



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **6TH DAY OF JULY, 2016** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Commissioner Fish, presided at 9:30 for the election of Commissioner Saltzman as President. Commissioner Saltzman presided. Commissioners Fritz and Novick were present. Mayor Hales arrived at 9:45 a.m. and presided, 5.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Susan Parsons, Acting Clerk of the Council; Ben Walters, Chief Deputy City Attorney; and Jason King, Jim Wood and John Chandler, Sergeants at Arms.

Motion to elect Commissioner Saltzman as President of the Council through December 31, 2016: Moved by Novick and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4)

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

		Disposition:
COMMUNICATIONS		
780	Request of David Kif Davis to address Council regarding war on copwatchers by the City (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
781	Request of Alexander Krokus to address Council regarding affordable housing and job polarization crisis (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
782	Request of Shedrick J. Wilkins to address Council regarding hard sports versus soft sports (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
783	Request of Crystal Elinski to address Council regarding 5% vacancy rate (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
784	Request of Glenda Hughes to address Council regarding small business and contracting with the City (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
TIMES CERTAIN		
785	<p>TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM – Accept report on 2016 Summer Free For All program (Report introduced by Mayor Hales and Commissioner Fritz) 30 minutes requested</p> <p>Motion to accept report: Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-5)</p>	ACCEPTED

CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION		
Mayor Charlie Hales Bureau of Planning & Sustainability		
*786	Approve annexation to the City of Portland of property within the boundaries of the City Urban Services Boundary in case number A-2-16, on the southeast edge of the City on the east side of SE Jenne Rd south of the Jenne Rd/Jenne Lane intersection (Ordinance) (Y-5)	187872
Office of Management and Finance		
*787	Authorize a three-year lease with SKBERGS 1, LLC for additional office space for Bureau of Development Services at 2020 SW 4 th Ave, Suite 190 commonly known as the CH2M Center for approximately \$415,000 per year (Ordinance) (Y-5)	187873
Commissioner Steve Novick Bureau of Transportation		
788	Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Maywood Park for design engineering and construction of pedestrian safety improvements at the intersection of NE Prescott St and NE 92 nd Ave (Second Reading Agenda 748) (Y-5)	187874
Commissioner Amanda Fritz Portland Parks & Recreation		
*789	Amend ordinance for the temporary suspension of system development charges for the construction or conversion of structures to accessory dwelling units to correct Exhibit A fee schedule (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 187791) (Y-5)	187875
Commissioner Nick Fish Bureau of Environmental Services		
790	Authorize grant agreement awarding up to \$73,000 in FY 16/17 to Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc. to provide outreach, technical assistance and community involvement for watershed projects in Southwest sub-watersheds (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 13, 2016 AT 9:30 AM
City Auditor Mary Hull Caballero		
791	Amend certification of elections results of the Municipal Non-Partisan Primary Election held in the City of Portland on May 17, 2016 (Report; replace Report 678-2016) (Y-5)	ACCEPTED

<p>REGULAR AGENDA</p> <p>Mayor Charlie Hales</p> <p>Bureau of Planning & Sustainability</p>		
<p>792</p>	<p>Adopt requirements for deconstruction of the city's oldest and most historic houses and duplexes (Second Reading Agenda 772; add Code Chapter 17.106) (Y-5)</p>	<p>187876</p>
<p>Bureau of Police</p>		
<p>*793</p>	<p>Authorize a contract with Versaterm, Inc. for maintenance of the Regional Justice Information Network in an amount not to exceed \$3,790,000 over a five-year term (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested Motion to amend not to exceed amount from \$3,500,000 to \$3,790,000: Moved by Hales and seconded by Fish. (Y-5) (Y-5)</p>	<p>187877 AS AMENDED</p>
<p>*794</p>	<p>Authorize a Memorandum of Understanding with RTI International for resources up to \$48,700 to facilitate the Police Bureau Regional Justice Information Network transition to National Incident-Based Reporting Systems (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p>187878</p>
<p>Office of Management and Finance</p>		
<p>795</p>	<p>Accept bid of Skyward Construction, Inc. for the Portland Communications Center Seismic Upgrade, Roof Replacement, Mechanical Upgrades, and Envelope Repair Project for \$2,786,000 (Procurement Report – Bid No. 00000291) Motion to accept report: Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fritz. (Y-5)</p>	<p>ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT</p>
<p>796</p>	<p>Adopt a new Comprehensive Financial Management Policy FIN 2.17 Payment Card Industry Compliance (Resolution) 10 minutes requested (Y-5)</p>	<p>37221</p>
<p>*797</p>	<p>Authorize health and welfare contract administered by the Bureau of Human Resources, Health & Financial Benefits Office with Express Scripts, Inc. for Pharmacy Benefit Management effective July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2021 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested (Y-5)</p>	<p>187879</p>
<p>798</p>	<p>Amend public benefits for Google Fiber Oregon, LLC franchise (Second Reading Agenda 773; amend Ordinance No. 186641) (Y-5)</p>	<p>187880</p>
<p>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p> <p>Bureau of Development Services</p>		

July 6, 2016

<p>799</p>	<p>Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the State of Oregon on behalf of Portland State University to provide selected students with the opportunity to earn scholarships and stipends while working at the Bureau of Development Services for \$51,885 (Ordinance) 15 minutes requested</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 13, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>Portland Fire & Rescue</p>		<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 13, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>800</p>	<p>Amend fee schedule associated with Fire regulations (Ordinance; amend Portland Policy Document FIR-12.01) 10 minutes requested</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 13, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>Portland Housing Bureau</p>		<p>187881</p>
<p>*801</p>	<p>Authorize nine subrecipient contracts totaling \$2,598,579 for the provision of services in support of providing affordable housing (Ordinance) 15 minutes requested (Y-4; Saltzman recused)</p>	<p>187881</p>
<p>Commissioner Steve Novick Bureau of Transportation</p>		<p>187882</p>
<p>802</p>	<p>Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with the Portland Development Commission to provide funding for the design and construction of the 10th & Yamhill SmartPark Garage Renovation Project in an amount of \$5,000,000 (Second Reading Agenda 774; amend Contract No. 30005195) (Y-5)</p>	<p>187882</p>
<p>803</p>	<p>Authorize contract with Shiels Oblatz Johnsen to provide owner's representative and project management services for the design and construction phases of the 10th & Yamhill SmartPark Garage renovation project not to exceed \$503,319 (Second Reading Agenda 775) (Y-5)</p>	<p>187883</p>
<p>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</p>		<p>PLACED ON FILE</p>
<p>804</p>	<p>Presentation by David Morrison on the risks of microwave exposure from wireless devices (Presentation) 10 minutes requested</p>	<p>PLACED ON FILE</p>
<p>Portland Parks & Recreation</p>		<p>187884</p>
<p>*805</p>	<p>Authorize two-year grant agreements with seven organizations for programming for at-risk youth in partnership with Portland Parks & Recreation under the Mayor's Community Center Initiative in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$700,000 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested (Y-5)</p>	<p>187884</p>
<p>Commissioner Nick Fish Bureau of Environmental Services</p>		

July 6, 2016

*806	Authorize a contract with the lowest responsive bidder for construction of the Riverside Basin Combined Sewer Overflow Pipe Emergency Repair Project No. E10844 for \$738,675 (Ordinance) (Y-5)	187885
807	Authorize grant agreements or Intergovernmental Agreements with thirteen community groups and native plant mini grants related to the Community Watershed Stewardship Program up to \$100,000 total (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 13, 2016 AT 9:30 AM
808	Facilitate implementation of the City Stormwater Management Manual and Source Control Manual (Ordinance; amend Code Chapter 17.38) 15 minutes requested	PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 13, 2016 AT 9:30 AM
Water Bureau		
809	Authorize a contract with TRC Pipeline Services, LLC not to exceed \$400,000 for condition survey and assessment services of the Bull Run Supply Conduits (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested	PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 13, 2016 AT 9:30 AM
810	Declare surplus property at four Water Bureau locations and request authorization to dispose of the properties (Second Reading Agenda 763) (Y-5)	187886

At 12:15 p.m., Council recessed.

July 6, 2016

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **6TH DAY OF JULY, 2016** AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 5.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Susan Parsons, Acting Clerk of the Council; Linly Rees, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and John Paolazzi, Sergeant at Arms.

<p>811 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM – Amend Title 33, Planning and Zoning to allow limited commercial use of accessory parking within the Northwest Plan District (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Title 33) 2.5 hours requested</p>	<p>Disposition:</p> <p>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 13, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
---	--

At 4:41 p.m., Council adjourned.

MARY HULL CABALLERO
Auditor of the City of Portland



By Susan Parsons
Acting Clerk of the Council

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

July 6, 2016
Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript.

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

JULY 06, 2016 9:30AM

Fish: Welcome to the Portland City council will you please call the roll?

Saltzman: Here **Novick:** Here **Fritz:** Here **Fish:** Here **Hales:** Here

Fish: A quorum is present Mayor Hales will be joining us later this morning. Our first order of business today is to elect a new council president. I would ask for a motion nominate Commissioner Dan Saltzman as council president for a term ending December 31 of this year.

Novick: So moved.

Fritz: Second.

Fish: The motion has been moved and seconded, please call the roll.

Saltzman: Aye **Novick:** Aye **Fritz:** Aye **Fish:** Aye

Fish: It's unanimous, and congratulations.

Saltzman: Well, thank you. So the first order of business is rules for council meetings, the purpose of the council meetings is the orderly consideration of the public's business. Preservation of order and decorum is necessary for due consideration of matters before council and the public is welcome to attend the council meetings. During the meeting there will be time limited opportunities for public comment on various agenda items. Although citizens can sign up for communications, public testimony on a council calendar item must address the matter being considered. Please state your name for the record. We do not need your address. If you are a lobbyist, please disclose that information at the start of your testimony, if you are here representing an organization I ask you disclose that, as well. Each member will have three minutes to speak in front of council. At 2.5 minutes you will hear a beep and a light will flash on the box before you. At three minutes you will hear four minutes and the lights will flash and that will be the time for the next person to speak. I ask you respect the time limit so there is time to hear from each person who signed up to speak. If you have any handouts give them to the council clerk and she will distribute them to us. Please testify to the matter at hand. Oregon law allows the public opportunity to attend council meetings. And the council rules the presiding officer to preserve order at these proceedings, and allow the public opportunity to offer testimony specifically addressing the currently pending matters. Rules of procedure seek to preserve the public order and ensure that council's deliberations proficiently and all who want to participate get to be heard. Conduct that disrupts the meetings, for example, shouting during people's presentations. Interrupting testimony or council deliberations will not be allowed. Please show your support or displeasure with your hands, ie thumbs up, or hands up and down. This is a warning that anyone disrupting the proceeding may be escorted from the council chambers, and excluded from the city hall. Lastly, if needed, the counselor will take a half-hour break, at approximately 12:00 or 12:30 depending on the schedule, and I will announce that when we reconvene -- I'm sorry, forget the last point. Ok so we are ready for council communications. Sue, read the first item.

Item 780.

Saltzman: Ok, Mr. Davis isn't here, read the next communication, please.

Item 781.

July 6, 2016

Saltzman: Welcome. If you could just give us your name and you have three minutes.

Alexander Krokus: I am alexander krokus, and thank you for hearing me everyone. For 17 years Oregon was prohibited in enacting the exclusionary policies to create affordable housing. Only two states in the entire nation refuse to provide vital protection to the local citizens. Oregon and Texas. The senate bill 1533, which passed in the state legislatures during the last legislative session and signed into law by Governor Kate Brown was promoted as solution to our affordable housing crisis. The formula for pricing affordable housing communities -- unions is derived from applying 60% of the region's meeting wage, and unfortunately, the senate bill 1533's definition of affordable housing is households with incomes equal to or higher than 80% of the median family income. According to the housing bureau, the median income family for a family of four in 2015 was approximately 74,000 in Multnomah County. Applying the medium 80% co-efficient factor for a family of four is just under 60,000. If the threshold rose to over 90% a local family would have to earn 67,000 dollars to be able to afford any of these exclusionary zones. Middle waged jobs that have diminished, while low and high wage jobs have increased significantly this pattern is defined as job polarization and perhaps could be considered similar to the stage of cultural imperialism. The Oregon office of economic analysis displays an over 20% increase in the high wage jobs in urban areas from 2008 to 2015. Low wage jobs also rose in the Portland metro area by 20% in the past decade. While middle wage jobs have decreased by almost 10% in the same time period. The top four occupations for individuals located in the metro area had an average medium wage of 24,000 in 2012. The top specific occupation was a retail salesperson, and followed by food pension, including fast food and the third was a cashier. In 2015, all the administrative support, sales and related occupations and food preparation and service related occupations provided the most important support. The average middle wage job for those sectors, which employed over 370,000 local residents was only 31,000 in 2015. Applying 80% is a co-efficient factor for the determination, enables housing developers an opportunity to appeal to out of state customers who have the capacity to afford one of these unions. Our local affordable housing crisis will continue to exist as long as it will allow realtors and developers to use a higher threshold in the determination for pricing structures. This new exclusionary zoning law discriminates against families making less than a minimum of 15,000 here annually in Portland. I am sorry.

Saltzman: Thank you very much.

Krokus: Sorry. I didn't get to that.

Saltzman: Ok.

Saltzman: Read 780 now that Mr. Davis is here.

Saltzman: Mr. Davis you know the rules. You have three minutes.

Davis Kif Davis: So you guys seem to have a real big problem with even the word, child sex trafficking being mentioned in city hall, and I was hoping mayor hales would be here since he's at the top of the chain of getting funds from child sex abusers just like nick Fish, Dan Saltzman, and Steve novick all give Amanda Fritz a thumbs up for not accepting any funds from terry bean and other child sex abusers. You know, you say, you must address the agendas on the item. Well, last week, I was arrested here and I was speaking on the items, and that caused a chain reaction where three other people were arrested including Joe Walsh, and you would not let him use the bathroom which is an ada violation and because I dared to mention child sex trafficking on the item talking about safe streets and if you cut off the citizens and have them arrested within 30 seconds, of speaking, how do you know what I was speaking about? Because I utter child sex trafficking when we are talking about safe streets, you know, a lot of things in society are interconnected and it's not all like it has to be specifically about this or that code. It was not that, ok. You illegally

July 6, 2016

had people arrested, cop watchers. Two of them were cop watchers, ok. And Mary eng is a cop watcher, too, so three cop watchers, and Joe Walsh, a 70-year-old vet and you deny him taking a crap in city hall. He had to go cost the taxpayers 5,000, 10,000 to go and take a crap in an ambulance and the district attorney has no problem with out of town mayors smashing cameras like mine smashed after the rose parade last year you all hung out with him and shook his hand and said we're really sorry that it went down like this, Greg. So you have no problem with out of town mayors smashing cameras of citizens even though it's on video, and those charges get thrown out but here you are arresting activists at city hall, and people like me who filmed Barry jo stull getting beat up on November 25 which you have not provided the surveillance camera footage from City hall because you are covering up for your crime, ok. I was falsely imprisoned and falsely charged with crimes, and I filed a tort claim against the city which you know about.

Saltzman: Your time is up. Thank you. Please read 782. Mr. Davis, have a seat.

Item 782.

Saltzman: Welcome, give us your name and you have three minutes.

Shedrick Wilkins: I am Mr. Shedrick Wilkins and I am here to say I just read in the Oregonian that yesterday that the corporate tax was denounced by the Oregonian, no mention that the tax is for schools, making a million dollars, for public schools. It's not likely to pass. In 1999 there was talk of the school cuts and I remember the first thing they were going to cut was sports. Not science teachers. Although they are the most valued, art, history, but sports. This was serious, and I think that mayor Katz passed the county tax. I had to pay like the art tax, so it got shucked off a lot but hard sports to me is football and baseball. Hockey is a hard sport. People have helmets on, and soft sports are more like basketball and volleyball or soccer. And those are soft sports. I think we should cut hard sports. Baseball is clocked at 80 miles per hour now, and these people get injured by these hard sports in our public high schools. I think that another example was when I was in the army, we Played touch football. We were not allowed to hurt ourselves. We were allowed to hurt other people if there was a war. We did not play hard football. They would not allow it, as the officers of the city you should not allow high school kids to bust each other up and take steroids so they can be professional sports players, this needs to stop. I do like Portland, Oregon because of the fact that we do not have the Seahawks, nor do we have a professional baseball team. Like the mariners. We're right for this. Whenever I talk here, in December if the corporate tax fails I will address the Dixon building which is near the Lloyd center, and half the children in this area in Oregon go to school here. So I think that we should eliminate the hard sports, and commissioner Fish and I have had the flu for the last three weeks, and it's not a bad one. I have had ones where I have thrown up. I could have gotten it from the rose festival fleet but we need to have medicine work on these diseases. For the last three years I've been getting sick, and I remember from 2003 something went around, and for ten years, and the last three years we need to concentrate, maybe we're on the verge of a pandemic and we need to deal with that thing, making sure that we boost our immune system, and use maybe stem cell technology, and forget this sports stuff. We did not play hard sports in the army. We were not allowed to.

Saltzman: Read item 783.

Item 783.

Saltzman: I don't see miss crystal elinski here, so could you read 784.

Item 784.

Parsons: She contacted me and we'll have to reschedule.

Saltzman: Ok. Great. So that completes the communications and we're ready for our first time certain.

July 6, 2016

Hales: Good morning. Sorry I am late but late for a good reason. I apologize for being late. We just had a wonderful announcement this morning between Multnomah county and the city of Portland about opening another 200-bed homeless shelter so very proud of that partnership and it will open in time so the folks staying in the peace shelter will have a place to stay so commissioner Saltzman, the housing bureau and everyone else, they are still doing great work and this is just one more sign of that so we announced that this morning. So I think that we can suspend the rules and say progress [applause] I am proud of that, and everyone hear the phrase, it's not my department.

This is a case where the sheriff's office, the police bureau and Multnomah county and the city of Portland all said it is our department. We're ready to move onto the time certain, sorry, the consent, and we have some items removed from the consent already. Namely 793 and 796. Any others? I am sorry, they were just flagged. So I have no items to remove so far. Anything else? Anyone want to speak? We'll take a vote on the consent calendar as printed. Please.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye 785.

Item 785.

Hales: I want to queue this up for commissioner Fritz, we were at Dishman community center last week, and the summer has begun, and there is a lot of great things happening in the park system, particularly for young people, and I want to thank you for the great work that the bureau is doing, and I know that for the folks here to speak from the bureau this is the work of heart not just head, so fun to see the culture out there, so with that, commissioner Fritz.

Fritz: Thank you, I appreciate your partnership and that of the community as well as our staff in Portland parks and recreation. This is an especially wonderful time to be the parks commissioner, as we tell you about the free for all. Summer break is a joy for many children and families, it can be difficult for the one in four families experiencing poverty in Oregon. If lunch is not provided during the school day, which after the school is no longer in session, the families may struggle to find other options to provide Food and basic needs. The summer free for all makes an impact on families. It will serve 100,000 lunches at 27 sites this year. This program, when you add it all up, an in-kind cash and general fund support totals more than 1.8 million. It's valued priceless when it comes to the community building and livability in our city. Summer free for all is a city-wide opportunity to activate our parks and playground in a productive and positive way all summer. It's possible because of our great partners, not only the council who provide general fund support, but also Comcast, bank of America, and Portland parks foundation, and local school districts, all working together to invest in summer free for all. Are you will hear from the community partners but first turn it over to mike abbate.

Mike Abbate, Director, Portland Parks and Recreation: Mayor and commissioners I am joined by the recreation services manager Eileen Argentina and our development manager shelly hunter, and this morning we'll tell you a bit about the movies, the concerts and the playgrounds, and that we're proud to offer this summer. And we're going to talk a bit about how we're creating the performance space and is showcasing of local artists that make Portland a vibrant arts community, and how we're establishing that art focus within the bureau, building successful partnerships that lead to cultural, culturally relevant programming and you will hear from our generous partners as commissioner mentioned, so summer free for all exists as a gateway to arts and culture and recreation in Portland, and summer free for all is a community-centered and powered by the hundreds of volunteers that give their time and their treasure, and encourage groups and individuals, other individuals to do the same. Since branding the program as summer free for all, six years ago, we have seen an incredible growth in community demand for these programs.

July 6, 2016

So we spent time this year investing in the program. We established a mission statement, which reads on the screen, it says summer free for all empowers Portlanders to create and cultivate community by providing free accessible and family friendly summer activity that is celebrate the city's growing cultural diversity. We are striving to improve the reach of the program by building partnerships with the community-based organizations and by diversifying and training our staff and cultural competency, and also by diversifying the programming offerings. Hundreds of hours working with 68 groups will yield a totally of 283 free events of culture, art, and recreation at 94 sites throughout the city. Our playground program activates 46 sites with a variety of recreation activities and arts and crafts and expects to serve more than 105,000 lunches at 27 different sites throughout Portland. Through the generosity of our sponsor and is partnerships of local school districts, we work to close the gap for children during the summertime. When those who need it the most lack access to free and reduced lunch programs. We are proud of this work because as you know, as the commissioner said nearly 60% of Portland's youth qualify for the free and reduced program, free and reduced lunch program. So here to talk a bit more about the program offerings is the recreation services manager Eileen Argentina.

Eileen Argentina, Portland Parks and Recreation: Good morning mayor and commissioners with a budget of 1.8 program this is leveraging public investments to put our community's artists to work so we've been listening and heard you council. We heard the public weigh in through the audience intercept survey last summer, and you told us you want Portland to be a community in which arts are accessible and high quality. We built a program that pairs the national renowned artists with the best of the artist scene, the classic with the indie. We're paying 82 local performers to play some of the best spaces or parks. Interested in seeing a performance that marries Afro-Mexican and European traditionalists together? Come to the park on august 13 to see [inaudible], a fabulous local band. While we could not cover every artist and lineup, we want you to know that we have something for everyone. This summer we're offering a Lineup of local performers such as edna Vasquez, Norma Sylvester and Portland's festival symphony. And thanks to the sponsorship. Partner Latino network along with funds from the director's office, and the generosity of the band, we were able to collaboratively bring local band group [inaudible] to our second annual festival this year. The group is a community favorite and is regularly heard on the radio waves. We have added a children's series and we are also able to offer a variety of artists the opportunity to play for the crowds and the movies such as [inaudible]. We're bringing the arts to the forefront as mentioned, we're reorganizing the recreation services to create an arts culture and special events department. This will bring to go arts related programs and facilities under one manager, and will include the art center, community music center, and the summer free for all, and urban parks programming and provide a basis for championing and maximizing the collaboration with local arts organizations. We expect to have the new arts culture and special events manager onboard in august if not sooner. We worked with the east Portland neighborhood office, the office of neighborhood involvement, and other community-based organizations. This year we are offering marketing materials in nine languages. Arabic, Burmese, English, Chinese, Nepalese, Russian, Spanish, somalin and Vietnamese. We have Arabic in the anticipation of refugees. Portlanders like the east Portland neighborhood office who now offers an Arabic language class on Sunday says are invaluable in this process. This has been a resounding success. Over 2,700 people in four weeks have visited our translated the marketing materials on the Portland parks website and we have also distributed nearly 50,000 translated marketing pieces. Last year we worked in partnership with Latino network to produce the inaugural event festival Latino. This demonstrated our commitment to engaging new audiences through potential and strategic program design, marketing

July 6, 2016

strategies and partnerships. We are able to engage with the Spanish-speaking population with over 1,000 people in attendance. And we are now happy to say that this season three of our 42 upcoming events will be offered in Spanish due to the community requests, and nearly 20% of Portland's residents speak languages other than English, and we look forward to continuing our work with the partners and others to meet the needs of new and diverse communities. To speak more about the partnerships, I will turn it over to Shelly Hunter, development manager.

Shelly Hunter, Portland Parks and Recreation: Thank you. This is a partnership between the community and the city, they give us hundreds of hours, and tap into the network to engage support, and donations to help us build a revenue stream. It cost \$1.8 million. And over 180,000 was raised by the community volunteers and communities for summer free for all, and that budget includes 19% of cash for the sponsor and is donors and 28% from the city's general fund, and 54% from the in-kind donations. We found that the corporate sponsors care, and one in particular care as great deal. Comcast has become our title sponsor for the summer free for all after three years of investing in the program. Thank you for the continued generosity. Oregon blueprint, L-ray, I-heart media and Comcast are donating 900,000 for printing and broadcasting advertising support, and this is a significant savings for the program, and it enables us to keep the program free while building brand recognition. We also offer local businesses the opportunity to get involved in their community by sponsoring events through summer free for all. The coordination of in-kind donations and sponsorships by our community partners and fundraising committees continues to engage and activate the community throughout Portland. Each event is a celebration of the months and months of planning, a shared success between the community members. Now I will turn it over to Mike who will introduce some of these partners.

Abbate: Thanks again for your great support of the summer free for all program. And now we have three members that are coming to testify I want to introduce you to Rebecca Brown with Comcast who as Shelly mentioned is our title sponsor, and just ask her to say a few words of why Comcast is interested inside.

Fritz: Could you put the folks on?

