

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL AGENDA</b>  <b>City Hall - 1221 SW Fourth Avenue</b>  <b><u>WEDNESDAY, 9:30 AM, DECEMBER 21, 2016</u></b></p> <p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 5.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Disposition:</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMUNICATIONS</b></p> <p><b>1419</b> Request of Charles Bridgecrane Johnson to address Council regarding bridgecrane the police contract, enhance COAB and CRC, DApI solidarity with Standing Rock, stop Jordan Cove (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1420</b> Request of Michael Withey to address Council regarding homelessness (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TIMES CERTAIN</b></p> <p><b>1421 TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM</b> – Accept the final annual report of the Public Safety General Obligation Bond Program Independent Citizens Committee (Report introduced by Mayor Hales) 30 minutes requested</p> <p><b>Motion to accept report:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ACCEPTED</b></p>
<p><b>*1422 TIME CERTAIN: 10:15 AM</b> – Appropriate \$300,000 of contingency funding from the City general fund to the Portland Bureau of Transportation for emergency Vision Zero improvements and community engagement efforts on Outer Division (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales and Commissioners Novick and Fish) 20 minutes requested (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>188161</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b></p> <p><b>1423</b> Appoint Wendy Chung and Annie Mahoney to the Historic Landmarks Commission for terms to expire December 31, 2020 and reassign Matthew Roman to the Historian membership category (Report) (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>
<p><b>1424</b> Confirm appointment of David G. Shaff as Commissioner for the Civil Service Board for a term to expire December 20, 2019 (Report) (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Bureau of Planning &amp; Sustainability</b></p>	

<p><b>1425</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University in the amount of \$83,482 for the Single Family Weight Study 2017-2019 to determine weight of garbage for ratemaking purposes (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JANUARY 4, 2017 AT 9:30</b></p>
<p><b>City Budget Office</b></p>	
<p><b>1426</b> Adopt the Budget Calendar for FY 2017-2018 (Resolution) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>37258</b></p>
<p><b>*1427</b> Amend FY 2016-17 Fall Supplemental Budget ordinance to correct technical errors (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 188061) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188154</b></p>
<p><b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p>	
<p><b>*1428</b> Pay claim of Emily Johnson Purry in the sum of \$250,000 involving the Portland Parks and Recreation (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188155</b></p>
<p><b>*1429</b> Provide one-month City paid health insurance to certain staff of outgoing elected officials' offices (Ordinance) <b>Motion to amend staff list in Exhibit:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Hales absent) (Y-4; Hales absent)</p>	<p><b>188166</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>*1430</b> Authorize a grant agreement with Janus Youth Programs, Inc. for \$66,000 to help sustain the Village Market in Portland (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188156</b></p>
<p><b>*1431</b> Authorize a Special Appropriation grant agreement with Focus on Youth in an amount not to exceed \$60,110 to fund expansion of their program and construction of an attached garage for use as an indoor classroom/demonstration kitchen and bathroom for students and volunteers (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188157</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p>	
<p><b>*1432</b> Amend contract with Axiom Event Productions, LLC for volunteer and course management services through the Portland Sunday Parkways program for an amount not to exceed \$151,000 (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 30003708) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188158</b></p>
<p><b>*1433</b> Authorize a contract with Toole Design Group, LLC for the development of Safe Routes to School Project Planning in the amount of \$345,366 (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188159</b></p>
<p><b>*1434</b> Accept a grant in the amount of \$36,660 from Oregon Department of Transportation for the Enhanced Transit Corridors plan and authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188160</b></p>

<b>REGULAR AGENDA</b>		
<b>1435</b>	Provide affordable housing through an Inclusionary Housing program (Second Reading Agenda 1381; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Title 33, Planning and Zoning)  (Y-5)	<b>188162</b> <b>AS AMENDED</b>
<b>S-1436</b>	Provide affordable housing through an Inclusionary Housing program and update the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program (Second Reading Agenda 1382; Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Saltzman; add Code Section 30.01.120, amend Section 30.01.030 and Chapter 3.103)  (Y-5)	<b>SUBSTITUTE</b> <b>188163</b> <b>AS AMENDED</b>
<b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b> <b>Office of Management and Finance</b>		
<b>*1437</b>	Approve settlement of claims with Level 3 Communications, LLC for past due franchise fees (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested  (Y-4; Hales absent)	<b>188167</b>
<b>*1438</b>	Authorize an agreement with Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless to provide wireless services for a three-year contractual total not to exceed \$7,500,000 (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Hales absent)	<b>188168</b>
<b>*1439</b>	Approve findings to authorize an exemption to the competitive bidding requirements and authorize the use of the alternative contracting method of Construction Manager/General Contractor all in connection with the Tryon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Headworks Project for an estimated amount of \$54,000,000 (Previous Agenda 1402)  <b>Motion to add emergency clause due to the critical aspect of getting the exemption soon:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Hales absent)  (Y-4; Hales absent)	<b>188169</b> <b>AS AMENDED</b>
<b>1440</b>	Clarify definitions, administrative authority and make housekeeping changes to the Transient Lodgings Tax Code (Second Reading Agenda 1403; amend Code Chapter 6.04)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)	<b>188170</b>
<b>1441</b>	Amend Tourism Improvement District code to update definitions and change the due dates and delinquency dates to match those in the Transient Lodging Tax code (Second Reading Agenda 1404; amend Code Chapter 6.05)  (Y-5)	<b>188171</b>
<b>Portland Development Commission</b>		

<p><b>1442</b> Authorize the submittal of a boundary change request to the State of Oregon to add .92 acres to the East Portland Enterprise Zone (Resolution) 15 minutes requested  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>37259</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p>	
<p><b>*1443</b> Authorize contract with Kimley-Horn Associates Inc. to provide consultant services to develop a Parking Management Plan, formerly Performance Based Parking Management, not to exceed \$205,835 (Ordinance)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188172</b></p>
<p><b>*S-1444</b> Authorize a permit fee surcharge and additional Supplemental Plan provisions to the Northwest Portland Zone M Area Parking Permit Program (Previous Agenda 1417)  <b>Motion to accept substitute ordinance:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Novick. (Y-5)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>SUBSTITUTE</b> <b>188173</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b> <b>Office of Neighborhood Involvement</b></p>	
<p><b>*1445</b> Amend City's marijuana business regulations (Second Reading Agenda 1416; amend Code Chapter 14B.130, Portland Policy Document ADM-20.01)  <b>Vote #1:</b> (Y-5)  <b>Motion to reconsider:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)  <b>Motion to add emergency clause so the permit process can be expedited:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)  <b>Vote #2 on ordinance as amended:</b> (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188178</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b></p>	
<p><b>1446</b> Create a local improvement district to construct park improvements in the Portland Open Space Sequence Local Improvement District in partnership with the Halprin Landscape Conservancy (Second Reading Agenda 1410; C-10054)  (Y-4; Saltzman abstained)</p>	<p><b>188165</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b> <b>Bureau of Environmental Services</b></p>	
<p><b>1447</b> Authorize a contract with the lowest responsible bidder for construction of the Safeway Pump Station Upgrade Project No. E10292 for an estimated cost of \$1,090,000 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO</b> <b>SECOND READING</b> <b>JANUARY 4, 2017</b> <b>AT 9:30</b></p>

<p><b>1448</b> Authorize a contract with the lowest responsible bidder for the Airport Way 1 Pump Station Improvements and AW03 Forcemain Repair Project No. E10529 for an estimated construction cost of \$2,374,000 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JANUARY 4, 2017 AT 9:30</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b> <b>Portland Housing Bureau</b></p>	
<p><b>1449</b> Establish annual sale price cap of \$350,000 for the Homebuyer Opportunity Limited Tax Exemption Program (Resolution) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>37260</b></p>
<p><b>*1450</b> Amend subrecipient contracts with Unlimited Choices for \$110,000 and NAYA for \$260,338 for home repair services (Ordinance; amend Contract Nos. 32001386 and 32001382) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188174</b></p>
<p><b>City Auditor Mary Hull Caballero</b></p>	
<p><b>*1451</b> Initiate foreclosure sale on one property for the recovery of delinquent City liens placed against the property (Ordinance) 15 minutes requested  <b>Motion to add emergency clause in order that the current Council may act on the foreclosure:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Saltzman. (Y-5)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188164</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>FOUR-FIFTHS AGENDA</b> <b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b> <b>Portland Housing Bureau</b></p>	
<p><b>*1452</b> Authorize the appropriation of \$51,000,000 for a Housing Property Fund (Ordinance; add Code Section 5.04.540) 20 minutes requested for items 1452 and 1453 (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188175</b></p>
<p><b>1453</b> Authorize a temporary operating loan of \$51,000,000 between the Development Services Fund and the Housing Property Fund (Resolution)  <b>Motion to amend resolution to state that HUD loan—not a grant—will be used:</b> Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>37261</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b></p>	
<p><b>*1453-1</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Milwaukie to revise urban service boundary of unincorporated areas between City of Milwaukie and Portland (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188176</b></p>

<p><b><u>WEDNESDAY, 2:00 PM, DECEMBER 21, 2016</u></b></p>	
<p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 5.</p>	
<p><b>S-1454 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Second Reading Agenda 1414; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 30 minutes requested for items 1454-1455</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p><b>SUBSTITUTE</b>  <b>188177</b>  AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>1455</b> Adopt a Connectivity Strategy for Comprehensive Plan Centers in Eastern Neighborhoods (Second Reading Agenda 1415; (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Novick)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188179</b>  AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>1456 TIME CERTAIN: 2:30 PM</b> – Extend to December 31, 2017 the Council-approved Corporate Securities Do-Not-Buy List (Previous Agenda 1418; Resolution introduced by Commissioner Novick) 2 hours requested</p> <p><b>Motion to add Wells Fargo and Caterpillar to the Do-Not-Buy List:</b>  Moved by Novick and seconded by Fritz. (Vote not taken. This motion was overridden by Fritz amendment.)</p> <p><b>Motion that the City not invest in any corporate debt and restrict investments in corporate securities to those meeting a to-be-determined minimum rating. City Treasurer to return to Council by April 1, 2017 for approval of City’s Investment Policy:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p><b>37262</b>  AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b><u>THURSDAY, 2:00 PM, DECEMBER 22, 2016</u></b></p> <p><b>DUE TO LACK OF AGENDA</b>  <b>THERE WAS NO MEETING THURSDAY</b></p>	

**NOTE:** “Time Certain” indicates that an item will not be heard by Council **prior** to the time specified.

Communications items are three minutes each. Regular Agenda items taking longer than five minutes have the time estimate noted next to the item.

The \* indicates an emergency ordinance, which takes effect immediately if passed. Non-emergency ordinances require two readings and a 30-day waiting period before taking effect. Resolutions, reports, etc., adopted by Council are effective after adjournment.

The above summary is published by the City Auditor as provided by Section 2-113 of the

Charter and Ordinance No. 130672.

Council Chambers is equipped with a sound system for the hearing impaired. Assisted listening devices are available from the Clerk.

The City of Portland will gladly accommodate requests for an interpreter or make other accommodations that further inclusivity. Please make your request at least 48 hours before the meeting to the Council Clerk 503-823-4086. (TTY 503-823-6868).

City Council meetings can be viewed at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/video>. The meetings are also cablecast on CityNet 30, Portland Community Media television.

Mary Hull Caballero  
Auditor of the City of Portland

=====

Testimony is taken on Reports, Resolutions and Ordinances (first reading). To testify, sign up on a testimony sheet as you enter Council Chambers on the day of the meeting. Individuals have 3 minutes to testify, unless otherwise stated at the meeting. Testimony is not taken on Communications, Second Readings, Proclamations or Presentations in accordance with Code 3.02.040 F. and G.

Written testimony may be emailed or mailed to the Council Clerk prior to the meeting.

To schedule a Communication, email or mail your request to the Council Clerk. Include your name, address, phone number and a brief description of the subject you will be addressing. For full details, see Testimony Policies and procedures. <http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/index.cfm?&a=63123&c=34447>

Clerk Email: [karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov)  
Council Clerk Testimony: [cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov)  
US Mail: Council Clerk, 1221 SW Fourth Ave., Room 130, Portland OR 97204

=====

Declaration Required by Lobbyists. Portland City Code 2.12.060 states: Prior to offering public testimony before City officials, at the beginning of any meetings or phone calls with City officials, or in emails and letters to City officials, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent for that communication.

=====

*“Be a part of the picture...get involved with your City...volunteer for a City of Portland Board or Commission. For more information, a brochure, or a volunteer application, stop by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement in City Hall or call 503-823-4519.”*

**OFFICERS OF PORTLAND CITY GOVERNMENT**

**CHARLIE HALES, MAYOR**

Commissioner of Finance and Administration  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 340, 97204  
 (503) 823-4120  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/mayor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/mayor/)  
 e-mail: [mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>
Portland Police Bureau Portland Development Commission Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Fire & Police Disability and Retirement Office of Equity and Human Rights Office of Management and Finance Office of Government Relations City Attorney City Budget Office Oversight of the Willamette River Super Fund clean-up project

**NICK FISH**

Commissioner of Public Works  
 Position Number 2  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 240, 97204  
 (503) 823-3589  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fish](http://www.portlandonline.com/fish)  
 e-mail: [Nick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Nick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Environmental Services Bureau of Hydroelectric Power Water Bureau	<i>Elders in Action</i> <i>Portland Utility Review Board</i> <i>Venture Portland</i> <i>Portland's Centers For The Arts</i> Regional Arts and Culture Council

**AMANDA FRITZ**

Commissioner of Public Utilities  
 Position Number 1  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 220, 97204  
 (503) 823-3008  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fritz/](http://www.portlandonline.com/fritz/)  
 e-mail: [amanda@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:amanda@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Parks & Recreation Office of Neighborhood Involvement	<i>Royal Rosarians</i> <i>Multnomah County Animal Control</i> <i>Portland Parks Board</i> <i>Urban Forestry Commission</i> <i>Golf Advisory Committee</i> <i>Portland International Raceway Advisory Committee</i> <i>Protected Sick Time ordinance implementation</i> [continued next page]



	<p><i>Council Lead on the City Coordinating Committee addressing the Department of Justice Settlement</i></p> <p><i>Visitors Development Fund Board (with Saltzman)</i></p>
--	---

**STEVE NOVICK**

Commissioner of Public Safety  
 Position Number 4  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 210, 97204  
 (503) 823-4682  
 website: [www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/)  
 e-mail: [Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Transportation Bureau of Emergency Management Bureau of Emergency Communications	<i>Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)</i> <i>Portland Streetcar Inc.</i> <i>Regional Emergency Management Group</i> <i>BOEC Users Group</i> <i>BOEC Finance Committee</i> <i>Taxi Cab Board of Review</i> <i>Towing Board of Review</i>

**DAN SALTZMAN**

Commissioner of Public Affairs  
 Position Number 3  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 230, 97204  
 (503) 823-4151  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/saltzman](http://www.portlandonline.com/saltzman)  
 e-mail: [dan@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:dan@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Development Services Portland Fire & Rescue Portland Housing Bureau Gateway Domestic Violence Center Portland Children's Levy (formerly Portland Children's Investment Fund)	<i>Travel Portland</i> <i>Visitors Development Fund (with Fritz)</i> <i>Home Forward</i> <i>League of Oregon Cities</i> <i>Adjustment Committee</i> <i>Building Board of Appeals</i> <i>Design Commission</i> <i>Historic Landmarks Commission</i>

## **MARY HULL CABALLERO**

Auditor of the City of Portland

1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 140, 97204

(503) 823-4078

website: [www.portlandonline.com/auditor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/)

e-mail: [AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov)

### **Portfolio**

Assessments, Finance & Foreclosure  
Audit Services

City Elections

City Recorder

-Archives

-Council Clerk / Contracts Division

-Records Management

Hearings Office

IPR - Independent Police Review

Ombudsman

Portland Multnomah Progress Board

### **BUREAU DIRECTORS**

Bureau of Development Services	Paul Scarlett
Bureau of Emergency Communications	Lisa Turley
Bureau of Emergency Management	Carmen Merlo
Bureau of Environmental Services	Michael Jordan
Bureau of Human Resources	Anna Kanwit
Bureau of Internal Business Services	Bryant Enge
Bureau of Planning & Sustainability	Susan Anderson
Bureau of Police	Michael Marshman
Bureau of Revenue & Financial Services	Ken Rust
Bureau of Technology Services	Jeff Baer
Bureau of Transportation	Leah Treat
City Attorney	Tracy Reeve
City Budget Office	Andrew Scott
Fire & Police Disability and Retirement	Samuel Hutchison
Office of Equity and Human Rights	Dante James
Office of Government Relations	Martha Pellegrino
Office of Mgmt & Finance –Chief Admin Officer	Fred Miller
Office of Neighborhood Involvement	Amalia Alarcón de Morris
Portland Development Commission	Kimberly Branam
Portland Fire & Rescue	Mike Myers
Portland Housing Bureau	Kurt Creager
Portland Parks & Recreation	Mike Abbaté
Revenue Director	Thomas Lannom
Water Bureau	Michael Stuhr

Updated 08-19-2016



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

**OFFICIAL  
MINUTES**

**Excerpt Items 1454-1455.**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **21<sup>ST</sup> DAY OF DECEMBER, 2016** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 5. Mayor Hales was left at 12:05 p.m. and Commissioner Saltzman presided. Mayor Hales returned at 1:30 p.m.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Denis Vannier, Deputy City Attorney at 9:30 a.m.; Lory Kraut, Senior Deputy City Attorney at 2:05 p.m. and 3:18 p.m.; Kathryn Beaumont, Chief Deputy City Attorney at 2:40 p.m.; and Jason King and Mike Cohen, Sergeants at Arms.

Item No. 1429 was pulled for discussion and on a Y-5 roll call, the balance of the Consent Agenda was adopted.

The meeting recessed at 11:32 a.m. and reconvened at 11:36 a.m.  
The meeting recessed at 12:33 p.m. and reconvened at 1:34 p.m.  
The meeting recessed at 3:14 p.m. and reconvened at 3:18 p.m.

<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>		<b>Disposition:</b>
<b>1419</b>	Request of Charles Bridgecrane Johnson to address Council regarding bridgecrane the police contract, enhance COAB and CRC, DApl solidarity with Standing Rock, stop Jordan Cove (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>1420</b>	Request of Michael Withey to address Council regarding homelessness (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>TIMES CERTAIN</b>		
<b>1421</b>	<b>TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM</b> – Accept the final annual report of the Public Safety General Obligation Bond Program Independent Citizens Committee (Report introduced by Mayor Hales) 30 minutes requested <b>Motion to accept report:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-5)	<b>ACCEPTED</b>

December 21, 2016

*1422	<p><b>TIME CERTAIN: 10:15 AM</b> – Appropriate \$300,000 of contingency funding from the City general fund to the Portland Bureau of Transportation for emergency Vision Zero improvements and community engagement efforts on Outer Division (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales and Commissioners Novick and Fish) 20 minutes requested (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188161</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b></p>		
<p align="center"><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b></p>		
1423	<p>Appoint Wendy Chung and Annie Mahoney to the Historic Landmarks Commission for terms to expire December 31, 2020 and reassign Matthew Roman to the Historian membership category (Report) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>
1424	<p>Confirm appointment of David G. Shaff as Commissioner for the Civil Service Board for a term to expire December 20, 2019 (Report) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>Bureau of Planning &amp; Sustainability</b></p>		
1425	<p>Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University in the amount of \$83,482 for the Single Family Weight Study 2017-2019 to determine weight of garbage for ratemaking purposes (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JANUARY 4, 2017 AT 9:30</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>City Budget Office</b></p>		
1426	<p>Adopt the Budget Calendar for FY 2017-2018 (Resolution) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>37258</b></p>
*1427	<p>Amend FY 2016-17 Fall Supplemental Budget ordinance to correct technical errors (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 188061) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188154</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p>		
*1428	<p>Pay claim of Emily Johnson Purry in the sum of \$250,000 involving the Portland Parks and Recreation (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188155</b></p>
*1429	<p>Provide one-month City paid health insurance to certain staff of outgoing elected officials' offices (Ordinance) <b>Motion to amend staff list in Exhibit:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Hales absent) (Y-4; Hales absent)</p>	<p><b>188166</b> AS AMENDED</p>
*1430	<p>Authorize a grant agreement with Janus Youth Programs, Inc. for \$66,000 to help sustain the Village Market in Portland (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188156</b></p>

<p><b>*1431</b></p>	<p>Authorize a Special Appropriation grant agreement with Focus on Youth in an amount not to exceed \$60,110 to fund expansion of their program and construction of an attached garage for use as an indoor classroom/demonstration kitchen and bathroom for students and volunteers (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188157</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p>		
<p><b>*1432</b></p>	<p>Amend contract with Axiom Event Productions, LLC for volunteer and course management services through the Portland Sunday Parkways program for an amount not to exceed \$151,000 (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 30003708) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188158</b></p>
<p><b>*1433</b></p>	<p>Authorize a contract with Toole Design Group, LLC for the development of Safe Routes to School Project Planning in the amount of \$345,366 (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188159</b></p>
<p><b>*1434</b></p>	<p>Accept a grant in the amount of \$36,660 from Oregon Department of Transportation for the Enhanced Transit Corridors plan and authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188160</b></p>
<p><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b></p>		
<p><b>1435</b></p>	<p>Provide affordable housing through an Inclusionary Housing program (Second Reading Agenda 1381; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Title 33, Planning and Zoning) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188162</b> <b>AS AMENDED</b></p>
<p><b>S-1436</b></p>	<p>Provide affordable housing through an Inclusionary Housing program and update the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program (Second Reading Agenda 1382; Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Saltzman; add Code Section 30.01.120, amend Section 30.01.030 and Chapter 3.103) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>SUBSTITUTE</b> <b>188163</b> <b>AS AMENDED</b></p>
<p><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b> <b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p>		
<p><b>*1437</b></p>	<p>Approve settlement of claims with Level 3 Communications, LLC for past due franchise fees (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested (Y-4; Hales absent)</p>	<p><b>188167</b></p>
<p><b>*1438</b></p>	<p>Authorize an agreement with Cellco Partnership dba Verizon Wireless to provide wireless services for a three-year contractual total not to exceed \$7,500,000 (Ordinance) (Y-4; Hales absent)</p>	<p><b>188168</b></p>

December 21, 2016

<p><b>*1439</b></p>	<p>Approve findings to authorize an exemption to the competitive bidding requirements and authorize the use of the alternative contracting method of Construction Manager/General Contractor all in connection with the Tryon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Headworks Project for an estimated amount of \$54,000,000 (Previous Agenda 1402)</p> <p><b>Motion to add emergency clause due to the critical aspect of getting the exemption soon:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Hales absent) (Y-4; Hales absent)</p>	<p><b>188169</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>1440</b></p>	<p>Clarify definitions, administrative authority and make housekeeping changes to the Transient Lodgings Tax Code (Second Reading Agenda 1403; amend Code Chapter 6.04) (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188170</b></p>
<p><b>1441</b></p>	<p>Amend Tourism Improvement District code to update definitions and change the due dates and delinquency dates to match those in the Transient Lodging Tax code (Second Reading Agenda 1404; amend Code Chapter 6.05) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188171</b></p>
<p><b>Portland Development Commission</b></p>		
<p><b>1442</b></p>	<p>Authorize the submittal of a boundary change request to the State of Oregon to add .92 acres to the East Portland Enterprise Zone (Resolution) 15 minutes requested (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>37259</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p>		
<p><b>*1443</b></p>	<p>Authorize contract with Kimley-Horn Associates Inc. to provide consultant services to develop a Parking Management Plan, formerly Performance Based Parking Management, not to exceed \$205,835 (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188172</b></p>
<p><b>*S-1444</b></p>	<p>Authorize a permit fee surcharge and additional Supplemental Plan provisions to the Northwest Portland Zone M Area Parking Permit Program (Previous Agenda 1417)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept substitute ordinance:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Novick. (Y-5) (Y-5)</p>	<p>SUBSTITUTE <b>188173</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b> <b>Office of Neighborhood Involvement</b></p>		

December 21, 2016

<b>*1445</b>	Amend City's marijuana business regulations (Second Reading Agenda 1416; amend Code Chapter 14B.130, Portland Policy Document ADM-20.01) <b>Vote #1:</b> (Y-5) <b>Motion to reconsider:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-5) <b>Motion to add emergency clause so the permit process can be expedited:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-5) <b>Vote #2 on ordinance as amended:</b> (Y-5)	<b>188178</b> AS AMENDED
<b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b>		
<b>1446</b>	Create a local improvement district to construct park improvements in the Portland Open Space Sequence Local Improvement District in partnership with the Halprin Landscape Conservancy (Second Reading Agenda 1410; C-10054) (Y-4; Saltzman abstained)	<b>188165</b> AS AMENDED
<b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b> <b>Bureau of Environmental Services</b>		
<b>1447</b>	Authorize a contract with the lowest responsible bidder for construction of the Safeway Pump Station Upgrade Project No. E10292 for an estimated cost of \$1,090,000 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JANUARY 4, 2017 AT 9:30</b>
<b>1448</b>	Authorize a contract with the lowest responsible bidder for the Airport Way 1 Pump Station Improvements and AW03 Forcemain Repair Project No. E10529 for an estimated construction cost of \$2,374,000 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JANUARY 4, 2017 AT 9:30</b>
<b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b> <b>Portland Housing Bureau</b>		
<b>1449</b>	Establish annual sale price cap of \$350,000 for the Homebuyer Opportunity Limited Tax Exemption Program (Resolution) (Y-5)	<b>37260</b>
<b>*1450</b>	Amend subrecipient contracts with Unlimited Choices for \$110,000 and NAYA for \$260,338 for home repair services (Ordinance; amend Contract Nos. 32001386 and 32001382) (Y-5)	<b>188174</b>
<b>City Auditor Mary Hull Caballero</b>		
<b>*1451</b>	Initiate foreclosure sale on one property for the recovery of delinquent City liens placed against the property (Ordinance) 15 minutes requested <b>Motion to add emergency clause in order that the current Council may act on the foreclosure:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Saltzman. (Y-5) (Y-5)	<b>188164</b> AS AMENDED

<b>FOUR-FIFTHS AGENDA</b>		
<b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b> <b>Portland Housing Bureau</b>		
<b>*1452</b>	Authorize the appropriation of \$51,000,000 for a Housing Property Fund (Ordinance; add Code Section 5.04.540) 20 minutes requested for items 1452 and 1453 (Y-5)	<b>188175</b>
<b>1453</b>	Authorize a temporary operating loan of \$51,000,000 between the Development Services Fund and the Housing Property Fund (Resolution) <b>Motion to amend resolution to state that HUD loan—not a grant—will be used:</b> Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish. (Y-5) (Y-5)	<b>37261</b> AS AMENDED
<b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b>		
<b>*1453-1</b>	Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Milwaukie to revise urban service boundary of unincorporated areas between City of Milwaukie and Portland (Ordinance) (Y-5)	<b>188176</b>
<b>S-1454</b>	<b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Second Reading Agenda 1414; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 30 minutes requested for items 1454-1455 (Y-5)	<b>SUBSTITUTE</b> <b>188177</b> AS AMENDED
<b>1455</b>	Adopt a Connectivity Strategy for Comprehensive Plan Centers in Eastern Neighborhoods (Second Reading Agenda 1415; (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Novick) (Y-5)	<b>188179</b> AS AMENDED
<b>1456</b>	<b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:30 PM</b> – Extend to December 31, 2017 the Council-approved Corporate Securities Do-Not-Buy List (Previous Agenda 1418; Resolution introduced by Commissioner Novick) 2 hours requested <b>Motion to add Wells Fargo and Caterpillar to the Do-Not-Buy List:</b> Moved by Novick and seconded by Fritz. (Vote not taken. This motion was overridden by Fritz amendment.) <b>Motion that the City not invest in any corporate debt and restrict investments in corporate securities to those meeting a to-be-determined minimum rating. City Treasurer to return to Council by April 1, 2017 for approval of City’s Investment Policy:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-5) (Y-5)	<b>37262</b> AS AMENDED

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



December 21, 2016

---

**THURSDAY, 2:00 PM, DECEMBER 22, 2016**

**DUE TO LACK OF AGENDA  
THERE WAS NO MEETING THURSDAY**

---

**MARY HULL CABALLERO**  
Auditor of the City of Portland



By Karla Moore-Love  
Clerk of the Council

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

December 21, 2016  
Excerpt Items 1454-1455.

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.**

**DECEMBER 21, 2016 1:30 PM**

**Item S-1454.**

**Hales:** We don't normally start with a drum roll or fanfare of trumpets but it would seem appropriate today. So Susan, Eric, thank you for this great piece of work. Take it away.

**Fish:** Mayor, I don't want to rain on the parade here, but this feels rushed to me. [laughter]

**Susan Anderson, Director, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** It's so true. Good afternoon. Susan Anderson, director of bureau of planning and sustainability. With me is Eric engstrom, principal planner. This is a big vote for us today and to thank possibly more than a few people. You know, I have said it probably a dozen times and I'll probably say it again, we all know that great places don't happen by accident. We are this wonderful, walkable, prosperous city that so many people want to move to exactly because we did a comprehensive plan more than 35 years ago. That plan led us in a very different direction than most other American cities. So today we're here to celebrate the final steps of the comprehensive plan as we become a city of 800,000 people over the next 20 years. Again, this is task 5 of the comprehensive plan. I know Eric and joe are sad there's no task 6.

They have to get over that. This is the final step. As you know the plan, it isn't just about the map and the building height and setbacks, it's about people. It's about helping people thrive, the goal of this entire document at least from my perspective is to create wonderful neighborhoods to ensure that we have an abundance of jobs to make sure that there are all types of housing throughout the community, to make sure it's easy to get around and travel. Create a vibrant downtown and to protect the environment now and for future generations. To me that's what this is all about. I know that staff wants me to list all the great components of the project I'm not going to do that, but there were so many components that are so, so important I do want to list out just five. First the new mixed use zones. They ensure that growth, that housing and jobs can be accommodated in our corridors in our mixed use centers and that will expand our wonderful neighborhoods.

Second changes that we proposed for employment zones will continue our commitment to living wage jobs. With more opportunities in the central east side and to keep our strong industrial sanctuaries. Third, the new campus zones allow Portland to expand our education and medical institutions and that will help us grow as a west coast center for knowledge for innovation, for research. Fourth, the new tsp embraces the transportation hierarchy you all adopted last summer to better serve freight and businesses to make sure that it's easy to get around and to improve air quality and reduce carbon emissions. Fifth, the plan for me was really all about civic engagement. The plan was -- is a plan for everyone. It really builds on a great neighborhood association but it went many steps beyond that and includes the full spectrum of Portlanders who were involved and that it serves including lower income families, including young people and renters, people who want to age in place in their neighborhoods, disabled people, immigrants, people of color and more. Again, there were a lot of details but this wasn't just about zoning and code.

This was totally about creating a place for people to be thrive. I just want to thank several people. First you and your staff, your staff were amazing. They met with Eric often. I think

December 21, 2016

they are all new best friends. We appreciate their diligence and really appreciate all the great questions that they asked and being able to put all the pieces together. I think second I really would -- it's almost thanking the entire community. All of the work groups and committees that were involved, literally there were thousands of people who made comments on the plan either in person, by mail, by email or on the map act and the plan definitely are reflects all of that work. Probably more actually a couple thousand comments. Next I want to thank Andre Baugh. Maybe he will stand up for a wave. Catherine Schultz, who regrets she couldn't be here tonight or this afternoon. For their leadership as chairs of the planning and sustainability commission and really all of the members of the psc, including Howard shapiro, who chaired the citizen involvement committee. Finally, I want to thank some staff. Barry manning, John coal, Shannon Bruno, Sarah Wright, Marty Stockton, all of the district liaisons, Denver Igarta from pbot. A whole slew of staff from pbot, bes, pdc, there were so many different bureaus that were involved. We appreciate all of their work. Probably half of the bps staff was involved in one way or another, tom, Steve, Tyler, Julia Thompson, Al, bill and many, many others. Mark and his design team. And a special thank you to Kevin martin, who with his team created the map app and we really have become sort of a leading design studio and leading place in terms of doing planning throughout the united states in the work that we have done with creating tools like the map app. Finally, most of all I want to thank my partner's joe zehnder, Debra stein and the man, Eric engstrom. Eric as you know was phenomenal on this project. I can't begin to describe and you've all been witness to this, his knowledge, incredible technical skills, attention to details. His absolute perseverance, his tenacity in completing this project and making sure all of us took part. I would like to actually give a standing ovation for Eric. [applause] I just have one last comment. Something Eric told me of course that I need to say on the record. After you vote today, assuming that you all vote yes, this all takes effect in about a year, January 2018, and of course that is after we send it all down to Salem for their approval at dlcd. Then with a project this size there's likely or more than likely to be some objections and we will take all those in stride. I guess it's time for you to vote. I know this has been a really big day for inclusionary housing and now for a new comprehensive plan for the city. This really is the last time today that we'll be here on the comprehensive plan. It's just been a really great process. For me it's been truly an honor. So thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you all. Any further discussion before we vote? Let's take a vote, please.

**Novick:** Thank you, Eric. Thank you, Susan. Thank you, joe. Thanks to everybody at bps and pbot and all the other bureaus who worked so hard to get to this moment. Thank you, colleagues, especially mayor hales, for being here for this period doing the comprehensive plan. Can't think of a better person to be mayor during this process. You've given so much life to thoughtful urban planning. One substantive thing I want to say is this is a plan which anticipates and allows for growth. This assumes that more people are going to be moving to Portland. Recently we have been experiencing a lot of growing pains. There's no denying that. I want to take a couple of minutes to talk about the reasons it's a good thing that more people are moving to Portland and that we should especially we should allow more housing to be built. One is that the greatest challenge the human race has ever faced, which unfortunately we're forcing a lot of the species to face with us, is climate disruption. If we're going to fight climate disruption one thing we want to have happen is more people living in moderate climates because building heating and cooling are major aspect of energy use and if you're in a place that's hot or cold or both of those different times of the year, then you'll see more energy used on heating and cooling. So as a species we want more people living in places where you don't have to fire up the heater or the air conditioner on a regular basis. Second, I have had development such as that

December 21, 2016

anticipated by our comprehensive plan is conducive to people driving less and spending less energy on transportation because if you have people living closer together it's easier for biking, walking, taking transit to make sense and that's particularly true in a city that has preexisting commitment to transit and biking and walking. Another reason it's important that we accommodate growth and building of more housing is that Portland has somehow become a really, really popular place. A lot of people want to move here. As a result, we have seen the price of housing skyrocketing. If we severely restrict the supply of housing, the demand will continue and prices will continue to go up and up and up. Allowing for more housing to be built as this comprehensive plan does is an important tool in limiting the sky high housing price increases we're seeing. So again, I realize that growth is going to continue to be controversial. It does impose inconveniences. But there are two big reasons why I think we should embrace it and I'm glad this comprehensive plan embraces the idea that Portland will continue to grow. Finally, I want to thank Katie Shriver on my staff for putting in hundreds and hundreds of hours on this comprehensive plan, and related policies. So thank you, aye.

**Fritz:** Amazing the work that's got done. Thank you for getting it here on the last day we're a council. You deserve a standing ovation too, Susan, Joe Zehnder and your I'm very glad to see many were able to be here. Special to watch the end of a project like this which for me and many others has not just been four or eight years, it's been 12 or 16. I was on the planning commission in 1996 working away on some of the beginning of this. Tom Potter had the community connect and bureau improvement project and a bunch of very strong minded women in the bureaus started pushing for we need to have an equity component in this comprehensive plan in things that we do. Partly a result of what Mayor Potter did. Desiree Williams, Rush Knee, Amalia Alarcon de Morris, Danielle Brooks, others and these other women who just would not stop saying we have to change things. It's up to us to change things. So it's been such an honor and delight to work with Mayor Adams to get the Portland plan done and take time to get it right, now to work with you, Mayor Hales, for four years on all the exciting things we have been able to do including correcting some of the things I was most steamed about back in 1996. Thank you. It does stand us in good stead and especially with the community involvement chapter which clearly spells out much deeper than the old goal 9, the old policy 9. What we're expecting from all our communities. Who is entitled to participate and to make a difference. Not just to be heard but to be listened to and to have their suggestions made into law. I do thank Claire Adamsick on my staff and also Pooja Bhat the two of them it was almost miraculous the way they nor mouse body of work could get laid out. I knew exactly what you were doing. They worked with Eric and Joe and multiple staff coming into our offices working with my staff so that I oftentimes had things handed to me with very little effort on my part. I just really appreciate it. I think I would have liked to have been a staff person working on this plan. It's been a huge honor and I'm very, very happy we got to this place on this special day. Happy holidays, everybody. Aye.

**Fish:** Well, you're going to hear some similar themes as we go down the line.

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

**Fish:** Okay. It's fitting that in the last council day of the year and in your last session, Mayor, we're adopting a comprehensive plan. Because I think this issue more than any other issue defines your public service. I think it helps to explain why you do public service. Because of all the issues that we work with you on, this is the one that always brought out your best. It was clear, watching you in this building. So each of us has a long list of thank yous. There's no harm in thanking the same people more than once. Because this has really been just an extraordinary effort, and Susan, you are the captain of the ship. You put together this team. So you deserve our great thanks for your leadership. And Eric, you and

December 21, 2016

I have had a chance to work on many things. I have never seen someone get into the details on something as complicated and shows such command and we used to tease you that every once in a while you would miss something. Some detail like you would be off by a centimeter on a line on a map. We're always shocked because of your command on this issue. Joe zehnder, Eric, I want to thank you for the boot camps that you put me through. Every once in a while because I don't have Amanda's background or Charlie's background I would ask Susan for a boot camp. She would send her best people in to help bring any level of understanding up and you guys had a lot on your plate and you never said no. It helped me engage in this process in a much more thoughtful way. So thank you. To Debra Stein and Marty Stockton and all the folks who worked so hard on this, thank you. To the whole planning commission, we saw a lot of the members coming through and offering views but particularly to Katherine and Andre, I mean, citizen volunteers, Charlie, you talk all the time how blessed we are to have people that step up and do these jobs. These are two of the best we have ever had in that role and they shined. I'm loathe to mention the city council staff because then I'll be accused of poaching at some point. But everyone here has a great personal staff and no matter what the temperature is on this council, the staff people always work well together. They are always operating in a collegial level. Matt grumm, because we're just one door apart, spent the most time in my office maybe because we have great food in the kitchen. Matt is an extraordinary public servant. Katie Shriver has been a pleasure to work with. Claire Adamsick, Pooja Bhat we wish we had met her before you did. She's terrific. Camille, then I want to mention, brag on my Jamie dunphy. In a hearing someone referenced an amendment that Jamie did. You remember it. I don't but that's the difference in our i.q., you called him out on something and Jamie has worked tirelessly on this. Has really been just a tremendous benefit at every hearing and every time we had a big issue I would be handed a document to help me understand the choices. That's the best kind of staff work. So I'm grateful to Jamie's work. I want to thank my teams at the utilities. We're not the lead bureaus, bes had a big piece, but they have done good work. The hundreds of property owners and advocates and businesses and neighborhood associations and volunteers and everyday citizens who came in and testified and pushed us and cheered us and booed us and advocated. The best of Portland. Joe Rossi, who never missed a meeting there should be an award for that. [laughter] I want to say something about commissioner Fritz and the mayor because both of them dove head first into the weeds on this. I was looking at what I had written. I can't say that around Amanda. It's too close to another responsibility she has regulating weeds. The weed I should say. They both jump into complicated issues. I used to joke at the end of our hearings that I could put in for college credit. As the two of them would talk through complicated issues. Amanda served on the planning commission and Charlie has devoted his life to the built environment. I have never served with two people who knew more about a certain subject and it helped frame some of our most controversial discussions. I think you have both been anchors in that respect. I thank you for what you've done. Again, Charlie, I have served with three mayors. Each one had something that you knew above all other things they cared about. You know, I think for you my guess it's the built environment, making sure this process was done the Portland way. Now that the comp plan is finished Eric engstrom can get a full night's sleep without waking up in the middle of the night in a cold sweat. And once we vote on this we get to come back in January and start working on the central city 2035 plan. So we get to start all over again. It's a privilege to be in public service because you get to work with wonderful people and you get to shape the direction of a city you love. There's nothing I'm prouder of than this exercise that we have done together and I thank you for allowing me to be a part of it. Aye.

**Saltzman:** I think it's all been said. I will just say I have never felt so baited and switched in

December 21, 2016

all my life. [laughter] every time we deal with the comp plan I kept asking, is this it? Is this it? Is this it? Yeah. Then all of a sudden, what are these hearings two weeks from now? What are these work sessions? This is not my strong area compared to mayor haes or commissioner Fritz certainly, but I played along. Tried to act as smart as I could, hopefully made some contributions to this. But it's been a really even though this is not my forte I appreciate the enormity of the effort and know that it's very important to the blueprint of the city and very important to the residents. I was really impressed with the turnout. Only in Portland do you have turnouts like that for a comp plan hearing or do we have organizations formed around the notion of parking or no parking. We have all these vibrant committee's other cities don't come close to. People really do care about this stuff and I appreciate and admire that. I want to thank the bureau of planning and sustainability for their hard work, my colleagues for their perseverance. Aye.

**Hales:** Well, couple thank yous to add then a few thoughts. Camille trummer, Zach Klonoski, Jackie Dingfelder on my staff have worked so hard on this as well. We have all mentioned staff. I want to mention them in addition to Andre and Kat, think about the thousands of Portlanders who have been in this chambers at one of our meetings, been involved at times when we were worried about public engagement. This one happened. It happened because of good work by this bureau. I had a chance to meet with Susan and her staff the other day to thank them for the opportunity for me as a planner to work with them as planners because they are the best. This plan realizes that truth in how it was done and what has been done. I grew up, I was born in a city that was designed by a brilliant planner in Washington d.c., L'Enfant, George Washington giving him the job of planning the city. I grew up in the suburbs outside much the city and I saw sprawl metastasize and ruin so many of the quality of life I thought would always be there. Then I moved to Portland and 30 years ago I got involved in planning issues because I remembered that mistake of letting growth just happen the wrong way. And loving this city like we all do, I knew we had a chance. Got involved in planning in the city in the year our first light-rail line opened when there were questions would people really want to live in the city neighborhoods? We had experiments like the livable city housing project. Would people want to live in high rise development in a former railyard? Would they ride a streetcar? We didn't know those answers 30 years ago. That's not that long in the life of a city. It's been a big chunk of my life, my professional life but 30 years is no not so long yet in that time we have gone from wondering whether city course could recapture vitality from the suburbs, a thousand people a month moving to our city and companies that we have never talked to transplanting themselves from the suburb to the urban core. A lot of change in a short time. This plan is a big deal because of those trends, those are not one-year affairs, not flashes in the pan or bubbles. Those are big trends. Our kids all want to live in cities. Other people's kids all want to be live in Portland. They are coming here like I did because this is a great, livable city. This plan will make sure of that. We all know Daniel Burnham's phrase make no little plans. This is no little plan. This is a great plan for a great place. I'm very proud to have worked on it. Very happy I appointed one Amanda Fritz to the planning commission a long time ago and have had the privilege of working with you in partnership on this. This is good work. It will be very durable. It will mean when we are a city of 800,000 it will still be Portland, it will still feel right it will be a green, sustainable model for the world and a great place to live. Thank you very much. Aye. Let's take a two-minute recess and take up our last item. Thank you.

