



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 31ST DAY OF MAY, 2000 AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, Hales, Saltzman and Sten, 5.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Britta Olson, Clerk of the Council; Harry Auerbach, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and Officer Chuck Bolliger, Sergeant at Arms.

Item Nos. 770 and 773 were pulled for discussion and on a Y-5 call, the balance of the Consent Agenda was adopted.

Commissioner Sten left the meeting at 10:15 a.m. Commissioner Hales came in at 10:24 a.m.

- *752** **TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM** - Authorize an extraterritorial sewer service extension from City of Portland to the property in case number SE-1-00, SE McKinley (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)
- Disposition:** Ordinance No. 174501. (Y-5)
- 753** **TIME CERTAIN: 10:30 AM** - First periodic review of General Obligation Bond for Fire facilities (Report introduced by Mayor Katz)
- Disposition:** Accepted. (Y-5)
- 754** **TIME CERTAIN: 11:00 AM** - Continue Downtown Business District Property Management License Fee for one additional year, commencing October 1, 2000 (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)
- Disposition:** Resolution No. 35890. (Y-5)
- 755** Amend agreement for Downtown Business District Management Services between the City, the Association for Portland Progress and Portland Downtown Services, Inc. (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 50996)
- Disposition:** Continued to June 7, 2000 at 9:30 a.m.

MAY 31, 2000

CONSENT AGENDA - NO DISCUSSION

756 Accept proposal of Walsh Construction, Inc. to furnish CM/GC services for the addition and remodel of the Portland Communications Center for \$15,000 for Phase I preconstruction work and for six percent of the guaranteed maximum price for Phase II construction work (Purchasing Report - Bid No. 99863)

Disposition: Accepted Prepare Contract. (Y-5)

757 Accept bid of Mt. Hood Roofing Co., Inc. to furnish Multnomah Art Center re-roof project for \$206,659 (Purchasing Report – Rebid No. 99869)

Disposition: Accepted Prepare Contract. (Y-5)

758 Accept bid of W.G. Moe & Sons, Inc. to furnish SE Foster Road/SE Jenne Road intersection improvements for \$717,907 (Purchasing Report - Bid No. 99922)

Disposition: Accepted Prepare Contract. (Y-5)

759 Accept bid of Portland Freightliner, Inc. to furnish 33,000 gvw cab and chassis with chip body for \$63,871 (Purchasing Report - Bid No. 99930)

Disposition: Accepted Prepare Contract. (Y-5)

760 Accept bid of Alamo Paving Company to furnish seal and coat 2nd level deck NE Precinct parking garage for \$98,400 (Purchasing Report - Bid No. 99935)

Disposition: Accepted Prepare Contract. (Y-5)

Mayor Vera Katz

761 Adopt language for the Civic Stadium Noise Variance (Report)

Disposition: Adopted. (Y-5)

762 Accept completion of Inverness Trails, Project No. 5841, and authorize final payment to Brant Construction, Inc. (Report; Contract No. 32397)

Disposition: Accepted. (Y-5)

MAY 31, 2000

***763** Amend agreement with the State of Oregon, Office of the State Fire Marshal, for Regional Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Team Services (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174486. (Y-5)

***764** Pay Claim of Alan McDonald (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174487. (Y-5)

***765** Contract with Alamo Paving Company to seal and coat the second level of the NE Precinct parking garage for \$98,400 and provide for payment (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174488. (Y-5)

***766** Contract with the lowest responsible bidder to upgrade the HVAC system controls at the 10th and Yamhill parking garage commercial space and provide for payment (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174489. (Y-5)

***767** Authorize a contract and provide payment for a fish access, habitat assessment and alternatives analysis at Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174490. (Y-5)

***768** Authorize a contract and provide payment for a fish and wildlife habitat assessment and alternatives analysis in Crystal Springs watershed (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174491. (Y-5)

***769** Authorize an agreement with the Bicycle Transportation Alliance for design and manufacture of four art bike racks to be installed in Portland parks (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174492. (Y-5)

MAY 31, 2000

- *770** Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Gresham and the City of Portland for the cooperation of units of local government to prepare and update the Consolidated Plan to meet affordable housing goals and to receive payment (Ordinance)

Motion to accept amendment: Moved by Commissioner Sten and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman.

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174502 as amended. (Y-5)

- *771** Authorize contract with the lowest responsible bidder for the Holman Pump Station improvement project for the Bureau of Environmental Services and provide for payment, Project No. 5369 (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174493. (Y-5)

- *772** Authorize new consortium agreement with Multnomah County and the City of Gresham to participate in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's HOME Investment Partnership Program under Title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 as amended (42 USC 12701 et seq.) (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174494. (Y-5)

- 773** Authorize donation of fifty inoperable firearms to Brian Borrello for use in an art project entitled "Guns in the Hands of Artists" (Ordinance)

Disposition: Passed to Second Reading June 7, 2000 at 9:30 a.m.

- *774** Authorize intergovernmental agreement with Multnomah County Drainage District #1 in the amount of \$50,000 for maintenance and repair of water quality and hazardous material containment facilities in the Wellhead Protection Area (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174495. (Y-5)

- *775** Authorize a contract and provide payment for the construction of Whitaker Ponds stormwater pollution reduction facility - Phase 2 of 2, Project No. 5736 (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174496. (Y-5)

MAY 31, 2000

776 Vacate a certain portion of NE 123rd Avenue and NE Hoyt Street, under certain conditions (Second Reading Agenda 708; C-9975)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174497. (Y-5)

777 Amend contract with Neles Automation in the amount of \$165,440 to upgrade the SCADA system for the Water Control Center (Second Reading Agenda 723; amend Contract No. 30999)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174498. (Y-5)

778 Adopt City Engineer's findings for an encroachment in the public right-of-way and grant a revocable permit to adidas Village Corporation for a skystructure over North Greeley Avenue, south of North Sumner Street (Second Reading Agenda 726)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174499. (Y-5)

Gary Blackmer

779 Transmit Certificate of Completion for street, storm and sanitary sewer improvements in the NE 158th Avenue, Marine Drive to Columbia Slough, south of NE Airport Way Local Improvement District (Report; C-9926)

Disposition: Placed on File.

REGULAR AGENDA

Mayor Vera Katz

780 Accept the Purchasing Board of Appeals decision regarding prequalification of American Building Construction (Report)

Disposition: Accepted. (Y-5)

781 Accept contract with Werbin West Contracting, Inc. for 4" water main in Waterfront Park as complete and authorize final Progress Payment No. 4 and release retainage (Report; Contract No. 32549)

Disposition: Accepted. (Y-5)

MAY 31, 2000

- *782** Agreement with Franciscan Enterprise of Oregon for \$180,000 to provide law enforcement services in support of the New Approaches Anti-Drug grant (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174503. (Y-5)

- *783** Accept the transfer of certain parcels of land known as the South Waterfront Park extension from Portland Development Commission and assign to Portland Parks and Recreation (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174504. (Y-5)

- *784** Declare two parcels of land at Ed Benedict Park surplus and authorize their reconveyance to State of Oregon Department of Transportation (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174505. (Y-5)

- *785** Extend agreement with construction consultant on claims resulting from the Columbia Slough consolidation conduit project (Ordinance; amend Agreement No. 32934)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174506. (Y-5)

- *786** Approve annexation to the City of Portland of property in case number A-1-00, Seton (Ordinance)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174500. (Y-5)

- 787** Authorize the rates and charges for water and water-related services by the City of Portland during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001 and fix an effective date (Second Reading Agenda 702)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174507. (Y-5)

- 788** Amend Title 17 of the City Code to revise sewer and drainage rates and charges in accordance with the Fiscal Year 2000-2001 Sewer User Rate Study and amend Title 7 to reduce the Utility License Fee for the sewer utility (Second Reading Agenda 703; amend Code Chapters 17.36 and 7.14)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174508. (Y-5)

MAY 31, 2000

789 Amend City Code relating to Purchasing (Second Reading Agenda 704; add Chapter 5.33, repeal Chapters 5.01, 5.32, 5.44, 17.20, replace Section 3.30.050.A.3. and add Section 3.15.080.C.)

Disposition: Ordinance No. 174509. (Y-5)

Communications

790 Request of Kathleen Juergens to address Council regarding Police response to the May Day march (Previous Agenda 747)

Disposition: Placed on File.

791 Request of Dave Mazza to address Council regarding community involvement in the May Day investigation and police deployment for political events (Previous Agenda 748)

Disposition: Placed on File.

At 12:02 p.m., Council recessed.

MAY 31, 2000

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 31ST DAY OF MAY, 2000 AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, Hales, Saltzman and Sten, 5.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Britta Olson, Clerk of the Council; Pete Kasting, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and Officer Larry Siewert, Sergeant at Arms.

***792** **TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM** - Amend the Comprehensive Plan Map and change the zone of property near SE Flavel Street, SE Deardorf and SE 122nd Avenue from OS (Open Space) to R10 (Low Density Single Family Dwelling); and approve amendments to environmental zones as shown on Exhibit H-17 (Previous Agenda 393; LUR 99-00301 CP ZC

Disposition: Continued to September 27, 2000 at 2:00 p.m.

793 **TIME CERTAIN: 2:10 PM** - Revise residential solid waste and recycling collection rates and charges, effective August 1, 2000 (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Saltzman; amend Code Chapter 17.102)

Disposition: Continued to June 14, 2000 at 9:30 a.m.

At 3:22 p.m., Council recessed.

JUNE 1, 2000

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 1ST DAY OF JUNE, 2000 AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, Hales, Saltzman and Sten, 5.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Britta Olson, Clerk of the Council; Kathryn Beaumont, Senior Deputy City Attorney, at 4:00 p.m., relieved by Linda Meng, Chief Deputy City Attorney; and Officer Larry Siewert, Sergeant at Arms.

Commissioner Francesconi left at 5:03 p.m.

794 **TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM** - Adopt and implement the Southwest Community Plan Vision, Policies and Objectives (Previous Agenda 693 introduced by Mayor Katz)

Disposition: Continued to June 29, 2000 at 2:00 p.m.

At 5:15 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland



By Britta Olson
 Clerk of the Council

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

MAY 31, 2000

Closed Caption Transcript of Portland City Council Meeting

This transcript was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast.
Key: == means unidentified speaker.

MAY 31, 2000 9:30 AM

Katz: Come on up for a second. You've seen mr. Tahn here. He's studied—come sit down, because i'm going to ask you to say a few words. You have—mr. Tahn has studied at Portland state university and has visited us on a regular location—regular occasion, and dedicated to expanding our relationship with his city. What we have here today are students from—and we have parents from with son high school and jackson middle school. And i'm sure representatives of the sister city organization who are hosting 19 young ladies and young men who are here, and it was mr. Tahn with the work of a lot of people who have extended this opportunity, and this is a first for us. So congratulations, and why don't you just say a few words and introduce the principal, and whatever.

Interpreter for Mr. Tong, from Suzhou, China: thank you, mayor vera Katz, and commissioners. We're here to conduct the first student exchanges between wilson high and jackson middle, with— please allow me to introduce mr. Wong, the teacher of political science of our high school, and the teacher of english from the same school, and we also have mr. Chang, the administrator. This time we have brought over 19 students and five teachers. Thanks to all the efforts by the our sister city association and these two counterpart schools, and with the support of city hall mayor Katz in particular, and—we made it, and hope that this will be a regular exchange program. We are having the students of similar number from wilson high and jackson middle to our city. And also, we discussed yesterday with mrs. Phyllis auster and—the president of Portland's sister city association, how to expand the program from where we are. So thank you again for all your support, and we are working on it, we have lots of support. So i'd like to—the education committee of the sister city association, they have put lots of time and energy into that.

Katz: Thank you. Thank you. Do we have representatives of jackson school here?

==they could not make it.

Katz: Wilson high school?

== are the students going to be here through the rose festival?

==no. They'll be here ten days. We arrived on the 25th, and we're leaving on the morning of the 4th. But we'll make the starlight parade.

Katz: It's nice to have— your english is probably better than our chinese, right? [laughter] it's nice to have all of you here, and if you can, when you're finished, if you can e-mail us and let us know some of your impressions of Portland and what you saw, that would be nice.

== they—at the beginning of the year, they start e-mail each other to their counterpart student ever since. So it's not—

Katz: So it's not a big deal. So do it: Just do it: [laughter]

==really contributing the understanding between our next generations.

Katz: Yes. Thank you. It's good to see you again. Thank you, everybody. Thank you, jackson middle school and wilson high school, Portland's sister city, and especially thank you to the host parents who have opened up their homes to these youngsters. And as everybody knows, when our youngsters go over there, the parents of our sister city families will open up their home. And it is going to be a wonderful, wonderful exchange. Thank you. All right. We have something else. We have a bird. A city bird. It is the great blue heron week. I have to tell you, I actually saw one standing and walking when we took the boat tour around ross island. And I was close enough, it was just absolutely an extraordinary sight. I felt so proud. Let me read the proclamation. Whereas great blue heron week is an annual celebration of fish and wildlife and other natural resources that are an integral part of our city. This week citizens are invited to participate in 16 events that provide a

MAY 31, 2000

glimpse of our city's natural assets, and great blue heron week is an appropriate time to restate our vows to protect, enhance and restore our natural resources, and whereas i, the mayor of Portland and on behalf of the city council, pledge to renew our efforts to understand what we must do as a city to integrate economic vitality and social equity with environmental protection, and therefore i, mayor of the city of Portland, do hereby proclaim the week of june 3rd to the 11th, 2000, to be the 14th annual great blue heron week of Portland. These are the keys to our sustainable future. And go out and take a look for yourself, because they're magnificent birds.

==thank you, mayor, for kicking off great blue heron week once again. I think ron might want to say a couple of things about some events.

==real quickly, I want to thank the city of Portland from day one has been an important partner on this, and I want to thank you, and particularly park staff for their support. I think that you said it well in the proclamation, that there's no better way to understand and be inspired by the natural world than to get out and experience it. And that's what this event is all about. I really encourage you all to do that if you get the opportunity. In particular, i'd like to quickly highlight what I think is my favorite event, which is the last event listed, sunday, june 11th, it's an outrageous event that mike hawk, could—who could not be here today unfortunately, it's a paddle around ross island. We typically have at least 50 --

Katz: Bye, everybody. Have a nice day.

== if that's—if you can only pick one event, I encourage you to pick that one.

Katz: Thank you.

Francesconi: Can you give us a couple others that you like?

== oh, gosh. The ross island paddle is a great one, I also like the bike ride. There's one that's on peninsula crossing, I think there's one at that mike—actually, i've got to pick oaks bottom. My wife and I just moved to— near that area just recently, just bought our first house, and that's always been a favorite place of mine in the city. So that's a wonderful trip. That's on thursday, june 8th. I just don't think you can go wrong with any of these, really.

Katz: Thank you, everybody. I need a couple of actions. If there are no objections, we need to move 786 from a regular calendar to time—

Francesconi: Your wife is doing a terrific job on the parks 2020 plan.

Katz: 786 to time certain with 752, because they're linked, and tie those two together. Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. There's also a request to pull 770 and 773. Any other questions from counsel members?

776 is the first one?

Katz: 786. We're going to hear that with 752. Anybody in the audience wanting to pull an item off the consent agenda for discussion? All right. Hearing none, then let's vote on the consent agenda.

Francesconi: Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Sten: Aye.

Item No. 786

Katz: Mayor votes aye. All right. Time certain. 786. Approve annexation to the city of Portland of property in case number a-1-00, seton.

Katz: 786. Come on up.

Denise, Metro: mayor Katz, commissioners, i'm denise, an employee of metro. You have contacted with me— contracted with metro for annexation services, staff reports, and ken martin is the person who actually generally staffs the function. He took an extended leave of absence and i'm filling in for him temporarily until august. I would be more than happy to have laurel give this general staff report. We've worked together and she's more familiar with doing presentations to you, so—

Butman: that will be fine. If I miss anything—

MAY 31, 2000

Katz: Go ahead. Introduce yourself.

Laurel Butman, Office of Management and Finance: I'm with the office of finance and administration urban services program. This annexation is an annexation of land 1.73 acres contiguous to the city of Portland and within our urban servicing boundary where we expect to deliver services in the future and where we do pursue annexation, particularly when initiated by homeowners, property owners. This is an owner-initiated annexation, and they are initiating the annexation for purposes of developing the property to some extent. It's a pretty much cut and dried case. It meets all the local and state criteria for annexations. It meets our policies for annexations. We've done some service delivery analysis on it, and the property owners have started to work with staff on their development desires. There is no financial impact to the annexation itself, and we recommend it for approval. Denise, is there anything else you wanted to add?

Denise: I don't have anything to add. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Katz: Questions? Anybody else want to testify? No questions? All right. Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Sten: Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. 752. I've got to have it read first.

Item No. 752

Laurel Butman, Office of Management and Finance: okay. I'm laurel, with the office of finance and administration, urban services program. This extraterritorial service extension is for a small sewer line to a single property. We struggled over this a little bit because it is an extension to an area in the former pleasant valley urban reserve area outside the city, but within the urban growth boundary, and it is, according to governance agreement with the city of gresham, eventually going to be within gresham and served by gresham. So we have worked long and hard to figure out how to extend sewer to this property, because they have a failing septic system, and they need to remedy that problem. But to do so in a way that doesn't harm the future planning that will be—that is going on right now in that area, and that will be continuing to go on toward annexation and urbanization. So we've come up—the bureau of environmental services in communication too with the city of gresham and planners here in the city of Portland, we've come up with a series of conditions that we believe will protect the planning interests for the future of this property and still allow us to connect sewer and remediate the problem that has—that is on the site. I'll just summarize the conditions for you now. The property owners going to obtain permits for this, the connection will be a pipe no greater than four inches in order to prevent additional connections on the site or development on the site. It is what we're calling a temporary connection, not according to our code, but in recognition of the fact that eventually gresham will be providing sewer to the area, and they'll be having system development needs. The property owner will pay all the fees associated with the connection. Again, there's a statement about the connection being temporary so that when the city of gresham intends to connect—extend its own service, then they can enter into communications with the property owner. There is a clause that failure to cooperate with gresham will could result in disconnection of the line into the city of Portland services, and that would be in the future. The extension is to be the private sewer of the property owner. It's only for the current level of development, and legally allowable uses under the Multnomah county zoning code because it is in the jurisdiction of Multnomah county for planning at current time. There's a warning about failure to comply with rules for sewer connections. Those are the conditions, and we feel they do meet the spirit and standard that we're trying to uphold, and still help us to remedy the situation with the failed septic. So we're recommending approval with the conditions in place. **Katz:** Questions by council? Staff, anybody on the staff want to testify? Linda? Citizens?

Olson: I have one person signed up.

MAY 31, 2000

Katz: Linda? Okay. Ladies, why don't you just move over, and have staff come over, and linda, why don't you come up at the same time. We feel like you're part of our staff crew here.

Jonathan Harter, City of Gresham: 1333 NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham, 97030, good morning, mayor Katz, council members. I'm johnathan harker, a planner with the city of gresham. I just wanted to briefly speak to the application. We have an intergovernmental agreement with you that we're jointly doing master planning for this area now, and in the future gresham would likely provide governance and urban services there. I just wanted to emphasize your staff has been diligent in corresponding with gresham and addressing the issues that we had concerns about. We do support the staff's recommendations, and those conditions that laurel just summarized. I did submit a letter from our community development director to that effect. We also struggled with this one, and we saw assume there will be similar issues in the future like this, so we think that it would be a good idea to maybe have some policies in place so that we can address this in a simpler way than the several months it took us to come up with an answer. We're recommending our continued discussion with Portland to modify or—our intergovernmental agreement to that effect. That's really all I have to say. I just want to thank you for the opportunity to address our issues.

Katz: Thank you. Linda? Somebody move over and give her a little bit of room.

Linda Bauer, Pleasant Valley Neighborhood Association: linda bauer, pleasant valley neighborhood association. I just want to thank everybody involved for doing this. This was ground-breaking, and it's hopefully going to work very well. Thank you.

Katz: Everybody hear this?

Bauer: just this one time.

Katz: Linda, thank you. Thank you, everybody. Congratulations. Anybody else want to testify? Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Sten: Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. All right. We moved so quickly, we need— we'll need to go to—no, we've got two items on the consent first. 770. Has everybody received the amended page? ==did someone need to move an amendment?

Katz: Thank you for keeping me on my toes. I need a motion to move the amendment.

Sten: I would move the substitute.

Katz: Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. Does anybody want to say anything about this? Commissioner Sten?

Sten: I don't think so.

Katz: Okay. Anybody want to testify on this item? Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Sten: Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. I can't see without my glasses. Is brian here? No wonder. You were sitting behind the post. Let's read 773.

Item No. 773

Olson: Authorize donation of firearms to brian for the use in an art project entitled, guns in the hands of artists.

Katz: Let me introduce this I saw brian probably about a year ago, right?

Brian Borello: yes, ma'am.

Katz: And he had this idea that he wanted—which he'll describe in a minute. Not to glorify firearms or the violence, just the opposite. And chief moose at that time wasn't really particularly interested in it, and I told brian at that time, hold off, and as soon as chief kroeker came on board, brian and the chief met and that's why he's here. I certainly didn't want to do it without having the

MAY 31, 2000

approval of the chief in the police—and the police bureau. And it's here because it's something that's being given to brian. I need to add that any other artist that wants these firearms, if they're willing to meet the conditions that brian has to meet, that's perfectly okay. So brian, describe your project.

Brian Borello: thank you. I'm brian, an artist, also working as design team artist for the light rail project. This is a project I feel very strongly about. This is not about gun control, this is not a gun control initiative, this is strictly about bringing the dialogue about guns in our society and particularly handgun violence to a different level to get it out of the—it seems to be mired in the passionate dialogue and op ed pages and newspapers and talk shows this. Is a way of taking art, using the power of art to take it more to a different level, maybe to a different level of conscious necessary, and to look at the way guns are used—it's called guns in the hands of artists, and in a nutshell, it's taking the confiscated hand guns from the police department and destroying them and converting them into original works of art. I'll be the distributor or the responsible person that will be taking these responsible—seeing to the destruction of the guns and passing the parts to the arts community for artists to make works of art. It will be sculptors, jewelry makers, painters, cartoonists, even choreographers and dancers that might use these things as some point of reference for their dialogue about guns. I can't predict what might come about. I know i'll be handling my end of this very responsibly in terms of safety and responsibility. But the artists are going to be making some pretty provocative things. It's important to add too that i've got an arts council grant to try to develop the project, and with that money i'll be both giving honorary for the artist, but more importantly to make sure there's no city outlay of money for this, all police expenditure for their manpower, for the overseeing of the destruction and the transfer of I will cover all those costs, as well as acting with the police department for whatever equipment they need for the destruction of the guns and keep it for future efforts. I've done this twice before in two other cities, in new orleans, louisiana, and in Washington, d.c. Very gun-laden cities. It was to great critical acclaim. “”new york times,”” “time” magazine picked it up favorably, the city paper in Washington, d.c. Described it as one of the most important public art projects in the decade. I hope to make this a very—raise the bar a little bit here, i'm looking forward for your support, and i'm—i've got some examples. This is a piece rosary that has been made from triggers and springs. Also it's a book of just art that's been made once before.

Katz: Questions of brian?

Saltzman: I—

Saltzman: I thought our—

Brian Borello: the guns are currently send to a foundry and melted down and destroyed. I was looking towards being able to use art at least in a more creative method in the destruction. Just as an example, there's—this is an invitation piece, and this is called rex hex. This was a—created by an artist and his 12-year-old child, and it's made from seven pistols and four dinner forks. And it represents a dinosaur. So this is an example of some of the sculptures that were made. What i'd like to—i don't want to complicate things, but reading the ordinance, i—this ordinance authorizes the donation of 50 inoperable firearms, and i'm very grateful for this opportunity. In my dialogue with the police chief, we talked about 50 being the initial offering with the idea that maybe 100 or 200 being the total number.

Katz: We might have to come back.

Brian Borello: okay. I'd be glad to.

Katz: For the public who can't see this, there are beads attached to it that spell out “peace.”

Francesconi: I do have one question. So is there any way to—strategy for getting young folks involved in the art and the changing of swords into through plow shares?

Brian Borello: I do quite a bit of work with the community. I work with a literacy project, I look wherever possible to bring youth into the mix. In new orleans, did I work with inner city youth, at-

MAY 31, 2000

risk youth, all youth are at risk, and we actually made using the triggers and springs and the broken chunks of these guns, we made peace signs. We dialogued about—talked about the guns and their presence, and what the kids knew about it, and we made peace signs where these triggers and springs were formed into peace symbols, and we actually donated those things to kids—kids presented to the mayor, the chief of police, so i've made those efforts before, and i'd like to cautiously engage some youth into the project as well.

Katz: Thank you. Thank you brian, and thank you for being persiStent. I thought the idea was a wonderful idea, and you had to wait a little bit, but that's all right. Thanks. Anybody else want to testify? Okay. Roll call.

Katz: It goes to second. We've got jackson middle school?

==jackson middle school. I'm sorry we're late. We're here now.

Katz: We welcome you. We welcome you—they look older than the wilson high school students. Unless i'm looking at the teachers. Welcome to the city of Portland. And the student—those are the students. Why don't you stand up. Nice to have you in the city. Enjoy it. I gave the students of wilson high school an assignment. Using e-mail—you all know how to use e-mail, right? Okay. Send me a little letter. Not too long—about what you found the most exciting that you saw here in the city of Portland. Okay? And I want to give the assignment to our american students when they go to our sister city. Did you all see the garden? Not yet? Make sure they see the garden before they leave. Because without our sister city, it would not have been possible. Thank you. All right. We're going to have to jump to the regular agenda. Can—somebody remind me—would you remind me at 10:30? Okay. Since you're watching me so closely today. I appreciate it, because I do goof up. All right. **780.**

Katz: Is anybody here to testify on this? I'm nervous about moving ahead. Does anybody have question was regard to the report? You know, i'd like to wait for sue.

Katz: Oh. Thank you. Sue, come on up.

Sue Klobertanz: no additional report is necessary.

Katz: Okay. Roll call.

Item No. 781.

Katz: Anybody want to say anything on this? All right. Roll call.

Item No. 782

Katz: Anybody want to say anything about the grant? We do have a lot of partnership with community-based organizations, especially in—housing property that they're involved in, and this is going to be a great assistance to us. Roll call.

Item No. 783.

Katz: Does anybody want to testify on that item? We have provided funds to make this happen as well. Roll call.

Francesconi: This is a big deal. We appreciate it. We appreciate our partnership with the Portland development commission, and we appreciate the council giving us the money to maintain it. It is an expensive park to maintain, but it's a special park. And what's good about this park is that it provides some diversity along the greenway. I have really come to believe that the greenway, it is important to have an adequate buffer along the river, but it's equally important to have diversity of experiences. And this is a diverse urban park that is going to be expensive to maintain, as i've said, so we can't have all of the greenway with this level of maintenance. But this is an important thing. It will make the area better for the businesses that are there, as well as the residents. The mayor deserves credit for this one, because she pushed it. And parks deserves—and pdc deserves credit for how it was designed. And parks deserves credit for pushing this as well. We knew it was going to be expensive to maintain, but we want to do this. So there's also a functioning rest room there, and that's the credit of bgs. We're looking at ways to have more functioning rest rooms operated by the private sector. It's a little thing, but it makes an important difference at a crucial time. So the—for a

MAY 31, 2000

lot of reasons, this is another kind of jewel that's an overused expression, another terrific place as we create more terrific places right at our river. So this is a very important thing, and i'm very pleased to vote aye.

Katz: Part of the promise of this community many years ago was to finish the extension of the waterfront park south. So this is it. It took a while to do it. The park is a park for quiet thought and contemplation. It is very serene. It gives an opportunity for citizens to actually get down to the waterfront and touch the water when the tide is low, which is not low right now. There is a little beach. I wish I could tell you that you can swim from the little beach. You can't today, but you may be able to do it in a couple of years from now. And it's a joy. It's different, as commissioner Francesconi says, and not every park needs to have places to throw frisbees or to play soccer, or kickball. There are parks that need to be very quiet. And this is a very quiet park with some wonderful artwork nicely integrated within the park. So—and it is a lovely rest room. Lovely rest room. And now it needs to be open so people can use it. The community around it, the citizens who live around there had taken a real active part in the development—developing of this park, and I think will take an active part in maintaining the park. So I want to thank the Portland development commission and now Portland parks and recreation for maintaining it, and for teaching us about perennial plants. Aye. Okay. Did I not let you say anything?

Item No. 784.

Susan Hathaway-Marxer, Parks Bureau: i'm susan hathaway. I'm here today to talk to you about parks bureau's desire that you declare two parcels of land to be surplus and authorize their reconveyance to state of Oregon department of transportation. Most of the land now known as ed benedict was required by odot with federal highway money in 1970, 30 years ago. At that time, of course there was going to be a freeway through there, and so land was acquired with that—with that transportation money. It was 15 years later that council requested the land to be deeded over to the city for a park. It was three years after that that the land was actually deeded over in 1988. At that time there was a master plan developed for the park, but there was no money to build it. It wasn't until the 9-1-1 center went in in 1993 that some seed money was generated for the development of ed benedict, and when the bond measure passed, of course there was money for its development. And that park was completed and opened in 1996. There are two parcels, and I hope you can see them here. If not, i'll walk them up. This one is about 11,000 square feet, this one is about—this has a perfectly good three-bedroom house on it. This one is vacant land that's on a corner that's about 8,000 square feet. Since the city has owned it, the land has been rezone and could support a duplex. These parcels are—they're surplus to the park. When the park was finally designed, those many years after the land was acquired, the geography of the park left these two parcels to be surplus. We tried very hard to get the federal highway administration to let us sell those properties and use the money to finish ed benedict, but because that—but there would be huge precedent involved in undoing and having the land go to a private party, and in fact the deed says it can only be used for park and recreation use, we're obligated to either sell it ourselves and return the money to the state, which will give us to the federal government, or simply transfer it over to them and they will do it. And what will happen is these two parcels will go back to the tax rolls. And they—if we are able to declare them surplus, they'll cease to be a burden for the park bureau. This house—this is a perfectly good three-bedroom house with a big back yard. A family needs to be living in this house, and right now it's boarded up.

Saltzman: What's on the other parcel?

Hathaway-Marxer: vacant land. This is the 9-1-1 center.

Saltzman: Have we talked to bgs about any potential interest in that parcel?

Hathaway-Marxer: they know that we have taken this action, parks bureau has, to declare them surplus. The way the deed is written, if they were to want this, they would have to go to the state

MAY 31, 2000

and get a reuse authorization in the same way the city had to get a reuse when this was developed. So they're perfectly free to go to odot, and they know—

Saltzman: They know this parcel is potentially available?

Hathaway-Marxer: yes. It's across a street, so it's not—

Saltzman: The only reason i'm asking, we've been looking into opportunities for child care for bgs employees and even tri-met employees, and things are crowded on the existing site, so that's why my interest piqued when I saw the parcel so close to the facility.

Hathaway-Marxer: parks bureau always notifies other bureaus when it transfers or disposes of park property, which as you know is not very often.

Katz: Questions? Anybody want to testify on this? Roll call.

Francesconi: We're being very aggressive at getting park land, and i'm proud of the bureau for that. In fact, folks, i'm not going to tell you, but next week we have another very important park acquisition that's going to come to the council, I suspect. But we're also practical. And we don't—this is not part of the park, practically speaking. There's a house on it. This other parcel doesn't make any sense to connect it to the park. As susan said, there should be a family living there enjoying the park. With eyes on the park. And that's the practical and right thing to do.

Item No. 785.

Katz: Anybody want to testify on this item? Does anybody have a question on this item? Roll call.

Item No. 787.

Francesconi: Thanks for your work on this, commissioner Saltzman and commissioner Sten. **Sten:** Glad to vote on this. Aye.

Katz: Good work, everybody. I want to thank the bureaus on both this item and the next item for herely—clearly understanding that rates need to be released and they've done their part as well as the commissioners. And as well as ofa. Aye. 788. Amendment title 17.

Item No. 788.

Francesconi: I think since I thanked commissioner Saltzman for the water rates, I should thank commissioner Sten for the sewer rates. Thank you both for your work on this. I said it last week. This will be a benefit for our residents, especially our low-income folks that need the help. Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. 789.

Olson: Amend city code relating to purchasing.

Francesconi: This is the purchasing issue.

Katz: Second reading.

Francesconi: This has—adds the 500,000 as opposed to the 250. But i'm going to—can I ask sue just a question? Or is that not appropriate? Never mind. I don't need a question. I'm going to go with it. We're going to raise it to 500. I was originally thinking it would be bet tore have it at 250, but because there are enough checks and balances, at least there will be when this is completed, I have confidence that this will be handled right. I do want to see those checks and balances before this goes into effect. Aye.