Rebecca Brown: Thank you. At Comcast we do care and we are committed to making a difference in our communities and working hard with our neighbors to do so by finding and supporting programs that are meaningful and impactful like Portland summer free for all programs. As Shelly mentioned over the past three years we have invested 85,000 in financial support, and over 150,000 in on-air support to summer free for all because we do clearly understand that while it is about fun and entertainment and play, it is also more than that, it is at the heart of efforts to realize a healthy Portland. We know that we are still living in a time where families struggle to provide fun experiences for their families, and at Comcast we believe that every child should have the opportunity to create summer memories that last a lifetime. I know that I have many fond memories of park play when I was younger, so that is why Comcast is proud to help present a program that provides all Portlanders with access to the arts and recreation and fun times.

Abbate: Great, and now I want to introduce a Portland legend and a premiere performer in our concert, in the parks program and that's Norman Sylvester.

Norman Sylvester: I am Norman Sylvester here to speak about the park series, I've been working with them for years. But what I see more than networking is fellowship. Fellowship is more of a spiritual word for what's happening in the parks. When I look out from my stage, I see children advancing and playing and families relaxing and disabled citizens and senior citizens, all enjoying this. This is a valuable resource for me to network my art and see the multi-cultural diversity. It really touches my heart to perform in the parks and I am

July 6, 2016

working on the Washington park 100-year celebration as we speak, that's coming up on August 4. Can we sing?

Hales: Of course. [laughter]

Sylvester: Some of us may be able to. ¶ to be free for all is important to our town ¶ ¶ fellowship, love and unity in every park in our town ¶ ¶ music and movies and playground fun ¶ ¶ swimming lessons, too ¶ ¶ summer free for all is fun for me and you ¶¶

Hales: Oh, yeah. [applause]

Abbate: Thank you very much, and I want to introduce the arts and culture manager from the Latino network to say a few words, as well.

Joaquin Lopez: Good to see everybody here. I think -- I am Joaquin Lopez and I am a proud Oregonian, and performing artist with working with the Latino network, familiar with the parks as a Boy, I cannot tell you the honor it is to work alongside the team at Portland rec. Is there on? Ok. It's like talking to a greater spirit. Never in a million years did I think that I would be collaborating with the Portland parks and recreation creating events like the festival Latino, and the marriage of summer free for all and Latino network. This shows our Latino culture to a thousand people, on August 13 we invite you to join our families, happening in Rockwood, and we have camp youth, they are screening the first self-made documentary source about the summer experience. We perform traditional dance and will have live Sonharocho. Safe spaces, to be a family, and positive culture visibility or the beautiful benefits that the, of the summer free for all and Latino network create, we're creating a cultural pulse, integrating our families into public spaces communicating, we see you, and you are beautiful, and you belong. And no testimony is complete without a shout out for my fellow artist who is hold the rhythm of life in their hands, and summer free for all hires so many artists in the summer beautifying with melody and songs. It is an honor to walk beside Portland parks and rec and contribute to the summer free for all and we have no doubt that the festival Latina will continue to grow and evolve beautifying our city, Portland, Oregon. Thank you very much.

Hales: Thank you. Questions for this team?

Saltzman: I really appreciate the meal programs offered but I note that they end on August 26, and Portland public schools and other districts begin next year.

Abbate: We have closed the gap with the exception of three stays of staff training and? Days of the schools that need to make, that make the lunches, and are not available. We filled every available date with lunch programs.

Saltzman: So three days?

Abbate: I can get you the details at the end of the summer because you asked a specific question but the school districts prepare the lunches and so we picked up seven days at the end. Summer. And I will get that back to you what days they cannot make the lunches we distribute.

Hales: Other questions? Thank you all definitely. Any other invited testimony? Anyone else want to speak on this report?

Parson: We have two people signed up. Are either here? Ok, they have left are can I hear a motion to accept the report?

Fish: So moved.

Fritz: Second.

Hales: Roll call, please.

Saltzman: Thank you for the presentation. And I am very impressed with all the different languages that the brochures have printed, and the sponsors and everybody stepping up to make it a great summer for Portland residents, so thank you. Aye.

Novick: Thank you very much for the presentation, and thanks for the sponsors and staff and the song.

July 6, 2016

Fritz: I hope everybody will get out and see not only the events in your local parks if you are fortunate to have a park, we are working on closing that gap and you will have three more parks coming online shortly and thank you to the volunteers who embraced providing help, try going to a park not in your neighborhood and volunteer. It's really fun, and thank you very much to Eileen Argentina, who is our amazing recreation manager who manages not only this, but currently is looking at doing the hiring that the council passed funding for, and thank you to Shelly Hunter, who is an amazing development person who contacts so many people, and companies, and encourages them to be part of the wonderful experience, and thanks to Comcast and Bank of America and everybody else. It's truly something that is a win-win and everybody has a good time so invite some of your neighbors to come with you or meet new neighbors that you did not know would be there. Thank you very much, Council. Aye.

Fish: I went through the list and sure, I have to put in an absence in starting in a week. There is no way that I can do my day job and hit these events. Commissioner Fritz thank you for continuing to grow summer free for all and expand it and deepen the connection to the neighborhoods. Mike, I think that the decision to create art and culture position as part of your reorganization was inspired. It is the lead bureau in effect, other than RACC for delivering art to the public. To have a position that leads that effort was smart. I want to acknowledge that we continue to grow the healthy meals program and I want to give out a shout out to Emily York. It was your team that really leveraged the fact that there is federal money available to grow that program. We served 40 to 50,000 meals and now it's 100,000, hunger is a huge problem how proud we are that Portland Parks is serving hungry families. As Commissioner Fritz said let's give a shout out to the public spirited businesses sponsors and all the folks volunteering to make this happen. I think this is Portland's favorite city service. We can double check but I think that it's among the most beloved and something this Council is proud to support. Congratulations to everyone. Aye.

Hales: It's a great summer and this makes it better so thank you, Comcast. This list is impressive, not only in the length but in its diversity. We have news media here, Z100, L-ray radio, and we have corporate good citizens led by Comcast but other business, and then the nonprofit, the Latino network and East Portland Action Plan, and the Portland Parks Foundation, and public sectors, Centennial Dining Services, and Portland Public Schools, so it's great work by the bureau to have this depth and breadth of sponsors supporting this, so it is really a privilege to see this happen every year in our community, and sweet music for all. Thank you, aye. Good work. Ok. Let us move please to the regular agenda starting with item 792.

Item 792.

Hales: Second reading. Take a vote.

Saltzman: Aye

Novick: I am pleased to support this and thanks to the mayor for the leadership in bringing this forward. This is one of the most important issues facing --

Fish: It's hard to hear you.

Novick: This is one of the most important issues facing the city and the world. There is a lot of things that we can do at the local level to reduce our cash understanding emission and is providing deconstruction rather than demolition is one of those. Deconstruction has significant carbon benefits because of the higher percentage of building materials are reused to recycle than demolition. We heard from DPS deconstructing one house as opposed to the demolition, saves 20 metric tons of CO₂, which takes four cars off the road or plant, 16 acres of trees. I am told the carbon savings is now greater than taking four cars off the road, because the market for energy recovery is dried up with the closure of a Newberg mill, and as a result all the material goes to the landfill and reuses more

July 6, 2016

important. We have a climate a-plan, and this plan walks the talk with that plan. In Portland we think will be the first city in the country and probably in the world to require the deconstruction rather than demolition for the subset of buildings. Limit implementation, and hopefully we'll see others try this, as well, we have the potential to multiply that in fact. There is other benefits, too, there is less dust in the neighborhoods for us to breathe and deconstruction creates a new pathway into the construction industry. This program needs to work on the ground but I understand the concerns raised by moment builders that there might not be enough capacity to handle the increased demand for deconstruction. I appreciate it, commissioner Fish's suggestion that dps send a letter prior to implementation of the status of the trainings and capacity of the firms to come out of this requirement. I'll be looking for this letter and hope it brings good news about the contractors trained but if it looks like we need additional time, we could press pause. Same is true when we receive updates with six and 12 months after the event. In addition to the update, I also want to point out by only requiring homes and duplexes built before 1916, to be deconstructed where it affects sticking a toe in the water to test out the plan, homes built before that accounted for one-third of demolitions and while there is the goal of including houses built before 1941, as a requirement by 2019 it does not prescribe an automatic facet. We combine these requirements to present implementation updates of six months and one year, and should provide some assurance that we won't get into a situation that grinds infill development in the city to a halt, and in addition to thanking the mayor I would like to thank Susan Anderson and Michael Armstrong and Shawn wood for their work on this. And am pleased to vote yes, aye.

Fritz: After that inclusive speech I was saying, you said it was only a third and I was impressed it is a third of homes demolished in the last 2 years were built in 1916 or earlier and if we don't preserve those, we can at least preserve their good parts of them to be reused. Thank you very much, mayor, good job and aye.

Fish: Thank you mayor and bps for bringing this forward. I thought the hearing was fascinating and informative. And one of the things that stuck with me is we are phasing this in slowly, and I think those who are skeptical or concerned about how this is going to work, the fact that we targeted one class of homes which will represent about a third of the houses and 100 houses will be impacted in year one. I think it's prudent that we test drive this and see how it works and then fine tune it. I remember when what was then called the housing authority of Portland, undertook the largest hope 6 project which was the redevelopment of what used to be called the Columbia villa. And they had the idea of deconstructing the residences, and it wasn't a complete deconstruction but a good faith effort and I learned a lot about deconstruction, it was not something that I knew a lot about. Jamie Dunphy and I went out to Kenton, and in addition to paying our respects to Paul Bunyan, who by the way needs a good paint job so I will be asking for the modest contributions. We visit salvage works and that's a big success story. And pdc has played a huge role. They have in the great products of deconstruction for sale. It is raw or refined and wood that has come out of Portland's history, and they are thrilled that we are about to pass this because and they are ready to accept the challenge so I think it has the potential to be good for our local economy and for the people who do the work, and the companies that will be in the secondary market, and I appreciate mayor that we are phasing this in to test drive it. I think it's an example of Portland trying to lead in the area of climate. I am proud to lend my support. Aye.

Hales: I talked about this last week but a few thoughts, and one what we're doing here, you know, we just celebrated our parks and they are something we take for granted, other cities have one or two signature parks Like Stanley park in Vancouver but not the pattern of parks that we are still implementing, they also don't have mile after mile of streets

July 6, 2016

surrounding those parks, many cases with great wood frame houses that are still standing in many case this is good condition that is a treasure. Others don't have that, they might have a few but they don't have the fabric that we have of these houses. Many of which built 100 years ago. They are great houses and beautiful, the craftsmanship is evident and popular and unfortunately now expensive. Since I bought the first of the old houses myself when I first became a homeowner for \$60,000, and then sold it, darn I know they have become expensive. One of my favorite books about architecture has the title, "frozen music." that's what it is. In the music of these houses it's beautiful and should not be lost. Without thought and care and careful examination of all the alternatives. If it has to be lost to be done in the right way so appreciate the counselor's support. And the counselor's support, it is the right thing to do and I expect I won't be here when we take up the question of how about the next third. I suspect that we can do that given we are walking first and running later. Shawn thank you, Shawn wood at the bureau of planning and sustainability and I hear there will be a celebration and there should be for your good work and Alyssa king is back. Thank you for your support and the bureau of staff has done a great job and I want to recognize Jackie dingfelder, who is now off learning from other cities but who advanced this and Zach who has brought it to the finish line in good order. So thank you all for great work and I am proud of this and I think it will to a lot of good, street-by-street and house-by-house all over a great old city, aye, thank you. Let's move on. 793.

Item 793.

Hales: We have a presentation, and Tamara Mayer is here from the police bureau, and we have an amendment to increase the amount so maybe I should take the amendment, put it on and make a presentation, and then we'll take up the amendment. You can explain why we have to amend.

Tamara Mayer, Portland Police Bureau: Yes.

Hales: Good morning.

Mayer: Good morning.

Mayer: This is to authorize a contract between Versaterm and the city of Portland for the justice network region in an amount to be amended hopefully to 3,790.

Hales: 3 million.

Mayer: 3 million, sorry. This is a five-year contract, for the warranty. We had a one-year warranty with the original purchase of the system. Starting with the final acceptance on July 14 of last year. And we wished to continue to receive technical support from them under a separate maintenance agreement. One-third of the funding for this contract comes from Portland police and the other two-thirds is shared by our regional partners, 40 plus other law enforcement agencies.

Parsons: I'm sorry would you add your name for the record please.

Mayer: I am Tamara Mayer.

Parsons: Thank you.

Hales: And this software is up and running and working, and that's important because we have a thoughtful technology oversight process here, and we want to make sure that we are getting what we planned on.

Mayer: We went live on 14 April of last year. So it's just over a year in the works.

Hales: Ok so let me move the amendment to change the amount to 3,790,000. Is that even? Yes.

Mayer: Yes.

Hales: I will move that amendment.

Fish: Second.

July 6, 2016

Hales: So the discussion on the amendment. We'll top it and see if anyone wants to testify on this item. So roll call on accepting the amendment.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye.

Hales: Aye. [gavel pounded] any other questions for the police bureau team? Thank you very much. Anyone want to speak on this item? Anyone signed up?

Parsons: We did not have a sheet.

Hales: Come on up, please.

Charles Johnson: Good morning, I am Charles Johnson. And, I am not a specialist in all the data systems used by the police department or the Oregon department of justice or the fbi but I think that probably more than just myself read from the press that city of Portland will be left out of the fbi's 2015 crime report following problems with the new record-keeping software used by law enforcement. I would like to know if there is a connection between this \$3 million system contract and the unfortunate inability to interface with the department of justice's federal bureau of investigation.

Hales: Good question.

Mayer: All law enforcement agencies are required to report their crime statistics into the fbi's crime data system. For 2015 because we had transferred to a new system, and because we went from the ucr reporting to [inaudible] reporting which tripled the amount of data reports that we were required to report you, we were still in the process of attempting to convert the system to report the state requirements. That was a problem with trying to code. It was not just a regional problem. There were other agencies in Oregon that had problems converting their current rmf outside of the region to report that data. We have -- we are in the process of converting to [inaudible], which is the normal federal requirement and getting rid of [inaudible], we received, we received improvement from the state police to do that and we are currently in the process of doing that.

Hales: You expect this will be a one-year problem as a result?

Mayer: We had a grant that we submitted, and we came to council two or three weeks ago to approval. And to help us with that conversion. To get away from the coding problems that it caused to get us to the nibers and we expect that to take two years. We're going to fix 2016 first so we can make our February deadline to report and we're going to go back and correct the 2015 data and submit it. We will submit it to report the data, it did not make the publication because it was not submitted before February of this year, but it will be accessible on the website. Once it is submitted.

Johnson: Even though we have known me as one of the harsh meanies about some of our progress on the police reform it's a complex bureaucratic issue that is not all the fault of the Portland police bureau. There was Oregon State specialized reporting.

Mayer: The complexity caused problems with the new system, and the two together caused --

Hales: Appreciate the question and the response. Thank you very much. Anyone else? Let's take -- is this an emergency ordinance? Take a vote, please.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye.

Fritz: I got to see versaterm getting another contract it means our system goes together well thank you. Aye.

Fish: Aye.

Hales: Thank you, aye. [gavel pounded]

Hales: Second item on the same subject.

Item 794.

Hales: Speaking of that grant.

Mayer: We came before you three weeks ago, to request approval to apply for the grant. The sum of the grant was in excess of 400,000, and the grant is not going to be awarded

July 6, 2016

until October, November time frame, and it's going to take us six months to make the transition, so we have talked with the state and, or with the bureau of justice statistics, and in coordination with rti they have offered us a pilot program which gives us the cost to fund the conversion through the vendor versaterm, 48,700 in advance of the grant funding so it's a piece of that grant that we received approval from in advance so we can start now and get that going and still be able to make the February time line.

Hales: Good work. Other questions? Anyone else? Let's take a vote, please.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye.

Fritz: Thank you for your work. Aye.

Fish: Aye.

Hales: Thank you for your good management of this complex change, and it's not easy. And acronym control, that stands for national incident-based reporting system, so in case anyone wonders.

Mayer: And it is the Oregon version of that.

Hales: Right. So we do a lot of acronyms and it's good to explain them. Thank you very much and aye. [gavel pounded]

Hales: Ok. Let's take 795, please.

Item 795.

Sharon Raymor, Office of Management and Finance: Good morning, I am Sharon Raymor with the facilities group, and I will be the project manager on this project. And I am here to answer any questions if you have any for this.

Lary Pellat, Procurement Services: I am Larry Pelatt from procurement services.

Hales: So 2,786,000 project here.

Fish: The two things that jump off the memo are -- the one bid and the difference between the original estimate and the final bid amount, would you care to comment?

Raymor: I can speak to that. So we had a mandatory meeting, and five contractors were in attendance however we did receive the one bid from skyward to speak to the difference in the cost estimate versus the bid received, and we did a professional cost estimate with the 100% construction documents which was the plans and the specks. All of the details on the project however the difference can be kind of spoken to as an indicator of the current construction industry, and that We're experiencing a boom with private and public sector opportunities, and I did reach out to the contractors that did not bid to find out was it was that prevented them from bidding, and essentially, it was that there were more opportunities elsewhere that were not as complex, and then the second piece of that, of this project is that because of that, the communication center, and this was a 24-7 operation occupied during construction, that there is a lot of risk to be held on the level of due diligence that we're requiring of the contractor is on the upper side of the scale of, you know, so that -- we cannot have any other critical facilities going down.

Fish: I've been on the council long enough to remember during recession that firms that did not bid for certain kinds of work were bidding because they wanted to keep their crews busy, and they were undercutting the market because they had fixed costs so they wanted to work. Are we at risk of the reverse now where because of the fact that there is so much activity, we're getting fewer bids and people are bidding at a premium? It's a double whammy?

Raymor: Essentially, the premium is a brain jog for me that any work part of this project because it's a seismic upgrade, the trex and are hvc equipment, and anything that's deemed really disruptive, that would prevent the 9-1-1 call operators from being able to hear their conversations has to happen during the low call volume times which is Monday Through Thursday, 2:00 to 6:00, and so with the contractors' message being theirs to

July 6, 2016

determine how they go forth and execute the work, having to account for a very odd hour swing shift potential is driving up the cost.

Fish: One last question where there is a significant gap between the estimate and the final bid, and we see this a lot. This is not the only one. What's the circuit breaker in the system where we ask the question do we need to do a do-over and figure out whether there is a different way of presenting this project to get a competitive bid?

Raymor: I think its case by case dependent. We are within our budget so that we were able to absorb essentially this larger number. The construction documents are solid. The plans, and the design team put a lot of effort and a lot of coordination going in on it, and it's that means and methods' piece, but the contractor has the liberty to determine with the parameters that we established in the documents, they get to decide how they will, actually, nuts and bolts put it together, so that is hard to represent because it is up to the contractor to determine that the means and methods, the execution of the work. I understand what you are asking, I think the nature of this project, I don't know that we could package it in another way. Because of the critical facility, it's going to be a Harrier project.

Fish: [Microphone not on]

Hales: Other questions?

Novick: Yes, first of all, thank you very much for your work on this contract. I have a question about the time line, as you said, it's a significant, the significant element of the project is replacing the roof of the communication center which has the 9-1-1 operations floor as well as bts staff, given that it's July 6, how much of that work do you think that we might be able to get done before the rain starts?

Raymor: So the plan is to, essentially, front load the nature critical, the weather critical elements of the project. There is a lot of cross connect between the mechanical equipment on the roof, and the seismic members of the roofing structure, and as well as the roof so those -- we'll be working with the contractor to hammer those pieces out with the weather window that we have. And so we are taking that into consideration absolutely.

Hales: Any other questions? Thank you both very much. Anyone want to speak on this item? If not, a motion please to accept the report.

Saltzman: So move.

Fritz: Second.

Hales: Roll call, please.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: Thanks to procurement and omf for bringing this to us today, this is a very big deal for the bureau preparing the roof has been a high priority for us for several years. The roof leaks on the operations floor when snow accumulates, and you can imagine the problems that causes since they rely on computers, so they can answer calls and send help. We have been able to rig up buckets to keep the water away but there is a fear that fail and sends a message to our dispatchers that have to navigate around the buckets. We were pleased to secure the funds in fall bump. I understand the processes take time, and our folks are anxious to get the project done this year and not wait for the summer of 2017 so I am glad that we are expediting this. It would be a shame to endure another winter risking water damage to expensive technology. Sharon said we hope to build a front load to be completed during nice weather, and if we can finish the rest in indoors this fall, that will require everything going well, and including the timely securing of the permits from the various permitting bureau says, so I want to say that we hope the city bureaus will testify in the coming weeks, and coordinate when possible, and expedite their view of this contract and require the building permits. And we cannot simply turn it off. I am glad that we can

July 6, 2016

work together and get it moving this year so thank you it very much and I am pleased to vote aye.

Fritz: Thank you for your work, I am really impressed that after the contractor turned in a bid with no participation from the women, emerging small businesses and minorities, you were able to work with them to get to the 27%, sorry, 20.7% of the contracting work. So that's really impressive. Thank you. Aye.

Fish: Aye.

Hales: Good work. Yeah, obviously, buckets and other expediciencies in the 9-1-1 center are a very short-term solution so this is the right thing to do. Thank you. We need to wait on 796 until the city treasurer is here, and she is doing interviews and won't be back until 11:00 so we will take up 797 please.

Item 797.

Hales: Good morning.

Cathy Bless, Bureau of Human Resources: Good morning, mayor and commissioners. I am Cathy Bless health and financial benefits manager. I am here to speak on 797 authorizing the contract with express groups and the city of Portland. And to provide benefit services, the acronym is pbm so I will be referring to that for the remainder of my talk. The pbm acts as a third party administrator for prescription medications, and we reimburse the pbm for costs incurred, and by contracting with express scripts the city gets the value of their discounts and broad network pharmacy access, safety and efficacy programs and the management of a restricted formulary. Express scripts with the rfp finalist from the selection committee that included one labor and one management representative of the labor management benefits committee, and subsequent to the selection of the scripts the committee voted to implement a restricted formulary providing additional savings. The city spends 8 million on pharmacy costs for the self-insured health plans, and the estimated savings for the contract is about 2.5%. Which is estimated at 860,000 per year, each year over the contract period. The savings is projected off the current cost of prescriptions and significantly decreases the 10 to 12% inflation we experienced in the pharmacy costs over the past few years. The new contract is also a significant factor that allowed the city to lower the out-of-pocket maximum from 3,500 to 3,000 for employees. And to hold the rates again for the second year in a row on the city plans. Changes are always difficult in the health plan and changing to a new pharmacy pbm is no different. We began communicating about the change to express scripts with the first annual enrollment information's at home and via email in mid may. Temporary i.d. Cards were mailed out on June 27, and express script started mailing the welcome kits and i.d. Cards at the same time. The groups has extensive online and app capabilities allowing the participants to cost, to access the cost information by pharmacy, and by location, and brand or generic quiver lens and whether they can fill the prescription for a 30-day or 90-day period at any of the area pharmacies. 376 of the 10,650 planned Participants have received letters indicating they may be affected because of the formulary put in place July 1. They will work with planned participants and providers to safely transition to a covered medication, and/or work through at the appeals process to provide non-covered medications as an exception because of the medical need. We have worked with the healthy foundations program to provide assistance as a local resource for concerned participants. So I am happy to answer any questions and also request you approve this contract. Thank you.

Hales: Questions for Cathy?

Saltzman: I guess that I am still trying to get, to wrap my head around this. Can you explain what that means for the city employees using the prescription medicines and what changes, headaches may we anticipate in the next month?

July 6, 2016

Bless: Sure.

Bless: So restricted formularies are market standard. And they, for larger pbm's, they have a lot of buying power, and they can make significant cost savings to, to groups that they work with by only providing maybe four of the eight medications offered in the marketplace that maybe all eight are therapeutically equivalent so they contract with a few lesser of the vendors. It provides the city to be bigger discounts, and less cost to the participant when they are picking up their prescriptions. That's a basic premise around the formulary, and it does not restrict the newest medication, that's not what it is about. And it is about looking at the wide variety of the medications that are available and selecting the ones that are most effective and add the most value.

Saltzman: Can the pharmacy do that without having to get a new prescription from a doctor?

Bless: Typically, it depends on a plan. We do have, in our plan, we have some safeguards for that. If a doctor says it is written, then the prescription, as long as it is on the restricted formulary, it is dispensed as written. The pharmacy will not override that prescription. If the member says I would really like this one, then the pharmacy will check with their doctor to see if there is a medical need, if the medication is not on the restricted formulary there is an appeals process, and maybe you are allergic to one of the medications that are on the restricted formulary and there is a medical reason. For you to be on something else, that's covered through an exception process. And that involves a provider of the patient and the pharmacy.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Novick: I don't mean to give you a hard time and I assume I can work this out but I went to renew my prescription for these glasses to prevent you from getting glaucoma, and so far I could get three months of those drops, and they were looking under the new insurance and said we can only give you an 18-day supply, so if it turns out that I have to go down to the Pharmacy every 18 days and pick it up, I am going to have a bone to pick with these people so I will try to work it out.

Bless: And please, please let me know if there is a problem because the expansion of access to a 30-day prescription from a 90-day one, we used to be able to get 90 days through Fred Meyer and target and Wal-Mart. Now it is Safeway, Costco, and Walgreens so it is expanded but it might be medication specific.