**At 3:14 p.m. council recessed**

**At 3:18 p.m. council reconvened**

**Hales:** We need to return briefly to a previous item of business for a moment then take up -- 1445. I'm going to return us briefly to item 1445 for a motion. -- no?

December 21, 2016

**Hales:** It's 1445. We'll return to 1445 for a motion and commissioner Fritz, do you have a motion?

**Fritz:** I was busy praising Amalia Alarcon De Morris for being an integral part of the comprehensive plan she was busy texting me with a very gracious text on my work phone that said, was the decision to pass the marijuana changes as nonemergency intentional. The answer was no; I didn't read the script as usual. So I would like to move to reconsider that vote so that we can then attach an emergency clause on to the regulations.

**Fish:** Second.

**Hales:** It's been moved and seconded. Roll call.

**Novick:** Commissioner, your short-term memory loss is understandable. Aye.

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

**Hales:** Aye. Amendments?

**Fritz:** I would like to move to have an emergency clause. All of us recognize we want to help the flourishing cannabis businesses get through the permit process as quickly as possible. We would like to add an emergency clause so the permit process can be expedited.

**Hales:** Second?

**Fish:** Second.

**Hales:** Roll call, please.

**Novick:** Aye.

**Fritz:** For those watching at home this hardly ever happens. I was very glad it was brought to my attention before we left the council chambers for good. Aye.

**Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

**Hales:** Aye. Done. So it's repassed with added the emergency clause. We have to pass the ordinance again. Roll call.

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

**Hales:** Aye. Done. Thank you. Now item 1456?

**Moore-Love:** We skipped over 55. We didn't take a vote on that.

**Hales:** Indeed, I did. 1455, implementing item for the comp plan.

**Item 1455.**

**Hales:** Any further discussion? Vote, please.

**Novick:** Thank you, mayor, for coming up with this concept. Aye.

**Fritz:** And I appreciate the amendments saying they will come back with a more urban form to the streets, but this at least locks in what we've currently got. Aye.

**Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

**Hales:** Thank pbot for listening to and attending to my table pounding and remembering that buildings last 200 years. Streets last a thousand. Aye. Okay, let's move on to the final item, which is 1456.

[End of excerpt.]

**PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
City Hall - 1221 SW Fourth Avenue**

**TUESDAY, 9:00 AM, DECEMBER 13, 2016**

**SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING**

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Commissioner Saltzman, Presiding; Commissioners Fish and Novick, 3.

**1381 TIME CERTAIN: 9:00 AM** – Provide affordable housing through an Inclusionary Housing program (Previous Agenda 1379; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Title 33, Planning and Zoning) 3 hours requested for items 1381-1382

Continued to December 14, 2016 at 11:00 am Time Certain.

Motion numbers indicate order the amendments were made for 1381 & 1382.

**2) Motion to amend Title 33 to make technical fixes:** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)

**3) Motion to amend Title 33 to add the initial phased in inclusion rate:** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)

**5) Motion to adopt historic transfer amendment:** Moved by Novick and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)

**7) Motion to adopt family size amendment for Title 33:** Moved by Novick and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)

**8) Motion to adopt parking linking amendment:** Moved by Novick and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; N-1 Novick)

**PASSED TO  
SECOND READING  
AS AMENDED  
DECEMBER 21, 2016  
AT 9:30 AM**

**S-1382** Provide affordable housing through an Inclusionary Housing program and update the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program (Previous Agenda 1380; Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Saltzman; add Code Section 30.01.120, amend Section 30.01.030 and Chapter 3.103)

Continued to December 14, 2016 at 11:00 am Time Certain.

**1) Motion to accept substitute ordinance containing a number of technical fixes to Title 30 and Title 3:** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish (Y-5)

**4) Motion to adopt family size amendment for Title 30:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Saltzman. (Y-5)

**6) Motion to adopt FAR 5.0 amendment:** Moved by Novick and seconded by Fish. (N-5) Motion failed.

**SUBSTITUTE  
PASSED TO  
SECOND READING  
AS AMENDED  
DECEMBER 21, 2016  
AT 9:30 AM**

**WEDNESDAY, 9:30 AM, DECEMBER 14, 2016**

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

**COMMUNICATIONS**



<p><b>1382-A</b> Request of Mike O'Callaghan to address Council regarding theft (Communication)</p>	<p><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1382-B</b> Request of Matt Smith to address Council regarding declare support for Portland's Muslim community and censure Donald Trump (Communication)</p>	<p><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>TIMES CERTAIN</b></p>	
<p><b>1383</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM</b> – Adopt the 2017 Portland Electric Vehicle Strategy to accelerate the transition to electric vehicles and increase deployment of public charging infrastructure (Resolution introduced by Mayor Hales) 30 minutes requested   <b>Motion to add paragraph designating resolution as binding city policy:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Hales. (Y-5)   (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>37255</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>1384</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 10:15 AM</b> – Accept the 2016 Annual Fire Prevention Report (Report introduced by Commissioner Saltzman) 30 minutes requested   <b>Motion to accept report:</b> Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Novick.   (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ACCEPTED</b></p>
<p><b>1385</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 10:45 AM</b> – Restrict bulk fossil fuel terminals (Previous Agenda 1378; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Title 33, Planning and Zoning) 10 minutes requested   (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>188142</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b></p>	
<p><b>1386</b> Appoint Thuy Tu and Daniel Newberry to the Urban Forestry Commission (Report introduced by Mayor Hales and Commissioner Fritz)   (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>
<p><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b></p>	
<p><b>1387</b> Extend the terms of Jeff Bachrach, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman and Maggie Tallmadge of the Planning and Sustainability Commission to expire April 1, 2017 (Report)   (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>
<p><b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p>	
<p><b>*1388</b> Ratify a Letter of Agreement between the City and Laborers' Local 483 regarding shift premium pay for certain Portland Bureau of Transportation employees (Ordinance)   (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>188134</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b></p>	

<b>Bureau of Transportation</b>		
<b>*1389</b>	Accept a grant from the Portland Development Commission in an amount of \$1,453,956 for construction of Foster Transportation and Streetscape Project, SE 82 <sup>nd</sup> Ave to 90 <sup>th</sup> Ave (Ordinance)  (Y-5)	<b>188135</b>
<b>*1390</b>	Authorize a contract with the lowest responsible bidder for the Foster Streetscape Project, Phase I (Ordinance)  (Y-5)	<b>188136</b>
<b>*1391</b>	Amend contract with CH2M Engineers, Inc. for final payment for work completed for the Smart City Challenge grant project in the amount of \$5,000 (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 31000660)  (Y-5)	<b>188137</b>
<b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b> <b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b>		
<b>1392</b>	Authorize a competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for construction of the Argay Park Tennis Court Improvements Project for an estimated \$500,000 (Second Reading Agenda 1352)  (Y-5)	<b>188138</b>
<b>1393</b>	Authorize a competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for construction of the Forest Park Trail Bridges Replacement Project for an estimated \$640,000 (Second Reading Agenda 1353)  (Y-5)	<b>188139</b>
<b>1394</b>	Authorize a competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for construction of the Rieke Field Replacement Project for an estimated \$968,808 (Second Reading Agenda 1354)  (Y-5)	<b>188140</b>
<b>1395</b>	Authorize a competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for construction of the Whitaker Ponds Entry Improvements Project for an estimated \$606,000 (Second Reading Agenda 1355)  (Y-5)	<b>188141</b>
<b>REGULAR AGENDA</b>  <b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b> <b>Bureau of Planning &amp; Sustainability</b>		
<b>1396</b>	Require disclosure of energy performance ratings for residential single family buildings when listed for sale to promote transparency in housing costs and reduction in local carbon emissions (Second Reading Agenda 1358; add Code Chapter 17.108)  (Y-5)	<b>188143</b> <b>AS AMENDED</b>

<b>Bureau of Police</b>		
<b>*1397</b>	Apply for and accept a grant in the amount of \$15,000 and appropriate \$10,000 for FY 2016-17 from the Oregon Department of Transportation Traffic Safety Division FY 2017 Speed Enforcement Grant program for sworn personnel overtime reimbursement (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Hales absent)	<b>188144</b>
<b>*1398</b>	Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Washington County for sharing tactical team resources in mutual aid (Previous Agenda 1359) 10 minutes requested  (Y-4; Hales absent)	<b>188145</b>
<b>City Budget Office</b>		
<b>*1399</b>	Authorize contract with the World Council on City Data for joining a global network of cities that are improving city services and quality of life with open data (Ordinance) 15 minutes requested  (Y-4; Hales absent)	<b>188146</b>
<b>Office of Management and Finance</b>		
<b>1400</b>	Accept bid of Streimer Sheet Metal Works, Inc. for the Mt Scott Community Center Heating, Ventilation and Air Condition Replacement and Direct Digital Control Upgrade Project for \$828,585 (Procurement Report – Bid No. 00000428)  <b>Motion to accept report:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz.  (Y-4; Hales absent)	<b>ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT</b>
<b>*1401</b>	Authorize an amendment of the FY 2016-17 appropriation schedule in the amount of \$19,255,033 for the Portland Building Reconstruction project (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Hales absent)	<b>188147</b>
<b>1402</b>	Approve findings to authorize an exemption to the competitive bidding requirements and authorize the use of the alternative contracting method of Construction Manager/General Contractor all in connection with the Tryon Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant Headworks Project for an estimated amount of \$54,000,000 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested	<b>RESCHEDULED TO DECEMBER 21, 2017 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>1403</b>	Clarify definitions, administrative authority and make housekeeping changes to the Transient Lodgings Tax Code (Ordinance; amend Code Chapter 6.04) 30 minutes requested for items 1403-1404	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING DECEMBER 21, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>1404</b>	Amend Tourism Improvement District code to update definitions and change the due dates and delinquency dates to match those in the Transient Lodging Tax code (Ordinance; amend Code Chapter 6.05)	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING DECEMBER 21, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b>

<p><b>*1405</b> Authorize a lease extension with Oregon Pacific Investment &amp; Development Company for the Bureau of Fire and Police Disability and Retirement office space at 1800 SW First Ave, Suite 450, commonly known as the Harrison Square Building through October 31, 2020 for approximately \$205,000 annually (Previous Agenda 1365)</p> <p>(Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188149</b></p>
<p><b>*1406</b> Authorize financing not expected to exceed \$51 million for an affordable housing project known as the Ellington Apartments (Previous Agenda 1364) 15 minutes requested for items 1406 and 1413</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188150</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> Bureau of Transportation</p>	
<p><b>1407</b> Authorize the Portland Bureau of Transportation to develop a Transportation System Development Charge methodology based upon the "Person Trip" model to more accurately reflect Portland's Transportation System (Resolution) 15 minutes requested</p> <p>(Y-5)</p> <p><b>1408</b> Accept findings of the South Portal Partnership Plan Project pertaining to proposed changes to roadway alignments of SW Bond Ave, SW Moody Ave, SW Hamilton St, SW Hamilton Ct, SW Lowell St, and SW Thomas St, and direct implementation of a plan to fund, design and construct remaining South Waterfront street connections (Previous Agenda 1369) 10 minutes requested</p> <p><b>Motion to adopt amendments in staff memo dated December 14, 2016:</b> Moved by Novick and seconded by Fritz. (Y-5)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p><b>37256</b></p> <p><b>37257</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b></p>	
<p><b>S-1409</b> Adopt the Open and Accountable Elections Policy (Second Reading S-1370; add Code Chapter 2.16)</p> <p>(Y-3 Hales, Fritz, Novick. N-2 Fish, Saltzman)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b></p> <p><b>1410</b> Create a local improvement district to construct park improvements in the Portland Open Space Sequence Local Improvement District in partnership with the Halprin Landscape Conservancy (Previous Agenda 1371; Hearing; Ordinance; C-10054) 10 minutes requested</p> <p><b>Motion to adopt amendments in staff memo dated December 13, 2016 as updated December 14:</b> Moved by Hales and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p> <p><b>Motion to add remaining property at 1700 SW Fourth Avenue:</b> Moved by Hales and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>SUBSTITUTE</b> <b>188152</b></p> <p><b>PASSED TO</b> <b>SECOND READING</b> AS AMENDED <b>DECEMBER 21, 2016</b> <b>AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b> Bureau of Environmental Services</p>	

<p><b>*1411</b> Authorize an application to Oregon Office of Emergency Management for a Hazard Mitigation Grant Program grant in the amount of up to \$2,500,000 for Johnson Creek floodplain acquisition (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188153</b></p>
<p><b>Water Bureau</b></p>	
<p><b>1412</b> Authorize a contract with the lowest responsible bidder for the construction of the Greenleaf Pump Station Project at an estimated cost of \$1,275,000 (Second Reading Agenda 1374)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188148</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b> <b>Portland Housing Bureau</b></p>	
<p><b>*1413</b> Authorize the purchase of certain real property located at 1610 NE 66th Ave at a price not to exceed \$47,000,000 for affordable rental housing (Previous Agenda 1376)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>188151</b></p>
<p><b><u>WEDNESDAY, 2:00 PM, DECEMBER 14, 2016</u></b></p> <p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz and Novick, 4.</p>	
<p><b>S-1414 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> - Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland's 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Previous Agenda 1293; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 1 hour requested for items 1414-1415</p> <p><b>Motion to accept the substitute ordinance:</b> Moved by Hales and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept corrected wording in exhibit H, Community Involvement Committee appointment process to have Council confirm the appointments:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Hales. (Y-4; Saltzman absent.)</p> <p>Note: On December 14th, Council held the first reading of the substitute ordinance and findings for adoption of various measures to implement the new 2035 Comprehensive Plan (as amended). The Council has already received testimony regarding the PSC-recommendation, and Council amendments. Public testimony was limited to the content of the revised ordinance. The evidentiary record is closed and no new evidence may be submitted. The final vote is expected on December 21<sup>st</sup>.</p>	<p><b>SUBSTITUTE PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED DECEMBER 21, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>

<p><b>1415</b> Adopt a Connectivity Strategy for Comprehensive Plan Centers in Eastern Neighborhoods (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Novick)</p> <p><b>Motion to add directive d to require Bureau of Transportation to report back with recommended revised spacing standards for each center:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED DECEMBER 21, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>
<p><b>1416</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 3:00 PM</b> – Amend City’s marijuana business regulations (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Fritz; amend Code Chapter 14B.130, Portland Policy Document ADM-20.01) 3 hours requested</p> <p><b>Motion to accept Saltzman amendments to Exhibit A:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p> <p><b>Motion to amend Minimum Standards 14B.130.040 for retail courier:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Hales. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED DECEMBER 21, 2016 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>THURSDAY, 2:00 PM, DECEMBER 15, 2016</u></b></p> <p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 4.</p>	
<p><b>1417</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Modify Area Parking Permit Program to create new permit area type for residential areas, expand provisions of the Supplemental Plan Description, and integrate transportation demand management principles, in accordance with the recommendations of the Centers and Corridors Parking Project (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Novick; amend Code Sections 16.20.800 – 16.20.850) 1 hour requested</p>	<p><b>CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 21, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1418</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 3:30 PM</b> – Extend to December 31, 2017 the Council-approved Corporate Securities Do-Not-Buy List (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Novick) 2 hours requested</p>	<p><b>RESCHEDULED TO DECEMBER 21, 2016 AT 2:30 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>

**NOTE:** “Time Certain” indicates that an item will not be heard by Council **prior** to the time specified.

Communications items are three minutes each. Regular Agenda items taking longer than five minutes have the time estimate noted next to the item.

The \* indicates an emergency ordinance, which takes effect immediately if passed. Non-emergency ordinances require two readings and a 30-day waiting period before taking effect. Resolutions, reports, etc., adopted by Council are effective after adjournment.

The above summary is published by the City Auditor as provided by Section 2-113 of the Charter and Ordinance No. 130672.

Council Chambers is equipped with a sound system for the hearing impaired. Assisted

listening devices are available from the Clerk.

The City of Portland will gladly accommodate requests for an interpreter or make other accommodations that further inclusivity. Please make your request at least 48 hours before the meeting to the Council Clerk 503-823-4086. (TTY 503-823-6868).

City Council meetings can be viewed at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/video>. The meetings are also cablecast on CityNet 30, Portland Community Media television.

Mary Hull Caballero  
Auditor of the City of Portland

=====

Testimony is taken on Reports, Resolutions and Ordinances (first reading). To testify, sign up on a testimony sheet as you enter Council Chambers on the day of the meeting. Individuals have 3 minutes to testify, unless otherwise stated at the meeting. Testimony is not taken on Communications, Second Readings, Proclamations or Presentations in accordance with Code 3.02.040 F. and G.

Written testimony may be emailed or mailed to the Council Clerk prior to the meeting.

To schedule a Communication, email or mail your request to the Council Clerk. Include your name, address, phone number and a brief description of the subject you will be addressing. For full details, see Testimony Policies and procedures. <http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/index.cfm?&a=63123&c=34447>

Clerk Email: [karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov)  
Council Clerk Testimony: [cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov)  
US Mail: Council Clerk, 1221 SW Fourth Ave., Room 130, Portland OR 97204

=====

Declaration Required by Lobbyists. Portland City Code 2.12.060 states: Prior to offering public testimony before City officials, at the beginning of any meetings or phone calls with City officials, or in emails and letters to City officials, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent for that communication.

=====

*“Be a part of the picture...get involved with your City...volunteer for a City of Portland Board or Commission. For more information, a brochure, or a volunteer application, stop by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement in City Hall or call 503-823-4519.”*

**OFFICERS OF PORTLAND CITY GOVERNMENT**

**CHARLIE HALES, MAYOR**

Commissioner of Finance and Administration  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 340, 97204  
 (503) 823-4120  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/mayor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/mayor/)  
 e-mail: [mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>
Portland Police Bureau Portland Development Commission Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Fire & Police Disability and Retirement Office of Equity and Human Rights Office of Management and Finance Office of Government Relations City Attorney City Budget Office Oversight of the Willamette River Super Fund clean-up project

**NICK FISH**

Commissioner of Public Works  
 Position Number 2  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 240, 97204  
 (503) 823-3589  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fish](http://www.portlandonline.com/fish)  
 e-mail: [Nick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Nick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Environmental Services Bureau of Hydroelectric Power Water Bureau	<i>Elders in Action</i> <i>Portland Utility Review Board</i> <i>Venture Portland</i> <i>Portland's Centers For The Arts</i> Regional Arts and Culture Council

**AMANDA FRITZ**

Commissioner of Public Utilities  
 Position Number 1  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 220, 97204  
 (503) 823-3008  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fritz/](http://www.portlandonline.com/fritz/)  
 e-mail: [amanda@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:amanda@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Parks & Recreation Office of Neighborhood Involvement	<i>Royal Rosarians</i> <i>Multnomah County Animal Control</i> <i>Portland Parks Board</i> <i>Urban Forestry Commission</i> <i>Golf Advisory Committee</i> <i>Portland International Raceway Advisory Committee</i> <i>Protected Sick Time ordinance implementation</i> [continued next page]



	<p><i>Council Lead on the City Coordinating Committee addressing the Department of Justice Settlement</i></p> <p><i>Visitors Development Fund Board (with Saltzman)</i></p>
--	---

**STEVE NOVICK**

Commissioner of Public Safety  
 Position Number 4  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 210, 97204  
 (503) 823-4682  
 website: [www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/)  
 e-mail: [Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Transportation Bureau of Emergency Management Bureau of Emergency Communications	<i>Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)</i> <i>Portland Streetcar Inc.</i> <i>Regional Emergency Management Group</i> <i>BOEC Users Group</i> <i>BOEC Finance Committee</i> <i>Taxi Cab Board of Review</i> <i>Towing Board of Review</i>

**DAN SALTZMAN**

Commissioner of Public Affairs  
 Position Number 3  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 230, 97204  
 (503) 823-4151  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/saltzman](http://www.portlandonline.com/saltzman)  
 e-mail: [dan@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:dan@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Development Services Portland Fire & Rescue Portland Housing Bureau Gateway Domestic Violence Center Portland Children's Levy (formerly Portland Children's Investment Fund)	<i>Travel Portland</i> <i>Visitors Development Fund (with Fritz)</i> <i>Home Forward</i> <i>League of Oregon Cities</i> <i>Adjustment Committee</i> <i>Building Board of Appeals</i> <i>Design Commission</i> <i>Historic Landmarks Commission</i>

## **MARY HULL CABALLERO**

Auditor of the City of Portland

1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 140, 97204

(503) 823-4078

website: [www.portlandonline.com/auditor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/)

e-mail: [AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov)

### **Portfolio**

Assessments, Finance & Foreclosure  
Audit Services

City Elections

City Recorder

-Archives

-Council Clerk / Contracts Division

-Records Management

Hearings Office

IPR - Independent Police Review

Ombudsman

Portland Multnomah Progress Board

### **BUREAU DIRECTORS**

Bureau of Development Services	Paul Scarlett
Bureau of Emergency Communications	Lisa Turley
Bureau of Emergency Management	Carmen Merlo
Bureau of Environmental Services	Michael Jordan
Bureau of Human Resources	Anna Kanwit
Bureau of Internal Business Services	Bryant Enge
Bureau of Planning & Sustainability	Susan Anderson
Bureau of Police	Michael Marshman
Bureau of Revenue & Financial Services	Ken Rust
Bureau of Technology Services	Jeff Baer
Bureau of Transportation	Leah Treat
City Attorney	Tracy Reeve
City Budget Office	Andrew Scott
Fire & Police Disability and Retirement	Samuel Hutchison
Office of Equity and Human Rights	Dante James
Office of Government Relations	Martha Pellegrino
Office of Mgmt & Finance –Chief Admin Officer	Fred Miller
Office of Neighborhood Involvement	Amalia Alarcón de Morris
Portland Development Commission	Kimberly Branam
Portland Fire & Rescue	Mike Myers
Portland Housing Bureau	Kurt Creager
Portland Parks & Recreation	Mike Abbaté
Revenue Director	Thomas Lannom
Water Bureau	Michael Stuhr

Updated 08-19-2016



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

**OFFICIAL  
MINUTES**

**Excerpt Item S-1414 and 1415.**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **14TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2016** AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz and Novick, 4.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Kathryn Beaumont, Chief Deputy City Attorney and at 3:00 p.m., Heidi Brown, Deputy City Attorney; and John Paolazzi and Mike Cohen, Sergeants at Arms.

The meeting recessed at 2:36 p.m. and reconvened at 3:01 p.m.

		<b>Disposition:</b>
<b>S-1414</b>	<p><b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> - Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland's 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Previous Agenda 1293; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 1 hour requested for items 1414-1415</p> <p><b>Motion to accept the substitute ordinance:</b> Moved by Hales and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept corrected wording in exhibit H, Community Involvement Committee appointment process to have Council confirm the appointments:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Hales. (Y-4; Saltzman absent.)</p> <p>Note: On December 14th, Council held the first reading of the substitute ordinance and findings for adoption of various measures to implement the new 2035 Comprehensive Plan (as amended). The Council has already received testimony regarding the PSC-recommendation, and Council amendments. Public testimony was limited to the content of the revised ordinance. The evidentiary record is closed and no new evidence may be submitted. The final vote is expected on December 21<sup>st</sup>.</p>	<p><b>SUBSTITUTE PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED DECEMBER 21, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>
<b>1415</b>	<p>Adopt a Connectivity Strategy for Comprehensive Plan Centers in Eastern Neighborhoods (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Novick)</p> <p><b>Motion to add directive d to require Bureau of Transportation to report back with recommended revised spacing standards for each center:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED DECEMBER 21, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>

At 4:05 p.m., Council recessed.

**MARY HULL CABALLERO**  
Auditor of the City of Portland

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'K. Moore-Love', is positioned below the name of the Auditor.

By Karla Moore-Love  
Clerk of the Council

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

**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.**

**December 14, 2016            2:00 PM**

**Hales:** Council will come back to work here for the afternoon session of the December 14<sup>th</sup> city council meeting would you call the roll Karla?

**[roll call]**

**Hales:** And before we get into our agenda we need to take a moment and recelebrate the long overdue and understated recognition for the job that Karla Moore-Love does as our council clerk. Thank you so much. Please. She was the recipient of the spirit Oregon award last night and you are indeed the spirit of Portland.

**Moore-Love:** Thank you. You're welcome.

**Hales:** All right, let take up this afternoon's work and adopt -- accept the work in front of us. Do we do these together?

**Item 1414.**

**Hales:** Mr. Engstrom.

**Eric Engstrom, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** As we get started I want to remind you what we'll be adopting. This is the ordinance which would adopt zoning code and zoning map amendments to adopt the new comprehensive plan you adopted in June. It includes phase 2 of the tsp update including updated bicycle classifications as Karla mentioned a new community involvement program, also intended to implement the policies in the new comp plan. Also accepting a report from the community involvement committee which has been our watchdog to oversee process doing this work and several other directions are included in the ordinance per some of your earlier amendments. Where we are in the process you met on the 22nd of November to consider amendments to the package after having a hearing on those amendments on the 17th. You have before you now a substitute of exhibits that correspond to the adopted amendments. After you -- the next step beyond today, assuming this goes to second reading would be staff is going to be submitting the package to the lcd for their review and acknowledge. There will be several follow up projects following up per the direction you've given us in the ordinance and then we'll gear up for staff training to implement this for 2018 working with pbot and bds in particular. In terms of process, this is the first reading of the substitute ordinance. We brought the record with the testimony from that time. This is not a hearing about the new amendments, although today, you'll ask if there's any comments. That is just focused on the ordinance and findings that are new.

**Hales:** So the action before us this afternoon is to make a motion and take action on adoption of a substitute. The substitute captures all of the amendments that we brought forward, considered and adopted that retuned the plan in many cases and many different sites and a number of policy issues. We have a couple clarification items we need to act on, right?

**Engstrom:** And I can walk you through. There's two clarifications that we just want to be sure you understood. One is that we've brought a revised exhibit h for you today, which has been passed out. During the amendment process, commissioner Fritz made some Amendments to title 3 language, which is related to the community involvement, committee appointment process. And we realized the verbal description that was discussed and the written description didn't exactly match and I believe it was the commissioner's intent that

the council confirm the appointees to that committee and that was not how it was written on the amendment, so we want to have you reaccept that motion to readopt that amendment with that language which is reflected in the revised exhibit h.

**Fritz:** Would you like us to do that now?

**Hales:** Go ahead. Any question on accepting the updated exhibit h? I believe we need to take testimony on that, we'll take testimony on the adoption of the substitute if there's any. Take a vote on that.

**Novick:** Aye **Fritz:** Aye **Fish:** Aye **Hales:** Aye

**Hales:** And then Exhibit o?

**Engstrom:** This is a typo. Since it was written incorrectly when you voted we wanted to make sure you understood. Exhibit o is the list of sites you'd like us to reconsider and do further research on and come back later. One of the addresses was off by one number and it should have been 506 and northeast Thompson rather than 505 and we want to correct the record, so we substituted that. You don't have a new version of that because we caught it before we distributed the larger package.

**Fritz:** Would you just do that as a stenographer's mistake?

**Engstrom:** We want you to be aware that we corrected it.

**Fish:** I'm not the only one who does that.

**Hales:** Noted as a correction.

**Engstrom:** Since it involved an address.

**Fish:** I'd moved that I still use my old zip code.

**Hales:** I will move the substitute ordinance as amended. Is there a second?

**Fritz:** Second.

**Hales:** Is there is anyone want to testify before council takes action on the substitute? If not, take the roll call vote on accepting the substitute please.

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

**Hales:** Well I have a few more things to say next week Mr. Engstrom about you and the rest of your team about the good work on this, but this is a mammoth undertaking, as the paper stack indicates, that only a little bit is revealed by the size of the stack of paper, the thousands of people that participated and significant direction as a city we're taking to accommodate growth. So I have more to say then, but I really appreciate the good work from this bureau. This is a map of a city of 850,000 people. That weight of that number has been on our shoulders and I think we got it right. Aye. Thank you so much and we'll see you next week or second reading at 2 p.m. On the 21st.

**Engstrom:** Thank you.

**Hales:** Well done. Unfortunately, we didn't schedule these items without a break and so we have to adopt 1415, but then maybe that's going to take us a little while but we'll probably have to take before three so let's take 1415.

**Fritz:** How terrible that would be.

**Item 1415.**

**Hales:** Commissioner Novick do you have some comments?

**Novick:** I was told since it was the mayor's idea he would have comments. Comments for both of us. I'll give me mine first. Earlier this year we adopted a new comp plan policy calling new connections through blocks to improve access for community destinations in the eastern neighborhoods pattern area. This ordinance builds on an already existing code requirement that requires no changes to title 17 or title 33. The ordinance provides further guidance on the application of existing street connectivity requirements when redevelopment occurs in designated sectors of eastern neighborhoods. And in addition this council action will direct pbot to consider whether developers who create new street or pathway connections should receive transportation system development charge credit as part of the tsdc update currently underway.

**Hales:** The only thing I'd add is this is technical stuff and some people's eyes glaze over when we work on this kind of thing and ours don't. The hardest thing in urban planning today is very different from the hardest thing 20 years ago. How do you take suburban places and actually make them urban? We got a lot of the city that was built around the far and the car only and really without good circulation for cars in some cases so this effort to try to carefully knit those pieces of the city together is really important so Denver thank you.

**Denver Igarra, Portland Bureau of Transportation:** It's a major challenge. Good afternoon. My name is Denver Igarra I'm a senior transition planner with the Portland bureau of transportation. Following up on your action on the comprehensive plan early implementation package three weeks ago you approved one amendment, number 50, which directed pbot to prepare the ordinance that's here before you today. This ordinance advances new policy direction that was adopted in June with the comprehensive plan. Specifically, it calls for new connections in eastern neighborhoods and also future street connection plans and centers the areas that are targeted for the most growth and change over the next 20 years. Historically Portland has placed requirements on development to meet street spacing standards this has produced the gridded street neighborhoods in your neighbors. Our existing street spacing standards per our comprehensive plan policy objectives and the city code are 530 feet between full street connections and 330 feet between pedestrian bicycle connections. We also adopt street plans in some areas to find where we anticipate new streets to be located in some areas that's not the spacing standards that's required we adopt these street plans to guard the alignment and function of those new connections. Gateway regional center is one example it's had a conceptual street plan since 2000 it was last updated in 2009. There are several of these city wide. As one step toward advancing those policies I mentioned a moment ago, pbot funding for the current fiscal year 16/17 to carry out a connected street plan which is a more comprehensive planning effort, opportunities for connection in the jade district and rose neighborhood center. The outcome will be a tailored plan for connectivity specific to those areas and that plan will also create a model we can use in other centers city wide for choosing connectivity that will be completed next year. Another step to advance the connectivity policy is the ordinance that's before you today the connectivity strategies in eastern neighborhoods. This would adopt a strategy to achieve connectivity in these centers as you can see in the map there shown in dark grey, the strategy offers further guidance on the existing city code. In essence it would strengthen our commitment and result to improving connectivity in these centers. The aim is to avoid missing connections and opportunities for new connections as development occurs with the newly adopted zoning code. Most importantly where the connections are needed the most which is in these centers in eastern neighborhoods where we lack basic connectivity and level of service from our street network. The parcels further away from a parallel street and parcels larger in size that's essentially what the ordinance directs pbot to do. At the same time, it also directs pbot to look at the potential for credit to developers who create new connections as part of the transportation system development charge that's underway. Again this ordinance would not change existing city code. The final slide I wanted to show is from the investment strategy. The circles are shown are centers city wide. The ones to the right are the centers that are target to accommodate more growth. The ones at the stop are the centers that are most deficient in infrastructure. The dark red circles are centers with higher average concentrations of vulnerable residents and the centers in the eastern neighborhoods on the map, that's being adopted with this ordinance are the ones being shown in yellow. As you can see these are primarily the ones most efficient of the centers and also the ones that are in those areas with higher vulnerable residents.

**Hales:** And the size of the circle represents?

**Igarta:** It represents the type of center so we have central city which is the largest and then the regional centers get gateway and then the town centers are the next ones down and the neighborhood centers are the newly adopted centers that we adopted in June.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Fritz:** I have a question the blocks downtown are 200 by 200. So I would wonder why we want more connectivity to pedestrians at 165.

**Igarta:** Well the way that works is that the connectivity standard is actually 330 between pedestrian connections but what this strategy says is that the parcels that are 165 feet from the nearest connections. So if you have two connections that are spaced 330 feet apart the furthest any parcel would be is the 165 so it's the same as our standard so it actually is 330 feet between pedestrian connections rather than downtown we have 200 feet block frontages so it's 200 feet between full street connections so it actually is further apart than the downtown grid.

**Fritz:** I'm not following that.

**Igarta:** The specific strategy is talking about the parcel so if you have a property and it's on a block that has the standard spacing which is 330 feet between pedestrian connection, the furthest that parcel can be from the closest connection is 165 feet so that's where the 165 feet comes from.

**Novick:** Did we clarify downtown with the 200 foot blocks the furthest you can be from a connection is 100 feet.

**Igarta:** Exactly.

**Fritz:** So do we require pedestrian connections through city block downtown?

**Igarta:** No because its already a parcels would be no more than 100 feet away so it would need, it would already meet the standard.

**Novick:** Right wherever you are downtown your no more than 100 feet from a connection because your 200 feet foot blocks if your smack in the middle your 100 feet away. So the idea here is to make sure in these centers your no more than 165 feet away which would be midway through a 330 foot block.

**Igarta:** That's correct.

**Fritz:** And what about the 265?

**Igarta:** That's our standard street spacing, which is 530 feet between full street connections so that's where motor vehicles is have access by distinction.

**Hales:** Which is 10 per mile?

**Fritz:** Well, again, in somebody else's neighborhoods the block is 200 by 450. So this seems like half of that would be 225 and now we're saying 265.

**Igarta:** That's right. That's our standard street spacing the 330 ped connection and the 530 feet between full street connections is a metro regional transportation plan standard that we have adopted.

**Fritz:** Is this intended to be the same as other neighborhoods, the same as downtown? Why did you choose those numbers?

**Igarta:** Because this is what our existing code is. It's not a change to our existing code. Our existing code has on the earlier slide I showed the spacing for pedestrian connections is 330 and the existing is 530, so there's no change to what is already in the code. This is specifying where the parcel would be in relationship to the next parallel street.

**Hales:** What's your underlying concern.

**Fritz:** Are we making it connected enough or are we being more restrictive here or requiring more streets than we do downtown and how does it reflect the lot pattern in east Portland with more of the junior acre type places?

**Igarta:** Part of what we're doing is with this we're emphasizing the centers the areas where we anticipate the most growth, the areas where we affect the most pedestrian activity, so we're trying to achieve the connectivity that we have city wide. We're trying to



achieve the connectivity that we have as a standard city wide that's partly why I was explaining the connected centers plan project because for jade and rosewood what we're trying to do is come up with a more tailored approach more strategy for eastern neighborhoods so as part of that we'll have a tailored street plan for that center and my plan is that we can use that as a model to do more tailored street plans.

**Fritz:** I'm, sorry to be dense on this. It's been quite a day. You're in the middle of a block. You turn 65 feet from either parallel street. That's more than in my neighborhood where it's 450 for the long access of the block.

**Igarta:** Our current standard would require that a new street connection be improved if it's triggered for the development. So that's our current standard.

**Hales:** Maybe try a different angle. It's not about the maps. It's about are we being reasonable and equitable across neighborhoods and I think -- this is a concern I want to make sure -- are we working with the pattern that's there? Is the way I would put it. The pattern is there, it can get better through more connectivity, but because of how it was plated the first time there are some limitations to how good it's ever going to get from a peer planning stand point. So is the 265 foot rhythm the right one to take advantage of whatever the lotting pattern is in east Portland or in areas where that would be posed.

**Fritz:** Now I understand there's something in the middle in lot town center neighborhoods like mine you would require a street closer together than what we're requiring here?

**Igarta:** These are centers shown on the map and not--

**Fritz:** The block length would be 200x550 right.

**Igarta:** The block spacing would be for full street 530 feet between full street connections.

**Hales:** Both directions.

**Fritz:** In my neighborhood it's 450, so why is it greater in a town center than it would be in a neighborhood like mine that doesn't have any semblance of a town center?

**Igarta:** It's the current standard that we have in place.

**Hales:** Maybe that should change, too.

**Igarta:** I think that's true. It's part of again, why we are doing this connected centers street plan is to do some more detailed analysis to identify the opportunities and see realistically how we can produce the connectivity that we will need in these areas.

**Hales:** You're not codifying this now?

**Igarta:** No.

**Hales:** So as you go into codifying this I think that's a good question.

**Igarta:** That is a good question, yes.

**Hales:** We shouldn't be bound by either old policy, or metro policy but we're going to exceed the intent of metro policy with what we're doing, but it ought to be reflective of the reality of how that district got laid out in the first place. What's our best scenario in the future what's the streets and then are we getting it right in terms of increasing that frequency of connection in the centers which is what your map appears to be doing.

**Igarta:** We recognize that city wide standards have not been successful and that we need to tailor our approaches to the pattern areas for the direction of the comp plan.

**Fritz:** Leaving aside measuring from the middle, here the blocks will be 350 by 550, right?

**Igarta:** Here the blocks for full street connections would 530 feet.

**Fritz:** Yes. I guess I'm asking for you to go back and look at is a very kind of rural well not rural outer kind of neighborhood pattern of the streets the right thing in our town centers and our particularly in our business areas where we want more connectivity than we found in a residential area.

**Hales:** I guess again one of the philosophical drivers behind this is look the real estate market is really good, a lot of stuff will get redeveloped over the next 20 years, got a second chance to get it right, albeit with what constraints on what's actually possible, 122 and division, but we should go down that direction towards connectivity as is feasible and

talk about the south water front very different situation, but come on, develops there can afford to build some streets as that redevelopment occurs and I don't think that's not going to be true five years from now. So do you feel a need to amend a what we have, Amanda?

**Fritz:** Yes, I don't think it's intense enough for the town center. Particularly under b 2 which is where it says about the halfway being 165 and 265 that is fewer street connections then in an outer neighborhood.

**Fish:** I understand this would be changing the current standard.

**Igarta:** No.

**Fritz:** This doesn't change the standard, what I'm saying is I think it should be.

**Igarta:** With the directs we had, we recognized that we were not -- we were not having the time to propose a code change and before the adoption, and so we were working within the existing code, which gives us the authority to make the required connections at the spacing standard we currently have.

**Fritz:** And does this go into effect right now? Does it do into effect in 2018?

**Igarta:** Yes.

**Fritz:** Right now, or later?

**Igarta:** Right now.

**Fritz:** I'm comfortable with making this cause at least we want this right and could we add commissioner part D that directs you to go back and look at actually what kinds of connectivity do we want in each of these areas.

**Fish:** I offer a second to that amendment.

**Novick:** I also just wanted to note that this was prepared pursuant to an amendment we presented November 22nd. So there's been a rather short turn around time.

**Fritz:** And I really appreciate you getting it and also an explanation that helps me to understand it so yes, I think we should definitely don't them. Probably we're going to want to have 200 by 450, not 200 by 200 in some of these areas.

**Fish:** Why don't we treat that as an amendment?

**Hales:** Yes. So pbot can report back with recommendations for revised spacing standards.

**Fritz:** Yes, and it might not different in each of the areas.

**Fish:** The only thing I want to say in sport of the amendment given the morning we have i'm astonished Amanda is able to focus on this. My brain is already frazzled. I would move the amendment.

**Hales:** Make sure I've got the sense of the people, that pbot is going to report back about the revised space for each center.

**Fritz:** Thank you.

**Hales:** Further discussion on that amendment? Which is going to be a new item d under council direction. Anyone warrant to speak to that amendment?

**Novick:** Aye

**Fritz:** I really appreciate you helping me puzzle it through cause usually I think of these things 10 minutes to late, Thank you. Aye.

**Fish:** Aye.

**Hales:** Aye.

**Hales:** Okay, anyone else want to speak on this strategy overall?

**Fish:** I have a comment. It's not directly related, if you'd give me indulgence?

**Hales:** Of course,

**Fish:** we went long and we missed a very important event, which was the ground breaking on the county health building congratulations to chair Kafoury for moving that forwards. You said something a few minutes ago that stuck in my head, which is you talked about moving from a suburban style to urban style forum. About seven or eight years ago, or just after Amanda and I got on the council, we had a plan for the access center and it was on block U. There was a lot of history about where it would be located. It ended up in block U.

As the new housing commission I was presented with a diagram that showed a three storied building designed by host architecture and it was a big community win. And I was having breakfast with al Solheim who knows something about development and I was describing this project in the pipeline and he looked at me kind of crooked and he said why on earth would you put a three-story building downtown on a block-like at that. So he took a napkin in the diner and he redesigned it and said instead of taking the whole block why don't you redesign the building. He said by the way you want to put it on Broadway to have the nicest building adjacent to the street. I took the napkin, I think I have somewhere, and went back to the team. It was Margaret, it was Steve, it was pdc. I said al Solheim said why are we doing a three-story building. They came back with a new concept where they just stacked the building and since the whole block was going to be divided into three quadrants, they stacked them and made a urban building. What it did is it opened up the second half of block u and that was now found space. City I think on your -- either just before you came in or just after you came in, the city finalized a transfer where we donated space to the county and then under a previous deal around urban renewal money that Jeff cogen negotiated where the county got some money in exchange for a new river district. The county came in and said we want to put a county health building there and if we had not -- and today the groundbreaking on a building that Debra is leading. To your point if we had gone to a suburban style two or three story structure there we would not have the county building there. Now we'll have two buildings side by side because we observed the urban form and I want to just do a shout out to al solheim because I wasn't smart enough to catch that.

**Hales:** And now it's going to be overshadowed by the scale of what happens on the post office site, so it would look even more absurd to have a suburban scale development there where the bud clark commons is.