Saltzman: Aye. I just want to commend purchasing office and all the people who work order revising these rules. I think it is going to make a lot more sense and make doing business with the city of Portland a lot better. Easier for vendors and better from our perspective too.

Sten: Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. Ms. Juergens and mr. Mazza, with why—why don't we hold off a second. I don't think there's going to be anybody coming in to testify on the time certain, the 10:30 time certain. And we've got all of our fire personnel here. Are we going to have a problem to proceed with it?

Harry Auerbach, Senior Deputy City Attorney: it's a report, right?

Katz: Yeah.

Harry Auerbach, Senior Deputy City Attorney: no, there's no problem.

MAY 31, 2000

Katz: You're not all here. Fine. Then we'll wait and we'll take out—we'll go ahead to our communications. 790.

Sten: And I have to be excused, but i'll review the testimony afterward.

Item No. 790

Katz: You have to leave, and charlie should be back in one minute. Good luck. 790.

Katz: Both ms. Juergens and mr. Mazza, you have three minutes.

Katz: Request of kathleen juergens and dave mazza to address council regarding police response to the may day march.

Kathleen Jurgens, 3229 NE 7th, 97212: mayor Katz, commissioners, I appreciate having this opportunity to address you today. I was a member of the Portland may day organizing committee and was on the streets all day may 1st. Peaceful marchers became the victims of an unprovoked attack by Portland police which can only be understood as a deliberate attempt to suppress free speech. Chief kroeker justifies his actions by saying he had, quote, intelligence. That some among us were planning, quote, disruption and police were forced to respond. What disruption? One or two people possibly threw things only after being attacked with extreme violence by police. Under questions from the citizens, kroeker has refused to say what his intelligence was or where it came from. Yet we're expected to accept baseless allegations made without evidence as justification for police—this is an outrageous mentality. It must not be tolerated in Portland. Chief kroeker needs to be fired. Unfortunately Portland's policing problems did not start with chief kroeker or again on may 1st. Peaceful demonstrators were fired on in northeast Portland in august 1998. Mentally disabled veteran dicky dow was murdered in october 1998 by police. There was a distinct pattern here. People of color, vulnerable citizen and political dissenters are treated as the enemy. The citizens have made it clear we want real community policing that protects our safety and our civil rights. The corporate elite want the citizens to be kept does ill and compliant in an age of increasing corporate power. Which side is the Portland city council on? The mayor has propose add review procedure for may day. The police will do their own report, which will then be reviewed by piii, the chief's forum and the council. This is the same system that has failed us in the past. The police will cover up, white wash and lie outright. The rest of us will waste our time reviewing this bogus report. If any substantive findings come out of the process, the chief will have the power to overrule them. The mayor has also put together a work group to recommend improvements to Portland's police review board. If this group does its job right, it will come back to this council and tell you all what you already know, because citizens have been telling you this for years. The police review board needs to be greatly strengthened with real power to hold police accountable to citizens. This includes the pow tore act independently, investigate and subpoena, make binding determinations of misconduct and review police policy and mandate changes. In short, the city code changes outlined in the pac 2000 initiative. If the city council does not enact these changes, the people will. The initiative process is the people's last resort when our representative government fails us. Please do not fail us. Do the right thing. Fire chief kroeker: Commission a truly independent review of the events of may day. Adopt the city code changes that will make police accountable to the citizens they're supposed to protect and serve. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Dave Mazza, 1124 SE Rex, 97202 (address on request to speak): my name is dave mazza, chief petitioner of the police accountability campaign 2000, 1511 north alberta street. I want to thank the mayor and the council members for giving us time today. I just wanted to bring up a couple of things here. First of all, I wanted to invite the mayor and the council to attend our next community speak-out. As some of you know, we held one last month in northeast Portland. We had about 200 people come forward from the community who felt that it was a safe area where they could come in and talk about their issues with police misconduct. We're holding our next one downtown monday, june 12th, at 7:00 p.m. At the first congregational church. We would strongly encourage you to come and

MAY 31, 2000

listen to what folks have to say. This is a discussion that's going to go well beyond the scope of may day. I'm sure there will be some folks coming forward on may day as well, but this will be dealing with issues of police misconduct that are making place in old town and elsewhere, in particular where low-income people seem to be residing. So I just wanted to extend that invitation. Number 2, I brought you copies of the special edition of "street routes," which has a disturbing photograph on the front cover of a person being underfoot of mounted police. I would just like to ask the council to consider doing a moratorium on the use of mounted police in any crowd control sections until this entire public examination of our police bureau and their tactics is completed. I think this picture is very compelling and a pretty strong argument that these horses have no place in this sort of explosive situation that we ended up with on may day. I don't think any of us would endorse using police squad cars to roll into crowds of people. These are just four-legged squad cars with the potential for the same amount of damage. Lastly, I have two quick questions for the council. Number 1, in looking at the videotape that the city put forward for folks to see, as well as on citynet, which was very helpful, two things came to mind. One was, why was the sound going on and off throughout those seven hours? It seemed that conversations were suddenly cut off. And I would like to know if there was an explanation for that. And number 2, there was a videographer who showed up on the videotape. So clearly there was at least one other camera out there. Is that tape going to be made available to the public as well? My recollection from the seven hours was the police officer showed up somewhere around when the march was down near city hall. My other question was that has the city come up with any sort of figures in terms of the potential cost to the city for the may day incident? I know the mayor from the last year's claims against the police bureau has requested, and I assume it's been approved, about \$600,000, and I'm curious if the risk assessment folks have figured out if this is going to be a big spike in our cost to us. I know, for example, the city of los angeles just requested I think it was \$200 million to deal with the last nine years of police misconduct down there. So that's the reason I'm here. Thanks.

Katz: Thank you. All right. Let's move on, then, to time certain, 753. Hi, everybody up there. Welcome. Have a wonderful day.

Commissioner Hales came in the meeting at 10:24 a.m.

Chief Robert Wall, Fire Bureau: good morning. I'm chief robert wall, chief of the fire bureau. We're here this morning to provide an overview of the general obligation bond project for upgrade of fire stations and relocating and building new fire stations. We're going to go over the objectives of the bond, we'll talk about the budget and the schedule. We'll talk about some key milestones that we have in front of us, and that you're going to have in front of you very soon. And then an update on current renovations and status of the newest fire station to be built in the west hills, and a report from our oversight committee.

Karen Kramer, Bureau of General Services (BGS): this is karen cramer. I'm bgs facilities manager. 18 months ago, the voters passed a fire rescue bond to improve the response time and strengthen stations to withstand earthquakes. We've been working on that for 18 months. As a team. The fire bureau, fire and rescue, and the bureau of general services. We will come back to you again for a series of formal reports to give you a status on how things are going. Just to remind ourselves, overview of the project, the objectives, the objectives that the voters voted on 18 months ago, was to upgrade fire facilities to allow firefighters and their equipment to effectively respond in case of an earthquake. We also wanted at the same time to relocate new facilities to meet the four-minute response time as the city grows, it becomes more problematic for the fire and rescue mission to be accomplished to reach the citizens. We also wanted to renovate facilities to be consistent with the changing mission of fire and rescue, certainly we know that over the last 50 years the fire and rescue organization has changed in how it performs. We also wanted to provide privacy accommodations for firefighters and to enhance ada accessibility. To give you a sense of how big this program is, it is 62.6 million dollars of which the general obligation bond approved the actual bond amount was

MAY 31, 2000

\$53.8. The difference is being made up from contributions from other sources, and also the fact that we are selling some old fire sites, fire and facility sites, and therefore we're reaching the benefits to make up the difference. The term of the program is ten years, and we're only in the first really the second year of it. We will be constructing—we will have 33 projects associated with this program, of which 21 are renovations, and 12 will be new buildings. We also have eight sites. We have to accomplish eight new sites for these rescue facilities, of which we are now officially with today's program, we'll be completing three of those successfully. We have three more that are on the drawing boards that you'll be hearing from us soon, and there's one yet that we have yet to come—accomplish. Some phasing. You have—you actually have on page 7 of your packet a remodeling schedule, the schedule we're using. The work is underway currently at three stations. Station 41 at southeast 122nd, excavation 22 in north Portland, and station 4, which is very close by city hall, actually, near psu. The next—we'll actually be going out to bid for an additional two stations. We recently dropped out the third to wait a year because of remodeling on the ross island bridge. But that will be station 14, which is on killingsworth and about 20th, and station 10, on tailor's ferry. So we are well underway.

Chief Wall: as these projects go forward, a key element is building partnerships between the city and the community. Someone once said, there's nothing so difficult as opening a new fire station. Well, maybe closing a fire station. But in both cases, the community has a very large stake in where we site a fire station, what the station looks like architecturally, and what it's used for. And so to build that partnership, we've established station advisory committees with participation from the local community along with city representatives, and those station advisory committees and groups are working very well, very active. They will deal with station location, in some cases where we do not have property purchased to actually find property and approve a series of sites and secure the property. Station activities, what kind of activities occur around the station is also critical to the community, as well as design, which I mentioned before. The role of the station capped captain, supervisor of that station is going to be key to this, and so each station advisory committee will have officers represented, as well as very strong labor participation in the process. Just a little bit you'll hear from one of the station captains reporting on his experiences with the station advisory committee. The community objectives are fed into the whole process as well. We really listen to them, and try to meet their needs as we site a station and build the station. Because it is, as karen mentioned, it's a 50-plus-year project. A station is going to be there for a long time, and we want it to be right.

Kramer: financial management is one of the things we're taking very seriously, particularly with a program this long. And you'll find on page 17 of your packet that we started last year by writing down some financial policies that will guide this program. We have priorities for the use of a program contingency, we have a process for approving uses of the program contingency, and we have a process for changes to the project budget. We have something we call a trade-off, a discipline trade-off program to keep all of the resources in line with our \$62 million budget. We recognize that over the course of ten years we've recognized over the last 18 months we've learned a lot, and we've needed to make some changes. When those changes are made, we're very care about documenting those changes, assuming some of us won't be here in ten years to see the end of this program. We want to make sure that there's a good record for our successors, and a good record for citizens about how every nickel and dime of their resources have been spent. We've actually approved three trade-offs so far within the 62.6 budget, and the process has worked very well for us, and included a review by the oversight committee. The oversight committee was established about six months ago. The model for that oversight committee was very much like the oversight committee that we used for the renovation of this building, the renovation of city hall. It was appointed by commissioner Francesconi, and established with citizens who have the broad interest of the city at heart, and have some skill and experience in working with large renovation programs. A list of those members are

MAY 31, 2000

on in your packet, and dan harmon from hoffman construction is here today to address you on that as well. The purpose of this committee is to review schedules, to review our budgets, and to establish and review program policies. They also of course are providing us support and understanding as we proceed through this long-term program.

Steve Sivage, BGS: good morning, mayor, commissioners. I've steve, with bgs facilities. I'm the section manager for project management, and i'm filling in for candy, who is actually on your agenda this morning but has taken ill and couldn't be here. On my left is will stevens. Will is the cochair of the siting committee, the committee for stations 12 and 40. And who has subsequently joined the— us as a city employee in the office of transportation. On my right is captain tom rupright, who will be the captain at station 12. Current captain at station 40. I apologize. We're going to—i'll talk today a the bit about the sac process, and then i'll turn it over to will and tom to talk from their perspectives of how it works. We look at it as a real win-win situation out there for these two stations. What the commissioner had asked us to do, and what the bond has asked us to do is to provide a public involvement process for siting our stations. That would involve both the siting and the eventual design, the purpose being that we want something that works in the neighborhoods for the neighbors. And we felt if the best way to do that is like the rest of the city does it, and that's go out and talk to the people involved. We want to set up a process, we have set up a process, we believe, that is comfortable and provides an opportunity for meaningful dialogue between the neighbors and the fire bureau and fire—bgs staff working on this project. To do that, we usually have the meetings at a fire station, to give the—to be in the neighborhood and to give the neighbors a sense of what an active fire station is like. We recruit our sac members through a variety of means. The newsletters through the neighborhood associations and the business associations in the affected fire management area of where we're looking for a new station. We have also implemented a process with the fire captains who work in that area, who are now going out and meeting with neighborhood associations, and this is a refinement suggested by the fire bureau. It has worked really, really well. The fire captains get out there and talk to the people and say, would you like to be on this committee. And we've recruited some great sac teams that are working. Once we have a sac selected, the first thing they do is work looking through the criteria for siting the station in a fire management area. That criteria is on page 13 of your packet. If you'd like to look at it. It's on—it's generic, but it gets more specific depending on the particular area we're looking for site in. Once they've reviewed the criteria, the whole sac and staff and everybody go to work looking for properties that meet those criteria. And we do that through the individual members of sac team, and we often always—often do it as well through professional searches, engaging the real estate communities. So once we have then a listing of the sites, then they're reviewed against these criteria and discussed. It's a challenge. Sometimes frustrating. Some of these processes have taken six months to a year to get the sac to bring forth the information to get comfortable with what they're looking for to review all the sites involved. So therefore, it takes a great deal of dedication on the—on behalf of the sac members. Once the work is done and the sac then has a recommendation, it's taken forward into the staff—actually almost simultaneous. We all look at it. There's a recommendation from all of us. We then forward that to commissioner Francesconi for processing. So it is an involved process, it's taking a lot of time, but there are some wonderful stories coming out of it, and this one at 12 and 40, I understand tom has actually made cookies for the folks in the sac meetings. But it doesn't end there either. Once we have a site, then we have the second part of the goal, and that's to make sure that the station itself fits into the neighborhood. And that the neighborhood is comfortable with it. So we involve the sac in the design process as well. The first thing they do is they select a member from their committee who sits on our pte selection process to find the designers that we'll be using for the station. And then from there, they continue on working with the team that is put together to actually do the design of the fire facilities people and the bgs project managers, and architects and engineers. And they keep us honest and involved. We keep them involved, and we find that we're just—that's

going to be really useful. We're just starting up the first of those processes to transition from a siding—siting activity to a design activity for station 16, which is up at the sylvan interchange. We had a ground-breaking for the first of our remodels a couple of weeks ago out at station 45, and we will continue having sell bra tore ground-breakings as we go through the process over the years. And to give you a little insight as to how it feels to be on one of those sacs, we've got will here to talk about and then tom, from his perspective. Thank you.

Katz: One second, before you start. Go ahead. Okay.

Will Stevens, Siting Committee: I appreciate the comments from steve, and i'm very disappointed that candy could not be here, because much of the credit for the success of our advisory committee goes to candy.

Francesconi: She says most of the credit goes to you.

Stevens: this is a mutual admiration society, obviously. Actually, we were going—in an enviable position as a committee, because we had the opportunity, several of our committee members had the opportunity to have worked on committees beforehand together, so we had a feel for one another, and how each other thought, and how the process of committees work in partnering with the city, so that was a unique opportunity for us, and I believe that this particular committee truly was a win-win story for both the neighborhood and for the city together in that we had the opportunity as a committee to take charge of the process from the onset, and I believe when we got to the point of siting station 40, which is at 57th and sandy, we saw a very unique opportunity to restore the original use of the historic fire station there. This is a building that many of you i'm sure are familiar with, has over the years followed—fallen into a state of disrepair. And there was actually some concern as to the future of the building. And so the fact that we have the opportunity to move into this site and have a significant level of restoration and revitalization of the property was I felt a unique opportunity. The committee I think was on board with that from the beginning. So the real—the—there really wasn't any significant difficulties from the siting advisory committee standpoint, other than the fact whether the rfps were sent out, we received absolutely no responses to the siting for stations—for station 12. And I think that's where our involvement provided some degree of direction and eventually a real winning outcome in that several of us took it upon ourselves to go out and do site visits throughout the area, taking into account the fma, the fire management response route. Of course decided upon the current location that I believe as of today, or yesterday, may have been finalized. But I didn't want to take a lot of time. I do have one person that is with us this morning that I wanted to point out, representative for cnn as well as the neighborhood association, william warren. He is sitting behind me and i'd like him to stand and—

Katz: We know him. Mr. Warren.

Stevens: he was a key member in this committee, and we am—we all had a really—to put it in simple terms, a very rewarding experience with our involvement in this process.

Tom Rupprecht, Fire Station 40 Captain: good morning. As mentioned earlier, i'm the current station captain at station 40, and I worked with will and william on the station advisory committee. To be good neighbors we decided to work with the station advisory committee to choose the two sites, the one for the—to replace station 40, and also an additional site in that area. Operational considerations were a key criteria for the fire bureau. It was important that we develop sites that provide for the response time throughout the fire management area, along with provide an access to major arterial response routes in the area. Both of the sites the committee picked fit that criteria perfectly. The new station 12 on 87th and sandy and the his terror call station 28 on 56th and sandy both provide, or were within four blocks of the ideal location to provide the response time within the fire management area. The sites also provide good access. They're both on sandy boulevard, so the response routes are excellent and the cross streets are excellent also for response times in that fire management area. I found that the sites that the committee picked, I think are going to in the future provide the neighborhood a much safer environment. The fire bureau a response that will be easier,

MAY 31, 2000

quicker, and more neighborhood-friendly, and I found also that the committee was excellent to work with and it was a real pleasure to work with the committee and see the process work. They did an excellent job.

Saltzman: I just wanted to take a brief interlude and recognize we have visitors here from an elementary school. I want to welcome them to the Portland city council. I believe we have fourth graders.

Katz: Raise your hand, 4th graders.

Saltzman: And first graders too? Okay. Great. Welcome and we'll see you at lunch.

Chief Wall: I want to go over a couple of milestones very quickly, things that are going to be coming up.

Katz: Just for the record, identify yourself again.

Chief Wall: chief wall, chief of the fire bureau. I'll talk about siting of three stations that are going to be coming before you as our next major milestones. We have—if there's a map that could be shown to you, the next map, i'll point those out for you. Starting out on the left side of the map, upper left is station 27. That's a station that will be sited in kind of along skyline area. So that's going to be a key. 21 is on the left side of the map, kind of midportion of the map, 21 was—is in southwest --

Katz: Let me interrupt you on 21. Are you still talking with chief kroeker on the possibility of doing a joint venture on that one?

Chief Wall: yes. We've looked at some property that might go that way. We've not ruled that out. So it's a question of money.

Katz: I understand. And it may not be doable, but at least keep the discussion going on.

Chief Wall: exactly. We'd like to do—

Katz: That part of southwest needs to have a little bit of attention.

Chief Wall: exactly. And the third one is station 9. We mentioned that a little bit earlier, but that's one is almost in the middle of the map. Howard boyd is going to go over a couple of key issues that you'll be seeing as—during the renovation.

Dick Ragland, BGS: i'll start. I'm with the bureau of general services, project manager for the project. I've been working closely with fire bureau, mike spec. I wanted to talk a little bit about the process re—we used on the first three stations that are now just under construction karen mentioned. We're using a group, a subcommittee from the oversight committee. We discussed different ways of contracting those. We talked about the cmgc process, the low bid process, we talked about some kind of hybrid. At the time we were in discussions, we were too late for this first group, so we went through the low bid process. We had ten general contractors at our mandatory prebid meeting, and we had one bid that—the bad news, we had one bid. The good news, it was \$60,000 below or budget and \$260,000 below the architect's estimate. So from what we're hearing, the bidding climate right now is favorable for bidding projects through the standard method. We're also talking about keeping an eye open on the climate. Each station will be looked at individually on how we might want to proceed bidding those. As we mentioned, the first three stations are about two weeks now into construction. They're all the demolition is about complete. Things are moving fairly favorably. We've got a good contractor on board, and we should be done sometime—projection is sometime in early november. I wanted to talk a little bit about the minority, women and emerging small business processes. We've been very clear about trying to get our architects and engineers and—and their staff and their consultants to use consulting firms, mwsb consulting firms. We've had a very good success on that. We have three firms on board now doing remodels on the new station. The overall average is around 36% combining both minority, women and emerging small business. The last architect hired for the new station up at sylvan has a 34% of which about 21% are minorities. So I think we're doing real well in encouraging participation. We're also encouraging participation from our contractors, working closely with purchases and we're at the first station we came at just

MAY 31, 2000

under 9%. We're trying to set an operational goal of somewhere between 10 and 15%. So we're hoping to improve that over the course of the projects. In deciding which stations to remodel, about a year and a half ago there were a number of meetings with Howard and staff talking about the—we have all this work to do. We have all these 33 projects to do, which one do you do first? And just talk a little bit about that, we felt the most important thing on the remodels were those stations that had the most critical operation requirements or needs in the city. Those were given top priority. Those stations that had the most severe structural problems were also given high priority. We also didn't want to shut down stations all in a group in the city because of the response time. So we selected an approach that would distribute the stations around the city, and you'll see in this first group in the north Portland, in southeast Portland, and they're downtown, so we won't impact any of the fire response areas. And we're doing that with the groups of stations now. So through that process we thought we came up with a pretty good way of tackling the ten-year program of taking these in small groups. We're not going to impact the overall response time in the city. We also worked closely with the station captains for the remodel projects and trying to decide where we're going to put them when the station is closed for remodeling, because we didn't want to have to have a contractor—the contractor to work around the officials in the station. So we're actually taking them, closing the station down. It will quicken the time the remodeling will occur, so before each of the remodels we have a number of meetings with the station captain and try to allocate those resources the best we can. As far as the remodeling, we've taken a different approach on the station advisory committee, the SAC process on the remodeling we have. Since people have been living around these stations for a long time, the issue of putting a new station or closing one down really wasn't there. I think most of the concerns by and large are how long is it going to be closed, what kind of impacts is it going to have on my personal life. And so we've used a process working with the architects to develop the early drawings on the project, review those with the captains and then the captains meet with the station advisory committee people. Here's a good example of a result. We did some major additions to station 41, which is out in southeast. We had the process out there, there was some concern about the design of one part of the addition. We worked through that really successfully with the neighborhood groups, and we went through a conditional use on that, and we had no opposition at all, it passed with no changes to the design work or conditions. That's kind of a quick review of the remodeling. I'll turn it over to headquartered, and—Howard, and he'll talk about our first new station.

Howard Boyte, Deputy Chief, Fire Bureau: good morning. Howard Boyd, deputy chief, Portland fire and rescue. I'd like to talk about station 16. Council approved the purchase of the duplex site in March at the Sylvan interchange. More commonly referred to by the station advisory committee in that area as the Sylvan village station. They're very adamant they wanted a station in Sylvan village. We have hired an architect, and in fact just this week we hired an architect and we're on the way to working with that same station advisory committee on a complimentary design for the site. I'd like to talk a little bit about—more not only about this station, but what we're going to do there in terms of greening, or green building initiatives. I know Commissioner Saltzman, this is near and dear to your heart, and I was reminded by Commissioner Francesconi that—to remind you there was no funding in the bond for green building initiatives, but that we might be coming back to it. But the fire bureau—

Saltzman: In our new budget we do have a green investment fund, so we can probably talk now.

Boyte: great. That's exciting. But I want to remind everybody that the fire bureau's been very aggressive in terms of green strategies and what we will do with all of our new buildings and all of our renovations. And that runs from—we're very aggressive at recycling all of our waste materials at the stations, we've been at the forefront of low-flow shower heads, toilets, all the kinds of things that are small that really add up over a number of years that really are some good strategies that will save

MAY 31, 2000

energy and save the salmon, so to speak. And like I said, this will be a total strategy for all the remodels, and all the new buildings.

Chief Wall: i'd like now to have a report from dan harmon from hoffman construction reporting from the oversight committee, so if dan could come up, dan harmon.

Dan Harmon, Hoffman Construction: 1300 southwest sixth avenue, Portland. Good morning, mayor, and members of the city council. As I indicated, my name is dan harmon, i'm with hoffman construction company. It's a pleasure to be here representing the fire and rescue building oversight committee. Late last year, I was asked along with some other individuals by commissioner Francesconi to serve on this oversight committee. In your packet of information I understand there's a full list of all the members in the committee. As you can see, we're all individuals from the private sector with some particular expertise we think in finance construction, banking, architect which your, and there's some firefighters on the committee also. This oversight committee was specifically charged with providing review and oversight to the entire bond program. I think I can say on behalf of the committee there's good recognition of what our role is and what our role is not, maybe the not part is the most important. As you've heard, the fire and rescue building bond program is a ten-year program involving 33 projects. Some of these projects are remodels, and some involve new stations to serve the city. It's an extensive program, along a fairly long duration program, and we have some very specific tasks as a part of our oversight. We provide oversight in the area of financial monitoring of the budget and review of trade-off decisions. You heard some information about that process, and the importance of that process and maintaining the integrity of the budget over time. We also provide oversight of accountability for assuring that the taxpayers get the benefits that were promised when they voted for the bond, making sure the programs are there. Finally, we have—had the opportunity to work with this council and the staff in a collaborative fashion to assure the program is managed in a sound and businesslike way. We meet every four to six weeks. It's a very good group of people, very understanding of what the objectives are of the bond. And so far we've reviewed a number of things as we've moved along in time over this program so far. We've reviewed the program financial policies, which you heard karen talk a little bit about, making sure the city and staff has in place policies that dictate the use of contingencies and the processes for developing trade-office. The second area we've looked closely at is the budget and budget monitoring processes to ensure that the estimates and the methodologies that are behind the estimates are sound, particularly looking at contingencies versus inflation, as you work over a ten-year period. We've looked at recommendations for siting of stations. Not the siting decisions themselves, but the cost of the siting as it may affect the budgeting process. As you heard, the siting is an extensive process that the station advisory committees are going through. The most controversial so far is the distribution of art resources. We received some recommendations, and I didn't realize there were that many ways to distribute art. They had a lot of recommendations of different strategies. We have looked extensively at bidding and contracting strategies. I particularly am uniquely aware of some conditions in the market that dictate some strategies and working with staff as a part of a subcommittee, to look at those strategies to get the maximum benefit for the city and the taxpayers. We've looked at recommendations for trade-office and the accompanying redistributions, as you can imagine, as you work over time, there are things that come up, changes that occur, and the staff has been working very hard to accommodate those things within the budget and looking at options. Finally, we've reviewed a public information strategy so that the public is aware of what is going on in this program as we move along. On behalf of the entire committed, I can say it's been a real pleasure working with the staff. They are very committed, very diligent about this program, and I think it's truly reflective of good government doing its best work. The people work in very—are working very hard to understand what is going on in the program to accommodate the things that are necessary to have an outstanding fire and rescue program. However, we remain vigilant as a committee. As you move along, there are also uncertainties that exist and we'll continue to represent

MAY 31, 2000

the community and the council through this oversight. I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to serve on this committee, and if you have any question, I'd be happy to answer those.

Chief Wall: that's our report. It's quick, and we gave you a lot of information, but I think the key word is "partnerships." And we're building lots of partnerships, and there's good cooperation. And so we're happy to report that it's going well, and the progress is exciting, and so we're ready for questions if you have any.

Hales: I guess I've got a couple. Commissioner Francesconi, the bureau, or the bureaus involved have obviously set up a good process, and this—and is well-equipped to deal with the issues. The questions I want to ask are in effect premature, because I think they involve projects on the list that you're in the early stages on, but I think they're ones where they're going to be other issues outside of the fire bureau that are going to have particular impact on the decision and where the decision is going to advise a verse a have impact on those other agendas. And that is dealing particularly with station 1 and station 9. Is it still your working assumption that you're going to colocate the new station 1 and the administrative headquarters of the bureau? Is that where you are at the moment? In terms of what you're planning to look for?

Chief Wall: actually, no. The idea was to have two separate—it would not be a colocation.

Hales: You're going to relocate both?

Chief Wall: well, that's the—the original plan was, yes, to relocate both. We are looking at one option, is it because the early estimates are coming in high for administration building, so we're taking a look right now at, is it feasible to refurbish the current building for administration and then just relocate the station 1? But it's a little early in the process for they month—for me to say that's a decision. It's just something we're looking at.

Hales: I think that's one, jim, we ought to have an informal or something. It happens that phil is here on other business, but in terms of the current character of that district with the light rail line 200 feet away from a surface parking lot where we park cars for people that work in the office building, that's a wildly inappropriate use for the site as it now sits. It wasn't when it was built. It's not the fire bureau's fault, it's just time and circumstance vs. Moved on, we built the light rail line, it's a different place now. And the last thing we ought to do, frankly, as far as I'm concerned, is take the cheap route and keep a surface parking lot and an office building where most people drive to work on a light rail line in a city that's spending hundreds of millions of dollars on light rail lines. Obviously you get that stuff, but that's an example where in that particular case the bureaus bureau's criteria and the city's criteria might be different. And might remember assistance, resources, whatever, outside of the bond measure in order to get to the right result, which would be the reuse of that site for something other than a 1950s office building with a parking lot.

Francesconi: You just said the magic words.

Hales: And I understand that. I'm not saying you have to carry the whole load. We have a history here—we have two histories that maybe at odds. One is that although we always work really hard to set up criteria for site selection for any public building, truth is, it's always a mixture of strategic thinking and opportunism. You look at the northeast precinct, look at the last two communities centers we cited, the last fire station we built, 17, in each case it's been a mixture of—the perfect site never falls out of the sky at the perfect moment, and you have to make it work. So I understand that, and I understand the challenge you face in this issue. But I think in the case of station 1, the disposition of the site will really matter to lots of community agendas other than just the fire bureau's. And I don't have—

Chief Wall: we're aware of that.

Hales: I just want to flag that. I think it may require resources outside of the bureau to get to the right result. I don't know if it's in the tax increment district or not. But the redevelopment of that site—in other words, one version of the criteria that you might be operating on is this— if this council were to think about the disposition, would be to say, when you leave the site, make sure the

MAY 31, 2000

building is down and the site is scraped and ready for creative reuse. Because we don't want to leave the site for redevelopment with somebody having a couple hundred dollars of demolition costs to climb over before they can get to the proper reuse of the site. I'm not suggesting we would lay that mandate on you in this budget today. I'm just trying to flag the importance of what is it mike hawk always calls it, multiobjectives in this case. I just want to flag that. I think it's going to require all hands on deck with a combination of pdc, help from p dot in terms of street configuration. And—
Francesconi: And your help. What I guess i'm extending to you is to stalk to you when we get there and include you in some kind of process for looking at this. We have precedent on this. Station 16, we actually through the citizens advisory committee ended up picking a different site in order to be able to use the fire station as an anchor for the town center. So it's the example of multiobjective. Our first priority is making sure it's part of the network for public safety. Once we've taken care of that objective, at the—if we can acquire some other purpose—the sylvan site cost another 3 to \$400,000. So I had to make a decision to eliminate something. You can only make so many of these choices. We do this also at station 45, because we wanted that part of our network for public safety. So there was another one of the trade-off. So that's why when I said you said the magic words, the best thing is not only if we could just not leave it flat, but we know what the next purpose is, and we can work to accommodate it if we can within the network. So I think—i'm just thinking out loud—we need some extended citizen advisory committee that will look at that, and we will address that. To take into account your concerns.

Hales: That's a tough one.

Chief Wall: it is tough. As long as we're putting up flags, just to remind all of us that one of the budgetary issues was built on the sale of that building. And that building is worth probably more standing than scraped. But—so I don't know. But it is—it's a bigger piece. So it is a significant part of the budget process. So as long as that's flagged, I think it's—we welcome the interaction and welcome a good best solution.

Hales: On the same site, do you own the surface parking lot across the street where people park now, or is that a lease situation?

Chief Wall: no. We do not own the surface parking lot across the street.

Hales: Okay. And then a similar question about disposition, station 9. A whole different situation there. That's a historic build can, has a lot of architectural value for uses that are less seismically vulnerable than a fire station. Have you got a preview of what the disposition process will be for that site? I suspect the bell moment district doesn't want to have it just be anything, so we don't want that to be the belmont location of fantasy adult video or something. How are we going to get to a constructive reuse of that site?

Chief Wall: that committee is very active, and I believe there's going to be a lot of good suggestions for that.

Hales: The committee is involved in both the location of the new station and the disposition of the property that's going to be sold.

Chief Wall: i'm sure they will be. That's part of the—that one is a little easier, because we did not fold in budgetary number continuing end on the sale of that building.

Hales: You're assuming it is going to be sold ultimately by some process. That's your working assumption for now, right?

Chief Wall: well, we have flexibility with that one.

Hales: Okay. Good. A little more flexibility the better. That's another indication—that's a building we don't want to lose, but how the end game is run in terms of what happens to these properties after you finish the process of relocation matters too. I know you know that. Again, I think there are multiple community objectives in that particular case, just like there are with station 1.

Chief Wall: just to make it clear, I think the station advisory committee in this case, station 9's case, it would be appropriate for them to spend time on now what? Now what do we do with the

MAY 31, 2000

current site and the current building? I think that's completely appropriate, and it may even be respond that committee somewhat to deal with that issue.