Fritz: I just got my card and you can have it delivered by the mail. So that way it does not really matter if it's 18 days or three months. I thought that was nice.

Fish: Can I ask you a question about the flexible spending account, so for those of us that opted out because we have a spouse on another plan, we get this now credit card.

Bless: Yes.

Fish: And is it front load all the money or does it get put in pro rata.

Bless: If you elected 1,000 in the flexible spending account, all \$1,000 is available on July 1. It is one of the great things that it allows you to have the money available and pay for it through the planned year, and at the pharmacy, the best way to use the debit cards, co-payments, at the doctor's office, and at a pharmacy. Those are just clean swipes, and benefit health solutions will not e-mail you and ask you for additional information. So those are very easy ways and convenient ways to use it.

Fish: I applaud you to that, the old way was, was a little --

Bless: Arduous.

Fish: Arduous, and it covers my entire family.

Bless: It does.

Bless: All eligible dependents.

Fish: On behalf of the Fish family, thank you.

July 6, 2016

Bless: You are welcome.

Hales: Other questions or issues to raise? Anyone want to speak on this item? Ok. Thank you very much, and this is an emergency ordinance and now a vote, please.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye.

Fritz: Thank you Cathy Bless and the labor management benefits committee. This shows that the healthcare doesn't have astronomically rising costs and you can get better service for the same amount of money by being diligent and managing the cost so I appreciate that, and I appreciate having the privilege of healthcare for everybody thanks too Obama care, aye.

Fish: Nice work. Aye.

Hales: Thank you, aye. [gavel pounded] ok. Let's move to 798 which is a second reading.

Item 798.

Hales: Roll call.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye.

Fritz: Thanks to Mary Beth Henry and your team, aye.

Fish: Aye.

Hales: Steady progress towards a better city. Thank you, aye. [gavel pounded] ok. And 799.

Item 799.

Saltzman: Thank you, mayor. The bureau of development service is working hard to increase the diversity of the workforce and better reflect the demographics of the community we serve. Part of that work is finding valuable partners such as Portland state university. The bureau is made up of building inspectors, architects, engineers, planned examiners, and urban planners. The communities of color are underrepresented in these fields. The intergovernmental agreement with Portland state university is a step towards building a stronger partnership between the city and the psu to move towards getting more students of color into the urban planning profession and the valuable work experience they need prior to graduation. While assisting the bureau of development services with their work so it is a true win-win in my book. I will turn it over to Rebecca Esau who is the manager of the land use services division, and Jennifer Gill, psu professor, and director of the school of urban studies and planning for details.

Rebecca Esau, Bureau of Development Services: Good morning, mayor and commissioners. The urban planning profession is not very diverse. Communities of color have been underrepresented. According to the 2010 census, 81% of American planners are white and according to the American planning association, reported in 2013, only 16% of the members identify as racial minorities. We want the workforce to reflect the community that we serve, and getting more students of color into the planning profession is part of that goal. Bds is developing a multi-pronged approach to reflect, to address this issue with some short and long-term strategies. Long-term strategies include sowing the seeds early by getting our staff out to school, talking to kids, and to get them interested in, and aware of the career opportunities in urban planning and engineering and etc., and we also participate in the architects and schools programs. The iga is before you today to partner with psu and their diversity program. This program seeks to get students of color into psu's urban planning program, and in exchange for paying into the scholarship and stipend fund, psu, bds would get three part-time interns, each year, and this would give the students work experience prior to graduation, which would help them to compete at jobs for bds as well as bps and other planning offices in the metro area. For bds the source of funding is revenue from land use services fees, not from the general fund, and also psu is contributing to the tuition for these students. So they have a financial stake in it, as well. And the ordinance before you, it gives the bds director the authority to renew the iga, and

July 6, 2016

We think it's going to be a great investment for both psu as well as bds in helping us get the work done and improving the diversity. And a quick thank you to others involved with us in this project. Bds director Paul scarlet and I met with connie from psu many months ago starting this discussion. She's out on sabbatical. Thanks to them and also to Ross on my staff and Elshad Hajiev getting all these documents finalized. This is a new pilot and we hope that it's going to be the model for other projects in the future and thanks to the commissioner for your support. Jennifer, anything more you would like to add?

Jennifer Gill: Sure, I appreciate the opportunity to be here today so each year our master's program we graduate 35 to 40 students each year, professionals who then enter the field of the planning, and about two-thirds of the graduates remain in the Portland area. 80% are in the northwest. But we, like plane other programs, throughout the country are really trying to make efforts to improve the diversity of the student body. We made a big commitment over the past few years, and for many of the students the biggest barrier is financial. One of the most effective programs that we implemented starting five years ago is our Portland planning and diversity award program where we are reaching out and recruiting diverse students and providing Tuition support. So we're very excited about partnering with the bureau of development services and to help support and expand this program in the coming years. We do view this as a partnership and expanding and collaborating on some of the future efforts that were mentioned in terms of the outreach at other levels of students and etc. About planning. We are, as was mentioned, contributing over 26,000 from our budge for tuition for the students and we are definitely very committed to improving the diversity of the students and also an environment where they learn how to plan for just equitable and diverse communities, and this is going to be a great way to continue and expand that. Thank you.

Saltzman: Thank you both.

Hales: Great presentation. Thank you. Any questions? Thank you very much, anyone want to speak on this item?

Shedrick Wilkins: I would like to.

Hales: Come on up, please.

Wilkins: I can say this because -- [inaudible]

Hales: Put your name in the record.

Wilkins: Shedrick Wilkins. I have a degree from psu in electrical engineering from 1991 when I was a student there, and I thought psu was very class oriented, most of the people I went to school with were middle to upper -- or middle class. And one of my students, his father was a millionaire and his father a doctor. I was a first generation Student, and it was difficult, if I had not gone into the army I would not have graduated from psu. It was too rough, and sometimes I regret going there and wish I had gone to Mount Hood community program, a two-year program at one-third of the cost. This is a good program because I do believe that its worse at times people of different races don't have the exposure, typically, the student and a white Caucasian student, it's not fair. And any student at psu needs all the encouragement that they can get. When I was going to school, why am I here? It's not fair.

Hales: Thank you very much. Thank you all. This ordinance passes to second reading and will come back on our next week's calendar but thank you for good work. Aye. Ok. 800.

Item 800.

Hales: Commissioner Saltzman.

Saltzman: Thank you, mayor and members of the council. I will let the people in front of you explain this but I did want to acknowledge our outstanding fire marshal, and welcome for the first time in his appearance before city council. Our new chief who has been on the

July 6, 2016

job less than a week. Chief Mike Myers. And he is not letting any -- not wasting any time, he's visited all 30 fire stations. Welcome and we will turn it over to you ornate.

Mike Myers, Chief, Portland Fire & Rescue: Thank you. And good morning. I am Mike Myers, for the record, the fire chief for the city of Portland. To my right is the division chief of the fire prevention and marshal, Nate Takara, and he will be speaking on item 800, and this item is going to address adjustments in the fee schedules.

Nate Takara, Fire Bureau: Good morning, thank you very much for allowing me to speak this morning regarding the ordinance and increase our fees for services that we provide. I am Nate Takara the fire marshal for Portland fire and rescue, and in the fiscal year 2016-2017 in the adopted budget, to increase revenue by 50,000 to help improve our ability to recover costs, working with the prevention committee, which are members, which are representatives from the business within the community, we identified fee increase and these are the three main areas. First, special use permit fees, especially public assembly and event permits, and these are required for large events and any events. The last time these fees were adjusted was 10 years ago. The second is related to the fireworks related permits, these are associated with wholesale and retail related to storage and distribution of fireworks. Also we're looking to increase the fees associated with the public display. These fees haven't been adjusted since 2000. The third area, these include site development, street locations and the single family Residential dwelling unions. Currently the reviewers have a review for access and water supply with, without charging for the services that we provide. These increases help us to recover our costs for the services we provide and we anticipate these to the fee schedules at \$50,000. Thank you.

Hales: These are relatively minor increases in the amount of the fee in the case where they are changing.

Fish: This one that is not proposed to go up, but just curious under the major projects group programs, surcharge for the program participants, 10,000 per project, could you remind us what that is?

Takara: That's when we have the projects within the city. They pay a special fee, and what that does is gives them access to a fire plan review, and at times they meet on a weekly basis, but they have particular access. The project becomes priority.

Hales: This will be something like the collaborative life sentences center or major downtown tower or something, and time is money for them so they pay an extra 10,000 and get access to the reviewers, is that how that works?

Fish: So they are like the concierge service.

Takara: Exactly.

Fish: Is there any fee that I have not looked at all of the fees here, is there any particular fee increase that is going to fall disproportionately on any community organization that seeks to hold the event?

Takara: I don't think so. I think that it's over the broad spectrum of the events, and I don't think that there is one particular community or group that that would be adversely affected.

Hales: Yeah. That's straightforward. And another one that did not go -- I am curious about, the reinspection fee, so there is the stair step that you know, the first time, you be, it's 150 for the violation and then 300 and then 600, and are we seeing that happen very often? Maybe not given the situation?

Takara: At times we do but what we try to do is work with our customers, and if there is minor violations that need to be abated it's usually a short time period but there is times when it's permit related and that could take up to a year, and as long as there is some progress, we work closely with the building department and if there is progress in the fire code violations, the reinspection fees, we do not reinstate it. That stays frozen. We stayed away from the code enforcement fees, I believe three years ago we adjusted them so the

July 6, 2016

fees that we have today in front of you, the adjustment is just strictly permit related. And some other items that we do a good example is when our crews, they provide services during the development there is times that, not often but it does happen where a street would be closed, and it's a major error and we provide an engine to provide fire service, and medical services on the other side because it's a main road And blocks any type of emergency services. Prior to having it in our fee schedule, we did not have the ability to charge so we would stand by for five or six or sometimes a day with the engine crew without being able to get cost reimbursement.

Fish: Can I ask you to address something that I hear from time to time and remember when we get a phone call or an email, it's the one in 100 person that hasn't had the happy experience, right. We don't necessarily get the 99 emails saying great job. The thing is, that I have heard on a couple of occasions is from a business person doing a major renovation, and having more than one fire marshal come and handle the project, and this is anecdotal but the gist of it is you have one person who comes in who says do this and this and you are on the right track, and a couple weeks later someone else comes and says you forgot to do this and you don't need to do that and how do we -- what is our system for insuring kind of continuity at the inspector level?

Takara: So we try to minimize those type of incidents however what happens is we have inspectors with different specialties within the fire prevention division so let's say that it's a restaurant. And you have a sprinkler system and a fire alarm system, and those are two completely different specialties, so you would have the fire inspector that specializes strictly on the sprinklers so he or she would come in and look at it and there is, a lot of times changes, and that's when we do the inspections and there is modifications that need to be done so that it could reflect the permits that they submitted, and the second would come in and he or she may be a fire alarm specialist, and he or she is looking at specifically the fire alarm issues, not, has nothing to do with the sprinkler system, so they would say you need to make these corrections in order for the permit to be approved.

Fish: That makes perfect sense. I guess -- you may be doing this but you know what we might hear from some of these business says like starting up restaurants or doing a major remodel is they want to make sure that they get all the bad news at once at the front end. When they start working on one piece it potentially implicates another piece, and to the extent possible do we try to get all that on the table at the front end so people say no, what all the challenges are that they are going to have to work through are?

Takara: It depends -- it depends on the contract, on the timing of when the sprinklers are completed and the fire alarms are completed. If the general contractor and they call us at the same time then all of it can be addressed all up front but there is times that it's a timing of the project. It's based on communication and if we go the plans up front and a lot of times they are submitting plans through different vendors and there is a Different company for the permit.

Fish: If I am doing a new restaurant, do I have the option of calling you and saying with my contractor can you send out x, y, and z and give me soup to nuts all of the a menu of everything we'll be facing and then we'll start engaging you at the front end before I start making investments and fixing this and being told that I have to remove the drywall because I have got to fix another problem. Is there a mechanism for getting things done at the front end with your current system?

Takara: I believe so, if the customer request for us to come out and advise we do that, but the cost that we have is where we insure that the code is being met we don't design so where it gets to be tricky. We go out there and start designing so that's something we don't do, we ensure the codes are being met so that's where there's a fine line between giving them something that need however we want to stay away from designing systems.

July 6, 2016

Hales: Other questions? Thank you both very much. Anyone want to speak on this item? If not it comes back for approval next week. Thank you very much. Ok let's move onto to number 80—unless Jennifer is ok 801.

Item 801.

Hales: Commissioner Saltzman.

Saltzman: Thank you mayor, this council has spent a lot of time in the last few weeks dealing with the capital side of affordable housing, approving sources of revenue that would authorize us to build more affordable housing for our residents, but also as important is services and the services before you today are multiple organizations that provide a broad continuum of assistance and services for low income homeowners and renters. Funding for these contracts are under approval in the bureaus approved budget, a majority of the community service providers receiving these contracts have been in partnership with the city for many years and are in alignment with the housing bureaus strategic plan. These services provide home buyer education and counseling, foreclosure prevention and aids in home retention by providing critical home repairs. Services provided to renters include funding for a renter's rights hotline and relocation referrals. These are critical to prevent families from losing their homes, to purchase a home, to prevent further displacement and to add to safety nets of low income Portlanders who are homeless or at risk of homeless. Kim McCarty from the housing bureau, do you have additional comments?

Kim McCarty, Portland Housing Bureau: Good morning, mayor, commissioners. I don't have more to offer. I'm here to answer questions and take back any comments you have.

Fish: This exhibit tells us the organization, the amount and the funding site and activity. It doesn't tell us what they have committed to doing. So how do we know at this stage of the process what the obligation is of each contractor?

McCarty: I'm certainly here to answer questions about what historically these contractors have done. We have worked with them for many years and they have all historically fulfilled their contractual obligation. We're happy in the future to add those contracts. You can see as an exhibit, a typical contract these are over 100,000 and those are the contracts that we bring to you. Is there a specific one?

Fish: We're familiar with all these organizations because we have a long history with them. I would say that for the next time you bring this matter before council I think it would be helpful for us to see another column which just says for the amount of money we're allocating, what are the outcomes we hope to get.

McCarty: Okay.

Fish: So that -- the dollars in isolation, it's hard to sort of -- it's difficult to look at these numbers and know what they mean unless we know what in effect we're buying.

McCarty: Right.

Fish: An outcome panel would be helpful to understand this better and then obviously a year later for us to track it.

McCarty: Yes, absolutely.

Hales: Other questions or guidance? Thank you very much. Anyone want to speak on this item?

Parsons: We have four people signed up.

*******:** Good morning, mayor.

Mike Jenkins: Good morning. I'm mike Jenkins. I'm with the Hawthorne bus. We're starting up a new program, we're an outreach program these kinds of programs that will be built also you have a program called bud Clark that is for heroin junkies to use their heroin. Well, it didn't work for me. I went through that program. It didn't work. I'm building a new program, I'm putting on buses that will have showers, will have washer and dryers and will

July 6, 2016

be feeding vegan and we'll be talking about detoxing with him. We're not going to be using methadone for 27 years. That's the problem I see out there. I'm working with rtd to go and feed seven days a week with a bus, facilities. Also I want to be able to go to bud Clark and feed people in there that aren't getting proper fed. We're these programs when we're not doing anything inside the program. I was totally lost when I went into this program. I got stage 4 cancer. I got broken back. I had my leg cut off. I still had them problems today. It's been over a year. But I'm not going to sit on my butt and let smoke raise. I'm out here building the community so we can work with people like me and get us help. That's all I got to say. Thank you and I hope I hear from all of you.

Hales: Thanks very much. Good morning, Mr. Davis. Come on up.

David Davis: So I would like to see you guys actually take over some of these abandoned houses to some degree and put more money into that if it's actually legal to take the houses from the people. Because a lot of these houses actually have owners and they might have some, you know, various health issues or other things, but in generally think that you guys are talking about taking a bunch of zombie houses for the city. I think if that's going to be the case and if you do actually take a bunch of these houses and the city becomes the owner I think you should put them in the hands of right to dream 2 or other community agencies, maybe, you know, some other community groups that actually are working to house people and not make a profit off the whole poverty pimp crisis capitalism role model that seems to be fueling America, and I think that actually a lot of these housing issues would be taken care of if there wasn't so much profit motive to keep people homeless and to keep housing prices so high. And all that. So basically, I don't think that the city should get ownership of these zombie houses that you call them. I think that they should actually be taken over by a community organizations that actually aren't profit driven like central city concern and other people of that ilk that have turned poverty and homelessness into a major industry. I would like to see, you know, people like right to dream 2 have more have more political power in this city and I would like to see you guys work with community organizations more than with these poverty pimp corporations like central city concern. Which also have patrols that go around and wrestle with the homeless every day and call the police on the homeless and wage cultural war on the homeless. Maybe you guys could put some money into some real community organizations and if you're going to take a bunch of these houses, put them in the hands of the community and stop throwing away so much money with all these poverty pimp organizations. Obviously not working.

Hales: Thanks very much.

Davis: Homelessness won't be solved with affordable housing. It needs to go beyond that.

Parsons: Shedrick Wilkins is next.

Hales: Come on up.

Wilkins: I'm Shedrick Wilkins. I agree with Mr. Davis. These zombie houses should be turned over to the public. In Hillsboro there's a house I was donated to veterans, kind of like in downtown Hillsboro. I was there when I was homeless five years ago. Since you have them, and people are talking about using parks, why not just use these homes for right to dream 2, things like that. There were complaints from the neighbors anyway, in the first place, if there are complaints because there are homeless people there there's not much change but at least people -- a lot of homeowners don't want intrusion. Certainly if there's any disturbance the police can get involved.

Hales: Thanks very much.

Saltzman: Point of order, I need clarification from our attorney, probably. I intend to recuse myself from this vote as there's a potential appearance of a conflict of interest. My partner works for impact northwest, which is one of the sub recipients here. This is an emergency

July 6, 2016

ordinance. Do I need to leave the room or does that statement suffice?

Ben Walters, Chief Deputy, Attorney's office: You'll need to leave the room by charter.

Hales: All right, Dan will recuse himself and the rest of us will take action.

Fish: We'll wait until Dan leaves. I have a couple of amendments. [laughter]

Hales: No, you don't. Roll call, please.

Novick: Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye.

Hales: Yeah, the organizations on here like Native American youth and family and community alliance of tenants indicates that we are trying to reach to a pretty broad spectrum of folks to help with this work. I appreciate that. Good work. Aye.

Hales: Okay, let's return to the item we passed over because our treasurer is here and take up 796.

Item 796.

Hales: Good morning.

Jennifer Cooperman, City Treasurer's Office: Good morning. Mayor, commissioners. So the city has a set of comprehensive financial management policies in place and we are talking about the addition of a new one in 2017. As you may recall, the city is a large acceptor of credit cards for payment for services that we render and we spent most of 2015, calendar year 2015, working very hard to become compliant with the payment card industry security standards. Now that the city is compliant, this policy states our intent to remain so and what the minimum security standards are that we will hold ourselves accountable to. It goes through some definitional terms that explains that pci compliance is incredibly comprehensive. It talks about services, devices, software, everything that is involved in the process of accepting cards for payment. After the definitions it recognizes that there are many groups in the city that coordinate to protect the city's pci compliance particularly when third party vendors are used. The technology group and procurement services is essential to work on the contract, treasury and bts particularly the information security group are critical in reviewing all rfps and contracting and development prior to presentation to you. That bureaus need to work with their vendors to have on file stations - - applications of compliance from the vendors that we keep on file to determine if they are working for us. In the event any third party is in breach of contract because they are not compliant, that the bureau is required to work with treasury and bts to have remediation plans that can end the relationship. Pci compliance is for a city as a whole. We're only as strong as the weakest link so every link needs to be compliant.

Fish: First, Jennifer, congratulations to you and everyone that worked on pci compliance. You could write a chapter in the history of the city of how complicated that was, how difficult it was to meet the deadline. Along the way we had to inconvenience a lot of people and we constantly get emails from people at the water bureau lamenting the fact that we had to discontinue auto pay during this transition. We'll have good news for them this summer. But it was an unbelievably complex process which leads to my question. This was a very much top down driven process on pci compliance. You and Fred and others went bureau by bureau, making sure we're in compliance and met the deadline. To what extent does this now decentralize compliance piece going forward or is there still someone at the top of the food chain riding herd on all the bureaus to make sure that -- you raised your hand. To what extent are you asking us to be tracking this and to what extent are you going to continue to track it and let us know when problems arise?

Cooperman: So I actually think pci compliance is bottom up rather than top down. The discussion of the requirement was top down but the building blocks to make us compliant start at the bottom level and work their way up. Every building block that we add to the city's payment infrastructure needs to be compliant so they all contribute to the larger picture. At the ends of the day, any new functionality that gets added to the city's payment

July 6, 2016

infrastructure has to be approved by treasury. It also has to be vetted by information --

Fish: An example. Kathy cook at water decides to add an enhancement to the system but it triggers this particular requirement. My guess is she would automatically reach out to treasury and omf, say, let's talk about this.

Cooperman: There's actually fin 210, which talks about low country electronic payments.

Fish: We're all familiar with fin 210. You don't have to patronize us. [laughter]

Cooperman: It discusses electronic paints. States that additions to anything that adds to the city's payment infrastructure needs to get approved by parts of. [audio not understandable]

Fish: I want to be clear that there are sufficient eyes on this that -- yes, I will say to my bureau director, here's this document. We have to be compliant. But there's lots of bureaus and this is notoriously difficult form of government to corral everybody. I want to make sure the same outstanding system is in place that got us to this point for the next phase and it's not just incumbent upon us to be asking our bureau directors.

Cooperman: I think most people these days know about -- they recognize pci. They may not be able to tell you exactly what it means or what it requires, but there is certainly a heightened awareness and sensitivity throughout the city about the need to be compliant and what the repercussions of not being so might be. Including fines or being told that we couldn't accept cards any more.

Fish: The biggest users are pbot, the utilities --

Cooperman: Pbot by far because of the parking meter system. I haven't ranked them because they are all our favorite children.

Fish: Thank you. Volume.

Cooperman: Volume I would say water and parks.

Fish: Those are the big three.

Cooperman: Yes.

Hales: Other questions? Thank you very much. Anyone want to speak on this item? If not let's take a vote to adopt the resolution, please.

Saltzman: Thank you very much. Aye.

Novick: Great work. Aye.

Fritz: I live in fear of the Treasurer showing up in my office saying you're the weakest link Aye.

Fish: I want to state for the record I was a big Jennifer Cooperman fan before I learned her daughter and my sister share the same name. Nice work on this. Again, you know, the pci compliance had it gone south would have been a big story. The fact that you got us to the finish line, unbelievably difficult multi-bureau exercise was remarkable. Thank you. Aye.

Hales: Anyone who just checked in on this discussion today would think this was easy. Aye. Let's move on to 802.

Item 802.

Hales: Why don't you read 803 as well?

Item 803.

Hales: I'm sorry, second reading.

Parsons: Yes.

Hales: Let's take a vote on 802. [laughter]

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye.

Hales: Aye. 803. Roll call.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: 804.

Item 804.

Fritz: Thank you, mayor, colleagues. I asked mr. Morrison to come up. I was running for

July 6, 2016

reelection from January to May, and Mr. Morrison was also in that race. He raised some issues which I found fascinating and needing to get wider audience than the masses who came to our event. Commissioner Fish, commissioner Saltzman may remember in 2009 the council asked the federal government in a unanimous vote for a resolution to look at whether there are any health impacts from cell towers. Fcc says we're not even allowed to consider that. We were not successful in getting congress to require the fcc to take another look at it. Mr. Morrison has very helpful tips not only for us but particularly for children, so I invited him to give this presentation. It's purely a presentation. There won't be any testimony afterwards.

Hales: Welcome.