**Fish:** What an irony. The posts office site wasn't even a twinkle in our eye and the county actually had to go back to the neighborhood and get permission for a taller building because we weren't sure if it was out of scale now it's actually one of the more modest buildings.

**Hales:** That's why this stuff is so important because that's a concrete building, it will be there 200 years. Nobody is going to move Broadway; Broadway will be where it is forever. That's why this work you get one second change in these areas that have the wrong street spacing because the first time around it was cheap cinder block buildings That are going to last less than 50 years and they're going to go away. When somebody build a four-story concrete building on that site that streets never moving, that's why the work their doing on this is really important to get it right a second time because we won't get a third chance. Alright anyone else to speak on this item? So it's going to pass to second reading as amended next week with the comp plan. Good work. Thank you. We're going to take a 20-minute recess and come back at 3:00 for our final item today.

[End of excerpt.]

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL AGENDA</b>  <b>City Hall - 1221 SW Fourth Avenue</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>TUESDAY, 9:00 AM, NOVEMBER 22, 2016</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING</b>  <b>FOR COUNCIL DELIBERATION AND VOTE ON AMENDMENTS</b></p> <p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, and Saltzman; Commissioner Novick teleconferenced at 9:45 a.m., 5.</p> <p><b>1293 TIME CERTAIN: 9:00 AM</b> – Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Previous Agenda 1292; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales) 3.5 hours requested</p> <p><b>[Motions to come]</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disposition:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUED TO  DECEMBER 14, 2016  AT 2:00 PM  TIME CERTAIN  AS AMENDED</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>WEDNESDAY, 9:30 AM, NOVEMBER 23, 2016</u></b></p> <p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, and Saltzman, 4. Hales left at 12:25 p.m. and Saltzman presided.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMUNICATIONS</b></p> <p><b>1294</b> Request of Peter Rink to address Council regarding Eagle Scout project of care packages for the homeless (Communication)</p> <hr/> <p><b>1295</b> Request of Julie Reardon to address Council regarding Corporate Securities Do-Not-Buy list (Communication)</p> <hr/> <p><b>1296</b> Request of Steve Myers to address Council regarding Corporate Securities Do-Not-Buy list (Communication)</p> <hr/> <p><b>1297</b> Request of Gary Bucholtz to address Council regarding criminal activity at a homeless camp and law enforcement (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TIMES CERTAIN</b></p> <p><b>1298 TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM</b> – Require disclosure of energy performance ratings for residential single family buildings when listed for sale to promote transparency in housing costs and reduction in local carbon emissions (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; add Code Chapter 17.108) 1 hour requested</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendments from November 23, 2016 staff handout:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-3; Hales and Novick absent)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUED TO  DECEMBER 7, 2016  AT 9:30 AM  AS AMENDED</b></p>

<p><b>1299 TIME CERTAIN: 10:45 AM</b> – Appoint Andrea Chiller to the Citizen Review Committee advisory board to the Independent Police Review, a division of the City Auditor’s Office (Resolution introduced by Auditor Hull Caballero) 15 minutes requested  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>37249</b></p>
<p><b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b></p> <p><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b></p>	
<p><b>1300</b> Appoint Joaquin Lopez to the Portland Community Media Board of Directors for term to expire November 30, 2018 (Report) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>
<p><b>1301</b> Reappoint Lisa Faust to the Portland Community Media Board of Directors for term to expire November 30, 2017 (Report) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>
<p><b>Bureau of Police</b></p>	
<p><b>1302</b> Ratify an amendment to the collective bargaining agreement between the City and the Portland Police Commanding Officers Association to make PPCOA Labor Agreement Article 33 consistent with Human Resources Administrative Rule 8.03 (Second Reading Agenda 1266)  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188103</b></p>
<p><b>City Attorney</b></p>	
<p><b>1303</b> Amend City Code to set procedure for returning evidence, found property and safekeeping prisoner property (Ordinance; amend Code Section 14C.30.040 and add Section 14C.20.050)  Continued to November 23, 2016 at 2:00 pm.</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING DECEMBER 7, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p>	
<p><b>*1304</b> Amend the FY 2016-17 Revised Budget to include additional funding for City Council Office transition work in the amount of \$76,499 (Ordinance)  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188104</b></p>
<p><b>*1305</b> Authorize a contract with Interface Engineering, Inc. for The Portland Building Commissioning project for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$198,720 (Ordinance; Contract No. 30005569)  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188105</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b></p> <p><b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p>	
<p><b>*1306</b> Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County for Healthy Streets Project (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 30004973)  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188106</b></p>

<p><b>*1307</b> Accept a grant in the amount of \$15,000 from KaBOOM! Play Everywhere Challenge for Sitton Elementary and George Middle School Walking School Bus Stops (Ordinance)</p> <p>Continued to November 23, 2016 at 2:00 pm.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188108</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b> <b>Bureau of Environmental Services</b></p> <p><b>1308</b> Authorize the Bureau of Environmental Services to execute an easement with TriMet as part of the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail: SE Powell Boulevard/16th Avenue Storm Sewer Project No. E10060 (Second Reading Agenda 1279)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188107</b></p>
<p><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b></p> <p><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b> <b>Bureau of Police</b></p> <p><b>*1309</b> Authorize application and accept a grant in the amount of \$100,000 and appropriate \$67,000 for FY 2016-17 from Oregon Impact for overtime reimbursement for participation in DUII High Visibility Enforcement events during Federal Fiscal Year 2016-17 (Ordinance)</p> <p>Continued to November 23, 2016 at 2:00 pm.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p> <p><b>*1310</b> Pay claim of Tinca Stoica in the sum of \$18,000 involving the Portland Police Bureau (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested</p> <p>Continued to November 23, 2016 at 2:00 pm.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188110</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p> <p><b>1311</b> Authorize the Bureau of Transportation to allocate \$500,000 to the Portland Parks Foundation for construction of the Footbridge Over Burnside (Second Reading Agenda 1283)</p> <p>Continued to November 23, 2016 at 2:00 pm.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188111</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b> <b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b></p>	

<p><b>1312</b> Amend provisions relating to possession of cannabis in parks to conform to State law (Second Reading Agenda 1285) Continued to November 23, 2016 at 2:00 pm. (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188112</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b> Water Bureau</p>	
<p><b>1313</b> Authorize a contract and provide payment for the construction of the Sandy River Engineered Log Jam Placement Project at an estimated cost of \$2,300,000 (Second Reading Agenda 1289) Continued to November 23, 2016 at 2:00 pm. (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188113</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b> Portland Housing Bureau</p>	
<p><b>*1314</b> Authorize a contract with CBRE HMF, Inc. for the refinance of the Headwaters Apartments (Ordinance) 15 minutes requested Continued to November 23, 2016 at 2:00 pm.</p>	<p><b>REFERRED TO COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS</b></p>
<p><b><u>WEDNESDAY, 2:00 PM, NOVEMBER 23, 2016</u></b></p>	
<p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, and Saltzman, 4.</p>	
<p><b>1315 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Appeal of LRS Architects Inc. against Design Commission’s decision to approve with conditions—specifically C.1 and C.2 corner building element—a new ¼-block 12 story residential building located at NW 14<sup>th</sup> Ave and NW Raleigh St (Hearing introduced by Commissioner Saltzman; LU 16-197257 DZM) 1.25 hours requested  <b>Motion to grant appeal and remove conditions C.1 and C.2:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>TENTATIVELY GRANT APPEAL; PREPARE FINDINGS FOR DECEMBER 7, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b><u>THURSDAY, 2:00 PM, NOVEMBER 24, 2016</u></b> <b>DUE TO THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY THERE WAS NO MEETING</b></p>	

**NOTE:** “Time Certain” indicates that an item will not be heard by Council **prior** to the time specified.

Communications items are three minutes each. Regular Agenda items taking longer than five minutes have the time estimate noted next to the item.

The \* indicates an emergency ordinance, which takes effect immediately if passed. Non-emergency ordinances require two readings and a 30-day waiting period before taking effect. Resolutions, reports, etc., adopted by Council are effective after adjournment.

The above summary is published by the City Auditor as provided by Section 2-113 of the Charter and Ordinance No. 130672.

Council Chambers is equipped with a sound system for the hearing impaired. Assisted listening devices are available from the Clerk.

The City of Portland will gladly accommodate requests for an interpreter or make other accommodations that further inclusivity. Please make your request at least 48 hours before the meeting to the Council Clerk 503-823-4086. (TTY 503-823-6868).

City Council meetings can be viewed at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/video>. The meetings are also cablecast on CityNet 30, Portland Community Media television.

**Mary Hull Caballero**  
Auditor of the City of Portland

=====

Testimony is taken on Reports, Resolutions and Ordinances (first reading). To testify, sign up on a testimony sheet as you enter Council Chambers on the day of the meeting. Individuals have 3 minutes to testify, unless otherwise stated at the meeting. Testimony is not taken on Communications, Second Readings, Proclamations or Presentations in accordance with Code 3.02.040 F. and G. Written testimony may be emailed or mailed to the Council Clerk prior to the meeting.

To schedule a Communication, email or mail your request to the Council Clerk. Include your name, address, phone number and a brief description of the subject you will be addressing. For full details, see Testimony Policies and procedures. <http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/index.cfm?&a=63123&c=34447>

Clerk Email: [karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov)  
Council Clerk Testimony: [cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov)  
US Mail: Council Clerk, 1221 SW Fourth Ave., Room 130, Portland OR 97204

=====

Declaration Required by Lobbyists. Portland City Code 2.12.060 states: Prior to offering public testimony before City officials, at the beginning of any meetings or phone calls with City officials, or in emails and letters to City officials, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent for that communication.

=====

*“Be a part of the picture...get involved with your City...volunteer for a City of Portland Board or Commission. For more information, a brochure, or a volunteer application, stop by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement in City Hall or call 503-823-4519.”*



**OFFICERS OF PORTLAND CITY GOVERNMENT**

**CHARLIE HALES, MAYOR**

Commissioner of Finance and Administration  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 340, 97204  
 (503) 823-4120  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/mayor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/mayor/)  
 e-mail: [mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>
Portland Police Bureau Portland Development Commission Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Fire & Police Disability and Retirement Office of Equity and Human Rights Office of Management and Finance Office of Government Relations City Attorney City Budget Office Oversight of the Willamette River Super Fund clean-up project

**NICK FISH**

Commissioner of Public Works  
 Position Number 2  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 240, 97204  
 (503) 823-3589  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fish](http://www.portlandonline.com/fish)  
 e-mail: [Nick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Nick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Environmental Services Bureau of Hydroelectric Power Water Bureau	<i>Elders in Action</i> <i>Portland Utility Review Board</i> <i>Venture Portland</i> <i>Portland's Centers For The Arts</i> Regional Arts and Culture Council

**AMANDA FRITZ**

Commissioner of Public Utilities  
 Position Number 1  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 220, 97204  
 (503) 823-3008  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fritz/](http://www.portlandonline.com/fritz/)  
 e-mail: [amanda@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:amanda@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Parks & Recreation Office of Neighborhood Involvement	<i>Royal Rosarians</i> <i>Multnomah County Animal Control</i> <i>Portland Parks Board</i> <i>Urban Forestry Commission</i> <i>Golf Advisory Committee</i> <i>Portland International Raceway Advisory Committee</i> <i>Protected Sick Time ordinance implementation</i> [continued next page]

	<p><i>Council Lead on the City Coordinating Committee addressing the Department of Justice Settlement</i></p> <p><i>Visitors Development Fund Board (with Saltzman)</i></p>
--	---

**STEVE NOVICK**

Commissioner of Public Safety  
 Position Number 4  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 210, 97204  
 (503) 823-4682  
 website: [www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/)  
 e-mail: [Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Transportation Bureau of Emergency Management Bureau of Emergency Communications	<i>Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)</i> <i>Portland Streetcar Inc.</i> <i>Regional Emergency Management Group</i> <i>BOEC Users Group</i> <i>BOEC Finance Committee</i> <i>Taxi Cab Board of Review</i> <i>Towing Board of Review</i>

**DAN SALTZMAN**

Commissioner of Public Affairs  
 Position Number 3  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 230, 97204  
 (503) 823-4151  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/saltzman](http://www.portlandonline.com/saltzman)  
 e-mail: [dan@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:dan@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Development Services Portland Fire & Rescue Portland Housing Bureau Gateway Domestic Violence Center Portland Children's Levy (formerly Portland Children's Investment Fund)	<i>Travel Portland</i> <i>Visitors Development Fund (with Fritz)</i> <i>Home Forward</i> <i>League of Oregon Cities</i> <i>Adjustment Committee</i> <i>Building Board of Appeals</i> <i>Design Commission</i> <i>Historic Landmarks Commission</i>

## **MARY HULL CABALLERO**

Auditor of the City of Portland

1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 140, 97204

(503) 823-4078

website: [www.portlandonline.com/auditor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/)

e-mail: [AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov)

### **Portfolio**

Assessments, Finance & Foreclosure  
Audit Services

City Elections

City Recorder

-Archives

-Council Clerk / Contracts Division

-Records Management

Hearings Office

IPR - Independent Police Review

Ombudsman

Portland Multnomah Progress Board

### **BUREAU DIRECTORS**

Bureau of Development Services	Paul Scarlett
Bureau of Emergency Communications	Lisa Turley
Bureau of Emergency Management	Carmen Merlo
Bureau of Environmental Services	Michael Jordan
Bureau of Human Resources	Anna Kanwit
Bureau of Internal Business Services	Bryant Enge
Bureau of Planning & Sustainability	Susan Anderson
Bureau of Police	Michael Marshman
Bureau of Revenue & Financial Services	Ken Rust
Bureau of Technology Services	Jeff Baer
Bureau of Transportation	Leah Treat
City Attorney	Tracy Reeve
City Budget Office	Andrew Scott
Fire & Police Disability and Retirement	Samuel Hutchison
Office of Equity and Human Rights	Dante James
Office of Government Relations	Martha Pellegrino
Office of Mgmt & Finance –Chief Admin Officer	Fred Miller
Office of Neighborhood Involvement	Amalia Alarcón de Morris
Portland Development Commission	Kimberly Branam
Portland Fire & Rescue	Mike Myers
Portland Housing Bureau	Kurt Creager
Portland Parks & Recreation	Mike Abbaté
Revenue Director	Thomas Lannom
Water Bureau	Michael Stuhr

Updated 08-19-2016



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

**OFFICIAL  
MINUTES**

A **SPECIAL MEETING** OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **22<sup>ND</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2016** AT 9:00 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, Saltzman; Commissioner Novick teleconferenced at 9:45 a.m., 5.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Susan Parsons, Acting Clerk of the Council; Kathryn Beaumont, Chief Deputy City Attorney; and Jason King Sergeant at Arms.

The meeting recessed at 10:39 a.m. and reconvened at 12:17 p.m.

<b>SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING FOR COUNCIL DELIBERATION AND VOTE ON AMENDMENTS</b>		<b>Disposition:</b>
<b>1293</b>	<b>TIME CERTAIN: 9:00 AM</b> – Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland's 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Previous Agenda 1292; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 3.5 hours requested	<b>CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 14, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN AS AMENDED</b>
<b>Motions attached.</b>		

At 1:17 p.m., Council recessed.

**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.

**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.**

**NOVEMBER 22, 2016 9:00 AM**

**Hales:** Welcome to this special meeting of the Portland city council. Would you please call the roll?

**Novick:** [teleconferenced at 9:45 a.m.] **Fritz:** Here **Fish:** Here **Saltzman:** Here

**Hales:** Here

**Hales:** This meeting is called to allow the council to begin work on amendments to the comprehensive plan. And, that is to the zoning code and map changes attendant to the plan. We have a lot of testimony behind us and bps staff is going to give us an overview or where we are in the process and then we're going to start walking our way through potential amendments after that. Commissioner novick is going to join us by phone later in the session. We're going to pause the discussion at 10:45, returning at about noon, so we can participate in the event over at the post office site. So --

**Fish:** I was in new york last week and missed all the drama. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to meet on some of the amendments. I met with joe Zehnder and his team yesterday. I'm a step behind my colleagues in terms of the cheat sheet and the sequencing. I apologize in advance for any clumsiness.

**Hales:** Okay. There are areas where we'll want further discussion. I've got and questions, as well. Okay. With that, Eric?

**Eric Engstrom, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Thank you, mayor hales.

**Parson:** Could I read the title, please?

**Item 1293.**

**Hales:** Okay. Thank you. Please proceed.

**Engstrom:** As you know, over the past few weeks, each of your offices have sent potential amendments ideas to bps staff and we've compiled them into a memo released on November 4<sup>th</sup>. In addition to that memo, we published several other staff memos, identifying minor areas and some technical changes that you should adopt. Those memos were dated the 30<sup>th</sup> of September and then 10/13, 11/4 and 11/14. We have also drafted an agenda for today. In that agenda, as we go through each item, it refers to the amendments in those memos and you should have the memos in the pile of papers in front of you. If you need to be oriented, say so and we'll try and help you find the right memo. We also distributed a bundle of testimony that arrived -- the record was open until Friday for written comments and we did receive some. They've been entered into the record. I understand there are a few more stragglers that will be distributed today, probably. Today's agenda, we're going to start this morning with several consent lists, taking care of the staff identified errata. We'll move into considering public trails. Then, on to code amendments, zoning map amendments and after the break, the mayor indicated, we would focus on the transportation items then and we expect commissioner novick to join us. We have reserved a time-certain tomorrow at 3:15, if you need it. We need to discuss some of these items, so that's there if we need it. Any questions about the papers or the order of business?

**Fish:** Since it's the four of us and not the five of us for the first session, if we don't have three votes for a particular approach, is it your inclination to just move that forward to either the next session or to the residual session?

**Hales:** At least that there's three. I think there are going to be some of these items where we're going to have three votes or no more

**Fish:** The default is we go back to what planning has recommended. If the four of us can't resolve the issue, I would hope our procedure is to kick it to later or tomorrow.

**Hales:** I think that's the right thing to do, thank you.

**Engstrom:** We've tried to cluster the harder issues later so commissioner novick is present tomorrow. If there are no other questions, we'll start with the errata of memos and sort of ease into it with those. And, I think the way we could work this, if you'd like, is I can be the emcee and identify the amendment and then you all can then make motions, as you see fit.

**Fish:** I'll move the motion for number one.

**Fritz:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion on number 1? Let's take a roll call vote on that amendment, please.

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

**Hales:** Aye. Okay. And then, let's move on to number two.

**Engstrom:** It is a number of technical amendments. They're not errors, they are fairly small. We recommended nine minor changes to the code and 10 mapping changes. We recommend that you pull, item 2-e, concerning southeast Reynolds street. You heard testimony about us not removing the commercial zoning. We recommend you pull that item

**Hales:** So, the effect of pulling item 2-e is to retain --

**Engstrom:** They would retain mixed use commercial zoning which is what they had asked for.

**Fish:** I move the motion.

**Fritz:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion? In this, it has been removed?

**Fish:** I move the motion that includes removing 2-e.

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

**Hales:** Aye. Okay. Number three?

**Engstrom:** Now we're moving into some more general bundles of things that we did not get the sense from any of you that you were concerned about so we bundled these into group votes. We pulled from item number 3, amendment 18, which relates to southeast 102nd because there was testimony saying that they prefer amendment number 30 and if this passes, they don't need it. The site is residential property owned privately within the Adventist hospital. They would like to keep residential zoning so amendment 18 did that. However, when we introduced the amendment, they wrote in again saying they would be okay with that and would prefer it over 18.

**Hales:** Okay.

**Fritz:** I haven't seen that testimony. I was wondering why, in principal, should we have campus zoning on a property that they don't have ownership of?

**Engstrom:** In general, that has been our approach unless the property owner specifically had other views. The property owner does not have an issue with the campus zoning but wants to be able to maintain residential.

**Fritz:** Would it mean they can only sell to the campus, to the institution?

**Engstrom:** I don't think so because it would allow other uses. It restricts the property differently than a residential zone would be restricted. If you keep residential they would not be able to do medical offices, if you keep the campus zoning, they could do private medical offices without being associated with the campus and not necessarily have to sell to the campus. Or, they could do housing if you're inclined to doing housing in that zone. It hinges the philosophy of when you apply the campus zone and in this case, whether you intent to vote for number 30 or not.

**Hales:** It's no longer number 30, it's something else now.

**Fritz:** Number 10.

**Engstrom:** I guess we should state that the amendments have their numbers from the memos, but the motion item number.

**Hales:** Motion number, code amendment 30, motion number 10.

**Engstrom:** Sorry for that confusion.

**Fish:** I move the motion.

**Fritz:** What motion?

**Hales:** Number three, as drafted.

**Fritz:** I have some comments on 16 and 21, as well. I'd like to pull those for discussion. 16.

**Hales:** In that list? Okay.

**Fish:** We'll do the ones that are noncontroversial

**Fritz:** 16 and 22, please.

**Fish:** My motion is number three, excluding 16 and 22.

**Fritz:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion on that revised motion?

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

**Hales:** Aye. So do you want to go ahead and pull out 16 and 22 and talk about those, Amanda?

**Fritz:** 16 is the south side of Powell and west of 17th avenue. The request is to change it from ce to cm2. Staff says that the north side is zoned ex, so it's a step-down.

**Hales:** And you support that?

**Fritz:** I support the staff's recommendation.

**Hales:** Okay. So, why did you pull it? Wouldn't that have been accomplished if it had remained in the package?

**Fritz:** I'm quite challenged by the process here.

**Fish:** I hope we err on the side of ventilating.

**Hales:** You're comfortable with cm2 being apply applied to that property at 17<sup>th</sup> and Powell you didn't want to change that you wanted to apply.

**Fritz:** Which is the more intense zone, ce or ce2?

**Engstrom:** There both roughly equivalent Ce has a slightly broader allowance for manufacturing and a slight broader allowance for auto-accommodating uses.

**Fritz:** Wouldn't that be a good thing in the central east side.

**Hales:** I think cm2 makes sense here and that's what the property owner's actually request, I believe. Again, if the north side of Powell there is going to redevelop, then having more -- less auto-oriented uses across Powell at that point, would make sense. Major industrial sites near there, it's the transition into the Brooklynn neighborhood. So, to me, that made sense as a scale.

**Marty Stockton, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Just to clarify, I spoke with Eric wyland and he said, we've been wanting this change for years. They did not submit testimony in support for them, it was -- they were very favorable. They --

**Fritz:** I'm sorry, i'm fine with it.

**Hales:** Let's act on 16, then unless there's any other discussion around that.

**Fish:** So moved.

**Fritz:** Second.

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

**Fritz:** 22 is the sylvan highland issue and there's a couple of them that are here and we had many discussions about if they should be up zoned from r20.

**Hales:** There's one or more here in the package.

**Fritz:** My recollection is that we did handle each one individually but we had good discussions about let's not change the zone and we would do what property owners said

and we could put the comprehensive plan designation up. But we need a quasi-judicial zone change process so the neighbors can weigh in so we can require all the transportation improvements we need.

**Hales:** What does 22 in particular cover?

**Engstrom:** It covers the properties on southwest 58th -- 1434 and 1512. You received testimony from the property owner. There -- the frontage in front of them is unimproved sidewalk but they are north of where there is a sidewalk. They testified it is their intent to build a sidewalk. Staff told you we are slightly more comfortable with doing a quasi-judicial change in this situation. They testified that there is evidence that we have succeeded in requiring sidewalks with building permits and so it's a little bit of a debate about how strong our ability to require sidewalks is and whether we need the quasi-judicial hearing. The property owner is comfortable building a sidewalk.

**Fritz:** They still need to go through the process because the neighbors might not have been paying attention to this. I've been looking obviously while we've been doing all these changes I've been extra vigilant at looking at where pbots have required sidewalks and where have they not. There is evidence that sidewalks are always required where needed.

**Hales:** I think I have the opposite viewpoint on this. These are r20 today, right?

**Engstrom:** They're in r2 comprehensive plan.

**Hales:** If we're doing long-range planning, r-2 doesn't make sense. I think making someone go through a quasi-judicial process to get a sidewalk is a wrong tool. We should make sure that pbots' requirements are clear and strict so when that development occurs that sidewalks are required and constructed. But, we don't have to rely on assurances. We can rely on regulations. I would assume that we would rather, in many cases -- we have connectivity stuff in here in the tsp portion of the plan. I would rather us be, always in planning, be very explicit on what we expect and require rather than say, it's an open-ended process. If we want it to be developed for housing, let's say so but then let's make sure we get the sidewalks that are the issue, right? There's not another issue here besides the sidewalks. Are we guaranteed getting the side walk?

**Fritz:** And is it okay now? If we vote for r2 we're saying, go ahead. The challenge mayor is you're not going to be in charge of pbots, I'm going to be in charge of pbots. We don't have the same pressure from neighbors at the hearing on a quasi-judicial change.

**Hales:** I'm pretty mystified that we can't require sidewalks in a situation like this. I mean, is there anybody here from pbots that can help eliminate this for us?

**Engstrom:** Based on -- I mean, pbots, feel free to come up. I think it's site-specific sometimes. There is an ability to waive the requirement or accept waivers especially when it's an isolated site. This is not isolated.

**Hales:** This is the parcel at the end of the sidewalk, right?

**Denver Igarta, Portland Bureau of Transportation:** Yeah, I think we do have the tools and code authority -- my name is Denver Igarta and we do have the code authority in making those requirements, as they're described sometimes, it's site-specific based on the conditions. We also have tools, such as the new local transportation infrastructure charge to get fee in place of improvements on local streets. With that, we're able to provide more clarity on where we need the street improvements the most and so I think pbots has been a lot firmer in recent years about getting street improvements.

**Hales:** Yeah, I think you have been, too. I've heard a number of complaints about pbots being too strict about sidewalks. I haven't heard a single complaint from a neighbor about they wanted a sidewalk and didn't get one. It seems to me you're erring on the side of infrastructure rather than we should get to it later.

**Fish:** Let's test where we are.

**Hales:** I'm going to move 22, as-is. Which is the change, right?

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



**Hales:** Let's take a vote on that.

**Fritz:** Good discussion, thank you. No.

**Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

**Hales:** Aye. So, those are done.

**Engstrom:** Now we move to motion package number four, which is a collection of zoning code amendments that staff has identified because they appear to have support and are not controversial.

**Fish:** I'll move the amendment.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Fritz:** Were there a couple of amendments that we were going to do on 26, which is school districts to add it to the contract requirement?

**Fish:** Thank you, commissioner Fritz, we have a friendly amendment to add business associations to 26?

**Hales:** Makes sense.

**Engstrom:** Yes, that's correct. Do you want to consider that separately?

**Fish:** I understand the sponsor has graciously agreed to add it.

**Fritz:** The school district, has that been added?

**Engstrom:** You would be amending 26, in addition to listing schools for the neighborhood contact requirement, you're adding business associations.

**Fish:** Do you want to vote on that or can it be a friendly amendment?

**Hales:** It can be a friendly amendment. Anymore discussion about that one? Let's take motion four with that understood friendly amendment.

**Fritz:** I'm going to, at times, look through my notes to make sure there's nothing else I was supposed to do. Aye.

**Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye. Okay.

**Engstrom:** Now we're transitioning to some trails. The first motion is a bundle of trail amendments we believe we had support for. You know, you may want to have discussion of this bundle. They are relatively uncontroversial.

**Hales:** This bundle does not include the two questions on Hayden island, which are separately addressed later?

**Engstrom:** Correct. The Hayden island question is part of the street classification map, not the trails map. For individual vote, the marquam hill and the Saltzman road trail segments because we believe there was discussion necessary there.

**Fritz:** I have a question on this. It includes the trail near i-405. Can you tell me where near I-405?

**Engstrom:** As you approach westbound, the vista tunnel on the south side of 26 there, there's a trail that starts there, right before the tunnel and goes east, south of 405 and connects kind of past south of psu.

**Fritz:** Okay. I got briefed yesterday by parks on an issue, on a different park, about the green loop. Is the green loop included in any of this?

**Engstrom:** No, the green loop is part of the central city plan.

**Fritz:** Okay. Thank you. Aye.

**Fish:** I think we have a second.

**Hales:** Now we can vote.

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

**Hales:** Aye. Okay. All right.

**Engstrom:** Motion six related to trail segment 82 on marquam hill and the request -- this is a modified version of amendment number 46, the request or the modified version is to move the trail segment from crossing a property to follow southwest campus drive. The reason we suggested the modification is we got testimony from the southwest trails and neighborhood and ohsu folks that they all agreed with that change.

**Saltzman:** I'll move motion six.

**Fish:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion?

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

**Hales:** Aye. Number seven.

**Engstrom:** Number seven is an amendment to remove a segment on Saltzman road west of skyline, staff recommended against the motion. Mr. Cole is here to provide a little background on that.

**Engstrom:** This is John Cole, with my staff, who has been focusing on the trail issues.

**Hales:** Refresh my memory about this one, John, why there's a difference of opinion on this one.

**John Cole, Bureau of Planning and sustainability:** You did receive a number of public testifiers against including this particular segment based on issues, I think, of privacy and of impact on some natural resources in the area. It had been included in the packet initially to match up with a west side trail project that had been adopted through a public review process through metro. During the adoption of that metro trail segment, through a resolution of the board of county commissioners, they did raise some concerns over the specific alignments that occurred under county jurisdiction to the west of the city property. So, that was the basis of their testimony against including this particular trail segment. It is entirely within city right-of-way, so we're not on any private property and staff had taken the position that having this particular trail segment, that does match up with the conceptual trail alignment was an acknowledgment of that particular trail planning process and did indicate that we were interested in providing, if you will, a receiving point, of the west side trail regardless of which alignment it eventually settled on under county jurisdiction. I don't think it's anything that staff feel strongly about, but we do think that retaining that particular trail segment is a signal in support of the metro west side trail planning process.

**Fritz:** It's the concern of the neighbors that it's entirely private property so it takes people down a public right-of-way, but there isn't a connection to anything public on the other side?

**Engstrom:** The designation of a trail on the zone map doesn't necessarily lead to signage or any specific trail that the public would be aware of. I guess it's staff's assumption that people don't use the zoning map to navigate trails in Portland.

**Fritz:** Yes, but that doesn't answer my question there's private property on the other side so the county would have to condemn property to get the connection?

**Engstrom:** Or exact it through a development process, correct. That's been the debate with -- at the regional level about the routing of the trail to the west of here.

**Fritz:** Since it's public right-of-way, I'm not sure why we'd put a trail designation on it if the words will have exactions with the county property it should be a street not a trail.

**Engstrom:** The primary effect in public right-of-way is to give pbot a signal that this is a potential trail. You're correct, the trail could be built without us having the stars on the zoning map because it would be connecting to the public right-of-way.

**Hales:** So, your inclination is to take it off?

**Fritz:** Yes.

**Hales:** So that's the motion before us. Staff had the contrary recommendation.

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

**Hales:** Further discussion? Roll call, please.

**Fritz:** Another good discussion, aye.

**Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

**Hales:** I want to say thanks to the staff. We're working our way through a lot of trails issues in this. It ended up in this -- at least for me, late in the game, turbulence between the metro process and our own. I think we're getting it right in terms of sorting out where trails are

practically likely and we'll return to that conversation. We talk about Hayden island. As opposed to ones that are going to get people concerned. I don't mind pushing the envelope on trails that have a reasonable prospect. Aye. Okay. Let's move on to number eight.

**Engstrom:** We're now shifting gears into code amendments that we want to consider individually. The first motion relates to amendment 36. I believe commissioner Fritz had further revised it on November 13. This is amendment to title 3 to establish the citizen involvement committee and to provide more specificity.

**Hales:** Are you satisfied with where we are?

**Fritz:** Yes, very much.

**Fish:** As modified by a November 15 memo. Do we have that memo?

**Engstrom:** You should have that memo. If you don't, we can certainly find it. P

**Fish:** Commissioner Fritz, can you summarize the highlights?

**Engstrom:** I believe we have it in the box somewhere. [laughter]

**Hales:** In one of those boxes. [laughter]

**Fritz:** It was cleaning up who's responsible for this committee, what it does, how many is a quorum and that kind of thing.

**Fish:** I heard the word, appointment. Under your approach, what would be the appointment process?

**Fritz:** It's after 9:30, but I'm not functioning particularly well.

**Saltzman:** Bureau of planning and sustainability would be the appointing?

**Hales:** I believe that's correct.

**Fish:** Would they come to council?

**Fritz:** Yeah.

**Hales:** They typically would.

**Fritz:** Technically the mayor on the recommendation.

**Hales:** Like other appointments?

**Fritz:** Just working to make sure it was congruent with our other committee.

**Engstrom:** We also included in that, in discussion with commissioner's office, an amendment to include the phrase that it was going to be geographically represented and that was received from the neighborhood association's concern.

**Hales:** Broad spectrum. Commissioner Fritz moves and I'll second number eight. Further discussion? Okay. Let's take a vote, please.

**Fritz:** So, I apologize to Claire Adamsick, who has done an amazing job helping sort through it. She's included the memo in my packet and so it consists of five, no more than 12, board of representatives. Renewable for one second term, but not after that. And, gathering information. Aye.

**Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

**Engstrom:** Number nine is amendment number 37. This was a staff request. I'll try to go over the purpose of it. Metro title 1 require that have densities codified in their zone. Commercial mixed use zone don't have minimum residential. If you do residential, there's not a minimum. With the new comp plan and the zoning map we're asking you to adopt, we've done a number of zone changes that shift it from residential to commercial and the net result was to reduce the total minimum density of our zoning map as a whole, which may run afoul of the metro title one requirement that we maintain and not slide back on our overall total minimum density for residential zoning. We're proposing an amendment when residential development is proposed. If you're going to build residential, you have to meet a minimum density similar to how you would be doing that in residential zones and we believe that's a sufficient addressing of that issue that would satisfy metro's concern.

**Fritz:** Does that mean it has to be housing in the commercial zone map?

**Engstrom:** No, you could build 100% commercial and it wouldn't be subject to this. If you're going to put housing units on the site, it would preclude someone for using a prime mixed use zone for one house. If you're building new development -- if you have existing residential development, you can come closer to conformance without going all the way. If you're redeveloping a site, it would require a minimum density if residential is included.

**Fritz:** So moved.

**Fish:** Second.

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

**Engstrom:** Motion 10 is related to zoning code amendment 30 memo dated November 4th his is the one we referred to earlier that was requested by Portland community college to add the allowance for housing in the -- in one of the two campus designations, the denser of the two. There's a second question on whether the Sylvania campus should be zoned that. The request there's two campus zones one that's more oriented to lower density neighborhoods and example of that is Lewis and Clark, another -- or reed. Another campus zone is the denser one that is more accommodating, like killingsworth, pcc or the hospitals, good sam. And the proposal, as originally recommended by the planning commission, the campus zone allows housing for staff and students. It doesn't allow just separate housing and the request was to be a little bit broader and allow housing outright and the distinction would be that it would allow those campuses to entertain the idea to build affordable housing, which is something pcc is considering.

**Fish:** It would also allow them to develop market rate housing and use the proceeds for other parts of the operation.

**Engstrom:** Correct.

**Saltzman:** So moved.

**Fish:** Second.

**Fritz:** I have a question. Is there any concern that the -- any institution would develop housing for profit and then not have enough student accommodation?

**Fish:** I don't have that. I would defer to the board of directors and the political process and the governing process. I was just clarifying there is no constraints. From a public policy point of view, there will be tremendous interest to be other housing -- housing for other than faculty and students because there is a shortage of affordable housing for students or minimum-wage workers. I have confidence in the political process.

**Hales:** I have another question.

**Fritz:** I'm just thinking about the building that psu helped complete, which is for sale. They're condos, not dorms, right? It would be good to know how many of those are being rented or sold to students versus the general public.

**Hales:** I hear you. I don't know the answer to that question. I have another question, which is -- I should know this because we have talked about this before. I understand the scale and design requirements attendant to the mixed use zones, what would prevail here, is there floor-area ratio. We don't want Lewis and Clark building a 25-story tower.

**Engstrom:** The campus zones have their own floor ratios the lower density one has a .5 f.a.r. These tend to be big campuses with a lot of trees. The denser one has a 3:1, which is moderate to the mixed use zone. They do include some of the same design standards at the mixed use zones where it fronts up against commercial streets and mixed use streets. The transit setbacks and the articulation is the same standards.

**Fish:** One other thought I want to throw out there, I've been thinking about ways that we could create more incentives for faith communities, campuses to build housing for older adults. The idea being that we know that older adults like to be adjacent to academic institutions. Perfect case would be within the university district. We also know that we have some churches in the city that are losing their congregations, what better place if they were to develop a parking lot, to have housing for older adults. That's not before us, but I'm

personally intrigued by the idea of housing for older adults and affordable housing on campuses because of the other amenities the campuses offer.

**Hales:** I like that, too. Another question, I'm assuming we're moving forward with inclusionary housing, would those apply to non-student housing?

**Saltzman:** Probably, that's a good question.

**Hales:** We might want to specify that?

**Engstrom:** Tom armstrong, I believe, is in the audience.

\*\*\*\*\*: [indiscernible]

**Hales:** Would inclusionary housing apply to the non-student on the college campus? As it should be, in my opinion. Further questions or concerns about this one? Let's take a vote.

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

**Hales:** It's a little bit of an experiment. I like it. Aye.

**Engstrom:** Now we're moving into one that we expect a little bit more debate. This is the alphabet district. We've put three alternate motions on the table, a, b and c. motion a upholds the planning commission recommendation with a slight technical change that is at staff's recommendation. Motion b adopts -- rejects the planning commission recommendation and retains the existing 4:1 f.a.r. In the alphabet district in the rh zone and motion c was an attempt at a compromise from the mayor that retains the planning commission recommendations but adds a few more properties to the 4:1 area. The rh zone has two potential f.a.r.s, 2:1 or 4:1 and it's mapped in the zoning code. The alphabet district was 4:1. There is conflicts between the landmarks design review process and the floor area and 4:1 has been rejected because of concerns about masses. You modified some of the boundaries of the rh zone so we had to go clean up these maps and we got the attention of some of the neighbors who then testified that this should be 2:1, not 4:1. You heard some testimony from affordable housing providers concerned about the loss of density in an urban neighborhood. You heard from nwda that the 2:1 was more appropriate. The planning commission's recommendation kind of split and kept 4:1 on the south side, which is close to the max station and where there is a slightly higher preponderance of buildings. The maps on the screen, the red line on the map is where the planning commission drew the line. So, the rh zone, south of that line retained 4:1. The area north of that was reduced to 2:1. So, that's sort of what would be in place if motion a passes. If b passes, the line would go away and it all 4:1. Motion c would add the properties in red in the map to the area that is 4:1 and retain south of the line 4:1.

**Hales:** To complicate this further, another notion that was floated was to look at 3:1 instead of either of these, or as a compromise.

**Engstrom:** Correct, that was discussed a little bit. Staff didn't recommend that. It would be introducing new framework into that.

**Hales:** I'm not sure which of these I like, either. I'm not sure if I like that one. It was at least worth talking about.

**Fritz:** My understanding is C is the one you were leaning towards?

**Hales:** I think c is a reasonable compromise. You know, there are detractors to each of these approaches. Detractors to option c is it's spot zoning. I think it is -- it was an attempt to try to make a reasonable call about where the 2:1 really should be applied for purposes of historic preservation and where higher development could be allowed, but it's subject to the landmarks. Maybe start with -- I don't know if you want --

**Engstrom:** I believe this is the point where commissioner novick wanted to join the conversation.

**Hales:** Is he available to do so? Okay. All right. So, council member is going to participate by telephone in the meeting. I need to make these announcements that need to be made before we do that. Commissioner novick is participating by telephone because there might

not be enough people present. We made sure that commissioner novick is properly informed. Do any of the council members object?

**Fish:** If this was another legislative body in Washington, d.c., I would reserve my objection depending on which way he would vote. [laughter]

**Hales:** Commissioner novick, you're participating.

**Novick:** Is commissioner Saltzman moving motion B?

**Saltzman:** Moving b?

**Fish:** I will second that.

**Hales:** This is retaining 4:1 everywhere, where it is currently mapped, not excepting the recommendation from the psc or my attempted compromise.

**Fritz:** I would like to speak against the motion. In terms of answering the question of is this spot zoning I think a lot of what we've done in this comprehensive plan is lot by lot zoning. So I'm not concerned that we would be providing that. Also, as we found within the council, if you can't possibly or very unlikely to meet the historic review standards, we're not doing people a favor by developing at the higher intensities.

**Hales:** I agree with that viewpoint. Further discussion before we take a vote on option b? Okay. Roll call, please.

**Fritz:** No. **Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Novick:** Aye.

**Hales:** No. Okay, but it passes. All right. Let's move on, then, to option number 12.

**Engstrom:** Motion 12, like the previous one is three options. This concerns drive-thru regulations. We've discussed this, at length, in other briefings. We have three options, a, b and c. Option a retains the planning commission recommendation and clarifies, includes some clarifying language from staff. Essentially, it would prohibit drive-thru's east of 80th. West of 80th, it would allow it in the accommodating ce zone. West of 80th, it would allow rebuilding and expansion of existing facilities in cm1, 2 and 3 zones. Motion b, we tried to keep the same pattern. I believe this was commissioner Saltzman's amendment. It goes back to the staff august recommendation before they added the 80th avenue distinction. So, it would allow new drive-thrus and quick vehicle services in all of the ce zone citywide. It would also allow existing facilities to be expanded or rebuilt. They would continue to be prohibited in the central city and the new main street overlays. And those would be treated as non-conforming development. The option c was a potential compromise. It would continue to prohibit drive-thru facilities in the mixed use zones, but not just east of 80th. Unlike the planning commission, it would allow quick vehicle servicing uses in any of the ce zones citywide. It was drawing the distinction. All drive-thru facilities would be treated as non-conforming. Like the other a option, it would allow existing facilities to be rebuild in the c1, 2 and 3 without being non-conforming. We had some maps we had prepared of the net effect of this. They are on the screen. Option a, in these maps, they use the same color scheme where red is showing where new ones are prohibited. Orange is showing where new one are prohibited but existing ones have a more liberal rebuild bounds, green is where you can build new ones. Under option a, you can see the green has retreated to the remaining ce zoning west of 80th. Under option b, the green basically corresponds to the ce zone, city-wide and is east and west of 80th. In option c, there is also -- there is less green, but more orange and it depends -- the distinction is whether your quick vehicle servicing or drive-thru.