Hales: Good. Thanks.

Katz: Further questions? Thank you. Anybody else want to testify? Public?

Francesconi: I guess we should start with tom, I saw him a minute ago.

Katz: He was here, and allicin, you weren't recognized, but you are an active member of the neighborhood association.

Allison Stoll, Central NE Neighbors (CNN): i'll allicin, the executive director of southeast neighbors. We're presently located in the old fire station where new station 40 is going to be built. This process has been an interesting one. Central northeast neighbors, the neighborhood coalition office has been located in that location for a long time. Over 15 years. But the fire bureau and the sac committee has talked about a colocation with the new station 12, which wasn't mentioned here, but the location of the new station 12 is kind of across from the grotto. The site used to be an old auto wrecking yard, and it's kind of a blighted site. It's just kind of a dumpy-looking site, and that will benefit the community with a brand-new fire station and hopefully if all the plans go well, we'll be benefited by new office space and new community room for use of the community. So that's a very exciting process with the neighbors and the neighborhood. So although it's difficult to leave a station that has a lot of nostalgia and that you've been there for a long time, the fire bureau is looking into preserving the exterior of the that station, because a lot of the neighborhoods feel it is a historic landmark for the neighborhoods. So that's a very exciting process. Thank you.

William Warren, CNN: william warren, central northeast neighbors. I just wanted to say thank you very much for allowing us to have that terrific input and working with the neighborhoods and we for the sac committees, we feel very excited about the fact there will be a colocation opportunity with the fire bureau and a district coalition office, and the maintenance of the historic building as well as providing very fine adequate fire service to all the neighborhoods, and for commissioner Hales, there will be a new summer parkrose station, which won't be terribly far from new station 12. So this is a real win-win for the neighborhoods in central northeast.

Saltzman: Do you feel the new location is a better geographic fit for the central neighborhood --

Warren: well, that's a very good question, because it does put us into a far corner of our whole geographic location. And it's one of those hard-to-say. We do get a lot of foot traffic into our present location because we are located on sandy boulevard, and it's very easy with mass transit and walk-in clients. I don't know. But we will be located, as william pointed out, much closer to the parkrose station, which is a plus. So I don't know. As you all know, it's very difficult to move out of a place where you've been for a very long time and locate somewhere else, even if you know you're coming back. It's just, change is always difficult. But we're trying to look at it as positive for the community.

Saltzman: Thanks.

Katz: Further questions? Anybody else? Did tom leave? Okay. Well, let him know that he—we looked for him. Nobody else wants to testify? No further questions? Roll call.

Francesconi: A couple things. First I want to start with thanking the voters. The voters chose this. They had several options during that ballot season, and they chose public safety as the only one that they wanted to fund from property taxes. So we want to—we again thank them for that. We wanted to do this report which was a little tedious at times, but it was thorough, and important that we do this. Because of the issue of explaining to the voters what they're getting for the money that they paid. It's a lot of money, \$62 million plus, over a ten-year period, and we want to share this with them and with you, council. The other agenda item was to let them know that there is going to be accountability with how the money is spent. Dan, you said it I think best. This is good government at its best. And that's because of the talent of people in bgs, karen from our facilities side, steve, the other folks here that testified. Dick, combined with the expertise of the fire bureau, chief wall,

MAY 31, 2000

howard boyd deserves some special recognition. Howard will soon be retiring, and he's done a terrific job as the facilities coordinator helping make sure the deputy chief, making sure this works from a fire bureau standpoint. So I want to take this occasion to thank howard for his many years of service to the fire bureau, to the citizens of Portland. Again, the primary has to be—i'm—i actually love being the fire commissioner. People care about public safety. They love firefighters because of what they contribute. Not only public in fire, but also in emergency services and other rescue. And it is part of a system. It's part after network, because you have to make sure there's adequate backup. So in all these sitings, our first objective is covering the holes in the city. There are some holes on the east side, folks, where it is difficult to maintain four-minute response times for a fire standpoint, or for a heart attack, for that matter. The firefighters are usually the first ones on the scene, and that four minutes makes a big difference in a heart attack circumstance. There are also many places on the west side where that is not we don't have adequate coverage. So the voters knew that in approving this. And most of the new stations you heard described today are going to be on the west side. The other public safety feature is the seismic side. So you heard about the reinforcement that's happening in the buildings. We wanted to take time to set up a process to make sure there was public accountability before moving ahead, which we are now doing. But if we can accomplish other objectives while using the public dollars so the public gets more than one benefit with the expenditure, that's what we want to do. That was the point commissioner Hales was making. So we've already done that in three regards. One is this town center that I referred to at the sylvan interchange that will help anchor that community. A second is—that didn't come out today, some of these community rooms we're talking about, primarily on the east side, we're talking to elders in action to use these for seniors for computer access and everything else. So we're not going to call it community tiring, but we're going—firing, but community fire services, or something. We're not going to let police be the only ones with community as part of it.

Katz: Carry guns, too.

Francesconi: You keep your guns. The other one is the neighborhood office. I'm glad allicin and william explained it. So having a larger station there that will accommodate the neighborhood association will be terrific. It seems far out, but 82nd is about half the distance between the river and the wrist of the city. So you are only in the middle. So anyway. The other thing I want to say, so the third objective with public—pending the public dollars, if we can also accomplish other pickup services. I'd like the committee to look at at least 15% as a goal for minority hiring, if not higher. I'd like them to also look at what we can do by pushing the bar. I heard testimony here it's 10 to 15%. I would like the committee to look at this as we get into construction. The other is how can we really use the fire station construction to advance sustainable development propers. We haven't gone far enough in that regard. I'd like the oversight committee to talk with sustainable commission about how can we advance this using some incentive dollars, and expertise of the city staff now. So those are the—the last thing I want to do is thank the oversight committed. If you look at page 18, the talent of these folks are terrific. They are really making sure this thing is managed correctly. We have good staff, but it takes good citizens who know what they're doing. And that is a tremendous group. Finally, there was another employee of the city that I would like to thank that got this off on a great footing. And his name is david kisch. He has done a terrific job about understanding the importance of public safety, the importance of our buildings, importance of maintaining our buildings. So another one we're working on is lents, and that fire station combined with the boys and girls facility as to how that can benefit the community, that's the genius creativity of david, who got this off to the right start in the beginning. So thank you, folks. I'm not your commissioner, bgs, but we still work together very closely. And fire, I still am. Thank you. Aye.

Hales: Good work. Aye.

Saltzman: We'll definitely be working with the oversight committee. I appreciate your offer to do so. Good report. Aye.

MAY 31, 2000

Sten: I love firefighters too. It's terrific. [laughter] aye.

Katz: Everybody loves firefighters. The police bureau is so jealous of the fact that you have approval when we do our survey of what, 90 some-odd percent, 94. But as I say, over and over again, you don't carry guns. But you are very important to this community. I'm very fortunate I live close by to one of the stations, and I see them at work, and I feel even though they make some noise, I feel comfortable that they're out there serving the community. I want to share this with you. During the budget period we wanted to make sure that the time of firefighters was used very wisely. And we suggested—we wanted to write a budget note that perhaps they ought to use home groceries homegrocer.com as a way of thinking in—in the 21st century. It's not a budget note, but—it's not a budget note, but—he'll try it. Thank you, everybody. Especially the citizens. It is not easy, even to site a fire station. It's certainly not easy to close one down. So you've all done a terrific job. Aye. All right. 754.

Item No. 754

Gregg Kantor, Association for Portland Progress: I am. Good morning. Mayor Katz and council members, my name is greg canter, and I am the chair electricity of the association of Portland progress's board of directors. I'm here to urge you today to support—your support for continuing the highly successful business improvement district for another year. As you know, it's much like a water district where people in the district paid for services. Pay a fee for services. We ar the nonprofit organization that manages the district at the direction of the funders. For the past 12 years, b.i.d. Services have been making downtown a cleaner, safer and more active place to be and Portland is a better place for all of us—its citizen and its businesses because of the benefits derived from the services. Let me explain why we have agreed to continue the b.i.d. Through september 30th, 2001, rather than undertake a formal process for a longer period of time. Ruth scott will be leaving us on june 30th. Our members felt it was important the new ceo put his or her imprint on the new district and continuing to—the b.i.d. For another year will allow that to occur. The b.i.d. Renewal process will begin this fall and we fully intend to be in the chambers again a year from now with a new one for your approval that. Includes the input of our new ceo. Phil, pdsi's treasurer and past chair will provide a brief overview of the services which will continue to be provided during the next 15 months. However, I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your support. The city has been an essential partner in all of this, and without that partnership, the b.i.d. Wouldn't be the local and national model that has—it has truly become. Thank you.

Phil Kalberer, Portland Downtown Services, Inc.: 235 SW 5th. mayor Katz, commissioners, may name is phil calber. I'm here in place of tom, who couldn't make it today. Tom has been chair of the pdsi the last couple years, and has done an outstanding job in the past and also getting the pdsi, the renewal to where it is today. I'd also like to introduce our new officers of pdsi for the coming year. Ken novack will take over as chair, clayton herring and greg goodman will also be officers. And those three will make sure that the renewal takes place 15 months from now, or a year from now, as well as making sure all the services are provided during the next 15 months. We're bringing to you a 2000-2001 status quo budge and budget which include service, cleaning and policy advocacy services. This district has overwhelming support from the people who fund it because it has been so successful. It also demonstrates the commitment, the—that building owners and property managers have to downtown that they are willing to pay for these enhanced services. I want to emphasize the importance of these services to the continuing health of the downtown by making the streets clean, safe and active for the past 12 years. But let's look at what's happened the past three years. The b.i.d. Cleaning service provide rapid graffiti and litter removal, extra sidewalk cleaning, and on-call help for special programs. Imagine what downtown would be like if there were another 180,000 pieces of graffiti on the walls. This is the amount we have removed the past three years. Or what would the 212 square blocks look like if they had not been power washed and cleaned on a regular basis? And what would it feel like if there were 48,000 bags of trash that hadn't been collected which

MAY 31, 2000

is what the b.i.d. Has done the past three years. Not to mention the 50 homeless people that we do—that find themselves back in employment that we hire for the cleaning jobs to clean the downtown streets. Portland guides and patrol officers provide a street presence to help control low-level street disorder. Security services also include crime prevention training, assistance to the mentally ill, and coordination of all private downtown security personnel. With the addition of the three Portland police bureau officers to our security staff, we have also doubled our security and our dispatch has reached 144 calls per month. These presences provide not only a better safety on the streets, but the perception that Portland is safe, which is very critical for the livelihood of the downtown area. B.i.d. Services also attract more visitors to downtown, encourage and support downtown living and support a healthy and diverse business climate through policy development and advocacy on important downtown issues. And this part of the b.i.d. Provides to downtown districts the west end, cultural, retail, arch and—arts and entertainment, and has helped in promoting these districts the diverse qualities that these districts possess, and in enhancing them to be home to thousands of downtown visitors. The b.i.d. Has been an immensely successful partnership in—and has helped make downtown one of the most livable and successful city centers in the nation. The reality of these services is that our sidewalks are clean, our buildings are free of graffiti, our citizens are safer, and our businesses have a resource to go to for help when they should need it. We remain committed to providing these services so critical for the livability for this next year, and also the years beyond. I thank you for the support of the b.i.d., And I encourage you, and I want you to know that you have the support of all of the downtown business owners and property managers. Today at the table with me are Ruth Scott, who we will miss dearly after the end of June, who has done a wonderful job as our president and ceo, and Chris Thomas, our legal counsel, who helped draft the ordinances. If you have any questions, we would be happy to answer them.

Katz: Ruth, do you want to say anything? This may be your last—

Ruth Scott, Planning Commission: my last shot?

== we're not letting her off the planning commission.

Scott: you guys better vote yes, that's all I can say. [laughter]

Katz: I'm going to put you on the spot. Nicely. This may be your last opportunity to share with the council what you've learned over all these years in this kind of a role that you played in the—and the partnership that we have the—with the business community, and residents in the downtown.

Scott: i've learned all sorts of things. Frankly, the partnership between government and business keeps changing. So I guess it's just like human beings. You're always learning something new. 15 years ago, as I initially worked with a.p.p., The roles were really quite different. If you guys think back and think about how council operated and how the business community operated 15 years ago, it was really quite different. In fact, the stories about the back room deals and the good old boys were kind of around, and then all of a sudden there was this girl who came around to work with the good old boys and the story wasn't quite the same. So there are changes from 15 years ago. Today I think we have probably a much more collaborative environment than we had 15 years ago. We don't have even the perception of back room cutting deals we had 15 years ago. So I think we're in a different partnership environment than we were. I think that we examine things far more thoroughly than perhaps in the public environment than we did before. Frankly, one of the things i'm a little concerned about going forward is the extreme level of public examination of public-private partnerships. In other words, i'm a little concerned about going forward the relationship between business and government as they attempt to do things together in the future. I think of some of our recent deals where we really got into the financial parts and—of a public-private deal, and I look at some of the deals coming forward, and it's a little concerning to me. I think that some of the changes we've seen in—are—in our land use and planning, referring to the planning commission, and some of the changes there, we've made some progress and—in making it easier to be good partners and make progress together, but we've also made it harder. I'm a little bit concerned that we're getting into a

MAY 31, 2000

sense of band-aiding rather than them making real change. And I think that's also part of the collaborative consensus building process that things tend to get a little muddy. That's an awfully long answer, and I could probably go on forever. How can you cover 15 years in three minutes? But I think it really has changed a great deal, and I think there are some challenges ahead of us that we'll all need to work together on. And I'm particularly concerned about the public-private partnerships. I think we have to respect the needs of government and the needs of business and honestly look at how they can be mutually supportive, and I believe they are different than they have been in the past.

Katz: Thank you. Questions? Okay. Thanks. Anybody else want to testify? Come on up. Is there a list? No. Okay.

Jay Woodworth: 1033 SW Yamhill. good morning, my name is jay, I have a building downtown in this area on southwest yamhill. I just have three comments. I agree with a lot of things that were said here this morning. ever, but I do have reservations about the effectiveness of the downtown—guys in the green jackets. Number 1, because of the comments made this morning about the effectiveness to all of the city, all of the visitors, and all of the people involved, I think that some of the burden should be lifted from the property owners in that area. If you want to benefit the whole city and benefit the visitors, I think they ought to be paying for some of these costs that the building owners are being assessed. I have five or six fees I have to pay because I'm a downtown building owner. Management fees, property taxes, the trolley fee, the max fee, the new line fee I'm being assessed \$5,000. So the fees are getting to be such a great burden, if you want to benefit the city, the city ought to participate in those. Two ways I wish—two other things. I see these little green guys walking around with two or three in a group. I think that can be cut down. I don't think you need two or three of them walking around together. I think you can do it with one. They have radios and they are in contact with the police, and I think it's a double necessity to have two of them or three instead of one. Secondly, I've had graffiti put on my building. When the graffiti people have come to remove it, they refuse to do it above what they can reach. They go up six or seven feet and they refuse to move the graffiti. So that leaves it back upon the property owner to remove that other graffiti. While there may have been a lot done, there could be more done in that regard. I think you need to relieve the people that are paying all these taxes downtown and assess other groups as well.

Katz: Thank you. Questions? Further testimony? Come on up.

Freda Cohen: NW Park and Flanders. good morning. My name is freida kohn. I own the—freida. I own the property on the corner of northwest park and flanders. We are assessed approximately \$1,000 for the downtown clean and safe. When there was graffiti on our building, they took it off. They should have left the graffiti, because the wall looks worse than when the graffiti was there. There's a lot of construction in our particular area with new lofts and so forth, and when the streets were all being dug up, there was an enormous accumulation of grime and dirt and so forth, which they left to accumulate because they said they wouldn't do anything until the construction outside was done. When they finally came to clean it, they used such powerful washers that they took all the grouting out of the sidewalk, necessitating repair of the sidewalks to the tune of almost \$4,000. I'm a Portland native. I grew up in Portland in the southwest area all my life. We had street cleaners, street washers. When we did have a break-in in our building, it was not downtown clean and safe who helped us, but two very astute policemen. I think the fees are excessive. I do not think they do the job that they say they do.

Katz: Thank you. Further testimony? Anybody else want to testify? Okay.

Maxine (?): 33 NW 9th, 33 NW Everett and 821 NW Flanders. chairman of the board of peter's office supply, as well as the owner of two properties. On northwest 9th, everett, 821 northwest flanders. And I've written a the personal note to you, mayor Katz. And I'm sure maybe it's among your files.

Katz: I do read my mail.

MAY 31, 2000

Maxine: I pay—pay approximately I didn't bring my exact figures, \$3700 a year. I have been made aware, and maybe i'm incorrect, that the people were right on 9th street, the part time right across the street are not assessed. We have no voice in it, and I think it's extremely unfair. I agree with the two previous speakers that the graffiti is great. They remove it as far as they can reach. And you have to pay for the damage yourself to have it cleaned above that area. I don't see why we're paying this kind of money when so many areas are not. People right across the street, all the companies across the street from my area are not being assessed. I would sure like to know what the total budget is. When you say we can—if one-third much us—of us—of the income object to this fee, that you would reconsider. But I just sort of think it's taxation without representation, and I object totally to it. Now, if everyone in the ear— area, if you were to take the funds that you were gleaming from this big assessment every year, and spread it to the whole city of Portland, you say the city of Portland, these fine four people that are working so hard, the whole city of Portland is benefiting. Well, they're benefiting on the backs of few companies. Few business owners, building owners, property owners. So I hope you'll take a good look at it. Because it's got to be fair. We all want Portland to grow and be beautiful, and we certainly see in our northwest area what's happening, probably—property values are going sky high, the old buildings are being torn down and beautiful lofts being built. All of this is improving the image of Portland. But does it have to be on the back of just a few people?

Katz: Thank you.

Maxine: thank you, mayor.

Katz: Why don't we—ruth or somebody else, come up and respond to a couple of issues raised.

Jim Wadsworth, Director, License Bureau: mayor Katz, council members, i'm jim wadsworth, the director of bureau of licenses. I did want to make you aware of the six letters of remonstrations in object to the continuation of the district that we did receive, and those six letters did represent eight properties. We also received one letter that was a general complaint about taxes. That is the total of the remonstrations letters.

== representing how much of the district?

Wadsworth: not even .4% of the district.

Scott: Ruth scot. In response to a couple of the issues that have been raised, on the second-story graffiti, we would love to be able to clean it. Unfortunately, the cost for both insurance and of labor to go above the first story is extensive. And we also have to have the legal property owner's permission to remove the graffiti from their building at all. So we've never fit it—felt it was financially feasible to go above the second story. Unfortunately that would increase everyone's fees.

Katz: Let me interrupted, I put in about I think it was \$26,000 for the rest of the city to begin doing second and third floor.

Scott: which is fabulous.

Katz: Not—you might want to check how—to see how hugh is doing that.

Scott: we'll also make sure people know that's available. Or you may not want to do it in the district, but—anyway. In terms of the grout, that's something we'll check on. We've been really trying to be careful of any pressure washing or anything like that. We're doing to make sure we aren't damaging property, so we'll look into that. Any time we get a complaint we do look into it. So we would be more than happy to follow up on that. Yeah, removing graffiti is not because of being environmentally careful, we've changed the chemicals that we've used, and it's not as tidy as it used to be. We used to have more variety, and we used different chemicals for all the different surfaces, and we've just gotten so sensitive about what we're using that could get into our environment, that we—it doesn't clean as well as it used to. And we work really hard on that, and sometimes it doesn't get the way you want to. Nonetheless, we'll work with the property owner to do whatever we can do to have them be happy. We're not going to repaint a wall, likely. Obviously that's not fair for other property owners. So I will say very clearly, any complaints we get we absolutely follow up on them. We will follow up on those we've heard this morning, and the

MAY 31, 2000

clumping of the guides, we try, we try, we'll go back and holler at them again. People like to be with people, and you're right, we don't want them clumping. When we see—sometimes they're in training and we do authorize when you have a new person on, absolutely you send them out in twos for training. But frankly, this clumping is a national issue. We get together with our peers from around the country and we all say, so what are you doing about clumping these days? And it's—we're dealing with people out there. And we hire guides that are gregarious. And—

Katz: There was a complaint the properties are—that there are properties not being assessed.

Scott: there is an edge to the district, and it is entirely possible for you to be on one side of the line and the person on the other side is not in the district. When the district was put together, you have to draw lines, and commissioner Hales has been working on us for quite a few years to do the entire freeway loop, and indeed the pearl district is coming along. I don't know when that will get to council, because, like the original district, it requires about 70% support of property owners before that district can be established. And it's coming along, but it's not there yet. We also have a small district down at psu, but there's quite an area up around 11th, 12th, and 13th around the south end that doesn't have the economic base for supporting district services. So there will continue to be lines where on one side you're paying, and on the other side you're not. However, that line also stops services. On one side we pick up trash and remove graffiti and do patrols, and other business assistance, and on the other side we don't. So, yes, there are lines.

Francesconi: A question of mine—on the question of lines, one of the brew advertise of the summit was the poster that showed the central east side included in the central city. Can you talk a little bit about where that is? What the future holds?

Scott: the lloyd district has formed its own business improvement district, and we're providing some administrative services to them. In the future, it looks like their district services may expand as the need arises. One of the beauties of these b.i.d.s is that you design them to suit the needs of the neighborhood in terms of the centrally side, I wouldn't be surprised in the time to come in the next few years that they won't choose to have some sort of district services based on their particular needs. I'm very hopeful that this city council will continue encouraging the formation of business improvement districts throughout our city, because it is I feel one of the most effective public-private partnerships out there. I do see the central east side coming along. Pearl district is coming along, we've had some conversations in northwest, but they're not moving at this point to my knowledge.

Francesconi: My mom and dad were visiting for mother's day, and they just come from san francisco. And so dad was saying, look at how much cleaner your city is. And look at—there's no homeless folks around at the degree that people are just living on the streets in san francisco. Well, he attributed the negative side to democrat willie brown, and my mother, the—i was the one that was doing all this. But the truth of the matter is, it's my dad do better. It really is this public-private partnership. The downtown is everyone's neighborhood. We talk a lot about building things, we politicians, and it's good. We need to build things in order to create this terrific downtown. Light rail, streetcar, waterfront park, pioneer square. What we don't talk about so much is how do we maintain it? And what's special about our city, not just those projects, but maintaining it at a high level. And to do that, the city has to do their part by living up to agreements that we've played in the past to provide a certain level of services. In exchange, though, we do need the private participation. Ma'am, I understand that you— it's hard to pay that amount of money, and you see others not paying it. But your downtown wouldn't be— your living rooms and the sidewalks would not be as clean, the amount of trash, rubbish, homeless folks, you just don't want to be living unfortunately in downtown san francisco right now. There's not enough resources in government to do it at the high level that is necessary to keep a vital downtown. So we need to keep this going. And we need to support this. In terms of the future, other than you went to the second string for your next line of leadership, other than that, I hope you can survive losing ruth scott. You've done a lot for our city. Sometimes we disagreed, but you're always very clear on where you're at, which I really appreciate.

MAY 31, 2000

And you've helped educate me during my time before and being an office. And we'll continue to work on these issues I know are important to you. Three things, briefly that I'd like to continue to work with you, since the—you're all here. One, the issue of parks and open spaces is really critical to our whole city, including our downtown. So Bryant Square is not a good example of a park. And we need to change it. We need to do something about it. And we need to do something about it not only to help the vitality of that part of town, but also to change what I believe is an old perception of parks that we don't know how to do things. And I really appreciate how you've embarrassed parks and new folks, but we need a tangible project we can show that we know how to do things differently. I think you're seeing that in Jamison Square, we just opened South Waterfront Park, there's a lot of exciting things happening. So I want to work with you on that. Park Block 5, I want to work with you on that, we're working on that whole vision. The issue of the Greenway on Macadam is a very important issue that I want to get again more engaged in. And so how we create these public spaces in our central city is very important to me and to parks, and I want to work with you on that. The second related is how do we keep our city economically vital, including the downtown? That relates to making sure Macadam works from a financial standpoint for jobs, but it also works with the small business strategy. I want to take the responsibility to thank Rob and Stephanie for the tours of the small businesses downtown for the work on the strategies, for how we bring the expertise you brought to advocate for businesses in our downtown to our neighborhood business districts, Ruth, I'm going to need your help in that, Jim is here, who if you haven't had a chance to get to know him, we're really trying to make licensing more customer-friendly and in this past budget, we created a small business strategy. We now have a person in licensing who can advocate for small businesses through the permitting process, for example. Celia, so we're moving in that. And I want to continue to work with that. As an aside, it was your requested to—idea to get your auditors as well as more technology, and we're doing this. We hired four more. Because it will more than offset itself in generating revenue. The last thing I want to say is more of an organizing thing. I think sometimes you feel as if it's hurting cats, I don't know if that's too derogatory, in terms of five of us going on different directions. On this side, it's sometimes difficult with—with business folks going all over the place, and we need organizations in one spot where our business leadership is where we can try to develop these things from individual parks to broader economic policies. So I guess I want to thank you for the role that you played. In order for that to continue, we need new leadership in government and new—younger leadership in the business community. Especially with the way things are happening. And it looks to me like you're one of the few organizations that actually has a strategy for doing that. And so I hope that's true. But as we kind of—I'd like to do whatever we can to continue to work together in that regard. So thanks. And it's the right—it's easy for me to vote aye on this. Aye.

Hales: Obviously it always makes people uncomfortable when there's an otherwise happy story and there's folks that are concerned about that story, and obviously these constituents of the district have raised legitimate issues, which I'm sure the district will address and explain how it operates. But I think you mentioned the outset, what if we hadn't done this, I think that really is the measurement of success here. There's a literary device, it got used most memorably in "it's a wonderful life." What if something hadn't happened? What if some decision hadn't been made? I suspect if this decision hadn't been made, this room would be full of property owners, and it would be full of complaints. Why our downtown isn't as nice as Seattle's or San Francisco's. And how much did this district contribute to that story? Probably can never tell. But we know it's a lot. And we know it works. And we appreciate the good work. Aye.

Saltzman: I just want to commend Ruth for her years of service. And also to commend a.p.p. itself. I think we're—I don't know how many there are in other big cities, but I have a hunch there's not that many. I think we're really blessed to have business leaders who look beyond just the bottom line and look to issues of quality of downtown life and quality of life in the city of Portland beyond the

MAY 31, 2000

downtown. And i've always had a good experience working with the leadership of a.p.p., And I look forward to continuing to do so. Aye.

Sten: I want to thank you ruth for all your hard work. I've learned a lot from you. I think the board will make a smooth transition, but you'll be missed. And thank you. I'm sure there will be parties, I can't imagine there won't be in the next month, but you may not be back in here. Celebrations of all you've done. I think the one-year extension is the way to go. I think we need to think this through, and I don't think it's good or bad news, it just is. The citizens have decided property taxes were too high, and I think in many cases they were, and so we've had tracks capped also in the time since this agreement. So I think that the notion of trying to craft agreements with groups that make sense to provide direct services where the groups pick up a bigger share of the cost than what happens with general city services, is if not the future, the present. I think this is the right way to go, and you're approaching it in a thoughtful way. Aye.

Katz: Ruth, ditto. Thank you. Your service not only to a.p.p. But to the community has been a wonderful benefit for all of us for the city of Portland. I know your next venture is probably going to be even more exciting. We look forward to working with you on that. Let me just share a story in line with where commissioner Francesconi was heading. I went downtown one day on retail therapy. It was sort of my— [laughter] small way of trying to figure out what's happened since pioneer place ii was constructed, and what's going on. Interestingly enough, this is only anecdotal, and i'll have to look at the bottom line in terms of profit and loss, that pioneer place ii additional retail has brought in—brought in a lot more people into downtown, and a little store in I that I thought was going to lose business is actually doing business because people were sharing buildings and they were going from one—they were seeing ii first and then figuring out they're going to see pioneer place i. But also our trend now is to move west. And you all know that, and the discussion now with regard to park block 5 needs to proceed. Commissioner Francesconi raised the issue of bryant square. We've got some ideas in terms of putting some eyes on the street there, and maybe what we need from a.p.p. Now is a little bit more discussion of how we bring more public this involvement in terms of the park blocks, because there's been a lot of other conversations that are now going public with regard to the future of the park blocks, and i'm not sure this is only a decision for all of us to make. I think the public needs to have some input as to what they want to see, especially if we provide retail niches for local home-grown store owners. I'm going to plug one of them who—a la carte, that's the kind of little niche retail envisioned for at least the way I envision it, for that particular area that needs a lot of work. So I think in terms of our work for the next couple of years with the parks and recreation bureau with commissioner Francesconi, with the downtown association, with property owners and with a.p.p., That's our next challenge, is to get to closure on the future of that small section of the downtown that's really been kind of neglected for a long time. Interestingly enough, edinburgh, scotland, has green jackets. I didn't ask them how they are financed, but the notion of having a clean and safe district is one that's now really international. And I know for some property owners, you might not see the benefit or you feel that you're paying too much, and I can understand that. But I think when you look at the benefit for the entire downtown and what would have happened if we hadn't done this, things would have been different. Yes, we can always improve, and the communications with small property owners needs to improve, just as our communications with the citizens of the city needs to improve. But—so you'll have that opportunity to brainstorm how you're going to do that with the help of ruth, and your new board and your new director. I feel very positive. My hope is you come back next year and say things have changed. Aye. 755.

Katz: Who wants to talk about that? Anybody? Okay. If not, it passes on to second. And ladies and gentlemen, we're finished with the morning agenda. We stand adjourned until 2 o'clock.

At 12:02 p.m., Council recessed.

MAY 31, 2000

THE FOLLOWING TEXT WAS PRODUCED THROUGH THE CLOSED CAPTIONING PROCESS FOR THE TELEVISED CITY COUNCIL BROADCAST.

Key: == indicates unidentified speaker.

MAY 31, 2000 2:00 PM

Katz: Good afternoon, everybody, the council will come to order. [roll call]

Katz: Item No. 792

Olson: Amend the comprehensive plan map and change the zone of property near southeast flavel street, southeast deardorf and 1 22nd avenue from os to r10.

Katz: That has been rescheduled to september 27th at 2:00 p.m.

== the longest-running story.

Katz: All right. Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. We've got a 2:10 time certain, but I think we can begin. Why don't you go ahead.

Item No. 793

Katz: Commissioner Saltzman, do you want to open this up with remarks?