David Morrison: Hi. Very thankful for the city council especially commissioner Fritz for inviting me to talk about the hazards of cellphones and Wi-Fi. I'm also here as a member of nonprofit advocacy organization wireless education action. Our work is to inform the public of the harmful biologic effects from devices. During the campaign for city council I showed a photograph of the human brain before and after 15 minute cell phone call. It's up there. To students at Benson high. Commissioner Fritz and I were both surprised at the curiosity and interest of the students when asked the kids agreed that schools should be teaching them safer cell phone use in their health classes. My interest in health effects of microwaves began about ten years ago when my daughter's school put a cell phone tower in the middle of the campus. In researching the work of scientists who studied the effects of microwaves I found an enormous amount of material dating back over 60 years. Microwave radiation from all wireless devices is classified to be a carcinogens by the world health organization in 2011, which placed it in the same category as automobile exhaust, ddt, and lead. Worse than lead, actually. Last year 200 biological and health scientist from 39 countries warned the United Nations and world health organization stricter regulations are needed to protect the public. The big news is that the debate about whether cellphones cause brain cancer just ended with the study that was completed by the national toxicology program confirmed that cellphones cause brain cancer as well as rare form of heart cancer. The microwaves used in that study were from a single source. Now we're exposed to multiple frequencies of varying types and strengths constantly at any given moment anywhere almost all the time. The American cancer society has denied the cell phone cancer connection until now. In response to this study, the chief medical officer of the American cancer society, Dr. Otis Brawley, had this to say. The report linking radio frequency radiation to two types of cancer marks a paradigm shift in our understanding of radiation and cancer risk. All Portland schools have Wi-Fi and seven schools have cell towers. All of those cell towers and all of those Wi-Fi routers emit at the same frequency that cellphones do. Some of the cell towers are located just a few feet from the upstairs classrooms. Cell towers and Wi-Fi are arguably more dangerous because of the long term chronic exposure. World health organization expert Dr. Anthony miller agrees. Dr. Miller says Wi-Fi networks in schools and cell towers in your school grounds could significantly increase the cancer risk in your community. Interestingly, an assistant to the principal at writing letter school said when the cell tower was built, the kids became noticeably jumpier. A considerable number of children across the nation are already reported to be experiencing negative health effects, cognitive impairments and increased adhd symptoms. In los Angeles a teacher reported children bleeding from the ear and nose since Wi-Fi was installed in her classroom. Schools have been receiving huge amounts of federal funding for wireless technology but nobody stopped to ask the question is this technology safe. And what does it really do to learning and cognition? One answer comes from yet another recent study at mit, at the u.s. Military academy that showed that students who use computers had test scores 18% lower than students without computers. Portland

July 6, 2016

resident award winning scientist Dr. Martin call, with us here today, internationally respected for his work in environment medicine, is now focusing on researching biological effects of microwave radiation. Dr. Paul says, if you take one thing away from here, this is the most important quote, microwaves attack four things people value the most. Our health, brain function, integrity of our genomes and the ability to produce healthy offspring. The telecommunications industry can't even get liability insurance anymore because wireless technology is listed in the highest emerging risk category by Swiss risk management insurer. We don't have time to wait for our government agencies to catch up with science because strange as it seems there's no local, state or federal agency monitoring microwave emissions in our environment. City commissioners should ask Multnomah County to enlist the public health services task force of the health authority to review independently funded peer review studies and when their review is completed they should share the results and inform the public of simple steps to reduce radiation exposure. Like greenbelt, Maryland, did in 2014 by unanimous exposure. Some things that can be done in the meantime, use your cell phone on speaker, which Amanda Fritz does now. Don't leave the phone in your bedroom at night when it's on. Unplug your Wi-Fi router at night. Curb device use in all moving vehicles including buses and trains, and enclosed places like elevators. Keep the phone out of the pocket or bra. Replace cordless phones with land lines, and never use a laptop or i-pad on the lap, especially the lap of a child or pregnant woman. So we need to ask ourselves in another quote from a friend of mine, from the east coast, whether we are a society committed to protecting children, telling the truth about scientific facts, accepting the consequences of these facts, acting responsibly in the face of these facts, and ultimately modeling how to think critically for the children that they serve. So in my mind the first step would be to replace wireless internet in schools with safe cabled internet connections. I forgot to show my photographs.

Fritz: Can you run through them quickly?

Morrison: This is a map of the -- I took a reading at meek school, far away from the buildings, off the playground. As you can see, the reading is right at the top of my meter. That's a school that has a cell tower on it. This is a photograph of the different absorption rates. This is a five-year-old over three times the amount of absorbs in the brain as an adult. 10-year-old right in the middle so you can see children and under 20 are much more susceptible to harm from microwaves.

Fritz: Thank you very much. I appreciate you sharing this information.

Morrison: Thank you for inviting me.

Hales: Very compelling.

Fritz: Mr. Morrison said in terms of not using your cell phone on the bus, I get motion sickness but then I started commuting by bus a lot more since I have been on council. I thought I could train myself to look at my phone for a bit of the time and work my way up. What was interesting the battery started running out a lot quicker, even if you are not convinced of the health impacts, that using your phone on the bus, which now I look around and almost everyone is on their phone that's one of the things that drains the battery faster.

Morrison: The microwaves get caught in like a tin can like any sort of vehicle, and they don't really escape. So you're getting much more concentrated exposure.

Fritz: Thank you, very much. Thank you for your indulgence, colleagues.

Hales: Let us move on then -- that's just a report. But it's obviously an important report. So appreciate getting it. We're going to move to 805.

Item 805.

Hales: Happy day and appreciate Commissioner Fritz, you and the parks bureau, making this such a success. Last year we had more than 12,000 kids using free access to our

July 6, 2016

community centers and to our teen programming. There was and is a great need in the community and this effort is doing a lot to meet it. We just unveiled the new cell phone app that allows our youth to access the information about what's going on in our community centers which is developed by a partnership with i-urban teen and commissioner Fritz and I got to meet the young people who built this app. It's cool and works and is very user-friendly. I think it will get a lot of use. Then we have a virtual alphabet soup of community based partners that are going to be included in this effort here today. Poic, irco, boys and girls club, sei, and reep. That diversity of acronyms also indicates quite a diversity of community basis in those groups. I'm really happy about that commissioner Fritz, thank you for your partnership in this.

Fritz: Thank you, mayor. I think this is a great example of where the commission form of governance works really well, especially with a mayor that is passionate about looking at activities rather than waiting until kids get into trouble. I'm looking forward to the work next year in partnership with Portland parks and recreation. We approved \$2 million in ongoing funding to support -- create supportive environment for Portland youth through the mayor's community center initiative. I hope it will continue. I hope it will continue to be called mayor hales community initiative. The staff at Portland parks have done amazing work as have staff in the mayor's office and it's a truly a community effort. The funds will be directly given to community organizations, staff programming for at risk youth and create new programming. Collectively we reached over 12,000 youth in the first year. The mayor's office, my office, office of youth violence prevention and Portland parks and recreation reviewed grant proposals in open competition to be awarded to the selected organizations in amounts not to exceed 700,000. Mayor mentioned many of the acronyms, some are crucial time to keep the youth engaged in constructive activities. I think the next stop is to look at how we can get bus passes for everyone in the city of Portland for youth under 18 year round not just during school time. Colleagues, I don't have a presentation other than just explaining that.

Hales: Anyone want to speak on this item. Let's take action on this emergency ordinance.

Saltzman: Thank you for your leadership, mayor hales, commissioner Fritz, making sure we have our youth will served by organizations that very much care about them as do we. Aye.

Novick: Thank you, mayor hales and Commissioner Fritz, for this very important initiative. I do have to say the fact that the mayor followed up the last presentation by praise a new cell phone app -- cut it with a knife. Aye. [laughter]

Fritz: You just hold it out here and you don't hold it to your head. Thank you, mayor. Aye.

Fish: Aye.

Hales: I urge everyone to spend a little time in a community center this summer. It's magical. I appreciate all the work. Parks bureau staff is so fired up about this, works so hard. I want to thank Tara pierce and Diana Nunez in my office who worked so hard to make this. A couple of moms, as a dad think we can all see the value for our young people. I'm very pleased. Thank you. Aye. It 806.

Item 806.

Hales: Commissioner Fish.

Fish: Thank you mayor as my colleagues know over one third of Portland's more than 2500 miles of sewer pipes are 80 years or older. This ordinance would authorize repairs to two sewer segments that are 106 years old and are severely deteriorating. I'll turn it over to Scott Gibson. Scott?

Scott Gibson, Bureau of Environmental Services: Thank you commissioner Fish, Mr. Mayor. For the record my name is Scott Gibson and I'm the principle engineer at the bureau of environmental services. We are here today asking for authorization to approve

July 6, 2016

and emergency contract with oxbow construction to repair 1021 feet of severely deteriorated public sewer. The contract amount is 738,675. So this map will show you the location of the sewer, which is the dashed line. It's adjacent to going street but not in the right of way. It crosses underneath the union pacific railroad, rail lines and spurs. It's a combined sewer overflow pipe that relieves the sewer system to the river in times of heavy rain. It was constructed in a ravine and has since been filled. It's actually very deep in certain areas since it was filled in with fill and crosses underneath the union pacific railroad's north-south rail lines. Bes has a number of sewers beneath rail so we're familiar with working with them, working around the railroad in any case can be very complicated. I want to show you some pictures of the exact alignment. In this exhibit the light blue line is the sewer line, and you can see the rail line along with trains currently in the image. With the inset pictures you see some of the defects that we found. As commissioner said its 106-year-old brick line concrete pipe and it has significant corrosion in the upper half of the pipe and there are a number of large holes in the pipe. I have one more photo. As the alignment continues up into going you can see in these image what we're calling rep frequenters. In this image here to the right you can see exposed steel. So that's the reinforcing steel which is now exposed to corrosion. Then most concerning to the engineering team in the lower section this pipe is no longer rounds. It's starting to ovalize which is indicated that it's beginning to fail.

Fish: I want to acknowledge Scott is a pioneer of what we call anti-photo shopping. [laughter] just trying to make something look better, he finds the most disgusting photographs he can find and he normally gets extra credit if there's a four-legged creature

--

Gibson: No creatures in this one. [laughter] we do see a lot of sewer defects reviewing tapes. The team was especially concerned about these defects given their location. That was why we determined that this was an -- justified an emergency procurement and emergency response by the bureau moved into an emergency repair project, the first step was to define the solution and what we were planning for this pipeline segment is you pull in -- pipeline to reinforce it with a pipe inside a pipe. That's four basic steps. We'll have a robot computer laser profile the geometry of the inside. The manufacturer will manufacture the liner to meet that geometry. We have to build a 72 inch deep manhole to improve our access. The liner will be pulled into the line, inflated and it will be cured there. That's the engineering solution we propose. Wanted to talk about the emergency procurement. The procurement was done under title 5 as an emergency contract. This process started with the declaration by commissioner Fish in support of our assessment that it was an emergency then from then we prepared a set of bid documents that could be bid on site. We expedited that process. It states the city shall seek competition for emergency contracts as reasonable and appropriate understand the emergency circumstances. In this case we met contractors on site and received four bids for the work. The lowest bidder was oxbow construction of Troutdale, Oregon. The owner is Jjune Calhoun. They are a certified women owned business process. The liner manufacturer is a company called Michaels, which we worked with in the past this. Rea sub to oxbow. All this money is going to a certified firm as the prime. Wanted to talk about the estimate in an emergency situation like this estimating can be challenging. The final engineer's estimate provided at time of bid was 685. Low bidder was 738,675, about 8% over the final estimate. In our initial emergency declaration we estimated the work at 750,000. We had moved the estimate -- initial estimate was 2% over final cost so all the costs were within a range of 10%. The cost estimates were described as low confident because at the time we were working through it we were uncertain about what conditions we would have from the railroad. We have since worked out all of the approvals and permits for working on the railroad but at that time we

July 6, 2016

were uncertain what the requirements would be to that generated a lot of uncertainty for us. So the project we have a large diameter sewer rehabilitation project budgeted at \$1 million for fiscal year '17. This project will use that money. We won't postpone the work previously identified. That's where we're getting the budget for this. On the estimates. Then finally it's an emergency but we did our best to cover the public outreach elements. We have notified residents and businesses in the area as well as network neighborhood association and swan island business association in general because the project is located on union pacific railroad right of way and because it's a trenchless technology impact should be relatively minor.

Fish: Good job.

Gibson: Thank you.

Hales: Any questions?

Saltzman: This line is used only for overflow purposes?

Gibson: That's correct. It's below the cso tunnel system. So routinely 98% of all drainage would go up through the Columbia boulevard wastewater treatment plan. In times of heavy rain the system overflows and relieves itself down through this line.

Hales: Thank you. Anyone want to speak on this item? If not then let's take a vote, please.

Saltzman: Thanks for the presentation. Aye.

Novick: Thank you, scott. Aye.

Fritz: Aye. **Fish:** Aye.

Hales: Aye. Okay, 807.

Item 807.

Fish: Thank you, mayor. Jennifer, why don't you come forward? Today council is considering the annual plate of community watershed stewardship grants. Although this program began in 1995, it continues to grow and reinvent itself as diverse and creative Portlanders design new water projects and forge new partnerships. The proposed grantees this year, this proposed grant this year will fund a number of innovative projects including two pavement removal projects to manage storm water, a student and elder project to create a garden. A Johnson creek cleanup day, eco-roof and wall project at a community center, and a micro filtration project to see if mushrooms can be used to treat storm water. These grants empower community leaders and volunteers in making Portland greener and cleaner. I'm pleased to welcome today the coordinator of the program, Jennifer Devlin. Welcome.

Jennifer Devlin, Bureau of Environmental Services: Good morning. I'm Jennifer Devlin. I'm with Bes and I have been coordinating the grants program for about 14 years.

Esmerelda Sanchez, Bureau of Environmental Services: I'm Esmerelda Sanchez, program coordinator. I'll be working with Jennifer Devlin.

Fish: Move the mike a little closer. Is this your first appearance at council?

Sanchez: No, actually the second time.

Fish: You're a pro then. Welcome.

Sanchez: Not quite there. Thank you.

Devlin: We didn't request time on the agenda today, but we are certainly here to answer questions. She has been with us about six months. She's with Portland state university indigoes nations program as a student, so she's been doing outreach to generate interest in the grant. She managed our grant selection team and will be working with grantees this year to complete their contracts and their projects. We're here to answer any questions if you have any.

Hales: Long list of interesting partners there. Obviously you got a lot of interest.

Fish: Mayor, this is a relatively small amount of money with a pretty significant impact.

This program is not without its critics, but I appreciate the stalwart support that council has

July 6, 2016

given to this over the years. In particular commissioner Fritz for whom this has a soft spot. We think these grants achieve important outcomes for our bureau at a very modest cost, engage the community and help us test innovation.

Hales: Great work. Questions? Thank you both so much. Anyone else want to speak on this item? If not, it passes to second reading next week. Thank you.

Devlin: Thank you.

Hales: Item 808.

Item 808

Hales: Commissioner.

Fish: Fish this is a council favorite, mayor. The bureau of environmental services first adopted the storm water management manual in 1999. The manual requires new development and redevelopment projects to manage storm water on site whenever possible. It's an important tool for reducing the damaging effects of storm water runoff and protecting our rivers and streams. The bureau has revised it several times since 1999 and has just completed the most recent revision. Here now with more information about the updates are Amber Clayton and Angela Henderson from the bureau of environmental services. Ladies, welcome.

Amber Clayton, Bureau of Environmental Services: Thank you. Good morning. We are here this morning to talk about some code changes to 1738 that supports the storm water management manual and what we're proposing is the new source control manual. Hold this up here for a second. Portland city code 1738 authorizes bds to implement the manual and for 16 years the manual has included both requirements for impervious area management as well as source control requirements. These are activity based requirements for development. What we are proposing is moving the source control requirements to a separate administrative rule so the storm water management manual will continue to be the administrative rule and design requirements for impervious area requirements. If you create 500 square feet of area required to manage that runoff to protect water quality and runoff. We propose to move it to a new administrative rule called the source manual. For example if you want the pump ground water if you want to create fueling stations, all of these things that are not directly related to the creation of impervious area. So what we are proposing in front of you today are some minor code changes in order to explicitly authorize adoption of a source control manual in addition to the implementation of the storm water management manual. There are a couple of other things that we are including in this changes to 1738, also includes updating administrative review and appeal language, clarifying that removal of a required storm water management facility is a violation of city code, and correcting a couple of type graphic errors in spellings. We did hold a public comment period for both revisions to the storm water management manual, source manual and proposed changes to 1738. We did a variety of public notices, web services as well as a bunch of electronic and social media. We also worked with the bureau of development services since most of the implementation happens through the permitting process. We reached out to everybody on the bds examiners description and there were zero comments received on the proposed changes to Portland city code 1738.

Hales: Okay.

Clayton: Just a quick summary there's no financial impact to the city and there's no new financial impacts to development projects.

Fritz: I really appreciate you providing the strike-through. I think that may be a stenographer's error in the authority. The sentence with the last phrase deleted doesn't make sense. If we could correct that --

Clayton: Yes. You are correct. We intended to keep the word chapter in.

July 6, 2016

Fritz: That is a friendly amendment. Why are we deleting this?

Clayton: We clarify throughout the rest of the chapter where we mean storm water and source control manual.

Fritz: Thank you. I noticed you deleted appeals to the code hearings office the part about paying for that, page 7.

Clayton: Yes.

Fritz: This is because -- set new rules for appeal fees?

Clayton: Yes. So we are -- the code changes are specific to administrative use and appeals are to be consistent with the auditor's recommended changes. I believe bes is also looking at the rest of the administrative rules to make sure they are being consistent. We're just the first out the gate.

Fritz: Remind me what the appeal fee is. Does nobody pay anything at this point?

Clayton: If somebody appeals -- if the first step is administrative review with bes, that is a \$100 appeal fee. If they are not satisfied with the results of the administrative review they go to code hearings and we do not charge -- bes does not charge any fees to go to code hearings.

Fritz: I'm a little concerned that we have taken out the bit about reimbursing appellants if we finds in their favor, the \$100 you charge for administrative appeal. You don't refund that if it turns out they are correct?

Angela Henderson, Bureau of Environmental Services: Correct. That might be specific to the storm water management manual itself. But the idea behind the recommended code revisions is that the process itself will be described in the individual administrative rules. Both manuals. The authority -- excuse me, the code would just be limited to our authority to grant the review and/or further appeal of whatever the station might be.

Fritz: Change administrative rules if they get refunded if they prevail?

Henderson: Yes.

Fritz: Thank you.

Fish: Is that a friendly suggestion?

Fritz: Commissioner, thank you.

Hales: We'll make the one friendly amendment to section 010, no other suggested amendments, and anything else in the way of questions for these folks?

Fish: When Commissioner Fritz thanked you for doing it in a it red line format I think, she has previously made the request of all the bureaus where there's changes to a complex document that we do it in red line. It actually makes it much easier for us to track. So thank you for being faithful to. That.

Hales: Helps. Anyone want to speak on this item? Okay.

Parsons: We had two.

Hales: Thank you both. We'll let those folks testify then move it on. Thank you.

Hales: Good morning.

Al Iverson: Good morning. Okay, my name is Al Iverson. I live on southwest 36th avenue near Gabriel Park. I'm a professional engineer registered in civil and environmental engineering. I'm here to ask for a delay to approval of the storm water manual until it addresses storm water management in southwest Portland better than it does now. I had submitted comments to bes before and during the comment period concerning sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 but I received no response addressing these concerns. These sections are about how storm water is to be discharged. Portland needs a different approach to storm water management for southwest Portland. It's geologically different than south of the Willamette river. For that reason it's always followed a different pathway. Needs to be expanded to accommodate that different path way. All storm water runoff in southwest Portland eventually ends up in the Willamette mainly by Tryon and Fanno creek, not as as

July 6, 2016

ground water. These two creeks are fed by numerous names and unnamed creeks which are in turn fed by smaller creeks, seeps and springs. Most of this last group do not flow year round and when the area was settled the practice was to fill them in and install peopled drains to keep the patches from getting soggy. When the area became urbanized storm water still had to find its way through the Willamette and in many cases our street system became the uppermost part of the drainage system to the detriment of the street system. The guiding principal stated in section 2 of the ordinance controlling storm water runoff before it runs off of individual sites simply does not mimic nature in southwest Portland. A better guiding principle would be like the one I offered in my comments to bes. They are the city of Portland's approach to storm water management in southwest Portland emphasizes the use of various facilities to treat and convey storm water through natural and constructed to a natural stream not detrimental. Please delay the approval of this storm water manual until it better approaches storm water management in southwest Portland. Thank you.

Marianne Fitzgerald: I'm Marianne Fitzgerald, here as a citizen. Al and iman tore storm water issues together for many years. I know that in 2012 mayor Adams had an ordinance associated with the out of the mud initiative which recognized some of the unique properties in southwest Portland and allowed exemptions to the storm water manual for these issues. In 2015 Tryon and Stephens creek neighborhood street plan recognized unique infiltration issues in southwest Portland so I was surprised when I saw 2014, 2016, the manual comes around no of southwest issues at all. Unlike you, Commissioner Fritz, I got a three-page bulletin that went out for public comment. Life happens and I didn't comment during the comment period. I knew al had, so yesterday, the holiday, life gets in the way, I read number 13 that said no comments were received and I thought, that's funny. I know al submitted comments. One is more than zero so it really struck me why are you allowing this to go ahead and not acknowledge the comments you receive. So i'm really asking you to direct the staff to revise the storm water manual. I'm not addressing the ordinance other than the one incorrect statement, but I am asking to at least acknowledge that the staff should allow exemptions to the storm water hierarchy in southwest Portland and where it cannot be infiltrated to allow it to convey off site. We have ditches all over the place but we have such poor infrastructure and because of the challenges of storm water we have no sidewalks. It's cost -- I get very frustrated looking at this cycle continue and the fact that once again the manual is being revised with no mention of any special conditions in southwest troubles me. Thank you.

Fish: I'm going to have staff come back. I think there's a distinction between the manual and code. I want to give them a chance to address those issues.

Fritz: Have you sent your comments to the whole council?

Iverson: I have not.

Fritz: Could you please do that?

Iverson: Yes.

Fritz: Thank you.

Clayton: Amber Clayton from bes. The comment we made that we received no comments on the proposed changes to Portland city code is true. We also received no comments on the south control manual. We received comments on the storm water management manual from a variety of folks and we have posted online a summary of responses to those public comments. I also did email al back saying thank you for your comments and that there is an exemption process it's not technically feasible to infiltrate storm water. Southwest Portland is not the only area of town where infiltration may not be appropriate or safe. There's an exemption process already built in to provide for storm water management and treatment regardless of whether or not infiltration is technically feasible.

July 6, 2016

Fish: Let me ask a question of commissioner novick. Steve, we have a project or two in southwest where we're now actively looking at this intersection of the code, and some high priority projects. We have had some meetings actually with our distinguished guests today who testified. I'm hopeful that will bear fruit because they have both our bureaus working collaboratively. Colleagues, I would be happy to as this is not the first reading. What I would suggest let's keep it on for next week. My bureau will follow up with our two who testified and make sure there's an understanding of where we are in the process, what can and can't happen under these proposals and I'll report back before next week. Pass it on for second reading. The one thing is this is an intensely complicated question. The question that I want to make sure is that in whatever is before us next week there still is flexibility that we need or commissioner novick and I working with southwest neighbors to come up with a creative solution on at least one of the projects that we're focused on. I take the spirit of the comment seriously. Appreciate you being here. Jim Blackwood, my liaison, is out today so I'm a little under the gun. We'll follow up with both of you. I would like to keep it on for second reading so we have a control date.

Hales: If there's no one else that's what we'll do, count on you, commissioner Fish, to follow up with folks in southwest who obviously spent a lot of time trying to figure this out.

Fritz: I appreciate this an exemption process. It's pretty much standard in southwest you can't infiltrate throughout. It's clay soil. I was actually involved in developing the first storm water manual in the late '90s. I thought there was a section on specifics, we know you can't infiltrate and here's what you need to do so ill look forward to hearing about what you need to do.

Hales: Thank you all. That will be back next week. Let's move on to 809.

Fish: One thing, mayor, before we do, apparently there is some confusion about what is allowed or not allowed under the Storm water manual. I want to state on the record that I hope avoids further confusion. This morning I walked to Sandy Boulevard, stopped at Cesar Chavez, waited for the number 12 bus. There's a gigantic bio swell there, part of the reconstruction. It's beautiful. Like a forest and a jungle in one. Very lush. Unfortunately there was a large discarded sofa in the middle of it. So in case it's not clear in our code we do not allow people to dispose of surplus property or junk in our bio swells. It's really outrageous that someone thought that was okay.

Hales: Good point. [laughter] 809.

Item 809.

Fish: We have a lot of old pipe. Turns out we have old conduit. The conduits are the most important part of our system for obvious reasons in terms of the front end. Dave peters is here to walk us through this ordinance.

Dave Peters, Portland Water Bureau: Thank you, commissioner Fish, mayor hales, commissioners. I'm David peters principal engineer with the water bureau here to ask for authorization to contract with trc pipeline services. This is part of the water bureau undertaking a comprehensive multi-year condition assessment of our large diameter conduits that bring water from the Bull Run watershed into town. The elements of the comprehensive assessment are outlined in the conduit's rehabilitation plan. Includes review -- this plan includes this review of our aquatic protection system. It also includes internal visual inspection of the pipes it will include remote collection of some condition data and the analysis of all that collected data to give us an understanding of what condition those large conduits are in. So this contract, is the first element of that comprehensive evaluation. This \$400,000 contract for professional services will evaluate how well that has been protecting those conduits against corrosion. The system consists of approximately 6 rectifiers installed in the '80s and are nearing the ends of their useful life. This contract will specifically report on the condition of those systems and improvements

July 6, 2016

needed to continue to protect our conduits from corrosion in the future. A side benefit is we'll also be able to identify areas of our conduits at high risk for active corrosion and use those out comes then in to provide input and guidance on where we will do our internal and visual inspections of the pipes. We plan on doing those later this fiscal year. That's a brief overview of this contract. I would like to open it up for questions.

Hales: Questions? Thank you very much. Anyone want to speak on this item? Come on.

Charles Johnson: Not sure if it's morning or afternoon, commissioners. As you've no doubt seen in the media there's great concern over what many would say are failures of Portland public schools to address water with lead contamination, and in those articles and discussions there's talk about different factors that a water utility can take that sometimes lead to increased lead leaching from old products. I understand that's probably completely different from the cathodic system, which is solely electric, but has there been any public pressure, public forum to talk about the pros and cons that anything that the water bureau can do that would until we know there's been a big push in the school system maybe have our water situated in a way that is a little bit less disturbing to latent lead?