**Hales:** So, let me speak about motion c -- let me speak about all of these. I thought the planning commission's idea of east of 80th was laudable, but not -- I don't think really workable. I think what we should be trying to do in this planning effort is zone for the city we want and be serious about climate. Well, we want the whole city to be less auto-oriented. We have to acknowledge the reality that people need to have their vehicles serviced. The distinction we're making in c and b about quick vehicle servicing is just being practical to me. And then secondly, I don't want to -- the problem I have frankly with option

b is it really does the opposite to east Portland. It says east Portland is very auto-oriented now and it's going to stay that way. I'm concerned about that. So, my preference here would be, first choice, c, second choice, b. In my evaluation of these options, I can live with b, but I think c's better.

**Fish:** Can I make a couple of observations? This discussion about drive-thrus brings back some memories because this is an issue that the mayor has been very passionate about and has shaped the debate and has brought a lot of his own values and history to this and I'm reminded, when I served with another mayor named Adams, he helped me doing something called bud Clark commons there was an issue a couple years later he cared a lot about. He passed a note down to me and I opened the note and it said, this is my bud Clark commons. Unfortunately, I still couldn't support it. [laughter] based on the briefings I've had, mayor, I have a one-a, one-b on this. I want to make a couple of observations. As my colleagues know, last year, I lived by myself with a much more limited support network because my family was in Europe and from time to time, I got sick. And, it was really eye-opening, frankly, to navigate hospitals, doctors, drugstores and the basic necessities of life. It really sucked to have, you know, a medical condition and be in a drugstore trying to navigate all the things. I began to appreciate the convenience for some people of staying in their car and pick something up. And, you know, years and years ago, we had younger children and there was a benefit of not having to get out of the car. There was a convenience factor. I think commissioner Saltzman has made an important argument about opportunity to some of these businesses that we don't necessarily endorse as a city, but have created opportunities, particularly for majority entrepreneurs, our newest member of the state legislature is a successful entrepreneur who owns McDonald's franchises. There's another concern I have here and that is, I have a young -- I have a 12-year-old now who seems to be spending a lot of time in Washington county and Clackamas county because they have malls and that is a safe place where kids get sent on the weekends. So, I'm seeing a lot more Clackamas and Washington. And I notice that there's a lot of drive-thrus in those counties and it would be a pre verse outcome if we ended up encouraging people to get in their car and drive to another county to take advantage of something they can't take advantage of closer to their home. I will close by saying, on the question of what kind of economic activity we try to encourage, again, thanks to my daughter and chuck and others, I have a different view about food and about choices. But, as I get older, I'm loathed to impose those on others. When I go to the county fair, I don't break out in hives because people walking around with candy apples and cotton candy and smoking and have above what the weight limit is for our age. Because people get to make those choices. We hope we can encourage them to do healthier things. I'm an example of someone who can be taught to do healthier things. I'm reluctant to mandate. In parks, for example, when I was a commissioner and continuing under commissioner Fritz, we offer healthy choices, but they're not mandates. Those are the kinds of things I've been struggling with this. I have a one-a and a one-b. I hope we can vote first and if there isn't a consensus, take up c.

**Fritz:** Could you just show me option c map, please? I'm looking at barber, going diagonally on the west side and also at sandy on the right side. Those are places which I would prefer to have fewer drive-thrus than there are now, which it looks to me like the Hales amendment [indiscernible].

**Engstrom:** Both are showing the ce zone. The distinction is only the quick vehicle servicing. The green shows with the ce zoning is. Commissioner, there may be further opportunities to perfect that map as we learn about light rail stations.

**Hales:** To put it in a policy term, the approach I'm recommending in option c says we want walkable urbanism everywhere we have zoned for mixed use. And, drive-thrus would be --

would generally not occur there. We want quick vehicle servicing in the ce zone because that's the kind of use that's supposed to happen in the ce zone.

**Engstrom:** The other distinction, I guess, or element of several of these options is the idea of allowing a liberal rebuild allowance and not considering the ones non-conforming. It allows the property owner to upgrade their facility to the latest brand design, which usually means they're going to come closer to meeting our pedestrian standard rather than locking them into the exact footprint they have now.

**Fritz:** Presumably the vertical ones are 82nd and 122nd, it seems like that is zoning for what we want. Trying to change from the very auto oriented properties, I think that was why the Portland action plan was so keen to have slightly less liberal allowances than they have now.

**Engstrom:** All of these have less green than the current zoning map.

**Hales:** The only other comments I would make; this has been a really robust debate. The only comments I would make is I was struck on this discussion, as I have been in a lot of things, about a generational divide. The young, progressive Portlanders saying we don't want to live in an auto-oriented city. We don't want parking. Along generational lines. Secondly, is our commitment to climate action. We should have started 25 years ago, but we're trying to catch up.

**Saltzman:** On behalf of my amendment, you know, I believe there's a lot of different currents running through this issue on drive-thrus, climate action. I'm looking at it from a point of view that these are -- drive-thrus are things our residents want. Every time I see a line in front of a Dutch brother's or taco bell, people want the convenience of drive-thrus. I don't want to impose my set of values here and restrict that option. I think we are restricting it but we should be more tolerant of them. As commissioner Fish eluded to, a lot of these are the first rung for minority entrepreneurs to be successful. It does provide an avenue for successful people. People to be successful as business people and I think these are values that, to me, make me support my amendment. I would move my amendment.

**Hales:** Dan moves motion b. Steve; do you want to comment before we vote?

**Novick:** Yes. I'm persuaded by the mayor's argument. I think option c is correct. I would also note that limiting drive-thrus is a way of honoring Michelle Obama and her healthy campaign.

**Fritz:** No.

**Fish:** I really appreciate this discussion and again, I was being light-hearted. But the mayor has made this is a signature part of our debate and have a much deeper understanding of the competing values here and I think there may be a couple of right answers. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye. **Novick:** No. **Hales:** No.

**Fritz:** I move option c.

**Hales:** Second that. Further discussion? Let's take a vote on option c.

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

**Novick:** This is c?

**Hales:** This is c.

**Novick:** Sorry.

**Hales:** You're at a disadvantage. This is c.

**Novick:** Aye.

**Hales:** Aye. Thank you very much. Okay. Let's move on then to 13.

**Engstrom:** Motion 13 is -- we're now moving into the zoning map amendments, shifting gears out of the code and into the map. This first one goes back to something we touched on earlier. This is the request from pcc Sylvania to change their zoning designation from campus institution 1 to campus institution 2. There is a caveat that the request comes with



a .75 f.a.r. Rather than the normal 3:1 that would come with that denser zone, acknowledge acknowledging that this isn't quite a urban. You did get a letter from pcc saying that they were okay with that caveat. It may help calm concerns from neighbors about the scale of development.

**Fritz:** So, what kind of buildings would we get if they wanted to do a residential with .7?

**Engstrom:** .75 -- both the current .5 that would exist and the .75 would allow a substantial increase in what they have now. Their intent, we believe, is to try to move the new building in the direction of the street in front and toward the light rail line to the north. There is an e zone that wraps around the south and west of the campus, which would restrict some of the growth in that direction. But both zones would allow considerable growth above what's currently allowed by their master plan. The main distinction is that the ci2 zone has a broader use in campus beyond the ones that are strictly part of the college and as your earlier amendment did, it allows a broader allowance for housing and the building orientation and other standards are more like the mixed use zones more like the cm2 zone

**Fritz:** So again I'm getting back to how do we get sidewalks within the campus?

**Engstrom:** Both designations, campus zoning has similar requirements for pedestrian connections as the mixed use does.

**Fritz:** They have internal pedestrian circulation but they don't have any connection between the buildings in the middle and the streets outside. How would that be effected by having the ci2 and the designation and some kind of process to approve it?

**Engstrom:** Oh, I see what you're asking. Yeah, if this was left to a quasi-judicial request, both of these zones are allowed with the campus designation on the camp plan map you've given them. That would be an option to ask them to do this quasi-judicially.

**Hales:** I think I share some of the basis for your concern. This is a huge area. I mean, I have the same reaction. Oh, my god, that's a huge area. So, we're moving from, you know -- in the past, what we did with campuses is we zoned them r5 and had a conditional use master plan. We've come a long way, baby, from that. We're deliberately zoning campuses. Do we get a mixture of housing or just student housing? I like adding other housing in. We've done that. Does it actually fit into the neighborhood and do we have the kind of transportation leverage that we need to get the infrastructure that should be there if it's more than just a campus? And, those details are going to matter in terms whether the innovation of this special zone is going to be in practice.

**Engstrom:** The pedestrian improvements, I think -- I attended the charrette that the college eluded to in their testimony where they did a pretty comprehensive discussion about what the future of Sylvania should look like. A dominant part was the pedestrian environment is terrible on the campus and for people with disabilities. That, I believe, is an emerging theme within their internal master plan discussion. A second angle is as we consider the southwest light rail line, one of the associated projects is a pedestrian improvement that would connect the campus better to the light rail station.

**Fritz:** The barbur transit center is a mile from the campus. There is a sidewalk. I live in north Portland park neighborhood, which is to the east and to the south is the far southwest neighborhood how does the master plan work? If you have a quasi-judicial process, you get to say, you need to have this connection to here and here.

**Engstrom:** We'll still have a quasi-judicial case because we reviewed it as a requirement for both of these zones. The floor area is allowed, it still comes with a land use review to look at transportation impacts, which would give you an opportunity to discuss that element.

**Fritz:** You get to discuss it, but can you actually effect the choices. Unlike university of Portland who has made it a point to attend every cathedral park meeting I don't think there has been that ongoing conversation with pcc Sylvania and far southwest or west Portland park I'm concerned about giving them more intensity without the ability of the neighbors to

point out what might work for them especially because we know we're not getting light rail going to the campus. I think there needs to be more discussion about how does this work.

**Hales:** Staff recommended in favor of this, tell us why we should be reassured.

**Engstrom:** The southwest project offers a big opportunity to effect this and that has been a focus of that discussion, not only the sidewalk connection but how do we improve bus service and shuttle service to the college? The fact that we're still requiring a transportation impact review with substantial expansion, they'll have to do a transportation plan. The criteria have been strengthened and you heard nervousness and testimony from the colleges that we've upped the game and we've reoriented the criteria for multi-modal. It will look at pedestrian and bike and transit access and what are we going to do about that? The other driver in this case is their land base is basically their parking lot. If they want to build new buildings, they're going to have to figure out a way to build structured parking or shift their mode split to other modes, to make that land available because their students are driving at a fairly high rate.

**Fritz:** Actually their not, their parking at the barber transit center and taking the bus or walk? It's really different on days that the campus is not open. With the transportation review, that that would happen in a quasi-judicial setting?

**Engstrom:** Yes.

**Fritz:** And neighbors would have input and there would be a hearings officer deciding whether it's good or not?

**Engstrom:** I have to refer to staff.

**Hales:** Come on up, john.

**Cole:** One of the amendments that'll come before the commission later today is a direction, if you will, from the commission for staff to work with neighborhood associations, the public and the institutions on transportation demand management and what that means. But, currently in our discussions and currently, as it stands in the code, the transportation impact review is a type ii application that's appealable by the neighborhood associates, if they were aggrieved to the hearing's officer.

**Fritz:** Have we had that input from either of the neighborhood associations on this amendment?

**Engstrom:** We had a few letters in opposition from neighbors earlier in the process. We have had testimony from a few neighborhoods, preferring to keep the existing conditional use process and expressing nervousness about the new system.

**Fish:** Should we test this motion? I'll move the motion.

**Hales:** Is there a second? Further discussion? Let's take a vote and see where we are.

**Fritz:** Thank you for the information. No.

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

**Hales:** Aye. Okay. I think we're going to have to make sure that that transportation master plan works.

**Engstrom:** So, moving on to number 14, this is map amendment number three from the amendment -- the November 4<sup>th</sup> amendments memo. This changes one property on Hayden island. Its missing a number in the address there, but it's on the map in front of you.

**Fritz:** 1225, not 1.

**Engstrom:** Yeah. It changes it from cm1 to ce, this was a request from joe angel.

**Hales:** This was a island of ce surrounded by cm1.

**Fritz:** Isn't ce the more intense zone?

**Engstrom:** Ce is more intense and allows a broader range of auto-accommodated uses. Cm1 is a neighborhood-oriented commercial zone. I believe the -- currently, this picture shows after the amendment. So, this broader area is an island of cm1 in the ce zoning on jantzen beach.

**Fritz:** So our current plan is to have it cm1 like the rest of that area?

**Engstrom:** Currently, I believe -- Marty can correct me -- I believe it's cn.

**Hales:** It's cn now. There's all that -- across the freeway is the whole -- you know, the whole area that was -- how did we end up zoning that?

**Engstrom:** All that is still ce, although it has a plan district, which has a street requirement that is different and it has some housing, you know, requirements with bonuses.

**Hales:** I'm inclined to accede to this. The prospect of change on hayden island is distant. Where it will happen is in the giant strip mall complex on the west side of i-5.

**Fritz:** What was the reasoning for having the cm surrounded by ce?

**Engstrom:** We took this area, in general, to cm1, because we believed it was the closest analogue to the cm zoning that the neighborhood plan established at that time. The intent time was the area west of the freeway be the more urban area and this area east was a more neighborhood-oriented node.

**Fritz:** That would be a spot zone and have one property in the middle?

**Hales:** Fair enough. That's what the property owner requested. I would be willing to go ce over more of this. The gas station, the fast food restaurants, the motel, the car wash, they're not going anywhere anytime soon. But --

**Engstrom:** You could amend your motion to change the whole pink area on the map to ce, that would be a choice.

**Fritz:** We haven't had any testimony on that, right?

**Engstrom:** No, you just heard from the one property owner.

**Fritz:** We didn't hear from the Hayden island high noon?

**Hales:** Okay. Anybody want to make a motion?

**Novick:** I want to first note that I introduced this amendment after hearing us about it from joe angel. Eric, could you elaborate on that? What kind of discussion was there about this?

**Engstrom:** I think we were just concluding that the cm1 zone is a better representation of the neighborhood plan. That was our -- after some discussion internally with staff.

**Hales:** Mr. Angel's here. So, we only got testimony from one person about this whole area? One property?

**Engstrom:** A lot of testimony about the trails nearby, but not the zoning.

**Fritz:** I thought we had the comprehensive plan map process before and now this is another coming back at it.

**Hales:** Okay. So, yeah, I mean, seeing this map, frankly, this would be kind of an absurd result even though I thought it was a reasonable request. I'm not sure if I can support this amendment.

**Fish:** Do you want to move forward with this?

**Novick:** I'd be fine with moving forward with it. I move the amendment.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Hales:** Let's take a vote, as stated.

**Fritz:** Obviously, this has been a good discussion, we need to encourage things to change. I do think we should stay true to the process and not go back on it just because somebody asked. Aye. I mean, no.

**Fish:** No. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Novick:** Aye.

**Hales:** No. I can't justify this, not when I see the map. No. Okay. Let's go to 15.

**Engstrom:** 15 is a similar request from cm1 to ce, this is 6454 north greeley. The testimony here was concerned about the existing use of the property as it relates to ce versus cm1 zone.

**Hales:** So, I'm trying to track this here.

**Engstrom:** There are other ce and cm1 in the corner.

**Hales:** It's just the red circled parcel?

**Engstrom:** Yes. I believe in this case, the concern -- the argument against was coming kind of from a neighborhood perspective that there had been some neighborhood discussion and the preference was to move this to a less auto-oriented format. We do acknowledge the ce is probably closer to the use allowances of what's there now on that property.

**Hales:** So, the amendment as -- the effect of the amendment would be to create the pattern that you've just mapped?

**Engstrom:** Correct.

**Hales:** Opposite, diagonal of ce and cm1 on the four corners?

**Engstrom:** Right.

**Stockton:** Just to clarify the uses of this intersection, on the northwest corner, there's a gas station. On the northeast corner, that is a convenient store. The subject property in question has some sort of auto-oriented nature to it and then on the southwest corner, it's a medical office.

**Fritz:** I've done a lot of sign waving on this corner. It's really good for evening rush-hour. It would be good to have it the node of commercial neighborhood, because of the gas station.

**Fish:** I move the motion.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Fritz:** No. **Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Hales:** No.

**Engstrom:** 16 includes map amendment nine, it's been modified slightly based on test many that happened on the 17th. This is northeast Fremont, the original amendment changed it from cm1 to 2. The further modification is to extend that to 50th so the whole stretch between 46th and 50th would be changed from cm2 to cm1. The original logic -- this is -- the other property owner was commenting on the initial request. The logic of drawing it at 48th was that that's where the cs zone shifts to cn. But you did get compelling testimony. So, that's the change.

**Saltzman:** I move the amendment.

**Fritz:** Second.

**Hales:** Roll call.

**Fritz:** Aye.

**Fish:** First jimmy maks now stanich's we're losing our cultural heritage. Aye.

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

**Hales:** They didn't say they were going to close. Aye.

**Engstrom:** Number 17 is map amendment 11 from the November 4 memo. It concerns properties on the west side of Chavez between division and Sherman and this is a change from r1 to cm2 with a d overlay added. You got testimony in favor from some elements within the Richmond neighborhood and in opposition from some neighbors and other folks.

**Stockton:** There's no opposition on this amendments, but strong support from five members of the Richmond board.

**Fish:** Eric has been talking non-stop for an hour. [laughter] I think that was the first mistake.

**Hales:** Maybe in six months. What's the net effect of what you could now do with this change? I know this corner pretty well.

**Stockton:** In this case, there are five properties. The planning and sustainability commission recommendation is for this to go to r1. So, if you have a 5,000-square-foot lot, you're looking at five to seven units per property. With it going to cm2, you know, for a 5,000-square-foot lot, about a 19-unit product. It's a gain in potential housing with this change. It is at a very prominent intersection at Chavez and division we have two major bus lines that intersect at that intersection.

**Fish:** We have a lot of development happening there. This is Chavez, it is -- we're going to --

**Stockton:** I actually walked down Chavez at about 8:00 and was really struck by the lack of pedestrian improvements along that stretch there.

**Fish:** I move the motion.

**Fritz:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion? Roll call, please.

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

**Hales:** Number 18, the Mount Labor sites we've talked about, these are opportunities to try to shape a little neighborhood center where there isn't one now. Aye. Okay. Let's move on, then, to 18.

**Engstrom:** 18 is accommodation of amendments 12 and 13. They both concern a node of zoning at 50th and Hawthorne. Number 12 is to change that -- one property on that node that is kind of at the end of Hawthorne to cm2 and 13 changes the whole node, including the cm1 to add a d overlay. I realize that there may be some preference among at least one or two of you to split this into two votes. I put this together to see where we were.

**Fritz:** I'm not. I think the d overlay is. But we had the discussion in the comp plan process and it's been a step-down to the residential neighborhood. So, there really isn't a step-down if you make this cm2.

**Hales:** Oh, I see. You think it's too intense with the d overlay.

**Engstrom:** There would be remaining cm1 to the east and north. I believe the property in question has cm1 doesn't actually touch the residential property, it's got cm1.

**Fritz:** It's a question of is this a big finale to the going Hawthorne or whether it starts to indicate that we're transitioning to the neighborhood.

**Stockton:** One clarification that's important to make here is that because of the comprehensive plan map amendment that was made at 50th, on Hawthorne, it does transition to mixed use neighborhood and so what that means is, even with the addition of the d overlay and if this property goes to cm2, because of the mixed use neighborhood opportunity, there is no ability to bonus height on that site if it goes to cm2. So, that is a nuance --

**Hales:** Why is that again?

**Stockton:** You have to have the mixed use urban center designation and d overlay to get to the height bonus. They don't have the urban center.

**Hales:** So wouldn't the step-down requirement apply?

**Engstrom:** Not to this site because it doesn't touch the r5 directly.

**Hales:** There's cm1 between it. That's not clear on the map here.

**Engstrom:** The property that has requested to go to 2 is the square that the arrow is pointing to. The pink would remain as cm1 to the east.

**Hales:** Everything to the west is cm2, right?

**Engstrom:** Correct. You're talking about where you want to draw the step-down.

**Fritz:** Is this where the animals club is?

**Stockton:** I don't know about that, but I know that the Sapphire Hotel is in this building.

**Engstrom:** It's a residential building now.

**Stockton:** No, the building in question is a classic -- it's the picture on the upper right. It's a classic, you know, traditional storefront building that -- the Sapphire Hotel is the business I'm familiar with.

**Fritz:** What would be the zoning to have that stay?

**Stockton:** So, currently, the zoning is storefront commercial so a straight translation would be the cm2. That is what the property owners are requesting is they have a straight translation of the cs to the cm2.

**Hales:** Commissioner Fritz moves.

**Saltzman:** Is this a very small design overlay? Do we do that? It's kind of like spot zoning?

**Stockton:** All of Hawthorne has a design overlay with the exception that went to mixed use neighborhoods. We have two deviations to that. We have one here at Hawthorne and the entire neighborhood of sellwood-moreland. That is a deviation from kind of the parameters that staff were working with.

**Saltzman:** So, there is a d overlay on the rest of Hawthorne? Okay.

**Hales:** Let's take a vote, unless there's further questions.

**Parsons:** Who moved and seconded?

**Hales:** Commissioner Fish moved and I seconded.

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

**Hales:** Let's move on to 60th and Belmont, number 19.

**Engstrom:** This is amendment 14 from the November 4th memo, 60th and Belmont.

**Hales:** Not sure which group of students just visited, but thank you. Where are you from?

\*\*\*\*\*: [indiscernible]

**Engstrom:** This is a change from cm1 to cm2, as well.

**Novick:** I introduced this amendment to follow-up with the comp plan. There was a question raised about the impact on the transportation system and pbob said that a few additional units that would be allowed aren't going to have a significant impact.

**Hales:** Commissioner novick moves. Is there a second?

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Hales:** Let's take a vote.

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

**Hales:** This makes good sense, aye. Okay. 20.

**Engstrom:** This is a return up to sylvan. This was the other property that had been debated in that context. This particular one is from r20 to r5, which is the compromise you ended up with when you had the comp plan --

**Fish:** I move the motion.

**Hales:** Any further discussion?

**Fritz:** I think it would be better with a quasi-judicial process so to be consistent. No.

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

**Hales:** Aye. Okay. 21.

**Engstrom:** 21 is amendment 19, from the November 4. This was at roughly 50th and Woodstock, several properties. With the further modification, you received testimony about both the joinery and autos, the properties are between Woodstock and southeast martin, between 48th and 49th and on the west side of 42nd. The modification is to expand the change to add properties to the cm2 zone on those, based on testimony.

**Saltzman:** Move the amendment.

**Fish:** Second.

**Hales:** Roll call.

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

**Hales:** We're preserving long-distance future redevelopment because if northeast would mourn the loss, they would mourn the loss of autos. Aye. 22.

**Engstrom:** 22 is not something that was in any of the memos, but it's something that came up in testimony on the 17th. This was from a property owner at 3844 northeast 82nd requesting a change from r1 to ce. It is abutting other mixed use --

**Stockton:** Specifically, to the north, that's the old Shriners hospital site. There along sandy and 82nd, it is the red roof inn. It is not only south of this property, but it is also to the east so it kind of wraps around an I shape.

**Engstrom:** Staff heard that testimony.

**Hales:** Single-family house on the site now? That's kind of an anomaly at this point.

**Engstrom:** It was a comp plan designation.

**Hales:** Ok is there a motion?

**Fish:** I'll move it.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Hales:** Roll call.

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

**Hales:** Aye. We're ahead of schedule.

**Engstrom:** You want to try and take a few from the afternoon?

**Hales:** We got to leave at 10:45.

**Engstrom:** Number 23. This is -- we're moving into a directive now. This would be -- in this case, a separate ordinance. I invite Denver from pbot to discuss this.

**Igarta:** Hi, again, I'm Denver Igarta, senior transportation planner with the Portland bureau of transportation. This amendment is not part of the transportation system plan recommended draft. However, it does relate to several sections in the transportation system plan. So, specifically, we're working on an ordinance that would advance comp plan policies to improve connectivity in centers in eastern neighborhoods. With this direction, we looked at existing city code. Specifically, thru-street requirements. And looking at the code, we determined that we have sufficient code authorities to make requirements for new connections that meet the spaces standards of in city. The ordinance that we're preparing would adopt a strategy providing further guidance on applying those existing city code, by focusing where the connections are needed most. Essentially, it would be council giving direction to pbot to enforce the requirements per city code and per the code requirement. Specifically, in centers where we in tend most of the growth to be focused. In eastern neighborhoods, where we're asked to create connections. And then along with our spacing standards, the sites that are furthest from parallel streets.

**Engstrom:** So, if you -- the effect of this amendment would be that pbot will file a separate ordinance and it'll be heard on the same day as the comp plan adoption, how to move forward.

**Hales:** I want to speak favor in this. This is a long conversation I've had with pbot and planning bureau. It is really important. You know, you start to get more of a neighborhood connected feel to an area that was -- developed without any regard of people walking around at all. This is good work; I move this item.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion? Let's take a vote, please.

**Parsons:** Who seconded?

**Saltzman:** I did.

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

**Hales:** Aye: Thank you very much.

**Fritz:** On the next few things, I would appreciate it if we could wait until I've had another cup of tea after lunch. If there is one we can take care of now, which is 29.

**Hales:** All right. The other ones, you want to be refueled for. That's only fair.

**Fritz:** Thank you.

**Hales:** Number 29 --

**Engstrom:** Motion 29?

**Hales:** Motion 29?

**Fritz:** Yes.

**Hales:** Are you ready to move that?

**Fritz:** It's making it clear that there's going to be a public process on whether it's 7th or 9th.

**Fish:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion about this? Let's take a vote, please.

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

**Novick:** I will support this. I think that 7th is a better option. Aye.

**Hales:** Aye. Okay.

**Fish:** Commissioner novick, are you going to rejoin us after the break?

**Novick:** I am, indeed.

**Hales:** We should take a break now and we'll return at -- is it noon, when we're coming back?

**Saltzman:** I believe so.

**Hales:** Okay. So, we're going to recess until 12:00, noon.

**At 10:39 a.m. council recessed.**



## 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.

**NOVEMBER 22, 2016 12:00 PM**

**Parsons:** Mayor, we could call the roll real quick.

**Novick:** Here. **Fritz:** Here. **Fish:** Here. **Saltzman:** Here.

**Hales:** Here. So. We have back to our transportation list. We did 23 of 30. Is that right?

**Eric Engstrom, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** You did 23 and 29, I believe.

Next up is 24, which is another one of those multi-part options. This is the pairing of off-street parking and transportation demand management. And the off-street parking has a couple options. The transportation demand management directive is the same in all three except that we've revised the large. To aid you in this discussion you should have two pieces of paper. One that looks like this, that has the, revised directive concerning transportation demand management. And then -- you should have a piece of paper. That says option b four amendments 34 as well. That's supplemental piece of material that was noticed earlier.

**Hales:** Half sheet?

**Engstrom:** Half page. Correct. The three options that we crafted and, of course, you could bundle these motions differently than I did. But there's an a, b, and c choice. And a is to act only on amendment number 51, which is the directive to adopt further tdm work or to direct further tdm work without adopting changes to the off-street parking requirements. Option b removes the minimum off street parking requirements you put in place in 2012 and is amendment 34 and also adopts the tdm directive. Option c which is an approach which is represented by this half sheet which was shown earlier. And that's a version that has been suggested by commissioner Fish. And I can go through these a little bit more detail but before I can that I wanted to show a map. And this map is just a reminder that the current off-street parking requirements waive parking for buildings over 30 units where they are close to frequent transit. And the lines on this map show the frequent transit. There are two different flavors. The yellow what is tri-met considers frequent bus line and the gray is the stuff that isn't tri-met frequent service but does meet our definition or did at least with had we made that map last year. Some of those gray lines could come and out each year depending on the bus cuts or changes. But gives you a geographic idea of what geography we're talking about.

**Saltzman:** It's not just light rail its bus?

**Engstrom:** It's frequent bus and light rail stops. And it's defined at 20-minute peak hour or greater which could be either a.m. Or p.m. Peak. But 20 minutes is the cutoff here.

**Novick:** Clarification. Was it in 2013, not 2012, when we adopted these requirements?

**Engstrom:** It might have been 2013.

**Hales:** I think it was early 2013.

**Engstrom:** So just a reminder that the current code and the psc recommendation essentially was to, there's still limited parking required for buildings over 30 units based on the table that I just put on the screen. Farther from transit, there would be still parking requirements that are higher than that. And then small lots, it was recommended by the psc in the mixed use zones that very small lots not have parking requirements. And this parallels the current code, which gives the, some of the cn zone and cs properties which are usually those small lots. Doesn't require parking there. So the psc recommendation

was essentially status quo on parking but adjusting it to match the new mixed use code framework. They also recommended a few changes, wider allowances for commercial parking, maximum ratios, greater allowance for shared parking and of course the tdm program being applied to buildings with 10 or more units. So option a as I said would keep the existing framework for buildings over 30 units that was worked out in 2013. And in parallel with that direct to further work prior to the effective date of this ordinance. And as you recall this whole package isn't going into effect until January 2018. You would be directing pbot to do more work clarifying the tdm requirement for mixed use and campus zones. You would also be directing us to develop an expanded phase two, which you would consider at that time so it doesn't commit us to that but it asks us to go prepare options for that. And then the last bullet is to acknowledge that you would be directing us to revisit the parking question at that time in light of whatever we come up with that, with those more detailed and revised tdm requirements. And that just reflects the fact we think these two are related issues and that whenever you open one, you should probably look at both. Option b then would remove those requirements, as I said, for the mix use zones. But leave the same tdm directive in place. And then option c is a different version which would remove the parking requirements from residential developments but only if the building is following one of several paths that includes the affordable housing either bonuses or the future mandatory or voluntary inclusionary housing provisions. And zone this relates to the upcoming consideration of that ordinance.

**Hales:** Sure.

**Fish:** May I propose we take the motions up as follows. Motion a first because that effectively is the first test as to whether we are going to go with effectively a status quo or a change. And then depending on the outcome of that vote, go to motion c. Because motion c then has the condition that links, brings the affordable housing piece into the equation. And then depending on the outcome of that, bring motion b in, because that's essentially motion c stripped of the affordable housing component.

**Novick:** I would like to have an up or down vote or motion [inaudible]

**Fritz:** On what? Could you say that again, commissioner?

**Novick:** I would like to keep it the way it is and vote a motion a first and b second, and c third.

**Fish:** The problem with that, Steve, is that motion c is motion b with an amendment. So all I'm suggesting is rather than amend motion b to conform to c, why don't we take up the amendment first and see if that passes and if it doesn't, then motion b is the clean approach. Otherwise what I will do is just make a motion to amend b to conform to c. I think that makes it more --

**Hales:** But hang on. Before we do that, I mean, I think we could unbundle and understand our choices. I agree with you about taking an up or down on a. Because are we ok with the status quo? That will determine that question. And if we aren't ok with the status quo, then what are we going to do?

**Fish:** Right.

**Hales:** Status quo plus tdm. But in terms of the regulatory requirement. Option b is a more sweeping approach to not requiring parking.

**Fish:** Right.

**Hales:** Option b is a sweeping approach to not requiring parking and option c is -- not a compromise in that sense but is a more focused application of the change.

**Fish:** Right. And by the way, and I was going to say more when c came forward, but my sense is that option c will effectively, the impact of option c is that it will work just like option b with the exception being, instead of waiving a current requirement, will be creating a linkage so there's actually a public benefit for each time it's triggered. And my assumption is it will be triggered in each and every instance.

**Hales:** Let's stay in discussion and then we will see what we want to do about motions. So help us out here, staff. And that is, what's the universe of, if we were to pick b versus c, or vice versa, what's the change in the universe of projects that are not required to provide parking?

**Engstrom:** Right. Well, if inclusionary housing programs pass and go into effect, the universe will be very virtually identical in the sense that the only buildings that we require to have parking is those over 30 units. Will also be the only, subject to inclusionary housing every time. So in every case, the, this exception would get triggered as commissioner Fish just said. The universe would be different, however, if inclusionary housing doesn't end up going into effect.

**Fish:** For one of two reasons. The council doesn't adopt it which is highly unlikely or it's challenged in court on some constitutional basis, and the interim, what we have is a voluntary system, not a mandatory system.

**Engstrom:** Right. So under that scenario, the provisions in the commissioner Fish version allude, and point to voluntary bonuses that are built into the mixed use code that you are considering today that would be the default if inclusionary housing doesn't pass. And so that would still allow those projects through using the voluntary bonuses to get a relief on the parking. But projects that didn't do that, an example might be if someone tried to build three, a building just based on the standard code without using the bonuses for affordable housing. They would trigger the parking if they use the bonus, they wouldn't.

**Fish:** Mayor, let me connect the dots. When I was briefed on this, what staff told me was that if we take off the minimum parking requirements, in some of the target development, that's likely to occur, it has a substantial value to the developer. And we are talking about hundreds and hundreds. Thousands of dollars of savings. And in the current market that we're in, there is no guarantee that being relieved of that obligation there's going to be any pressure downward on rent. We are in a unique market right now where it is at least conceivable that relieved of one regulatory obligation, what we have done is we have made the pro forma more generous for the developer because there's a competition for scarce units. And people are willing to pay a premium. Now, enter stage left or stage right, however you want to look at it, we are going to have a debate about inclusionary housing. And I am not well versed in all the details. But we will be, Dan will be proposing a bunch of benefits that will be offering people to buy down to close to 60% or below of mfi. And my understanding is that the tool kit will include things like far, systems development charges, a whole range of things which will, with the exception of far will come out of someone's pocket. They will cost us something if we do a tax abatement, Deborah kafoury has to agree to it and it comes out of the county budget. If it's a system development charge, we're robbing peter to pay Paul and on and on. What my amendment is trying to get at is, that by relieving, someone of this obligation to have the park, which may be good for the environment, may be good for smart planning's, may have all these independent reasons why you want to do it, it also has a significant economic impact on the developer. And since we are about to debate a set of tools which we will propose to essentially buy down the rents in the affordability component of mandatory inclusionary housing, it seems like this is a unique opportunity to take two things. A desire to change our parking rules and leverage off the windfall that goes to a developer and merge them so that this becomes one of the things that we can fight to as buying down the affordability. What I have heard from joe zehnder in my last briefing is that this does -- this approach is not, you know, ideal for code writing on this. It doesn't quite fit. We're probably doing something in French where English is preferred. But notwithstanding that caveat, joe doesn't think it's a dumb idea. He's just not sure that this is the right process to achieve the goal. Here's my ultimate concern, Charlie. Every time we've talked about how to seize an opportunity to leverage affordable housing of late, and I will cite to the example on transit corridors, where we said,

hey, maybe we could down zone and give people bonuses as a way of getting affordability. We have been told there is some reason why we can't do that. Here we are completely clean. But if we are and it results in a substantial savings to a developer, why not now, if this is the council will, why not now link that to iz so this becomes something on the menu of options which buys down the affordability component recognizing in almost every instance that is what will happen.

**Novick:** Commissioner, may I respond to that?

**Hales:** Sure, go ahead, Steve.

**Novick:** If we eliminate minimums, the overall cost of development will go down. So fewer incentives will be necessary to make inclusionary policies necessary. Maintaining this is a way of driving up the overall cost of housing. The white house weighed in on this recently in a statement on a variety of zoning site rules that prevent development of housing and they limit off-street parking requirements as one of the local "rules inhibiting housing development, reducing options for working families and causing housing cost to grow much faster than wages and salaries." parking mince raise the cost of house, if for whatever reason we don't adopt -- then we will still have this provision that drives up the cost of housing across the spectrum. And I think that the idea that we should preserve a policy that increases the cost of housing as part of a strategy to raise more affordable housing is as convoluted as it sounds.

**Hales:** I understand that. I guess I want to respond as well. I like, I think I like the approach that you are taking, commissioner Fish, in that I'm operating on an assumption we are going to move forward on inclusionary housing. No surprise there. I am also operating under an assumption this parking incentive assuming it's provided or, sorry, the benefit of not providing parking, financial benefit of providing park, will it will not in and itself be sufficient to offset the market effects of our inclusionary housing requirement. We might have to give other incentives in addition to that.

**Fish:** Less of something else.

**Hales:** Some additional weights in the balance in order for it to tip towards feasibility. I don't know exactly how much more but I am assuming this won't be enough all by itself I also am intrigued by the possibility, maybe it's a vain hope, doing it the way you suggested will give everyone an incentive to make sure inclusionary housing policy works rather than having people want to argue about it.

**Fish:** Mayor, I appreciate both comments. But I will use maybe this is a feeble analogy. But we all just got dealt a hand in a game of poker and there's an ace in our hands. I am not going to trade that in for another card right now. We are creating value. And I don't disagree with what Steve said about the economics which is why I think the likely outcome will be this plus something else will get us to what we want which is a certain kind of development with the affordability. If it's mandatory iz, our subsidies by state law can be a lighter touch. If it's discretionary it's going to have to be more market based. That's the key distinction. But the legislature gave us some discretion. I would hate to say this tool out of our kit.

**Hales:** Right.

**Fish:** By the way, if at some point there's a complication in the future about the future of iz or something else, I would argue let's come back and revisit this but not take this tool off the table now. That's all.

**Hales:** Yeah.

**Fish:** I think it's a unique moment to seize this opportunity.

**Hales:** Other comments?

**Novick:** Commissioner, what we will have to do to affect the iz program?

**Hales:** Say that again, please.

**Novick:** What we are going to have to do to have an effective iz program is to have a rule and a package of incentives that make this economically feasible to create housing that includes affordable housing at the lower end. If you take the cost of parking off the top at beginning, you get as much closer to making the affordable housing economically viable as you do if you take it off somewhere down the line. The economic impact is the same no matter where you do it. The risk that you take if you tie, if you adopt commissioner Fish's amendment is, we wind up with only a voluntary program. And there's people who don't choose to follow voluntary programs and they don't have housing affordable below 80% or 60% mfi, but the housing they do build is more expensive. It's that much more expensive for people less 90% and 100% and 110 percent mfi. I think we need to be worried about those people as well there's nothing lost by taking the requirement off the top rather saving it as a carrot.

**Fish:** Mayor, the only comment I would have to that is I think it will be easier to operate off my proposal and make the fine-tuning later than to bring it back in. And if we're wrong about either the forecast about iz or how the market works, we can fine-tune this. By the way, we are talking about changes that are going to be in the future here. I just think I think we get the strong we had hinds -- head winds at our back and not our face and if we are wrong we will fine-tune it. Why miss this opportunity to acknowledge there's a benefit to the developer? And in this market, you can do any forecast you want. There's still no guarantee of affordable rents. We may be relieving someone of some obligation and just increasing their profit. The impact on iz is hard to anticipate because it's not even before us and we haven't adopted. I'm saying don't miss this opportunity to bake it in. If I am wrong, if our thinking is wrong, we can revisit it.

**Hales:** Commissioner Fritz's thoughts?

**Fritz:** Thank you, mayor.

**Hales:** Steve, I think we are going to give Amanda a chance here.

**Fritz:** Thank you. I agree with you, commissioner, we don't want to give away our ace and we haven't had any discussion with the public at all on inclusionary housing yet. That's still to come. So my recommendation is to go to option A which is do not give away the parking minimums until we have discussed inclusionary housing, what incentives we can or should do, what the rules for that is. I have not seen any evidence that says that comparable apartments with or without parking are less expensive. And certainly with my son and daughter-in-law were shopping, there didn't seem to be any discernible difference whether a unit came with a parking spot or not. As you said in this market developers are charging whatever they can get and so are landlords.

**Fish:** Commissioner Fritz, may I --

**Fritz:** Let me finish.

**Fish:** I want to assist you. As the only renter on the council, the way landlords are doing parking, they are charging everyone the same rate and charging a extra cost. In my building which has about 400 units, if you want parking, it is the market rent plus a parking space. And that is at your option. To support your point.

**Fritz:** Well --

**Novick:** But they're not able to rent all of the spaces. And I think you probably know that. So the cost of all the other units cover that, I'm sure.

**Hales:** Commissioner Fritz.

**Fritz:** Thank you, mayor. Rather than guessing and using our own intelligence, about what might not happen, I think we should do again, look at the whole issue. Have a different discussion on inclusionary zone and have this as one of the options as what we can give developers on affordable housing, we need to have a separate discussion on parking alone. I thought it was more in 2011 that we went through all of the challenges on division. There were literally hundreds of people involved in it. And I think that most people are not

aware that we could be getting rid of parking minimums in this comprehensive plan process. Especially when the hearings have been on the afternoons of workdays. So I know that more people would like to discuss this it's a particularly good way of looking at this with an equity lens. Is that fair? Which workers are going to suffer because there may not be parking for them. And often it would be the shift workers who tend to be more women. I would just like to draw to your attention I kept a tally during the hearing that we had on this. As to how many men and women supported removing the parking or keeping the parking. So removing parking was 13 males and four females. Much of them quite young and looking like it would be an option for them. Keeping the parking was six women and one older gentleman. So I don't know that -- I wonder if any of you have had to think about parking under the street lights and then walking back to your door with your car keys between your fingers in case you would get attacked. Because that is kind of a normal thing for women to have to think about is how safe is it from getting from the bus stop to my home? It's a very intricate discussion that we could be having and we should be having it in a holistic way so that we do make sure we are going to make decisions in a, in the right order. So to me that would be 51, which has the transportation demand management. And then inclusionary housing. Then a discussion on parking alone and looking at the equity issues and coming back to these issues. I would really appreciate if we would go with not doing 31 right now and doing 51 and then we are leaving all of those options open rather than closing doors.

**Hales:** We got a lot of testimony on this issue. I mean, I disagree with the characterization we haven't ventilated this. I think we got a lot of testimony about whether or not we could keep the minimum parking requirements or not. I believe it was early 2013 because I voted for it and I think it was a mistake. I think the threshold question of are we going to stick with required minimum parking or not is a legitimate threshold question and we can answer that by voting on a. And then what is what arises with b and c. One says go ahead and do it now across the board and count the benefits, frankly commissioner novick, I am hoping that it would be, that our beneficence would be required by those still asking for more in exchange for inclusionary housing. I am not sure our beneficence will be remembered even a week or two later.

**Fritz:** It would be taken as a given.

**Hales:** that's why I am inclined to go with option c if we are going to make a change, then to hope that our -- what we have already put on the ledger to make it feasible to meet our inclusionary housing requirement would be given full consideration prior to what you get in exchange.

**Fish:** May I ask the housing commissioner a question? I think for me the final piece of just, this discussion, Dan, you have been doing some modeling in support of your inclusionary housing work. And you will be coming to given with some recommendations.

**Saltzman:** Right.

**Fish:** I assume that your modeling was based on the existing parking requirements. In other words, whatever the costs were and the impact of iz you were assuming developers were otherwise required to meet the existing code for parking mince.