Saltzman: Last week we dealt with the water and sewer rate ordinances, and I had specifically postponed the solid waste ordinance to allow more time in part because of one of the proposals i'm making with respect to the franchise fee, but also I felt solid waste issues get short shrifted because we're tired after we deal with water and sewer. I think the issue that's really before us today is the notion of increasing the solid waste franchise fee to 5% from 3.45%, as a mechanism to provide an ongoing funding stream for the green investment fund, which is something that we the city council adopted in december of '99 as part of the green building initiative, and with this last budget—the upcoming fiscal year budget, we have now funded the program—we've established \$700,000 of one-time money for the green investment fund. The franchise fee increase is the means to provide an annual stream of revenue to the green investment fund. And I believe that—i believe there is a relationship— enough of a relationship between what we throw away and how we turn the corner and become a sustainable society that I believe this is a warranted increase and a warranted appropriate use of the increase in the franchise fee. I also believe it has a minimal impact on residential solid waste ratepayers. In fact, under this proposal the increase for the 32-gallon can, which is about what half of Portland residents put out on the curb, the monthly increase is a quarter. It will be 25 cents per can. And in return, what we're getting I think is the opportunity for us as a city to start matching our rhetoric about sustainability with reality and resources. And I think like a lot of cities in the country, we're good at passing resolutions and we're good at setting up commissions, but where—if we're really going to make a difference in how our society looks and how our physical environment gets reconnected to our natural environment, which is one of the biggest challenges we all face everywhere, is to recognize the importance and the need to respect our natural environment and some of the principals underlying it, the only way to get there is put—start putting resources to get things on the ground. At someone said once at a recent retreat, she's not here for the meetings or the policies, she wants to know when we're going to start tearing up pavement and putting down green things. I think this is the opportunity that's before us today, is a chance to go from a situation where we will have a fund that will last us for quite a while, and enable us to make green investments realities, and the green investments can occur under the green investment fund for public sector or private sector projects, they can occur for residential projects, they can occur for commercial projects, they can occur for industrial projects. So there's no necessarily limitation on how the green investment fund will be used other than to make green investments realities on the ground. One of the examples I talk about a lot is ecoroofs. They're basically vegetative material, they absorb storm

MAY 31, 2000

water, cool down the urban environment, they're a win-win situation for our environment. The trouble is, to see an ecoroof in practice, you have to tell people right now what—we do have one in—we have two in Portland, but for the most part they're more commercially available in places like Germany and Denmark. As long as we have to tell people you have to go to Germany to see a functioning ecoroof, we'll never see them happen here on the widespread impact that needs to happen to have both a positive impact on our environment and also to have a positive impact on how we do business. I am convinced if we can, through the green investment fund, provide grants, loans, or otherwise be partners with the private sector, public sector, including the school district, that we can start making these investments realities, and once we reach a critical mass of these investments on the ground, they'll become commonplace. Once they're commonplace, they're no longer going to be eligible for any kind of incentive through the green investment fund. The idea is to take the green ideas and get them to be to the point where they're acceptable building practices. And that can happen, but it won't happen without the will and the leadership. And we've taken one step already in our budget this year. The big step in that leadership. And I want to thank the mayor and my colleagues for helping me get this first step up and running. What I hope you'll do today is give me the third leg of the stool, or the second step, to make our green investment fund a sustainable fund that will allow us to really move ahead and for not—to not have to worry, from my perspective, the \$700,000 we're establishing in the green investment fund in this year's budget is going to go very quickly. I've—we have a number of letters from b.e.s., People interested in ecoroofs, commercial developments. I just came out after meeting with folks who are building the convention center expansion. They're very interested in doing ecoroofs. If we're in the business of providing incentive to make these things happen, the \$700,000 we have in the one-time only is going to be used very quickly. That's why I'm asking for your support for the ongoing sustainability for the green investment fund. I commit to you, I believe I've met with each one of you and talked about some of the other green investments I see being eligible for the fund. But I really believe the decision before us today is, do we increase the solid waste franchise fee as a means of seeding our green investment fund. I hope you'll agree with me there's enough of a connection of what we throw away and what and how we turn the corner that this is a meritorious move to make, and that we should do it now because rates have decreased for the most part due to higher recycling revenues coming in, and this is the best time. Finally, I should point out the public is ahead of us on this. I've put on each one of your desks a statewide poll that was done on sustainability, and it shows that over 50% --56% of the public believes the state and our local governments need to be doing more in terms of tangible incentives for green investments. Things that reduce our waste of toxic materials, conserve energy and water. And on the question of whether government should be in the business of providing incentives through fees, other types of financial incentives, the statewide support was upwards of 60% agreed that, yes, we need to be making that step. I think our public is ahead of us, and I think we have an opportunity not only to make Portland in essence the leading city in terms of providing resources to match the rhetoric, but to really take a positive step ahead for not us, but really for our children and the people who will be living in the city for years to come. And living on this planet long past when we're gone. We need to start turning the corner, we need to start green investments happening now. The rhetoric alone will not get us there. I would ask for your support in adopting the solid waste franchise for this year. The rate ordinance, and with that I'd be happy to be quiet and listen to the testimony.

Neal Johnson, Bureau of Environmental Services (BES): I am the rate-maker economist.

Sue Keil, BES Solid Waste: I have just a few power point slides to go through with you. This may be the short eggs presentation I've made in who knows, the least relevant. Usually we have surveyed the public with our oversized postcards on new program additions, things that folks might be interested in seeing. We did that on the plastics, on the storm debris, we did it on expanded yard debris service, then we followed their advice. I don't have that to bring to you today, because we

haven't had any time to get a card out on that. So that may still be something you want done. But neil, let's go ahead to the first slide. That's interesting. Well, you've had me read things to you before. The—you'll see the '99-2000 rates in the right column, and under the 5% franchise fee proposal, you see the changes that would be reflected. Just focusing in on the second item there, that's the 32 gallon can. There is the 25% --25-cent increase as commissioner Saltzman said relative to the current rate. Due to the improved recycling market, that 32-gallon can rate would have dropped a nickel to 17.55. Hauler productivity and improved recycling markets would have dropped that rate a nickel. So it's actually 30 cents from what it would have been had we not changed the franchise fee. Maybe if we go through—go to the next one. This one shows you the change in the rate for the 32-gallon can, and if similar im—simple inflation, without disposal had occurred, we would currently be charging \$20.30 for the 32-gallon can as opposed to the 17.85 under the franchise fee. So we've constrained the costs of—rather well, between the haulers, us, and the customer, reducing the waste, they really have done quite a good job of keeping the rates down. This one is—this is what's going on inside the rate. I think the collection cost you can see. Again, the two columns to the far right would be the important ones, although this gives you the historical perspective on it. The collection cost has dropped. That's hauler productivity again, gone down from 4.24 to 4.16. You can see a slight change in the yard debris charge. We have more people participating, a little higher tipping fee. Recycling has gone up a bit, and that is the effect of new trucks coming online, as well as increased volume. As you know, we're up in excess of 14% by weight on recycling since we went to the commingled system. And you can see a change in the offset from the sale of materials from 15 cents in the current rate to 50 cents, which is a big swing in the recycling market. So you are getting some good support from the sale of materials. Overhead charge reflects the effects of some changes in contracts and benefits programs, cost of benefits, and then the major item of increase, the franchise fee in that last column going from 61 cents to 89 cents in the rate. all right. This is really the last one of the—those that are relevant to this 5% rate. The downward pressure, as I mentioned, are the higher prices for recyclable materials, the reduced labor costs for recycling collection, actually we've had a good productivity improvement, were it not for the additional tonnage being collected there. Reduced allowance for roll carton container rental. Our experience has shown the carts can last longer than the they originally were projected to last, so we reduced the depreciation on those. Upward pressure obviously the franchise fee increase, repair and maintenance on vehicles, we're reaching the end of the life. They're fully depreciated, so you might expect more repair and maintenance on the vehicles. And new recycling vehicles coming into the rates. So those are the essential reasons that the rates are as they are. So I would be happy to answer any questions about those specifics, or anything else you'd like to talk about.

Katz: Why don't you go back to the first slide. You started going over what the rates would be if we didn't have the franchise increase. Do you want to run that down?

Keil: it would be in the mini-can, it's 25 cents less than it currently is. The increase in the mini-can, aside from the franchise fee, is some additional weight in the can, and some additional collection time. The—in the 32-gallon can, the second one, you have a 25 cents of that increase—excuse me, actually it's 30 cents.

== this is what the rates would be without the—

Keil: okay. So the 32, it would be 17.55 instead of 17.85, were it not for the franchise fee change. The mini-can would be 15.40. The 35-gallon roll cart would be 19.05, the 60-gallon would be 22.60, and the 90-gallon would be 25.80. And the drops in the carts are particularly the effect of the longer depreciation schedule on them. The train charge has gone up because of the franchise fee, and also reflects the effects of increased fuel prices and vehicle maintenance. **Saltzman:** Isn't it true about 60% of residents fall into the first two categories, the 20-gallon can or the 32-gallon can?

Keil: it's about 70%. And if you take that next class of service, the small cart, it's actually even a little higher. You've got about 75, 80 percent of the customers in those classes of service.

MAY 31, 2000

Sten: Is there any—other than the cycles, is there any good trend happening that the price is going up? Are people using more for recyclables?

Keil: are they setting out more?

Sten: You said the price is better. I thought—

Keil: yes, it is. It's a good trend. Actually, we get a pretty inexpensive report that's a market projection for us, particularly on paper, since that accounts for about 85% of our revenue. And that looks like it's going to hold well this year. So that, what you're seeing there is what we believe the projection will be for the rate period beginning in july to the next july. So we look backwards a bit what the real experience is, it's good now and—

Sten: Is that the u.s. Market getting better at using these resources?

Keil: you're dealing with a commodity. I think it has some relationship to offshore economics improving, but most of our stuff stays within the united states. You might want bruce up here on some of this, but it actually I think is just a general health of the economy, and the asian recovery.

Katz: Further questions? Okay. Let's have the purb and then the urt. Then we'll open it up to public testimony.

Doug Morgan, Portland Utility Review Board (PURB) Chair: good afternoon, mayor, honorable commissioners. Doug morgan, i'm joined today by jim, who chaired the solid waste subcommittee when the issue of the increase in the franchise fee came up at our last meeting. Last week we presented the results of our work in a report that included the solid waste, lest the specific point that we made on the solid waste with respect to the franchise fee got lost, let me simply repeat what we said in that report. We all probably would agree with the 56% of the folks that commissioner Saltzman quoted, if you took individual members of the purb in supporting green initiatives. We're green people by nature, I think, on the committee. But if you ask us, would we be in favor of taking money out of the solid waste fund, increasing the franchise fee to support that, we probably would not be in favor of supporting that form of taxing the citizens any more than we would be in favor of increasing the fee on water, sewer, or any other service that's provided to the citizens that isn't directly connected to the service that they're paying for. In short, simply begin with where we ended last time—purb is in favor of adhering to the cost of service principle. That is to say, customers who get a service from the city should be charged for what they receive and they should not be charged for services as a part of that service that are being used to support other things that they're receiving that may be of general benefit. The increase in the franchise fee without being specifically designated for green initiatives that support things connected with solid waste disposal is something that the purb did not support, and we were unanimous in our desire to support green initiatives in general, but unanimously opposed in increasing the franchise fee to support green initiatives that aren't specified. The second problem we have with this proposal is that it did not receive any kind of public debate. That is especially important. If we want the citizenery to support green initiatives, I think there has to be adequate public discussion of that to explain what it is the initiative is about, and why it's a good idea to pay for that out of the solid waste franchise fee. In the absence of that kind of debate, to end up using this as a means of supporting a good idea will in the long run I think undermine the confidence of the citizens and the public trust that's necessary for all of us to get the kind of public support we need and the money necessary to support the larger ends that this proposal is intended to serve. So if that—with that, let me close by paraphrasing I think something that was published in the paper today. No green for green.

Francesconi: I'm sorry, i'm slow. It's not directly online with your testimony, but did the purb, do you have any other ideas for funding source on an ongoing basis for green investments?

Morgan: I think the kind of position you've taken for funding efforts to mitigate fish, spreading the costs over all of the bureaus where there's clearly identifiable connection between what it is that's being done and the cost necessary to support that makes some sense. To the extent that parks and the bureau of environmental services and water and police and all of the other bureaus end up having

MAY 31, 2000

projects that are green projects, then to that extent those bureaus should support that, and it should be taken out of the portions of the budget that are appropriate and proportional to the green activities that each of the bureaus end up being responsible for. So part of it would come out of the general fund, part of it would in this case come out of the solid waste fund to the extent that there's a connection between the green initiative and the solid waste services that citizens are receiving.

Jim Abrahamson, PURB: i'm jim, a member of purb. In addition, some of the green initiatives that I have heard about really sound like they fall under the general heading of storm water mitigation initiatives, and it seems like it would be—i know this is old news, because we dealt with water and storm water rates a month ago, but it would seem there would be more of a direct linkage between the storm water benefits that would be achieved through some other green initiatives through storm water rates than there are through solid waste rates. More of a direct linkage to the benefit and the cost.

Dave Hasson, Office of Management and Finance (OMF): good afternoon, i'm dave hasen, utilities review team, office of management and finance. Our office has sported using solid waste funds as seed money for initial start-up of the green building initiative. However, before raising the franchise fee, we would have preferred to see a fully developed financial plan that addresses a number of issues and is—some of the issues that we would like to have seen in such a plan would be a clean listing of the programs, projects and activities, the costs of each of those programs, projects, and activities, the impacts of the funding proposal on solid waste funds ending balance over time, the impacts on ratepayers over time, addressing the question of how both single-family and nonsingle-family participation financially could be accomplished equitably, given franchise fee resources come from single-family resources only. And the larger issues of program priorities and overall council priorities as they relate to solid waste and green building initiative. So although we would have preferred to see all of these items addressed prior to consideration of the solid waste rates that are before you, we can still support the proposed rates as long as a financial plan is prepared during the next fiscal year, and brought forth to the council for council's consideration prior to a permanent funding arrangement being established.

Katz: Thank you. Questions? Somewhere, this is probably to sue—somewhere I was reading that the rates are planning to go up in four or five years, and I need to clarify that. That's in light of the financial plan discussion.

Keil: right now we are under funding the program for solid waste from franchise fees because we have a large fund balance which earns interest. And we're—where the fund— were the fund balance brought down to the prudent person's reserve and the rate stabilization fund of 250,000, I think the prudent reserve is about 200,000, so bringing it down to somewhere in the 450,000 to 500,000 range, it would take a franchise fee of 4.5% in order to simply cover that which is funded out of the residential program currently. That includes the 225,000 dollars that we spend for nuisance abatement, \$150,000 we spend on bulky waste, the—and then normal staffing, education, promotion and staffing for it.

Katz: That would happen in the fifth year?

Keil: neil, what year? It depends on how much is drawn out of the fund balance, and then the interest that's earned on that. But five to seven years?

Johnson: in five years if the fund balance was down to 700,000, you would need a franchise fee of 4.5%. If we were to drop down tomorrow, we'd probably get by with a smaller franchise fee, somewhere around 4%. Essentially each year you go out you're going to meet a higher franchise fee directed towards maintaining the program.

Keil: just covering basic cost that's are currently included.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. Let's open it up to public testimony.

Paulette Rossi, PURB: i'm paulette rossy. Nothing is new under the sun is a familiar proverb. As a Portland utility review board member, hearing transportation street leaf collection program was to be funded by solid waste payers was not startling. After all, commercial ratepayers had assumed

MAY 31, 2000

maintenance as cost of selecting city street garbage cans and for years ratepayers had paid the bureau of buildings for illegal dumping or nuisance abatement. Creation begins with vision. It is not visionary to raid rate pairs' dollars because they're available. It is simply business as usual for a city council that has more wants than it has general fund dollars to spend. Community benefit should be paid for by the general fund, not an enterprise fund. Furthermore, when the solid waste and recycling division is run efficiently, operating below their allowed 5% franchise fee, ratepayers should be rewarded with lower rates. Council's newest proposal to max the franchise fee above the lowest percentage needed for core solid waste and recycling programs is a money-generating mechanism for the green building initiatives that will see ratepayers paying rates above the cost of service.

Likewise, ratepayers who have high regard for the city's solid waste and recycling division will lose accountability for those dollars if they are not administered by the bureau they recognize as having kept their garbage and recycling rates consistent for years. Future new recycling projects like the collection of residential food waste, could also be compromised if the bureau does not have direct control over the franchise fee. If green buildings is sustainability are laudable for today and tomorrow, profitability will drive the producer and the consumer together in the marketplace. Franklin delano roosevelt wrote, new ideas cannot be administered successfully by men and women with old ideas. For the first essential for doing a job well is to wish to see the job done at all. The public in the free market will decide with building dollars, not their bargain rates, the value of green solutions.

David White, Tri-County Council Chair: mayor Katz and council members, my name is david white, chair of the tri-county council. Our association represents haulers in the tri-county area. The increased rates proposed reflect a fee to be used for sustainable building projects. These programs have much miles an hour and it are worthy of our support. I do need to point out a franchise fee increase really has little direct impact on the residential hauler. We merely collect the money for you and pass it along. We do support your decision, whatever it may be and whatever you decide. We do, however, have observations and questions that i'd like to bring to your attention. Our residential solid waste customers, the appropriate source for paying for this program? These programs are related to business, industry and construction. It seems some of the money should come from those who are either creating the problem or benefiting from the solution. Maybe an increase in the building permit fee would be appropriate. Collection rates have been based upon the cost of providing the service and administering the program. Changes or addition to service, for instance when we decided to add plastics, yard debris collection, were based upon a survey of confidence to— customers to get their input. Customers may love this idea, but I don't believe they have specifically been asked. The budget overview in the green building initiative mentioned a \$420,000 estimated budget requirement with 100,000 coming from grants. My understanding of the number was \$1 million coming from the solid waste fund, and i'm hearing today it's 700,000. I think that's some of the confusing we're facing here. What are the real numbers? If other bureaus or sources pay their share, with the solid waste amount go down, or would that be an additional amount of revenue? How to use the 4.7 million in the reserve fund has been an issue for years. There has been talk about using the money to pay for containers of re—for recyclables. We didn't need to do that. We continued with the same bins. You are already taking 1.2 million from the reserve fund in the next two years for leaf collection. What will the impact of this proposal be on the city's recycling program? Lastly, this rate increase will be viewed by many of our customers as going no the— into the hauler's pocket that. Is not the case, so we think it's critically important that it be made clear this money is going to the city for environmental programs. The more specific you can be on how and why the money is being collected, the better. If you decide to postpone the decision and have meetings, we would be more than happy to participate. Lastly, I was quoted in today's Oregonians as saying haulers have been kept in the dark. I want to point out commissioner Saltzman called me up, explained this proposal and we appreciate that. It's not that we're in the dark, it's more that we haven't had an

MAY 31, 2000

opportunity to really look at it, haven't participated in meetings to discuss it, and that's what I meant when I said we feel we're a bit in the dark. Thank you.

Saltzman: I've also told David I understand the perception issue, that they don't want the reception that somehow the haulers are benefiting from this increase, and you have my commitment that the public understands that this increase can be laid squarely on my shoulders. But this is not—you have my commitment we'll make the public understand where this money is going for.

Bob Cassidy: 1331 Sw Washington. My name is Bob Cassidy, and I own a small business downtown. I'm a member of the solid waste advisory committee and have been for several years. I guess having heard the last few people speak, I want to endorse many of the things that have been said. For example, it's unclear exactly what the green investment fund would subsidize, but it appears from the partial listing I've seen that all would have to do with commercial ventures and none would have to do with solid waste or recycling. The problems with that are that the funding of the program are through revenues from residential fees, but are going to be directed toward commercial ventures and secondly, that the rules of the city I think say that you can't use funds generated from solid waste fees for areas other than solid waste administration over programs. The second problem I have is that there seems to be no clear agenda or timetable or goal, or specific budget for specific programs so far mentioned. It almost seems as if we're getting the cart before the horse. We're coming up with a giant budget and no specific programs or direction of the money, and lastly, why is the rush? Why are we going so fast? It's been mentioned several times there's been no discussion, and I would agree certainly the committee that I listen to has had not the opportunity yet to discuss this.

Katz: Thank you. Questions?

Francesconi: It's not for you, sir, but I do have a question. Is—because it is my understanding it's not a charter provision, but there's a statutory provision that we would have to change to allow the franchise fee. So is there—am I wrong about that? Or is there another ordinance—

Saltzman: We've had our city attorney, right here—

Francesconi: That's where I got my information.

Pete Kasting, Senior Deputy City Attorney: there are several revenue streams that flow into the refuse disposal fund. Some of those revenue streams are restricted to solid waste and recycling purpose by statute and by general state law. Currently there's a city code provision that says that everything that goes into the refuse disposal fund will be used for administration, implementation and operation of southwest and recycling programs. That's a city code provision. The city council could change that. The revenue stream that goes into the refuse disposal fund that is not restricted by law is the franchise fee. That's essentially compensation under a contract. The franchise. And if council chose to direct that revenue stream somewhere other than the refuse disposal fund, it could do so.

Francesconi: You'd have to amend a code section to do it, wouldn't you?

Kasting: the council would, right.

Francesconi: Is there another provision?

Saltzman: I will bring the code change at the second reading next week, if we can move ahead on the first reading.

Sten: You have to amend or not amend for the franchise fee section?

Kasting: right now the way it's worded is that all fees, civil penalties and interest received by b.e.s. With respect to solid waste collection or disposal shall be deposited with the city treasurer. If you wanted to—and it goes on to restrict the uses of money in the refuse disposal fund. There is no external law requiring the franchise fee to be credited into the refuse disposal fund. That's something council did as a matter of policy.

Saltzman: I apologize. There is no code change necessary to do—

Francesconi: I apologize. I misled. I was wrong. You don't need to change any— by changing— how do you change the policy, then?

Kasting: the council's policy is reflected in this code section. The code section does two things it says that all fees go into the refuse disposal fund, and then it says money in that fund can be used for the solid waste and recycling purposes. What the council would need to do, if it wanted to fund programs that don't fall within the umbrella of solid waste and recycling programs, and that's something you'd have to clarify, you could do it by saying that franchise fees, for example, don't flow into the refuse disposal fund. There's no external law that requires that.

Katz: Let me ask the question in a different way. When we put the budget together, and i'll talk about this a little later, we did make a decision that we would do a one-time use of that fund. Do we need to change the code before we adopt the budget to make that happen?

Kasting: I don't know the details of the programs that you want to fund. The code does say that money in the refuse disposal fund shall be used for administration, implementation and operation of solid waste and recycling programs. So if it is something other than administration, implementation and operation of solid waste and recycling programs, then you would need to alter that code language.

Katz: Mark, would you and david double-check that? Because that then would need to be done at least for the \$700,000 that we—okay.

Francesconi: Let me summarize this. The code change that would have to happen would be taking the franchise fee out of the solid waste fund. Because that's where it is now.

Kasting: I think that would be—that's really a budget question on the best way to account for the money. From my perspective, that would be a clean way to account for it, but I defer to the finance folks on the best way to do it.

Francesconi: I'm confused, commissioner. You'll just have to look into it.

Katz: We'll have time. This won't be voted on today. Let's continue.

June M. Boone: most of what I wanted to say my name is June Boone, I've been on the staff advisory committee for recycling and solid waste for almost five years. I've been through the rate-making process, the rate process with b.e.s. For a few times. You wish to finance a green buildings initiative by using the city's chunk of the rate. Green projects are great. That's terrific. We certainly need to protect our environment. But it seems wrong to charge the cost of those projects to ratepayers. Cost of service makes sense. In the past, such things as landscaping and modifications for people with disabilities have been required as part of building codes. If you really feel new construction in the city needs environmental changes or improvements, then why couldn't that be put into the code? That's one possibility of funding these things. Another possibility would be tax credits or incentives for people who were doing green construction. But funding it by using the rate, without asking the public if they want their money used in this way doesn't seem appropriate. You also seem to be putting the cart before the horse. You're raising the money before I hear of any specifics. What exactly are you funding?

Bryan Engleson, Eastside Recycling: 14041 NE Sandy Blvd. I'm Brian Engleson, representing east side recycling and I want to tell you I'm very proud to be part of the solid waste system that Portland has put together. Being one of the individuals that has served on several committees and working with council and b.e.s. Staff and the haulers, I think we've brought something that's unique, and fits Portland's needs. And like I said, I'm very proud to be part of that. I want to thank b.e.s. Staff during this review. I just—I get elected as one of the guys from the haulers' side to present issues to them, and they listened, they convinced me of some things on the staff side they thought should be in the rate review. I think they listened to what I had to say, and we still disagree on a few issues, but I think it was very professionally done, and I think we've arrived at a very fair rate. I just want to express, we all come back to the green initiative. As haulers, we generally are not opposed to the funding mechanism, but we're concerned about the departure from the cost of service. Portland is one of the few communities that you can truly say uses the cost of service model. Most other communities use some form of subsidy, either out of their general fund or some other fund to pay for

MAY 31, 2000

solid waste. And then they advertise and they boast they have low rates. But they don't truly have a cost of service. When we see this particular departure from cost of service, it makes us nervous, because we're wondering, are we going to turn on the spigot and something else whether come along? It could be just as good a program, because we're going to benefit from these programs. We realize that as living and working in Portland, as next—much as the next person. So our concern is just the departure from the cost of service, and that let's continue to discuss it, let's continue to get the public involved with those postcards and I think we had 30,000 returned the last time they were done. And continue to keep the solid waste system moving forward. Thank you very much.

Thor Hinckly, Sustainable Portland: 6315 SE Belmont, my name is thor hinkley. As a member of the sustainable Portland economics, I wanted to make a few comments in support of dan's fee increase proposal. Today Portland findings itself with a strong economy and a fairly robust development community. This presents us with a great opportunity to demonstrate Portland's commitment to assisting both nonprofit and private developers in the challenges and obstacles involved with green buildings. As you know, skepticism and businesses usual approaches to development make the barriers to constructing green buildings somewhat formidable. By ensuring a multiyear commitment to green building incentives through this relatively modest fee increase, Portland can ensure that developers will fee comfortable going out on a ledge to construct green buildings. This incentive fund, much like the development process itself, takes a number of years before it bears fruit. As someone who has worked around sustainability issues for a number of years, it is clear we need to support this fee increase now in a healthy economic climate as we have today to ensure this incentive fund can have the ability to influence long-term positive changes in Portland's environment. I want you to—i urge you to vote until support of commissioner Saltzman's proposal.

Katz: I just want to say that jacket you're wearing is the result of our space program.

== well, thank you.

Katz: Did you know that? [laughter]

== our city space program.

== we haven't gone that far yet.

Katz: I'm not kidding: It's a material that was used in space, and it's now—you're all laughing at me. It's been commercialized, it is a wonderful fabric, it keeps you warm, it's paper thin, it—

== very light.

Hales: At some point you're going to have to go back to teaching offer clothing. We've heard about clothing a lot today.

Katz: That's true.

Richard Ellmyer: 9124 N. McKenna. mayor Katz, members of the city council, my name is richard, I live at 9124 north mckenna in Portland. I'd like to start by suggesting that water needs to go into a house, sewage and garbage need to go out of the house. These are essential services. The rates for these essential city services, such as water and refuse collection, have a direct and unavoidable consequence on the citizens of our city. Essentially the debate here seems to be between what it costs for an essential service versus the cost of an essential service plus a very good idea. And it seems to me that's really the choice that council has to make today, whether we continue to say ratepayers need to pay just for essential services, or if we have a very good idea, that we attach that. This is not an easy decision, but it seems to me that's the dilemma the council faces. There are two families on my block that do not get garbage collection. I don't know how many of you know how many people on your block don't get garbage collection, and I haven't asked my neighbors why they don't get it. But I would be willing to bet that as the rates for any service go up, and particularly something like garbage, where there is an alternative, unlike, say, water or sewage, perhaps, that for every nickel or dime or quarter or dollar, somebody falls off the edge at the low end. At some point someone, some fellow citizen says, \$10 is okay, \$10.25 is too much. I've got to find an alternative. So I think you need to keep that perspective, because there are a lot of folks out there that the level of

MAY 31, 2000

the overhead they have to pay for water and sewer and maybe it's cumulative, makes a difference. I think "the Oregonian" had a good point today when it said that this initiative needs a little more time for the public and those involved to take a look at it. And I would urge you to give this a bit more time. I don't think in general the public has had {ra} lot of chance to take a look at this. And I think ending on a lighter note, if you pass this, there is probably in very—a very good chance that metro will get the blame. [laughter] most folks think that metro is garbage and recycling, and so I would guess that you probably would be off the hook, although I suspect your colleagues would probably ask you to take out, as commissioner Saltzman suggested, a very large ad saying, we the city council are in fact responsible and not metro.

Jeanne Roy: 2420 SW Boundary, 97201. i'm jean roy, speaking as a citizen. I'm favoring this increase in the franchise fee for three reasons. First is, I don't want to draw down the solid waste reserve fund. I'm looking forward to the day when the city is going to be collecting food and yard debris from residents, and when the city does that, it's going to need to buy carts. And i'd like to make sure there will be money there for that. Second, I want continuing money for the green building initiative. I've been a part of the natural step network construction group. It's made up of developers, architects and engineers, and they've followed the process of developing the green building initiative and are very supportive of continuing funding for that. And third, i'd like to respectively disagree with the purb that this is an improper use of solid waste funds. Solid waste funds are already being tapped for projects that don't come under residential solid waste and recycling service. For example, I understand that some of our household garbage fees go for emptying trash cans in the parks. If we were doing strict service, that would come out of the parks budget. I understand that some of the solid waste fees from our household ignore badge fees go to bureau of buildings for nuisance abatement, which has already been mentioned, and I think that technically should come out of the general fund. I'm also aware on my electric bill there's a city of Portland tax that i'm sure that doesn't go—have anything to do with my electric service. So we already have many instances where fees cover projects that are not directly connected with the services that we receive. And I feel fine about that. Also, since several people have mentioned the cost of service model and are concerned about getting away—getting away from that, i'd like to give a different perspective. I don't think that we should be aligning so strictly to a cost of service model as a government in order to carry out our policies, I think we want to be able to use rates to provide certain incentives and disincentives to create certain behaviors. For example, I think we want to provide incentives for people to waste less, to cut down on garbage, to cut down on water, on energy, and to do that we should be using our rates, for example, in the bay we're going to start using our water rates, to have higher costs for people who use more.

Francesconi: The garbage cans are back in the parks, but I don't think the solid waste is paying for it. I'll have sue confirm that.

Keil: the only thing we should give them credit, do you remember a few years ago when we were going to cut back, the haulers volunteered to pick some up on their nickel, they're still doing it. We're not charging any of the collection—

Francesconi: Keep on doing it, haulers: We appreciate it. We really do.

Boone: what about the garbage cans downtown?

Keil: that's out of the—that's the commercial tonnage fee.

Katz: Okay. We've got all the facts straight. Let's go.

Tom O'Keefe, United Community Action Network (UCAN): tom o'keefe, unit community action network. I do agree with purb. I think this is treading on new territory by increasing residential franchise fees to benefit commercial and industrial development without increasing the commercial and development franchise fees to me is a form of corporate welfare written in green ink. I just put a little bit more bluntly where everybody beats around the bush here. I think that's what it is. I think we need to be careful by doing this. We're all in favor of green investments. That's where you get

MAY 31, 2000

the money. By touching those services, to me, whatever money comes from those services should be dedicated to those services. I think purb has said that for years. And I think you should look for different funding sources. Why not look for incentives for people who reduce storm water or who are reducing their kilowatt outage? We've never gotten any feedback. What does this 700,000 save? How much is it going to save in water consumption and water disposal? We don't have any idea of what the cost ratio is here. But I think there is funding sources out there you could look at, and I'll give you one suggestion. I think the city of Portland still can—does have the authority to raise the gas tax by one penny, and that will generate you a million and a half a year.

Katz: Thank you. Next?

Olson: That's it.

Katz: Does anything else want to testify? Come on, jada.

Jada Mae Langloss: I'm jada, council candidate, and I never get caught, but I have some good advice. I have decided to become an entrepreneur and start making money hand over fist with an idea I would like you to help me get started. It would be a 24-hour waterless ecological earth van friendly composting toilet station with change of clothes and things like that to be run by the people who use them. And it would kind of break even. Because instead of always talking about money, let's start talking about things that money can't buy. Like labor, money is something that it's lost. Use four hours of labor to the people—they're going to be using this ecological friendly composting toilet city or housing, or everything that goes along with self-sustainability. And that means a home for all these people without homes. It would be—it could all go into one thing. But I want to take care of the toilet part, since "the Oregonian" labeled me the toilet lady eight years ago, I want to be the most famous toilet lady in the history of the country, and start using our waste instead of flushing it down the river. That's how I'd like to make money hand over fist, so I can start paying taxes.

Thanks.

== congratulations, mr. Saltzman.

Katz: Let me get a sense. This isn't going to be voted on today. So let me get—does anybody want to say anything?

Hales: I think we might want to comment on this proposal. I certainly want to. First of all, I just—sitting here reflecting on this hearing, I think this hearing is an example of stuff that we take for granted in Portland. The fact that we're having this discussion around an issue that although it's important is really on the margins of the basic service, and we're debating some technicalities about the rate-making procedure. Only in Portland would our issues about solid waste be this small. In most cities, the subject of solid waste is an area characterized by high rates, bad service, strikes, and scandal. And here we're arguing over the technicalities. And it's because it's one of the most consistently competently provided services in the city. I'm going to sue, but in the eight years I've been here, it's obvious we've got a successful model with what the haulers do and what the city does, that avoids bad service, high rates, strikes and scandal, and provides people good service at a reasonable rate and supports an industry that's part of the city. It's a huge success story, and that means we can have a debate over an issue like this instead of why the garbage is piling up in the streets, which is how most cities spend their time on solid waste issues. So to all of you, thank you. Secondly, I'm sorry Doug is not still here, because I took his public budgeting class, and I appreciate the—when I was at Lewis and Clark I took his class, and I appreciate the purb being such strong exponents of pure rate making. But I think they're—there are three choices for the city council about how we deal with these issues, and one is pure rate-making, cost of service, don't mess with it one particle. And that—the purb does a great job of articulating that point of view. The opposite extreme would be, maybe pure cash cow, where you take the rate and use it for anything you want. And then something in between, which is where we are as a city, a reasonable load on the utility rates for some public services that at least have a rational connection to utilities. And we—some of us are treating this one as it's—as if it's a first. It's not. As a consequence of one of—a

MAY 31, 2000

previous decision, there's a construction project going on where the water bureau is doing a massive remodel to the fountain. Years ago the council made a decision to put the maintenance of ornamental water fountains, because I guess they have water in them, on the back of the water bureau, instead of on the parks bureau. And the water bureau has for years now, and it's just part of their doing business—not even the purb would say, let's unload that responsibility on the parks bureau, make them spend the million dollars a year on maintaining ornamental fountains, because that would cause a riot in the council chambers. So we're not pure rate-makers. We have a reasonable load approach, and I think this is a reasonable load. I think too, dan, another reason this deserves our support, we spend a lot of time on the council squabbling over the margins of the budget, and here's an example of somebody on the council going out and being creative and finding a new revenue source for something we'd otherwise have to be fighting over general fund allocations for. I think frankly when one of us is creative that way, it gets some benefit of the doubt from me. So I any this is a reasonable load to put on a service that's so well managed that we have the luxury to even consider putting this load on it.