Hales: Good question. I think that's a matter of ph, mostly, right?

Fish: We're fully in compliance. There is -- with the exception of occasional traces of very small amounts of lead in our water our water is blessedly lead free. Source water and our distribution system. The question that you're raising has to do with corrosion control and to what extent can we help mitigate the impact of corrosion that occurs in certain plumbing in certain buildings. We are in conversations currently with the Oregon health authority and environmental protection agency about what they referred to as maximizing corrosion control and we'll be coming back to council probably in the early fall with some further discussion on that. The one thing I will tell you is that a consume years ago the council, a year and a half ago council authorized a study called corrosion control study, which among other things allows us to test the impact of taking the reservoirs off line. Because it's a very complicated system you do one thing it has unanticipated effects here. We have to be very careful about any change to the water chemistry. This being Portland even the conversation about new chemicals has to be handled in a transparent, respectful way. So those conversations are ongoing. The water that you get from the water bureau is safe and clean and reliable. Problem occurs particularly in high risk buildings that have a copper plumbing and lead Sauder. I think in the fall we'll have more to say about options the city may have but to your point our water is safe. The kinds of things we do in maintaining the system ensures it will be safe. Thank you, Charles.

Shedrick Wilkins: I'm Shedrick Wilkins. I have changed my mind. I think we should take the reservoirs off line. I was personally affected by the May 2014 event. I had urinary pain. I thought maybe I was getting prostate cancer. Two days before it happened. Friday it hit, I think around mother's day 2014. We sold bottled water at target and Portland got on national television because the ufo guy passed through the Portland airport and he just said I was in Portland so we got on national news. I was affected by t. I have not had urinary pains before or since. I even make coffee and it went right through that. Something happened that we need to address and I think having an exposed water system like the reservoirs is not correct. Thank you.

Fish: You're no longer drinking water from the reservoir. They are all discontinued.

Wilkins: That's a good idea. I remember four years ago Scott Fernandez made these rational arguments we should keep them open they get ultraviolet light, but I have changed my mind.

Hales: This passes to second reading. 810.

Item 810.

Hales: Roll call, please.

July 6, 2016

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye.

Fish: A number of people to thank, mayor, on this. Obviously the bureau and these are category 1 properties, so they are the ones that get the least amount of public review and scrutiny and least processed because they are bits and pieces in and many in cases accidental pieces of property. I do want to acknowledge one thing. We have a completely different surplus property policy in constituent right now. It started with a dispute in southwest Portland about disposition of a piece of property that had a water tank on it. It led to the water bureau under then David chaff's leadership, developing a comprehensive new set of guidelines that brought more public process, more sunshine to the disposition of surplus property which then beget a city-wide review. Led by Betsie Ames that led to a new policy that covers all bureaus for surplus property. Here we are at the ends of a long and winding road with I guess the second or third set of properties that the water bureau has offered up. A lot of work went into this and it started with citizens raising their voice and asking us to do things differently. I appreciate our friends in southwest Portland who made this a cause and our process at the city is better because of it, aye.

Hales: Good work. Aye. We're recessed until 2:00.

At 12:14 p.m. council recessed

July 6, 2016
Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript.

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

JULY 6, 2016 2:00 PM

[Roll call]

Hales: We have a single item on the calendar, number 811, would you please read that?

Item 811.

Hales: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome. We'll call up our team from the bureau of planning and sustainability to walk us through this issue. Then I know we've got some invited testimony and other folks that want to speak on this item. So Joe, good afternoon.

Joe Zehnder, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: Good afternoon, commissioner and mayor. I'm Joe Zehnder, chief planner, and I'm here today with Joan Frederiksen, who is the west district planner and the lead on this particular legislative project. So what you're going to see today are some proposals related to parking in the northwest plan district, the main part of which actually started a decade or so ago when we were first working on the update of the northwest plan district, and it adds flexibility in terms of how shared parking could be used. Initially when this project went through the psc there were two aspects to the program, both the shared parking and in position of parking minimums for new development and the planning and sustainability commission only forwarded the shared parking part of the program. So you're likely to hear testimony on both pieces of this today, but what is being forwarded by the planning and sustainability commission is only one piece. And before I turn it over to Joan I'd like to also thank -- this project was done in close collaboration with the bureau of transportation and the bureau of transportation staff voted in the parking program and the planning program.

Joan Frederiksen, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: Good afternoon, commissioners. I'm Joan frederiksen, thank you for the opportunity to present the recommended draft of the northwest parking update project. We've partnered with the bureau of transportation on this project, and here with me today I have staff from that bureau, Chris arms from the parking operations division as well as grant Moorhead from the policy and planning division. What we're talking about today is limited parking resources in northwest, this is just a quick visual. So there's limited on-street and off-street parking resources, which makes it difficult for users in the district, commercial customers, employees, residents, to locate parking when they need it. The district also has an untapped resource in its existing private lots that go underutilized for some of the time, whether in the evening or weekends, or sometimes during the day. It also has existing zoning code language that is supposed to tap this row source, but that zoning code language has gone largely unused over the years since it was adopted in 2003. The code changes I will go over for the shared parking, proposed to update existing provision and to allow better utilization of these types of existing and future parking resources, i.e., parking lots. For a little context, we're all familiar with the northwest plan -- the northwest area, many of us know it's a popular shopping and dining area, its pedestrian friendly, but I want to make sure we understand the full range of the area, so I have a map here. This is the broader geography, you can see the actual plan district ranges from Burnside to the north, of Vaughn and Thurman, and east to west between northwest 23rd and i-405. So this district is far and away one of the densest in the city outside of the central city. Specifically

July 6, 2016

today we have about 7300 households, and over 12,700 employees. We are -- we know this area is going to grow and it's projected to grow to significantly to about 9400 households and over 14,000 employees in the 2035 time frame. This growth in conjunction with the historic development pattern of the area were many of the old apartment buildings didn't include parking. Coupled with the popular shopping and employment areas, continue to create a constrained parking environment. The city's been working with stakeholders in the northwest plan district area for many years to try to find solutions in this arena. This slide shows the northwest parking management plan area, which pbot worked on with stakeholders, and it was adopted in 2013. Management of parking resources has two main puzzle parts so to speak. On-street part and off-street part. This is the on-street part. The northwest parking management plan begins to address on-street parking issues, they have implemented an updated parking permit area program, and added metered parking as well as creating a local advisory committee to help pbot make informed decisions moving forward related to parking in this area. Some work is being done, some good work. Specifically about this proposal, it relates to the off-street part of the puzzle. The private property side of the equation. In an area with long-standing parking shortages like northwest, it's beneficial to look at how to utilize all the parking resources, both on street and off-street. The proposed code changes will help the district better utilized, make more efficient use of those parking resources, particularly by expanding the ability to have commercial parking across the whole district in accessory lots. A classic example to this is as you can see here, in the photos, is legacy good Sam They have large parking lots to serve their patients, visitors, staff during the day, business -- regular business hours, but they go underutilized basically largely in the evenings and weekends. So this is a perfect logical solution to create an arrangement where customers of the area, residents can park after hours in many cases. Just to highlight where the proposed code provision would apply, the red commercial areas on the map show where commercial parking is allowed outright today. And the blue and the purple areas which is the bulk of the district, the r.h. And e.x. Zones, don't allow that today outright. So the proposed provision was allow accessory lots to be used commercially in those blue and purple areas. Specifically to the code changes, we want to expand how and when accessory parking can be used as commercial parking. The code -- the proposed code will create flexibility by allowing short-term and long-term parking, and expanding the allowed users. Currently there will limitations on all those. Specifically the provisions to allow short-term parking are seen to be one of the key improvements that will really make it viable and attractive for property owners to access and use these provisions and provide those parking resources to the community. The changes also provide an advisory role for the northwest parking management stakeholder advisory committee in reviewing the applications. Lastly, a set of administrative rules have been created to help implement these provisions, and pbot and staff have worked closely to put these in place and those are provided as an Exhibit in the materials that you have. And finally, before I close, I want to mention engagement opportunities throughout this process. The northwest parking management stakeholder advisory committee has been having robust and long conversations about parking and about shared parking in this district, and staff has been attending those meetings regularly, the it's comprised of neighborhood and business representatives as well as at large community members, and it's open to the public, regularly scheduled, so it's a good way for folks to tap into the issue if they're interested in it. Also a little bit unusual, we made sure we sent notice of this proposal to all property owners before the hearing to make sure that people who might have projects in the pipeline or who have concerns about the proposal were aware of it, so we sent out public notice to all property owners. We also held an open house and had information online. Today we're here with the psc's

July 6, 2016

recommendation, and we ask council to consider amending title 33, the zoning code, as shown in the recommended draft report, and to adopt the recommended draft report. One last item we also hope that council will direct pbob to adopt the administrative rules for implementation, better implementation of these provisions and that's it. Thank you. Staff is available after Questions. Thank you very much for your time.

Hales: So one question I have, that is two questions, this is permissive not mandatory, if the property owner doesn't want to make their commercial lot available for shared parking purposes, there's no requirement they do so.

Frederiksen: Right.

Hales: And the second, is it -- so this goes into effect, do we know the total resource of those spaces, how many spaces there are? Potentially that the property owners --

Frederiksen: We don't have a number. We've done an -- pbob helped us do an inventory of where the parking lots are, but that's constantly changing as properties get developed.

Hales: It's at least a thousand. A guesstimate.

Frederiksen: Yes.

Hales: Third question, that is, we're not regulating the market here, that is, not only is it permissive in terms of the property owner being able to make their parking available, did they want to make it available free or at a fee, we're not regulating that --

Frederiksen: Correct.

Hales: Okay. So that's up to the property owner as they see fit. Okay. Other questions?

Fish: If we don't make the administrative rules a little more flexible, and unlike other letters and emails we got dealing with the parking mandate, this seems to be a very Specific technical issue about having a sufficient time on the permit to justify the investment, what they're going to do with their surface parking. I don't purport to understand it completely, but you were copied on it, do you have any feedback?

Frederiksen: So the issue that they raise is that as part of the administrative rules, we have set up a recurring permitting system where you would get a permit, the first year for one year the first time and then renewable every three years for these shared parking commercial permits. The idea with that is that we really want to make sure that the -- that we can monitor the program and that there aren't unintended consequences coming out, and that it's a good way, a regular way to address any concerns that come up. So it's an opportunity for -- to have a renewal permit, it gives staff the opportunity to -- pbob staff the opportunity to address concerns or make additional conditions with any permit.

Hales: What's the objection?

Fish: They're going to make a big upfront investment apparently --

Frederiksen: Maybe.

Fish: And because the current language says if the parking facility is found to be in violation of any kind, so it's very broad, pbob has the authority to revoke the permit. And they're looking for just -- I'm -- I haven't met with them, I'm not their lobbyists, I'm trying to understand the argument. They want certainty on the back End if they're going to make an investment, and I guess is that -- is that a concern? If it's found to be in violation of any kind, is that any kind of violation, even sort of a technical one, or are we --

Frederiksen: I think the intent was that the violation relate to parking issues, I think the intent is they are -- because the administrative rules ask for certain information in order to approve the permit, and they also stipulate that you have to make sure that you're not displacing your -- the users on your property, the -- that section addresses pbob's ability to have the property owner address issues that come up without just having a recurring permit allowance.

Fish: I don't want to dwell too much on this. I would hope in any system going forward there's a reasonable chance to cure some kind of good faith standard, because it's a pretty

July 6, 2016

heavy penalty if you are revoked, you can't even apply for six months. So I'm guessing they want to play by the rules, but they want to make sure if for some reason they're in violation for some technical reason, they're not knocked out for a period of time, and that's not your intent. And I think that can be dealt with through something about good faith efforts and failure to cure any problem so it doesn't come out of left field.

Frederiksen: Yes. And the administrative rules are still in draft form, so we are happy to take a look at that again and refine that language to find the right balance between wanting to be able to enforce any issues or address any issues, and also being flexible enough that plot owners feel they can benefit from these provisions.

Saltzman: I have a question, I assume we're going to hear a lot about parking minimums, so I want to get a question about, could shared parking be a way of meeting a parking minimum requirement in your opinion? Either one of you?

Zehnder: I don't believe, I believe you have to provide the required -- shared parking, the parking minimum requirements are for a number of spaces to be provided with the new development.

Saltzman: And I'm saying what if a new development was able to satisfy that requirement by demonstrating they have secured shared parking spaces within, I don't know, some radius of the new development.

Zehnder: I believe that we allow that, commissioner, in the current -- what it does --

Saltzman: We currently have parking minimums?

Zehnder: Where we have parking minimums we allow that, there's some radius.

Frederiksen: Yes. I think for residential it has to be on site, but for other uses it can be within a certain distance and we're considering changing those with future projects. But right now that's allowed to a degree.

Saltzman: You said residential is required to be on site? That's what I was probing about, is residential --

Frederiksen: Yes.

Saltzman: We're not doing that now.

Zehnder: Not under the current ordinance in the centers. We require the residential to be on site, and part of the thinking, at what time of day are you -- if you're going to lock up spaces that already exist for shared parking, there's a period where the commercial spaces are used and when they're not, on the residential spaces especially given the research I guess that we did, you see cars are stored a lot during the day because a lot of these are in transit-rich places, so we at least in the first generation of this did not allow that flexibility for the residential.

Saltzman: And I don't want to -- I have no idea what it costs maybe to perhaps for a new development to lease shared parking spaces on a long-term bases to demonstrate clients versus building the parking as part of the development, but it seems to me it might be something we want to allow.

Zehnder: In the spirit of why we're allowing parking flexibility that would be really consistent. You already have a parking resource, so it's optimized how it's used, and let's not overbuild parking because of the cost, and also of the transportation impacts.

Hales: Other questions at this point?

Fritz: I have a couple of comments, mayor. Just I was reminded it was the last year in the Adams administration we were doing Northwest parking, and here we are again. I seem to remember back in 2003 -- so here we are again, and each iteration I think becomes clear that yes, indeed, we collectively have a problem. And that we haven't solved all our problems so far. Bike Portland article said yesterday there are 9,700 parking permits with only 4,100 spaces. So if the order of magnitude is the shared parking use, maybe one or at best 2,000, we still don't have enough parking in northwest. So for the purposes of

July 6, 2016

discussion, I really thank everybody, we've gotten a lot of testimony, lobbying ahead of time, so I think all of us are pretty much aware what the pros and cons are. I would like to move to put back in the planning staff's recommendation to the planning sustainability commission to have the same minimums we have elsewhere, which is up to 30 units no parking is required, 31 to 40, one for five units, 40 to 50 one per four units, and 50 or more one per three units. And then no required parking for other uses. I'd like to move that, and I would suggest if we can put it on the table for consideration, we can then vote on it after we've heard testimony.

Hales: Is there a second?

Novick: For purposes of discussion we should have, I will second it.

Fritz: Thank you. And also, I'm going to put an alternative on the table, at least mention it, which I believe it was suggested by commissioner Chris Smith at the planning and sustainability commission, another option would be to prohibit occupants of buildings over 30 units after -- that are built after a particular date to not allow them to apply for parking permits so people would be moving into those buildings knowing they don't have a secured space and they don't have a parking permit either. That's another option, and I'm just interested to hear what folks who have been living and breathing this for many years, which option you prefer.

Hales: There are some of those folks here, yes. So that amendment is on the table. We'll talk testimony on that as well. Anything else for our team? Thank you both. And I know we're going to have a lot of people signed up to testify, but first I want to call on members of our planning and sustainability commission who are here, and I know Chris Smith is, I'm not sure if anybody else is from psc. Thank you for being here. Thank you for weighing this issue for us before us.

Chris Smith: Thank you. So let me start with -- first, Chris Smith, vice chair of the planning and sustainability commission. Let me start with the uncontroversial piece, which was the shared parking opponent was broadly supported. I think it's seen as a mechanism to make the efficient use of the resources that already exist, particularly when there's counter cyclical demand when there may be one use during the day and another use off hours. We did add one provision to that as it came through the psc, and that is that the sac is the primary administrator of -- at least recommending the administration of that program, but if in the event it were to go away or become inoperative for some reason, and parking politics in northwest have been known to go south at times, pbot would take over that administrative role. So the shared parking program would survive potentially political upheavals in the neighborhood, and that was a provision we added at the psc. So let me get to the more controversial part, which I'm sure you're going to hear about extensively this afternoon, which is whether or not parking minimums are a good policy or an effective solution to the issues in northwest. We voted 5-2 against recommending parking minimums, and there were really three threads to that discussion. First is a fear creating any unintended consequences around housing and affordability, that was paramount in everyone's mind given our current housing affordability crisis, building parking contributes to the cost of projects may prevent projects from being built, or if there's parking in a building that is not utilized, potentially the carrying costs for that infrastructure get passed on to the people that are paying rent in that building. The other two factors that came into play were obviously a concern about other citywide policies, the climate action plan, portions of our comprehensive plan, that worry about overbuilding parking and the need to reduce the use and ownership of automobiles over time. The tsp, for example, calls for single-occupancy vehicle rate, load share well over 20% 20 years from now, and continuing to build parking is not something that will help us in that direction. The other interesting factor is there are of course folks in our commission who build things, and are

July 6, 2016

worried about having excessive regulation, and interesting fact that I think is overlooked in this debate is that currently new construction in northwest Portland is producing parking at a rate of between .5 and .6 spaces per unit. So there was several people in our commission who felt like well if we're already producing parking at that rate, why would we need to add regulation that produces .3 spaces per unit? The partial answer to that is that well, there's still some buildings that aren't building any. So what this would -- the effect of this would probably not impact most projects in northwest, but it would take the option of building buildings without any parking off the table, if there were more than 30 units. So I think there is a policy question here, are you trying to address the amount of parking built in any individual building, or are you trying to get to the market in aggregate as commissioner Saltzman referred to, you could have fluidity of meeting parking requirements between buildings rather than insisting it all be on site in a given building, and of course the shared parking part of this proposal that is not controversial would facilitate that fluidity. So if your developer didn't build any parking there's a potential you could rent a space in a building next door which is not legal today, but would become legal under the shared parking component. My name has been mentioned in connection with the idea of not allowing new buildings to have parking. I would give credit where credit is due, which is that was described by Jeff Tumlin in the parking symposium, so I'll give Jeff credit for the idea and maybe he'll get the pitchforks as well. I would say there are other policy tools that may get at the underlying problem, even more efficiently. The planning and sustainability commission has also reviewed the centers and corridors tool kit that pbot is developing, that hasn't come to you yet, but there are a number of policies in there that I think could be effective. I think the goal that I think everyone probably agrees on is that it is silly to have 8,000 permits competing for 4,000 spaces. Parking minimums are a very indirect way of addressing that. It essentially says, let's create more parking that will cost \$150 or more a month to rent in the hope that someone will choose to pay that \$150 rather than get a \$60 a year permit to hunt on the street. So if you're cost conscious, the availability of the \$150 parking space doesn't necessarily make you less likely to go ask for a permit to get the hunting license to look for a space on street. So the more direct policy that would get at that would be to cap the number of permits issued in the district. The great fear in the neighborhood is, we have several thousand more residents coming in the next few years, is that going to be several thousand more people hunting for a parking space in that limited supply of 4,000? We could simply say, we're not going to give out more than the 8,000 residential permits that already exist, and that would alleviate that fear. That means you would wind up with a waiting list or some other mechanism to -- I think some of my colleagues might agree with me that that has fewer potential unintended consequences that require the creation of parking that maybe nobody will rent if they're not willing to pay \$150 a month. So there are any number of policies in that tool kit that have been vetted through a stakeholder committee process, and staff is in the process of preparing for your review, that may be more efficient and more direct solutions to the real problem than mandating the creation of very expensive Parking. So I would leave you with that thought.

Novick: We haven't brought the parking tool kit to council yet, the tool kit we think will include giving neighborhoods the ability to limb the total number of permits to limit the number of permits that each individual person gets, because right now the way the permit system works, have you a license plate, you can get a permit, even if you have ten cars. And also to use price as a tool to regulate parking. For example, could you charge more for the second car somebody owns than the first? We haven't brought that yet, partly because I want to do some, though we have stakeholder advisory committee, I want to do additional public outreach on questions like if we have a limited number of permits, how

July 6, 2016

are they allocated? Are they allocated evenly, without regard to whether they're in the residential zone and mixed use zone? Are they put up for auction so we just let the market determine? I think there's a number of issues that we're all going to want to hash out. But for right now, northwest is in a position where they have a permit system, but they don't have a limit on the number of permits, and so what Chris suggested was sort of an ad hoc permit limit by saying that the new buildings without parking don't get permits. I actually -- one thing I want to ask you, Chris, if we were -- I think it's an intriguing idea, One thought I have about it is that given the parking minimums only require a fraction of the units to have parking associated with them, then basically the parking minimums assume in effect that a bunch of people in those buildings would be getting permits and chasing spots. So if you wanted to create a permit limit that had the equivalent at best of parking minimums, you would want to give a bunch of permits to the people in those buildings, just not to 100%. Does that make sense?

Smith: That would be an in between position and I should be clear now that you're talking to Chris Smith transportation advocate, rather than the planning commissioner, because my commission has not considered the kind of questions we're verge nothing right now. I'm sure you could calibrate this in a variety of partial stats. Maybe political youthfulness --

Fish: Let's bring equity into the equation. Next time Dan Saltzman proposes to put an affordable housing development in northwest, we say to the folks who live there that they're not eligible for getting a parking permit because they came too late? Doesn't -- if you're going to go down that route, shouldn't you ration them way we ration section 8 vouchers and have a lottery?

Smith: I think the key word is "ration." there are only 4,000 on-street spaces in northwest Portland, so we are rationing them. Today we ration them on the Basis of how long you're willing to circle your block or how far you're willing to park from your house. Are there more rational rationing mechanisms, I'm sure there are. I mentioned a waiting list, a lottery could be another. I think --

Fish: I think we would be reluctant to adopt a system that said by virtue of the fact you lived there first, you have rights over someone that maybe is getting their first affordable apartment, for example in that area. But let me go to the affordability piece. A lot of the materials we're getting are focusing on housing affordability. That was the first point you raised. This is slightly out of date, but the last time I checked on it, in the last three years, we've added about 24,000 private rental units to the market, 87% are luxury, so they're at the very height of the market, and less than 3% qualify as affordable by any definition. Clearly we're in this unique time in the market where people are building the most expensive housing and they're filling it. So what's -- this affordability thing is important, because it's something I think you and Jeff agree on. Whenever you and Jeff agree on something, it gets my attention. What is the best evidence we have that the mandate drives up the cost of market housing?

Smith: I think you're correct that the current rental rates are a function of scarcity rather than Underlying costs. So the immediate impact would probably not be strongly felt. Over time that's likely to change, and I think we worry about, at least I worry about two issues related to affordability, one is I think there's experience industry wide that the amount you can charge for a parking space itself doesn't always cover the cost of building that parking space, so you wind up getting a cross subsidy from the housing rents to cover the cost of building the parking. The other would be, again, there's this continuity between the 4,000 spaces in northwest that are available for \$60 a year, which are in huge demand, and the other supply of spaces in northwest Portland are available for \$150 a month or more, which I don't think we have any data that says those are oversubscribed. If you create stuff up here, the folks competing down here may still prefer to circle the block and hunt rather

July 6, 2016

than pay \$1800 a year, and if we force construction more of those from the developers see a business case to build, then if they remain empty somebody is bearing the carrying costs of an unrented property, and presumably that's going to find its way into the ranks. Those would be the two things I would be concerned about.

Hales: Back to Steve's point, in the development of the tool kit, you're looking at potential changes to the permit system that include capping and pricing, right? And some of the capping ideas are not just first in, congratulations, last in, sorry, but also total number per household, looking at all those options?

Novick: Total number and some version of per household. Which -- so we could say there's only going to be a total of 6,000 permits, and if you have a -- if you have your own garage, then you aren't entitled to one at all, or maybe you're entitled to one but not two, maybe that kind of thing.

Smith: I also served on the centers and corridors stakeholder committee, commissioner novick is correct, we could adjust for things about whether you have off-street parking available. We could escalate the price for the second and third cars, so you pay more. In are 20 or 25 items in that tool kit, and I would urge you to look at all 25 before going to parking minimums. I've used minimums as a last resort.

Hales: Okay. Thank you, Chris. Other questions?

Saltzman: What was the time line for this again?

Novick: Well, I think -- I want to bring it forward within the next few months. I think we are going to need to have some public discussions about some of the issues involved, because I think that although stakeholder advisory committees have vetted these concepts, I think they're going to be -- they're going to attract a lot of public interest and we'll have a lot of public discussion. So we're going to talk shortly About establishing a timetable for that, what that should look like and I want to engage all of you in figuring out what sort of outreach we should do.

Hales: In the comp plan process it would be good to bring those in.

Saltzman: Okay, thanks.

Hales: Okay. Thank you very much. So we'll take public testimony. I think we should call on.

Novick: First, and this is -- nwda first, it seems to me the neighborhood association ought to get first disabilities f there's official testimony from nwda we'll call you on first and everybody else. Or from the stakeholder advisory committee.