**Saltzman:** I believe that's correct.

**Fish:** So mayor --

**Hales:** Let's take up amendment a first and see how we stand on that and then move on to the other two ok. A motion, please. For option a.

**Fritz:** So moved.

**Fish:** I am going to second for purposes of our debate.

**Hales:** Let's take a vote on that, please, unless there's any further questions or discussion. Ok.

**Fritz:** Yes.

**Saltzman:** No.

**Novick:** This is a or b?

**Hales:** This is a.

**Saltzman:** No.

**Hales:** Steve?

**Fish:** A lot of barking there, steve.

**Novick:** Oh, sorry. All right. I am going to second what the mayor said about making a mistake in 2013. I am proud of the work I have done on this council but I am not all proud of 2013 proposal to add parking mince in frequent transit areas. Only commissioner Saltzman did the right thing at that time. This is what should be two of our goals, fighting climate destruction. I know earlier what the wows had to say recently about the effect of park, minimums on the cost of housing. But parking mince are also a way to continuing to build society -- if we were to prevent climate destruction we need to get people out of their cars. People are most likely to change their transportation habits when they move. Somebody moves into a new home without onsite parking, is obviously more likely to disband their car and rely on walking, bicycling and transit. Plus, take the occasional cab rides than someone who moves into a new home with onsite parking. Again, the white house weighed in on "when transit oriented development, intended to help reduce automobile dependent parking requirements and undermine that goal by inducing residents to drive counteracting goals to increase public use of transit, walking and biking. In two weeks we will vote on two major fossil fuel terminals in Portland. When it comes to fighting climate destruction, parking minimums are more important. Fossil fuels are like narcotics. We are not going to interrupt the problem. As long as the demand is there supply will find demand. Eliminating parking minimums is an important step to reducing demands. If we prevent new fossil fuel terms new Orleans to eliminate parking minimums, we could fairly be charged with climate -- I recognize to eliminate parking mince we need to give our neighborhoods robust tools to manage parking demands through permits systems and I am working with pbot to see if we can bring the tool kit to council before the end of the year. We have a first reading scheduled on December 15th. Even if that's not feasible I am confident the bureau will be able to bring the tool kit later in the spring I vote no.

**Hales:** And as I said earlier, I do believe it was a close call then and it's a close call now but I think it was a mistake on my part to support these minimums. Although we did it for understandable reasons. I have been trying in my service on this council both in the past and now to try to preserve neighborhood livability, issues like historic preservation, accommodate a huge amount of growth and move us towards a carbon free future, all this thing do not rectify easily but I have again on this issue been particularly struck by the demographic distinction about the many young Portlanders or young Portlanders who argued for a parking-less future. And I think that's where we need to go on this. We are going to have, there will be traffic. There will be congestion. There is now and there will be more. But we are not going to be able to accommodate 200,000 more cars for 200,000 more people in this city. Finally, on a personal vote living on a block that's now a favorite park and ride I like it better because traffic moves slower now that it's more crowded. Aye. No. Sorry.

**Fritz:** I would like to move option c if you would consider it, commissioner Fish, I am comfortable adding your specific code language because I think we could have a public hearing on this. I think actually the option c as modified on this paper will get us all to where we need to be. It says we are going to direct pbem to come back with further chase including recommendations to increase or decrease the minimum or maximum number of offed off-street parking but it does it in that kind of logical sequencing including a consideration of iz, inclusionary zoning that I was hoping for. I am moving c bull without

your additional language because I think we could get there but I think we could get there later.

**Hales:** Option c as stated in the materials from the bureau is a provision that either voluntary or mandatory inclusionary housing requirements are the trigger for the lifting of a requirement for off-street parking. Are you saying that stays?

**Fish:** That is the amendment. That's the guts of it.

**Hales:** That's the guts of it, right. This additional language.

**Engstrom:** That was intended to be referring to the additional language.

**Fritz:** Commissioner Fish's? This one?

**Fish:** Yeah.

**Fritz:** From the city attorney, don't we have to take testimony on code changes?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Well, at this point you have heard testimony and you are having amendments proposed in response to that testimony. So you can do that. You are not required to take testimony on all amendments.

**Fritz:** Ok. I mean, we heard from 24 people. That doesn't seem a lot given the far reaching nature of it.

**Fish:** Just so we are clear, there was a lot of testimony about the need to leverage affordable. And I have just come up with a tool. Not a perfect tool but a tool to make sure that the benefit we are conferring results in a public benefit by linking it to iz, which again from staff's interpretation of this, will mean virtually every case this is exercised but this becomes one of the tools as the mayor said, there may still be some additional consideration we have to offer to get what we're looking for. But it puts it in play. That's the gist of what I am proposing.

**Fritz:** And I can support that. So I second that.

**Fish:** Thank you.

**Hales:** So option c is moved and seconded. Further discussion before we take a vote on that? Ok. Vote, please.

**Engstrom:** Just want to be clear that option c does include this language as we wrote it.

**Fritz:** It includes both, right.

**Engstrom:** The red underlined and commissioner Fish's half page.

**Fritz:** As I read it commissioner Fish's, affordable housing when its near transit.

**Fish:** Also includes all the errata.

**Fritz:** Thank you, commissioner Fish. I appreciate that.

**Fritz:** Aye.

**Fish:** I want to thank Jamie dumphy in my office for working on short notice to craft this. I want to thank the staff at the planning bureau for being superb partners which generally means when the door is closed and I am with senior folks they push back on a lot of what we're thinking to make sure that we're doing it in a thoughtful, coherent way. And if this approach falls short, colleague, then I would propose we revisit it in the future. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Well, as my colleagues know, the inclusionary housing legislation that passed in Salem requires that local governments provide some sort of an offset to the development of, for affordable housing under the law. And as we move into considering and debating this in the next few weeks, I'm very, I think it's very important that we hold on to this powerful incentive we do have to get developers to take advantage of the inclusionary zonings, whether it's 60% of median income or required 80% of median income. But as the modeling and everything shows, being able to waive onsite parking is a powerful, powerful tool. And we need to keep it for the use for inclusionary housing. That's why I'm supporting this amendment and I thank commissioner Fish for putting the words on the paper. Aye.

**Hales:** Steve, did you hear that?



**Novick:** No. I didn't that. I haven't been hearing the call. I recommend if we are going to have a rational requirement that we can then waive to encourage affordable housing we should also adopt a requirement that everybody get a pony when they get a new house and we can waive that for affordable housing. No.

**Hales:** We have heard from a lot of people in this comprehensive plan process. Neighborhoods, individual citizens, and even organizations. And the fact that we could have organizations like Oregon walks or a new one, Portlanders for parking reform, mean that we live in a city where people actually think about this tough ask that's a good thing and I appreciate their help. Aye. Ok. Let's move forward.

**Engstrom:** Motion 25 is amendments to the proposed street vacation code. This amendment has been further modified through a memo from commissioner Fritz dated November 15th. And I believe you have the final language on that, commissioner?

**Hales:** Are you comfortable with that, commissioner Fritz?

**Fritz:** I think there's just one, a couple of amendments suggested by Catherine Beaumont. Has everybody found the -- the changes that commissioner Novick and I worked out?

**Hales:** I'm looking for it. A.

**Fritz:** This is approval criteria. And the one further amendment is to -- delete the needed in the future. Is that right?

**Hales:** You had talked about that.

**Fritz:** It would now read, I don't understand this, Catherine. Could you explain it to us?

**Novick:** You're fading, commissioner.

**Hales:** Hang on, commissioner. We are looking for copies in order to be able to discuss this. I don't see that deletion of "needed in the future." we've talked about that.

**Fritz:** I think we need that in there.

**Hales:** Not needed in the future.

**Fritz:** Not needed in the future. That's what you do in street vacations. You think about it. What is it you wanted to change, Catherine? Or Claire from my office? Are they able to come in and give us copies of something?

**Hales:** Good idea. We will move on to another one and come back to this when we are better equipped. So let's.

**Fritz:** Sorry. I wasn't aware I was supposed to bring copies.

**Hales:** You and me both. Let's move to 26. You want to go to 26?

**Engstrom:** So 26 is amendment number 41. This replaces a portion. South waterfront street plan and related narrative in the tsp with revised text to accommodate recommended changes in the vicinity of the south portal. You heard a discussion of this on November 16th. And I believe it's coming back to you on Monday for a resolution.

**Hales:** Right.

**Engstrom:** This amendment essentially directs you to provide that that resolution pass, it directs us to make the parallel amendment to this package. There would be no sense in amending the current tsp and not also amend the new one that would be into effect in 2018.

**Fish:** This is anticipating what Andrew Aebi is bringing to council next week?

**Engstrom:** Correct. Today the way you would word it is, if that resolution passes, next week, that we are directed to incorporate the same version in this package.

**Hales:** Ok.

**Fritz:** Do we have to have the date on it? Supposing it doesn't get done by December 14th?

**Engstrom:** The only reason it has to be done before December 14th because that's when we are coming back for final action on this. We would need to know whether it's in or out by then.

**Fritz:** Ok. I was expecting to have more discussion on that with somebody's staff in the interim.

**Engstrom:** You can take that out but as practical matter we would still need it.

**Fritz:** I wanted to let you know I would like --

**Hales:** We are going to have that discussion. But this is, this will be moot if we don't do anything. But assuming we proceed, it will then go into effect.

**Fish:** I move the motion.

**Fritz:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion? Let's take a vote, please, then on 26.

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

**Engstrom:** 27 is a housekeeping measure. If you recall at end of the comp plan discussion, we inserted some policy related to transportation planning performance measures into the transportation chapter of the comp plan. And we said at the time that it was kind clumsy sitting in the policy document but now that we have the tsp document, portions with this package, we would like to move those to become objectives in the tsp rather than sit at the highest level in the policy document. Effectively there's still in effect. We are just moving them to the place where they are with their friends so to speak in terms of other policies that are similar.

**Hales:** Ok. All right. Any questions about this? Is there a motion to approve it then?

**Fritz:** So moved.

**Fish:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion? Let's vote then.

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

**Hales:** Ok. And then we have 28a and b.

**Engstrom:** This is Hayden island bike classifications. This is one you got a number of testimony about. Motion a was to remove the city bike way classification just from Hayden bay which is I believe circled on the screen. Motion b is an additional change that would also remove the bike segment that passes to the west through the manufactured home park on the north shore of the island. You got system on both of these elements. And this second motion b was not part of the original amendment. But you have got a lot of testimony supporting that. And Denver Igarta is here from pbot's perspective.

**Denver Igarta, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** There was a significant amount of testimony. I wanted to say a few words about background and clarification. Since 2009, the Hayden island plan was adopted then. There's been a bicycle classification in place along the river as shown on the screen. On the waterfront with exception of the Hayden bay marina. There was no bicycle classification there. The amendment, the original amendment would be no change to what's been in place since 2009. In April, the planning and sustainability commission reconfirmed their desire to have bicycling access along the river and voted to add in the Hayden bay marina alignment as shown here with the circle. Extending bicycle access to the east. We did receive a lot of testimony from residents of the manufactured home park, particularly concern about being displaced and removal of the existing houses there should the path be built. Classification, this is the bicycle classification. So the classification alone establishes the policy basis to accommodate bicycles if a path is built and the design of that path. And to consider easement and property dedication when the property voluntary lie undergoes a major redevelopment. Based on the classification alone, the city would not initiate a path improvement, and prior to redevelopment and therefore there would not be removal of existing homes. A project would have to be in place within the tsp major projects list or the Portland bicycle plan project list for pbot to make that type of investment and building a path. And that does not exist in either the Portland bicycle plan or the tsp as a project. So it's not on either list. Staff was recommending to stay consistent with the adopted Hayden island plan that was

adopted in 2009 which is shown on the screen. The question is, with testimony that we've heard from the manufacturing park, the motion b, the motion, the second motion was presented as an alternative.

**Hales:** Yeah. So I appreciate the policy basis. But I plan to support both of these amendments. You know, if we need any reassurance that this is the right thing to do to take these off, remember why we just had to do on a, albeit on a grander scale why we needed to move forward with better naito. We don't have room for a wide public way along this bay front and along the waterfront where the mobile home park now exists unless it was completely redeveloped. To have both people walking along the riverfront and bicycles going by we would have conflicts on the narrow paved surface that's there. So I think there's no upside to trying to mix pedestrians and bikes in this environment. There's a good bike way on tomahawk island drive. There could be good bike access in the redeveloped strip malls west of the highway when that someday happens. But there's no need to either scare people in the short run or even hold out the prospect that there's ever like leak to be a bike way on that water way. I don't think that's going to happen no matter what we say. I don't believe there's any upside and a lot of short side by scare, people. I believe we ought to pass both of these and take it off.

**Fritz:** I do, too. The manufactured home is already walkable and bikeable. Just not in people's backyards by the river.

**Hales:** It's a different environment out there than tip a I will move option a. Motion a.

**Fritz:** She we do this them together?

**Hales:** Take them both together. I will move them.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion? Roll call.

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

**Hales:** Ok. Thank you.

You had already done 29.

**Hales:** We have 30 and we can go back maybe to 25. You want to go back then? Let's go back then to 25 was it? Yes, 25.

**Hales:** 25. Magic of the print button.

**Fritz:** As this is being passed out, colleagues, you remember we had to have extensive discussion in the comprehensive plan policy about what things should be considered in street vacations. This is merely checking back on that and making shush it's all listed.

**Hales:** Yes. Steve, would say the area proposed to be vacated is not needed presently and not identified in any adopted plan for public services, transportation function, utility function, view corridors and/or viewpoints, tree planting, pedestrian amenities or community or commercial uses. In other words, if there's a plan to use this right of way for one of those purposes, hang on to it.

**Fritz:** I actually did not realize the changes that is being requested because unfortunately we are moving away from adopting community plans. So --

**Hales:** Any adopted plan. It doesn't have to be a community plan.

**Fritz:** Comprehensive plan?

**Hales:** Yeah. Well, or these neighborhood, these district connectivity plans that they're working on now. Right?

**Courtney Duke, Portland Bureau of Transportation:** Maybe. Courtney Duke, transportation. I think originally this conversation about adopted plan had come from the tree plan. Is one of the things at least when we were looking at it as staff had looked at it. And then we look understanding at in the past when we done it as part of the comprehensive plan we have looked at existing neighborhood plans. The existing plans from the '80s and '90s we have gone back to look at and an example being in the west Moreland plan there were some connections identified to the river that were not

necessarily bike or ped path identified later that we looked at in one of our street vacations. So I believe that that's why we had, that we kept that in there because we still look at old plans to just see if there's something that might be needed. We wanted to be able to give direction to, I know commissioner Fritz is interested in the future staff. As to what they should look at. And I know I wanted to make sure staff looked at any adopted plans in the area and I agree with mayor Hales, it could be connectivity plan, an existing neighborhood plan, it could be the master street plan. And again it's identified. I mean there's still criteria. There's still things that even if it's there you still make a finding that it's not relevant anymore or something else has overridden it. I think the concern that as staff had was the questions about some of the tree plans and the tree plantings. And what that would mean for vacating a street. That if there was an identified tree or those are new, newer plans that we haven't used in a vacation before, but I think that we are comfortable with moving forward with this. And if we start coming up with problems or issues related to that, we can revisit it. Or that will be a part of our work as a part of team.

**Fritz:** Thank you for walking us through that. I passed out the whole approval criteria. So we have got other places where it says doesn't impede the future use of development or access use. I am moving all the amendments as written here.

**Fish:** Can I just ask one question about drafting. In sub-a it says, the proposed language now is the council will consider the following factors as relevant." and it replaces the approval criteria are as follows. What does the word "relevant" as opposed to just saying "the council will consider the following factors"?

**Fritz:** That was Kathryn Beaumont's suggestion?

**Kathryn Beaumont, City Attorney's Office:** I had suggested the "as relevant" because not every one of the listed things may be relevant to the particular street vacation. So say you would consider --

**Fish:** I see what you mean. I didn't read it that way. So as relevant is conditional, not superfluous. I read it as we are going to consider these factors because they are relevant. I was thinking why do I need to be told they are relevant if we are going to consider them? You are staying as relevant.

**Fritz:** I will put a comma.

**Fish:** A comma.

**Fritz:** A Cambridge comma.

**Fish:** After "factors." that's the missing piece for me.

**Hales:** The Cambridge comma is added as a friendly amendment.

**Fritz:** I do want to thank Courtney and Catherine for all their work on this and Clair Adamsick in my office.

**Hales:** Commissioner Fritz moved that. Will someone second that?

**Novick:** Second.

**Hales:** Let's proceed unless there are any questions about the language as included in the november 15th memorandum with the oxford/Cambridge comma. Roll call, please.

**Fritz:** Thank you, to commissioner Novick and Kate Shriver in his office and all the people who worked on this. As you have known from the beginning this was one of my most important pieces and I am very happy we got it here. Thank you. Aye.

**Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

**Novick:** I really appreciate the work with commissioner Fritz and Claire and the work of Erica and Katie on my staff and the work of bureau staff. Thank you. Aye.

**Hales:** Yes. Thank you for sweating those details. They will matter. Just can't quite see where yet but they will. Aye. Ok. Do we have anything left?

**Engstrom:** There's two others left. 30 and 31.

**Hales:** There we go.

**Engstrom:** 30 is a motion to adopt amendment 52. And this concerns, this is a direction for bps to take a look at, over the next year, the purpose and the scope of the f-overlay along skyline. I believe there's a slide. If you wouldn't mind. There's an area along skyline near forest park that has the future urban overlay. There was originally put in place to require 20-acre minimum lot sizes in this area. This is an area of the city that's outside the urban growth boundary which is a little unusual but it predates the ugb. We had already annexed it but upon creations of the ugb we were required to treat it as rural land. And it is still going to be rural land. But the now that metro is close to resolving its urban and rural reserves question, once that is resolved, there is the opportunity for us to consider whether 20 acres of or two acres is the appropriate rural designation in that area. And the property owner has requested that we take a look at that question. It is something that probably should be looked at. We don't know which way we would go on that. But it would probably involve looking at transportation and storm water considerations and whether that 20-acre lot size is helpful to those other issues. We don't object to looking at it.

**Hales:** Ok. Any further questions about this one? There is a motion to adopt it?

**Fritz:** So moved.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Hales:** Further discussion? Roll call, please.

**Fritz:** Always a good thing when we study things more. Aye. Or mostly. Aye.

**Fish:** Aye.

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

**Hales:** Aye. Ok. And 31.

**Engstrom:** This is, this last one is kind of a cleanup. And this is a catch y'all that includes a number of properties that fall into the category of, you made a decision in the spring with the comp plan map and testimony came up that caused you to maybe question the, some of the comp plan designations there. You can't amend the comp plan with this implementation and zoning ordinance without reopening that, which we advised against. But a way to move forward would be to make this list and direct us to come back as open a post acknowledgment amendment upon once the new comp plan is in effect. And relook at some of these properties and either reaffirm the decision or go in a different direction. There was responsive to testimony. We added a couple properties based on the most recent hearing that came out of the testimony from Allison Reynolds, I believe.

**Hales:** Ok. What is 31, 38, w.i.n.?

**Engstrom:** It's a vacant site. So it's a parcel within 3138 n. Vancouver.

**Hales:** O. Within.

**Engstrom:** The acronym.

**Hales:** I didn't know that part of Portland.

**Engstrom:** What happens when we cut and paste from Portland maps. Ok.

**Hales:** Is there a motion to approve?

**Fritz:** So moved.

**Fish:** I will second that.

**Hales:** Any other discussion of this cleanup grass catcher motion?

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

**Hales:** Aye. Ok. Next steps.

**Engstrom:** So given that we've finished the discussion of any amendments, I guess the next step that we had contemplated was, you would direct us to go back and prepare findings and prepare an updated ordinance that incorporates these amendments that you have made. We have, on the calendar, I think a session on December 14th at 2:00 p.m. That you would essentially be continuing this item to so we can bring those back to you. And then you would, that would be the motion to pass to second reading. And we have another session on the 21st to take that final second reading.

**Hales:** Ok. So directed. And --

**Fish:** One question, mayor. What do we have on the calendar for the afternoon of December 7th? Joe, this came up yesterday. Is that residential infill?

**Parsons:** It is.

**Hales:** That's what it is, yeah.

**Fish:** Colleagues, I may have a conflict that afternoon. And I have raised that before. And it somehow got scheduled on that day. Would you have any objection to moving that a day or to another time? Off of that afternoon?

**Hales:** I don't have any objection as long as we have a slot where we can put it.

**Fish:** How much time was set aside for that.

**Parsons:** For residential infill it was 90 minutes.

**Fish:** There is an alternative that week? Like Thursday?

**Parsons:** No. That's your fossil fuel vote for just a few minutes but then inclusionary housing.

**Fish:** And then the next week?

**Parsons:** Then the next week, is full.

**Fish:** Ok. Well -- we'll stick with it for now.

**Hales:** Then we can return to that, we have time to adjust if we have to.

**Fish:** Thank you.

**Fritz:** Obviously today is a Tuesday. Right? So we have got, this session extra. It seems to me with the amount of stuff that we have got left that we want to finish up before the end of the year that we might need to schedule either some Tuesdays or some evenings or both. To get through it.

**Fish:** I would appreciate if whatever could do to get out of that on the afternoon of the 7th.

**Hales:** Obviously getting all this done helps. Good work, everyone. Thank you very much. We will plan on that schedule as you just articulated, Eric and with findings to come back on the 7th.

**Engstrom:** Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. [gavel pounded]

**At 1:17 council recessed.**

## **Item 1293 Comp Plan Implementation Amendments**

**November 22, 2016**

### **Errata Memos**

- 1. Motion to adopt the amendments identified on the three staff “errata memos” dated September 30, 2016; October 13, 2016; and November 17, 2016:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Novick absent)

Description: This includes correcting a number of mapping errors identified by staff, correcting a few omissions to the code document, and making some stylistic changes to recommended Title 17 language to comport with the Auditor’s Office recommendations.

### **Minor/Technical**

- 2. Motion to adopt the amendments identified on the two staff “minor/technical amendment” memos dated November 4, 2016 and November 14, 2016, but without item #2e:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Novick absent)

Description: This includes 10 minor mapping changes, and 9 minor changes to the recommended code. Many of the code changes are clarifications requested by BDS. Staff recommends pulling item 2e (SE Reynolds) based on testimony received on 11/17.

### **General Lists**

- 3. 3a. Motion to adopt zoning map amendments 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 15, 17, 20 and 24 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Novick absent)

**3b. Motion to adopt zoning map amendments 16 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz.

**3c. Motion to adopt zoning map amendments 22 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz.  
(Y-3 Fish, Saltzman, Hales. N-1 Fritz. Novick absent.)

Description: These are a collection of zoning map amendments that BPS staff have identified for a single vote because they appear to be non-controversial and supported by most Council offices. Note that amendment #18 (related to parcels on SE 102<sup>nd</sup>) was pulled from this package and withdrawn from consideration based on testimony supporting amendment #30 instead.

4. **Motion to adopt zoning code amendments 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 35 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016. Add business associations to school district notification to 26:** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; Novick absent)

Description: These are a collection of zoning code amendments that BPS staff have identified for a single vote because they appear to be non-controversial and supported by most Council offices.

#### Trails

5. **Motion to adopt amendments 40, 43, 44, 45, 47 and 49 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Novick absent)

Description: This includes adjustment of the Columbia Steel trail alignment, relocation of a trail on Dosch Park Lane to SW 27<sup>th</sup>, relocation of a trail on Marine Drive, removal of a trail near SW 64<sup>th</sup>, addition of a trail near I-405, and a new Gateway green connection on both the TSP bike classifications map and major public trails map.

6. **Motion to relocate the trail segment 82 on Marquam Hill to follow SW Campus Drive:** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; Novick absent)

Description: This is a modified version of amendment # 46.

7. **Motion to remove major public trail amendment 48 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Hales and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; Novick absent)

Description: Trail segments on Saltzman Rd. west of Skyline.

#### Individual Code Amendments

8. **Motion to adopt code amendment 36, as modified by the Commissioner Fritz memo dated November 15, 2016:** Moved by Fritz and seconded by Hales. (Y-4; Novick absent)

Description: This section of Title 3 establishes the Community Involvement Committee. This is included in Title 3 rather than Title 33 because the Community Involvement Committee will not make land use decisions. As described in the staff report, the process of chartering the committee and selecting members will begin after the Comprehensive Plan is adopted. The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability will work in collaboration with the Office of Neighborhood Involvement, the Office of Equity and Human Rights, and the Public Involvement Advisory Council to charter, recruit and select members for the Community Involvement Committee. The Commissioner-proposed changes provide more specificity about membership, meetings, and appointments.

9. **Motion to adopt zoning code amendment 37 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; Novick absent)



Description: Metro Title 1 requires cities to codify minimum residential densities in designated centers and corridors, and once established, those requirements cannot be reduced. Portland established minimum residential densities in the 1990's. Commercial/mixed use zones do not currently have any residential densities in Portland's zoning code. The recommended zoning map includes a number of parcels that will change from residential to commercial mixed use zoning. Some residential parcels are also being down-zoned. The result is that the overall regulated minimum residential density in Portland's centers and corridors is being reduced by the 36 recommended zoning map, even though total residential capacity is being increased. In order to maintain compliance with Metro Title 1, staff recommends adding minimum residential densities in commercial/mixed use zones, when residential or mixed use development is built. About  $\frac{3}{4}$  of all development in commercial/mixed use zones over the past decade has included a residential component. These new requirements would not apply to projects that do not have a residential component.

**10. Motion to adopt zoning code amendment 30 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish. (Y-4; Novick absent)

Description: Allows housing on campuses with CI2 zoning. Without this amendment campus housing would be limited to student and faculty housing.

**11. This amendment, related to FAR in the Alphabet District:**

**Motion to adopt zoning code amendment 25b from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016 (Motion B):** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish. (Y-3: Fish, Saltzman, Novick. N-2: Fritz and Hales)

Description: Reject the PSC-recommended 2:1 FAR in the northern Alphabet District, retaining 4:1 everywhere where is it currently mapped.

**12. This amendment, related to drive-through regulations:**

**Motion to adopt zoning code amendment 28b from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016 (motion B):** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Hales. (Y-2: Fish, Saltzman. N-3: Fritz, Novick, Hales) **Motion failed.**

Description: Option B reflects staff's August 2016 recommendation to the Planning and Sustainability Commission. It would allow new drive-through facilities and Quick Vehicle Servicing uses only in the auto-accommodating CE zone (the zoning map proposes a limited amount of CE zoning citywide). It would allow exiting facilities in the CM1, CM2, and CM3 zones to be expanded or rebuilt. They would be prohibited in the Central City and in the new main street overlay, where existing facilities would be treated as 26 nonconforming development.

**Motion to adopt zoning code amendment 28c from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016 (motion C):** Moved by Fritz and seconded by Hales. (Y-5)

Description: This option would prohibit new drive through facilities in all Commercial/Mixed Use zones, not just east of 80th Ave. An exception would be made for new quick vehicle servicing uses (gas stations, oil change businesses, and car washes), which would be allowed in the CE zone citywide. It would allow existing drive-through facilities to be expanded and rebuilt in CM1, CM2, CM3, and CE. All drive through facilities would be prohibited in the Central City and in the new main street overlay, where existing facilities would be treated as nonconforming development.

**Individual Map Amendments**

**13. Motion to adopt zoning map amendment 21 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Hales. (Y-4; N-1 Fritz)

Description: Changes the zoning at PCC Sylvania from CI1 to CI2. CI2 is a denser more urban campus designation.

**14. Motion to adopt zoning map amendment 3 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Novick and seconded by Saltzman. (Y-2: Saltzman, Novick. N-3: Fritz, Fish, Hales) **Motion failed.**

Description: Changes a property on Hayden Island (1225 Jantzen) from CM1 to CE

**15. Motion to adopt zoning map amendment 4 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Saltzman. (Y-3 Fish, Saltzman, Novick; N-2 Fritz and Hales)

Description: Changes 6454 N Greeley from CM1 to CE.

**16. Motion to adopt zoning map amendment 9 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016, but modifying it to extend the CM2 to 50<sup>th</sup>:** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fritz. (Y-5)

Description: Changes multiple properties on the North side of NE Freemont from NE 46<sup>th</sup> to 48<sup>th</sup> from CM1 to CM2. A further extension of the CM2 to 50<sup>th</sup> was requested in testimony on 11/17.

**17. Motion to adopt zoning map amendment 11 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-5)

Description: Changes multiple properties on the west side of SE Cesar E. Chavez Blvd between SE Division St and SE Sherman St from R1 to CM2with a “d” overlay.

**18. Motion to adopt zoning map amendments 12 and 13 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fritz and seconded by Hales. (Y-5)

Description: Change 5000-5018 SE Hawthorne Blvd from CM1 to CM2, and add the “d” overlay to this parcel and the CM1 parcels on Hawthorne east of 49<sup>th</sup>.

**19. Motion to adopt zoning map amendment 14 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Novick and seconded by Saltzman. (Y-5)

Description: Change several parcels at the corner of 60<sup>th</sup> and Belmont from CM1 to CM2.

**20. Motion to adopt zoning map amendment 23 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Saltzman. (Y-4; N-1 Fritz)

Description: Change 6141 SW Canyon Ct from R20 to R5.

**21. Motion to adopt zoning map amendment #19 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016, with further modifications to add property between Woodstock and SE Martins, from 48<sup>th</sup> to 49<sup>th</sup>; AND to add properties facing the west side of 42<sup>nd</sup>, between Woodstock and Martins:** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)

Description: Change 5105 SE Woodstock Blvd, 5115 SE Woodstock Blvd, 5112 SE Woodstock Blvd, 6028 SE 51st Ave, and 5119 SE Martins St from R2.5 and R1 to CM2. An additional modification adds parcels associated with The Joinery and Otto’s.

**22. Motion to change 3844 NE 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue from R1 to CE zoning:** Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)

Description: Change 3844 NE 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave from R1 to CE. This was not in any of the memos distributed earlier, but is based on testimony given on 11/17.

### Transportation Amendments

**23. Motion to adopt amendment 50 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Hales and seconded by Saltzman. (Y-5)

Description: Direct PBOT staff to prepare an ordinance that provides further guidance on the application of existing street connectivity requirements when redevelopment occurs in designated centers the Eastern Neighborhoods pattern area.

**24. Related to parking and TDM**

**Motion A to adopt directive 51 (as amended by staff 11-22-16 memo), without amendment 34:** Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-1 Fritz; N-4) **Motion failed.**

Amendment #51 would direct PBOT to take the further actions regarding Transportation & Parking Demand Management. A staff-recommended modification to Directive #51 also clarifies that further changes to the off-street parking requirements will be considered with the Phase 2 TDM recommendations.

**Motion C to adopt a modified version of zoning code amendment 34, and the modified directive 51 (copies of both provided staff 11-22-16 memo):** Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-5)

Description: This modified version of amendment #34 would change the recommended draft to remove minimum off-street parking requirements for buildings close to frequent transit, only if they include affordable housing approved through voluntary mixed use bonuses or under future mandatory inclusionary housing requirements. This has a similar effect as Motion A, but requires a more specific exemption to enable a site-by-site quantification of the incentive. All sites that are subject to off-street parking requirements are also subject to inclusionary housing.

Amendment #51 would direct PBOT to take the following further actions regarding Transportation & Parking Demand Management. A staff-recommended modification to Directive #51 also clarifies that further changes to the off-street parking requirements will be considered with the Phase 2 TDM recommendations.

**25. Motion to adopt amendment 54, as modified by the memo from Commissioner Fritz dated November 15, 2016 and 11-22-16 handout:** Moved by Fritz and seconded by Novick. (Y-5)

Description: The amendment links the proposed Street Vacation Code more clearly with adopted Comprehensive Plan policies on Public rights-of-way (policies 8.39-8.52, pp.GP8-16 and GP8-17 of the adopted June 2016 Comprehensive Plan).

**26. Motion to adopt amendment 41 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016. This amendment is conditional on a related resolution supporting the new street plan being adopted by Council before December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2016:** Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-5)

Description: Replace the South Waterfront Street Plan map and narrative in the TSP with revised text and map to reflect recommended changes at the South Portal, which were presented to City Council on November 16<sup>th</sup>.

**27. Motion to adopt amendment 42 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)

Description: Move Policy 9.50.b. from page GP9-16 of the adopted 2035 Comprehensive Plan to replace TSP Objective 9.26.a., and move Figure 9-4 from page GP9-23 to the TSP as new Table 9.2.

Figure 9-4 was placed in Chapter 9 of the Comprehensive Plan because the TSP objectives were still being developed at the time the Plan was being developed. The City is required to have identified service standards for urban services in its Comprehensive Plan, and they

must be consistent with those adopted by Metro. These are characterized as interim standards because the intent expressed in Policy 9.49 and 9.50 is to replace these standards with multimodal performance measures in the future. This evaluation standard and table are more appropriately located in the TSP, which contains similar performance and evaluation measures.

**28. This amendment, related to Hayden Island Bike Classifications.**

**Motion to (a) adopt amendment 38 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016 and (b) also remove the City Bikeway segment that passes through the manufactured Home Park on the north shore of the island:** Moved by Hales and seconded by Saltzman.

Description: Remove the City Bikeway classification from Hayden Bay.

Description: This additional change (b) was request in testimony on 11/17.

**29. Motion to move to adopt amendment 39 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)

Description: Direct PBOT to retain flexibility on the location of a Major City Bikeway on either NE 7th or NE 9th until more specific project design options are developed and more outreach is completed. Classify both streets as a Major City Bikeway until the decision is made.

**Other Directives**

**30. Motion to adopt amendment 52 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016:** Moved by Fritz and seconded by Saltzman. (Y-5)

Description: Direct BPS to study the “f” overlay area along Skyline to determine if the overlay is still necessary, and if it should be retained, modified, or removed. Bring recommendations back to Council in 2018.

**31. Motion to adopt amendment 53 from the amendments memo dated November 4, 2016, with the additional sites recommended by staff 11-22-16 memo:** Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-5)

Description: Direct BPS to study the comp plan designation and zoning on the following sites, and others if appropriate, and return with recommendations for any appropriate post-acknowledgment amendments in 2018: a. 7008 SW Capital Hill Rd (Hales, Saltzman) b. 9808 N Edison St (Fish) c. Strong property - 4931 – 4947 N Williams Ave (Hales) d. Marquam Hill mixed use node (Novick) 52 e. 4836 SE Powell Blvd (Staff) f. 310 NW 23rd Ave (Saltzman) g. 4337 NE Prescott St (Hales) h. 4543 SE Harney Dr (Fish) i. 5727 SE 136th

(Saltzman) j. 505 NE Thompson (Fritz). These are sites where commissioners have expressed interest in exploring further revisions to the Comprehensive Plan map, as a Post-Acknowledgement amendment in 2018. Staff recommended adding several additional sites based on testimony from Allison Reynolds. This includes: 25 N Fargo Street, 3138 W/N Vancouver Avenue, and 2525 NW Lovejoy Street and several abutting lots in medical office use).

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL AGENDA</b>  <b>City Hall - 1221 SW Fourth Avenue</b>  <b><u>WEDNESDAY, 9:30 AM, NOVEMBER 16, 2016</u></b></p> <p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fritz and Novick, 3.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Disposition:</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMUNICATIONS</b></p> <p><b>1260</b> Request of Chet Orloff to address Council regarding Forest Park (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1261</b> Request of Phyllis Reynolds to address Council regarding Forest Park (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1262</b> Request of George Milne to address Council regarding the liability of interfacing hikers and bicycles on the trails in Forest Park (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1263</b> Request of Barbara Dugan to address Council regarding dangers to senior citizens if single track cycling is allowed to occur on pedestrian only trails in Forest Park (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1264</b> Request of Alex Schay to address Council regarding dangers to people with disabilities if single track cycling is allowed to occur on pedestrian only trails in Forest Park (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TIMES CERTAIN</b></p> <p><b>1265 TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM</b> – Accept findings of the South Portal Partnership Plan Project pertaining to proposed changes to roadway alignments of SW Bond Ave, SW Moody Ave, SW Hamilton St, SW Hamilton Ct, SW Lowell St, and SW Thomas St, and direct implementation of a plan to fund, design and construct remaining South Waterfront street connections (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Novick) 1 hour requested</p>	<p>[Council Work Session to be held Nov 28 at 11am]</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 7, 2016 At 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b>  <b>Bureau of Police</b></p> <p><b>1266</b> Ratify an amendment to the collective bargaining agreement between the City and the Portland Police Commanding Officers Association to make PPOA Labor Agreement Article 33 consistent with Human Resources Administrative Rule 8.03 (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 23, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>

<p><b>*1267</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Multnomah County District Attorney to partially fund the cost of employing three full-time equivalent District Attorney investigators not to exceed \$265,405 (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188087</b></p>
<p><b>1268</b> Amend an Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County for the Sex Buyers Accountability and Diversion Program (Second Reading 1233; amend Contract No. 30002122)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188088</b></p>
<p><b>Fire &amp; Police Disability and Retirement</b></p>	
<p><b>*1269</b> Amend the Fire and Police Disability, Retirement and Death Benefit Plan in order to comply with an arbitration decision regarding final pay calculation for members of Portland Firefighters Association and Portland Police Commanding Officers Association (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188089</b></p>
<p><b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p>	
<p><b>*1270</b> Pay claim of Randall Cummings in the sum of \$6,554 involving the Portland Police Bureau (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188090</b></p>
<p><b>*1271</b> Authorize leasing of commercial office space at non-City owned buildings to temporarily relocate business operations during the Portland Building Reconstruction project (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188098</b></p>
<p><b>*1272</b> Authorize a lease extension with Oregon Pacific Investment &amp; Development Company for the Bureau of Fire and Police Disability and Retirement office space at 1800 SW First Ave, Suite 450, commonly known as the Harrison Square Building through October 31, 2020 for approximately \$205,000 annually (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p>	<p><b>CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 7, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1273</b> Extend term of a franchise granted to MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc. to build and operate telecommunication facilities within City streets (Second Reading Agenda 1238; amend Ordinance No. 169230)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188091</b></p>
<p><b>1274</b> Extend term of a franchise granted to Electric Lightwave, Inc. to build and operate telecommunication facilities within City streets (Second Reading Agenda 1239; amend Ordinance No. 170283)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188092</b></p>



<p><b>1275</b> Extend term of a franchise granted to McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. to build and operate telecommunication facilities within City streets (Second Reading 1240; amend Ordinance No. 175061)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188093</b></p>	
<p><b>1276</b> Extend term of a franchise granted to XO Communications Services, LLC to build and operate telecommunications facilities within City streets (Second Reading Agenda 1241; amend Ordinance No. 175062)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188094</b></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p> <p><b>*1277</b> Authorize the Bureau of Transportation to execute a temporary easement with Oregon Health Science University as part of the SW Bond Avenue Project (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>		<p><b>188095</b></p>
<p><b>*1278</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Bureau of Transportation and TriMet for the review and inspection of proposed improvements at the SW Bond Ave and SW Porter St intersection (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188096</b></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b> <b>Bureau of Environmental Services</b></p> <p><b>1279</b> Authorize the Bureau of Environmental Services to execute an easement with TriMet as part of the Portland to Milwaukie Light Rail: SE Powell Boulevard/16th Avenue Storm Sewer Project No. E10060 (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p>		<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 23, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1280</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Home Forward to allow the Percent for Green Program to fund the construction of a green street facility as part of Home Forward's construction project at St. Francis Apartments at SE 11<sup>th</sup> Ave., SE 12<sup>th</sup> Ave., SE Stark St. in the amount of \$113,936 (Second Reading Agenda 1243)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188097</b></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b></p>		

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Bureau of Planning &amp; Sustainability</b></p> <p><b>1281</b> Restrict bulk fossil fuel terminals (Previous Agenda 1259; amend Title 33, Planning and Zoning) 1 hour requested</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendments 1-6, and 8 as prepared by City staff November 16, 2016 and modify paragraph a of amendment 6 to prohibit the storage of coal:</b> Moved by Hales and seconded by Novick. (Y-3)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED DECEMBER 8, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Emergency Management</b></p> <p><b>*1282</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with eligible parties for the Sharing of Emergency Operations Center Personnel within the Greater Portland Metropolitan Region when personnel are unable to get to their normal reporting location (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>188099</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p> <p><b>1283</b> Authorize the Bureau of Transportation to allocate \$500,000 to the Portland Parks Foundation for construction of the Footbridge Over Burnside (Ordinance)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 23, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1284</b> Make administrative changes to Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Code for more efficient implementation of the Street Repair and Traffic Safety Program (Second Reading Agenda 1254; amend Code Chapter 17.105)</p> <p>(Y-3)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>188086</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b> <b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b></p> <p><b>1285</b> Amend provisions relating to possession of cannabis in parks to conform to State law (Ordinance; amend Code Section 20.12.040) 10 minutes requested</p> <p><b>Motion to replace “marijuana” with “cannabis”:</b> Moved by Fritz. Housekeeping motion. No vote taken.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED NOVEMBER 23, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>*1286</b> Authorize a competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for construction of the Colonel Summers Park Splash Pad and Portland Loo Installation Project (Ordinance)</p> <p>RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>188100</b></p>

<p><b>*1287</b> Amend contract with DAO Architecture, LLC in the amount of \$3,500 to complete work on the Colonel Summers Park gate design (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 30004821)  RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188101</b></p>
<p><b>*1288</b> Designate and assign the Mt. Tabor Annex from Portland Parks &amp; Recreation to the Portland Housing Bureau for development of affordable housing and transfer \$1,200,000 to Parks Memorial Fund (Ordinance)  RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188102</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b> <b>Water Bureau</b></p> <p><b>1289</b> Authorize a contract and provide payment for the construction of the Sandy River Engineered Log Jam Placement Project at an estimated cost of \$2,300,000 (Ordinance)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 23, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>WEDNESDAY, 2:00 PM, NOVEMBER 16, 2016</u></b></p> <p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fritz and Novick, 3.</p>	
<p><b>1290 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 &amp; 6:00 PM</b> – Accept the Residential Infill Project: Concept Report to Council as general conceptual parameters for subsequent zoning code and zoning map amendments (Previous Agenda 1258; Resolution introduced by Mayor Hales) 2 hours requested</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 7, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>
<p><b>1291 TIME CERTAIN: 4:00 PM</b> – Diverse and Empowered Employees of Portland Leadership Development Program (Report introduced by Mayor Hales) 30 minutes requested  <b>Motion to accept report:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Novick.  (Y-3)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ACCEPTED</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>WEDNESDAY, 6:00 PM, NOVEMBER 16, 2016</u></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>This meeting was a continuation of Item 1290 Residential Infill Project Hearing</b> 2 hours requested</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>~ continued next page ~</i></p>	

**THURSDAY, 2:00 PM, NOVEMBER 17, 2016**

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 4.

