional parks and green spaces at metro. I'm here to urge your support of this plan. Echoing commissioner Saltzman's remarks, this is a very science-based, very strong approach that metro strongly endorses, and I would also echo the comment that from my perspective, having worked with the city for 11 years on these sort of issues, i've seen unprecedented interagency cooperation on this with b.e.s. and the planning, and seeing mr. Kelley and mr. Marriott here today as well, echoes that. They worked very well with our staff as well. I also think this is a natural biproduct of the formation of the city nature team, mike houck mentioned the reorganization are that formed that team. The city has done great work in this area for a long time, but by putting all those specialist, putting a greater focus, I think we're seeing the city take its work to a new level with this plan. And we at metro are excited about that. The approach, everything that's being done here fits really well with the regional goals and really takes the metro work and continues it at a local scale. In that way I think together we'll deliver a product to the citizens where the whole will be greater than the sum of the parts, if you will, because it will be coordinated at both a regional level where metro is acquiring larger areas, the city somewhat smaller areas in some cases, and then with this grant program if our bond should pass, the neighborhood associations and other community groups will be able to work at an even more neighborhood level and the three together will create a much more coherent and complete system. There have been numerous references to the metro bond, it's been a while since councilman president bragdon and members of our council were here to talk about that, to reappreciate your memory briefly on that, should measure 2680 pass on tuesday, there would be -- it's a \$227 million fund, \$15 million would be immediately available to the city for priorities that they've established, and this council, your council has approved. So there's an immediate \$15 million fund that goes to the city. Additionally in the regional fund, there are a number of target areas where metro would spend regional funds separate from that 15 to do acquisitions. And it's a lot of the areas that we're seeing in the plan that you just reviewed. Johnson creek, columbia slough, which would include -- I should know from commissioner Adams' question, the golf course has frontage on the slew. Tryon

**November 2, 2006**

creek, the east side butte, additions to forest park, and along fanno creek. So not only the areas that you saw in this plan, but a few additional areas would be eligible for regional funding. And then as the grant program that mr. Houck mentioned is a \$15 million program, that awards additional points if you will in the review of grants for areas that are either under natured, or have lower income people. And I think that both those criteria will work well for the city of Portland and your neighborhood should be extremely competitive in that grant process. The coalition for livable future has done good work on equity that the metro council will review as it reviews these grants and so there's been close coordination with not only parks departments, but also the nonprofit community. So we're real excited about the potential to implement this bond if it's passed, continue the great work with your staff, and urge your aye vote of this plan.

**Saltzman:** So if or when 2680, the metro natural areas ballot measure passes on tuesday, how much additional investment would metro make in natural areas within the city of Portland?

**Desmond:** I'd estimate commissioner Saltzman, that the total will be somewhere in the neighborhood of 60 to \$70 million between the \$15 million local share pass-through, a healthy share of the grant funds, and then the regional acquisition that metro would make, those taken together should be at least \$60 million, hard to estimate exactly, I couldn't -- but it will be very significant and could be as high as \$70 million or higher. We're extremely committed to the johnson creek and columbia slough areas are highly threatened, the time to act is now. Those will be areas we move on immediately. We've already got a few sites under option that we can close on. There's one in the four corners area that was mentioned that -- and two that are on the -- on johnson creek. So we're already talking to landowners in anticipation of the measure perhaps passing.

**Saltzman:** Thanks.

**Potter:** Thank you, folks.

**Linda Robinson:** My name is linda robinson, and i'm not here actually officially representing anyone today, but I am participating on a number of park committees from my neighborhood up to the metro gpac and i'm active in the columbia slough watershed council. In addition, I live in outer east Portland, one of those areas that is particularly park deficient that needs both active recreation, a number of active recreation parks, but we envision a shortage of natural areas. Not only do we have a shortage of natural areas, but we have an extreme shortage of available of natural areas that could be purchased so it is important that we can acquire those while they exist, actually -- particularly along johnson creek and columbia slough, and there are still a few fairly large parcels that could be acquired. And this is one of our last opportunities to do that. I'm also excited about the grant opportunity for the renaturing, making some of those connections and making some of that access corridors and tree canopies at what could help us connect to the existing natural areas. But those parcels on johnson creek, columbia slough, kelly butte f. We can acquire those larger parcels, we can work on the connections later, but we need -- we do need those natural areas.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Michelle Bussard:** I'm michelle bussard, executive director of the johnson creek watershed council. Do you want our address?

**Potter:** No.

**Bussard:** Otherwise I was going to tell you it's in the johnson creek watershed, like that one woman did a few weeks ago. Anyway. Never mind. Thank you. Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment today on Portland parks and recreation's proposed land acquisition strategy. The council has nothing but praise for the proposed strategy on every level. It is responsive and bold, and exemplifies and makes manifest the concept of connectivity we apply to valuing and restoring fish and wildlife habitat. What do I mean? I mean that Portland parks and recreation strategy not only seeks the opportunity to create the greatest degree of connectivity between the 40-mile loop, willamette greenway trails, neighborhood centers, existing state regional and local parks, historic cultural and education centers and natural areas, it was developed within a framework that