Francesconi: Well, a couple things. First, I warn to say how terrific it is to have commissioner Saltzman on the council for a variety of reasons. One is this is clearly a bold and assertive move that i—that I respect. Second of all, more importantly, you've advanced the cause in the short time that you've been here. It clearly—we have to become more sustainable in our building practices, and our lifestyles have to reflect that if there's going to be anything left for our children's children, if not our children. Having said that, you said several times—I've heard several times that it's important to match receipt rick with reality, and I guess during the budget process the idea of \$300,000 for staffing for this I thought was matching rh -- {ret} rick with reality. The fact of one-time funding of \$700,000 to jump start this so we could have some roof garden examples that you talked about, because I think it's very important that we have that, that's something that I supported then, just a week ago, and I support now. The idea—and commissioner Hales, you may not like this—but the idea of expediting the permit process for those willing to engage in sustainable building practices make sense to me. I don't we can do it right now. We needed to put more money into that to make the system work. Clearly time is money, and if I have two equal projects, I want to expedite the green projects, which is a way that won't cost ratepayers or taxpayers any money. So I favored that. These are the kind of things that we do. But I think in this area when we are—by doing those actions, I have already violated some cost of service principles. And i'm willing to do that when I know what the benefit is to the public. But here as we're entering an era that it's important to educate the public, I can't tell the public what we're getting when we raise these rates. Because there isn't a program behind it. And I think that it is very important that we—that good public policy match our rhetoric. I think it's very important that results match in this era of some distrust of government. To do that, we need program objectives. We need outcomes. We need measurable results. We need a way to evaluate this thing. And I thought that's what was going to happen during the year. We've now got the staff on board, we've got the money, and I think it's \$700,000, which is more of the budget of 400,000 that we were anticipating. So we have time to create a financial analysis and a financial plan with measurable results, so then we could say to those citizens, this is what you get in exchange. Because that is what we have to do. The other thing, and there was some testimony about this, there's a list of developers who have testified in favor of this. I want to know what these developers are contributing financially to this deal. So during this year period, I want to {va}, okay, here, reasons, we're—residents, we're willing to put this into it. Private sector, what are you going to put up as part of the deal? And that's what I want to know. And I want to know that these incentives that goes go to the developers are going to get passed on to the tenants and not kept by the developers. The whole principle behind the green initiative is that somebody is saving money from doing these practices in the long run. The idea much just jumping in with public sector money right off the bat and—before it's part of a deal with the private sector is I believe not the right way to

MAY 31, 2000

proceed. So I think that we're on the right track, you've set us on the right course, we're moving in the right course, but in this era of some distrust of government, we've got to make sure that our heads match our heart so that we end up with a sustainable Portland. That's why I can't support this now.

Sten: A few thoughts. I do intend to support this. I think that the cost of service approach, which was amply described, is absolutely the right way to analyze these issues, and what I've found is that once you do that analysis, two things often come true. One is that there is some dispute as to what's cost of service. I harken back to the service charge issue with the water rates, and I think you can make a good case the way we had the service charge reflective cost of service, but I think you can make an equally good case that the new approach is also cost of service, but one favors a certain type of user and another favors another. And I don't think there's a clear winner on that philosophical discussion. In this case, you have to use—in this case I don't think there's any argument that this increase would follow cost of service principles. But as I think commissioner Hales articulated, I think that needs to be said, you have to use judgment and try and figure out what are the right things to move forward. I would like to see this program a little further put together. I'd agree with that. but I also think I can see where it is going, and based on my judgment, which is what I've got to use, the direction this is going is in sync with where I think most people want to go. I think there is nexus between just below a philosophical level as opposed to a complete nexus between the fact we've created a world where we throw everything away and are eating up the earth at a rate that it cannot sustain, and the notion that we need to build out—in a way that is much smarter and much more efficient. And I do—I don't think you can say, how much ignore badge you throw away directly contributes to how much you support or don't support green buildings, but I think there is a tie in and move we're trying to make. And I think there's two ways to approach this. You say, hey, we can't move on something like this and we can't talk about it—a quarter of a month until everything is in place, or move on it and have some faith and hold people's feet to the fire to make sure it works, and if it doesn't work you retract it. It's a quarter of a month. You can't take any amount lightly. But I do think this is a stream of revenue that will be used very well, and I think will contribute greatly. And I think Portland, for all our green rhetoric is quite a ways behind a lot of the world. I don't think money will put us in leadership, but— commissioner Saltzman is putting forth some leadership, and I'm willing to vote for it.

Katz: Let's not rewrite history here. Actually, I'm very disappointed. We tried to meet the council's direction, and the council's vision and {clishion} Saltzman's vision on this issue. During the time we put the budget together. And we kind of mashed our teeth about how do we do it. Do we do it out of the general fund? Well, you all had priorities, and this was not on the top of the list and housing was on the top of the list, and to know we really can't sustain it with a general fund. Do we take a portion of the {krchld}rc, the capital portion of our resources? You know it gross a million dollars a year, can we capture a piece of that and see whether we ought to continue that? These are all issues that came from ofa. The other notion was, which I thought was a very good idea, we probably ought to be rethinking how we package the green initiative, and perhaps at least initially take a portion of the reserve fund to staff and to begin providing—putting a program together. And then once that's done and we identify the program and we have a discussion with the community as to, is this the right structure for the program, we would have another opportunity to go back and say, do we want to continue funding it this way, or are there other opportunities? Now, usually I would have an answer for you. But this was really, as you all know, we had a real difficult time {dpeelg} with the budget reductions that we all wanted, and it had to be done rather quickly. And so the notion was, let's tap into the fund this one time, get the program started, you absolutely are right, commissioner Francesconi, we didn't know how it was going to be put together, we didn't know who was going to be responsible, we didn't know if it was going to be a grant program. We had no idea whether it was going to be a loan. We have no idea how it's going to be repaid. What the criteria for distribution of the resources, and we said, that's fine. Commissioner Saltzman, with the help of ofa and b.e.s. Will

MAY 31, 2000

try to put this together and bring it forward to the council. I had no idea that this was coming up front today as a rate increase. Now, potentially—I'll be very honest, that might be a possibility. But that would only be a possibility after we realized as a council there may not have been other resources, and that the program was on board, and that it did show results, and it did look equitable and fair, and we knew how to collect the money if it was a loan program, what percentage was a loan, what percentage was a grant. None of that has been flushed out yet. And quite frankly, I don't think that with all due respect, that the council would finance a program and raise rates without—raise rates without knowing what the details of the program is going to be. So I still support the green building initiative. I'm glad we were able to put it together. But I think I would rather get it on board, see some results, and then come back and discuss how we continue funding it. Because this may not be the way we want to continue funding it.

Saltzman: I just want to say that I realize this is a tough issue. But I also believe that it's time for a bold initiative. My commitment to the council is to put this {ral} together and to make it work. And I intend to live up to that commitment. But I do believe, and I believe one of the reasons we don't take a vote on everything, and the reasons why you vote to put five people up here, is to make some decisions. And you have to always weigh what—where is the trade-off between extensive public debate versus sucking in your gut and making a decision. And I guess I believe I'm at that point here. This is a point for leadership, not for extended debate about cost of service principles. And I guess secondly I would also say that if you look at some of the issues the city council has tackled, most of them probably before I was here, I think you would have to say that it—if the city council were to wait to dot every i, cross every t, have a fully developed financial plan for every action we did, we'd probably still be talking about things we've already done. Let me just rattle off a couple. One is the whole notion of mixed use development. The Belmont Dairy. Was that going to work? If we had sort of held ourselves to the standard that I think you're asking the green investment fund to be held to, we'd still be talking about it. We'd still be assessing the public's mood. We'd still be looking for financial ways to make this happen. Instead, we moved ahead and sensed this was the way of the future. We moved ahead, and today in fact our urban landscape is showing mixed use development and showing that it works. The streetcar I think is another example of that too. The housing investment fund. I think we realize that there's a crisis in affordable housing. We need to have money in order to do those deals, to talk to the private developers. You mentioned, {frishion} Francesconi—commissioner Francesconi, out of you need resources to—that's what this action will do, is give us resources. We are not going to be excessively generous. We want to leverage this {furnds} to the maximum. The recycling program itself that we created, I'm not sure which year we created it, but it's a great program. But you asked us I'm sure when we set the goal of recovering 54% of our solid waste stream, we didn't know exactly how we were going to get there. But we did decide we were going to do it, and we were going to finance it through solid waste rates. And indeed, today we are there. And I think civic stadium renovation, that's the one project that has been here since I've been here, and it's come to the point where it's a well developed proposal, but it hasn't {amion} been that way. It started out as an idea that we wanted to keep the civic stadium as a vital urban asset to our city. It's next to light rail, right in the heart of the city. It's a resource worth saving. And the mayor, she figured out how to make that happen. And we're close to flaking that happen today. So as many of you pointed out, cost of service principles are legitimate issues. But there are times when I think I think we've already hit those times when we've created the areas—secondly, as there's—there are times when you need to be bold and lead and to act. And my commitment is to make sure your actions will pay off.

Francesconi: I'd like to say a couple things. One is, I believe you. And I trust you. And I know you will do that. The reason I'm going to vote know next week is not that. The reason is, you cannot ask the public, especially when you do violate cost of service principles, to trust us. That we will do it. The program has to be there first. The Belmont Dairy, I wasn't on the council, but

MAY 31, 2000

commissioner Sten knew what the product was going to be that he was going to get. The streetcar, I was on the council. When we authorized that, I spent a lot of time analyzing that, but commissioner Hales, commissioner blumenauer, knew what they were doing, and I knew what the product was going to be. Housing investment fund, I knew the money would translate into 30 units of—at the maximum subsidy. I knew what we were getting for the trade-office. The point i'm trying to make here, i'm willing to—if we're going to violate a cost of service principle, we need to know what we're getting, and there has to be an appropriate process to get there. That's the point i'm trying to make here. We have—the last thing I want to say, we've done something pretty inconsiStent. Two weeks ago we lowered the fee on water and sewer rates, and now we increase them on the garbage rates not knowing what we're going to get.

Katz: Let me just add to that. All the programs we talked about, you're right, it took leadership from each one of us, but it wasn't a rate increase. I think that's really the difference. Anyway. We'll have an opportunity to debate—

Sten: Except for the streetcar, parking, hotel motel tax—

Katz: But this is a rate increase on residential users, on garbage rates that have a principle of cost of service. We'll argue this next week, or whatever—whenever it comes back.

Keil: I want to get clear on what the amount is. I'm still confused about what would come out of the solid waste fund, what would come from someplace else, and then what the expectation is on the rate increase on an ongoing basis. So out of the—if we're going to give you financial projections, I need to understand what is expected to come out of the fund. Can someone answer that?

Saltzman: These are discussions that you and I have had, and we'll be having in more detail in the next weeks to come. But the issue before us now is do we increase the franchise fee to 5%, along with everything else we're doing in the solid waste ordinance. The budget we just passed already did allocate out of the solid waste fund a million dollars. 300,000 for the green building initiative—

Keil: wasn't it 300 out of general fund?

Katz: Mark, come on. Actually it was 700,000.

Mark Murray, Office of Management and Finance: mark murray, financial planning. 700,000 one-time, all of it out of the solid waste fund.

Katz: Okay. We stand adjourned.

At 3:22 p.m., Council recessed.

JUNE 1, 2000

THE FOLLOWING TEXT WAS PRODUCED THROUGH THE CLOSED CAPTIONING PROCESS FOR THE TELEVISED CITY COUNCIL BROADCAST.

Key: == indicates unidentified speaker.

JUNE 1, 2000 2:00 PM

Katz: Council will come to order. Please call the roll. [roll call] **794.** Let me give the sense of what happened a couple of weeks ago. I think the hearing went very well. I think the council really listened to the concerns of the neighborhoods. There were differences of opinion. Where there were differences of opinion, my sense was that the council felt that language could be drafted that would—that could get us to where all of us, as well as the task force, felt comfortable with the language. It wasn't necessarily the task force language, nor was it the planning commission's language. And we gave marie and the task force additional assignments to go back and tinker, and the bureaus, to tinker with some of the language. There may be areas as we go through all of this today where we are not in agreement on the council. We'll need to flag those up again. And there may be areas where the task force feels very, very, very strongly that they don't want us to act on something. Now, this is my hope—my request of the citizens groups. I think there is an element of trust that has been rebuilt over the many hours that night that we worked through this. That's my hope. Thank you. And that my request of everybody is going to be that we all give a little bit. If there's some language that is really bad, we'll take it out, if it makes sense. Or we'll find something else. But remember, this next phase is what you really wanted us to do, was the mapping. So I don't want to take a lot of this time to kind of regurgitate some language that will probably be dealt with or taken care of the issues you're concerned of will be taken care of as we map. If i'm wrong, you'll correct me as we go along. This is what we're going to do. Marie? Come up, and deborah. They're going to give a quick overview of the last council's session and the hearing, and then how they want to proceed. I reviewed it with them, it makes perfectly good sense, because we do need to have the public testify on the issues, and then once they testify on the issues, we'll come back and as we did that night, go methodically through each of the areas that have been changed or where we actually didn't make a decision. My hope is we can go through it quickly, but if not, i'd like to finish it today and then have a final hearing on it on june 21st in the evening, and complete it.

Francesconi: Did your advice about give a little, did that apply to us?

Katz: Yes. Both of us. Both. Both. Okay.

Marie Johnson, Office of Planning and Development Review (OPDR): i'm marie johnson, with the planning bureau. I just wanted to say that I agree the format seemed to work well last time. We really liked the process where we worked side by side with the task force to talk with you through the issues, and when we get into council deliberations, we'll be doing that again. It will be myself, jere, and we'll have other bureau staff and task force representatives as well.

Katz: And mark still wants to do public facilities.

Johnson: and rick michaelson will also be available. At the last session, council made—supported 47 amendment requests. You completed work on the citizen involvement policy area, the public safety policy area, and the watershed policy area. The council decided to defer discussion of the public facilities and transportation policy areas because two of the commissioners were not present. In addition, the council asked staff to go back and develop new alternatives for 16 items based on council collection. Direction. We worked with the task force and bureau representatives to come up with new concepts. Today we'll do the overview of what's been—i'll talk about what's been happening in the last two weeks since our last hearing. Quickly review the new proposals that have come up to address the issues that came up in last hearing, then there will be an opportunity for

JUNE 1, 2000

testimony. And then we'll go through the deliberations. We ask that we could start with public facilities or transportation first, because office of transportation staff are only available at the beginning of the session.

Katz: You're only working half a day? [laughter]

Johnson: it's a nice day. Come on.

Katz: Okay. What do you want us to—public facilities?

Johnson: yes. And transportation. Those would be the first two, in either order. In the last two weeks, i've been working in planning bureau staff to draft some alternative language. We came up with preliminary proposals. We presented them to some other staff from other bureaus, and to some task force representatives. Then we refined the proposals, presented them to the entire task force, and to city council staff. There were a few last-minute revisions. We completed the revisions yesterday afternoon with one minor exception, and distributed those by e-mail to the task force members. So they should have gotten those last night to review for today's hearing. We listened to concerns, did our best to respond. In some areas we have agreement that we all can support, and in some areas we haven't been able to find the language that makes everyone completely happy, but we hope we've gotten closer. Also during this time, since last hearing, plan commission has met on a related matter, and discussed report drafted by planning commission subcommittee on watershed issues in southwest Portland. And rick michaelson will present that report to you, because it relates to the southwest community plan. It talks about implementation of watershed policies that council supported at the last hearing, and the report is being considered—forwarded to you for your consideration as we move into the next phase, into the mapping and implementation phase of the southwest community plan. Council doesn't need to make any formal action on this report, but we want you to have an opportunity to look at it and think about it as we move forward. So rick, could you— michaelson.

Rick Michaelson, Planning Commission: i'm here to speak on behalf of the planning commission. At your last hearing, the planning commission had not yet considered the storm water advisory committee's work, and we forwarded a letter to you to that effect. Since then, we had an in-depth discussion, and did agree to forward the report to you. The planning commission has a whole strongly endorsed the recommendations of the working group to do better watershed by watershed planning, zoning, implementation measures and really begin to approach the whole storm water issue in connection with the esa issues. The working group had recommended a series of interim measures be adopted immediately. The planning commission chose not to recommend the adoption of those measures. Primarily from a procedural point of view. The planning commission felt the amount of time and work and public involvement that would be necessary to adopt the interim measures and the specific—specificity of those measures would be as much work as it would take to do the permanent measures. So it was our recommendation that the city move forward and do permanent implementation of the watershed management efforts, coordinated with esa work, and those measures be moved forward as quickly as possible so we could make wise decisions on the mapping in southwest Portland. The memo and the report are attached, and I think they more clearly specify—

Katz: Do you feel very comfortable with that?

Sten: I think that makes good sense. I think probably the next step for me, maybe we could take a shot at this by the 21st. Simply nailing down time lines so that—i think there's a lot of expectation that says we expect to generally get some of this work done, and I think we would be prepared with endangered species response, and the council was briefed on where we are on this, to really make given this level of work, make the southwest watershed the first piece. We've got to do a chapter in our plan for every watershed in the city, and the strength and the ultimate success of this plan I think is based on having the right analysis of each watershed. Johnson creek and fanno creek are both creeks, but they're very different in terms of what's around them. I think we could maybe move the southwest watershed work quickly and that would I think really strengthen our esa plan. I think

JUNE 1, 2000

maybe the thing to give some sense to the neighborhood activists working on this would be to nail down a time line between the esa staff and the planning staff and the activists for when we could expect to get some of these things adopted. I think that could be relatively soon. I hesitate to put a number of days on it, but I think it could be in a reasonable time frame. I think by the time you size up all the esa work and what the work group has done, most of this information exists. It's a matter of pulling it together and giving some thought to how to actually move on it.

Michaelson: I know there were concerns in the working group that there were some implementation measures being recommended that don't seem to fit into any of the categories yet. We need to look at that list and make sure there is a category—

Sten: I'm very substantively in favor of a local of the interim things people are proposing. My concern is if we just move on the interim pieces without a little more process with the other communities that are affected by the esa, i'm just—I just got done with two hours of business with the esa, and we're close to agreeing on an approach. I want to make sure there's enough process before we adopt anything that we don't lose anything, because what we do in southwest—southwest is going to be less controversial, but it has enormous implications for the other streams, so I just want to make sure we get it all right. I think it can be done on—and involve all the right people before we make decisions. I think it can be done on a reasonably quick time frame.

Katz: Just to remind you, the progress board did a very good piece on johnson creek. So don't reinvent the wheel on that one. It would be nice to have a report like that on every watershed.

Michaelson: it would. Thank you very much.

Katz: All right. Marie?

Johnson: now we'll review the outstanding issues. In the vision policy—the vision section of the document, the council made 12 decisions on items v-1 through v-11, and on item v-14. There are two outstanding issues. The first—

Katz: Didn't you want to take transportation and public facilities first?

Johnson: when we get into deliberation. I'm sorry.

Katz: Go ahead.

Johnson: on page 4, v-12, will the task force had requested that the vision not include references to west Portland town center. The direction we got from council was that—planning commission version, excuse me, let me back up. The planning commission version retains the references to west Portland town center, but adds an asterisk that refers to a future planning process for west Portland town center. And what that would entail. Council direction was to refine or revise that asterisk so it includes a reference to planning for a significant portion of barbur corridor. We rearranged the wording here a little bit and added one section to reflect your direction. Item v-13. This is a section of the vision statement dealing with parks. Parks bureau had proposed an alternative that the task force did not support. Council had asked us to redraft the language so that it recognized that not all park lands should be developed. Somehow addressed the issue of housing around parks, and recognized that natural use—that land use near natural area parks may be different than those near recreation area parks. We made the following revision. The item now reads, by 2020, the southwest is no longer park deficient and considerably more park land has been purchased to provide outdoor recreation and natural resource protection. Southwest parks serve a have a variety of needs, including passive and active recreation and environmental protection based on their—on the value of their natural resources, the need for recreation and the context of the park. This adds to the references in natural resource protection, and removes references to limiting development around parks because there's—because we have the reference to environmental protection. Land use and urban form.

Katz: Before you continue, on the revised v-12, the task force agrees with this language? **Johnson:** i'm not certain that they do. I think they're more comfortable with it, but i'm not certain they agree.

Katz: Keep going. You're finished with the parks?

JUNE 1, 2000

Johnson: we're finished with the vision. Now we're on to land use and urban form. This is an attachment separate piece. We drafted a number of proposed revisions to the planning commission's land use and urban forum policy area. We did this because there's some good—we felt there was strong elements of the policy area, and it was much simpler for us given the time frame to make revisions than to start something from scratch. In this attachment that you have, task force comments have been inserted in boxes. The first change we propose is on the first page, item 3-c. Item 3 has to do with zoning designations that would apply community-wide. Item c would now say ensure that development and redevelopment occurring outside the mixed use areas respects the scale and the desired neighborhood character identified in individual neighborhood plans. Page 2. Item 1. These objectives would apply to all mixed use areas. This item would be revised to say, define boundaries of main streets and town centers through a public process in a way that supports commercial viability, meets metro's 20-year allocation and helps the city meet its housing goals. We're proposing a new objective, 3, that says encourage redevelopment within main streets and town centers that enhances commercial vitality and the desired characteristics of these areas. We're trying to state in the affirmative that development in town centers or main streets only certain types of development are appropriate. That it's not appropriate to have just any kind of development. On page 4, item 2, this is our a last-minute revision. I have a last-minute revision that's not in your copy. We're proposing changing this item to read, within the boundaries of town centers, create transitions along—

Katz: Is this your own?

Johnson: item 2, but we're suggesting we need to begin the item— this was a very last-minute response to some task force concerns.

Katz: Okay.

Johnson: within the boundaries of town centers, create transitions along the edges that respect the density design scale and character of contiguous neighborhoods. This respond to a comment that the task force had that they wanted to clarify the transition areas should happen within town centers and not outside of them. Item 3-c. Item 3 deals with master planning processes for town centers. C has to do with infrastructure improvements. We felt this objective should include identification of likely funding mechanisms.

Katz: Why don't you read it.

Johnson: okay. Analysis of infrastructure— i'll start with 3. Include the following in any future individual town center master plans and then c says, analysis of infrastructure improvements, including the necessity for increased connectivity within the town center required for rapid high density growth, the need for regional storm water management facilities, and identification of likely funding mechanisms. On page 5, item 3-c, again, item 3 deals with master plans, this time master plans for streets— main streets. Include the following in any future individual master—main street master plans. C. Analysis of infrastructure improvements needed and likely funding mechanisms to transition the main street to a higher density within 20 years. Page 6. We made—we're proposing some rather significant changes to the corridor objectives in response to concerns about some of the corridor objectives as a planning commission had written them, refer very specifically to what should happen along barbur. The task force felt this wasn't appropriate given that we're endorsing a future planning process that would determine how that area should develop.

Hales: could you go back to the previous one again? I'm not sure if it made sense to me.

Saltzman: 3-c.

Johnson: include the following in any future individual main street master plans. Item c says, analysis of infrastructure improvements needed and likely funding mechanisms to transition the main street to a higher density within 20 years.

Hales: I got it. Thanks.

Katz: Keep going. We'll come back.

JUNE 1, 2000

Johnson: correct. The way we handled some of the references—the barbur corridor corridors were in some cases suggesting we—they are removed, in others that they be reworded. The first item is item 1. Under what was previously called general corridor objectives. We’re suggesting that it be revised as follows. Encourage transit supportive concentrations of housing and employment density at appropriate locations. Item 4. This is an item that’s been modified from what was in the barbur section. Provide regional and on-site storm water management facilities that mitigate for the effects of run-off from transportation infrastructure. The next page, page 7. Item 5. Provide connections between transit corridors and nearby schools and public park facilities. We’re recommending that items— under the barbur corridor, west Portland town center section, the remaining items be deleted with the exception of one that i’ll get to in just a moment. Under special areas, the task force had developed an objective under parks that dealt with the willamette greenway, and the planning commission had developed an objective under lapped use and urban forum that dealt with willamette greenway. They seem to cover different aspects of the greenway, so we’re suggesting that the task force parks objective, that you had supported at the last session, be moved to the land use and you’re bang forum, and the planning commissions objective be modified slightly. So planning—task force objective that was in parks, we’re suggesting for land use and urban forum reads, protect the willamette river and the willamette river greenway by supporting statewide goal 15, willamette river greenway, the plan, its regulations, resolutions and vision. And item 2, which the planning commission objective, would read, foster the completion of the willamette river—the willamette greenway trail through the southwest community plan area and its connections to other southwest bicycle and pedestrian routes. Page 8. Item 2. This item we moved to special areas, has to do with the barbur transit center. Staff doesn’t have a recommendation on this particular issue, but we see the transit center as being a unique place within southwest, the only transit center within southwest, and we wanted to flag it for council’s attention so you could decide how to best deal with it. Encourage the development of transit supportive uses, especially office employment and retail at and centered around the barbur transit center. Those are the modifications we’re proposing to the planning commission’s lapped use and urban policy.

Katz: Keep going.

Johnson: the next session is—next section is public facilities. The city council did not discuss this policy area at the may 17th hearing. Since the hearing, we’ve developed a new proposal for one item. It’s item pf-7 on page 9. Actually, the proposal goes over to the next page. The task force proposed language, develop a process including—excuse me— involving public participation to find an equitable regional mechanism for funding improvements to inadequate infrastructure or additional infrastructure needed for new development. We’re proposing that there be an objective that reads, pursue new mechanisms for equitably funding improvements to public facilities.

Katz: It’s on the next page.

Johnson: yes, i’m sorry. All right. The next session is citizen involvement. You completed your work on the citizen involvement policy area.

Katz: Right.

Johnson: provided direction on another item. On page 14, item ed-3, the task force had asked that a portion of the objective 1 of the planning commission policies dealing with institutions, that that portion of the objective be removed. Council asked us to find a way to retain it if we could and develop an objective that more clearly showed the relationship between institutions and the economic development of southwest Portland. Our option reads, support educational and medical institutions and enhancing the quality of education they provide and research they conduct.

Katz: Okay.

Johnson: to come back with new proposals. I’m going to cover items h-1 and h-2 together, because I think they work together. The first item, task force asked the planning commission objective 1 be removed because it made references to specific housing targets for southwest. What

JUNE 1, 2000

we heard from the council was that while the specific—specificity may not be appropriate for the objective, that we needed to have a way to reflect that new housing development is likely to in—occur in southwest. The second item, h-2, the task force asked—suggested an alternative to planning commission objective 2. The task force's objective gave an overview of the kind of housing that they'd like to see, but didn't get any specificity. Planning commission's objective was quite specific. Council asked us to find a way to—asked us to find a way to refer to the kinds of housing that might be needed.

Katz: Why don't you read those very quickly.

Johnson: I will. So the two proposals that staff has developed are for item h-1, provide opportunities to achieve the development of new housing units over the next 20 years to accommodate new residents and the shift to smaller households. And then the proposal for h-2 is, provide for diversity of size, type and affordability of housing to meet the needs of young adults, small and large families, empty nesters, the elderly and others. We decided not to include the references to specific housing types because there are other housing objectives that talk about the types of housing in chosen—chose instead to refer to the people living in those houses. Item h-3, task force proposed an objective that dealt with compatibility of infill with existing development. Council asked us to draft an alternative objective that addressed implementation measures and zoning tools. This is the alternative we've come up with. Develop zoning and design tools to promote infill development that is compatible with the desired character of established residential areas. We're also suggesting that this objective might fit better in the land use and urban forum section. H-4, this was the objective or the proposal from task force that we have on—that housing not be referentially clustered around parks. Council asked us to come back with an objective that dealt with housing next to natural area parks. Staff was not able to develop an option. We identified aspects of the land use and urban forum policy, a planning commission that dealt with the connection between land uses and the environment, also the parks policy area talks about the adequacy of parks to meet the needs of existing and future residents. And we felt it was important to acknowledge that the environmental overlay zones we have are the legal tool we have for governing that, and the bureau is currently going through a process of revising those environmental zones. They may broaden and the code that governs the type of development that can happen is likely to change. What we saw in this particular objective was overlapping of two different issues, and one is the capacity of parks to handle the demands that are put upon them, and that's dealt with in parks objectives, and the second issue is protection of natural resources, which is handled in a variety of other environmental efforts, including the e-zones. Item h-5.

Katz: The task force option, is this a revised one, or the original?

Johnson: Housing near southwest parks must consider the unique problems and needs of the area. Specifically, a, do not concentrate housing around sensitive environmental areas, including environmental areas in parks or near or adjacent to in order to lessen impacts of urban run-off. B, existing southwest parks were generally acquired many years ago, largely via donation, and as a consequence, we're low—were located without consideration of future community needs. While the comprehensive plan of locating—i think it's the comprehensive plan policy—of locating additional residential density near parks is generally good because in 2040 design areas density near existing parks in southwest must also consider the desired neighborhood character, service level of the park and accessibility, as well as the potential impact on sensitive environmental areas.

Sten: Do you want me to comment on these now?

Katz: No. Hold off, because I know this one is going to need a little bit of discussion by everybody.

Johnson: item h-4 --

Katz: This one park, nothing else.

Johnson: the task force and the planning commission both had objectives that dealt with the connection between institutions and their impacts on residential areas, and the need for housing. The

JUNE 1, 2000

council asked us to find a way to meld the two objectives. This is the proposal we're presenting. Encourage medical and educational institutions to appropriately house students and work cooperatively with affected neighborhood associations to minimize negative livability impacts on adjacent residents. We're recommending that this be moved to the land use and urban forum policy, and it appears that task force supports this proposal. Parks. Council made decision on 11 items. There are three outstanding issues, one of the issues would modify one of the items you've already made a decision on. The first item is on page 19. Item p-10. The task force had proposed alternative language for planning commission objectives 1 and 4. Objective 1 had dealt with the provision of new parks and objective 4 dealt with the maintenance of existing parks. The parks bureau did not support the task force proposal. Council asked that we come back with further options. What we're proposing is a set of objectives that would work together that would address the issue of developing and maintaining new and future parks. And would include references to the parks planning process. So we are suggesting that the council support task force objective 1, create new parks and open spaces in southwest Portland to meet current and future needs for parks, recreation and open space at levels that meet or exceed standards adopted by the city. And that you support planning commission objective 4, maintain and enhance existing parks, recreation programs and community centers in southwest Portland to serve current and future residents. We're also suggesting that you modify task force objective 10 that you've already supported so that it read, promote active participation of citizens in the creation of all plans for parks and open space in southwest. Finally we're proposing a new objective that would say, establish criteria through a citizen involvement process for determining when changes to southwest parks or open space should be preceded by appropriate parks plans. This proposal has been reviewed by the parks bureau and by the task force, and they both support it. Excuse me. Item p-14. The task force had requested that planning commission objective 10 be removed. I skipped over one. I'm sorry. Item p-13. The task force requested that planning commission objective 8 be removed. This objective talked about increasing access to parks through land use planning and development in public improvements. The council asked us to develop an option that fits with similar items in the vision and in housing. We reviewed this and we did not come up with an alternative, and instead support the task force request to remove the objective. We did this for a couple of reasons. First, we felt the link between land use planning and use of public facilities is addressed in the comprehensive plan under housing objective 4.3, item c, and the public facilities policy area. We also think that the issue of access to parks is addressed in task force proposed objective 1. Item p-14. The task force had asked that planning commission objective 10 be removed. This objective dealt with efficient utilization of public lands and gave an example—for multiple purposes and gave the example of storm water management taking place in parks lands. City council asked us to find an option that would address task force concerns while acknowledging that sometimes it is appropriate—it is not appropriate—that sit appropriate to use public land for multiple purposes. We reviewed this—multiple purposes. We reviewed this objective and suggested the following revisions. Support utilization for lands—where appropriate. We really focused on the two words public lands, it's not a reference specifically to parks, and we felt this could apply to a variety of public lands, so we suggested this be moved to the land use and urban forum policy area. This is particularly—this is a strategy that's used right now as we're talking about how libraries could be used for mix uses, and we have police stations now that include public meeting rooms. So we're already doing this citywide. All three of the parks items are supported by the task force.

Katz: We're doing transportation now.