**1292 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM** – Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Previous Agenda 1152; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 3 hours requested

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on possible Council amendments to this ordinance. Last month Council heard testimony on the Recommended Early Implementation package for the new 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Since that time, each Council office has identified potential amendments. Testimony on these amendments will be accepted through the end of the public hearing on November 17.

Amendments are posted on the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability website: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/71964>

- To testify in person: People interested in providing oral testimony may begin signing up one hour before the hearing but may only sign up for one person at a time. Testimony is limited to two minutes per person.
- Via the Map App: Testify on recommended Zoning Map changes by location.
- By Email: [cputestimony@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:cputestimony@portlandoregon.gov) with subject line “Comprehensive Plan Implementation”
- By U.S. Mail:  
Portland City Council  
1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 130  
Portland, OR 97204  
Attn: Comprehensive Plan Implementation

For more information: See Bureau of Planning and Sustainability website: [www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/pdxcomplan](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/pdxcomplan)

**CONTINUED TO  
NOVEMBER 22, 2016  
SPECIAL MEETING  
AT 9:00 AM  
TIME CERTAIN**

**NOTE:** “Time Certain” indicates that an item will not be heard by Council **prior** to the time specified.

Communications items are three minutes each. Regular Agenda items taking longer than five minutes have the time estimate noted next to the item.

The \* indicates an emergency ordinance, which takes effect immediately if passed. Non-emergency ordinances require two readings and a 30-day waiting period before taking effect. Resolutions, reports, etc., adopted by Council are effective after adjournment.

The above summary is published by the City Auditor as provided by Section 2-113 of the Charter and Ordinance No. 130672.

Council Chambers is equipped with a sound system for the hearing impaired. Assisted listening devices are available from the Clerk.

The City of Portland will gladly accommodate requests for an interpreter or make other accommodations that further inclusivity. Please make your request at least 48 hours before the meeting to the Council Clerk 503-823-4086. (TTY 503-823-6868).

City Council meetings can be viewed at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/video>. The meetings are also cablecast on CityNet 30, Portland Community Media television.

Mary Hull Caballero  
Auditor of the City of Portland

=====

Testimony is taken on Reports, Resolutions and Ordinances (first reading). To testify, sign up on a testimony sheet as you enter Council Chambers on the day of the meeting. Individuals have 3 minutes to testify, unless otherwise stated at the meeting. Testimony is not taken on Communications, Second Readings, Proclamations or Presentations in accordance with Code 3.02.040 F. and G.

Written testimony may be emailed or mailed to the Council Clerk prior to the meeting.

To schedule a Communication, email or mail your request to the Council Clerk. Include your name, address, phone number and a brief description of the subject you will be addressing. For full details, see Testimony Policies and procedures. <http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/index.cfm?&a=63123&c=34447>

Clerk Email: [karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov)  
Council Clerk Testimony: [cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov)  
US Mail: Council Clerk, 1221 SW Fourth Ave., Room 130, Portland OR 97204

=====

Declaration Required by Lobbyists. Portland City Code 2.12.060 states: Prior to offering public testimony before City officials, at the beginning of any meetings or phone calls with City officials, or in emails and letters to City officials, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent for that communication.

=====

*“Be a part of the picture...get involved with your City...volunteer for a City of Portland Board or Commission. For more information, a brochure, or a volunteer application, stop by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement in City Hall or call 503-823-4519.”*

**OFFICERS OF PORTLAND CITY GOVERNMENT**

**CHARLIE HALES, MAYOR**

Commissioner of Finance and Administration  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 340, 97204  
 (503) 823-4120  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/mayor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/mayor/)  
 e-mail: [mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>
Portland Police Bureau Portland Development Commission Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Fire & Police Disability and Retirement Office of Equity and Human Rights Office of Management and Finance Office of Government Relations City Attorney City Budget Office Oversight of the Willamette River Super Fund clean-up project

**NICK FISH**

Commissioner of Public Works  
 Position Number 2  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 240, 97204  
 (503) 823-3589  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fish](http://www.portlandonline.com/fish)  
 e-mail: [Nick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Nick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Environmental Services Bureau of Hydroelectric Power Water Bureau	<i>Elders in Action</i> <i>Portland Utility Review Board</i> <i>Venture Portland</i> <i>Portland's Centers For The Arts</i> Regional Arts and Culture Council

**AMANDA FRITZ**

Commissioner of Public Utilities  
 Position Number 1  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 220, 97204  
 (503) 823-3008  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fritz/](http://www.portlandonline.com/fritz/)  
 e-mail: [amanda@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:amanda@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Parks & Recreation Office of Neighborhood Involvement	<i>Royal Rosarians</i> <i>Multnomah County Animal Control</i> <i>Portland Parks Board</i> <i>Urban Forestry Commission</i> <i>Golf Advisory Committee</i> <i>Portland International Raceway Advisory Committee</i> <i>Protected Sick Time ordinance implementation</i> [continued next page]

	<p><i>Council Lead on the City Coordinating Committee addressing the Department of Justice Settlement</i></p> <p><i>Visitors Development Fund Board (with Saltzman)</i></p>
--	---

**STEVE NOVICK**

Commissioner of Public Safety  
 Position Number 4  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 210, 97204  
 (503) 823-4682  
 website: [www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/)  
 e-mail: [Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Transportation Bureau of Emergency Management Bureau of Emergency Communications	<i>Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)</i> <i>Portland Streetcar Inc.</i> <i>Regional Emergency Management Group</i> <i>BOEC Users Group</i> <i>BOEC Finance Committee</i> <i>Taxi Cab Board of Review</i> <i>Towing Board of Review</i>

**DAN SALTZMAN**

Commissioner of Public Affairs  
 Position Number 3  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 230, 97204  
 (503) 823-4151  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/saltzman](http://www.portlandonline.com/saltzman)  
 e-mail: [dan@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:dan@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Development Services Portland Fire & Rescue Portland Housing Bureau Gateway Domestic Violence Center Portland Children's Levy (formerly Portland Children's Investment Fund)	<i>Travel Portland</i> <i>Visitors Development Fund (with Fritz)</i> <i>Home Forward</i> <i>League of Oregon Cities</i> <i>Adjustment Committee</i> <i>Building Board of Appeals</i> <i>Design Commission</i> <i>Historic Landmarks Commission</i>

## **MARY HULL CABALLERO**

Auditor of the City of Portland  
1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 140, 97204  
(503) 823-4078  
website: [www.portlandonline.com/auditor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/)  
e-mail: [AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov)

### **Portfolio**

Assessments, Finance & Foreclosure  
Audit Services  
City Elections  
City Recorder  
-Archives  
-Council Clerk / Contracts Division  
-Records Management  
Hearings Office  
IPR - Independent Police Review  
Ombudsman  
Portland Multnomah Progress Board

### **BUREAU DIRECTORS**

Bureau of Development Services	Paul Scarlett
Bureau of Emergency Communications	Lisa Turley
Bureau of Emergency Management	Carmen Merlo
Bureau of Environmental Services	Michael Jordan
Bureau of Human Resources	Anna Kanwit
Bureau of Internal Business Services	Bryant Enge
Bureau of Planning & Sustainability	Susan Anderson
Bureau of Police	Michael Marshman
Bureau of Revenue & Financial Services	Ken Rust
Bureau of Technology Services	Jeff Baer
Bureau of Transportation	Leah Treat
City Attorney	Tracy Reeve
City Budget Office	Andrew Scott
Fire & Police Disability and Retirement	Samuel Hutchison
Office of Equity and Human Rights	Dante James
Office of Government Relations	Martha Pellegrino
Office of Mgmt & Finance –Chief Admin Officer	Fred Miller
Office of Neighborhood Involvement	Amalia Alarcón de Morris
Portland Development Commission	Kimberly Branam
Portland Fire & Rescue	Mike Myers
Portland Housing Bureau	Kurt Creager
Portland Parks & Recreation	Mike Abbaté
Revenue Director	Thomas Lannom
Water Bureau	Michael Stuhr

Updated 08-19-2016





CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

**OFFICIAL  
MINUTES**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **17TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2016** AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 4.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Susan Parsons, Acting Clerk of the Council; Lauren King, Deputy City Attorney and Mike Cohen and Jason King, Sergeants at Arms.

Item Nos. 1271 and 1272 were pulled for discussion and on a Y-4 roll call, the balance of the Consent Agenda was adopted.

	<b>Disposition:</b>
<p><b>1292</b>      <b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Previous Agenda 1152; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 3 hours requested</p> <p>The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on possible Council amendments to this ordinance. Last month Council heard testimony on the Recommended Early Implementation package for the new 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Since that time, each Council office has identified potential amendments. Testimony on these amendments will be accepted through the end of the public hearing on November 17.</p> <p>Amendments are posted on the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability website: <a href="https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/71964">https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/71964</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To testify in person: People interested in providing oral testimony may begin signing up one hour before the hearing but may only sign up for one person at a time. Testimony is limited to two minutes per person.</li><li>• Via the Map App: Testify on recommended Zoning Map changes by location.</li><li>• By Email: <a href="mailto:cputestimony@portlandoregon.gov">cputestimony@portlandoregon.gov</a> with subject line “Comprehensive Plan Implementation”</li><li>• By U.S. Mail: Portland City Council 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 130 Portland, OR 97204 Attn: Comprehensive Plan Implementation</li></ul>	<p><b>CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 22, 2016 SPECIAL MEETING AT 9:00 AM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>

November 17, 2016

---

For more information: See Bureau of Planning and Sustainability website:  
[www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/pdxcomplan](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/pdxcomplan)

---

At 4:36 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.

November 17, 2016  
Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting  
**Item 1292 excerpt.**

**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.**

**NOVEMBER 17, 2016 2PM**

**Item 1292.**

**Hales:** Good afternoon, why don't you walk us through what's before us today and we'll get to testimony.

**Eric Engstrom, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Sure. Thank you, mayor hales. This is a continued discussion of the package of proposed zoning code and zoning map changes that the planning and sustainability commission recommended to implement the recently adopted 2035 comprehensive plan. The purpose of this hearing is to give you all a chance to hear feedback on the amendments that you have contemplated to that package. As you know you haven't voted on those amendments yet so they're tentative at this point and we're looking for feedback from the folks testifying today. Next week, we have time scheduled on the 22nd for you to deliberate on what you hear today and potentially take a vote on those amendments. A few logistical things. A reminder that in august, you held quite a few -- a couple of hearings, I'm sorry, September you held a couple of hearings on the package that the psc recommended that include zoning code and zoning map amendments, a new community involvement program, updated trails map and the next stage of the transportation system plan. The psc recommendation was made after they had held hearings for approximately a year in 2015 and 2016. We've worked with your office to identify potential amendments and we compiled them into a memo on November 4th which we released last week. That's been put in the record. We've been receiving testimony over the last week on those amendments which we've also delivered to your offices today and earlier this week, the two bundles of that testimony and we'll be giving you a final one after this hearing. We're also placing at this time some technical analysis into the record which in the box. We completed the transportation analysis of the zoning map and want to make sure that that documentation is in the record. And that concludes my introduction. I think assuming that we get through the oral testimony of the people signed up today, we would recommend that you close the written record tomorrow at the end of day.

**Hales:** All right. Questions? Thank you very much. So we're going to open the public hearing part of this testimony. As many of you may have been here before, if you haven't, you need only give your name when you come up to speak. It does help if you reference specific property by address or amendment by the amendments in front of us, just be as clear and specific as you can so that we can know exactly what you're recommending. Secondly we're going to try to hold testimony to two minutes apiece just because we've got a lot of people that want to speak and we want to make sure we hear from everyone. If you're here, if you go organize yourselves to have a spokesperson, that's great. Quantity matters less than quality at this point. The quality of what you say matters more than the number of people who say it. How about that? You don't need to make the point again if it's been well made before you. With that I think we're ready to proceed. We do have a planning and sustainability commission member here and maybe more than one and we always give our overactive volunteers a little bit of courtesy so Mr. Smith, and anyone else from the psc who's here, welcome.

November 17, 2016

**Chris Smith:** Thank you, mayor, members of council. I am Chris Smith I am vice chair of the planning and sustainability commission and I would like to briefly speak to you about two of the amendments. The first is parking minimums. The psc did not take up parking minimums in our consideration of task 5 of the comp plan limitations. We did look at it in the context of inclusionary housing and you will see our recommendation on that in a letter to you I think at the end of this week. In inclusionary housing the recommendation came to us to use waiving parking minimums as an incentive for the affordable units. After hearing testimony from the housing advocates, the developers and even from the housing bureau, we've heard pretty uniformly that leaving parking minimums entirely as the amendment in front of you with the comp plan actually creates a landscape that makes inclusionary housing more feasible all around so waiving those minimums, essentially reverting to the pre-2013 regime as this amendment does, we feel is a better solution. So you're actually going to have a couple of opportunities to vote on parking minimums. I would encourage you to vote early and often to repeal them.

**Fritz:** We're required to give something as an incentive for the inclusionary housing. So if we don't have a minimum for housing won't we have to give something else as well?

**Smith:** Well, when you hear our recommendation, we're going to tell you that you should be basically providing incentives to make the developers whole at this phase in the development of the inclusionary program. But I think another way to look at it is the removing minimums it improves the overall economics of housing projects period, so that kind of raises all ships and I think -- I can't say we've run the economics but may make the gap that you have to fill with incentives failure.

**Hales:** Okay.

**Fritz:** I'll need clarification on that.

**Smith:** The second amendment I would like to speak to you about is the bike way on 7th and 9th and we recommended 7th. You have an amendment to designate both of them and wait for the project development and certainly, we would agree that the public should weigh in on the project development. I do, however, feel that there is a right answer. 7th avenue is the better place for bikes because of the topography, the connectivity, it will connect to the bikeway coming out of the central city. 9th has the issue that it runs square into Irving park and while the parks bureau has been a good steward of our trail system, they generally have not been enthusiastic about building bikeways through urban parks. We did here a lot of testimony from people who wanted 9th. Their motivation was primarily don't let the cut-through traffic come deeper into our neighborhood and the challenge in project development will be to find a way to tame that cut-through project, and I think comp plan policy points very strongly to that both clearly prioritizing pedestrians, bicycles and transit over single occupancy vehicles and saying the traffic diversion is an appropriate tool to use to put cars where they belong. So if we wind up with ninth as the answer, I think we will have failed on the policy basis to achieve our goals. So I just want to leave you with that thought. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you, thanks very much. Okay. I don't think I see any other psc members here. Okay. Then let's move, please, to the list of folks that have signed up. We do typically give a courtesy as well to parents with small children or folks with disabilities. So if you fit one of those descriptions, come up early. Either in the first group or just thereafter. So go ahead.

**Hales:** Good afternoon, welcome.

**Anne Niedergang:** My name is Anne Niedergang and I'm here to voice my support for amendments 12 and 13 of the comp plan. This is relating to a property around 50th and Hawthorne. I support staff's recommendation for the cm2 zoning proposed for the site. This amendment will allow for higher density housing which will increase the potential for

November 17, 2016

affordable housing in the future. The site also sits at an important intersection of two major transit streets, allowing for less car-dependent transportation. Additionally, the zoning would match the other corners of the intersection as well as that of the main Hawthorne commercial district. I am also in support of amendment 13, requiring a design overlay for the site and the cm1 zoning to the east of the parcel.

**Hales:** Thank you. Welcome.

**Paul Niedergang:** Paul Niedergang and rather than repeat what she said I'm going to say that I think the site is an important place in the community. It's at the end of the Hawthorne boulevard or the beginning, depending on which way you're coming. And I think it's an appropriate location for higher density zoning and every step along the way we have choices to make, and I think it's important to make the choice of going towards higher density and building up rather than out. So I encourage you to support the cm2 designation for this site.

**Hales:** Okay thank you both. Thank you very much. Welcome.

**Tony Jordan:** Hello, mayor and commissioners. My name is tony Jordan. We urge you to pass amendments 34 and 51, eliminate minimum parking requirements. There are many good reasons. They make our housing crisis worse. The parking mandate suppressed housing supply. Parking requirements prevented the building of housing we sorely need at the time it was most likely to be built. The inclusionary housing package will be much less effective if we retain these regulations. Tenants pay for parking for the life of the building whether they use it or not and while it's true today that most Portlanders drive, it is less likely that Portlanders in 2035 will. That parking will remain and will have lasting harm. We face a climate crisis that is easy to ignore, but not for long. Portland is making an effort to accommodate climate refugees, but we should not accommodate their cars. We must make immediate efforts to reduce our own auto dependency. Parking requirements are a fertility drug for cars. That will have lasting harm. The reasons given to retain the requirements don't hold up to scrutiny, either. They don't ensure access for the disabled. They don't provide low-income folks with access to opportunity. More housing does that. Only a market for on street parking will find that balance. I urge you to spend some time reading the testimony supporting this action. There are 100 letters. The testimony is given not in the self-interest of those giving it but in the hopeful desire for a future Portland where housing and economic opportunity are available to all. It is testimony driven by a concern for our environment and understanding it is far past time to get serious about climate action. It is testimony yearning for the political courage to stop pretending we can bill our way out of this problem.

**Hales:** Thank you all.

**Novick:** The bar has been set for the rest of the hearing. I challenge anybody to come up with a better line than parking requirements are a fertility drug for cars.

**Hales:** Next three, please. Good afternoon. Whoever would like to go first.

**William Henderson:** My name is William Henderson. I'm a board member of the Portland independent chamber of commerce. We're a coalition of businesses and community leaders who are working together. We believe Portland can do better and we would like to urge council to adopt amendments 34 and 51. I'm not going to rehash Chris smith's arguments. You've heard them before, about the impact of parking minimums on housing affordability. It sounds like at this point the council understands those things. I would like to give you a little bit of a different perspective instead, which is how our current parking policies are hurting businesses. It's clear, I think you can ask just about anyone in town that our current parking policies are failing. We could double down on minimums and try to build our way out of them, but I doubt that would be successful and that would only make our housing affordability problems worsened. Businesses are hurt when someone needs to

November 17, 2016

drive and can't find a parking space. When they need to show up for work or when they need to come for an errand and they can't find parking, that hurts those businesses. Businesses are also hurt when we don't have the walkable and bikeable neighborhoods that we're all striving for. They need that access, whether it's vehicle or otherwise. We should be providing that for them and we're failing to do that right now. So we really encourage the option of both of these amendments because we view it as the two shoes. We think in 2012, only one shoe is on and that is part of why we continue to have this parking crisis. Only by having more efficient management of off-street and on street parking are we going to find better solutions for everyone, including these businesses. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you, thank you very much.

**Henderson:** Our testimony was joined by over 35 businesses in Portland, that included retail businesses, food and beverage, real estate developers, technology companies so a really broad group of businesses asking for something to be done here.

**Hales:** Just want to say I appreciate having your business organization getting involved in these issues. Thank you.

**Alan Kessler:** May I approach, please?

**Hales:** Sure, what do you got? Thanks. Welcome.

**Kessler:** Thank you. So I think most of the people in this room feel that we're in a different world than we were in a week ago. Everything is accelerated, everything is more serious.

**Hales:** Put your name back in the record, too.

**Kessler:** My name is Alan Kessler. It's time to be bold. I think one of the reasons and commissioner Fritz mentioned this, one of the reasons some of you may be thinking about holding this off until inclusionary zoning is you might use it is a bargaining chip to give developers to get that deal done. I would encourage you to be as bold as San Jose was. San Jose gave nothing. They gave nothing, they went to the California supreme court, they got a unanimous decision for them. They went to the supreme court. Oregon could be just as bold. There's no reason to view inclusionary zoning as anything different from exclusionary zoning. If we're willing to down zone a neighborhood to R7 and lower the building capacity without worrying about what we have to give back, we should be willing to do the opposite of that. We should be willing to bring more people into our communities without worrying about what we need to give back to developers and it seems like if you read through the -- I gave you a law review article that talks about the decision, if you read through the decision you'll understand the logic they used to get there and there's a good argument we can be bold. Even if you don't believe that Oregon will go the same way or you think the new supreme court will grant cert and reverse, there's another reason. This has to go through process. If you pass on Tuesday this amendment, you pass the comp plan, it's going to the state, it's going to come back, there's not going to be any right that's granted until that process is over. Inclusionary zoning happens a lot faster. So you can use this twice. You can use this as a bargaining chip if you want to and the benefit will be getting either -- no right is assumed, that benefit, or if the right is assumed, at least the benefit for the period between inclusionary zoning implementation and comp plan implementation. So I don't think this is a good reason to not support amendment 34. I have six seconds, I support amendments 11 through 16 as well and the td m-51.

**Fritz:** Point of clarification, I believe our legislature says we have to give incentives so a slightly different law.

**Kessler:** Understood.

**Hales:** Welcome.

**Gail Hoffnagle:** Hi, there, I'm vice president of the Sellwood Moreland improvement league. I've also been a committee member of the city's parking committee. Two years

November 17, 2016

ago, I spear-headed a spay amongst the sellwood-moreland neighborhood on a variety of issues to see how neighbors felt so the league could actually advocate for them. We had about 700 responses which is a pretty good number for a survey like this and the number one concern was the lack of reasonable minimum off-street parking. Our increasingly congested narrow streets put pedestrians including children walking to and from school at risk of injury and that's a major concern for us. In fact, on November 4th, a woman with a baby in a stroller was struck in the marked crosswalk at Milwaukee and bybee resulting in the mother having a broken collar bone. And that's in a marked crosswalk. We support and are hopeful that measure 51 will improve this situation. However, we currently don't know what the effects will be until they've actually been implemented. If we want to really accommodate increased density, reduce housing costs and foster use of mass transit, we need new parking regulations to be evaluated before parking minimums are eliminated. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you all very much.

**Parsons:** If I can ask, if you give me your handouts, then I'll be able to be sure to get one in the record and if you hand them to me first, I'll distribute them. Thanks.

**Hales:** Just hand them, we'll pass them down. Thank you. Here you go. You need one.

**Miriam Erb:** Good afternoon, I'm a board member of the sellwood moreland neighborhood. I'm also a member of the land use committee. Sellwood moreland opposes amendment 34 because it is the last amendment proposal that had not help the inclusive response that we need as all of our neighborhoods struggle with this difficult issue of parking. In our neighborhood, we are trying very hard to listen to the voices of those neighbors who strongly advocate protecting our resources for the good of all of us and our future generations, as well as to the neighbors of all ages and backgrounds whose livelihood and ability to function includes some need for parking. We think the safety issue that Gail Hoffnagle mentioned our businesses need parking to survive. We want to be a destination for the rest of the city as well as a pleasant place to live. We understand that we have to minimize parking to accommodate increased density, reduce housing costs and foster use of mass transit. We have the residential infill project the recently adopted inclusionary zoning and the recently passed affordable housing bond that should create more affordable housing. We strongly believe that the city should give these new tools a chance to work before eliminating minimum parking requirements thank you. I should add that we have over 1200 units in the pipeline in our neighborhood.

**Brad Baker:** Good after noon I'm brad baker I'd like to discuss why I'm for removing minimum parking requirements. I live in an apartment downtown I have a parking spot with my apartment, I don't own a car it feels like a waste of space and waste of money to have this resource when the builder could have used their money for more apartments that would have provided utility to people other than an empty parking spot, and I think this problem is going to be more exaggerated over time as people in my generation are less likely to own cars, more likely to use ride sharing as autonomous cars come in, it removes the incentive to own a personal car. Parking is going to be less and less of an issue. So I think having a minimum requirement for parking spots is building for a problem that's going to go away. We should be looking towards the future, we should be promoting alternative means of transportation, we should be promoting biking, taking the bus, walking, anything other than cars. We need to like wean off of cars. So I think removing the minimum requirements will help us move away from cars.

**Hales:** Thank you. Welcome.

**Kelly Francois:** Hi. My name is Kelly Francois and I decided to approach testifying here today in a different way of getting out and asking anybody who was opposed to my point of view why they were opposed to my point of view. I didn't want to talk to people that agreed

November 17, 2016

with me. And one of the things that I clearly found is that everyone agrees that we want less cars in our neighborhood and we want affordability. I was at a neighborhood meeting last night and one of the women brought up who was there said most of us in this room would not be able to afford to live in this neighborhood if we were moving here today. So removing parking minimums is not going to solve those problems, but it's part of a progressive package that will get us towards solving those problems. So that's why I am in favor of removing parking minimums as part of a package that's going to get us there, including parking management, which is something that I want to bring to my neighborhood in addition to removing parking. I think we can do both. I don't think there has to be one before the other. We can do both.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you all very much.

**Hales:** Good afternoon, welcome.

**Ted Labbe:** My name is ted Labbe I live at 3011 Ne Hoyt street, and today, I'm offering testimony on behalf of depave, a Portland nonprofit. I'm here today to ask you to vote yes for comprehensive plan amendments 34 and 51, which would remove minimum parking requirements at sites close to frequent transit and to implement a comprehensive system in the mixed use zones. Minimum parking requirements are contributing to the housing affordability and access crisis. When city council implemented the parking minimums in 2013, they were intended to be temporary. Our new comprehensive plan, as well as other measures, I think you can say that we've outgrown the need for these parking minimums. I understand that parking is a hot button issue for many, especially those who live close to transit corridors like southeast division, north Williams and others. Parking is an emotional issue for many including me. The historic building at 2nd and Washington in downtown building was the first four story commercial building in the city and the first built with an elevator. In 1934, it was demolished and replaced with a surface parking lot which remains to this day. So I get that emotional issue. The decisions we make today have far reaching consequences for the future of our city. Automobile parking both on and off-street already occupies a glut of space within our city. We don't need more. What we do need is more thoughtful and active approaches to managing the abundant supply so other worthy things like street trees and safe passage for bikes and pedestrians can be provided. Let's get our parking strategy right, do away with minimize and better manage the supply with tdm. We look forward to working with the city on further requirements and implementation of the comprehensive plan. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you, good afternoon, Mary.

**Mary Vogel:** Good afternoon. I'm Mary Vogel and my business is plan green. I'm a member of the downtown neighborhood association land use and transportation committee as well as the planning programs committee of Oregon walks. I'm a member of the congress for the new urbanism but today, I'm here on behalf of myself. As a planning consultant whose primary concern is to make the city more resilient in the face of climate change through policies that lead to better walkability, like others, I'm here in favor of amendments 34 and 51. As I testified last week for the residential infill project, I strongly believe that the city should eliminate parking requirements for all future infill and managed parking with pricing, you know, besides the mixed use zone. I was delighted to find recently Portlanders for parking reform, an organization founded and largely run by young people like tony Jordan who you just heard from, the people we should be planning for in addition to the residential incumbents that you so often hear from and discovered that they shared my perspective. In fact, I would go even further to say that I've never understand why a city that is largely without alleys would require off-street parking at all. In any case not to rub salt in our wounds, but the Obama white house released a toolkit last month to provide policy recommendations to ease housing shortage and improve affordability in



November 17, 2016

cities. As you know the report said minimum parking requirements have a disproportionate impact on low-income households and by designing more connected walkable spaces -- in any case, I will, you know, submit the rest of my comments in writing, but I did want to say that I believe that reducing the minimum requirements will also lead us towards a happier city and a healthier city where more people walk from their cars, the 10,000 steps that's recommended that we take each day. So in any case thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you very much.

**Jessica Engleman:** I'm cochair of bike loud pdx, also a board member of the hosford abernethy neighborhood association and the southeast uplift. However, I'm here speaking on behalf of myself today. Quite frankly, I don't have much to add in terms of parking minimize and tdm that hasn't already been said so I'm here to balance out for the nimbies who are upset that their parking free lunch might be over and also plus one to what Chris said to parking on 5th and not 9th.

**Hales:** Take the next group, please.

**Hales:** Good afternoon, welcome.

**Hales:** Go ahead.

**Chris Schwartzkopf:** I'm Chris Schwartzkopf. I'm here to address the number 38 on your bike way bike path along the Columbia river. I'm part of the hoa of the Hayden island mobile home park or actually manufactured home park. Mobile home is kind of a misnomer in our park, they aren't mobile. Once they're there, they're there permanently and if this bike path were to be continued, it would probably wipe out 100 homes, with the housing crisis as it is now, we wouldn't want to make the park less viable by taking out 100 or more homes for a bike path that it does not have any access to the Columbia river, there's a 30-foot drop. If you wanted to make a bike path, maybe you should make it more like downtown Portland where they made a dock out into the Columbia, but there's no way to make it viable across the manufactured home park. We would like that to be entered into as would be stricken from this plan. Thank you.

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

**Kiauna Floyd:** Thank you, mayor hales and Portland city council. The dynamic duo is back. I'm third generation owner of Amalfi's Italian restaurant on northeast Fremont street. We testified here at the last meeting about our block and the block of properties along 47th treat and first and foremost I just want to say thank you. Thank you for are your newest recommendation of cm2 zoning, my family appreciates that, thank you. And I'm really just here in support of my fellow comrade here and his restaurant and the rest of the two blocks that wasn't recommended for the cm2 zone change. You know, if possible it would be nice if all of the properties along Fremont street could get the cm2 recommendation. And really just again here in support of Steve Stanich and Stanich's restaurant and the rest of the properties and I want to thank you again, really appreciate the recommendation as well as your time on this matter. I know it's been a busy week. Very busy week for you guys so really appreciate it and by the by, our restaurants are the only two restaurants on Fremont street that actually have a parking lot with ample parking.

**Steve Stanich:** Come and park there.

**Floyd:** Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you very much.

**Steve Stanich:** Good afternoon, mayor hales and city council members. It's been quite a month for us. We're here a month ago and talking about the little league matters, stanich fields matter, customers matter. Property owners matter. We've been there since '68. I mean, 68 years. I made a joke last time we were here, should I bring the little leaguers here. And mayor hales said that he understood the field, etc. What I believe also matters very strongly and I told you I didn't understand the three neighborhood associations etc.,

November 17, 2016

but what should matter is I just on behalf of our family, just wrote four very large checks to pay our property taxes. We live within 10 blocks of the restaurant. We are in the neighborhood. A lot of the people that have been granted cm2 live in Vancouver, Washington, live all over the place. I think it's important that property owners matter and thanks to George and Gladys Stanich, we've got four of our family that live within 10 blocks. I'm also -- I'm very happy. I believe that pizza matters, but so does hamburgers. And you can have both. And it's been a hell -- heck of a month for us. A month ago, a cab driver sent a guy from the airport, we weren't on the 10 best burger list because we don't advertise, we give our money to little leaguers, etc. We were the 11th and in August we won the best cheeseburger in Portland. On October 29th, we were awarded one of the 10 best in the nation. Now, we'll only be on there for a year because next year, just like being businessman of the year they'll send me a bill for \$5,000 to get back on their list and I'll say no, we are not going on the food channel. We do have a parking lot and if you don't feel like a burger, I'll get you some pizza. All right. Thank you for your time.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Stanich:** We need that cm2.

**Hales:** We are still struggling over where exactly to draw that line. Let's hear the next three folks, please.

**Hales:** Good afternoon, and welcome.

**Madeline Kovacs:** Good afternoon, mayor Hales, commissioner Novick, Fritz, and Saltzman. I'm the coordinator of the Portland for everyone coalition. We ask that Portland city council eliminate parking minimum requirements in mixed use and commercial zones. Numbers 34 and 51 on your docket. Taking a guess at the proper size of a garage and then actually mandating that guess simply isn't the right way to solve the problem at hand. With smart parking permits, meter programs, lender underwriting standards, many new buildings will include onsite parking regardless of what the code minimum says. The point is to allow for flexibility, not mandate an assumption. The city's goal should be to leave the door open to entrepreneurs to develop new models that support low car life. Parking minimums, such as this make this impossible. You will also not necessarily strengthen Portland's inclusionary housing policy by preserving parking exceptions as a carrot. Whether developers are saving money with a parking exception with the policy or saving money due to lower parking minimum requirements it makes no difference to their ability to provide more affordable units. The inclusion rates will be set. What might happen, however, is that less parking might be built overall. What might also happen is that low-income residents who do score some of those units might be subsidizing their neighbors' parking. I will conclude this letter as I usually do advocating on behalf of one of our partners, to reiterate the Portland for everyone coalition will continue to support those land use decisions, provide plenty of affordable and diverse housing types in all Portland neighborhoods, prioritize housing for people over housing for cars, you know the list. And clearly, you don't have enough reading material so I gave you one of my favorite articles.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Welcome.

**Clint Culpepper:** Thank you for having me here today. My name is Clint Culpepper I'm a resident of the Sabin neighborhood. I am employed by Portland State University and I do serve on various advisory committees, but I'm not here representing them today. I'm the father of a 2-year-old. And I come here to talk about his future and the livability of the city of Portland. Our affordable housing crisis has been exacerbated by reserving shelter for automobiles rather than human beings. And in the future of this city, it relies on how we take care of the humans that live here, not the automobiles. I'm asking you to vote yes on amendments 34 and 51. I would also like to echo Chris Smith's comments about amendment number 39 and the prioritization of northeast 7th. And also to voice my very

November 17, 2016

strong support of amendment 40 which provides a bicycle and pedestrian connection to gateway green and as we move forward with the Portland parks project there, it's very important that we connect the elementary school that is just on the other side of i-205 to that park and to those resources that we'll have available. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Welcome.

**Jason Islas:** Thank you for having me. My name is Jason Islas and I'm actually on vacation from Santa Monica, California.

**Hales:** Welcome.

**Islas:** But I spent formative years in Portland, a graduate of reed college and I cover land use and transportation issues for a nonprofit news source in Santa Monica and I'm here to speak about 34 and 51 in part because southern California is a bit of a cautionary tale about parking minimum requirement mandates. A lot of the concerns that people have expressed, traffic and livability issues, I can tell you from first-hand experience mandating off-street parking requirements doesn't fix them. Southern California has I think some of the worst traffic on the west coast and a lot of it is exacerbated by an outmoded form of planning and I tell you a lot of us down south are very jealous of a lot of the great work that you're doing in Portland in terms of sustainability and livability. Also, speaking as someone who has done a lot of housing advocacy in southern California, mandated off-street parking can really be a burden to lower income households who don't own cars and take public transportation to work, myself included. Looking at 34 and 51 these are incredibly progressive approaches to the next century. Thank you for listening for me.

**Hales:** Thank you all very much.

**Hales:** Welcome, everyone, good afternoon.

**Janet Leigh:** Hello, thank you for your time, mayor hales and commissioners. I'm here switching gears to amendment 19 which takes place in the Woodstock neighborhood. Amendment 19 has been requested by land owner don Hannah, extending his block to include all commercial zoning designations. So his property is on Woodstock, extending south to martins and between 52nd and 51st. My husband and I own the building on Woodstock between 48th and 49th extending to martins. We're requesting to have the same cm2 zoning in our block. And, as you can see, on the map, it would be consistent with the commercial zoning extending to merchant street for many of the businesses already. The eventual commercial mixed use development of this block could help with southeast martin street, which is currently not even usable for pedestrians or bicycles. It's a mess. And having more commercial property in the area would be helpful since the availability now is almost I don't know very low. Can't find much to rent. I would be happy to answer questions, otherwise the property addresses are included here.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you very much.

**Matt Ferris-Smith:** Thank you. I live and work here in Portland and I'm here to encourage you to support amendments 34 and 51. And I don't care about car storage per se. That's perfectly fine with me. I see no reason to force people to pay thousands of extra dollars in housing costs if they don't want or need a private place to store a car. What I really care about is giving people the option to pay for car storage or not. I care about giving people the choice to pay thousands of dollars less in housing costs. I care about allowing our cities to grow in ways that support walking, biking and transit rather than cementing auto centric development into our city's development and I understand it can be tough for people to see new housing go up that does not include off-street car storage. That might mean people pay for car storage that they used to get for free, either looking for a space or paying money for a permit if their neighborhood chooses to offer that system. So you have a choice here. You can adopt a policy that helps keep housing affordable, helps us meet our goals for walking, biking and transit and helps us reduce our carbon impact. Or you

November 17, 2016

can relent to pressure from people who are accustomed to getting a public resource for free and who want to protect the public's valuable curb space for their own use and I'm not here to demonize anyone. If people want to have a private space to store a car that's fine, but not everybody wants or needs private car storage and that there are strong public health and environmental reasons for supporting people and choosing to forego private car storage. So please let's give more people that choice by removing parking minimums. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Good afternoon.

**Charlie Tso:** Good afternoon, mayor and commissioners, I'm here on behalf of Portlanders for parking reform. We strongly urge you to pass amendments 34 and 51, eliminate minimum parking requirements and require transportation management. I'm a renter and I live on north Williams avenue. I have good access to many transportation options, such as transit, bike share, walking and biking. I feel no need to own a car or drive. Recently, a new apartment building opened up on my street with 268 units and 237 underground parking spaces. I was told by the leasing office that a one-bedroom unit costs between \$1,500 to \$1,800 a month, but they are offering nine months of free parking. Is free parking what Portlanders need right now? An underground parking space costs \$55,000 to build. Parking developments require developers to oversupply parking which they give out for free to recover the costs by raising every tenant's rent. It is disturbing to me that when more and more Portlanders can't afford housing, the city chooses to prioritize car storage over housing affordability. In some ways, parking requirements end up raising the income requirements for living in transit accessible neighborhoods. Parking requirements also work at cross purposes with inclusionary zoning. Inclusionary zoning needs new housing supply to add affordable housing units, but Portland's 2013 parking mandate has already suppressed parking supply using -- we have parking management tools, they are better at managing on street parking and don't exacerbate Portland's housing crisis. Please pass amendment 34 and 51.

**Hales:** Thank you all very much.

**Joe Cortright:** I'm an economist here in Portland. I work for a company called think tank we do research on urban policy issues and also, a member of Portlanders for parking reform. In Portland, how did we get in a world and a city where we're so dependent on automobiles? With all their negative consequences, crashes, health and safety, air pollution and how did we get into a situation where housing affordability has become such a difficult problem for so many Portlanders. Now, a lot of the factors are completely beyond your control. But there is one factor that is directly in your control. And that's parking requirements. Parking requirements have the effect of driving up the rents for every Portlander who rents a house by a good estimate from study done by sight line institute, between \$200 and \$250 a month. The effect of parking requirements is to make every Portlander pay more for their rents whether they drive or not and it creates incentives for people to own and use and store cars far in excess of what they would do if they were left to their own devices and their own choices. So I think parking requirements are something that drive up the price of housing and therefore, you ought to definitely support amendments 34 and 51 because they would reduce parking requirements and have the potential to contribute to reducing rents and costs for all Portlanders. If somebody proposed to you today, a measure that added 200 to \$250 a month to everyone's rent, you would vehemently oppose it, but, in fact, that's the system that you have inherited and that if you don't adopt that amendment you're allowing to continue.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Welcome.

**Daney Dumdeang:** Good afternoon, mayor and city council. I own too many properties in this city and different cities. So we know that the city wants my property on 1138 se

November 17, 2016

Reynolds heavy -- my son will be talking and my daughter-in-law. So to change the zone to be ce, I would like to be approved, no matter neighborhood agree or not, this is my property, and I think I have a right -- I love this country because we are free to speak. They can speak what they want and I pay a lot of property taxes. I pay every year, property tax. I think the city of Portland, I live many places, I live in Canada, I love in Seattle we are in a crisis of housing so we can help the homeless with it. Thank you so much. You have problem with the homeless, I know that, you try so hard. So I support that my property should be ce soon. And then I like -- my wife --

**Hales:** You can leave it with sue.

**Dumdeang:** That's all I will say and thank you so much.

**Hales:** Thank you very much for coming. Good afternoon.

**Patricia Dumdeang:** Good afternoon, this is my husband Danny. Thank you for hearing us and our property is 1138 southeast Reynolds and the consideration is that it remains -- I'm sorry about the numbers, I'm not really clear, I think it's are r2.5 or the commercial zoning. So we've lived there for 36 years, we've raised our kids and our grandkids, our son lives next door at the other property being considered, 1126 southeast Reynolds. These two. Also, we own the property across the street, 933 southeast Reynolds and we have some renters living there who are great people and my daughter also lives in the Reynolds neighborhood so this is our neighborhood. The value of our property years ago, we refinanced our property, we took the money, we built a hospital in India so we're very civic minded people. Our goal here would be to have the opportunity to keep it residential or to go commercial. My church just closed and we were able to leave it for habitat for humanity. I mean, it's just a fantastic thing. My goal is for fantastic things, including ourselves, to have the opportunity to go commercial if it be a good thing, and I support that. Also there's a coffee shop directly behind the house that just opened up and it seems to me the neighbors like it because they use it. There are people -- in my neighborhood I recognize people want to have more going on for our neighborhood. We've got a gas station on the corner and it's just so ugly the way that they've maintained the frontage but basically the area is kind of commercial already. My 933 property is directly across from that. I see that it would be just as beneficial to have commercial as residential and we're getting older. I don't think I'll be living there too much longer because there's a lot of stairs. So I'm kind of planning for that, but I would like the opportunity.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you very much.

**Dumdeang:** Okay. Thank you.

**Hales:** Good afternoon, welcome.

**Hales:** Who would like to start? Whoever's ready? Go ahead.

**Joe Angel:** I'm always ready.

**Hales:** Go ahead, please.

**Angel:** I'll go real quick through the -- you have -- I've given the clerk four letters, you also have gotten all four letters by e-mail from me yesterday.

**Hales:** Just put your name in the record at the outset.

**Angel:** Joe angel. The first three letters I think are pretty routine so I'll go through them quickly. Two of the letters have to do with please don't put me into a nonconforming use. One of them is on Jantzen beach and one of them is on Greely. In both cases the proposed zoning is not c.e. C.e. Is the only zone in the proposed new code that is auto oriented? I have to have c.e. In order to run my existing businesses. So I'm asking that those two properties be properly zoned c.e., both of them -- one has been an auto oriented site since 1926. The other one has been a restaurant and next to the i-5 freeway. It's the only way it exists. There's just not enough population on jantzen beach for it to survive without i-5. The last one is the new Dutch brothers over by the metro center. There's a

November 17, 2016

proposed trail there. And it is a trail that leads to a dead end. The railroad just put in a new track alignment. So the bridge to nowhere has come to Portland in the form of this proposal. Please take the trail designation. It needs to come up the slope to the metro building and fit into the rest of the bike and pedestrian system.

**Hales:** That's a new one, I want to flag that. We have had a number of questions about the trail map. So thank you.

**Angel:** The real reason I'm here is I would like --

**Hales:** Summarize please.

**Angel:** We would like to have you choose and I would like you to read this letter carefully, option b. As it relates to drive-thru facilities. It's very important that we not be put into nonconforming status and even though the proposal says the drive-thrus will be allowed, when you read the other part of the code when you come in for a remodeling, it pops you into the nonconforming status of the code which takes away a bunch of things that makes you in essence not able to do a drive-thru.