*****: [inaudible] I am the president of the nwda -- [inaudible]

Hales: We just want to hear from those of how have been volunteering on this issue a lot. And then we'll hear from everyone. Thank you.

*****: Two minutes or three minutes?

*****: Three.

Rick Michaelson: Good afternoon, I'm Rick Michaelson chair of the sac, and in case we decide we need sworn testimony today, I brought the property bible with us.

Hales: There it is.

Michaelson: I've been working on parking issues for 40 years. In fact when I was in architect which your school I developed a plan for shared parking. I lobbied city council in 1980 to eliminate the parking maximums, any parking requirement in the commercial zone, and followed through with the assistance of Jean Harrison in the '90's eliminate the parking -- parking is very complicated. Very difficult to deal w these two minute sound bites are hard to focus on, so I'm going to focus on what the sac asked for and some big picture stuff. First the sac, made up of transit advocates, people who were very opposed to parking garages and fought them bitterly, and people who were in favor of parking garages, unanimously endorsed this proposal. I have -- to have the shared parking and the

July 6, 2016

parking minimums. The parking minimums were established in our neighborhood at the time they were established everywhere else. We had a lot of discussion about ways to improve the parking minimums. Eliminating the requirement for affordable housing, or giving credit for bus passes or doing a variety of things, but at this point we're going to ask for parity with the rest of the city in terms of the parking minimums. We will work to make them better as time goes on. We're sort of still in parking wars. On one extreme there are people who believe we should be providing a parking space, an easy free parking space for every customer on the busiest day. The other side, there are people who said, quote, I don't own a car and nobody else should, unquote. My role is to facilitate parking in northwest, which I define as making it possible for people who need their cars to park, not easy, necessarily, but possible. I view parking as a piece of infrastructure, public parking on streets, public parking in garages, private parking in developments, all need to function together interchangeably. And we're moving toward that as we price parking on the street. We need to make sure our infrastructure is sized appropriately. We need enough parking but not too much. If we have demand we have supply, we need to both look at encouraging the increased supply where appropriate and reducing demand. But some of the proposals today are not like raising your rates \$10 for water bill, it's like deciding some people will have no parking or no water. We would never do that. So we need a way to allow everybody who really needs a car and there are a lot of them, the opportunity to park. I think allowing some buildings to jump their load on the public is unfair, you have a letter in your file from a developer who speaks very much about that. With that I'll answer any questions.

Fish: Is this your power point?

Michaelson: That's Karen's.

Hales: So Rick, the -- Chris made the suggestion that we may just have -- not just, we may have a sequence can question here as well as a policy call. Should we provide parity in northwest to the other urban neighborhoods of the city where we do now have modest minimums? And that is the sequencing point is try all this other stuff, at least investigate this other stuff with pricing and capping, and other reforms, to a pretty good level of agreement we've built over the last few years about these issues in northwest, try that first, sort of a Hippocratic oath philosophy. What do you say to that, why do minimums now if we're about to prototype some of these other policies?

Michaelson: And I too served on that committee. I think this reason is, we want to get in sequence. We want the sequence of the rest of the city. The sequence of the rest of the city was to do these and look at the tools based on having these in place. If we use a tool kit and come back four years from now for parking minimums, we'll have lost a lot of opportunity. I think it's timely, I think it's in sequence to get with the rest of the city. We need it all.

Hales: Thank you.

Novick: If I may put words in your mouth, feel free to spit them out, I have to see a lot of problems with parking minimums, what are the ways and means -- one of the reasons I thought your proposal deserved a hearing is that in a way northwest has done what the planning people and the parking planning people want neighborhoods to do. You're a dense neighborhood, you have a permit system, you have meters, whereas there's other parts of the city where people are not paying for permits and there are no meters, and there's not as much parking demands, but they have parking minimums. So it seems -- it seems you have a reasonable argument that look, we're doing all the right things, but we still have a parking problem, it's unfair to not give us minimums when these other neighborhoods aren't doing the same things have them.

July 6, 2016

Michaelson: Let me answer that question a couple ways. First of all, what's different in the other neighborhoods is if you walk two or three blocks from the commercial district, there's parking available. We're a 20 block by 20 block area that has the same capacity problems and the same need and no ability to walk three blocks for cheaper parking. Secondly, creating new parking is expensive. But creating new parking and standalone parking garages is problem it will most expensive way because you have to pay for the land and amortize it. I'm after a supply that potentially we could then lease from the building owners and distribute more equitably throughout the neighborhood, but if we don't have those spaces available because we've allowed 40 buildings to be built without parking, that's a supply we could never get back. I also think we need to look closely at those minimums, because they need tuning, and I think we can get the function to make them work better but we need them.

Novick: Are we able to gift sac authority to limit the number of permits tomorrow, Would that obviate your -- would that mean you wouldn't have to worry about asking for parking minimums, you would just initiate the limits tomorrow?

Michaelson: I think that if we were to do that, the number of people you would hear coming to city hall to scream at the city because they just moved into northwest into a new appointing building and can't get a parking space, would be tremendous. I think we need to have more of a melding sophisticated solution than just doing that. But it's clear that we need a cap on the number of spaces in northwest as well.

Fish: How would you tweak the parking minimums? Is your primary concern that it's created a per verse incentive for smaller scalability?

Michaelson: Yeah, I think -- I started to do some work on this, by adjusting the percentages of spaces that are required for a number of apartments differently, you don't create these lumps for these bumps and you may end up with a better parking ratio. It needs work, it needs tweaking, but I think there are better ways to do that than what we've got. One thing, you could say that there are .2 parking spaces required or whatever it is for all units, except the first 25, for example. So -- or credits for giving bus passes to people instead of building parking or a have a variety of tools. But they're all based on having a minimum to work against. And don't work unless there's that minimum.

Hales: I take your point commissioner Fish, but I think maybe -- I wouldn't call it a per verse incentive, maybe dumb luck, like our requiring ground floor retail in the pearl district and it ended up creating a restaurant scene. Having created incentive for smaller apartment buildings as opposed to big one may have been a beneficial result even if we didn't see it coming. It looks like it might be working out that way.

Fish: The point I was flagging was the proposal for mandate was a compromise position that we adopted as a place holder expecting that based on experience and further development, it would be refined. It was never meant to be the final product, it was compromise.

Michaelson: And we want to join that refinement process from the inside, rather than having to pick after the -- in our neighborhood we're really talking about buildings that are 50 units or greater. For instance, we exempted all units below 50 in northwest, we would be fine, but that's different, and we're trying to get into sequence with the rest of the system.

Hales: Thank you, rick, very much. Karen, you're on.

Karen Karlsson: I'm going to switch over here so I can move the cursor. I've done a really quick -- Karen Karlsson, I'm here with a few hats. As I said, I'm president of nwda, I'm also on the parking Sac and I'm also kind of a number dweeb. So I'm here really to give you a bunch of numbers that you can use as you progress along. Back in 2013, I testified for parking minimums, and when I did that, I brought in a little example so some of you might

July 6, 2016

remember this little picture. I said here's a project that is just about to come online, this has got this many units, and I believe it's going to have this much of a parking impact on the street, and physically this is what it looks like. It's looking like it's taking up 18 of the 28 blocks faces that are around it. So parking takes up a lot of space that we don't really have on the street available, I was off by one by the way, it's now up and running. It's really a lot of ways, cumulative effect these projects are having. The one I just talked about with 104 units is on the right, there's another unit that -- building that was built around same time, 90 units, it has 63 parking passes. And we have three more that are in construction right now that are probably going open within the next couple months that are 49, 126 and 58. That's -- I don't know how many passes they're each going to have, though I have to say the 126 is the one that has no parking. But it is going to impact, and there's just only so much space out there. And thank you commissioner --

Saltzman: By passes you mean on-street --

Karlsson: On-street parking passes, yes, sorry. Thank you, Commissioner Fritz for pointing this out. We have 4100 street -- on-street spaces for people to park with passes. We have some more that are just for visitors, like 21st and 23rd. Right now we have basically 4100 residential permits and on top of that, we have like 1200 guest permits, 4300 employee permits, and as I see each building come online, even if we have minimum parking standards, even if we were down to .5 vehicles per household, we would still be having more passes now on the street than we actually have parking spaces. So I see that parking minimums is a little bit of a tourniquet to stop the intense bleeding. We've heard a lot about that the parking causes rents to go up. What we're finding in northwest is there really isn't a very good correlation of that. This lists the number of buildings I just went in a few days ago to look for a studio apartment in northwest Portland in a new building, and they ranged in rent from 1560 to about 1200, the 900 is footprint, that's the project that's buildings with shared kitchens.

Fish: Are these studios all comparable? In terms of square footage?

Karlsson: Pretty close to the same square footage. There's -- there will be a lot of differences that you're going to see, some places might -- the cheaper might be the bad view and more expensive might be a better View.

Fish: Whether it's a three, four, 500 square foot studio, in these examples, whether there's parking or not, the market is roughly the same.

Karlsson: Yeah.

Fish: One of the things, go back to the data I cited earlier, we may be in a market where you can get the same amount with or without parking if you push the limit.

Karlsson: And I do agree. The market is really controlling a lot of this right now, when you've got more demand than you have supply, people are going to get as much as they possibly can out of it. Anyway --

Hales: So we need to you wrap up, commissioner Fish dove into your time so i'll give you more.

Karlsson: We've heard about capping in pricing to increase availability. I want to point out even the people think northwest is wealthy, the 2013 median income of the core part of our neighborhood is 30 to \$35,000, and they have .7 cars per household. What we're asking to adopt -- adopting shared parking, which everybody loves, we need every tool out there to get our parking into control. There's too much demand, and we can't seem to get people to give up their cars very easily. Thank you.

Hales: Some people, anyway. Thank you. Go ahead.

Gustavo Cruz: Hi there. Rick and Karen did a great job, so there might be a little bit of overlap, but I'll try to go quickly. Good afternoon, my name is Gustavo Cruz, and I'm speaking on behalf of the northwest district association, the northwest parking stakeholder

July 6, 2016

advisory committee and as a lifetime resident of northwest Portland. First I'd like to thank the council and city staff for devoting your time and emergency to the parking situation in northwest Portland. Parking has been a challenge in our neighborhood for many years, and the accelerating pace of residential development has made our problem even more acute. Second, I'm here to advocate for the adoption of parking minimums in northwest Portland. As we weight alternatives I'd like to encourage to you consider the following key points. First, there appears to be minimum correlation if any between the ratio of parking spaces provided to new units and monthly rent. Affordable housing advocates are adamant that requiring parking increases the cost of housing. However, actual pricing reflects a number of factors and the practical reality is, as commissioner Fish just mentioned, rents are about the same in northwest Portland with or without parking. So the net economic benefit of pushing the parking burden to the streets primarily accrues to developers and not those seeking affordable housing. You'll also notice that commissioner smith just a few moments ago said that scarcity is what's driving rents, not Cost. To the sequencing question that mayor hales just asked, I would note that the recently established northwest parking plan is generated modest gains in on-street availability, but they will soon be wiped out if hundreds of additional units are built with off-street parking. The parking plan was a hard-fought win for both neighbors and business owners in northwest Portland, and would be a shame to lose those modest results by having irresponsible developers who have no long-term interest in the neighborhood. Next, cars are a fact of life, and to some extent they must be accommodated. Demand management strategies and market-based approaches are excellent tools, but will take years of effort and increased investment in public transportation to modify behavior. Despite Portland's progressive transit culture, some percentage of new residents, most likely around 70%, will own or operate vehicles. If we don't plan ahead and provide some off-street parking resources for those individuals, our dysfunctional parking situation will further deteriorate. Next, all tools need to be applied including parking minimums. There's no magic bullet for this problem, and we need all of the available tools to succeed. Land management, shared parking, caps on permits to be issued, and parking minimums for new residential construction. Finally, fairness. Ironically parking minimums were adopted in virtually every neighborhood in Portland except for northwest Portland, which arguably needs additional parking resources more than any other neighborhood. It is simply not fair to existing residents and businesses to allow significant new developments to occur with little or no additional parking. Please note that the nwda, the nwda's planning committee, the northwest Portland parking stakeholder advisory committee, the knob hill business association, and city staff are all in favor of parking minimums for our neighborhood. This is the rare neighborhood issue on which there's near unanimous agreement. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Hales: Let me push back on you a little bit.

Cruz: I thought you might.

Hales: That is, we -- I'm not sure we got it right in our parking minimums that we've applied elsewhere. I'm glad people are ready to revisit the particulars of that, because it was a little bit of a shot of let's try this, it was never intended to be a holly writ for all time, it was an attempt to rebalance in a rapidly changing housing market which is continuing to rapidly change. We did hear the argument that sort of, you know, one of these days we'll have transit nirvana here on division or Belmont, but we don't yet. Well, if there's one place in the city you could say we're Kind of there is this neighborhood where we built a \$200 million streetcar network. So what part of transit don't you have yet is a playful way to ask the question. We do have excellent transit service, it is walkable to downtown, it is considered part of the central city, and you have the streetcar. It's frankly I don't think it's

July 6, 2016

going to get much better than that in terms of transit in our lifetime, given there's a lot of stay that doesn't have streetcar yet. So where -- what's nirvana look like, transit nirvana look like if you're not living in it already.

Michaelson: That's the point exactly. We've got the best transit system in the area, and we still have a .7 throughout the densest part of the neighborhood and the whole neighborhood is 1.04, maybe this is the best yet. Three-quarters of the people own cars instead of 100% of them.

Cruz: As a practical matter, people do use transit. But they also have a car. So they ride the streetcar, they ride the bus to work, they leave a car parked on the street or car parked somewhere else, but they don't want to give up their car to run errands on the weekend or go to the coast, or do whatever it is they have to do to pick up their kids after school, or do these other things. People still feel somewhat tethered to their vehicles, even though they might have transit available to some degree.

Fish: If cost wasn't the driver, and I'm on the fence on that issue, I think you could make a case either way, but I'm not sure it's as conclusive as some people have suggested, in five, 10 years from now, if all the vehicles on the road were electric, will we be having this debate?

Cruz: Sure, we'd still need a place to store them.

Fish: We wouldn't necessarily talking about the carbon impact. Under the climate action plan --

Michaelson: Yes. If all these cars were electric would be talking about the lack of space they're than environmental --

Novick: If we're still using coal or natural gas, it still has an impact.

Hales: There could be panels on the roof --

Fish: There could be more parking in apartment buildings because we have to make room for bikes. It is -- i've never heard someone say there's too much bike parking.

Cruz: Long-term I think all of us are in agreement that the trend will be a way from vehicles -- in the long term, but what we're talking about is over the next, you know, five to 10 years, as we have hundreds and maybe thousands of new people moving to the neighborhood, how do we accommodate that? And right now, the danger that I see, and what really concerns me is that we spent years and years and years trying to put together the northwest parking plan, we've got some modest gains from it, and I think they're in danger of evaporating very, very soon. We have 120-unit building going in on 19th and Overton with a zero parking. That is outrageous to me. And think about the impact on neighbors around that building who are unlucky enough not to have off-street parking. It's a nightmare.

Novick: If we built the spaces now they would be around for more than just the next five to 10 years. What I wonder about is self-driving vehicles. It seems that's the way we're going, 10 years from now everybody might have a part ownership in a self-driving vehicle that never has to park. It drops you off and goes somewhere else.

Michaelson: I think when we're talking about a population increase in the neighborhoods of four to 6,000 people, and we're talking about these ratios, creating maybe a thousand parking spaces, there's no doubt that the population increase is going to outstrip the parking increase by a good factor. And it's just going to increase parking supply this much, and the demand, even if the demand gets lower, it's still going to exceed that number of spaces.

Fritz: Transit and self-driving cars are a few you're going to go from the point -- to another given point, it's a nightmare to get from northwest to southwest after hours because the buses go downtown. So there's always going to be a need for cars, I believe.

July 6, 2016

Karlsson: Mayor, you know I've been working in promoting transportation for years, working in light rail, Streetcar, I've always assumed through all those years that as we increased the access to transit people would get out of their cars. And they have been getting out of their cars. They just haven't been getting rid of their cars. And I don't know what the answer is. I don't know how to do that yet, but if we could do that, there's a lot of cars stored in northwest Portland on the street --

Hales: They're not getting used very much.

Fish: If we had minimums with the shared parking rules, we allowed them to use more flexibly and creatively, couldn't we revisit -- couldn't we revisit this in 10 to 15 years and if there was surplus, come up with a different use of that space? One thing I will say is someone who has moved to an apartment building recently there's a great shortage of storage units in apartment buildings and a lot of people who are downsizing would like a place to store stuff on site. It's expensive off site. Doesn't -- couldn't there be some scenario where we would build in an adaptation or change in use in the future if market conditions change?

Michaelson: Absolutely. But on the other hand f. We don't build the spaces now, we can never build them. So they won't be there to convert. We need to get ahead of this and not behind us.

Karlsson: Several of the places in Northwest that have built parking, they're not all underground. Some of them are like half of the first floor of a building, very easily converted.

Hales: Thank you all very much.

Cruz: Thank you.

Hales: Let's turn to the sign-up sheet, please.

Parsons: We have 27 who have signed up to testify.

Hales: Welcome.

Margo Black: Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Margo black, and I'm here as a renter, a mother with three kids, I have two cars. My family has two cars, and I am coming to speak out against the minimum parking requirements. Because we are in the midst of an unprecedented housing crisis and anything that increases the cost of housing and restricts supply is something that should be avoided at all costs. I've heard some compelling arguments that perhaps the increase in the development cost is not saving the renter any money, and that may be the case right now, but it does create a floor on what those rents can be. It certainly does increase the building cost which we can't disappear any other way besides passing that on to the renters at some point. I really see this parking quagmire as being part of our growing pains of going from small town to a big city. And really one piece of the growing pains is that we have to cut our addiction to cars. We hear over and over about folks -- the population growth coming into the city, and we're not going to be able to accommodate all those cars, and just like when people moved to New York City and San Francisco, they don't imagine having a car there, I think that is what we need to envision in Portland. I personally think that the parking and traffic situation is awful. We can't get anywhere in town anymore, and in under 40 minutes unless it's 2:00 in the morning. So I got a bike. My daughter just moved to a building downtown by PSU that doesn't have any parking, she got her driver's license the day after she turned 16, I couldn't stop her from getting a car. She's selling her car. So we are making choices that are informed by the fact that parking is expensive and hard to find, and traffic is awful. But basically if we build it, they'll come, right? I'm not going to move to a building right now that doesn't have parking, but that doesn't mean there aren't buildings that have parking. And so I think that we're building buildings that don't have parking, people are going to move into that knowledgeable about those buildings not having parking. It's not like there aren't

July 6, 2016

any choices, especially if they're willing to pay premium rents for studios in northwest. So I don't think that people are being forced to have cars or being forced to move into buildings with no parking and get on-street parking. I think that we need to -- building the parking now and Repurposing it later is exactly the way to slow our cutting our addiction from cars, and I want to say as a renter and a parent with cars, I absolutely am opposed to the minimum parking requirements.

Novick: What did you think about the idea of instead of parking minimums, limiting the number of permits that those new buildings get? On the one hand obviously it's discriminating against new people as opposed to old, but on the other hand, ultimately I think we are going to have to limit the number of permits and there's not going to be any perfect way. Would you be acceptable or unacceptably discriminatory to say for new buildings above a certain size, we won't give every -- we'll distribute parking permits for that permit area to half the people rather than all of them or something to that effect?

Black: I think that's fine, I think anything we're doing to limit the amount -- to prioritize making room for people over cars is a good thing, and if limiting parking permits is a way to do that, that's fine. I do think, and commissioner Fish brought up the equity lens, I think there will be folks who move in, possibly with disabilities or elderly, or they suffer injury or for whatever reason, they need to have access to a car. And I hope that any limiting of permits like that will have a mechanism for folks to obtain those permits when they are truly deemed necessary. But again, I think that right Now we have a lot of choices and one usually does not need to move where there is no parking right now.

Fish: I have an idea. I just ran it by Joe, What if we just said parking minimums do not apply to affordable housing, and if you're building a unit that serves someone at zero to 60 of median family income, which is where the greatest familiar need is, and you enter into a regulatory agreement to keep -- that doesn't run afoul of rent control, which we're preempted from doing --

Black: Until we overturn that ban.

Fish: We have to deal with the hand we're dealt today. What if we just said a affordable units that parking minimum doesn't apply?

Black: So let me just make sure I understand what you're saying. Right now the minimum parking requirements don't kick in until after 30 units. Are you saying that let's say there are 30 market rate units, and 10 affordable units, there would still be no -- those extra 10 wouldn't trigger the required parking space?

Fish: I don't have a Fish plan on this, b, there's a lot of people who would disagree with that approach for a lot of good policy reasons. But since you led with housing affordability, I'm asking you, one way we could clearly meet your concern is come up with a system that said for affordable units there is no parking minimum. I don't know -- we'd have to figure out how to structure it. I'm not pitching my amendment on this, but I'm trying to figure out whether there is a way to get at what you led with, which is anything that adds to the cost. And the truth is, lots of things add to the cost of housing, even for affordable housing.

Black: Especially for affordable housing, right? There's a lot of social costs built in.

Fish: For good reason. We want the low-income family to go send their kids to a school in southwest, and outer east, and northeast, and not have just one choice. We sometimes build on higher cost dirt. But I'm trying to get philosophically what you would think about having a minimum but not applying it to affordable housing.

Black: I mean, certainly in principle I don't oppose that at all. I think that's a great idea. I worry, though, about the cost of market rate housing because that is going to impact everybody who makes 61% and above median family income. And I think that anything that is adding to the cost of market rate housing is a concern.

Fish: It's an imperfect solution. But something to think about.

July 6, 2016

Black: Sure. M-hmm.

Hales: Welcome.

Charlie Tso: Hi. Good afternoon, my name is Charlie Tso, before I begin my testimony, I want to point out that there is -- before we talked about there's 4100 On-street permits in northwest, actually the northwest parking study actually cites there are 6,184 parking -- on-street spaces. I want to correct that number out there. So I'm here today to ask city council to reject new parking minimum requirements for northwest Portland. Parking minimum requirements is a policy that subsidizes car storage at the expense of housing affordability by increasing housing costs and restricting the supply of new housing units. Parking makes housing more expensive by increasing construction costs, and according to a study in 2012 by the bureau of planning and sustainability, parking space could cost between \$20,000 to \$55,000 to build, and that doesn't even include the -- the same study also shows that development was required -- with required on-site parking could increase monthly rent per unit between 6-60%, compared to the same development without required parking. Depending on the type of parking facility that's provided on site. Parking requirements restrict new housing supply in Portland, city data actually shows that if parking requirements had existed in northwest Portland in 2008, they would have legalized 23% or 305 new housing units that have been built in northwest Portland. Northwest Portland already has a lot of parking management tools, such as residential parking permits, on-street parking meters, and now we have the Option of shared parking. So I think without studying and evaluating how effective these tools are, in terms of managing parking resources, city council should not rush to impose new parking requirements. The most effective way to manage parking demand is charging the right market price to reflect the true cost of parking and not imposing arbitrary requirements that force tenants to pay for parking through more expensive rent, regardless if they own a car. Portland already has too many cars, I urge city council to not create more space for cars but more space for people. Thank you.

Tony Jordan: Mayor Hales, commissioners, my name is Tony Jordan, speaking on behalf of Portlanders for parking reform. I encourage you to pass the planning and sustainability commission's recommendation to allow more shared parking, but to refrain from extending the minimum parking requirements into northwest plan area. Minimum parking requirements have been banned from the housing situation in Portland, how bad? No one knows because we have not comprehensively studied the effect they've had on the housing market. Bps data shows since 2013 we've seen an abnormally high rate of buildings built with exactly 30 apartments. Because of the 30-unit threshold for parking, the 31st unit brings the requirement for six parking stalls which can cost depending on where it's built, up to \$300,000 in construction, and even more in lost opportunity for that space of the parking spaces. And I think this is critical when we're talking about the effect on cost, because it's really the lost supply that is currently in our current market where prices are going to eat up the savings from the parking, and it's the additional units in that building which are going to help more than the lack of parking construction currently. This is a policy that should be reformed or appealed, not suspended, especially during a housing crisis. Unlike neighborhoods in 2013, northwest Portland has a toolbox full of parking management strategies at its disposal, expanded permit zones, new meters and after the recommended shared parking we're asking for, and pretty soon we should have better permit programs available as well. So I think there's much less risk right now in waiting to see how these more flexible policies play out and then adjust them to work better rather than applying a policy that might not really help very much and certainly will hurt the -- will exacerbate the housing crisis. So I think that's really -- there's some evidence when you talk about how we're going to get people out of their cars, when you look at transit oriented

July 6, 2016

developments that have access to cheap parking, people don't give up their cars. There was a study recently in new jersey that showed that it was restricting the cost, increasing the cost of parking or restricting the access to Parking that led people to get rid of those cars they don't use very much. Portland has a very wide ecosystem of car sharing opportunities, peer-to-peer and corporate, and I went car-free seven years ago, I have a family with two small children, what made me do that was I had the ability to move and use a zipcar and use get-around and other things to go on weekend trips and use cars when I need them, adding these parking requirements I think is a step in the wrong direction for our city, for our plans and where we want to go. So I encourage you to not approve the amendment for minimum parking requirements. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you all very much.