Johnson: public safety, the city council made decisions on all four items. Transportation, there are four items remaining for—we've identified four nonconsent items. Unfortunately some—these four items came up late in the process. We have informed the task force that they have shifted. We're on page 28. Item t-1, this is a task force proposed policy for the transportation area.

JUNE 1, 2000

Katz: Excuse me. On the other amended requests, never mind. Go ahead.

Johnson: okay. City council did not discuss this policy area at the last session. So i'll highlight the four items that we've developed alternatives for. Or we've responded to.

Katz: Okay.

Johnson: item t--1, actually, this is task force objective 1, not the policy. It says, support the development of pedestrian facilities, including safe crosswalks, identified in the pedestrian master plan and the southwest trails map on arterials and local streets, major intersections and bus stops on unimproved rights of way and across public and private lands where needed to provide connections between residential areas and activity centers. A neighborhood association representative raised a concern about the use of the word "needed" and felt the word "appropriate" fit better there. Do you want me to read it again? Okay. okay. Item t-10. Excuse me. We had previously characterized this item as consent. In our discussions with council staff, they asked this item be moved to nonconsent for your consideration. The objective says, evaluate the transportation impacts of neighborhoods and—evaluate the transportation impacts on neighborhoods and arterials when increasing the development potential of the—of an area, including redevelopment and infill of large sites and include mitigation measures in the development plans. The council—the staff recognized that this objective actually deals with two types of land use, transportation connections, one that takes place in a legislative process like the southwest community plan, and others that happen in quasi-judicial projects. Typically we try to keep objectives as simple as possible. Task force item t-15 also deals with quasi-judicial projects. So we have suggested that the final—the end of that objective be removed. So that read, evaluate the transportation impacts on neighborhoods and arterials when increasing the development potential of an area. Item t-16. The—this item was previously characterized as consent. The task force objective reads, facilitate participation in transportation planning, project prioritization and project development in implementation using a dynamic dialogue model that includes soliciting regular input from the broadest possible audience and using the knowledge and resources of southwest residents. The staff felt like this deals with citizen involvement in transportation planning, and gets into a fairly high level of specificity. We have a citizen involvement policy with revisions that council supported at the last session, and we're suggesting this be modified to state, facilitate citizen participation in transportation planning, project prioritization and project development and implementation.

Katz: Can I just ask, which city council staff recommended this to be moved to nonconsent?

Johnson: we had a general conversation. I don't know if I could identify one particular person.

Katz: I thought—well, we'll talk later. I thought the council liked the dynamic dialogue.

Johnson: I think the idea was to bring it to your attention for your discussion.

Katz: Okay. That's it?

Johnson: one more item, i'm sorry. Okay. Item t-18. This had previously been characterized as a consent item. The task force had made some last-minute changes to the policy. We had thought that that made the policy acceptable to pdot, but office—but we hadn't checked with them and they raised some concerns. The task force proposed policy as revised and presented at the June—the May 17th hearing was, provide a balanced multimodal transportation system in southwest Portland that encourage increases in transit use and pedestrian accessibility and connectivity, discourage nonlocal traffic in residential areas, reduces congestion and focuses on improving and maintaining all streets. The option that has been developed was proposed by office of transportation, is, provide a balanced multimodal transportation system in southwest Portland that encourage increases in transit use and pedestrian accessibility and connectivity, discourage nonlocal traffic in residential areas, manage congestion and focus on improving and maintaining arterial and local streets. I think the concern was that the city policy doesn't focus on reducing congestion and the city does not currently maintain unimproved streets. The council—the next policy area is watershed council made decision on all items in the watershed policy area.

JUNE 1, 2000

Katz: Okay. Let's do this now. We'll have public testimony on what you just heard. Again, let me suggest that you try to accommodate some of the changes and really identify the ones that are really hard for you to accept and why. So that we here—we hear that as well. Okay? Who wants to come up? Then we'll come back and bring both marie, deborah, jerry and mark and others to go over each one of these items.

Olson: Three at a time, please.

Katz: If you can, don't open up things we've already decided on.

Dixie Johnston: 0550 SW Palatine Hill Rd., 97219. good afternoon, i'm dixie johnson. Thank you again for listening to us. Dave and I just came back from a 30-day rail pass trip throughout the u.s. And canada. On that trip, we had the opportunity to talk to interesting people, including an environmentalist getting an award from the united nations, and also an urban architect from india. We have learned through these people and—in discussions with them, with relatives and old friends, how much we appreciate this city. We want to let you know that we are extremely blessed in this city. And we feel like what we are proposing in the southwest community plan policies also in our zoning map does reflect this, and we have tried very hard to look at the big picture, and the long term. As far as discussion today, I do think we do need to discuss the development around parks, especially where there are environmentally sensitive areas. And that should be taken very seriously. The other thing is the watershed decisions, including the process, that should be more or less in writing and understood before we discuss the zoning map, because it will help with consistency and with clarity in our plan. Thank you very much.

Katz: Okay. I've got a—i've noted those. Thank you.

Dave Johnston, Collins View Neighborhood (CVN) Land Use Co-Chair: 0550 SW Palatine Hill Rd., 97219. thank you. I'm dave johnston, land use cochair of collinsview neighborhood association. I have just two things. I think they'll both be fairly brief. The first is probably a technical correction to make some of our objectives consistent with the vision statements of both the task force and the planning commission. That has to do with terwilliger boulevard and terwilliger extension, which runs through our neighborhood. Both the task force and the planning commission indicate in the vision statements that this should be a parkway and extend the formal parkway that only goes at this point from barbur boulevard north, but should be extended on out to tryon creek state park, which is essentially at the city limits. As we look at the summary of council decisions provided to us by bureau planning, under transportation, t-5, there is an objective task force objective 6 which indicates reinforce primary transportation functions of southwest terwilliger boulevard. We should adds the words “and terwilliger extension,” since it is terwilliger extension on south of barbur. As a parkway, bikeway and scenic drive—it presently sense barbur boulevard, it should say the city limits and southwest share dan street to be consistent. This is also a correction that we suggest under the urban forum, land use and urban forum portion. If we look at page 8 of that near the top it says, note under that, the first entry is number 2, it says, enhance terwilliger boulevard's scenic qualities, it should be terwilliger boulevard and terwilliger extensions, because it is partly terwilliger extension. We didn't have time to adequately address this at the task force meeting when we looked these over, so they were left as items that wouldn't go as consent. I don't think they should be controversial, though.

Katz: Are you noting these issues? You're trying. Who's got them? To make sure—see if we can get a yes on this one, I don't think it's a big problem, but I don't know.

Dave Johnston: we would like to preserve the parkway nature and protect.

Katz: I know.

Dave Johnston: the other point has to do with funding for needed improvements, and there are a couple of objectives that this might relate to. It's a matter of city council giving their intention to everybody as we go through the process. More than mandating anything in particular. It has to do with looking at infrastructure and various funding mechanisms that are possible. What I would like

JUNE 1, 2000

us to do, or consider is to add the words where it says "appropriate funding mechanisms," each i'm this appears, i'll give a couple of citations, adds the words, "including systems development charges." The reason I say that is, systems development charges were recently enacted by the city for road improvements. As an alternative to local improvement districts. But it's important that they be considered in the planning process up front, because as I understand the law, they can only be used when they're for anticipated development. Once the development takes place, it's too late to use that mechanism, and the local improvement district becomes the fund-raising mechanism. So as we plan increased usage of our land and with that we can anticipate increased needs for roads and road improvements, this would be the time to add those to the list for assistive development charge improvements.

Katz: Your time is up. Do you have any—

Dave Johnston: i'll leave a copy of the citizen advisory committee report on funding and— infrastructure.

Katz: Just a question of marie. I can't remember, appropriate funding mechanisms, did we have a list of them? We didn't have a list at all. Okay.

Hales: can I ask a couple questions? Why list that one, dave? Why just list one? Why not say appropriate funding mechanisms, obviously it's inclusive of that. Object ever I don't get it.

Dave Johnston: sit. Partly it's my own perception that we need to emphasize that we should use this mechanism, since we have enacted it, and from what I can tell working with the city bureaus, there seems to be a hesitancy to list it, or to list projects under systems development charges, rather than to pursue them later as local improvement districts.

Hales: I didn't follow your second point. The systems development charge will never produce enough money to solve a significant number of transportation problems around the city. It's just not going to do it. It's going to be an ingredient, but it's not a magic device that's going to solve that many problems. It's not exclusive of— exclusive of local improvement districts. There's a requirement under state law that you give a credit for payment of sdc's under some circumstances when an l.i.d. is formed, and I won't go any farther than that without confusing myself. But there is an interrelationship between those two, but no one should operate under the illusion that sdc's, system development charges, are going to solve any large number of transportation problems around the city, because they're only charged to new development, and they can only be spent on capacity increases that serve new development. It can't be used to fix existing deficiencies. Most of our problems in southwest are existing deficiencies.

Dave Johnston: I agree with that, but maybe an example would illustrate this as well as possible. If we're going to rezone an area in southwest for increased usage, and if we know this is going to require improvements of the infrastructure such as roads, perhaps we'll go from a gravel road and need a paved road to serve an apartment complex instead of single-family houses. At this point, we're anticipating a need for new development. Now, I realize we would need to apportion between the existing deficiency and the need for the new development. But if we wait to put this project on the list for systems development charge until the apartment complex is built, then it's too late to use that funding mechanism, then we're left with only an existing deficiency because of the apartment buildings, and we would have to use local improvement district. I wouldn't think that systems development charges could cover all of our needs. Or that we would eliminate local improvement districts. We would probably still need both. And so—but it is a matter of planning up front where it would be appropriate to use this additional mechanism to relieve our other funding mechanisms, including the capital funds from the city's treasury. If we plan these projects at the time that we know there will be a need for increased usage, rather than waiting until the increased usage is in place and having only an—

Hales: I think we're still not connecting. But we don't want to get into this now. We have to adopt a list of projects. We can revise that list later. But it's not that connected to any one development.

JUNE 1, 2000

It's charged on each development, but the project, the drafting of the project list is not all that connected to any one development. Anywhere in the city. And the other thing about the sdc project was, unlike the capital improvements plan project list, we don't run an unfunded liability. We don't list more projects than anticipated development citywide is likely to fund. So we don't over-promise.

Dave Johnston: that's right, and I guess would I say, as we anticipate development in southwest, we should put those needs on the list for system development charges.

Hales: I think if rezonings were approved, that would force us to go back and look at the list again.

Dave Johnston: yes.

Hales: I think we would agree on that.

Katz: I don't think you're disagreeing. Okay. Thank you. He wants you to consider those earlier on.

Hales: But it's not key to the development, it's key to the change in zoning.

Dave Johnston: consider it whether we change the zoning.

Hales: I would think that would—

Katz: Okay. I am still not sure we need to include it, but we'll get back to that. Go ahead.

George Marshall, Crestwood Neighborhood Association (CNA) President: 4430 SW Plum, 97219. my name is george marshall, I reside on southwest plumb. I'm the president of the crestwood neighborhood association. I'm also a task force member and the founder of the crestwood coalition—

Katz: Excuse me. How old are you?

Marshall: 39.

Katz: Really? Oh, you're lucky.

Marshall: i've been told so. [laughter]

Francesconi: Out of order:

Katz: I am. But thank you for responding. You didn't need to respond to that. You just looked so young once you gave your resume.

Marshall: sometimes I wish it were—

Katz: Go ahead.

Marshall: the west Portland town center has been an extremely contentious issue, and we agreed as a result of this long and contentious process to extract the town center and barbur boulevard from the community plan map for now and begin a separate process to define the vision and design for this area. For this reason i'm requesting the removal of the last item from the final page of the document on proposed revisions to the land use and urban forum document that concludes the statement, quote, encourage the development of transit supportive uses, especially office employment and retail at and centered around the transit center, closed quote. As written this, could be seen as an ill-defined town center and contradicts the spirit of the agreement I mentioned. On its face the statement could be used to build a town center of unlimited scope, centered around what, to what radius, office employment, to what standard? This area has every consideration there is to make. We have a transportation mess, we have a large park, we have businesses, we have homes. We don't know what the solution to this area is finally going to look like. We don't know if the transit center is a logical center to anything. We don't even know if it's the right place to have a transit center, depending upon what you plan for that area. I grew up in southern louisiana, and they decided for transportation reasons that new orleans would be a great place to have a city. It's a great city, but it's got a lot of problems because it's way too low, and a few other reasons. Baton rouge is great, but you don't need pumps pumping water out of it all the time. I would like to see a technical solution to this area, really sorted out before we decide that there's one particular element of it we think is key to that solution. And i'd therefore like to ask that process to plan barbur be allowed to go forward without prejudice to respect with what the final configuration of what the final area will look like and how it will work.

JUNE 1, 2000

Katz: Thank you. Keep going.

Colleen Culbertson, Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc. (SWNI): good afternoon. I'm here both for sweeney transportation committed—I'm also speaking for transportation. For southwest neighborhood we also want to address the last item on land use on the barbur transit center. We feel the area were going to develop naturally it would have by now. We strongly support the barbur corridor study, as a mechanism by which this should be done. We are concerned this is an undefined area and there are major safety concerns now. Just to stick a bunch much people in there is not going to be in their best interest. It's not that we don't support the area, it's—it's that we need to have a more planned way of going about that. We feel the corridor study would address that. Then for what has historically been the transportation committee views on the items, you mentioned giving a little, and I want to point out we had moved many nonconsent items over to consent. We were pretty surprised to see the four items show up that had previously been consent.

Katz: I want some—in all fairness to the southwest community, we need an understanding of how that happened, moving consent items over to nonconsent. That late in the game. As we go through the transportation issues, we'll review that. All right.

Culbertson: basically i'd like to address the four pieces. The first one was basically a word change needed versus appropriate, which seems innocent enough, but I would mention what it has historically been is an argument between the environmental concerns and the multimodal concerns. So this issue is basically phrased in both of those words. That is an issue that can be addressed as time goes on. One wording or the other, they're both going to bring up the same argument. On the second item, this was a major concern to our transportation committee, and I believe it's a major concern to several specific neighborhoods, including ctlh, which had in fact supported the policies. They do have problems of this one. The reason we had—

Katz: Which one is this?

Culbertson: t-10. Basically the second half— there's three parts. The part that remains, the part that calls for redevelopment and infill of large sites to be included in the mitigation measures. On the phrase development, what we have historically find legally is that development did not necessarily come to define infill and redevelopment. We've went caught in development, and so the second two phrases were put in to modify that to make sure we were never left out because we didn't use the exact right phrase. I understand the difficulty that there could be two processes here, legislative and judicial, and so what I would suggest, having just seen this, the other night, tuesday night, would be basically that we might break this down into two separate pieces, one addressing each of those. We might have a piece that said evaluation—evaluate the transportation impacts of zoning, since that's the problem we have in the legislative area. That could be worked out a little bit better of the in one piece we would address zoning and impacts. In the second place, we would say, include plan for mitigation of transportation impacts when developing and filling or redeveloping large sites, and that would address the quasi judicial piece. So I think this could be worked out and even the intent—leave in the intent without having to mess them—on the third item, t-16 --

Katz: Transportation is not a yes on that. But we'll go back to it. Thank you.

Culbertson: again, I see we had a very good working relationship with pdot over this process.

Katz: We'll get through it.

Culbertson: I was surprised that it came back with changes. Pdot—I recommend, I understand some of the concern is a budget, and committing to something that couldn't always happen. So I would suggest a little bit of massaging here, instead of using a dynamic dialogue model indicating we would always do it, we could say including a dialogue model that solicits input without saying regular. We're assuming regular, but not defining it legally. So we would say, include soliciting input and using the knowledge and resources of southwest citizens. So we're not tying it to being the broadest possible audience. That would just be a massage to make it less legally binding. On the fourth piece, which is t-18, this would—this came out of the through-put word, and I think the

JUNE 1, 2000

difficulty now is that we do have to face the problems already existing in— and—lack of what's happened in the past. Going forward from now, we do— reduces congestion, manages congestion, would hopefully be very similar things, but you have the historic build-up, and that seems to be what we already have, and that isn't efficient. It's more a problem of what has happened. The concept of maintaining all streets I admit looking at it today does seem very broad. What we had hoped to bring into the—there were some actions specific action items where citizens could help maintain their gravel streets in a pool concept. It would still be citizen-based and funded, but this overall policy would allow that to be an action item under it. So we're just possibly—local streets could be interpreted that way but we were looking for that inclusion of gravel streets not for the city to maintain, but a citizen basis for maintaining.

Katz: That's it? Marie, I hope somebody is keeping track of all of this. You're trying. I know. Okay. Keep going. Let's go. No. Are you finished?

Culbertson: I have one more piece about the terwilliger parkway. We had suggested language early on that might be helpful to reinforce the primary transportation functions of degrees ignited scenic drives and parkways by discouraging heavy volumes of commuter traffic.

Katz: You're the point person on transportation from the— okay. We'll call you back up later on.

Don Baack: I live in hillsdale, i'm also talking about transportation. First of all, I want to complement marie on the fantastic job of facilitation she's done. She's done a really great job. Done very well at it. I commend her. First of all, we're talking about a barbur, and I want to include the words i-5 corridor study. It isn't just barbur, it's i-5 and barbur and how they work together. It includes in the definition that you have there, the south Portland town center. I'm affirm one believing you do projects from the—when the ducks are flying. You don't go hunting when the ducks aren't there. The ducks aren't there on the south Portland town center. That should be held back, and done as a separate activity. In the cost of not doing that will be great chaos, because the positions are fixed, the personalities are strong, and the views are not at all in my view anywhere close to a compromise. So the south Portland town center in my opinion should be put off as a second thing, maybe three, four years. One thing in correlation, because we want to do the corridor study, we don't support the Portland transit center changes. Where the word is put in as needed versus appropriate as related to pedestrian changes, I would like to see it say as needed. In talking to staff about pedestrian improvements in southwest, I found more concern for the landscaping that the particular people along the street have than they have for the pedestrian safety. I find that outrageous. Things like needed are much more strong than appropriate, because appropriate is a very wiggly word— on t-16, dialogue, I really, really think it's important that be in there. Let me give you an example. In recent days, the—our staff from Portland pdot—pdot has said they should remove the— i find that outrageous. When we've put in the hours and hours we have, to have that happen without any discussion, no reasoning, no nothing— nothing made advice ill to us. We have ownership in that. We want to be part of that. We don't want to have these things changed arbitrarily or capriciously as it may not be the case, but it appears at this point without having the benefit of a dialogue. So the dialogue process is important to us. The final point I want to make is relating to infrastructure and funding. We've got a lot of things in southwest that we've got a lot of opinions on, people have pieces of the picture. I don't think any of us have a complete picture. I'd like to suggest that in your deliberations you think about organizing a pilot study where we look at the watershed in southwest, a small watershed, maybe divide it in two, and we look at it and—looking at transportation infrastructure needs, and—including the arterials as well as local streets and look at the watershed management issues, the groundwater and the surface— subsurface water, the surface water and the groundwater, and looking at that in conjunction with the transportation and all the other stuff, then look at ways and costs of doing things, like figuring out what the groundwater is, can we do it with surveys. Things—just using the knowledge that's in the neighborhood without going through expensive techniques. Or do we have to do the expensive things? Do we need all those things?

JUNE 1, 2000

Because we may find we don't need to know that. But do it on a small pilot basis, soon, and do it well with citizen input and appropriate staff people involved. But look at it as a pilot thing saying, okay, if it doesn't work, walk away from it. But take what we learn and go forward and move on in that way.

Liz Callison, liz callison, 60 three 9 southwest knightsbridge drive. I've given kay—britta some testimony for the record and i'm sorry I didn't bring enough copies for all of you, but i'll get you some if you're interested. Please let the record remain open for additional testimony on all aspects of these policies. At least until the schedule june 21st hearing. By restricting testimony to nonconsent or other arbitrary categories, you would soon to be using the task force and—in the process in general as a tool against many citizens who don't care to interact through a city-sponsored ad hoc community or sweeney committee. If council wishes to claim public endorsement of the plan or its policies, including whether or not it should continue to exist, and be funded as a civic project, I suggest council should hold an open public hearing in the southwest district with mailed notice to all potentially affected property owners. I hope the council is aware there is no widespread public support for this plan. In fact, at the only two large scale community meetings on the plan, overwhelmingly the response was negative n one large meeting at wilson high school, not only were there more than 500 people to signed up to testify, but out of them only two supported the proposed southwest community plan. Forced housing density will increase stresses to all local services. Including human resources. Increase in cost and liabilities to many taxpayers not only southwest residents and property owners. This plan has already costing the city about \$2 million as well as six years and thousands of hours of well-intentioned trusting neighborhood volunteers' time to grind through repetitive committees, which have no legal standing and whose work is often erased by the next top-down appointed committee. This is money and time that on have been better spent on enhancing basic infrastructure or human services, not just forcing density increases that only land speculators really want. Regarding a technical basis for the plan, in several aspects the plan still ignores the need for crucial and basic technical reviews. Even when planners have been presented with reports during the past six years, they have not sufficiently acknowledged this assistance. For example, the west Multnomah water conservation district commissioned two planning level reports on the hydrology and limitations of the fanno watershed this. Is a large portion of this whole southwest plan ore. This—these were submitted to the official record along with explanatory information and a conservation map of the southwest. Tease reports were not even referenced in the latest city document. The report from the southwest watershed's working group. If the city had done its own analysis and watershed planning, our reports would be arguably less crucial to the creation of an adequate plan for southwest. However, the city has not donny comparable work. Another particular value of our technical assistance is its neutrality as a commission work. Our district has a fairly simple mission of natural resource conservation and is not tied to city contracts or bureau agendas. On the other hand, the city's sewer and storm water bureau has a conflicted of interest in management of stream corridors and wetlands as they're used for their own utility pipes and outfalls. The reports were submit—we're submit can again to the city have the goal of maintaining and improving watershed help and health and the map shows areas for limited redevelopment. By the way, the 1999 report recommendations and map were endorsed by the southwest neighborhood associations coalition in december '99, and i'll stop, but you have the rest of my testimony. Thank you very much. I do hope you leave this record open.

Katz: I don't plan to shut off the testimony. I know everybody is going to be horrified at the notion, but once we have adopted everything, I think in all fairness we ought to give everybody another opportunity to comment, maybe say thank you.

Callison: I would appreciate just that in itself. Thank you very much.

Katz: Now, the other issue— this is the one that I think is the more difficult one. I sit on a lot of groups to try to integrate the work of other groups in the community. It is hard work to collaborate

JUNE 1, 2000

and to integrate the work done by a variety of groups outside of the jurisdiction. Just having a report and handing it off isn't going to make it happen. And so that is another—you might want to think about how you get that work integrated in city—in the city work plan, or in the city reports. It is very—

Callison: you know, we've met all year deadlines. We've handed it in at the right deadlines and haven't gotten any response or any apparent acknowledgment that you can use the work. So i'm bringing it to you again at city council. I've been involved with this plan since '94. And so I don't go to every committee meeting. I have, like you, and everybody else here, I do have another life too. But we try to track things, and we try to hit the key moments.

Katz: These are reports that have been submitted on—by our request?

Callison: no. They were submitted on our— whatever you call—initiative to you. And to your staff and the planning commission. This is the first time we've had the opportunity to bring them to city council, of course.

Katz: All right. Thank you.

Olson: I only show one more person.

Katz: Come on up. You'll come back later? Good. Thank you. For those of you who are going to be representing the sections, hold off and then we'll come on back and we'll include your testimony as well. Britta? Keep going.

Amanda Fritz, Planning Commission: i'm testifying for myself, just to follow the last speaker, the west Multnomah conservation studies are listed and were used by the watershed report. Most of the new language is a great improvement, and certainly kudos to the task force and to marie for working on it. Both of the corrections in the statement made last time have minor wording errors and I would ask you to authorize the staff to refine any necessary tweaks prior to your final vote. In the interest—it was negotiated with the community in 1998, it was an extensive dialogue process with the summit and other groups to get to the lands use and urban form policy. It's important to have a land use and urban form policy. I think it's very important to leave in the west Portland town center as reference with the asterisk, because that officially puts that designation on hold. I do support taking out the specific language from page 7 of the land use and urban form policy, which really tries to outline what the previous vision for that area was. However, I want us to acknowledge that by taking that out we're throwing out hundreds of hours of volunteer work. There was a cac, I think we spent \$100,000 on a consultant to help produce that vision. So there's no community consensus, but we should at least shed a tear as wes to it toss it out. I also support taking out the transit center. Again, because it needs to go to the future process. My concern is that there was a lot of—that people have questioned whether it's okay for other people to bring in new proposals at this stage, and I think it is. And I think we need to get to a place where we need to bring up new ideas. We should put off the west Portland town center planning for several years. Setting the boundaries is one of the key problems for the 2040 areas. You'll be asked to assign that to a nearby future planning process. The problem is that we don't have a diverse group of people participating at this point. We have a lot of diligent people still hanging in there on the task force, but in the citizen involvement policy you tend to tentatively adopted, you didn't say neighborhood associations could appointed all the members of the task force to make advisory decisions to you. I think we need to hold off on those kinds of bigger picture policy—processes so that we can all take a break, plant some trees, do neighborhood enhancement and bite off different parts of the community plan that are easier to chew. For instance, the neighborhoods plans. Either that or make a policy call for instance that anybody within a five-minute walk of these 2040 areas is within the planning area. There is a problem the planning area for these 2040 areas and the area where in will be upzoning or are changes may be different. In our neighborhood we wanted to have a big planning area, so we agreed to have a very wide area for—that would be designated town center because we felt like people even a mile away from the barbur and capital intersection needed to have a say in that process. This is going to come up in the upcoming

JUNE 1, 2000

goals 1, 2, and 10 comprehensive plan updates that is coming to you this summer. There is a map in there that shows the town center in west Portland a mile from the intersection. Our neighborhood thought that yes, those people need to be included in the discussions. Other neighborhoods have one lot deep and felt that was where we would do any of the changes. So the boundary issue is a major one. I don't see us any closer to being able to discuss that in any constructive way at all. Can I comment on a couple more things?

Katz: Quickly.

Fritz: the reason the transportation objective—i asked for it to be moved from consent to nonconsent. The community at large had not seen the list of consent/nonconsent items last time. I miss add couple of meetings and had not seen the list. That t-1 objective that talks about appropriate places for pedestrian pass, the last hearing, three of you said very strongly there are places in southwest where fish and wildlife protection is the— what we need to have. So regardless of whether a pedestrian pass might be needed, if this is pristine natural resources, we may not—it may not be appropriate to put a pathway through there. And I would really hope you would support the new language. Pf-8 talks about protecting natural water crosses and the staff response says that the e zones do that. First of all, they don't necessarily cover all the areas that need to be protected or else it's not designated where the water feature is within those zones. Groundwater recharge outside of those zones also protects water features, so that is important to keep in. That also talks about considering views. You did that in the hollywood-sandy rezone can where with you didn't—you—you didn't protect views but moved beyond previous city policy of not considering views at all to saying, yes, there's a hill here with nice homes on it and we might want to think about the effect of any height increases in front of that. You didn't say we're going to protect it, but consider it. Finally in h-3, it talks about developing zoning and design tools. I would like to add in fact the task force agreed to ask the word "subdivision." This is where I think we could really get to the issue that you talked about last time of design compatibility within neighborhoods. I would like to see you adopt the neighborhood plans as the next step. That's the next logical step from these policies. The neighborhood plans if done correctly have desired character statements in them. If when we do the land division code we include a reference to the comprehensive plan and if the neighborhood plans are adopted as part of the plan, you've made that connection. The desired character in the neighborhood plans and the voluntary design guidelines are all voluntary. It's not like we're setting up '92 or '96 design areas, but we're making a little bit better of a connection than we have done already. So I would really encourage you to go that.

Katz: Thanks, amanda. We're going to have to—this is a work schedule issue. All right.

Katz: (to John) We never got to your document yet.

John Alland, Advisory Committee: 10463 SW 53rd, 97219. that's fine.

Katz: Well, it's not. We—you put a lot of time in it.

Alland: I want to thank the staff and the council for the years work that all of you put into this. This is mounds and mounds, you saw the file cabinets last time. Keeping very specifically to the points today that have to do with page 7, in the barbur boulevard-west Portland town center, yes, it's contentious, there are a lot of folks that have issues about this. This is beyond just this one neighborhood. This—or the neighborhoods involved. This is a citywide issue. I disagree with that—it should be put off for five years. It needs to be looked at and moved forward. Yes, property says needs to be open and mere people brought in, but it's not something to put off into the back. The other section has to do with the removal of the sections 1 through 4. I can see where we went through the west Portland town center study, \$100,000 was spent on a grant through the state. There were—wording can be used. If you remove the specifics, area, along the vicinity of capital highway, the words actually work very well and fit in with city policy, especially number 2, where you provide a coordinated bicycle pedestrian transit infrastructure. These are fit city policy, and i'd urge you to look at this as actually being more feasible and usable than number 2 on page 8, where you encourage

JUNE 1, 2000

something in a single sentence. The purpose of the policies in my mind are a very broad definition of what we want to see in southwest. And there should be some mention of the policies and the urban form we want to see along the barbur corridor, within the fountain center area. Without these specific—being specific, because the town center corridor should be a planned district as we brought forward in our—the cac report submitted to you last time of testimony, it's a tool that the city needs to use, but there should be some statement in there of what the vision is and the broader policy for—in the urban form section for the corridor and the town center. So I thank you, I agree with the asterisk the town center designation remain and I hope you relook at the sections 1 through 4 on page 7 on how you use that.

Kay Durtschi, Citizens Advisory Committee: 2230 SW Caldew, 97219. just quick. I just want to point out three things. Number 1, it's been referred to the parkway, terwilliger parkway being extended. I would like you to include that clear to the county line, not just stop at the city limits, because that's the way the friends of terwilliger have proposed this and worked it—at great length with clackamas county to try to include that. So i'm just asking you to consider that when you look at that.

Katz: We'll talk about that.

Durtschi: number 2, page 29, t-18. If you would please look at the option language and emphasize, underline multimodal. Because it seems to me that most of the discussion today has been around pedestrians. They've left out bicycles, and I think we need to emphasize multimodal. That's my emphasis to you right now. Last but not least is the west Portland town center. I won't add any more comment. I think both amanda and john have covered that very well, except that for the last six weeks i've had a job where i've had to go through that intersection, morning and evening rush hour, and it's an unbelievable what people are doing to get through there to go where they want to go. All of it, if you put policemen out there you'd have a whale of a lot of traffic tickets that you could draw in because people are not doing what they're supposed to be doing in that intersection. It needs help. and it needs it now. Thank you.

Katz: Okay, folks. Let's—are you going to testify on a specific area?

Corrine Weber: 6245 SW 39th, 97221. I have three things listed here. Page 15. corrinne webber, 6245 southwest 39th avenue. On page 15, we're talking on h-1 objective. In the center column it says provide opportunities to achieve likely—achieve the development of new housing units over the next 20 years to accommodate new residents. I think a period should be inserted there. I think the rest is—we have already done some of this, by the way, if you recall with our accessory development dwelling units. As I understand, they are really developing quite actively. On page 17, we talk about the desired neighborhood character throughout this—neighborhood character throughout this document. And I would support heartily amanda's suggestion that the next step in this process should be to prove the neighborhood—approve the neighborhood association plans, because they do describe desired character of the neighborhood. And lastly, on page 29, t-18, reduces—the word reduces versus the word manages, I would certainly strongly endorse the word “reduces.” We do have a very serious congestion problem. It's not going to get better. And just managing it could manage it at any level. You're not—managing doesn't really specify trying to alleviate in any way. You could manage it at, you know, at gridlock if you wanted to. That's my testimony.

Katz: Thank you.

Weber: have a good day.

Katz: All right. I—let me say on the neighborhood plans, i'm trying to be disciplined myself as well as the council, as well as the community on our ability to deal with a whole variety of issues within a time line and a budget. I will bring that issue back up with gil and deborah, and marie in terms of what's next. So i've heard it in our conversations on a weekly basis. I'll bring it back up. But I can't make any promises today in terms of where we go next. So come on up.

== I think we'll need several chairs.

JUNE 1, 2000

Katz: Mark and Jerry, and another chair for the members of the task force that have a specific area.
== we'll start with—do you want to start with public facilities or transportation?

Katz: It doesn't make any difference.

== public facilities, we'd also like to have Matt John and— Matt Brown and John Gillham up here.

Katz: All right. Hold on. What color is it? Give us colors. Green. There are two greens.

==page 7.

Katz: You're hearing—not hearing people. Do you want to come up closer to the front?

== there's nothing wrong with my hearing.

Katz: What did you say? [laughter]

== I don't think the mikes are working.