**Hales:** We'll check on that. Understand the difference between intent and regulation. So thank you. Thank you very much. Welcome.

**Myla Middal:** Hi, I live in the Brooklynn neighborhood.

**Hales:** A little closer if you could to the microphone.

**Middal:** I live in the Brooklynn neighborhood and my home and my in-laws' home on Reynolds street was -- they want to change it to a c.e. Which I'm in favor of it. I believe some people in the neighborhood are not, which doesn't make sense. We have two houses, a vacant lot and a gas station. Right off Mcloughlin and Holgate near numerous I believe they're cm1, they're already zoned as commercial, as well as vacant lots down the street. We're on the edge of the neighborhood. I will be they're saying that it's making the neighborhood smaller and it doesn't make sense because I just feel like we're already commercial. I already feel like the commercial residency there, considering we don't have a huge neighborhood around it.

**Hales:** Your property is the gas station to the corner?

**Middal:** My in-laws are next to me and we have my house and down the street is another one of the properties that we own, as well as my sister-in-law. We have four properties in the Brooklynn neighborhood.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Thanks.

**Greg Schwartz:** Gregory Schwartz. I appreciate the opportunity. I'm here for 38, I agree that the bike path had to be taken off the tsp plan for Hayden bay with the provision that there be no easement anywhere along the island, specifically the Hayden island mobile home park where I live. My property is on the river. And a 30 foot or easements and my house being within that footprint, you would be empowering any builder, contractor, and disenfranchising myself as a constituent because my house would be under an easement and the owner, the builder, would no longer have to in good faith negotiate to have my place removed. This is a special one at 430 units. You would remove from the negotiations 100 some of your constituents. I think if someone wants to put a bike path in their plan, that's something someone else can figure out in another time, but to empower somebody by creating an easement from the city, you're destroying our opportunity to live there and negotiate in good faith. So I ask you to please include that there is no easements for anywhere on the island. Thank you for the opportunity.

**Hales:** Thanks very much. We've got number 38 on the list as one of the ones we're considering. Thank you. Okay.

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Bob LeFeber:** I'm a cofounder and broker with commercial realty advisors. Wanted to speak on amendment 28.A drive-thrus. I urge you to support commissioner Saltzman's

November 17, 2016

option b. The option a. From the psc makes an arbitrary distinction for zoning east of 80th avenue that makes no sense. Option c. From mayor hales would prohibit all new drive-thrus for coffee, banking, pharmacies and groceries. I think we all can agree drive-thru do serve elderly, handicapped and people with small children. They do reduce the need for parking which we heard a lot about today. I urge you to relook at where you are applying the ce zoning. We need to facilitate the retention and development of grocery stores and especially in underserved areas of Portland. Grocery stores need thousands of customers to support them, the vast majority of which come by car. The existing grocery stores have asked for c.e. Zoning, which is the only auto accommodating zone and also we proposed dozens of other sites that might lead to redevelopment so we can add more grocery stores into the unserved areas and these are all ignored at the psc level. The result will be it will be harder to redevelop existing grocery stores and new stores, especially affordable ones are less likely to redevelop, to develop in underserved areas and there will be millions of unnecessary vehicle miles traveled per year as urban residents drive to the outskirts to shop for affordable goods. Thank you for listening.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Eric Hovee:** My name is Eric Hovee, Economic and development consultant, speaking on behalf of the retail task force in support of more explicit recognition of the auto accommodating function of the c.e. Zone and in support of commissioner Saltzman's amendment 28, option b., proposal related to drive-thrus, both to reduce nonconformity. With respect to the c.e. Zone we are requesting the text of the zone purpose statement be revised to more explicitly state that c.e. Is the place for auto accommodating uses to facilitate new development and redevelopment. We further request c.e. Zoning for existing auto accommodating areas and for existing grocery stores. Adding more auto accommodating zoning is needed to avoid food deserts and nonconformity for existing grocery stores. This approach is also consistent with plan policy 6.16. F, recognizing that 80% of trips now are by car, allowing for a transition over time as market conditions together with transit patronage and increased density of development take hold, especially in east Portland. I'm also speaking in support of the option b proposal to permit drive-thru facilities in the c.e. Zone while continuing to allow existing drive-thrus in the c.m. 1, 2 and 3 zones to expand and rebuild. Our research makes it clear the drive-thrus including quick service uses are important to auto dependent customers, as for parents with children, seniors, the disabled and even tech savvy millennials. Drive-thrus also are integral to continued retail business innovation. This is the case for pharmacies as well as grocery pickup operations, trends that are likely to continue in the years ahead. We urge your support of the Saltzman option b. Proposal. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Welcome.

**Mark Whitlow:** Mayor and members of the council, I'm here on behalf of the retail task force and the international council of shopping centers. I've given you another letter, the first point of which is to support commissioner Saltzman's amendment, option b. To 28a. With drive-thru facilities. We like that as well as the other reasons stated for the reason that it does the best job of preventing these existing facilities from becoming nonconforming in a way that they can't remodel, rebrand or redevelop. So nonconformity has been a big issue of ours for the whole time but skipping over to grocery stores, we're finding some solutions for the nonconformity to drive-thrus, but we're leaving our grocery stores, particularly our middle market groceries, fred Meyers, safeway, Albertsons, 15 stores, they've asked to have c.e. Zoning, they didn't get, but one of them. They're all becoming nonconforming. That doesn't help our existing food desert problem. These people need to redevelop, update to a.d.a. Standards, etc., so on. They're right between two hard places and they need your relief. Really don't want to make them preserve the

November 17, 2016

status quo for the next 30 years and not be able to put new capital in there and maintain their auto dependency character. So the letter states all kinds of reasons, but it's hinged primarily on the planned policies that we had you work with to adopt earlier, 6.16f, which is again avoiding nonconformity. 4.85 grocery stores, and 6.67 retail development. Those things you've already made the decisions to do a better job in the mixed use zones project and the psc has recommended that you do.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you all.

**Hales:** Welcome, whoever would like to go first.

**Mizelle:** I'm not Mary that's my wife I'm going to speak for her. I'm saying this because there's a saying in our scriptures that the king is a representative of god so in this particular circumstance, you're as close to being the king as I can understand. So I offer you my respects as a result of your honorable position. So I don't have a political agenda, except to say that if you can call on the name of god, as much as possible, that will assist everyone in making the correct decision in all circumstances. There's another aphorism that says -- [speaking foreign language] Krishna is the supreme controller over everything. Everyone is the controller over something, but Krishna is the controller over everything. So if we give him that opportunity to act, then we're making the correct decision, no matter what the rationale or the passion behind the decision is. So actually I'm just speaking on a particular piece of property. My wife and I own a property on 82nd avenue. We understand that it's a mixed use civic corridor and somehow or another under the comprehensive plan zoning map, our property was included with this change in the property next to us. Only it wasn't included. The c.e. was assigned to the red, it wraps around us. We're simply requesting to continue to c.e. zoning to include our parcel, as well. This is sandy boulevard.

**Hales:** What's the address? What's the cross street?

**Mizelle:** 3834 northeast 82nd, between sandy and Fremont.

**Hales:** Are you leaving that copy with us?

**Mizelle:** I'm happy to leave these.

**Hales:** Just leave it with her and we'll get copies that way. Thank you very much and appreciate your thoughts and we need all the help we can get around here. Thank you. Welcome.

**Michael Robinson:** Thank you, mayor, good afternoon, mayor, members of city council. My name is Michael Robinson, I'm here on behalf of providence health and services. We support amendment 51. We may support it for different reasons than others we've heard talk today, but it provides clear direction to the bureaus that are going to be working with the public to develop the administrative rules that the folks who have an interest in the outcome of those rules are involved in the process, it's important not just for the institutions but for our neighbors as well and we appreciate that clear direction the amendment offers. The second thing we appreciate is the portion of the amendment that says that the administrative rules ought to effectively implement the land use regulations and make sure that you have appropriate development review standards. One of the things that we and the other institutions testified about is our concern through this very long process we're going to end up with something that while well intentioned will result in more land use appeals than we need and difficult standards to meet so we think amendment 51 does a good job of directing staff to avoid those outcomes. In any event we appreciate it being before council today and we hope council will adopt it when you deliberate next week.

**Hales:** Thanks for working on it with us. Thank you. Welcome.

**Rick Johnson:** Hello. My name is rick Johnson, I live in southeast Portland and I'm here to testify against removing the minimum parking standards. The position this is going to make housing more affordable is a red herring. Market rate is what determines rent. 100



November 17, 2016

people a day are arriving in Portland looking for housing. Demand far outstrips supply and will continue to do so for a while. I'll agree that affordability must be addressed, blaming it on parking minimums is wrong and removing them only decreases the livability in the surrounding neighborhoods. In buckman we have many families with children, families will use cars and I fear that a lack of parking will drive them out of the inner city neighborhoods. The lack of families changes a neighborhood's character, taking out the joy and innocence of children. Presently Portland lacks the necessary transportation infrastructure making it possible to efficiently move a family from a. To b. We need the parking minimums to remain and a slower transition out of cars to take place. With the last -- with less than two weeks of notice on the amendments, the lack of public process around this issue is appalling. No local studies on the effects of removing parking minimums, only the study prepared by a Dan Evans and associates that stated the following: 28% do not own or lease cars, the remaining 70% own at least one car. Furthermore, putting this in as an amendment at the last minute shows a lack of public debate and scientific input and I wish we had more time to debate this. Thank you for your time.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Hales:** I think you're first. If you're ready.

**Ty Wyman:** Yes, thank you. Thank you, mayor, members of the council. Appreciate very much your time and attention this day. And I don't intend to take up all my two minutes. Doctor rizoolie the property address 6141 southwest canyon court. I rise in support of amendment 23. Very much appreciate commissioner Saltzman for putting it on the list. The amendment 23 would rezone 6141 southwest canyon court to r5. That would correspond with a plan designation change that you approved earlier this year from r20 to r5. We understand that staff opposes the proposal due to concern about access to transit and interestingly we addressed this issue directly in testimony during the April-May plan amendment process. And I refer you to the letter of today that demonstrates the proximity to transit. It is a well under 15-minute walk that is supported by sidewalks and crosswalks. The subject property is improved with a sidewalk along one of its frontages. Question was raised about the second frontage and we submitted testimony from a traffic engineer to that effect, that upon development of the site under r5, sidewalks and indeed full half-street improvements would be required. Importantly we submitted that testimony this spring, we didn't hear any response. We're not aware of any rebuttal to a point that we've already made in the record. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Welcome.

**Carol Chesarek:** Good afternoon, mayor hales and council, I'm currently serving as forest park neighborhood association president and I'm here today on behalf of the neighborhood. I submitted e-mail testimony earlier today with background information and letters from affected property owners and you've been handed a subset of that information. I'm here to ask you to approve amendment 48 and delete together trail to nowhere from your major public trails map. I want to thank mayor hales and commissioner Fritz for moving this item forward. If you look at the second page of the map, just so you're aware the challenge is how to get from the purple squiggle on the right, the trail at forest park to the purple squiggle on the left, which is the trail in Washington county. The issue is this has to go through private property in unincorporated Multnomah county and we don't have a final trail alignment there. The board of commissioners requested more study because there are a lot of different issues. One of the most important is that the proposal would pass through a set of private properties that unanimously oppose the trail and those are outlined in red on your map with the property owners dropped in there. Those property owners also have a homeowner's association and they prohibit public trails. You need a

November 17, 2016

majority of that ho to support a change and that's very unlikely to happen. The yellow box on the map points to the trail segment that we want removed. Metro insists that they do not condemn private land for public trails. The proposed major public trails map currently includes the trail segment down Saltzman road, city policy requires that those trails be built, but what you get is a trail that leads on the street down a very steep hill into a dead end cul-de-sac without any identified practicable trail connection. Your trail users follows the trail, down and down and down and then where do you go? There's no sign to tell you, there's no outlet so you hunt around. And what you end up with is frustrated trail users who are going to have to go back up the hill, but probably not until they've poked around trespassing looking to figure out where this trail is supposed to be and some of these property owners have valuable livestock. So we don't see any upside to including this segment on your map now. The street is a public right-of-way. It's not going away. You can designate it for this trail later if we do figure out a connection for it. I'm asking you to please approve amendment 48 to remove this trail segment down northwest Saltzman road. We don't believe that the trail should be designated until you've got a trail alignment and a right of way connection. We don't need another trail to nowhere. We would be happy to work with city staff to identify a more feasible route. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Welcome.

**Susan Lindsey:** Mayor hales and commissioners, I'm here to --

**Hales:** Put your name in the record.

**Lindsey:** Susan Lindsey I'm here to make a little amendment of my own cause I was here recently testifying on the mixed use zone project as a member of that committee and at that time I was unaware that a change had happened that I wanted to make sure I bring to your attention. We had a really great process with that committee and the minimums that were set for the cm2 in the inner se were 45-55, 55 being with a bonus, but with the new discussions around inclusionary zoning that seems to have now—everything has shifted so that everything is 55 and there's an extra 5 feet for the ground floor so everything's kind of turned into a 60-foot apartment building which could turn into a enormous number of canyons through inner se and even into the residential areas cause if you look at where the cm2 is there's some cg that goes up stark and so I have a concern about that so I want to make sure that those bonuses stay true bonuses and aren't just waved away with this idea that since everyone is going to include some sort of affordable housing that we don't have to worry about the height anymore. I think we do have to worry about the height and second, I have to say something about parking. All I want to say about parking is this, that with all due respect, mayor hales, I think this is not really the best thing for the city. I'm very concerned that removing the parking minimums that what is going to take place is it's going to hurt working people, the working class. What we have seen in the parking buildings that have been built without parking that those units are more affordable in fact those units are just as unaffordable as ever. I'm very concerned if you remove this you are, in fact, removing an important negotiating piece. This will not benefit of the whole, but, in fact, will bit of the few. So I'm very concerned about this. While I appreciate and listened to the young people that this doesn't have to happen and all the reasons, having a residence very close to revolution hall I can assure you young people in droves are still driving cars and are still parking everywhere. So and we hear this time and time again concerns about parking I know that many working class people are not here today are not represented, but I wanted to speak out for them cause our transportation infrastructure is just not there yet to support those people and they deserve to be able to get around just as much as everyone else can.

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Doug Klotz:** I'm Doug Klotz. We heard a lot about the housing yesterday. This does not

November 17, 2016

ban parking it it allows the building owner to decide how many parking spaces are called for. And as long as. When we implement the parking tool kit which your gonna hear about on December 22nd that will be the key to making this whole thing work because then if You're building a building, you'll know, my intention is not going to be able to park in the street necessarily and with that in mind they may decide if there's any parking there or not. We have plenty of existing drive-thrus. I support all the numbers, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, number 39, the seventh avenue bikeway and I hope we can get -- specifically the parking removed with number 34.

**Hales:** Thank you so much. Welcome.

**Eric Bohne:** My name is Eric bohne. Thank you for the time. I own metal wield salvage in the cully neighborhood at 4311 NE Prescott. I purchased the protected early this year and I was kind of late in the comp plan as far as I'm concerned so two of the lots, the 4311 -- 4313 and 4332 are going to be rezoned the third lot that came with that purchase is lot 4337 which is not slated to be rezoned. I'm asking that it be added to the rezoning to be cued in c 1 for other properties for the ease of future development and thank you for the time.

**Hales:** The first two are currently designated c-m 1?

**Bohne:** They're going to be designated along with the new plan, yes.

**Hales:** And what was the proposal for 4337?

**Bohne:** No proposal it's just staying r7 I believe.

**Hales:** You'd prefer that to be cm1?

**Bohne:** Yes, so they're all zoned the same.

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Wendy Chung:** Good afternoon. I'm Wendy Chung, I'm here on behalf of Mwda and specifically to testify about amendment 25 a, pretending to be rh f.a.r. Changes in the alphabet historic district. I just have a few points to make that are discussed in the written testimony that you have there, but the primary thing I want to point out is that -- originally we asked that all the r-h4 to one be removed from the alphabet historic district. The psc recommended half of what we asked for which is the part north of Glisan. If you look at this map that is on your packet and also on the screen it really represents a miniscule part of the land in part every Portland. All the historic districts collectively only represent two to 3% of all the land. We're talked about a quarter of one district that we're asking not to be down zoned by right zoned from 4-1 to 2-1 therefore we believe that option A which the psc recommended is the appropriate option and I'll tell you why. Option C is basically spot zoning. It basically is three parcels that may be spots on. I understand there might be a concern about affordable housing and the potential speculative project that might come in there, but I think it might be a little short-sighted to spot zone a spike in favor of a project that may or may not happen with a plan that will in place for 20 years. I don't whether or not it's affordable, this body has been specific in what needs to be built out see the parcel we're talking about are surrounding by landmarks. You'll see in the top right corner of your screen and what they proposed as an early concept drawing. It's a six-story building, because they have four to one. This is precisely the kind of confusion that we were trying to avoid these are too big for this parcel. We're asking that this council consider an amendment if you are to do an Amendment I guess option a would be the best. We would prefer the entire historic district be zoned two to one for the reasons that we want this parcel zoned two to one.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thanks very much. Thank you all.

**Hales:** Good afternoon. Welcome.

**Richard Uren:** Thank you. My name is Richard uren. I live in the historic alphabet district. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on opposition A. My detailed reasons for supporting

November 17, 2016

this option are contained in the letter I emailed to you morning and in a letter I wrote to you last month. I support option A, because it clearly states that zoning he provisions in the historic district override the base zoning of the area in which the historic district is physically located. I support option A, because it affirms the importance and need for historic district zoning. I support option A because it does not allow for spot zoning for historic districts and finally I support option A, because it is the only one available that addresses the past, the present, and the future by asserting that a historic designation and its preservation is something of real and acknowledged value to the city. I urge you to support option A also.

**Jill Warren:** Good afternoon, my name is Jill warren. I own two historic properties in the alphabet district 1815 NW Hoyt and 607 NW 18th. I'm right across the street from the wright building, and the owners successfully getting the value of their building decreased claiming the restrictions made their property less valuable and they're unable to sell, so they are switching gears and partnering with the northwest housing alternatives to provide 160 units on a lease agreement while demonizing the neighbors claiming we're prejudice against senior housing and that's just simply not the case. My concern is because they have a lease agreement with this nonprofit what would happen if they chose to terminate that agreement and bump up to market race housing. There's a theory if seniors don't drive, but if they change the status of the tenants parking will be a nightmare. We all knew what our buildings were when we bought them and I feel the responsibility to care take that historic unique area of the alphabet district.

**Mike Conners:** Thank you. My name is mike Conners here on behalf of Hayden island enterprises. I'm here to here to testify in option to the bike path proposed on the park property. We understand there's an amendment to remove that bike path from the Hayden bayside and we're asking for a similar amendment for the bike path on our property. We've testified at length about the concerns we have with the bike path which are immediate impacts property values and refinancing the uncertainty and anxiety that creates for the owners residents of the park also the long-term impacts, Including if and when it's build and effectively rendering the park non-viable. Something I don't believe the city council supports. So since we testify quite a bit about that, I want to focus my testimony on the other end of the spectrum. The other end is why does this city want this bike path, what does it serve? Consistently at every level whether it be talking to staff or city council when we raise our concerns there has been consistent responses, don't worry, it's a line on a planning document, we're not condemning it, we're not planning on building out that bike path and we don't anticipate there being any redevelopment. They want the manufacturing part to stay. If that's the case, why are you deciding to consistently move forward with this plan? My client held legitimate concerns. So far what we've heard from the city is this plan doesn't really matter much because we're not really planning to construct it. It's a pretty heavy price to pay for something that doesn't appear to be a priority for future plan of the city and we ask you that remove it and consider our concerns. Thank you.

**Hales:** Let's get clarification on that at some point. I thought we had both amendments front of the us, both the bay portion and the manufactured home park portion. Just the bay portion? Okay, point clarified. Thank you. Appreciate it. [ reading ]

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Dona Dumdeang:** Hi my brother peter had to leave and go back to work.

**Hales:** State your name forward first.

**Dumdeang:** My name is dona Dumdeang and this is about 2035, the residents at 1138 and 1126 SE Reynolds. I grew up on 1138 and I'm on the other side of Brooklynn. Came back and loved the neighborhood. One of the things this neighborhood is lacking is for one, a store, restaurants other than a Mexican restaurant, a couple restaurants that have

November 17, 2016

come and gone. I actually think making a block that is already two-thirds commercial does not detract from the neighborhood, it rather enhances the neighborhood. I think it would be a really big mistake to keep these houses zoned 2.5 for the next I believe it's 20 years. Nothing is happening overnight, but to eliminate that from being an option, I think takes away from the neighborhood. Furthermore, as part of the Brooklynn neighborhood and my parents are still living at 1138 and my brother and his wife live at 1126 they weren't notified the fighting that was changed, the zoning on to change back to the -- the homeowners themselves weren't notified of this. I reject the Brooklynn committee proposing this change

**Hales:** Thank you so much. Welcome.

**Linda Degman:** Good afternoon, my name is Linda Degman and I'm representing Portland community college. I want to thank city staff for engaging large institutions in the region in a conversation about the comprehensive plan update. It was an intensive effort and well received by its staff. As you're likely aware pcc has engaged in the SW corridor plan for the past few years and we've been asked numerous times by that steering committee to provide a vision of what pcc Sylvania would like in the future if a regional transportation system is provided in our corridor. We finally did that work in September we held a two-day visioning work shop that was well attended by pcc staff, faculty, students, staff from metro, staff from trimet, staff from the city of Portland, and many more and the neighbors as well it was a great effort. Through that process however it became clear that the ci1 designation for us of any campus would not allow us to build out a more transit oriented campus we are asking that you support amendment 21 and change the Sylvania designation from ci1 to ci2 with the acceptance of the far to point .75 to 1 vs what is ci2 is 3-1 and we don't that intensive build out on our campus. This would allow sufficient capacity for future transit oriented development while preserving the residential surrounding neighbors, we have submitted a letter to all this as well I emailed it this morning so thank you for your time.

**Hales:** Thank you, both. Thanks very much. Okay.

**Hales:** Welcome. Whoever would like to start us off.

\*\*\*\*\*: I stood behind you in line. [ laughter ]

\*\*\*\*\*: That's true.

**Jennafer Furniss:** Hi. My name is Jennafer Furniss and I am here to talk about circling the block. We already know from research increasing for parking from ucla that 30% of the cars are in downtown are circling the block 8% to 75% in high density areas. As the density moves out in the neighborhoods we know that it's directly related to preterm and low birthrate children in those neighborhoods, so it's important we muggy this in effect rather than scrambling the end what are we going to do now there is a health problem. We know there's damage to dna sperm we know in uteral we are premature, heart defects, low birth rates, we know in infants and children whose lungs are disproportionately large their size, we have immune system problems, system development problems, asthma in inner city children and children that live near freeways, children that live in high density areas. The epa already knows that 80 to 100,000 deaths a year are caused by particulates and this is just the beginning of us getting into air pollution relating to health. So with regards to the parking over 30 spaces, I wholeheartedly am for bike transit, I'm wholeheartedly for getting our transit systems in place, but it's a part and package and I heard earlier it is part of an progressive package and we need to be managing the street parking before we start the other section. If we do one without the other, it will hurt us down the long run. It's something we're going to have to deal with for the next 100 years. Once the building is up it's there. We hear we already parked our cars, what are we going to do now. Do we want in a for the whole city, no, we want to be preventive, be progressive and be a great city and do both parts together not one or the other.

November 17, 2016

**Fritz:** So let me just clarify are you saying we should have some off street parking or not?

**Furniss:** I think that we need to manage the parking in neighborhoods, permits etcetera before we start allowing for - - basically depending that the new residents park their car in the neighborhoods so if you have a building with 60 units, we can't responsibly do that unless we have a parking plan for those streets and managing it effectively and we also know with the inclusive zoning ive been talking to the housing bureau and their already exempt from parking so if you go from a 30 unit to a 33 unit with a ten percent you don't have to do three parking spaces so we already have that built in and I just would hate to rule something out that could have really negative long term effects if it's not done holistically.

**Hales:** Thank you so much.

**Kandy Price:** My name is Kandy price and I'm here for I think it's 38 the Hayden island plan I don't have all the fancy talk and zoning that all these people know. I just am going to speak like 18 years ago, I got very little amount of money from my grandmother when she passed away, went straight to Janten beach and bought myself a little rundown manufactured home out there, and had two girls, single mom, did the best I could, upgraded it, made it a good little valuable investment for the members and my neighbors in the community. Going forward today, our houses are not mobile, we don't have the money to move them. As you know there's a lot of lower income residents out there, including myself. I am certified with the state as a caregiver and I also own my own housekeeping business, very small, and I do take care of a lot of the residential -- people that are out there that are older and do things for them because they don't have a lot of money, they don't have to move if this pike path goes through. It's a real big concern. So I guess quite a few people have installed their trust in me to put their names on a paper today. We're talking 120 people up to 44. I'm not going to throw numbers about the housing crisis, you guys are fully aware. I was raised to respect my elders and I would ask you to give us a little respect too and not displace us because we have nowhere to go, we can't move these homes and also it's already been brought to your attention that the other side of the island has already half their amendment proposal from you, but if I could also say, this is protected wetlands out there, too. There are nesting eagles out there and they're do quite well without a bike path or any other things to upset them. So we're just asking you that, please do not put in this bike path. It is just so you can successful and with the housing crisis that's already there we have a lot of concerned residents and that's what we're asking.

**Hales:** Thank you so much we appreciate you coming on behalf of your neighbors as well. Thank you.

**Jim Kuffner:** Good afternoon. I'm Jim kuffner representing the university of Portland today. We have been very aware of the ci zone process developing over the last two years ago. We took the opportunity about a month ago with some concerns, five of them. Two have been addressed because they were more interpretational and three were amendments. Two of those will address amendments and christe white will address those I wanted to speak about two other items. Somewhere along the line there seemed to be a sense that the university of Portland was seeking these amendments without due consultation with our neighborhood association. I really started to scratch my head on that because we have been blessed with a relationship with our neighborhood the last 15 years. I went to the board meeting, and tom karwaki the vice land use chair will be here shortly, he already submitted a very strong comment on our support because we went and sought that support because staff was thinking we weren't communicating and, in fact, we are and we always do. I attend all their meetings. The one thing we did not receive and we're a little bit concerned about it, the map and zoning, we worked very hard to get a

November 17, 2016

boundary that included all the realistic properties the university needed. We're a little bit concerned that why are they being left out. We're just asking basically to retain what we had in our conditional use master plan and the hearing officer approved as well.

**Hales:** Thanks for being here and while the record is open, if you have anything else to submit from property owners, in addition tours that would be helpful. I think that one of the issues that we're hung up on frankly in this case is whatever -- what policy statement we would making if we included non-university property or non-hospital property in a zone designation for institutions, property's not actually entitled to the institution yet, are we the city interfering with transactions. Those are questions that are lurking around your situation. It may be kind of an anomaly here. I think most of our campus properties; they own it all.

**Kuffner:** That's a really good point, mayor, I appreciate that. That came up in our discussions of the conditional use master plan. To include that property within the boundary, that the master plan did not affect those protects or is not in place for those properties at least in my mind it would make sense to go ahead and resort to it and say it doesn't apply until and unless the university comes into ownership of those property.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Hales:** Ms. White I think you're next.

**Christe White:** Thank you. Christe white for the university of Portland. Just commenting on the two amendments that are proposed and thank you, mayor hales, and the rest of council for listening to this testimony and our proposal. We support amendment 31 and 33. 31 is about the setback on the one portion of the street, but had imposed a 200-foot setback. I think there was a little misunderstanding it was lifted from the area setback. It was left for the conditional use master plan which doesn't have a setback. In fact, what it says is an area where we didn't plan to build in the next 10 years that had at athletic fields on it, we're changing the paradigm, we're going from a conditional use master plan that applies to 10 years to a forever zone. It was never attended there would a building setback there, so we very much appreciate this proposal understood 31 to move it from a 200-foot setback to zero setback. And then the other issue was on the building length standard we don't have one at this point. Rather, we have design standards for the frontal edge along the boulevard. We like them, the university park neighborhood association and what happened in the ci zone is what was imposed, 100 to 110, maximum building lengths and we talked to you about why that building length as inconsistent with the design pattern there and the problems it brings you as proposed in amendment 33 to increase that from 110 to 300 feet so we support that. We support them and hope we can look at this boundary issue we spoke about.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Welcome.

**Richard Larson:** I'm Richard Larson here today on amendment 53 asking you to support that. We have a property at 10th and southwest Gibbs. There's very little retail on that hill. We've got development plans we haven't submitted, honestly waiting for the construction cycle to easy up a little bit so. We're talking the zoning with the cs, we thought it was very similar, we hope you consider that a down zone. Also included some other properties we represent. They're not on your list currently and I'll be working on those in the coming manhattans.

**Hales:** That's help poll 'thank you so much. Welcome.

**JoZell Johnson:** I'm a neighbor within the alphabet district, and I am here in support of option a, which is the two to one f.a.r.. My reason for not being in support of the four to one is it changes the face of the historic district I've been a resident in this neighborhood for 23 years, that's why I purchased my property, that's why I stayed. I think changing that intentions, the intent of the alphabet district, and I want like to make sure we support that

November 17, 2016

as in the past. Again with the erosion of the continued development in the face of the historic district has been difficult. As a neighborhood I do want to support affordable housing. I support the affordable housing within the guidelines. So working in the actual overlay within love to have them there just not a six story building.

**Hales:** Thank you so much.

**Hales:** Come on up.

**Hales:** Good afternoon. Welcome.

**Vicki Skryha:** Good afternoon. I'm Vickie Skryha and I live on northwest 20th in the alphabet district. I just want to confirm what other people in northwest have said. I would like so much to be able to get to a place where we can move constructively forward with this project that's proposed and even though the f.a.r. Is under consideration if it's changed, there's still the overlay zoning. The overlays, I called the city and confirmed that they are still in affect and what we really want is the two to one be would be confirmed because it's consistent with what would be allowed with the overlay zoning district. On the reverse side of my paper, I looked up tons of examples where historical housing is build. They work together. I think because they have a background I think- - I worked a little bit in affordable housing a project of about 45 units or so would fit on that site and it would increase the number of units on that site. There are currently six. If we can get the two to one and be constructive at this, and neighbors would be happy to work with the nonprofit, come up with a good complex, it would be so wonderful, it would avoid a lot of contentiousness.

**Hales:** Welcome back to the council chambers, Ms. Richman.

**Jessica Richman:** Thank you, I'm Jessica Richman. You also have a letter with me. As you know, I worked for you as a planner for almost 30 years and for almost that long I've been a resident and owner in the alphabet historic district. I'm speaking as a resident owner and Very experienced, and so we call brilliant planner.

**Hales:** I would call brilliant.

**Richman:** Talking, of course to the f.a.r. In the alphabet district, and I agrre with Vickie and others who spoke in favor of reducing it all two to one. As a planner I'd like us to step back and remember that planning that planning involves zooming in and out to the big picture and, I think we've lost a lot of the big picture in focusing on this site and this site and what might happen on that one and I think we need to remember that the reason that the neighborhood and others have asked for the reductions two to one is as Vickie said, to provide a clear expectation that if you're in the historic district with rh zoning you're not going to be able to build that six store unit and not be compatible. You're going to go through a lot of frustration, so it's really asking for truth in stoning and that's the big picture part. I think we're talking about compatibility and clarity and also making decisions, again, good planning, based on circumstances of the land and the neighborhood, not on maybe proposals by the owners of particular sites. We need to look at this with dispassion rather than we want to help these particular projects, and finally just to note this two to one f.a.r. Would not take effect until January, 2018 so at least going to get in an application by then and would still be considered four to one. So changing two to one will not knock things out. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thanks very much. Good to see you.

**Hales:** Welcome. If you'd like to go first, go ahead.

**Markus Mead:** Thank you. My name is markus mead, and I live stumbling distance from Pok Pok restaurant, which puts me in the parking contested area formerly known as south division street. [ laughter ]

**Mead:** However, I fully support the amendments number 31 -- or sorry, 34 and 51. You might ask yourselves why that might be, that might be slightly illogical. That's out of love,



November 17, 2016

love for my city and the desire that I want others to love it just like I do and have the opportunity to do so. The best way for we humans to love something is to know it. Best way for us to know a city is to get out of our cars, so the more that we enable people to as transportation planners might say shift modes, get out of our cars and find the wonder in our city the more people might love it and I hope more people can do so and enjoy it the way I do.

**Hales:** Thank you. Who'd like to go next?

**Tony Schwartz:** I'll go next. My name is Tony Schwartz. I live at 1729 NW Irving in the Alphabet District and I live directly across from the two parcels that City Council is considering essentially spot zoning with regard to a and option c. I'm here in favor of the reduction in the historic district. I would say I'm a little bit concerned with regard to the owners of the site. I heard one of them say in the press that he would without doubt file a claim under measure 49 if the four to one, two to one reduction would occur. I read measure 49, measure 49 only applies to just compensation when there's a regulation that impairs the establishment of single family residences and your city attorney agrees with me. I would ask you to not only be aware of, but also reject that sort of bullying tactic. With regard to my house I bought in 2007, I did buy a house that would be built in 1884, nine years after Abraham Lincoln was shot. It was a test of time. I was a steward of this house and this historic district in terms of existing structures and also new development. New development would be essentially developed in compatible and comparable size and scope and architectural are feet first. I truly believe it was established with generations in mind, not just crisis from one year to another. Crisis come, crisis go. No one predicted the 2008 great depression we have no idea what's going to happen with the fiscal and monetary policy nothing is for certain, but what is for certain right now is this district and the district wants to survive and it wants to survive with compatible buildings into the future so I ask with everything that's been said before including from the NWDA to reduce the FAR from 4-1 to 2-1 thank you.

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Marty Stiven:** I'm here on behalf of Richard Pastinni who represents various members of the family and the properties they own in Portland. I've been here before you several times and I'm today in support of your four amendments. The first two are amendments 14, 60th and Belmont. This expands the zoning and, of course, we never support that. The second one is amendment 15. It affects our property at 7200 and 7400 Southeast Milwaukee Avenue. It's proposed to be zoned C-M2 and the district of this amendment puts a D overlay on it. I talked to the staff and support the district and the overlay zone. The third option is in regards to the drive through windows and quick servicing areas and we're in support of Commissioner Saltzman's amendment, 28b. If you remember, we have asked for zoning to be changed to CE because of the timing. You haven't seen your way to doing that yet, but we still would like to support the option for the 28b which would allow new drive-through windows and quick vehicle servicing in the CE zone. And lastly amendment number 53, we submitted testimony about property on Ninth and Gibbs on Marquam Hill thinking that knowing that it's a down zone from commercial storefront zoning to CM1 we're happy to see the commissioner Novick looking at several areas and we would support and hope, encouraging you to do that.

**Hales:** Thank you so much.

**Tim Ramis:** Hello. I'm here to support amendment 22. I don't believe there's any real disagreement about the goal for this property, which is a 1-acre site at 58 and Sylvan. The owners I think along with the staff agree that it's a great site for middle housing there needs to be an infill of the missing sidewalk frontage along the retail site. The real problem is how to get there. Failing to act on the amend will produce only delay. The

November 17, 2016

argument for delay has been the strange assertion that absent a quasi-judicial zone change, the city is powerless to condition the owners to build a sidewalk. I think as you travel in the city it is apparent that statement can't be true. Throughout the city you observe sidewalks, street frontal edges, all being constructed as project conditions. There's been no zone change. The reason is you have plenty of authority in your code and you enforce that. That is true on 58th and other projects along the way. The staff also makes the statement that it acts good solid access. This is the report the most recent work of pbot and says the site is well served by transit and comfortable and same walking results are available.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Garrett Stephenson:** Good afternoon, my name is Garrett Stephenson representing Columbia steel casting, here to talk about amendment 43, testifying in support of that amendment. I wanted to say that we appreciate working with staff on this. For the record was a minor change to the proposed bike and ped path that was mapped over our client's property and the staff was very easy to work with when we came and said we'd like to move that. Still on the property, but out of Columbia steel's operational areas, which included their Circulation, roadways, as well as their substation so I urge you to approve this. I think it's a good compromise and I'm here to answer any questions you have.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Evan Heidtmann:** I'm in support of amendments 34 and 51. Minimum parking requirements are a bad policy they don't create more parked overall, they don't ease parking congestion or traffic congestion, they incentivize car ownership and subsidize car ownership at the expense of everybody else. So parking supply wouldn't you think that minimums add more parking, but as you've seen in NW where we don't have minimums you see construction is producing minimums at a greater rate that would be required if minimums were required the difference is just that some buildings have more parking that would be required, but overall the ratio is comparable to what would be required elsewhere in the city. So limited minimums allow more choice in housing. The parking congestion, you might think minimums will free up street spaces, but that's not how that works. Minimums force builders to build parking, but nobody can force tenants to rent those spaces is street parking is free. So, as long as any is available on the street that is when people their cars the only time people will rent space in a lot is if street parking is so congested that sits really difficult to find a space so at no point do the minimums improve parking congest on the street. On the other hand, it is not free and you don't need to force builders to build it because they'll build as much as demand. So set the prices of street parking appropriately and people will find a place to park when they need it, you could also eliminate minimums to allow more choice in housing regarding traffic congestion, congestion is bad imagine what it will be like if we continue to grow at the same rate we have currently. We don't have the space for that many cars on our road so we need to stop incentivizing car ownership and driving as we currently do and we can start doing that by eliminating parking minimums. Climate change is another issue addressed by minimums driving is the most inefficient way to get around the city so we need to stop requiring developers to incentivize driving through minimums. Wealth and equality is also a part of this but I'm out of time so thanks.

**Hales:** Thank you so much.

**Hales:** Come on up.

**Hales:** Thank you. Welcome.

**Allison Reynolds:** Good afternoon my name is Allison Reynolds, and I'm with Perkins. I'm here on behalf of several of our clients as provided in our written materials. I don't know if you have those, but we have provided a table that has these request on it and we are

November 17, 2016

asking you to adopt some new amendments today that didn't make the list in on several of these client's properties, which is from leader staff considerations. Weapon to bring non-could be forming uses into conformance in the new codes. The areas shaded blue are changes that are used to prevent nonconforming which we feel is especially crucial. Many can be accomplished by only permitting new uses in certain categories. One is the golf course use which will become a non-open space use when industrial zoning and the overlay are applied to its property prohibiting only new spaces in the overlay would solve that non-conforming issue. If you don't feel that you can accommodate our request we ask that you add number 55 which directs staff to consider changes to avoid new and continued nonconformance to properties we've identified and potentially others.

**Hales:** Thank you. Very helpful. Thank you. Welcome.

**Siri Shelty:** Hi. Thank you. My name is Siri. I have a house on northwest glisan street behind the historical homes on Hoyt. I agree with all of my neighbors and hope you go for opposition a.

**Hales:** Thank you. Welcome. Good afternoon.

**Deborah Romerein:** Debra romerein. I'm actually here to urge you to maintain some adequate parking requirements and mixed use in commercial zones. If we need more study to predict what parking will mean need let's do it. The alternative is more contact investigated streets like Portland nw Portland where parking is a blood sport. Where more retail is built street parking obviously becomes more scares and the arduous task of finding is more stress filled. Businesses are hurt, and, I mean, all along one street went broke and closed for lack of customers could no longer park nearby when adjacent construction went in with little parking. That building now stands empty, the landlord is deeply desperate. This year, construction housing three new businesses, including 150 capacity restaurant and a theater music club were built with no parking, zero for staff and patrons right next to my small apartment building. My building has been there for 90 years and my residents come home to face the anxiety to circle and hunt for non-existent parking. How is that fair to ruining my business? Further many of my residents would have to take multiple buses to get to and from work thus doubling and sometimes tripling there commute. Time is a precious come order tee. There seems to be an inference that people who want a car are addicted to a luxurious lifestyle. I live in a small home, one apartment. I don't have kids that would have used enormous resources, I don't have a boat and other toys, but I have used the same Small fuel efficient car for the past seventeen years, which I need to run errand for my business, visit friends, but I find myself choosing malls in which to shop and avoiding small local businesses I used to frequent because they're on street parking is so blocked. We are not New York city with an extensive subway system. Give people incentives to move to electric and highbred in small efficient cars that they still need to park them and they should be able to park without engaging in stressful high parking wars.

**Fritz:** Where do you live?

**Romerein:** 3525 northeast 23rd.

**Tamara DeRidder:** I'm Tamara DeRidder. I'm here on behalf of the rose city park neighborhood association as their chairperson. At our last board meeting on the 15th, our board did support the letter that I about written on October 13th dealing with asking the council to address adequate parking. As it is written in the comprehensive plan, the policy is 9.58 and says strive to provide adequate, but not excessive off street parking where needed, but instead the mayor decides to take away the required parking that me and the other neighborhood representatives worked, so hard on for a full year back in 2012 to get in place. So the board also approved -- well, they went through and looked at the most proposed and opposed the removal of the minimum on street parked requirements, and the reasoning behind that is number one, incentive. By keeping minimum off street parking

November 17, 2016

requirements these parking spaces can be used as trade collateral for increased bicycle, pedestrian and amenities. B, needed for off street parked capacity. It creates off street parked that could be used as shared future public parking and it supplements the needed nearby off street parking for the handicapped accessible spaces, which is not necessarily on street. It supports local business clientele and it pertains to future income generating options so -- such as retain some leverage with the property owners and builders to bring them to the table to create future parking, management options such as a fee based system for them to pay in lieu of the off street parking. We lose that leverage, so keep it for now until we go through the process and create a management system thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Tom Karwaki:** Tom Karwaki, vice chair of the community park neighborhood association commission and land use chair. The university Portland has a conditional use master plan, it was unanimously adopted and accepted and endorsed by the neighborhood association. It was adopted by the city two years ago and it's been in place. The current proposal doesn't always address that and I think the particular amendments number 33 and 31 are particularly important. They actually return the staff proposal to actually what is in the conditional use master plan. So what we're asking for is to make sure that the university and the neighborhood are kept whole through this process and not hurt by the process which it would be without these two amendments. In addition to that there's the issue of the boundaries and in the conditional use master plan, that was a specific master plan applied only if the certain two properties that are islanded the mercers and the helders and the Baxter McCormick property were actually controlled by the university. The proposal before you on the campus institutional structure includes those properties, but the university does not control them, so there's a real concern you may be opening up yourself a lawsuit even because you're actually limiting these particular property owners from actually doing something with them. We are asking you to reword that particular section of institutional campus map was to the return back to what it was in the master plan.