Ted Timmons: I'm ted Timmons, I live in northwest. I was born here, I lived a few other places and I keep coming back. I live in northwest district. I love that I can walk around. I love that I can walk to coffee, and groceries, and more coffee. There's space in the northwest where we don't have to destroy buildings, destroy old houses to put in more apartments and not just apartments but condos, and purchased housing. We don't have other places in the city. Northwest is different in that way. We can put in these large units and absorb more people than we can in some of the other areas of town. The complex at 19th and Overton has over 100 units. Those are 300-square-foot units. That's why there's so many units. These are micro houses. That's not -- I want to live in a tiny amount of space and have a large car. Secondly, we have a lot of traffic in northwest already. I hear my neighbors complaining about it. There aren't many streets. You want to get from southwest or the west, have you Cornell and you have the freeway. Cornell backs up miles every night. Do we really need if we're adding 4,000 units, do we need to add 3,000 more cars? Either they're not being used or we're putting them on the roads that are already full. So I'm concerned that it's really an incumbent attitude of theirs space in front my house, in front of my building, and I feel like I own that space. And that's a public resource. It doesn't -- it's not something that is not in your title. There's a reason for that. And for that reason, among many other reasons, it's inappropriate to say, well, I was here first, but you don't get a permit. That I think is a terrible way to go. Given the permits are \$5 a month, we might be underpricing that resource a little bit. So that's what I've got. I'm concerned about that. I see no reason to enforce that.

Novick: Isn't anyway rationing permits unfair to somebody? If you raise the price, that Means people without much money aren't going to be able to afford it, as opposed to rationing them based on who came there first.

Timmons: What we've seen is a mix of well, if we, for instance in the central city, if we increase the price of parking, our lowest income people that come in can't afford to park here. There's a pretty strong correlation between car ownership and wealth. And so that's meant to say, well, we need to make sure they're affordable. Cars aren't affordable to begin with.

Hales: Thank you. Welcome.

Rachel Shadoan: Hello, my name is Rachel Shadoan, and I run a small data science user consulting fee. And I'm here to encourage you to reject parking minimum requirements for northwest. What this proposal comes down to for me is do we want a city that's built for people, or do we want a city that's built for cars? I grew up in Oklahoma, I spent the majority of my life in Oklahoma city, which is a city built for cars. Its larger inland area than los Angeles, and about eight times less dense. Most of my memories of Oklahoma are of endless driving and miles and miles of parking lots. It's not a good look for a city. In 2012 I worked with Intel on a project studying how people uses cars. And one of the biggest take-aways was cars are not in use 80 to 90% of the time. We have limited space here in

July 6, 2016

Portland. That is just a reality of the city. And these parking requirements required using these valuable space resources that could be used to house people, to accommodate privately held resources, that aren't even in use most of the time. Cars are a public health nightmare. Not just from an accident injury perspective, but also from a perspective of pollution and carbon footprint. We should not be putting in place regulations that encourage or make easier the ownership of cars. Car ownership decentivizes infrastructure in bike lanes in public transit, all of these things that we are having to build a city together. And because of the low unit requirements of three, that takes limited space and encourages small development, and this idea that small developments are better is sort of -- it's lovely, but housing is expensive, and we need to make the most efficient use of the space that we have unless we want to become like san Francisco, which is something I also don't want for Portland. So in effect, Portland is growing, we've got limited time, and limited space, and we're going to keep coming up against these choices. Do we want a city for people, or a city for cars? And I want to live in a city for people.

Hales: Thank you. Thank you very much. Good afternoon.

Evan Heidtmann: My name is Evan Heidtmann, I'm here to Testify on the parking minimums. I hope you'll reject the proposal. I have always -- I'll keep this brief, I've submitted written testimony. Commissioner novick and others have emphasized, framed this as a short-term issue that we have a problem in northwest with parking and we need to solve it, but this proposed solution of parking minimums is not a temporary solution, this is a permanent solution. This is a change to the regulation that would have effects for several decades. And several decades from now, I don't know about you, but I want to live in a Portland with fewer cars, not more. And so I think if you want to see fewer cars and not more cars in Portland, then you'll support smarter incentives, and reject parking minimums.

Hales: Thank you. Thank you all.

Alan Kessler: Alan Kessler, I'm here on behalf of bike walk vote. I want to let everyone know that bike walk vote is watching carefully, it is absolutely against anything that would increase reliance and eases use of automobiles in the city core. We are particularly concerned, it hasn't been mentioned yet, more cars -- if you have more cars on the street, the streetcar moves slower, it's easier to walk than ride it, cars get backed up, they block the max, it makes the buses slower, the more cars you fit into a district, the slower transit gets. And it's a vicious circle, because when transit gets Slower, people think I need to use a car to get around because they can't rely on transit anymore. There's no doubt in my mind being a person who comes downtown every day that there are already too many cars in the area. Every day there's a huge backup. I have to weave in the gutter with my bicycle to get to the bridges because people are backed up, sitting idling, to be in the space with their cars. I think that from comments I've seen from some of your offices, some of you know this is bad policy, parking minimums are a last solution in a big stack of good solutions. You also know that we're working on the solutions. You have already passed a great tool kit that northwest has to improve the situation. And it would be a terrible irony if the council today approves parking minimums, the tools that are already in place worked, and people credit the parking minimums of having improved the situation. Then we would be stuck in these dark ages for a lot longer. I -- we can pass this now but we'll look back across the city later, and I think that's -- it's the wrong move. It's not how -- you will shift the momentum, if you give in to this request for bad policy, to placate some neighbors. One other point I want to touch on that's not really in the bike walk vote purr few is this affordable housing issue. I think there's a lot of focus placed on less than 60%, but there are good reasons to want market rate housing to be affordable for the middle class. And when you think about affordable housing there are lots of different definition transcript but

July 6, 2016

you should be considering the people who will live in the 350-square-foot apartments in the 120-unit building. I think those people should be given consideration too, because we don't want just those people who are eligible and then the very wealthy, we want a spectrum of people. Finally, the -- that building that 120-unit building is exactly what this proposal will destroy. You need the geometry of the situation is you need that space for small houses to make a project that big work, and if you require every single building to have parking spots, once they get over -- those buildings won't work. There's a great article in bike Portland that talks -- explains how that will make so it we won't have these big buildings full of small units, that might actually become affordable to the middle class.

Hales: Welcome.

Chris Rall: Thank you. My name is Chris Rall, I live at 2332 southeast 54th avenue. You may wonder why someone from southeast cares about what's going on in northwest. Well, a couple things. One is that our city is in a housing crisis this, proposal for minimum parking, off-street park requirement cso have an impact on housing, so we're concerned about that. I have friends and colleagues moving out of town, to places like Troutdale, you know, colleagues whose wife doesn't drive and they're out there now because they couldn't afford to live in Portland anymore. Where are my kids going to live when they're old enough to get their apartment if we all have enough housing supply in 10 years from now when they're flying away from my coop? Number two is, I agree that the challenge of parking in northwest is a challenge there. My daughter goes to -- is part of pacific youth choir, we've got to get to northwest sometimes, and it can be a disaster zone. The thing about these off-street parking minimums, it's a bit like having a cut on your hand and you apply a tourniquet, I like the tourniquet analogy. Rather than addressing the situation, do some compression and elevation, solve the problem with the cut on your hand, we're putting the tourniquet on the arm, the problem is on the street. So address it with on-street policies that address the street, and how you manage parking on the street. As long as parking on the street is cheaper than parking off street, people are going to park on street. And with the existing imbalance, if you think about adding these off-street spots and trying to regulate that into new development, it's not going -- it's going to barely make a dent in the huge imbalance you already have in terms of permit imbalance of how many permits have been sold and how many Spaces are there. So I fail to see how it's going to solve the problem. What I'd like to see is not adding parking minimums in northwest, and then I really agree with this idea of parity, we need on to revisit the rest of the city and look at pulling back minimums from the rest of the city. And number three, just keep moving forward. We've got a lot of tools the city is developing in terms of managing on-street parking, I think we're on the right track, just need to continue to actually apply the market principles, we need to think about equity and figure out how to have ways for low-income folks to have a low-income program for permits, or whatever it s. Other ways to make sure we're addressing those issues. And we can do this. So thank you.

Hales: Good afternoon.

Soren Impey: Hi. I have rented in Portland for almost 17 years, so I am very much opposed to mandating parking minimums. As you've heard, Portland has -- is suffering from a rental crisis with vacancy rates that have been among the lowest in the nation for a very extended period. And thousands of Portland residents have been displaced due to rent increase and redevelopment of units. And low-income people are affected, but in my neighborhood, I'm seeing my middle income neighbors displaced or moving because of this housing crisis. So I wanted to just make that point, because this policy will affect in the short term middle income people more, but they are also being displaced and affected by this housing crisis. I wanted to focus too on the types of units or buildings that are being built. And it's my understanding that most luxury housing tends to exceed parking

July 6, 2016

minimums. So this policy is really targeting low and middle income buildings. So it represents in essence an indirect pact on the people most affected by the housing crisis. In terms of equity, in terms of rationing, as has been discussed, I want to reiterate if you look at census data in Portland, it is low-income people that tend to use -- tend to walk or use transit the most as their transportation mode. So I really want to strongly urge you to reject what I view as an unfair and unequal indirect tax on lower and middle income people. So apart from housing equity, there's this issue of Portland's climate action plan. And Portland's active transportation plan. This would be a big step backwards by sort of reinforcing the idea that we need to mandate parking, we are essentially making a statement, you know, that Portland will not or is unwilling to meet its goals of less than 50% car mode share, automobile mode share, 25% bike mode share. And I just want to finish, because there's discussion about the people who own cars. And not getting rid of them. I have an electric vehicle. I think I have not driven it as a single occupant for years. And why do I have this car? Because parking is so inexpensive and so underpriced in this city. If I had to pay 10 or \$20 a month for parking, I would get rid of the car instantly. So I urge you to not support parking minimums.

Doug Klotz: Hi my name is Doug Klotz I live in SE and I came here to give you examples of how the parking minimums have played out in SE. And I was one of those urging you not to put in the minimums back in 2013, but since there in place what we've seen is up to 40% loss in units in buildings. Just giving two examples right across the street from each other at 3013 Se Hawthorne a 100 x 100 foot lot and they built a 50 unit building there before the minimums were required and currently there's a building under construction tight across the street at 1515 SE 31st right on Hawthorne 100 x 100 foot lot it's going to have 30 units so there's the comparison right there. We were getting 50 before the requirements now we're getting 30. That kind of the general trend you get a lot of 30 unit buildings as you've seen in testimony probably had some charts mailed to you as well that shows the 14 buildings built right at 30 in the last couple years. And what you get instead of 50 units you get 30 units and well we can't put in more units, but we can make the ones we have bigger, more expensive units but we don't get more unions, and we have extra space that we can put in a restaurant, so we have more restaurant space but we don't have 20 units of housing. That would arguably be more useful in inner southeast, and certainly in northwest, to have the housing rather than more commercial space which we sometimes seem to have too much of already. Especially, these are -- in southeast these are spots right where they are on the transit or where we want to put people in northwest, and we have the most transit rich environment in the city, this makes the most sense to have the most people living. We don't want to be artificially reducing the number of people who could live there, Alan mentioned the 120 unit buildings, and that's, that's, as you mentioned, that's the sort of thing that there are no limits on how many units you can build but you can build smaller ones if there is a market. With the 30 unit minimum, with the parking requirements you are not going to get that, so I would say that we don't want to have the parking added, work on the management of the on street, and the price, price it so that people will make the choice not to have a car, and we'll look at the ways to accommodate low income and also the disabilities And other ways to make that, the equity picture part of it work. We need the market sending signals to folks maybe I don't need to have a car here.

Hales: Thank you, Doug, welcome.

Philip Selinger: Good afternoon mayor and members of council, I am Phil Selinger, a member of the stockholder advisory committee. A resident of northwest Thurmond Street. I believe in balanced strategies for the increasingly dense and active northwest neighborhood. The modest city-wide parking minimum's framework should be one of

July 6, 2016

those. I also support more aggressive promotion of active transportation modes and demand management programs. I would have preferred to fully exhaust the tdm strategies before implementing the parking minimums but new development is upon us and integrated parking cannot be provided retroactively, providing some baseline of the parking would seem prudent, and the city-wide parking minimum baseline is more modest than many. And fellow members would have liked but appropriate, I believe, in a neighborhood with the decent transportation options. I do acknowledge some of them are flawed and affordable housing should be one of those exceptions. It is encouraging that the bike town program, will have a strong presence in northwest, and a proposed cross town bus route is in the Fremont bridge, should also be popular. The pedestrian and bike Infrastructure improvements at 18, 19, and west Burnside, and as well as 405 over crossing the northwest couch and Flanders, and new street connections related to the Conway master plan will all help. I can see that the lack of parking is affecting the quality of life for anyone with a car. I hope some say we can reduce the car ownership, with car sharing and other services and programs, I think that the conservative city-wide minimum framework would continue to nudge the neighbors in that direction.

Hales: Good afternoon.

Jonathan Avery: Good afternoon. I am Jonathan Avery, the president of legacy Good Samaritan medical center. And I may be the outlier in the room because I am here to talk about shared parking. Good Samaritan is strongly in support of the proposed code change which would make it possible for them to share the parking assets with the residents, visitors and businesses in northwest Portland. For background, there is 2000 employees, and another 600 physicians and their staff work on our campus right now in our medical office buildings. We care for 60,000 patients annually. To provide parking we operate around 2000 stalls today. We have a complex parking situation, in that during the peak weekday hours we have the shortages of parking today on occasion, and that's become a bigger problem as northwest Portland and legacy has grown. And it's our number one goal to ensure that our patients and visitors have access to parking, and we have made a number of changes to use public transportation. And conversely on non-peak hours, weekends and evenings, we have excess parking capacity with hundreds of stalls open in the multiple lots, and our goal is to make our parking assets available to those who need it, in Portland, and we see it as a win for northwest Portland and for legacy, and first of all, it would reduce all of the traffic congestion that we see right now that's caused by the endless searching around the neighborhoods for scarce space and is provide more spaces to resident shoppers and businesses, and finally for legacy it would help us to defray cost of running our parking systems which are expensive to operate annually. And unfortunately, no, no -- there is no ability for us to do this, under the current code because the short-term pay to park options are not allowed for accessory lots, so we're strong supporters of the code amendments, and the rules allow us to operate our lots once the specific plans are approved by the sac. There will make stalls available to shoppers and other visitors in northwest Portland. Thanks.

Hales: Thanks very much. That's a big resource. Thank you.

Cory Poole: Hi, I am Cory Poole. I live in southeast Portland. And I remember -- I remember Looking for parking 20 some years ago, and having, being frustrated at that time finding parking, so I appreciate that we have had this problem for a while. I am speaking out against the parking minimums, primarily from a safety standpoint, this council, and we have done with the vision zero, and I think my friend, who, about a year ago today, lost his leg because of the careless driver, and we need to face that every car coming into the city where the streets are at capacity you, where there is congestion, and becomes an increasing risk to pedestrians, to bicyclists and two adults on scooters, and I

July 6, 2016

just can't see how, in this time, that we could be encouraging even mandating the people bring more cars, please bring more cars to Portland is what we're seeing with this. I also think back to, a lot to the pbot transportation hierarchy, and on that hierarchy, for those who don't know. Pedestrians are at the top followed by bicycles and transit and taxicabs and way at the bottom is the single occupancy vehicles, so it kind of bewilders me that the vehicle keep coming to the top on all these discussions, as the most important thing that needs to be addressed immediately. Parking isn't a human right I don't know where that exists. I just would say that I hope that maybe after we have addressed all the safety for pedestrians, maybe after the last sidewalk is built, and maybe after you know, Google's self-driving cars are here and The last of the streetcars are running, maybe we could come back and revisit the minimums, but until then I don't see why we're addressing it.

Hales: Thank you. Thanks very much. Welcome.

Reza Farhodi: Good afternoon. I am Reza Farhodi. I am with the neighborhood association but these words are my own. I want to start by saying I am 100% against the parking minimum aspect of the proposal chiefly for the reasons of housing affordability and two things that our city needs. I think this issue of parking scarcity can be described as a three legged stool that we have. The parking minimums for the off-street parking and you have the permit pricing, parking for on street parking, and you also have the presence of whether you have quality alternative to driving and all three of these issues need to be addressed, when we talk about the permit pricing, you heard of the cost of \$60, and it's 150 per month, and where is the incentive for people to park in the garage if parking is available so cheaply in the terms of the number of permits on the street. And in terms of the alternatives, I remember last fall when m bought -- pbot came to discuss this, and northwest Portland scored low chiefly because many of the greenways have too many automobile volumes, and mr. Mayor I am glad you brought up this, by popular opinion northwest Portland is not what you would consider a transit mecca especially the Further north you go, such as where the apartments are located, and we have done a lot of attention on that. I don't think that any tri-met or streetcar staff are in this room but they should be because they are a big part of the solution. Northwest Portland is in need of more service coverage, more service frequency, and a greater span of service. The enhancement plan by trimet last week, actually, would provide new service in the fast growing section. Conway and north pearl, and would add more service lines such as line 16, 20, and 77. So while I oppose any parking minimum, until these are implemented and price is made more fair and equitable, at a level on or near the price of off-street parking, we will see externalities from people moving to these developments with their cars and thinking they can park on the street for very little money. The situation must change. Thank you.

Hales: Ok.

JoZell Johnson: I am JoZell Johnson and I am, actually, a 25-year-old homeowner of a small multi-family housing in northwest Portland. I have seen where we have gone from actually having 1.5 cars per housing to gas, I am down to 1.25. I still have a one to one car ratio into my units. 75% of my units do not work in Portland. They are not available for transit. I am Nike. I am Intel. And I am, actually, supporting Beaverton and pharmaceutical owners. For me, I, actually, had to purchase the off-street parking to become affordable, not affordable but competitive with the new housing going in, and so that I could attract tenants. For me, I welcome the shared housing. Thank you. But I, actually, support the minimum requirement for the construction. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you all very much.

Stephen Judkins: I am Stephen Judkins, grew up in Portland, and recently I was lucky enough to purchase a house. I am concerned about the fact that in general, most people

July 6, 2016

testifying here are people who are privileged homeowners like myself. It's hard for people who have relied on off-street parking to find it now that it is becoming difficult and new developments will make it harder for them. I think it's important that we keep in perspective the challenges that people who are renters in this time of dire housing affordability crisis. I bought my house four years ago. The depreciation on it exceeded my salary so I was not lucky enough, this stream to stay in Portland would be receding from my sights. It's hard like a pretty big inconvenience but there are tools we can use to make it easier. The trade-off is to make it easy for people to find parking. With increasing the minimums, or to constrict the supply further and make it more difficult for people to find housing. I think that really the right thing to do for the council is to do anything to help people afford to live in Portland. That said, I like commissioner novick's idea of some novel strategies to restrict the number of permits available for the off-street parking, and we already have the neighborhood parking permit program that gives the neighborhood some tools to control this better. Like I said, this binary option here, if, it's going to be less affordability or less easy parking, and I think that looking at it from the perspective of the human welfare of affordability and ability to have a home should come out on top instead of the easy parking for, for people that generally are wealthy and securely are housed. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you.

Hales: Good afternoon.

Ron Walters: Thank you, good afternoon. I am Ron Walters, I live at 2057 Overton street, and that was a fantastic introduction, and we did not plan this. And I was the nwda president when the northwest parking plan was negotiated we serve on the board and the northwest parking stakeholder advisory committee. And my testimony is personal. And I am a supporter of affordable housing and sensible parking policy, I want both. I believe both are achievable and compatible with the policy change, the one raised here is, has been targeted a couple times here, I believe it's oversimplified if not inaccurate to suggest no parking equals lower rent. I think the absence of the minimums opens the door to increased developer profits and does not assure more affordable housing in our housing market. We need to make sure the savings accrued is passed along to renters and the public simply not captured by the developers who choose not to provide parking. I believe there is a straightforward solution, permits should want be readily available to residents of new market race developments that don't offer off-street parking, it's a win-win-win. Developers who argue the renters don't have cars are not required to provide parking. Renters who don't have cars are not required to pay for it and the public is not burdened with the cost of increased demand for limited on street parking. The market will pay renters who don't own cars with more affordable developments that don't offer parking, and as has been raised, exceptions could be made so I encourage the city council to evaluate some type of plan like this, which will assure more affordable housing and not worsen the already difficult parking situation northwest Portland. In the meantime, regarding this timing issue, I do support the parking minimums as a tourniquet. It's imperfect but an important tool to help us in the short-term while we find a more Comprehensive set of policies and programs that can be deployed in the longer term. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you. Good afternoon.

Sarah Iannarone: Good afternoon, mayor and commissioners. Thank you very much for your time today. I am Sarah Iannarone, many of you know me because I was running for mayor recently but what I do is try to finish my ph.d. In Portland state on sustainable urban development and share our policies and best practices in what we're working on. When we started our program eight years ago many came here to ride the streetcar from the pearl district to the northwest district to see what would it look like if they made investments in their own area and how could they grow places affordable and equitably and sustainably.

July 6, 2016

We're seen as a model, and frankly, the parking, the mandatory parking minimums, there is nothing modeled about that. It's not the pathway that we should be taking, there are many other things that we should be requiring in trying out first before the construction, especially when we're in the midst of an affordable housing crisis, and I know that you all realize the urgency and the importance of deal with that housing crisis. I thank you very much for your efforts in that area with the excise tax, referring the affordable housing bond to voters this November and all the other actions you have taken in the Last 18 months. We need to think carefully about how can we see these kinds of prices as opportunities to be in that position, what do we think about the transportation demand management tools we were able to develop when we worked on the town center and Doug Klotz is here today and there are things coming right down the pike that we can try very soon so I would ask you to please hold off on instituting something as permanent as the parking minimums in northwest Portland and consider using some more innovative and equitable and climate-based transportation transit bicycle pedestrian oriented tools before we think about looking at parking minimums in that district. Thank you very much.

Hales: Thank you all.

Hales: Good afternoon and welcome.

Thomas Ranieri: Thank you. I am tom and I am a member of the sac and have been involved in the parking issues in northwest Portland for about 26 years now. I am going to have to make my comments quick because I will get a parking ticket. However I was primarily coming down here today to support the passage or at least put my support for the parking minimums, and I was hoping to hear from the developers who could speak to the issue of the affordability impact that this minimum, the parking minimums would put on the development of the new spaces. And I was wondering if, you know, prior to voting on this there can be more testimony from People that are involved in building that could speak to whether or not these increases are -- as big as some are claiming. The other thing that I would say is that the idea of kicking this down the road after we have tried some other things. I don't see how we have that much time left. I've been, as commissioner Fritz mentioned, Sam Adams last hurrah with the parking but I witnessed now Vera Katz and tom potter and Sam Adams and Charlie hales, and I am wondering if after all of this time it will be 30 years, if it's ted wheeler's turn, so I am hoping that we can move on this because we've been promised a lot over the years, and, in northwest Portland and so far we have not received that much in terms of trying to tamp out this extremely difficult problem for everybody that lives and works and recreates in northwest Portland. Thanks.

Hales: Thank you.

Fritz: What you are saying you have tried everything else and the committee has looked at everything else and you unanimously came to the recommendation of the parking minimums?

Ranieri: I am saying that I think it's a reasonable approach to have the parking minimums put in there for developers who claim they are building for people not going to be having any car ownership. I mean that's a possibility right there of saying if they are making that claim, that they don't have prior ownership, then maybe they don't get the Permits, we look at a lot of things. We have a lot of stuff to look at beyond the parking minimums. But I think that we are looking at this in a balanced sort of way. There is a lot of institutional experience there, and what I think we need to do, if the issue really is one of affordability, if that's what's driving the vote. I think it would be important to get some better data about that or public data about how much it cost. Most of the housing stock is old. So we're talking about the new portion of it. And so, you know, let's look at whether or not -- my personal belief is that the market is whipping everything up here and we are embroidering around the edges with the policy. I am not saying it's important but the wind of this

July 6, 2016

economy and the market is kicking up is enormous creating its own weather.

Frank Stock: I am Frank stock. Thank you mayor and city council. I am speaking for one of the developers that is doing this and has a couple of projects. And it does matter. It is simple math, I think most people understand that we're marketing to the influx of the tenants, there is not going to be marketing and they realize they are looking at the units and realize there is no magic to make parking not there. They are asked for bike storage and it's a different influx of tenants. If this is passed what you are going to do is continue to see the 30 units or less. Math is math. So if we are required to put the parking for above the 30 units, that's what's going to happen. So we're in agreement of the shared parking, just legacy saying that would be great for us to offer for the tenants. The cost of the parking stalls are around 50,000. If you do the simple math that's decades to recover that. I got a little confused about the power point that was up on the screen earlier that suggested the range was from 1560 to 1175 for the studio units. And some of them had parking and some of them didn't. We own one of the properties in there. That's the range. You can see the difference in the cost. Some can't afford that for a studio. So we are -- many of the places are market rate but recently in the northwest district we're approved for the affordable housing component. That's what we are going to continue to do. I can't say that's the driving factor for parking because what does that do as the previous gentleman said about the parking rate units. Those will go up so the costs will have to be recovered in some way. We wrote a letter to the city council and I will go through this to see it. The requirements would have serious negative impact on the Future supply of the affordable housing if passed and housing as a whole. The ability to create new urban rental housing with escalating land costs, the increased permit costs, and increase material cost and is labor wages and we passed the increased taxes for our construction. It's a strain and yet we're asking for us to reduce the rent cost. The cost. The majority of the renters do not have the automobiles, at least the ones applying to us, the general public demand is a non-project related tendency and will not support the new parking. Therefore it becomes a secondary burden to the development and the ownership of the cost, and number two, debt service. With that being said, I think you got my message and I don't need to continue on.