Katz: That may be so. Britta, can you raise it up a little?

Olson: I don't know what more to do.

Katz: Folks, raise your voices a little bit. Marie. Walk us through now so that we can go through it and raise any of the questions that were raised by the citizens referencing this particular section.

Marie Johnson: okay. I'll start with four items that we have classified as consent. Contentment would be flies, but I think consented is what we're talking about.

Katz: Page 7.

Marie Johnson: page 7, e-1. The task force has proposed a policy that says, ensure adequate public facilities for both existing and new development through equitable funding mechanisms. Item p-2.

The task force has suggested an objective that reads, evaluate current deficiencies and public facilities. Item p-3 on page 8. The task force had proposed an objective and later agreed to an alternative objective. That alternative reads, develop a long-range plan and strategies to improve infrastructure consistent with the southwest community plan objectives. Item pf-6. The task force proposes an objective and agreed to have it revised as follows. Ensure the provision of new public facilities main tanks or enhances the functions of existing public facilities. start by reviewing those.

Katz: Council feels comfortable with those adjustments to these items, and to leave them as consent items. Hearing no objections, let's move on to the amended items.

Marie Johnson: on page 9, item pf-4. The task force has proposed the following objective. Ensure new development takes place only when it is in conjunction with existing adequate public facilities or plans—includes plans to bring inadequate infrastructure up to standard without burdening existing property owners. Staff felt this objective repeats some of the issues in pf-5. There are some differences, but also some similarities. Do you want me to go through them individually, or review all of them and go back to discuss individual items?

Francesconi: Individually.

Katz: No, let's do them individually.

Marie Johnson: the staff had the following comments. This item and item pf-5 overlap to a certain degree. The l.i.d. Reevaluation project is examining ways to restructure approaches for providing local improvements to avoid disproportionately burdening property owners. And there's a comp plan policy that deals with this issue in—and it reads, you're bang development should occur only where urban public facilities and services exist or can reasonably be made available.

Mark Sieber, Citizens Advisory Committee: I think in order to understand what we were doing with these objectives, I'll give you a brief comment and then go from there. We did not have the expectation that this was something you could just easily adopt as it's written. It was in many ways—

Katz: We may have a mike problem.

Olson: I've tried, and I've called general services.

Mark Sieber: when we wrote these pieces, particularly the first one, pf-4, we were relatively certain this was not something you could adopt as written. The pattern we had in the last meeting we can—a week and a half ago was you were asking us for what we thought might be mechanisms for

JUNE 1, 2000

getting some of these things accomplished, even though the policy itself might be unmanaged by its size. So going on that model, we have written out a number of things we thought could contribute to getting to the actual needs of these objectives. Objective 3, pf-4, we're talking about what we were commonly calling concurrency, which meant as development occurs, we need to have it supported by infrastructure. And in number—objective 4, pf-5, we were talking about getting those connections to happen. I think one of the best ways to look at this is as a model of how you bring something that's already behind the curve, not only up to speed, but also take care of future additions to it all at one time. Which is very difficult to do. So in order to get to that, we've listed a number of small pieces, some of which have already been discussed in some of the other policies, that if all added together, would get us much closer to taking care of that broad set of system problems. And i'll just run through those quickly.

Katz: Before you run through those, the comp plan public facilities on 11.2, it states, urban development shall occur only when public facilities and services exist or can reasonably be made available. Is that something that you would feel comfortable with?

Sieber: in fact, that's what we're—the specifics were—we're addressing is to get to that.

Katz: Go ahead, then.

== I guess there would be some --

Francesconi: Before you go to specs, I was at the same place as the mayor. What's wrong were that statement instead of your general statement? Let's say your statement, what's wrong with that statement?

Sieber: it is fine. We were flushing that out and trying to make it more specific.

Katz: I think we realize their statement, we weren't going to buy into it and—but you want to be a little bit more specific.

Jere Retzer, West Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District: there's also very much of the cost or burden issue involved, because in particularly in southwest, which—what you had is a situation where the easy places were developed years ago, and so the places that were passed by are the places in a lot of cases involve did it slopes, involve sensitive natural areas, or close to those kinds of areas, that for some reason people didn't develop them, primarily because of cost. So now you combine that and there are changes and standards over the years. We have higher levels of environmental protection, among other things. The cost of going back now and infilling really is a function of having an urban growth boundary and attempting to prevent sprawl. That cost can fall disproportionately on the property owners that happen to be there next to that unimproved area.

Katz: Okay. Let's hear some of the specifics.

Retzer: i'll give a list of potential remedies, and then wall talk about potential ways to pay for them. In order to achieve the goals of these policies, I think we need to have a collection of appropriate analytical financial and implementation tools. Some of those tools might include, and this is not running a short list, we need a surface water management plan for all southwest watersheds. We're getting close to being able to do that with what's been happening with the work group, and the watershed policies. What that includes in analytical terms is a top of the hill down to the stream hydrology analysis during the wet season. When we've started researching this plan, I went looking for a stud toy find out where the water came from, where it went. Nobody really knows. The quantification is not done. The quality work is done at the stream level by b.e.s. So they know on—as a whole what the watershed health looks like, but they don't know the physical parameters of where the water starts and where it comes from and what the actual dangers of landslide and those sort of problems are.

Francesconi: Wait. Time out. I've got to call a process question. We're here—we're coming up with language. I'm not clear—do you have specific language you want to be inserted here?

JUNE 1, 2000

Sieber: okay. What I wanted to do is get into conversation with you guys about what kind of tools we either have or might need to fill in the gaps in order to holistically reach the kind of solution that's we're looking for in the objective. So I can be less specific about each piece if you like.

Katz: Is it possible—let me piggy back on what jim just said. Is it something you want us to affirm that this is what we need, assuming we can affirm that? Do you want us to identify those as examples of work that will need to be done?

Sieber: yes. I think that's true. Some of it is partially done and some of it isn't. And the reason i'm listing it all together, it only works if all the pieces are there.

Katz: Why don't you list—

Sieber: we need surface water management plan, including analysis and engineering analysis, slopes right now are adjudicated by engineers generally during the dry season on a site-by-site basis. If we're going to have the watershed management we need to know how it can be developed in terms of engineering. We also need provisions for the connection of each site already existing or developed within southwest to be connected to that watershed management system. But—without knowing where the water is going to go, we default to either trying to keep out site, which is often inappropriate on a slope, or it gets dumped on the next guy on the hill, and that's going to be developed in a couple of years. And so what we're talking about is not only wholesale management of the environmental resources, but also of the human resources as they relate to that. We also need transportation level of service evaluations that are based on what the streets really perform like today. The current classifications say this is what we'd like them to behave like. A lot of times we don't know how they actually behave today. We also need alternative standards for street design, street surface materials, and city and private maintenance of substandard residential streets. It was mentioned earlier by bop that we don't maintain substandard streets. And yet that's resulted in a model where the old streets, which were annexed from the city to the city from the county, are continuing to degrade and— unless the citizens can afford them, and generally those are in the areas where it's hard to build and it's more expensive, and those only get triggered, those l.i.d.s, by the infill. We also want to ask for look at the investigation of alternative financial tools, both all local regional state federal and private, and what we propose is considering how programs such as esa can be tied together by an overall public facilities strategy, and the design of that needs to target pilot project like don was talking about, in order to determine what the potential mix of tools can be for that, both financial and physical. Bop has responded to the l.i.d. Redesign process. It's a good start, but it's only really looking at the tactical end of the piece. It's looking at one specific tool and it's doing a the bit of stretching to see if we can maybe do some maintenance of streets that aren't up to standards, and some of those questions are just starting to come on to the scale. They don't really have the mandate to look at what kind of regional or state funds can be leveraged into that equation. And so we're going to end up hitting a ceiling there unless we have directive from you to have that committee or another committee really expand our scope enough to figure out how do cost and benefit fit within the urban growth boundary. Because it's triggered different mechanisms for infill than if we were in the sprawl model. Those sites are getting targeted for infill, even though they're not particularly affordable. One of the tools that commissioner Francesconi was mentioning last time was a form of zoning which is trigger only when adequate public facilities are in place. And the task force had a discussion about this over the last couple meeting. There were diverse opinions, but I think we had some common concerns about how to go about doing that. One was a historical thing several people mentioned, and I think I need to say, we had asked about a similar sort of tool about 31/2 years ago, and we're told just outright that no, that's illegal, that can't be done. So if it could be done, I think it's certainly worth investigating. The questions we had which were the concern was what level would that tool actually be applied. If you were going to rezone an area that would then be held in advance until there were public facilities in place—

Katz: Actually—

Sieber: how big of an area woe that be?

Katz: We've done that. I don't know who told you that was illegal.

Sieber: in was several years ago. If we were to do a relatively small area, we were concerned it would end up in a lot of litigation. To do big areas, we would also want to then see whether it might not be a appropriate to bring in the infrastructure and then rezone. So those are two of the extremes of that model, but if there's some functional piece in between, we'd certainly like to discuss that. We're also concerned about what level of public facilities is considered adequate. Because that adequacy is defined from any number of sources right now, and in fact sometimes, for example, in the way that odot has benchmarks for state highways within the city, the status quo is generally redefined as adequate at various intervals. So we want something that reflects what happens on the ground.

Katz: Let me ask process wise, this discussion I think is very good. This was one of the most critical pieces that the task force brought over. And it's an issue that keeps coming up when we have development issues around, should we allow this for development when we don't have the infrastructure. Marie—deborah. Is this something that we may want to include as examples? Is this something we may want to include as an addendum to identify that these were the issues that were brought up for the council and for the bureaus to consider and get to that as we begin reviewing our comp plans? Help me out on this.

Deborah Stein, Planning Bureau: what comes to mind—I recall about maybe two years ago that we had a council work session on infrastructure, and a lot of these questions I came— think came up then. It was a really interesting discussion. I always felt like there needed to be some follow up to that. What it's making me think is that maybe we time some kind of follow-up discussion. These are great points. They're very thought-provoking. They're things the city should be—

Katz: How do we capture— this is citywide.

Stein: what i'd like to do is look at all my notes from the work session that happened a couple years ago and see if there's new thinking. I think there's work that's being done, you know, a lot of the work matt is doing is very relevant. You're right, it's only a piece of all this, so maybe coming back with something timed concurrently with as we move forward with southwest, I don't know exactly, I have to think about what do we do with this and where does it fit, but I think keeping the conversation alive is very timely, and—

Katz: My sense is we're going to get several of these examples of things that the council is going to need to look at citywide, and i'd want to capture it somewhere, maybe not necessarily in the document per se, mark, but capture it somewhere to acknowledge what you would identify—what you had identified and maybe include some other items. Marie, jump in.

Marie Johnson: i'm wondering if what the task force could do is draft a report to cancel about follow-up based on what's happened in the policy, you know, in your policy deliberations, and to help inform the next phase of the process. And then if it's submitted to council, it's in the legal record, and it's something the task force comes to agreement on.

Katz: A follow-up report to our deliberations.

Marie Johnson: it would be good to do it after we do the l.i.d. Redesign.

Katz: Well, it's—but his is much bigger than the l.i.d. Redesign.

Matt Brown, Portland Department of Transportation (PDOT): my name is matt brown, i'm with transportation l.i.d. Administrator. I think mark is right in the l.i.d. Process, first and foremost we're trying to fix that tool itself specifically, but I think we're also taking a broader view of how do we fund design construct maintain local infrastructure improvements, so there is this broader view of how those things are provided and funded, et cetera. And I think all of the things that he listed there to a certain degree are going to be captured within what we're doing. They may not be fleshed out like you said, but I think we want to capture those and they should be part of our conversation as we discuss the l.i.d. Redesign effort as well. I expect we're going to have a couple steps to that process.

JUNE 1, 2000

The first process is going to focus on the tool, and then some follow-up work folks seen on getting far enough along these other tools we can give the appropriate direction to appropriate people and get these going. So I think mark is right in the way that he described the process. I also think there's a way to pick these up and continue the conversation on in that context.

Katz: I don't—i just am a little nervous it will be narrowed, but go ahead.

Brown: it's broader than the financing. We're looking at alternative street designs and things like that as well.

Katz: But—one second.

Michaelson: this is really a fundamental quandary dilemma. If we map and look at the way things should be 20 years from now, we're going to be setting zoning designation that's are totally inappropriate based on the infrastructure that existed today. If we zone based on today's infrastructure, we're going to miss opportunities on future development and improvement. We need work done about how to balance that dilemma, because it really will affect the outcome of the map, what the neighborhoods are willing to accept, what the neighborhoods want to see combination order what the promises and hope for infrastructure are.

Retzer: I don't want to overload the wonderful concept we have going with the underground watershed that's going to start this summer. I think it's an opportunity to start thinking about this issue. For one, the streets are such a key part of—we have about 40% of our streets in southwest that are substandard and many of them unpaved. And the—in accordance with the current standards, the current streets when they go on, they're much broader. They all have a very severe impact by historic design upon the run-off. So as we think about the integrated watershed plan, think about the infrastructure that needs to be in place through whatever mapping we do, that I think is an opportunity to start thinking about what are those piece and how do we put them together and—in terms of what mark laid out.

Sten: I think my concrete suggestion is this one is going to have to hold until a little later, but let's see if I can frame a thought. It seems to me in my own opinion on where I am in this language is heavily tied to how much you're actually remapping. And what I mean by that is to the extent that you're going to do a bold—i'm not saying what that means, but a bold rethinking of where the development should go and why, and I like as an aside, I hope this clarifies, I like a lot the housing language you came up with. It's great. To the extent you're hitting that and saying, we're going to rezone this housing into certain places that makes more sense to us, you're going to—my issue is meet the goals, I don't care where you put it so much, and that implies or explicitly lace out an infrastructure agenda that we then have plans to move forward on, I get real comfortable with saying let's not actually build it until that's in place. So the extent that at the end of this vision process, which is as hard as this is where we're at now, we come to the conclusion we're not remapping much, then I have no interest in this language because you're essentially stopping forward movement with it, which isn't what i'm saying you want to do, and i'm not comfortable putting a moratorium on development without—which i'm not sure we could do legally, but voting to say we're not going to move forward until infrastructure is in place when I don't see a proactive plan to figure out— so I think to the extent that we're moving forward on the remapping, this begins to be the right strategy to me, and that's the comment.

Francesconi: Can I expand on that? To the citywide focus, in turning to the planning bureau in that regard, not only does that fall on southwest to respond to what commissioner Sten said, but the reason to do big planning and to pull this so we can have an overall look at the city, so in addition we have to talk about how are we going to fund this and in what priority order. And so outside of tax increment districts, how do we fund some of these things so you have to equate that into this, and then we need recommendations as to what part of the cities we should be prioritizing the infrastructure, because this is where we want to get to where commissioner Sten is 20 years from

JUNE 1, 2000

now. But we just can't be reacting to every neighborhood or part of the city. We have to have some overall strategy.

Stein: I completely—i completely agree with that. We've talked about working towards a day when we have an integrated citywide public facilities plan that really isn't looking bureau by bureau, but looks at the whole city with all the infrastructure needs over a long period of time. How does that get delivered, what are the priorities, and I think that's the time when this really gets discussed, because you're right, there's a huge investment, do we put it here, there, where is it best needed. And looking at it with a city wide prospective is critical to me.

Sten: the other piece, bold identification and rezoning of good more intense development opportunities in the area creates money for the infrastructure. I don't care how many citywide priority studies you have, we don't have a nickel for infrastructure. You have to channel redevelopment in order to get the infrastructure. It has to be driven by the market as well as public funding, or we can never get there. The existing development pattern is what's killing the streams. Existing. So if you freeze things as they are and buffer the streams, you might modestly slow down the extinction of the species, but that's about it. You have to rebuild the area and the infrastructure, and that takes new development. It is—it means we've got to have a bold thinking of what do we want to do to go with what we don't want to happen. That's where I am on this.

Katz: I think what mark was saying—I don't think mark was disagreeing with you, but—and mark, correct me, I think what mark was saying is that we need to begin to take a look at all these kinds of analysis as we continue our work in managing the growth of the city. And we haven't really done that. And that's i—I think that's the point that I got. I don't think you're calling for a moratorium.

Retzer: no. One of the things we are—that is exactly one of the points. We need that broad scale thinking and strategy in order to do each small piece. But I think maybe we can jump-start some of the small pieces with pilot projects, and this might fit in with what rick was saying about when we do our zoning map, maybe we could target a few areas that are combined, a number of these dies, and see if we can do that targeting and leveraging of a whole different series of funding source and physical tools. That will teach us what can be applied—we're still thinking in terms of broad redevelopment. But I think we could actually repair some of the damage on smaller scales if we could only leverage the funding to do that. And it wouldn't require the kind of housing redevelopment we're used to.

Katz: And I think this needs this is a city—this work, just like the l.i.d., Is a citywide task. So for staff, figure out how we whether it's a report by the southwest community task force members after we adopt this, whether you want to asterisk in identifying—and identify, you know, some goals for us to take a look at to meet these objectives and take a look at this integrated approach to how we manage development in the future. And the pilot. The pilot projects, i'm not familiar enough, but it sounds like that may be a way to go.

Saltzman: Didn't laurel, last year, didn't do you a big comprehensive stud I this very topic? So how does that fit into this? Are we just starting over again?

Katz: No, it's different. We'll—let's—if we have time—it's different. She was looking at the cost of growth, and the impact of the growth. What they're looking at is specifically identified the tasks that we need to look at and we need to—the work we need to do so that we can manage the growth much better. For lack of a better way of saying it. All right. So do you feel comfortable with that? We adopt the comp plan public facilities language, or maybe we don't—
== we don't need to.

Katz: But i'll have staff figure out with you, mark and jere, what would be the best way to capture this. I know there is going to be other language we want to capture. All right.

Marie Johnson: the next item, pf-5, says protect southwest community resources by requiring new development to be fully connect and served by adequate infrastructure.

JUNE 1, 2000

Retzer: I think I addressed that in the last discussion. These two are lumped together. So what I think we would like to hear from you is just the acknowledgment that you understand that there is a deficit and that we need to learn how to get from where that is to where things are under control.

Francesconi: We understand, mark.

Katz: We acknowledge it. I want to capture it. We won't include the language in pf 4 and 5, but I think you're right on target, and—in what you've identified. The language you use is probably not acceptable, but we understand.

Marie Johnson: pf-7, the task force has proposed an objective that reads, develop a process involving public participation to find an equitable fund— regional mechanism for funding improvements to an adequate infrastructure or additional needed for new development. The planning bureau proposed an alternative. Pursue new mechanisms for equitably funding improvements to public facilities.

Retzer: there was a little division on the task force, because people were suspicious of the word “equitably,” because they had seen in the past projects that were supposed to be equitable and it didn't work out that way. I think in general that captures what we were driving at. I don't see there's a huge difference from what we already said, and if you could live with what we said originally, that would be better. What this actually gets to is the piece I said about having to enlarge the scope of the l.i.d. Group. And maybe rather than in this policy if we could get just— that you are interested in expanding that scope of investigation to beyond just looking at the l.i.d. Tool that really looking at the regional mechanisms for cost and benefit, that would go along—a long way toward what we're looking for.

Katz: Do you feel comfortable with their objective 6, or do you want to adopt the staff recommendations with—but with the understanding that this is something that we will pursue?

Hales: What do you mean by the word “regional”?

Sieber: the best description we have is that regionally, by that I mean within the jurisdiction of what you guys deal with, the urban growth boundary has force add different dynamics I can in who pay and who ends up being burdened. That's what's needs to be address order a broader scale than the local improvement level.

Hales: Do you mean beyond the city? Or do you mean regional as in metro, or regional as in bigger inc. The neighborhood?

regional, as big as you guys are willing to bite off, and as willing as you are to connect with those other pieces.

Hales: I would suggest leaving that modifier out, with the understanding we are looking at stuff beyond the neighborhood, but I certainly wouldn't tie our ability to solve problems in southwest to action by metro.

Sieber: that's what I understand.

Saltzman: Other than that could I live with your version.

Katz: Okay. Let me suggest that we take the “regional” out and does council feel they can live with the task force language?

Francesconi: Sure.

Saltzman: Funding mechanisms --

Katz: Equitable—

Hales: for funding improvements to inadequate infrastructure. And additional infrastructure needed for new development. But—that's what I would suggest.

Katz: And? Instead of or. Okay.

== there's going to be more than one tool, I would suspect.

Katz: So it's mechanism—

== look at one for our own.

JUNE 1, 2000

== right.

Katz: Keep going.

Marie Johnson: pf-8.

Katz: Everybody feel comfortable with that on the council? All right. Go ahead.

Marie Johnson: the task force has proposed the following objective. Develop land use patterns and public facilities that protect natural watercourse and minimize the impacts of landslides and earthquakes, consider view sheds and conform improvements to the topography. We've—the planning bureau has the following comments, and I don't know that I need to read each one.

Francesconi: Do any of what they want conflict with any of those policies? Is there conflicts?

Marie Johnson: the issue about view sheds, the city only protects public views. The—there was an analysis done several years ago about visual resources views, and the city recognized that public views benefit a far greater number of people than private views, and that if we're to do if we protect views in any way, then it could stop any increase in height of building, it could be problematic to deal with. I also wanted to say there's a concern about conforming improvements to topography. We agree topography should be taken into consideration when improvements are being made. But there may be times when the it isn't appropriate, effective for a number of reasons it may be difficult to conform the improvements.

Saltzman: Can you give an example of what you mean? What specific—

Sieber: what we were getting at was don't bull doze down a significant feature in order to put in a, say, infrastructure piece. In other words, try and design that around that. This was a very clumsy way of saying that, but that was what we were getting at, that general concept.

Katz: Rick?

Michaelson: I am very sympathy they tick with the thought and attention behind this, but there's a problem with the language. If I saw a word that said minimize—use the land use plan process to minimize the potential impacts of earthquakes, that to me would mean we could downzone everything on the hillsides to r-20. So I think it clearly has to be taken into account and worked on, but minimize is probably the wrong word.

Katz: Council? Hello?

Saltzman: we have objectives three, four and six that more or less covers the same language.

Marie Johnson: I wouldn't say they cover it exactly. I'd say they in some—at some level address some of these issues.

Francesconi: If you said “consider view sheds and topography,” is that going too far? Would that be—rick, what do you think about that?

Katz: It says minimize the impacts of landslides and earthquakes, considers view sheds and topography.

Michaelson: I was dealing first with the first half of that. If you change minimize to consider in the first half, I think the first half would be fine. The second half marie was pointing out that considering private viewpoints, view sheds is a very different matter and a step beyond what the city has ever done before. We have always considered through mapping the corridors and other public views this is significant—a significant step beyond that that I think needs serious consideration. Planning commission did not consider this kind of idea, so i'm not going to go any farther than that.

Sieber: at our last meeting commissioner fritz said that had been done on the hollywood process, and basically what we're asking is consideration. We're not asking for a mandate that they absolutely be recognized. But there are many places in southwest, because it's—of its hilly nature, what might not be considered large enough to be a public view but still might be worth considering.

Francesconi: This—I remember the discussion on hollywood, and we—I don't know what the language was, but I remember the property owners. We were worried about them to some degree. But I would rather look at this citywide, and i'd like it through some process as opposed to putting

JUNE 1, 2000

language here. That was a nice try to distinguish this for southwest, but this is more of a citywide issue. I guess i'd—before we put night this plan, I think it's something the planning commission should look at to see if the words “consider” is too much of a hook. If that makes any sense.

Katz: What's the rest of the council feeling on this?

Sten: I'd take out the second sentence and switch “minimize” to “consider” or sends it back to the task force.

Katz: That would be my recommendation. Redevelop—considers the impacts of landslides and earthquakes.

Marie Johnson: is that a decision?

Katz: Wait a minute.

Francesconi: I'm okay with it.

Katz: I think there's four of us. Dan could live with that.

Saltzman: I can live with that too, but I think mark has a point. In the hollywood-sandy plan, we did give consideration to private view sheds, so the decision—

Sten: Five stories across the street instead of six.

Francesconi: It was the other side. It was on sandy.

Sten: It's not going to say --

Katz: Okay. I think we're done on this. So we'll make those changes and you need to capture his laundry list of considerations that we need to take. Let's keep moving.

== so we move to—

Katz: Let's get rid of the easy stuff. We've done—the vision?

Marie Johnson: we haven't discussed the vision.

Katz: Transportation. You're only working half a day.

Marie Johnson: we're making you talk about the most difficult things first.

Katz: Keep going.

Marie Johnson: transportation policy area begins on page 22. We currently have 20 items identified as consent—

Katz: Let's move on to the new con—nonconsent agenda.

Stein: there was a suggestion, to change the wording on t-5, which is a consent to take out—i undertake out the specific reference to southwest terwilliger, colleen suggested to say, t-5 -- reinforce the primary transportation functions of designated scenic drives and park ways by discouraging heavy volumes of commuter traffic. I think that works.

Katz: I can't—we can't— take somebody's mike.

== it's on page 23.

==you also had testimony—

Katz: One at a time.

Betsy Ames, Assistant to Mayor Katz: asking that after southwest terwilliger boulevard, that you include and the terwilliger extension, and asking in that second line to have the two boundary areas be heavy volumes of commuter traffic in the city limits rather than barbur boulevard. And southwest sheridan street, and someone else suggested the county limits.

Katz: Okay. Mark, or jere, how do you feel about that?

== i'm going to have to see it.

Katz: They're caucusing. Let's keep going.

Hales: if we're going to reach that far, why don't we say highway 43. The county line is somewhere around there. We're talking about a segment of the street that's beyond our jurisdiction.

== on which end are you speaking of?

Hales: The county line is a few hundred yards this side of the end of terwilliger. We're talking about whether that segment is controlled in a certain way or not.

JUNE 1, 2000

Baack: wouldn't the simple way, if we just say the designated scenic drives and parkways, then you can leave that open?

Francesconi: That's what— that would be better.

== then it becomes standard—

Katz: So can somebody—read it. Loudly. Please.

Culbertson: the primary transportation functions of designated scenic drives and parkways by discouraging heavy volumes of commuter traffic, periods.

Hales: Here, here.

Katz: Okay. Marie? Comfortable with that? Council? Move on.

==any other consent items?

Katz: Anything else we heard? All right. Let's get to the nonconsent items.

Marie Johnson: okay. First item is t-1, task force objective reads, support the development of pedestrian facilities, including safe crosswalks identified in the pedestrian master plan and the southwest trails map on arterials and local streets at major intersections and bus stops on unimproved rights of way and across public and private lands where needed to provide connections between residential areas and activities.

Katz: We heard where needed we heard where appropriate. Appropriate? Appropriate? Okay. Appropriate. Fine. Everybody okay on that? You can live with it? Okay. Move on.

Marie Johnson: the next item is t-10. The task force proposed the following objective. Evaluate the transportation impacts on neighborhoods and arterials when increasing the development potential of an area including redevelopment and infill of large sites and include mitigation measures in the development plans. The planning bureau had proposed removing the final—the last portion of the objective and during the testimony section we've been trying to draft an alternative.

Stein: I think we have—i need to get john in on this. I think we have a concept that will work. I think. And that was based on the testimony to divide this—to take the option language here and divide it into two separate objectives. One would be the wording we have now, evaluate the transportation impacts on neighborhoods and arterials when increasing the development potential of an area, period. And then adding a second piece that would say something— second objective that would say something like, develop a plan for mitigation of impacts that result from large—

Katz: Redevelopment and—

==w would have to figure out how to word that. I think the concept proposed here is that these would be things through the land use review process, not redevelopment or infill allowed by right.

Katz: Right.

so we don't have the wording figured out.

Katz: John, conceptually this is—

John (Alland?): that certain requirements are provided by code, and certain procedures are -- and so to separate the two conceptually I think is a good idea. And of course any new language that would be developed you could not conflict with existing code and—i think that—

Katz: All right.

Hales: i'm not sure what increasing the development potential means. If you're changing general commercial to story front commercial, i'm not sure whether you're increasing or decreasing development potential, but you're probably reducing trips. So I would say changing rather than increasing, because I don't know what increasing means when it comes to zoning. Intensity and—it's not directly—

Katz: That's a good cushion. So with that change, separating the two, bringing that back on june for approval. All right. Council? Move on. I'm going to be somewhat dick terroral on this. But holler if you really want— feel strongly about it.

== you won't hear this very often.

Katz: I need your help. Thank you. T-16.

JUNE 1, 2000

Marie Johnson: the task force proposes the following objective. Facilitate participation in transportation planning—

Katz: We read it.

Marie Johnson: the proposal that came up in the testimony was to change the word “using” to “including” a dialogue model and removing the word “regular” so that it would say, soliciting input and— instead of soliciting regular input.

== sold.

Katz: Okay. I like—go ahead.

Saltzman: What did you do with the dynamic dialogue model?

Marie Johnson: leaving, but saying including instead of using.

Saltzman: I wasn't here for the first—has that been defined? I have no idea what that means.

Katz: They defined it.

Saltzman: Never mind. I just want to make sure somebody knew what it meant.

Katz: Everybody is looking—

Saltzman: It's not a trademark program we have to buy or anything? [laughter]

Katz: If I recall correctly, wasn't the dynamic model where you use as many people involved in the community interested in this—in the ideas not somebody—am I way off base? You all had senior moments here.

== ongoing.

Katz: In an ongoing, but it was a much broader citizen participation group. Okay. Everybody's okay. Let's move to t-18. If we haven't defined it, we'll define a new one, that's all. That will work.

Marie Johnson: so for your consideration is the task force proposal and then the pdot alternative.

Katz: This one—i'm going to turn to commissioner Hales. It's the issue—a couple of issues. There was one citizens maintaining their own gravel street, but i'm more concerned about the reduction in the management. This is a real policy issue. Years ago we thought we would— could do both. Now it seems we can only do one.

Hales: I don't want to engage in false advertising. Putting reduced congestion in there would be false advertising. This is a part of the city surrounded by suburbs that are growing twice as fast as the city. We're all the major arterials lead to those areas. There's going to be more congestion. Whether there's another building about it there or not. So any goal that says reducing congestion is science fiction.

Stein: there was some testimony, at least my conversation with colleen that the word “manages” was a hot word, and—

Katz: A what?

Stein: a hot word that created some concern, and that perhaps as an alternative the word “manage,” we would say “addresses.” What does manage mean?

Hales: Calming it.

Katz: Using high technology.

Hales: Slowing it.

Baack: you need to measure it, benchmark it, say how are we doing, have a standard, compare to it the standard.

Francesconi: Don't look at me, i'm the parks commissioner. [laughter]

John (Alland?): manage or address, either way you're talking about congestion is going to happen, you have to manage congestion.

Katz: This is another area where you might want to look at a little asterisk that says, okay, what does that mean in terms of using high technology, calming, whatever tools that you might have. John?

John (Alland?): I was going to say that I don't think it matters so much. Actually, the term “managers congestion” has more connotations to specific tools than “addresses,” because managing

JUNE 1, 2000

congestion is part of typical long-range planning both in terms of demanding. [no audio] of single timing, a lot of different tools following the category of management. On the other hand, addresses what probably would be fine too. In my—from my standpoint—

Katz: In your vernacular, management is what's—that's the word that's used in all the literature that I have read. All right. You don't object, let's leave "manage—let's leave "manages" in. Anything else? Council? All right. Next. That's it on transportation. And let's get back to the vision. Outstanding issues.

Marie Johnson: page 4. V-12. This is the proposed change to the asterisk in the—that references the west Portland town center. And we've just rearranged the wording, inserting a section that recognizes a future planning process would include planning for a significant length of the barbur corridor.

Katz: Jere?

Retzer: our preference is to pull it out all together. I think we can probably live with that.

Katz: You can live with it including—leaving—

Retzer: the way it is right now.

Katz: Council?

== fine.

Saltzman: Will people know what it means? We all know because we're talking about it, but—

Marie Johnson: this is the language for the asterisk, and it is included in the document.

Katz: And—this is in the document. Jim?

Francesconi: This is going to slow us down, but there was testimony on this. What is the answer about what is going to happen with the town center? What is the plan? I know there's no plan now, but is it four years, is it—what should happen?

Katz: Go ahead. Deborah? Move the mike closer to you.

Stein: we don't have—i think we all agree it's a plan worth doing. We don't have a time frame to commence that work. It's not in our two-year work program in our current budget. So that would be a question back to you about when the appropriate time—

Francesconi: We don't need to get into this now. One suggestion might be if we— if these conditions—these conditions need to be met in order for this to go forward. So rather than just, it's a bad experience and totally run away from it, it is one—but not slowing down what we're doing, make sure we complete this. It might be good if there was a two or three-page statement, document somewhere saying, this is important for these reasons, and these conditions need to be met. For us to proceed forward. I don't know.