**November 2, 2006**

connected the city's planning with comprehensive watershed management plans with metro's fish and wildlife habitat protection program, and the priorities of individual watershed councils. At the johnson creek watershed council we're pleased to have been able to collaborate with Portland parks and roque this proposed acquisition strategy and welcome its positive influence on development of our acquisition advocacy strategy throughout the basin. That said, we do urge further work on securing protections for the urban canopy and equity -- finding however, may remain the single greatest challenge to realizing the vision put forth by the proposed strategy. With measure 2680 hanging in the balance, it behooves all of us. To take a more aggressive action to ensure its passage. But it's not a panacea and we need to continue to work cooperatively to engage funders and funding opportunities. Portland's watershed councils have a unique role to play as locally organized voluntary, nonregulatory groups established to improve the condition of watersheds out of Oregon regs. I suggest the councils be at the table when the funding opportunities are explored and be invited to put forward those funding opportunities. In 2014 we'll have the opportunity to renew our commitment to measure 66. I think we have a great opportunity ahead of us to leverage that 2014 boat. On equity, I want to say something that I think is -- that needs to be said. We in this room I guess I'm guessing are all very privileged. We have access to these wonderful treasures, these natural areas. I think as we talk about equity, we need to be very mindful of who we are talking about. What the impediments may be to the access, what the cultural views may be of nature, and how we can honor and support those views and deal with the challenges of the impediments.

**Potter:** Thank you very much.

**Moore:** That's all who signed up.

**Potter:** This is a report. We need a motion to accept.

**Saltzman:** Before we do that, I just wanted to add one thing is -- in, and I have some testimony from the friends of Portland community gardens that I will submit for the record, but clearly -- the issues they raise, I think are valid ones. That is that it is room in our natural areas forested areas, for community gardens. And I think we need to be more cognizant of that. Clearly wetlands and forested areas need special protection, but I think their point is a good one, that we need to look also at community gardening as a form of outdoor recreation. To the extent that there are compatible uses for community gardens within areas that exist right now or areas that we do acquire in the future, I think it's a good thing we keep that in mind. So I will submit their statement for the record, but I did I want to go on record saying I'm in support of that sentiment to find a way to work together with them. With that I would move adoption of the report.

**Adams:** Second.

**Potter:** Please call the vote.

**Adams:** I want to thank everyone involved with this. I've had an opportunity to go out and see some of the natural areas that b.e.s. Is both responsible for procuring, and maintaining. And part of what we've talked about as -- in doing those tours is to also differentiate for the generations to come those natural areas that serve an important water quality function or a significant water quality function versus a river quality function versus those that don't. And so we're working on that and think it will be hopefully a contribution to this effort. So thanks dean for your leadership, this is something that the city got into in a very big way since you've been leading b.e.s. And most people don't know that. So thank you, and to the rest of you, great work, keep it up. Aye.

**Saltzman:** I want to thank deb lev and b.e.s. and the many citizen and planning for their work on this, and parks as well. Clearly this is consistent with the parks 2020 vision that the council adopted in 2001, and of more relevance, it's not simply a road map, it's an acquisition strategy. And as you've heard me say and you've heard our parks people say, we want to be opportunistic and acquire properties and even if we don't -- can't turn them into a fully developed natural area, or community garden, over whatever, we need to lands bank them for the future so we're serving all

**November 2, 2006**

future generations of the city. I'm excited about the prospects of having \$15 million of city funds from measure 2680, the metro natural area's ballot measure, and further excited about metro's interest in acquiring, investing an additional \$30 million for natural area acquisition within the city limits of Portland. So once again, those of you who have not voted yet, I urge to you vote for 2680. Aye.

**Sten:** You are allowed to say I urge to you vote for 2680.

**Potter:** Would you say it again?

**Sten:** We're allowed to say it at least on the council level. I admire and appreciation the work you're doing. It's very good, and it's not missed by me, and I think people paying attention to this hearing that metro is working very closely with parks, b.e.s., and planning, and it's seamless, and we're going to spend this money, and I do think it will pass, because people value this very much. And it's something that distinguishes our region, and frankly it's easy to support green space, it's difficult to come up with a workable strategy that can be developed incrementally and successfully. And create the kind of habitat that we need with money coming in sporadically. I think that's what you've all successfully done. Of course mike and linda and company, thanks for your advocacy. It makes a huge difference, and I recognize and appreciate it. Aye.

**Potter:** Most of these discussions we talk about how we're going to pay for things. And I think we have an opportunity through the metro measure 2680 to really take some large amounts of money and begin to set aside our natural areas, not begin, but to continue, I should say, and particularly on a regional level. If there are folks, you know, who are wondering whether they should vote for that or not, I think they have to look at some of those areas that were natural 10 years ago and now have development on them. To know we don't really have a lot of time. We know this area is popular, that a million people will be coming here in the next 20 years, and we need to prepare for that day and ensure is that we've got that space set aside. I think what Portland parks and recreation has done is contribute to the overall notion that there is community value in setting aside and protecting our natural resources, and in fact, it's one of the major values of our city and our region. So if the two people who are watching this on cable vote yes for 2680, I would deeply appreciate it. [laughter]

**Sten:** I have evidence both commissioner Saltzman and i's mothers are watching. [laughter]

**Saltzman:** She's already voted for 2680.

**Potter:** And there's vera, she's watching. [laughter]

**Sten:** My mother assured me she's voting for open space.

**Potter:** Good job, folks. I'm very proud of you. I appreciate your leadership, zari, at the parks bureau. Thanks for that. I vote aye. [gavel pounded] adjourned until next week.

At 3:02 p.m., Council adjourned.