Hales: Thank you very much.

Novick: Can I ask you a question? So you heard the idea discussed of rather than having the minimum parking requirements, limiting the number of permits that the new buildings get so not everybody in the building would get a permit to park on the street. If you could only promise us to park in the permit area to half of your perspective tenants. They don't have the parking space on-site and be able to park on the street.

Stock: Absolutely, I think you are on the right path, and I don't know what the percentage is but I was paying attention when you mentioned that earlier if you saw the stats posted the 120 had, what was it, 90 or 60, was and so the percentages are working out. We would be in agreement with that.

Hales: Good to know. Thank you. Good afternoon.

Patrick Rafforty: Good afternoon. I am Patrick Rafforty, just a concerned citizen. I urge you not to pass this. There have been a handful of people in favor of it and four or five handfuls of people who have not been. Cars are not a fact of life. People have set that earlier today. As long as we keep parking inexpensive it will remain a way of life. They don't have to be. That's it.

Hales: Thank you all.

Hales: Good afternoon.

Iain Mackenzie: I am Iain Mackenzie and I am here to support the origins introduced and oppose the amendments. I am a member of the northwest association transportation

July 6, 2016

committee, and I am speaking on my own behalf. I love northwest. And it's a true great neighborhood that achieves so many of the things that we have. The daily necessities of life can be found in the neighborhood, and we're in a short walk to the pearl or downtown, it's why I choose to live there, a lot of other people like the neighborhood too which is why it's one of the fastest parts of the city, it's also an income diverse area, so some of the tracks in the heart of the alphabet district have median incomes of 28,000 to 35,000 which is far below the statewide average. I live in the 1927 apartment building, which is typical of the market rate, relatively affordable housing found throughout the neighborhood. With seven units and no parking the building would be illegal to build for most of the parts before you would be allowed in northwest, absent any changes. The demand to live in northwest is so strong that any parking probably wouldn't result in less construction overall. The developers would find ways to make a huge cost of underground working for their performers. This probably changes what built, buildings like the 120 unit zero is parking building, which is approved by the city council, would no longer be possible. It would not be physically possible to fit the parking stalls required on the site. It reduces the number of parking spaces required the developer or another developer would probably have chosen to build fewer but larger units and market them as luxury apartments. I have heard commissioner Fish say many times, almost all the construction in Portland is aimed at the luxury market. It would only exacerbate that. The wonderful mix of housing in northwest the future, so I urge you not to consider the requests to add the parking minimums, the parking minimums are in the rest of the city in 2013. We are three years into that but According to the bps director Anderson, when she was speaking to the sustainability commission in March, no analysis has been done by the city to date on what effect those had in the affordability. And we've been cleared, in the housing crisis, and I don't think that now is the right time to further experiment with adding that back into the city code. I love the neighborhood and the way it is growing to please don't change that.

Hales: Thank you and good afternoon.

Wendy Chung: I am Wendy chug. Mayor and commissioners thank you for allowing this testimony. I am so glad that Iain went before me because he hopes to illustrate the points that I would like to make today, really, strongly because he lives in a 1927 building with relatively affordable rents which could never add parking if it wanted to so unlike other neighborhoods, they have the minimum parking requirements, northwest is unique in that we have a large historic district not just with the single family homes like Irvington or Laurelhurst or east Moreland or places like that but multi-family reasonably priced apartments that they cannot add parking, whether they want to or not because they are historic, right. And so when we talk about equity, and I think commissioner Fish talked about this, one of the things that I have not heard is discussion about equity, we need more housing, and in fact we do. We are in a crisis and we need less cars and of course, because we have carbon problems so nobody is disputing that. Mayor hales, respectfully speaking --

Hales: Not parking nirvana.

Chung: I grew up on the east coast and spent several years in new York city where families live there with kids and got on the transit and off and that's not possible so people with children, people with elderly relatives, whom they are taking care of, or disabled people, all three of those groups are represented on my street alone. They need cars, and while I might say well, you know, from an equity standpoint, unless you want to push everybody, all those people out and have single professionals who are able to live in 300 square foot units, that are, by no stretch of the imagination are affordable with no kitchens so they can eat out. They can rent a car and go to mount hood, and this is, this is an equity issue and one of the things that I think that people are not understanding is that northwest

July 6, 2016

is not an, a rich neighborhood. If you look at the documents I gave you, you will see this spring survey, of the bedroom rents and the northwest district has 1360 for one bedroom units. The highlighted section the pearl and Chinatown and downtown Portland, which is part of the central city, as you know, northwest is not part of the central city. We are the only neighborhood outside the central city not included in the minimums. All we're asking for is not special attention but not to be discriminated against because we have fallen out of the ordinances that were passed for everybody else. A building like the one that Iain lives in just to give you an idea has a one bedroom for rent and there is a link to it in your letter for the 995. Compare that to 995 a 250 square foot micro-unit on Thurmond. Which is more affordable? Much has made about tess owe -- O'Bryan. Had they had requirements for parking and I want to point out the bike work article that cites that project clarifies that those units are 300 square feet and 1200 to 1400 a month. If that were not built I would be thrilled and happy if commissioner Novick or Saltzman were able to build a bunch of affordable units with or without it, and I agree those should be exempted from the minimum requirements but what it does is unfairly not passing it unfairly discriminates against people who live in historic buildings whether single family or apartments, and people with families and disabled relatives and others.

Hales: Thank you very much. Good afternoon.

Tony Schwartz: Good afternoon, I am Tony Schwartz and I live at 17th and Irving in northwest. I was listening to the folk advocating for the status quo, and I was thinking that we share the same goals which are less cars and less pollution and more affordable housing, and more income diversity in the neighborhood. I am a proponent of a vision to including the parking minimums in the northwest district for all kinds of reasons but primarily so we are taken into the city so the city can revisit these macro issues on a city-wide level. It seems fanciful to believe that not keeping or not putting in more parking minimums in our district would result in less cars, is untrue. I have not heard any experts really talk about that in-depth. I have heard about the developers but I can tell you from my experience on 17th and Irving we had a developer redevelop Hoyt, it's an old Powell's bookstore warehouse that was empty and we were thankful that it was developed into the studio apartments, and those are now running for 1100 to 1500 a month. That is not truly affordable, and in discussions with that developer in a neighborhood meeting they told us he's marketing to the folks with bicycles and those who walk. Great but I can tell you walking my dog to downtown and to and from the theater, people are getting out of their cars every day. I don't think this district should be used as a guinea pig for what I believe are unproven, fanciful public policy notions. We all want less cars and want to live in a city about people and not for four wheels. Take us into the city and think about the macro issues and we can work together, and in thinking about it, the flip side is get rid of the parking minimum city-wide and see how many will come into this building and room. We should work on this as a city and not allow our district to be used as a guinea pig. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you all. A couple more?

Parsons: Two more.

Hales: Thank you for waiting and welcome.

Ben Schonberger: Welcome. Commissioners, I am Ben Schonberger, a board member for the housing land advocates and we're focused on housing affordability issues. I would like to open by saying that parking makes housing more expensive. Period. It's amazing that we're having this discussion. Your own planning department did an analysis in 2012 in advance of the 2013 change that demonstrated this. There have been many studies, the bible of this has documentation. Developers have said just anecdotally its math it requires both land area and on the alternative suppresses the amount of housing created. On the

July 6, 2016

issue of affordability speaking to commissioner Fish's point, our group is interested in affordable housing in the subsidized category and in the low end of market rate category, and parking requirements and obligations affect those and make it more difficult to keep rents down in both those categories of housing and that's a concern of ours, and it's also a statistical fact in Portland and elsewhere that wealthier people drive more and own more cars than lower income people. Were we are thinking about the fairness and equity implications of this decision, it's important to keep those two things in mind. The rallying cry of the people making this change has been consistency and fairness, and I think that it's important to recognize a different district, different districts are treated differently, different zones and elements of commercial are treated differently. That's ok. There is unique circumstances that northwest Portland has that aren't available anywhere else in the city and the tool kit that you are thinking about using is one of those unique circumstances, and I think it's a tremendous opportunity for the city to do testing of those issues of how is the best way to distribute those, whether it's by price or availability or a lottery and how might that affect the availability of parking in the district and could you then solve those problems on a management and operations issue and not make a commitment to a construction of an extremely expensive and frankly 100-year commitment to parking on-site. That's really what that is about, when you build parking you are making a 100-year commitment to that, and we have robo cars in 10 or 20 years, have we made a mistake? If we have lost those units of housing that would have otherwise gotten built in Doug's example of the 50 unit versus 30 unit building, you never get those 20 units you might have had back or don't for the next 100 years. It's a concern there hasn't been analysis of this, and that's the final point is what have the impacts been of those changes. Could these problems be solved in other ways? The advocates believe this is a step backwards for affordability and the city.

Hales: Thank you very much. You get the last word.

Bill Welch: Bill Welch. 2705 northwest petty grove. Portland, Oregon. I've been on the planning committee for the district association, and going to weekly meetings since 1976. One of the problems that we have had over the, those last 40 years or whatever it is, is that our neighborhood was attacked in two ways from two directions because we were a slum. We had -- I bought two houses at 10,000 apiece. My neighbors, I could have purchased had I had more money, the entire block for virtually nothing. The problem here was we had such lowland values that the northwest industrial area was -- and the zoning that allowed it, was moving towards the south because the land was so cheap that they could make warehouses and tear them down and make warehouses. The same problem occurred on the eastern edge of the neighborhood when the Burlington northern railroad rails lines were there, and warehousing was needed for that. So they were in the process of buying property, and, on the eastern edge and taking outhouses for warehouses. We, not me certainly, but members of the neighborhood association worked together to try and figure out what we could do about that to save the neighborhood. What we came up with is to allow the denser zoning around the north and east sides of the neighborhood. The net result is that we have a lot more land than most of the neighborhoods in this town, for high density development. We faced the parking problems that the rest of the town came apart on a year and a half or three years ago. We had faced it for 15 years and we were not close to getting it done. These minimums are the only thing that we can now use to keep the 30 pending units that are on these maps having overwhelming the existing parking out there. I don't want higher rents. I don't want to lose affordable housing. I don't want more cars and none of my neighbors do, but they cannot live where this is, and you guys use us for the experiment to pacify all of the other neighborhoods in this town. Please put in parking minimums at this time if only for a small time to hold the dam.

July 6, 2016

Hales: Thank you very much. There is requests for more guidance from staff so --

Welch: You might want to look at this map.

Hales: Leave us copies. Thank you, bill.

Fritz: In response to Margo black's testimony I was looking up on my phone, New York City is the city in America which has the least car ownership but one in three people own cars there. And San Francisco has two in three families owning the car. Both require one to one parking, one unit, one parking space. London requires one unit, one parking space. Boston.

Novick: It was the opposite yesterday.

Fritz: No, it doesn't, they do. So I wonder how are we thinking that -- yes, we are different and we don't carry umbrellas, we wear raincoats but I was also struck and miss Chung's question about equity, there is a lot of low income people who live in northwest who rely on the on street parking to have their car because they work two jobs outside of northwest and they cannot get there at 3:00 in the morning, they cannot get back to their home. The one thing that we can all agree on is we are not going to be making many more, maybe a few at Conway where we might be creating a few but the on street parking is the thing that is limited. Given we're going to have these people who we zoned for in northwest, there's got to be some consideration to at least that some of them will have a car and in response to those saying that there's the 30 unit is a check-off I think that we should look at it and say it's one for five units and whether you have five or more you need a parking spot so people have choices.

Fish: A couple of questions. I can't believe a more Thoughtful hearing.

Hales: I was having the same impression.

Fish: The folks on both sides of this issue have distinguished themselves in making the best possible case and I am genuinely torn. So I want to ask Joe a couple of questions. In terms of why we would apply the parking minimums to the division and not to the northwest district what is the -- what would be a rational basis to distinguish between division and northwest?

Zehnder: There is several, originally when we adopted the interim regulations we did not apply this to any planned district that had its own parking regulations or approaches, so Hollywood, gateway, and northwest and a few others that have --

Frederiksen: We did not apply it to ones with parking minimums. So Hollywood didn't speak to the parking minimums, so they get the base zones.

Zehnder: So there are a number of planned districts that have been treated in the same way, and northwest had its own parking. Parking regulations so I got part of that wrong. That's a distinction. When we adopted this especially in division part of what we were saying is we do not have the full set of tools present we don't have on street parking regulations, and that's where they stepped up to develop those programs to put in place so we need this as a step along that way and once we actually see what an a parking permit program might be, might look like there, you know, we'll See how this works. Northwest has got every parking tool, on street regulatory tool that we had at that time, and got many that are going to look like what this new system might look like. Really the decision that we are so on, that's another distinction of the northwest district versus division midway in a different state of development visibility because of these the parking issues. Northwest is transit rich as the mayor pointed out. Although northwest is tech clever not part of the central city functionally in terms of the location and density and transit, it is unique in the city in that regard and kind of like the central city. These other neighborhoods emerging haven't reached that point yet.

Novick: Isn't northwest more parking challenged than division?

Zehnder: It absolutely is, which is why the first, in the first place we went down this path

July 6, 2016

with considering minimums. Were we took this up at the staff level, we puzzled over this in the same way. When we did the parking minimum study we looked at is there really on street congestion? How many spaces are occupied by different peak periods? We found they are congested, it's on the margin for all these places where we applied the minimums but it was close enough, the only place that we found that was really congested was at 15th and Broadway around Irvington. In northwest almost every hour of the day, the on street is occupied. So there is a distinction the other way. If the rule was that we were applying parking minimums in places where we started to see this heavy use of on street parking, northwest, we are doing that. So that's in part why originally we proposed the parking minimums for northwest to be considered. What's the big change in circumstances here that we were willing to consider now that we were not when we first started this project, and that's the idea of capping the number of permits of the pricing them more aggressively and allocating them differently. If you think about what's going to make a difference in whether a new tenant coming into the district perceives there is parking opportunities there or not, it's access to that permit so moving in a direction that we are aggressive in bringing that kind of tool into our on street parking permit regulations is probably the bigger game changer than any minimum that we might have.

Saltzman: Is that anywhere in this ordinance?

Zehnder: That's part of the new program they are talking about bringing forward for the rest of the city and we would be considering it.

Saltzman: Would it be appropriate for it to be in this ordinance? That's an important condition. I do, after listening to the testimony, I do think that the on street permits are woefully underpriced.

Zehnder: It's a matter of timing because this is part of the program that commissioner novick was describing needs to be brought out and vetted.

Saltzman: The tool kit?

Zehnder: So northwest has -- most of the kit doesn't have these critical pieces and our willingness to talk about those pieces. When we started this project it was not so much on the table. It's part of Portland getting its head around this situation of how to be a dense and compact city that meets our objectives and manage a limited parking supply.

Fish: Let me offer an observation, I've been on the council long enough to see the parking wars flare up and be deeply polarizing and in 2013 there was a moment of detente and broad support for an approach, and it was different being in this room with people getting behind a plan. We have a portion of this before us today, which is the ordinance before us has broad support. The amendment divides people down the middle and there are very compelling arguments on either side. One of the things that we're trying to anticipate is the effectiveness of the tool kit and whether the mandatory is necessary. The timing makes it awkward because we don't have the benefit of the shared parking and as Dan suggests we don't have the proposal in front of us as to how to fairly ration the parking. I, for one, find it distasteful to say the last person in the neighborhood gets the short end of the stick. We're all part of the city. I don't think that's a rational basis but there might be a different basis to do it, doesn't that argue for one of our options to adopt the ordinance but to, in essence, hold the decision or postpone it for a while on the parking minimums and wait until we come back and talk about these other tools? Before we decide whether we have to revisit that issue.

Hales: Go ahead but I have some thoughts about that.

Zehnder: Just as the mayor was explaining earlier, we put those parking minimums in place, we needed a tool kit and that's starting to be ready to be vetted. And once we are outside of northwest and we have the tool kit, will we want to reconsider the minimums? I think that's an open question but that was our thinking when we adopted them.

July 6, 2016

Hales: First I want to concur with your assessment of this hearing. It's one of those -- you say fairly often that boy there is a great job. We get to listen to people smart and thoughtful, and so this is -- that's one of the things that is amazing about Portland. I am not sure if it would be possible in another city so I appreciate everything that we have heard. I've been on the fence about this but this hearing has been very thought provoking, and the fact that there is some folks that came in with history on the issue, I don't have as much as bill or? Others in the room have, rick have had on this issue but I have had a bit. So has Commissioner Fritz because I think that as a city commissioner with a different hair color and a young mom on the planning commission we were working on these a while back. I was reflecting on that history, and in each case there's been a fear of the turn, what's the yogi bear line, come to a fork in the road take it. We keep getting these about parking issues, and we usually venture down the fork in the road that goes towards a more European, less auto eccentric model. We have to adjust and we learn as we go along. There have been adjustments so we had the parking lid because we had an air quality problem, and there were predictions that that would be an economic catastrophe. We had this wonderful woman who managed that parking lid, and she passed away, and Earl Blumenauer, who has not given the great one-liners often had the best one I have ever heard at her memorial service when he said never has one woman made more men rich over their objections. [laughter] she did. The downtown real estate market blossomed because we did not have so much of the real estate. But we did not quite see around that turn in the fork of the road. And then we got rid of the minimums and rid of the lid and went to the central city transportation management plan. We have kept tuning this approach, and then in 2013 we got to a level of agreement about parking in northwest that's salutary and adopted the modest minimums in the rest of the city. More recently again with predictions of economic apocalypse we tightened up on the drive-thru and I think that will have been a good and progressive move, you know, turning towards the future that we want, so I think that we -- I think that we would be ill-advised to adopt the minimum here today. For just the reasons you cited. I am not persuaded that we got it completely right in 2013 on what we did do.

Fish: I was not persuaded either. Just a compromise.

Hales: Just like the parking lid needed tuning just like our ratios have needed tuning over time, and I think that piece of legislation that we approved in 2013 needs some tuning, as well. I think that the northwest parking strategy needs tuning because I think that we are underpricing the on street spaces and we have to think about equity and folks that can't afford to pay more than modest amount, but \$5 a month is low. We have got to address that. I've been persuaded by this hearing because I've been you know, on the fence about this particular amendment but I've been persuaded that although the rest of this is fine and we have got consensus about that, we should move more swiftly on the changes to the northwest parking strategies and the tool kit and not yet impose the minimums here. Sorry I am rambling a bit, if Doug Klotz got it right, 14 buildings at 30 units, we have created a perverse incentive. And maybe there is part of that, that's good because the modest sized buildings might be better I don't know but we ought to know that and we ought to do that evaluation of what has actually happened on the streets and in the marketplace as a result of what we did with the minimums in 2013, is it working or need to be tuned? Then get to the question of do we expand it to northwest. I think it's not timely and that's my sense.

Fish: Commissioner novick.

Novick: I really appreciate this discussion and am delighted to have the rest of the council thinking about the parking along with me. We spent hours and hours with them, and Alyssa and the rest of the team talking about the parking. First I want to say that I understand I understand where the northwest parking is coming from. I am sorry, having looked, with all

July 6, 2016

due respect to the streetcar and tri-met having lived in new York and d.c., northwest is not transit nirvana, and I said we are going to have the new York city subway next weekend I will be message ok to abolish all parking by the weekend but we don't have that, if the federal government took this seriously, that would be a different thing. I understand the argument that the northwest is making, and particularly, I mean, it is absolutely true that the parking is more constrained in the northwest than division and we adopted the minimums 2013. Parking minimums are extremely problematic. I don't care what the prices are in northwest with or without parking or which might be based on a short-term weirdness. If you increase the cost of something you increase the cost of something. There is no way that requiring parking could be built with new buildings does not drive up the cost. If we are building more parking one of the things that we are doing is enabling and encouraging more driving. Until we have all renewable electricity, enabling more driving is destroying the planet. Those are two arguments against parking minimums.

Fish: When would the next phase come back to council?

Novick: I think the tool kit is something that is going to require a lot of public discussion because as to how you allocation the permits, I think that no solution will seem fair to people so I think it will take a lot of thought and discussion before we come to the least unfair solution. I want to get that process going to, really quickly. And plan to bring something in the next few months, it may be that before that we might want to a new approach in response to the cry we are hearing from that district now, and one of my Guiding principles is Chris smith is smarter than I am. He demonstrated that in the year 2000.

Hales: He's really smart.

Novick: Were we were working --

Fish: You went to Harvard when you were 11?

Novick: Were we were looking at the tax cuts to the rich he identified a key fact that I missed. It was my job to catch it so when Chris threw out, what about carving big buildings out of the parking prime minister area, and I called Michael and he said that sounds great and already maybe we have an idea here. That may not be illegal. But it may be some version of that where you allocate only some permits to the new buildings might be legal. I want to talk to the lawyers about that and the developers about that. I thought it was interesting one developer here today said he thought that there would be a market for such buildings. So what I want to do is bring the full package to council and as quickly as I can but I think that it's possible that we might come up with a native thing to try in northwest in the near future. I want to talk to all of you about those ideas and developers and the lawyers over the next couple of weeks.

Hales: Any other thoughts and do you want us to --

Fritz: I am hearing the commissioner in charge of transportation would like to have more time to look at the city-wide issues and the issues in northwest, and I am struck that the community that the neighborhood association and the advisory committee came with the unanimous recommendation to do the minimum which I don't remember that much unanimity in our past discussions and these are the folks we charged to look at what would work in northwest and wouldn't and this is what they came to us. I would withdraw the motion to the amendment that I made with the promise it will be looked at and including the northwest district folks as experts.

Hales: Thank you.

Saltzman: I would echo Commissioner Fritz's urgency. I feel bad -- there is a word overused today but an equity perception here that northwest is somehow not being treated fairly vis-a-vis southeast division street, and that area. I believe there is merit to that but I feel that I have learned that there is a lot of tools at the disposal of northwest that maybe

July 6, 2016

haven't been fully explored. It sounds like they will be and I think that that's, before I am more comfortable deciding one way or the other I would like to see that. Including the shared parking which I think that we are about to pass. I think there is a creative potential there for great minds to get together to figure out ways that we can use the shared parking to satisfy the needs of those residents who are going to have cars and want to park overnight primarily. I don't want to see this disappear. I think there is a sense of urgency in my mind that we open people in northwest a decision one way or the other soon because there are enormous pressures in northwest. I share the concerns about the impact on affordable housing and that's something that I want to understand better in the next few months.

Fish: If I could add a comment, the one thing that I am clear about at the end of this hearing so I don't think the affordable housing component is a top three factor in this discussion. With all due respect I think that we are in a market now that is so bullish that it is almost impossible to discern a marginal cost to parking, in part because people are getting prices based on what they are advertising their units for bought dynamics and as Chris said scarcity. Now the counter argument to that is the market is going to change. At some point. We should not plan for this feverish market but long-term and we understand that and that's a very fair point. So, but even though housing is one of my core passions that's not the principal driver. What I will say is what commissioner Fritz has proposed is something I appreciate because she's said that she will table her amendment until we have more information to bring the council on and that is a sign of leadership because we can force issues and have votes divided and we can have winners and losers. Or we can absorb the information We received which was in my opinion, I have said it earlier, the mayor has echoed it and all of my colleagues has said it, this has been a superb hearing, could there be a third or fourth wave that comes out of this that we have not thought about? I am reminded when we struck the compromise on mandated parking, we called it an interim solution and we said that we would revisit it during the comp plan and look at a very -- test our assumptions and I think we're long overdue taking a look at that. And we have had some issues that we may want to refine our proposal because it appears to be creating incentives to do smaller scale development which is due to our climate action plan and if 30 is the dividing line where people are building smaller buildings because they are trying to save on the parking, that works against the other policies we adopted for our scarce land. This is my take away from where we are. There is a proposal on shared parking which has broad support, and not even the testimony from legacy has caused me to go against that recommendation. There was a fear it would be snatched from the jaws of victory which is the risk of testifying and something that everyone seems to agree on and there might be some argument that causes someone to reconsider. That's done. This hearing caused each of us to think about this problem and perhaps in new and different ways and I love the suggestion that there may be a hybrid new idea out there worth exploring, And I love the idea of looking at a different way of rationing and pricing, interesting ideas have percolated and the way I read commissioner Fritz's action is we're tabling the amendment and bringing this whole suite of issues back to council and moving on the one matter before us that has support and I appreciate that approach to policy.

Hales: Good. Thank you all and thanks for an excellent hearing. The proposal as proposed will come back to the council on the second reading next week and good work. Thanks very much. [gavel pounded] we are adjourned.

At 4:41 p.m. council adjourned