Katz: Could that be tied to the recommendation that the southwest task force put together one or two pages doing just what jim described, plus some of the other issues that I was referencing as asterisks? That may do it. I don't think there's a disagreement. It's a disagreement on timing.

Stein: it's just timing. I think we know a lot more about how we might want to approach something like that, having gong through a hollywood and sandy kind of a process. I think we've learned a lot. I think there's work that we'll be learning from as we go forward that will benefit the future process quite a bit.

Katz: Okay. Let's move on to v-13.

Marie Johnson: this was a reference to parks.

Katz: It says here there seems to be a task force support.

Marie Johnson: we did not take a vote on this. There were a couple of expressions of concern on this, but I think the overall assessment, the majority of folks seem to support it, the language as written.

Katz: All right. Jim?

Francesconi: It's all good with me.

JUNE 1, 2000

Katz: Okay. Council? All right. Thank you. We've completed—

Marie Johnson: we've completed the vision section.

Katz: All right. The citizen involvement is done. The economic—economic development. Page 14. Is i'm not following the pages. Let's do lands use and urban form.

Marie Johnson: I wanted to point out one item that I missed before, and i'm not—i have to say i'm not sure the language is right yet. Page 8, item 1. You had testimony about the terwilliger boulevard, and I had added a proposed change here and forgot to note it when I reviewed this before. But I think it still needs modification. So the proposal—let me read what the planning commission language is, and then what a tentative alternative is. Planning commission says, enhanced terwilliger boulevard scenic qualities along portions of the road that are not currently within the terwilliger design overlay zone. You heard testimony that they— there were people who wanted to include a reference to the terwilliger boulevard extension. The language proposed here with some modification would be, enhance the scenic qualities of terwilliger boulevard and the terwilliger boulevard extension not currently within the terwilliger design overlay zone. I talked to john gillham of office of transportation while testimony was going on, and he wanted to point out that the terwilliger boulevard extension has a smaller right of way than the terwilliger boulevard, so any scenic improvements would need to take place as development occurred. It might than hard are to accommodate in the regular portion of the boulevard.

Saltzman: Does that make your language less valid, or less relevant?

Marie Johnson: I don't know. It's difficult trying to draft something at the last minute.

Hales: It just means it would be slower.

Katz: It doesn't change the language.

Marie Johnson: it doesn't seem like it would be a problem. I just have to say we haven't had time to really analyze it.

Katz: While we're on that page, there was some discussion on the language of—centered around barbur transit center. Do you want to address that? Or—and then jere address that.

Marie Johnson: staff doesn't have a strong position or strong recommendation on this. We felt it was important to flag for your consideration because we didn't want to preclude some we didn't want to assume you'd warn to preclude some changes to the transit center base even though planning for the boulevard might take place at a later date. But we don't have a recommendation.

Katz: Or somewhere else.

Baack: on transit center, the task force didn't feel like given we went through a long effort to reach an agreement, the people i've talked to, this is not— we did not take a vote, but given we went through a long effort to reach an agreement, that we're going to have a planning process later on on barbur boulevard, it didn't make sense to take a key portion of that and exclude—take it out and do something now and perhaps people—there is a trust issue we have to deal with as well. We really are—ought to handle it together.

Katz: Did you want a period after "retail."

Saltzman: I think we should just take it out. Oh, after "retail." I would just take out number 2.

Katz: Take the whole thing out.

Marie Johnson: there was another suggestion that had come up in conversations which is to remove the reference to barbur transit center and change it to transit centers, because there might be transit centers in the future. Again, I don't have a strong feeling about it.

Saltzman: It's listed under other essential areas.

== it would need—

Katz: Let's take it out. Sir? Did you want to testify now? Are you happy—a happy camper and you changed your mind?

== me? We have to do land use --.

JUNE 1, 2000

Katz: You don't—oh, okay. Land use and urban forum. Back to page 1. Marie?

Marie Johnson: i'm sorry. Do you want me to review the proposed changes again?

Katz: Just identify them and then let the task force members discuss them.

Marie Johnson: community wide objectives, item 3-c was the first item.

Retzer: okay. On item 3-c, we have some specific comments on this throughout the—with respects to the desired—scale and desired neighborhood character, i'm not sure this was an area that we were tremendously hung up on.

Mark Helfand: 8137 SW ?. maybe I should jump in. We have to switch chairs, though.

Katz: Go ahead.

Helfand: we're using this document on land use and urban forum.

Katz: It's the same one I think we have.

Helfand: we also have the summit one, because that was—that was handed out. It's over there.

Katz: Yes.

Helfand: okay. Well, I guess—were we about to go through that item by item, or can I give an overview?

Katz: We—i don't think the council is going to go to this --

Helfand: we're not saying they should.

Katz: Go ahead.

Helfand: the background is that we mentioned at the last hearing that we had done that work two years ago, and council said, let's see some of it. So we produced it. The task force—we have three points, really, with the planning commission policy objectives. Marie did a very good job of highlighting them. If we can start on page—we're on page 6 of the decision guide, really, this is the land use and urban forum page. The actual options before the council, I don't think they're really our policies in the summit which the task force hasn't even formally approved, versus the planning commission's, but rather the issue I brought up last time was that we think we need more specificity in the planning commission policies and objectives if they're going to be used to make zoning decisions. And the three big issues are the first issue is the one that you see at the beginning there on the front page of the document a marie made, task force general comment. The task force representatives would prefer the policy and objectives specified a desired population density in the mixed use areas. I have a lot to say about that. I don't want to take all day on it, but when we are talking about individual zoning decisions on the map, what we encountered was that there was no sense, really, of what the overall target was for density, additional units, anything in these mixed use areas that is main streets, town centers, transit corridors. So the planning commission was put in a position of looking at individual amendments, one by one, and looking for criteria to judge them. And it never came in whether the actual density that was already in that mixed use area based on the neighborhood's proposal was 39 persons per acre, you know, 45, 105, nobody knew, nobody seemed to care what the projected density was. I—and so nobody ever—nobody ever really was able to make a case that if the overall density targets in the mixed use areas are met, why should we have additional upzoning. If it's going to result in a density that's, say, two times or three times what metro allocated or recommended for those areas. Now, I said last time, but you can see them in the summit policy, and the—in the number 3, some examples there, it says establish boundaries and so on, if you look at b, it gives some examples of the persons per acre guidelines that metro gave several years ago from main streets and town centers. And these are old now, but metro also had guidelines for transit corridors for overall density along transit corridor, and for the target densities as the transit corridors go through neighborhoods, and as they go through other designations, main streets and town centers. So I feel that I think the task force feels that the language in here overall may not be used fairly, hey not give us enough specificity about what we're after to avoid a situation where the neighborhoods map has done everything it's supposed to do as far as achieving target densities from

JUNE 1, 2000

the best guide we have, which is metro, unless the city and planning commission puts in their policies what the targets are.

Saltzman: What do you think they should be?

Katz: You're playing an old tape.

Saltzman: I have no idea with what they should be. Do you know?

Helfand: well, I think the if you— if I was a planning director, first thing I would do is i'd add up the acreage for the different design tapes. Everything is a design type. Inner neighborhoods, outer neighborhoods, not just mixed use areas. I'd add up the target densities and the allocations to the main streets and town centers. And i'd see how we came out. Whether we were close to our overall target.

Hales: I'm saying what it should be to make a good place.

Helfand: I would still endorse what's in the—what metro—the guidelines of metro. But we've never had a discussion about it. We were projecting densities that were 100 or 120 inside those mixed use areas. Crazy densities that were way out of line with the intention of what a mixed use area was supposed to be.

Katz: Marie? Were you nodding? Deborah?

== well, maybe deborah can best address this.

Stein: we've been moving away from numbers, and I think we're trying to look at what the qualities are of a place I respective of what the density is. We want to say what are the qualities we want in an area. Starting—i think using numerical basis as the starting point is always going to lead us to problems, and i'd much rather say what kind after place do we want this to be, and then take a look—we can measure at the end of the day what the numbers produce, but not have that be the guiding—

Katz: My sense is you are playing an old tape. In fact, metro, they're talking very much the way deborah just described. They don't want to talk in numbers.

Helfand: I think I reapply would like the opportunity to say more about what I mean.

Katz: Go ahead. He didn't use his testimony. So i'm going to give you three minutes.

Helfand: there's three issues with the planning commission policies, and this is by far the most difficult. We're all sitting around in this process.

Katz: Excuse me. This is just—you can't believe your timing. It is perfect timing:

Saltzman: Do you want to do a pro tem thing?

Katz: I want to introduce US Congressman Earl Blumenauer who is here, and the discussion we're having now is perfect timing on density and do we use numbers, and what's a livable community, and we have somebody who's going to testify who's playing an old tape, but we're going to let him do that within three minutes time line. Would you like to say something? Come on up and introduce your friends. Everybody, move aside for a second.

i'm really sorry.

Katz: No, no, it's perfect.

Saltzman: You couldn't have picked a better time.

US Congressman Earl Blumenauer: for your record, my name is earl blumenauer. I represent you in congress. But i'm very pleased to be joined today by two gentlemen who are here looking at the fine work that you and your colleagues have done in local government. I would like to introduce congressman joe huffle from suburban philadelphia, and congressman rush polt, from middle of new jersey, and we have been looking at the urban growth boundary, we've looked at some of the renovation you've done, and talking about what it talks to—takes to make a live I can't believe community.

Katz: Why don't you just share with us your impressions, or things we've done wrong.

Blumenauer: i've only seen things you've done right. I was very impressed.

==we've been careful.

JUNE 1, 2000

== that's all earl has shown us.

== earl is a very controlling figure. [laughter]

Katz: We know that. It's not a surprise.

==I think we're behind schedule.

US Congressman Joe (?): it's been a great afternoon, and I come from suburban philadelphia, where sprawl is a huge problem, and we've not dealt with it very well. I'm picking up a lot of pointers here, a lot of things I think my community can use if we've got the foresight that you folks have had. Congratulations. It's great to be here. Thank you for allowing rush and me to be part of this.

Sten: You must have brought the sun.

Blumenauer: oh, yes, I meant to take credit for that.

US Congressman (Rush Polk?): it's a spectacular day to be here, by the way. I represent central new jersey, and we are the most densely populated state in the country. Our part of the state is the fastest growing, and therefore we are really on the front lines of suburban sprawl. And I think there's some lessons clearly lessons to take back from the way the city and the metropolitan area have dealt with the growth over the years.

Katz: We're doing the southwest community plan. We're still doing this. [laughter] but we're going to be finished with it. We're going to be finished today.

Blumenauer: I appreciate your courtesy in allowing us to join you and introduce my colleagues. Who are really on the front linings of this issue in terms of environmental issues, coaxing wiser investment of the federal government. They are members of the live I can't believe community caucus, and we've—we're learning a lot from them as well. I appreciate your courtesy.

Katz: And you're having a fund-raiser?

Blumenauer: a little reception. [laughter] rejuvenation house parts at 6 o'clock, for anybody who is free.

Katz: Leave your cards here, will you? Please.

== thank you, mayor.

Katz: Thank you.

Blumenauer: one of the things we've been talking about is how the interaction between the elected officials and the citizen infrastructure has made a big difference. We'll let you continue with that interaction, because I know you'll be doing—

Katz: And you can—thank you. Congressman blumenauer, thank you for taking the leadership and the issues and—that you've dealt with here in the city for many, many years to congress, and sharing with them our experiences and your experiences and hoping to expand this vision to bring a much better country and nation to understand the issues of sprawl, the cost of sprawl, and the negative impacts on people's lives.

Hefland: i'd like to in the interest of moving things along, to go through the other two points on the policies and then come back to this. For my own interest. This second point about the planning commissions land uses and you're bang forum policy is that item 3-c, the one that jere was about to read, ensure that development and redevelopment occur outside, that one, that one is the only really guidance that this whole policy gives for infill and inner and outer neighborhoods. The summit policy we handed out, if you look on the front page at item 4 where it says in capitals, inner and outer neighborhoods, is an attempt to actually have a policy and— objectives for infill in those areas. Now, I think we mentioned this last time, but it's been obvious to everybody, out of the 6 or 5,000 units that were supposed to eventually produce in southwest, whatever we do, only a minority of them are in these areas. 3,000, 2500, who knows. Most have to come from infill in the neighborhoods. And I think planning commission policy and objectives are deficient because that item 3-c is the only real guidance it gives for development outside mixed use areas, and what it says is to respect the scale and desired neighborhood character but it doesn't say anything about what

JUNE 1, 2000

zones to use, what's an acceptable approach to infill, what's not. The third point that the task force had with respect to the planning commission policy is the one on page 3 of the planning commission document. But where the objectives—the task force talks about objectives 5 and 6, basically our problem is that we'd like the descriptions of town centers and main streets to be a lot more specific. We would like to know more about what is considered to be the right forum and what suspect considered to be the form for town centers and main streets. The—we're unclear—we want more specific objectives for the town centers and—and on page.

Francesconi: Do you have the specific language you want?

Hefland: I have a summit document which has lot more specific language.

Francesconi: I know, but at this point you need to say, this is the language you want.

Hefland: well, what the task force—that's—what happened is the task force did not propose language for this. We thought it was going to take more work to solidify these concepts and what we proposed to do last time, may 17th, was, our proposal was not to adopt the planning commission's language, which was almost there but not all the way, but rather ton— rather to have two or more dialogue sessions in which question work out more clearly with different parties, not just the task force, what should be our concepts of these town centers and main streets. We don't think the planning commission on cities and again, it's not us making this for the city, it's the planning commission for the southwest community plan, we don't think they're specific enough. The types of language we have in the sum hit document where it talks about a main streets designation, pays attention to design features, it talks about average density and the transit corridors, if you read that language it's a lot of specific language.

Katz: And you talk about two or three—

Hefland: yes. I'm not proposing that specific language. We're not ready to say the summit document is it. Personally I think it's really pretty good.

Retzer: review the history of where we were, last year when we started working on the policies, we looked at the land use and went, wow. This requires an awful lot of work. To reflect what we need to do. And if you recall, we basically replaced it with statements about infrastructure and public facilities and that's—that sort of thing. In the process, we got to this point, it was pointed out to us that by not having a land use and urban forum policy per se, we were leaving out some rather important things from the community plan. So the problem was, we got to this point without really having a good proposal. We had a lot of work that had been done, a lot of excellent thinking, mostly by mark, but we had not brought it up to date in terms of what the task force was doing and where we are today. The work that marie and staff did on the current planning— currently approved planning commission proposal was pretty admirable in heading the right direction. But the points are that mark is trying to make, there's quite a bit more specificity that really should be brought into this process.

Francesconi: When?

Retzer: that's the real question. How would we do that?

Francesconi: My suggestion, i'd like to hear the staff's reaction, we not decide right now. But you've got two weeks or whatever to come up with alternative specific language that you want and then that's it.

Hefland: we would need to do is really look more carefully at the summit document and the task force and see to what extent they want to change it and bring it back to you.

Katz: Let—

Francesconi: Or else you'll get stuck with this.

Katz: And this isn't that bad.

Hefland: we know that. What i'm telling you is that this is going to be used to make zoning decisions on amendments. Now if you can—can you throw the switch for a second? Now I want to

JUNE 1, 2000

go back to the first point about what are the density targets in the designated areas. Am I on? Okay. I guess I need—can you guys see okay?

Katz: Is this your three minutes?

== yes.

Francesconi: I won't transcript you, I promise. Interrupt you, I promise.

Katz: Didn't we see this before?

== no, no.

Katz: This is new? You have nothing else to do but play with this?

Helfand: I do like doing it. That's true. I know you're all trying hard to understand why the task force wants more specific.

Katz: We understand.

Helfand: one reason is to help use the design types more effectively. But the other reason is that they'll be used to guide zoning decisions on the bureau of planning's amendments to our map. And thanks to this spirit of cooperation, which marie and you all deserve a lot of credit for, to some extent we're all sitting around acting as if these amendments, the bureau planning's amendments are an acceptable part of this process. And they're not. The bureau of planning's amendments, over 40 of them, Multnomah alone, are the legacy of a single effort to torpedo the whole bottoms-up process. In writing these amendments, the bureau took advantage of the fact a lot of criteria for zoning weren't spelled out clearly in the southwest community plan policy. That's why we want these policies to be more specific. If these amendments weren't hanging over our head, we might not be so obsessed with the details of this policy and objectives. The neighborhoods we're—were told if they followed the rules they could make judgments about which parts of the neighborhoods to upzone, and if we upzoned enough in some places we could try to spare others from markedly increased density. I think we did that in good faith. In my neighborhood, the net capacity went up when we upzoned. Overall capacity went up. The amendments swooped in on us and looked at the placing we tried to protect or set aside are or designate not for upzoning and said let's look at those in isolation. The rules they invoke—this gets at why there's so much language in all of these policies and objectives that the bureau winds up saying is redundant in their right, because we wanted—we kind of run 90 writing, because most of the policies they invoked, the objectives they invoked were things that weren't in the language of the southwest community plan. They were things like, this area looking at the map—

Katz: Let's turn down the lights so we can see this.

Helfand: just to get you oriented, i'm focusing on Multnomah just because I know it best. The—these are areas that are currently multifamily. These are new multifamily designations since 1997, including this one behind the Multnomah center there. And these are single-family homes. And these are the expected areas that will have—are the areas that will have under the neighborhoods plan, the areas that will be densified. So those are the areas that we said to densify. And these are the amendments. Now, the rationale for some of these amendments, didn't invoke anything in the plan policies or objectives. What i'm pointing to is the thing that's now a park. The open space. Pretty much completely surrounded by inner neighborhood. These ones around this park are set off against these ones which are somewhat near capitol, but for each of these, the planning bureau came up with a rationale that was kind of a new twist. So for this one here, this purple thing, they said, it's an area that's got a lot of single-family homes, but this is an area of single-family homes, and they said around the corner there's some apartment buildings. So those building are close, there's an issue of contiguous zoning. So that ought to be upzoned. And the planning commission rejected that argument for that one.

Katz: What—what year did this happen?

Helfand: it happened two years ago. But the point is that the amendments around here, the amendments over here, we looked at them all and we said, we'll concede two-thirds of these. But

JUNE 1, 2000

these ones we really believe in, and what was invoked were basically a new design type. That's near a park. We couldn't get you on a transit corridor, on a mixed use area. We don't have an infill one. So we got a new design type. It's a park. It gets upzoned. What that did is took some policies from other parts of the city code and it set them up in this process as trumping all of the considerations that went into the neighborhoods' zoning decisions. So we want more specificity in the lands use and urban forum policy so that those things get balanced the way they should. And that's the reason for the obsession, is that when we saw stuff like this and we said, really, if you're not saying it's the numbers, what is it? The answers to that were things that really were not in the concepts of land use and urban forum that were in the southwest community plan. And that's what the obsession is about. Okay?

Katz: Mark, and then rick. Then we'll have council.

Sieber: i'm hearing what you were suggesting about taking another couple weeks to hammer at this. There's been some strong concern that this group is not really—the task force is not large enough, not representative enough to really do a good job at that. We could come up with some things and I think the summit policies you have a copy of get to the meat of a lot of issues, but in order to have a fair process, what we were talking about in our work session and last time was moving that piece on looking at the design types up front and in the next phase of the process and to—into maybe it a full citizen participation process. That fits in what you have already talked about. And I think that although we could do the work, it would have to be revisited in a more public process. And at this point in this stage, it might be better to forward this whole piece into that discussion and by that I mean the one core to our concern with land use and urban forum and getting the specificity, and that needs to be designed in collaboration with all people who live there.

Michaelson: I don't want to play an old tape either, but I would point out combination order these policies, the draft policies that are adopted that you have since change and approved, the planning commission voted with the neighborhoods about 95% of the time. These policies were almost specific enough. I think there's real value in being more specific about policy. In fact, the planning commission took a great step toward in these policies and they're much more specific about urban forum than we've ever had in the past. If you get much more specific than this, you really need to look at each individual main street and each individual town center. As its own area. And specify them that way. That's a lot of work. And that takes a lot of time and it needs to be done before we real letter do the mapping of certain areas. My recommendation would be a little bit different from mark's, which would be to go ahead and adopt these now as the framework and say, additional work needs to be done on the specifics for each main street, each town center, each urban design area before you actually do the mapping. I think that way we've got a framework, we can take a step forward and we don't spend two weeks trying to do four months worth of work.

Katz: I'm a little nervous about spending two weeks on this. This is not easy stuff. I tend to agree with rick. I don't know how much you— what specificity you want in general. What you want is exactly what he said, to take a look at the main street that you're concerned about as you do the map and look at what you want that particular street to look like. You may want three or four stories. Thought one or two.

Retzer: there also needs to be refinement outside the 2040 areas. The inner and outer neighborhoods thing. So, for example, if you look— there's a good word, suggestions in the summit policy in terms of some of the mechanisms that might be used and—in some of these areas. Some of the things we've talked about in terms of tools and accessory units in other parts of our discussions. So there's some things that could be done to make the process better. It's a question of how to work the next steps and put them together.

Helfand: I basically agree with rick too. I'm not disagreeing with what he's saying, except instead of saying major changes, if we just said a couple of minor changes and the one he mention second degree probably the most dramatic to actually—inner neighborhoods are design types, not just the

JUNE 1, 2000

mixed use areas. It's a—the policy is 90% there. It's really good work. And Rick is right to be proud of it. If we're going to tinker with it at all, it would probably be to have more explicit language about guidance for infill policy in the policy, because that's all there is right now, is that one item, 3-c. For the main streets and town centers I'd be happy with Rick's suggestion.

Katz: Okay. So we got somewhere. Marie? Deborah?

Marie Johnson: Should I add anything to this? First I want to just point out that the policy, the urban—land use and urban form policy applies throughout the southwest community plan. You have a set of objectives before you that would apply community-wide. In addition we have housing policies that would apply community-wide. So there are some objectives that do address areas outside of the mixed use areas. The council at the last session talked about supporting a process for drafting character statements for the individual mixed use areas. As part of the next phase of the process. I think we could use these policies and objectives as a framework to build upon and then come up with some more specificity about how—what the character of those areas should be. In addition, in the policy—policies before you, each of the areas has a general description. They are broad in that different main streets, macadam isn't the same as Multnomah, so they're broad to accommodate the variety of main streets, but they do provide some general direction about what those areas should look like.

Francesconi: That sounds good for me. Forget what I said before.

Katz: I think they want me to be dictatorial. Go ahead.

Marie Johnson: Do you want to go through a review of the proposal?

Katz: No, but you did mention there was one piece in here that you really felt strongly about changing. Let's assume that the council is going to adopt this as amended. Let's make that assumption for a minute. What is it that you really feel strongly that needs to be—

the transit center, they've done that already. The thing we feel next most strongly about is more specificity about what zones are what to do—

Hefland: Having a section of it be about inner and outer neighborhoods and not about the mixed use areas. I would be happy to look at the items there to see if there's anything in the summit that he thinks would be— but that's the area I would be most concerned about.

Katz: Deborah?

Stein: That's where we have put policies already in the housing section that talk about infill. Those are the policies that I think most directly address the inner neighborhoods. Where they talk about --

Sten: I think the housing—

Stein: zoning and design tools to promote infill—

Katz: I remember this discussion.

Hefland: The transit corridors go through inner neighborhoods. And I think we're getting—we always get hung up on, okay, it's a transit street, or transit corridor, but it's also an inner neighborhood. What do we do? I would really like it if there was something more specific.

Sten: I think—I'm ready to the planning commission. I'm fine to add something on inner neighborhoods. I think the housing gets a lot of it. I think we may be over thinking it at this stage, because I think where the rubber hits the road is the mapping. In terms of where this matters. But I'm—the only one I thought fine with—not fine with, unless there's some way to reword it, is the—the first but of reviewed for the proportion of owner occupied to rental housing. I don't think that's legally possible.

Katz: You're looking—

Sten: I'm looking at his inner and outer neighborhoods bullets.

Katz: Sorry. You're right.

Sten: I don't think we can do that. I don't think—you can figure that out, but beneficiary—I would just—I don't think it's appropriate in a zoning document.

JUNE 1, 2000

Katz: So let me ask you. Folks, you're fine with this—the amended document that we have, and you would like for us to look at what commissioner Sten justified, the inner and outer neighborhoods? Out of your own document? Is that an accurate statement? This piece.

Sten: I don't have any problem with it. I think some of it is in the housing section. Putting it—
==I think all of it is pretty good. But that's what was the most important.

Hefland: I think the part about transit corridors is also useful detailed, but—

Retzer: there's specific comments as we go through this. We can get the—for example, you have the designated area versus appropriate areas along corridors, and there's a couple of those that we thought ought to be changed.

Hefland: you have the document. If there's anything else in there that strikes you as useful, great. But that is the most—

Stein: are you suggesting those be incorporated into—

Sten: All i'm saying is i've heard that we can all live with the lapped use document— land use document, moving forward with the next page with the exception that if it was possible to work in some of the thoughts in the neighborhood section, which is the second part of the white document, then we'd all be even that much more happy, and i'm saying that as I read that section, those are all in my opinion good ideas that are either implicit or explicit in the housing document, wrapping some tie-in to land use document that says these are issues we think somehow either referring to the housing document in the land use document or writing a little out, would not do any damage to anybody's position or allow us to move on. My one exception is I just don't think the zoning documents you can judge own or rental. That's an economic rental and— arrangement and zoning is form.

Hefland: all of that is assuming we're doing what rick said, which is to get more detailed descriptions over the next four months for the specific town centers and main streets.

Retzer: we could work with staff.

Katz: All right. Let me suggest this. Because I haven't really had a chance to take a look at it. What I hear I think from commissioner Sten, and I assume that we would like for you to take a look at the summit document. Especially in the inter—inner and outer neighborhood section, and then mark mentioned the transit corridor section. I'd like to look at that as well. And pick toes items that you think—those items that you think are not going to hurt— if it's in here, then identify where it is. Okay? And rick, if you want to weigh in on this, please do. We have two weeks. It—i don't want to see a whole rewrite of it, but pick those pieces that you think aren't going to do any harm.

Sten: And I don't want to make this more confusing, but I want to be clear, my view is i'm a little—not against it, but you haven't sold me yet on how specific you get on the design type issues until I understand how it identifies into the mapping. Because I got talked into taking any numbers out of housing, and i'm not saying this is what you're trying to do, but I can see a scenario where the design types you want on the town centers are pretty small. The design types we want in the neighborhoods are pretty small, suddenly there's almost no housing units. So I have to see how all this works together before i'm comfortable with what the design guidelines mean. But I sigh—so that languages on the white paper i'm not there on.

Hefland: all of this is not worth the effort if we didn't do a responsible job of zoning to accommodate increased—

Sten: I think you are.

Katz: So we'll do that. That will give us an opportunity to look at it, rick, and staff, and jere, and mark. Pick out those. We don't want to see that specificity, because I don't think it's appropriate here. It would be later on. But if there are elements in the summit document that isn't going to do dramatic damage or— okay. Are we—no, we're not. Yes, we are through with—

Marie Johnson: we're through with land use and urban forum?

JUNE 1, 2000

Katz: Yes.

Marie Johnson: do you want to discuss economic development?

Katz: There's not much to discussion.

Marie Johnson: one item on page 14.

Katz: Commissioner Francesconi said it was wonderful. Anybody else have any objections to the option? Support educational and—

Saltzman: Okay. Fine.

Katz: Thank you.

Sten: Let me be on the record. This is clear, but I think it skirts the issue. I think Lewis and Clark is involved in all sorts of things that this—I like some of those things that some people don't like. I don't like some of those things. But I'm not going to fight the vision document. I think it's somewhat purposely skirting the real issue of what's going on between the conflicts and those conflicts have got to be talked through in the next phase of this thing.

Marie Johnson: we just need to find good ways to work more closely with the institutions.

Katz: I just didn't think it was necessary—it wasn't an economic development policy.
== that's why I wrote you off line.

Marie Johnson: we do have objectives in housing and transit that— transportation that deals with impacts to institutions. So housing is—

Katz: Parks.

Marie Johnson: I believe we have—I believe the task force was willing to accept.

Katz: Accept both those. Council, take a look at them. I think we've got consensus on parks. Okay. Design, public safety. We—

Marie Johnson: the only remaining item is housing.

Katz: Watershed, housing. All right.

Sten: On the watershed, it won't be any big deal. I'll put out a memo in coordination with the esa office to outline what we talked about at the start of this meeting. So we're all on the same page.
==it's really great.

Sten: I'll try and capture what we said today.

Katz: All right. H-1. There was a suggestion that we take out in the shift to smaller households. I remember the discussion on that. Commissioner Sten, I think that came from you in terms of the direction we ought to be looking at. I think that's where that language came from. I—

Retzer: I don't know that we're tremendously hung up on it. We'll relook at where we're going. Recognizing you do have a shift to smaller households, the question is do you want to try to reverse the trends or—so I'm not sure you want to enshrine that in your policy.
== I don't think we get to decide that, jere.

Retzer: there's some folks who say the reason you're losing children is because of loss of open space and schools, whatever else. But regardless, I think the appropriate thing you're trying to do is reflect the needs of the community.

Katz: Council, what do you want to do? Do you want to leave that and shift to smaller households or take it out?

Sten: I prefer to leave it.

Hales: it doesn't do any harm. It's a factor.

Katz: Good. Next. H-2.

Marie Johnson: this one was calling for a diversity of size type and affordability of housing to meet the needs of young adults, small and large families, empty nesters, elderly and others.

Katz: Council? Fine? H-3.

Marie Johnson: this is in response to the task force proposal about compatibility and infill and we're suggesting it be moved to the land use and urban forum area that you support the staff alternative proposal and—

JUNE 1, 2000

== we want order a slight improvement on that to make it --.

Sten: Sold.

Katz: Objections? Move on. H-4.

Marie Johnson: this was the task force objective that dealt with housing around parks, staff did not come up with an alternative. We were not able to craft one that would pass muster with other people knowledgeable about drafting policies. It was a real challenge.

Retzer: what we attempted to do is simply recognize the realities of it's a balancing act.

Sten: Here's where I'm at. I think you've done a terrific job on turning this housing policy from what we were talking about last time, the negative, to the positive. I don't think you quite got it on b, but I'm going to say for me it's good enough in the spirit that you're saying my other things are good enough. So I think it's okay. I think this one you'll have to show me the map. Much where you're going the mutt the housing. If the map has the housing we need and it's not much next to the park, I'm not going to fight. If the housing we need deferring to the question of we don't know how much we need, I'm probably not going to worry about it too much.

Hales: Take b but not a?

Sten: Both. I'm not crazy about them, but I know you're not crazy about a couple things I've put in. So let's have at the map.

Hales: I guess I wanted the question on b, about the first phrase.

Saltzman: Existing southwest parks were generally acquired many years ago. Isn't that also true for parks elsewhere in the city? I guess I'm suggesting maybe we take that first phrase out.

Retzer: if it's not needed, that's fine. We were an annexation, so it tends to be a more prevalent issue in southwest.

Saltzman: If it is an issue, it's also true in other areas of the city.

Sten: I would like it better if you struck it. It would still keep the thought without sort of—

== you can strike—

Katz: It's a discussion. You're discussing—

==we're trying to—

Katz: Actually, what you really ought to do is start it with, density near existing parks in southwest. But that's all right. Let's cross out existing, eliminate existing to the word "needs." Is that what the council wants? Okay.

Marie Johnson: I have a suggestion. The last segment of the item b actually reads the lowest—closest to an objective if it's modified slightly.

Katz: I was going start, density near existing—

Marie Johnson: and I'm thinking land use patterns near existing parks in southwest should consider the desired neighborhood character service level park and accessibility as well as potential impact on sensitive environmental areas.

Katz: Yes. That becomes an objective. Object. Okay.

Sten: You would lose my reservation if we agree to that.

Katz: Everybody is on board. Fine. H-f.

Marie Johnson: okay. The city council had asked us to merge ---h-5.

Katz: Folks? We're done: Almost. We still have a little task to do that we'll take up in two weeks. And—

Marie Johnson: a new proposal for draft for transportation and the review of the proposal for inner and outer neighborhoods and—

Katz: It had to do with current planning transportation connection. Mitigation.

Katz: Work with jere and mark if we want to, and holy smokes.

Retzer: I'd—I know I speak for the task force, I thank the council for your patience and your dedication. We certainly thank Marie for her wonderful efforts. And Mark, it's going to be greatly missed. He's done a wonderful job in getting us this far.

JUNE 1, 2000

Katz: If mark can do as good of a job with his new job as he's done with this, he'll be worthwhile losing him. [laughter] we'll thank all of you in two weeks.

Marie Johnson: three weeks.

Katz: Three weeks. Okay. Thank you and we stand—thank you, council. We stand adjourned.

At 5:15 p.m., Council adjourned.