**Hales:** You mean, including them?

**Karwaki:** Yes, it includes them, only if the university or another institution controls them and otherwise you're precluding them from selling them to anyone else

**Fritz:** Is there an amendment that does that?

**Karwaki:** so far that is what I think mr. Kuffner is asking for. We are asking for that as well, that it actually be a little more tailored than it is now. It's easy to draw a line and say on this line is one thing, on this side it's something else. It's only they actually control the property either through lease or ownership.

**Fritz:** I'm glad that doctor kuffner is still here as well because I want to commend both of you, you do work really well to get the institution and the neighborhood whenever I've dropped in unannounced to the university park neighborhood association you have always been there so thank you.

**Karwaki:** And we have wanted to work to continue and that would be very important for that relationship. Thank you.

**Hales:** Is he really the last person signed up? So adam if you don't mind a reference at your expense or at least in your honor in the craig of the world adam was the first-man and in the creation of this multi-year comprehensive plan, you're the last. [ laughter ]

**Adam Herstein:** So yeah, my name is Adam Herstein. I am asking city council to pass amendment 34 to eliminate minimum parking requirements in mixed use zones. If we're to be a city that provides housing for people not for cars we want to discourage private automobile use, we must eliminate parking minimums along transit corridors. Given the fact that the next four years will be disastrous for climate change now more than ever it is imperative that city's take the lead in fighting against this impending disaster there is also

November 17, 2016

much uncertainty regarding housing affordability over the next four years. It's important for cities to take the lead to provide affordable housing. Requiring parking necessarily increases housing prices in neighborhoods where people have other options. I live in inner southeast and get around primarily by foot bus and bike. My wife and I enjoy walking to division street and many bars and restaurants there one of the reasons I moved to Richmond is the level of walkability and bikeability I believe adding more cars to the neighborhood please do not hesitate to pass measure 34 to eliminate parking minimums in mixed use zones thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you so much and that is the last word in terms of public testify. I'm going to close the public hearing, but leave the record open until five. Tomorrow, five. Tomorrow for written testimony. And any questions or inquiries for staff at this point? I know we have work sessions ahead. Thank you three very much for being our last testifiers. We'll get Eric up a bit.

**Engstrom:** The main order of business is you also have to continue this item until Tuesday, so the public knows you're going to have that deliberation so we don't have to re notify anybody.

**Hales:** We're continuing this to Tuesday's work session in.

**Engstrom:** It's actually a regular council session cause you'll be voting one the amendments.

**Hales:** Voting session. We're continuing it until Tuesday.

**Hales:** 9 a.m. Tuesday.

**hales:** And again, written testimony can be submitted until five. Tomorrow -- go ahead.

**Saltzman:** Are we allowed to bring new amendments Tuesday or not?

**Engstrom:** You can, just be aware that you won't have the benefit of as much public feedback about that. If you heard something tonight that causes you to make an amendment to your amendment or something different that's possible.

**Hales:** Okay, that could happen. Well, we'll have more chances To -- chances to think our hard worked and long run is effort by the staff. Thank you so much and we'll adjourn until next week and we'll see you Tuesday.

**At 4:36 p.m. council adjourned.**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL AGENDA</b>  <b>City Hall - 1221 SW Fourth Avenue</b>  <b><u>WEDNESDAY, 9:30 AM, OCTOBER 12, 2016</u></b></p> <p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz and Novick, 4.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Disposition:</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COMMUNICATIONS</b></p> <p><b>1118</b> Request of David Gwyther to address Council regarding 10<sup>th</sup> and SW Yamhill Parking Garage project (Previous Agenda 1094)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1119</b> Request of Douglas Peterson to address Council regarding 10<sup>th</sup> and SW Yamhill Parking Garage project (Previous Agenda 1095)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1120</b> Request of Fredric Alan Maxwell to address Council regarding inviting the USS Zumwalt to Portland (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1121</b> Request of Adam Brunelle to address Council regarding Lents Strong community action plan (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1122</b> Request of Craig Rogers to address Council regarding safety on the streets (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1123</b> Request of Charles Ormsby to address Council regarding Terwilliger Blvd Sewer Project (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1124</b> Request of Laura Struble and Oxana Oleynik to address Council regarding educational exchange with Portland's Sister City in Russia (Communication)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TIMES CERTAIN</b></p> <p><b>1125 TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM</b> – Proclaim October 2016 to be Filipino American History Month in Portland (Proclamation introduced by Mayor Hales and Commissioner Fish) 15 minutes requested</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<p><b>1126 TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM</b> – Accept the Office of Neighborhood Involvement FY16-17 Housing Emergency Community Engagement Plan (Report introduced by Commissioner Fritz) 20 minutes requested</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 19, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>

<p><b>1127 TIME CERTAIN: 11:00 AM</b> – Appeal of Portsmouth Neighborhood Association against the Hearings Officer’s Decision to approve the application of Bridge Meadows for a Conditional Use and Adjustment with conditions for New Meadows, a proposed group living facility, at 8710 N Dana Ave (Findings introduced by Commissioner Saltzman; Previous Agenda 1032; LU 15-273480 CU AD) 10 minutes requested</p> <p><b>Motion to adopt Findings:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>FINDINGS ADOPTED</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b></p> <p><b>1128</b> Reappoint George Fetzer to the River Community Advisory Committee for a term to expire May 21, 2019 (Report introduced by Mayor Hales and Commissioner Saltzman)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept the report:</b> Moved by Novick and seconded by Fritz.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b></p> <p><b>1129</b> Extend term of Street Closure Program in Old Town/Chinatown for a period of one year (Second Reading Agenda 1098)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188026</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Bureau of Planning &amp; Sustainability</b></p> <p><b>*1130</b> Adopt a Waste Reduction Plan and accept and authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Metro to receive Metro Waste Reduction Challenge Funds for the Recycle at Work Program in FY 2016-17 and 2017-18 (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188027</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p> <p><b>*1131</b> Pay claim of Teri Briggs in the sum of \$35,000 involving the Water Bureau (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188028</b></p>
<p><b>*1132</b> Pay claim of Philippa Brunsman in the sum of \$8,007 involving the Bureau of Environmental Services (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188029</b></p>
<p><b>*1133</b> Authorize a three-year lease with American Property Management for Portland Parks and Recreation to lease space at 305 NE 102<sup>nd</sup> Ave known as the Multnomah Plaza Office Building through September, 2019 estimated at \$75,000 annually (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188030</b></p>
<p><b>*1134</b> Authorize a one-year lease extension for \$12,925 with the Oregon School Boards Association and the League of Oregon Cities for the Office of Government Relations to lease space at 1201 Court St, SE, Suite 400, Salem known as the Local Government Center through June 30, 2017 (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188031</b></p>

<p><b>*1135</b> Authorize a contract with Convergence Architecture for 1900 Building Restroom Upgrades for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$157,508 (Ordinance; Contract No. 30005465)  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188032</b></p>
<p><b>*1136</b> Authorize a grant agreement with Historic Portland Public Market Foundation dba James Beard Public Market for \$200,000 to implement a program for a permanent, year-round public market in Portland (Ordinance)  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188033</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p>	
<p><b>1137</b> Rename a segment of NE Couch Ct and name a segment of unnamed public right-of-way as NE Couch St (Second Reading Agenda 1103)  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188034</b></p>
<p><b>1138</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation for inspections of City-owned highway tunnels (Second Reading Agenda 1104)  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188035</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b> <b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b></p>	
<p><b>*1139</b> Authorize grant agreement with the Rosewood Initiative in the amount of \$55,000 to fund Community Center Director position and operational costs (Ordinance)  (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188036</b></p>
<p><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b> <b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b> <b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p>	
<p><b>*1140</b> Authorize purchase of replacement Police Patrol Vehicles at \$3,243,864 (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>RESCHEDULED TO OCTOBER 19, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1141</b> Authorize water revenue bonds to finance water system additions and improvements and to refund water revenue bonds (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 19, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1142</b> Ratify a successor collective bargaining agreement between the City and the Portland Police Association relating to the terms and conditions of employment of represented employees in the Portland Police Association bargaining unit (Second Reading Agenda 1109)  (Y-3 Fish, Fritz, Hales; N-1 Novick)</p>	<p><b>188037</b> AS AMENDED</p>



<p><b>*S-1143</b> Authorize a contract with Labyrinth Solutions, Inc. for implementation services for SAP Enterprise Asset Management at a not-to-exceed amount of \$1,850,000 (Previous Agenda 1107) 10 minutes requested</p> <p>Rescheduled to October 12, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.</p> <p><b>Motion to accept substitute ordinance:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-4)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>SUBSTITUTE</b> <b>188041</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p> <p><b>1144</b> Vacate a portion of an unnamed alley between N Midway Ave and N Columbia Blvd subject to certain conditions and reservations (Second Reading Agenda 1110; VAC-10107)</p> <p>Rescheduled to October 12, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188038</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b> <b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b></p> <p><b>*1145</b> Authorize the acquisition of 12 acres of real property on NW 4<sup>th</sup> Place, adjacent to Forest Park, for \$860,000 to be used for Park purposes (Ordinance)</p> <p>Rescheduled to October 12, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.</p>	<p><b>RESCHEDULED TO</b> <b>OCTOBER 19, 2016</b> <b>AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b> <b>Portland Housing Bureau</b></p> <p><b>*1146</b> Extend contract with Housing and Development Services, Inc., for licensing and maintenance of the Portland Housing Bureau's core software system and increase compensation in amount of \$309,602 (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 30002366)</p> <p>Rescheduled to October 12, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.</p>	<p><b>RESCHEDULED TO</b> <b>OCTOBER 19, 2016</b> <b>AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1147</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Gresham for \$928,067 for the HOME Investment Partnership Program (Ordinance)</p> <p>Rescheduled to October 12, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.</p>	<p><b>RESCHEDULED TO</b> <b>OCTOBER 19, 2016</b> <b>AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1148</b> Approve application under the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program for Koz 16th and Marshall located at 1015, 1033 and 1039 NW 16th Ave (Second Reading Agenda 1114)</p> <p>Rescheduled to October 12, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188039</b></p>
<p><b>1149</b> Approve application under the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program for Koz 2211 SW 4th located at 2211 SW 4th Ave (Second Reading Agenda 1115)</p> <p>Rescheduled to October 12, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>188040</b></p>

**WEDNESDAY, 3:00 PM, OCTOBER 12, 2016**

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz and Novick, 4.

**1150 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM** – Recognize that irregular, unpredictable work schedules negatively affect businesses, employees and the families of employees, and encourage employers to review their worker scheduling practices and consider changes that ensure workers have predictability and the chance to work the hours necessary to earn a full, livable paycheck (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Novick) 1 hour requested

Rescheduled to 3:00 pm.

(Y-4)

**37238**

**1151 TIME CERTAIN: 3:00 PM** – Adopt the City of Portland’s Vision Zero Action Plan, Saving Lives with Safe Streets, developed by the Vision Zero Task Force (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Novick) 2 hours requested

**RESCHEDULED.  
DATE TO BE  
ANNOUNCED**

*Continued next page*

**THURSDAY, 2:00 PM, OCTOBER 13, 2016**

**1152 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM** – Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Previous Agenda 1117; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 3 hours requested

*People interested in providing testimony may begin signing up one hour before the hearing but may only sign up for one person at a time. Testimony is limited to two minutes per person. Testifiers who signed up on Oct 6<sup>th</sup>, but did not speak, will be called first.*

City Council also invites *written* testimony through October 13, 2016:

Via the [Map App](#): Testify on recommended Zoning Map changes by location.

By Email: [cputestimony@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:cputestimony@portlandoregon.gov) with subject line

“Comprehensive Plan Implementation”

By U.S. Mail:

Portland City Council

1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 130

Portland, OR 97204

Attn: Comprehensive Plan Implementation

**For more information:** See [Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Comp Plan](#)

**Questions?** Call the Comp Plan Helpline 508-823-0195

**CONTINUED TO  
NOVEMBER 17, 2016  
AT 2:00 PM  
TIME CERTAIN**

**NOTE:** “Time Certain” indicates that an item will not be heard by Council **prior** to the time specified.

Communications items are three minutes each. Regular Agenda items taking longer than five minutes have the time estimate noted next to the item.

The \* indicates an emergency ordinance, which takes effect immediately if passed. Non-emergency ordinances require two readings and a 30-day waiting period before taking effect. Resolutions, reports, etc., adopted by Council are effective after adjournment.

The above summary is published by the City Auditor as provided by Section 2-113 of the Charter and Ordinance No. 130672.

Council Chambers is equipped with a sound system for the hearing impaired. Assisted listening devices are available from the Clerk.

The City of Portland will gladly accommodate requests for an interpreter or make other

**OCTOBER 12-13, 2016**

accommodations that further inclusivity. Please make your request at least 48 hours before the meeting to the Council Clerk 503-823-4086. (TTY 503-823-6868).

City Council meetings can be viewed at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/video>. The meetings are also cablecast on CityNet 30, Portland Community Media television.

**Mary Hull Caballero**  
Auditor of the City of Portland

=====

Testimony is taken on Reports, Resolutions and Ordinances (first reading). To testify, sign up on a testimony sheet as you enter Council Chambers on the day of the meeting. Individuals have 3 minutes to testify, unless otherwise stated at the meeting. Testimony is not taken on Communications, Second Readings, Proclamations or Presentations in accordance with Code 3.02.040 F. and G.

Written testimony may be emailed or mailed to the Council Clerk prior to the meeting.

To schedule a Communication, email or mail your request to the Council Clerk. Include your name, address, phone number and a brief description of the subject you will be addressing. For full details, see Testimony Policies and procedures. <http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/index.cfm?&a=63123&c=34447>

Clerk Email: [karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov)  
Council Clerk Testimony: [cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov)  
US Mail: Council Clerk, 1221 SW Fourth Ave., Room 130, Portland OR 97204

=====

Declaration Required by Lobbyists. Portland City Code 2.12.060 states: Prior to offering public testimony before City officials, at the beginning of any meetings or phone calls with City officials, or in emails and letters to City officials, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent for that communication.

=====

*“Be a part of the picture...get involved with your City...volunteer for a City of Portland Board or Commission. For more information, a brochure, or a volunteer application, stop by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement in City Hall or call 503-823-4519.”*

**OFFICERS OF PORTLAND CITY GOVERNMENT**

**CHARLIE HALES, MAYOR**

Commissioner of Finance and Administration  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 340, 97204  
 (503) 823-4120  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/mayor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/mayor/)  
 e-mail: [mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>
Portland Police Bureau Portland Development Commission Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Fire & Police Disability and Retirement Office of Equity and Human Rights Office of Management and Finance Office of Government Relations City Attorney City Budget Office Oversight of the Willamette River Super Fund clean-up project

**NICK FISH**

Commissioner of Public Works  
 Position Number 2  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 240, 97204  
 (503) 823-3589  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fish](http://www.portlandonline.com/fish)  
 e-mail: [Nick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Nick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Environmental Services Bureau of Hydroelectric Power Water Bureau	<i>Elders in Action</i> <i>Portland Utility Review Board</i> <i>Venture Portland</i> <i>Portland's Centers For The Arts</i> Regional Arts and Culture Council

**AMANDA FRITZ**

Commissioner of Public Utilities  
 Position Number 1  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 220, 97204  
 (503) 823-3008  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fritz/](http://www.portlandonline.com/fritz/)  
 e-mail: [amanda@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:amanda@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Parks & Recreation Office of Neighborhood Involvement	<i>Royal Rosarians</i> <i>Multnomah County Animal Control</i> <i>Portland Parks Board</i> <i>Urban Forestry Commission</i> <i>Golf Advisory Committee</i> <i>Portland International Raceway Advisory Committee</i> <i>Protected Sick Time ordinance implementation</i> [continued next page]

	<p><i>Council Lead on the City Coordinating Committee addressing the Department of Justice Settlement</i></p> <p><i>Visitors Development Fund Board (with Saltzman)</i></p>
--	---

**STEVE NOVICK**

Commissioner of Public Safety  
 Position Number 4  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 210, 97204  
 (503) 823-4682  
 website: [www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/)  
 e-mail: [Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Transportation Bureau of Emergency Management Bureau of Emergency Communications	<i>Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)</i> <i>Portland Streetcar Inc.</i> <i>Regional Emergency Management Group</i> <i>BOEC Users Group</i> <i>BOEC Finance Committee</i> <i>Taxi Cab Board of Review</i> <i>Towing Board of Review</i>

**DAN SALTZMAN**

Commissioner of Public Affairs  
 Position Number 3  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 230, 97204  
 (503) 823-4151  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/saltzman](http://www.portlandonline.com/saltzman)  
 e-mail: [dan@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:dan@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Development Services Portland Fire & Rescue Portland Housing Bureau Gateway Domestic Violence Center Portland Children's Levy (formerly Portland Children's Investment Fund)	<i>Travel Portland</i> <i>Visitors Development Fund (with Fritz)</i> <i>Home Forward</i> <i>League of Oregon Cities</i> <i>Adjustment Committee</i> <i>Building Board of Appeals</i> <i>Design Commission</i> <i>Historic Landmarks Commission</i>

## **MARY HULL CABALLERO**

Auditor of the City of Portland  
1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 140, 97204  
(503) 823-4078  
website: [www.portlandonline.com/auditor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/)  
e-mail: [AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov)

### **Portfolio**

Assessments, Finance & Foreclosure  
Audit Services  
City Elections  
City Recorder  
-Archives  
-Council Clerk / Contracts Division  
-Records Management  
Hearings Office  
IPR - Independent Police Review  
Ombudsman  
Portland Multnomah Progress Board

### **BUREAU DIRECTORS**

Bureau of Development Services	Paul Scarlett
Bureau of Emergency Communications	Lisa Turley
Bureau of Emergency Management	Carmen Merlo
Bureau of Environmental Services	Michael Jordan
Bureau of Human Resources	Anna Kanwit
Bureau of Internal Business Services	Bryant Enge
Bureau of Planning & Sustainability	Susan Anderson
Bureau of Police	Michael Marshman
Bureau of Revenue & Financial Services	Ken Rust
Bureau of Technology Services	Jeff Baer
Bureau of Transportation	Leah Treat
City Attorney	Tracy Reeve
City Budget Office	Andrew Scott
Fire & Police Disability and Retirement	Samuel Hutchison
Office of Equity and Human Rights	Dante James
Office of Government Relations	Martha Pellegrino
Office of Mgmt & Finance –Chief Admin Officer	Fred Miller
Office of Neighborhood Involvement	Amalia Alarcón de Morris
Portland Development Commission	Kimberly Branam
Portland Fire & Rescue	Mike Myers
Portland Housing Bureau	Kurt Creager
Portland Parks & Recreation	Mike Abbaté
Revenue Director	Thomas Lannom
Water Bureau	Michael Stuhr

Updated 08-19-2016



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

**OFFICIAL  
MINUTES**

**Excerpt Item 1152.**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **13<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER, 2016** AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 4.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Lauren King, Deputy City Attorney and Mike Cohen and Jim Wood, Sergeants at Arms.

<p><b>1152</b>      <b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Previous Agenda 1117; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 3 hours requested</p>	<p><b>Disposition:</b></p> <p><b>CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>
--	---

At 5:03 p.m., Council adjourned.

**MARY HULL CABALLERO**  
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love  
Clerk of the Council

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



October 13, 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.

**OCTOBER 13, 2016            2:00 PM**

**Hales:** Good afternoon and welcome to the October 13th meeting of the Portland city council. Please call the roll.

[ roll call ]

**Hales:** Welcome, everyone. Appreciate your involvement this afternoon. We have a single item on the council calendar. I'll get Karla to read that and we'll get started.

**Item 1152.**

**Hales:** Thank you. Thanks, everyone, for being here. Appreciate your involvement. Today we're here to take more public testimony and we're relying on that to tune this plan and make it as helpful as possible for the future of our city. Before we start, I want to go over logistics to make sure this process goes smoothly. You can also testify in writing or by email or online with the bureau of planning sustainability's map app. And we recommend that you do that in addition to or to complete testimony that you might make here today. Want to acknowledge we continue to receive written testimony and in various electronic and paper forms. And that's very helpful to all of us. We're taking in a lot of information. So written material is quite helpful. To maximize the number of people that are going to be able to speak this afternoon, I'd like to limit oral testimony to two minutes each. And that gives you a chance to summarize your points. If you can't get it all in, you can follow up by email or in writing. And we do read these materials. If you are testifying about a specific property, if you can, don't forget to tell us the address just so we can note that in our own notes that we're taking as we go along. The content of your testimony is more important than the number of people who say it. So if you are here with a cause or with a concern in the community that has a lot of others in it, it's helpful if somebody summarizes that and people indicate they are on board rather than we hear the same thing 20 times. Again, we're going to try to hear as many people as possible today. And I know we have about 30 people who signed up last week because we had a hearing then. And we're going to take them first. I don't believe we need to take any staff presentations before we start. We did that the last time. We have a work session scheduled for October 25th to discuss testimony and identify potential amendments that one or more members of the council are interested in. And then there's a hearing tentatively scheduled for November 17th to allow you to comment on the amendments that we do propose. And keep an eye on our city calendar through the council calendar to make sure that's the date we stick with and that's the date we have in mind, November 17th. So with that, unless there's anything else I've neglected to include, we'll go back to the testimony list, which was not completed last time and start where we left off.

**Theren Park:** Good afternoon. I'm Theren park, chief exec of the delivery system which includes 8 hospitals in outpatient services. This testimony is specific to province Portland medical center. We have been successful in reducing our single occupancy vehicle rate from 88% to 68% over the last couple of years. And we remain committed to that work. However, our future is dependent on flexibility within the tdm strategies and what is effective for our campus. Operationally that includes how we partner with public transportation, our neighborhood associations with the city on how we implement the tdm. If the city adopts a tdm strategy that requires pay to park program, that could have a negative effect on our operations on our partnerships that we currently have. And most importantly on our care givers. A requirement of pay to park could affect and will affect our lowest wage care givers that we have at providence Portland medical center and would affect them the most. What we would respectfully request of the city council is to not adopt

October 13, 2016

a tir and tdm regulations. A complete package including the administrative roles should be made available on the tdm regulations for hospitals and we would like the opportunity to review that for public review and comment.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Fritz:** Can you just tell me where is that regulation about pay to park, where about is it found?

**Hales:** Michael can answer.

**Michael Robinson:** Good afternoon, mayor, members of the council. My name is mike Robinson here on behalf of providence. Can I step back to my chair and tell you where that regulation is? Do you mind?

**Hales:** Sure. That would be helpful.

**Robinson:** Thank you.

**Robinson:** We have a lawyer short. You might be happy about that. Let me make sure I have the right regulation. So council, in 33.266.410.a, this is under the transportation parking section, section a purpose. Describes the methods which tdm will reduce single occupancy vehicle travel. And one of them is pricing. We understand by working with our friends at pbot, the pricing includes charging employees for parking. We also have a handout given to us in July that shows a point system, which we thought was an encouraging way to address an objective system whereby we can try and use strategies to reduce beyond the reduction we've made. Under one of the strategies is pricing, charging employees for parking. Now, this version doesn't have a percentage figure. When we met the first time, the points you would get was 40%. So almost half of the points you'd be awarded for successful tdm strategy is pricey. And that is charging employees for parking. That's where you find this information. And let me do my testimony. It's only going to take 30 seconds and I'll make a final point. My name is mike Robinson. I'm here with Mr. Park on behalf of providence health and services Oregon. We have two letters we've submitted to council. One by myself and one by Portland providence medical center. And our primary concern is the lack of the administrative roles. That's really how the council will understand how tdm will be achieved. What we have asked pbot and we still think this is a reasonable request. Not only in title 33 but then the regulations in title 17. Let's see what the administrative roles look like. May be we're able to resolve our concerns. But as Mr. Park said, our primary concern is we're adopting the regulations and set this process in motion. We haven't done the rules yet. We don't know what they are going to look like. Our primary request is let's get the package, if we could, the complete package before we adopt the land use regulations that set this in motion. That's all I have for today.

**Fritz:** And obviously having been a nurse myself transit doesn't run from the hospital that I used to work to the house I now live in. I will be very interested to see what's going on. Thank you.

**Robinson:** Thank you.

**Richard U'Ren:** Good afternoon. My name is Richard U'Ren. I live in the alphabet district of Portland. I appreciate the opportunity to testify in favor of the proposed f-a-r reduction in historic alphabet district. I've also provided a written testimony. All of us who own property are aware of the privileges and restrictions of living in historic district. Two lawyer owners are unhappy with the obligations that come from owning property in such a district. Their objection centers on the floor area ratio for new buildings which means they cannot build the oversized 160-unit apartment complex they have in mind. They have been trying for several years to build something on the property between Hoyt and Irving on 18th street. Their proposals have been opposed because the buildings they want to construct in order to maximize their investment is out of scale with the surrounding historic neighborhood. They are asking to have their property exempted from the proposed zoning. They have also threatened to sue the city if the council refuses exemption. They have not stopped with the threat of lawsuit. They have cleverly attached their personal agenda to real and difficult housing issues the city currently faces. They have woven the desire of personal gain into a narrative of affordable housing and not in my backyardism. Because they are high level housing agenda issues, their efforts have fallen on receptive ears. Been able to

October 13, 2016

enlist media outlets and two non-profits to spread misleading information under the umbrella of their chosen narrative.

**Hales:** Going to ask to you wrap up soon. You can give us the rest of your written testimony.

**U'Ren:** Several examples of misleading information are included in my written testimony. Threats and mis-information are not unique in public discourse. But it is our hope your decision will be consistent with the provisions in June and not with the individuals who are asking for what amounts to a spot exemption for the property. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Thank you, all.

**Hales:** Welcome. Good afternoon.

**Bob Schatz:** Thank you. I'm bob schatz. I own property at 123-311 SE 97<sup>th</sup> avenue it's three properties together that add up to 54,000 sq feet. I Plan on developing it. The reason why I'm in front of you today is the planning bureau plans on changing the zone from this property from ex to eg1. In doing that in the ex zone, I am allowed to build apartment buildings and retail space in commercial buildings. In eg1, I am not allowed to do that. I'm currently building the first of six buildings. By doing -- by making this change, I won't be able to continue. This is what I do for a living. I own apartments, I rent apartments. I don't know anything about industrial land. I didn't buy this property to be an industrial manager. I urge you to not allow this change to happen. I'm 51 years old. I've been working since I got out of college to get to this point. And plans in the next ten years developing this property to very nice apartments and mixed-use buildings. This is planning to be my retirement. I'm going to hand this down to my kids. If it gets changed to industrial, I don't know what to do. I'm going to have to probably sell it and start over. So I urge you, please, to let it stay the zone that it is.

**Hales:** That was 123 Southeast 97th?

**Schatz:** Yes.

**Hales:** Make sure I heard that right. Thank you very much. Thanks. Good afternoon.

**Tim Ramis:** Mr. Mayor or -- mayor, for your record tim ramis thank you for the opportunity on comment on the zoning on a property and comprehensive plan designation. The address is two properties. 1434 and 1512 southwest 58th. I have two short comments I'll make based upon the letter I've submitted. The first is I want the record to be absolutely clear that I wholeheartedly support and join in the commitment made by my neighbor Michael foster that this land will not be developed without creating a sidewalk along southwest 58th. A sidewalk is a critical connection from michael's home further up the hill to the amenities and services in sylvan and it's been my commitment to him we make sure that happens. You will recall the concern of the staff has been at least in theory someone might try to develop that without a sidewalk. We won't do that. You have our commitment to that. Second, even without our commitment to get the sidewalk built, you have every ability to impose the requirement. You see in photographs of the other projects in the area which have extended the necessary sidewalk network along the street. And I provide with my letter excerpts from the record of two current projects which are in development and in development review. Both of which have been conditioned to build sidewalks on 58th. No objection to the developers. Clearly, the city has the ability to require. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Welcome.

**Brian Carlton:** Mr. Mayor and members of the city council, my name is Brian Carlton. I apologize, I'm going to read just to stay on task. I'm here to comment on the planned modifications to longstanding floor area ratios in the alphabet district. I'm currently working on a potential affordable housing project in the neighborhood. I'm working with nha and care deeply about affordable housing. The reason I'm here is to address the greater impact in the alphabet district can have on this neighborhood, other inner city neighborhoods and our metro area as a whole. Not only is allowing for higher densities in our inner city neighbors a staple. It is also a key ingredient in our effort to provide housing for low and middle income citizens. While it is never the right time to restrict access to neighborhoods that offer connections to jobs, public transit, shopping and services, it is especially short sighted to do so at a time our city is struggling to provide housing and

October 13, 2016

many in need of a place to live. As you all know the Architecture firm that received several awards for our historic preservation, I care deeply about the historic fabric of the neighborhood and believe historic resources should be protected. I also believe history should be viewed inclusively and in the case of the historic alphabet district one cannot protect the district without the architectural diversity. The mix of historic buildings Ranges from two story Victorian homes to six story apartment buildings to religious, cultural and commercial buildings. While they were introduced in 1903, taller apartment buildings added life in the neighborhood and opened it to more economically diverse group of citizens. I believe preservation and development must not be at odds. Neighborhood friendly development at higher density and scale is possible and Portland already had guidelines and review mechanisms in place to ensure new development sensitive to historic resources. And also we did written testimony and within that testimony we did some analysis on what we consider available land for development and cut out historic resources and that type of thing. There's actually a very limited opportunity to overwhelm the neighborhood, so to speak. And the 4 to 1 ratio on the available land is appropriate for the context of the neighborhood.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, all.

**Hales:** Welcome. Good afternoon.

**Mike Connors:** I'll go first. Thank you. For the record, I'm here on behalf of space age full and pliska investments llc who owns and operates several gas service stations throughout the city. We're here to submit both oral and written testimony in opposition to the planning commission recommendation that all drive-thru facilities east of 80th avenue be prohibited. What we're asking you to do is to adopt the staff recommendation that was developed below before the planning commission. I'll explain briefly why. First of all, we understand with the mixed use zones, there's a desire to make them pedestrian friendly. But you have to balance that against the need for uses. Gas stations being number one. Cars are going to be around for a long time. And you wrestled with that in the comprehensive plan it adopted policy 4.24 which said that prohibiting drive-thru facilities, gas stations is a subset of that in central city and restricting it in the inner-ring districts. But no other policy. Staff took that, carried that forward and came up with own recommendations and spent months talking with us and many other stakeholders to come up with the right balance. And introduced a recommendation that basically allows drive-thru facilities in the ce zone only. And then prohibits it in the remaining mixed-use zones but existing facilities do have the right to rebuild, upgrade or remodel. What happened in the planning commission level is after the public testimony during the work session, one of the commissioners proposed this new policy.

There's no analysis of the policy. Staff recommended the planning commission not adopt it. We strongly encourage you look at the deliberations. Some of the commissioners have voted for it weren't really in favor of the policy they just wanted to get the issue to have you discuss it. We think there's several problems of it. It takes away a need in a very large part of the city for gas stations. It penalizes those businesses that have developed those in there rendering them non-conforming uses and prohibit them from remodeling those facilities. What we ask you to do is adopt the staff's recommendation that was developed with your comprehensive plan policies and real thorough analysis. I appreciate you letting me go over.

**Fritz:** Presumably the Car washes are also drive-thrus aren't they?

**Connors:** Drive-thrus are a broad group a coffee places that you drive up to.

**Fritz:** I hadn't actually thought of a purpose of a garage or car wash. Which car washes are more environmentally sensitive than soaping it up in your front yard. Thank you.

**Jim Pliska:** My name is jim pliska. Manager of Pliska Investments owner of space age fuel. And we have four facilities that are affected by basically not allowing drive-thrus as making these nonconforming use. And we've been in business for over 30 years and have these facilities.

And we want to continue to service the areas out there. And I feel it's real unfair for us to upgrade these facilities in the future. There might be other forms of fuel in the future that

October 13, 2016

cars may use, et cetera. And I think it would be very short sighted not to allow the upgrade or rebuilding the sites for fueling facilities.

**Hales:** Thanks.

**Hales:** thank you. Thanks very much for coming. Welcome.

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**David Schoellhammer:** Hello. David schoellhammer. I chair the land use committee for the sellwood Moreland improvement league better known as smile. Our neighborhood has 2.8 miles of corridor experiencing growth. We seek to improve the quality of the mixed use buildings and preserve the desirable qualities and charm of our neighborhood. I will address changes proposed by the psc. Ellen Burr will discuss our request for design overlay and Rachel will testify later today. First, Smile supports the business alliance support the psc changes regarding store front areas, specifically cm 1 zoning southeast 13<sup>th</sup> avenue south of Tacoma street. Second, the psc proposes to increase the building height bonus from 3 to 5 feet for a tall commercial ground floor. We oppose this increase. Tall mixed use buildings can dwarf residences and deny solar access. The psc proposal favors commercial property values over the quality of life and property value of abutting residences. The mixed use zone project includes a height step down within 25 feet of some abutting residential properties.

The psc proposes to apply the tall ground floor bonus to the step down height. We oppose this increase. It would further sacrifice quality of life and home equity of commercial space. In summary, we support the tall ceiling bonus presented in the proposed draft report from the mixed use zone project presented in May and oppose psc changes in the recommended draft you are now considering. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thanks very much. Thank you, all.

**Hales:** Good afternoon, welcome.

**Ellen Burg:** Good afternoon. My name is Ellen burg. And I'm representing the smile neighborhood association. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. Our written testimony includes many details which I will not go into here. The Sellwood moreland improvement league is requesting you expand design overlay to our neighborhood. We understand that we do not meet one of the criteria of the mixed use zone project for the D overlay. We are not a comp plan designated to the urban center but mixed use neighborhood. We do meet the other criteria which states an D overlay is being expanded to those areas expected to see the greatest amount of development in change and warrant additional design oversight. In 2014, we had 5,927 housing units. As of a couple weeks ago, we're expecting an 18% increase with 1,119 additional units of multifamily development in the pipeline. This number does not include the increase in the two years between the 2014 census and now. Compare this to division a town center expecting 700 new units, lloyd center with 1,000 units. Both of these have an D overlay. If you apply this D overlay, you need to apply it to all neighborhood centers. We've included a chart and do not have our amenities nor experiencing anywhere near our growth. A little history here. One of those is Multnomah village. Both the east Portland community plan and southwest community plan were initiated. But in 1996, ballot measure 47 resulted in property tax cuts and the early suspension of these neighborhood planning programs. The city turned its focus elsewhere and sellwood moreland did not get to partake in the southeast community plan. Through the community plans, three southwest neighborhoods received a design overlay in their centers. We asked to receive the design overlay in parody with these southwest neighborhoods. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Good afternoon.

**Christie White:** Good afternoon. My name is Christie white. I'm representing the university of Portland and 5000 N Willamette boulevard. We had prior testimony in a couple letters in the record. I'm going to go over 3 of the 5 issues we have remaining up and down the c-l zone. And just want to express that university of Portland largely supports the ci zone project as it applies to its property. The first one is building length. The new c-l zone imposes a 100 foot building length. We have just completed our first dorm project and did it under the design standards that were adopted under our conditional use master plan. And

October 13, 2016

those standards were endorsed and approved by the university park neighborhood association. Those design standards don't carry the 100-foot limitation but articulations and breaks. We don't want to have a situation where our master plan expires in 2023. And we have additional dorm projects and this standard changes and we have inconsistent design because it's really important on campus environments to have consistent design of those same buildings. The other thing is if we apply the 100 foot break to the dorm project, we would have lost 52 double occupancy dorm rooms which would accommodate 104 students that would be living in the neighborhood and understood our student enrollment. Those neighborhood associations and neighbors would have students on our campus. The 200 foot building set back. There's a 200 building foot set back imposed. This might be unique to the university of Portland. I'm not sure. I didn't check. But what it's doing is just taking our current master plan provision and putting a 200 foot building set back. What that did is convert a 10-year condition to a permanent condition under the c-l zone and provide a big gap over the long-term. But still apply our design standards. And if I can take a few more seconds. Thank you. The last one is on the c-l boundaries. The c-l currently, don't include all of the properties that are in our conditional use master plan boundary. So the site is in our master plan boundary. It was planned and evaluated. But it's not in the c-l boundary. Which would mean we later have to do a type three amendment process to include properties that are already in our boundary and be able to develop them. Every property in our c-l boundary or our master plan should be in the c-l boundary.

**Hales:** In that case, the property is in the master plan and under the university's ownership.

**White:** It isn't yet. There's a master plan condition that says it's in our boundaries but we're not allowed to do anything on it until we own or control it. Though it's been planned and has f-a-r limitations. But we can't do anything.

**Hales:** You don't own it yet?

**White:** We don't own it yet it's just in the boundaries.

**Hales:** All right. Thank you.

**White:** Thank you.

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Kathy Birch:** Good afternoon. Can you hear me? I've not done this before. My name is Kathy birch. I'm a resident and homeowner in the Richmond neighborhood. I've been there for 30 years.

My property is currently zoned r5 and the zoning is to change to r 2.5. First of all, I wish to support the testimony given last week by Richmond resident who described and displayed pictures of several single-family homes that had been bulldozed and replaced by two houses in the \$800,000 category. This will not solve the affordable housing problem. I think that adus are more consistent with the design because then one set would go with both buildings. Having supported her testimony, I would like to add other ideas. I know there is a lot of pro and con regarding density. Instead of picking sides, I want to pick how density is designed. I personally am upset over removal of mature trees to squeeze in property new buildings from property line to property line. The building style is rationalized as a response to global warming. Within a mile or so within my home, many mature trees which have served to clean the air. Take up water for free, unlike the fancy swales. And visually grace the neighborhood. I guess I better scurry ahead. I would also like to refute the idea that minimum parking in new apartment structures is a bad idea. According to people that I heard last week, having a parking place for one's car necessarily incentivizes one driving it into the downtown. My son and his girlfriend are 25. They ride their bikes to work. But keep their old car for weekends to go and do all those things that Oregonians do outside. Seeing that one will stop people from having cars by denying them parking is kind of like suggesting that we curb teen pregnancy by forbidding the sale of condoms to people under the age of 20.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Thank you. That's got to be the best metaphor we've heard this week.

October 13, 2016

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Kevin Flanigan:** Hello. My name is Kevin Flanigan. I own inland sea maritime groups located at 3255 North Hayden Island Drive. Mayor and city council members, thank you for allowing me the time to address the city council today on this important issue. My testimony will focus on the eye overlay zone and the comprehensive plan. This overlay is inappropriate for Hayden Island and should be removed from the industrial land on the island. Hayden Island does not meet the criteria of the overlay. Mainly, we have no railroad access on the island. Currently, trains do not stop on the island and there are no plans for such a stop. Additionally, the island is limited for truck access due to a single bridge on the island. Due to these constraints, it's unfair to apply them to the industrial lands on the island. This is the gateway to the city and needs to remain flexible to accommodate future developments. Directly across the river in Vancouver, the water front is being developed similar to the Portland South Water Front. It's an area of the city that is changing and we need to allow for future changes on the island to accommodate the growth. Additionally, some of the best beaches in the city. The island is currently park deficient. Public access to the Columbia River should be important to the city. River access is very limited in Portland. And any opportunity to increase river access should be considered. My company had previously proposed a motorized boat ramp next to the train bridge on the north side of Hayden Island. I have included a conceptual plan for you to consider. This is a plan similar to the Cathedral Park Boat Ramps. However, the overlay limits parks to less than two acres which would preclude this ramp from being developed. The Oregon State Marine Board deemed this regionally significant access point. The advisory board had designated a river access park at this location. For these reasons, I ask the council to remove the overlay to allow for future growth and development and give residents greater access to the greatest asset, the Columbia River. Thank you for your consideration.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thanks very much. Welcome.

**JD Dinh:** Hi. My name is JD Dinh and I'm here for my mother Mo Dinh. Her current block zone is all one and changed to an EG 1.

**Hales:** Where is this located?

**JD Dinh:** On Southeast 82nd between 82nd and 83rd Avenue between Bybee and Glenwood Street. And it's a small block. The prospect of an industrial site going there it's kind of slim. But the change has already been made. The number one concern is the property tax. Would that change it for her under the new designation? That's the bottom line. I submitted a letter of concern to the testimony sites email. So she just wants assurance from the city to protect her neighbors, herself in this situation from higher taxation because they budget their expenditures and then whatever's left, they try to make enough to pay for their public tax. That's the concern we have. And if the city can represent us in that way with empathy, we much appreciate it.

**Fritz:** Have you tried approaching the Multnomah County?

**JD Dinh:** Not yet this is introduced to us now.

**Fritz:** I would recommend whoever is your county commissioner, bring it to that person's attention. It's the county that sets the property taxes. And should be able to answer that question. Am I right? Yeah. So we try and stay out of the whole property tax thing. But if you were to ask Multnomah County's tax assessor maybe your county commissioner involved, would probably give you an answer.

**Hales:** Does your mother live on the property now?

**JD Dinh:** Yes, she's lived for 18-20 years.

**Hales:** Okay. She's also a senior tax deferral process. We'll get your contact info and your testimony. Thank you. Welcome.

**Susan Sturgis:** Hello. My name is Susan Sturgis. And I submitted written testimony regarding the proposed far change in the RH zones in the Alphabet District. I just wanted to make one short point out of what I wrote in the written testimony. And that is that if you have trouble deciding about the 4-1, the 2-1. There are other options available such as a 3 to 1 F-A-R with a 60% lot coverage. So the earlier ones have been 85 lot coverage. But with the 3-1 and 60% lot coverage, you could have five story building but the reduced lot

October 13, 2016

coverage along with the setbacks might keep it from intimidating neighboring historic properties. I think this change was made in August. I didn't really have time to catch up with it and to do a lot of research on my own. Really evaluate the situation. So this is kind of my first brush at it. I just wanted to make the point there might be other options. There might be other flexible ways of handling the issues that would address the neighborhood concerns and other property owners' concerns.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, all.

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Jeff Cole:** Good afternoon. Well, I'm Jeff Cole, and this testimony today is on behalf of Wayne Rask, a fractional owner and representing adjacent properties at 110 and 160 southeast Ankeny street in the area of gateway. We have specific concerns about the rezoning of these lots from the current ex zone to a reconfigured eg1 zone. Our first priority has been to fulfill clean up on these parcels. It is listed as number 17 on the Portland brown field funded project list. The ownership's ultimate vision includes a five-story industrial flex building to accommodate start up minority and women-owned businesses. As well as build much needed affordable housing as part of mixed use development. And as you know, brownfield remediation will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars.

While we appreciate the city's need to dedicate an adequate inventory to land zone for the exclusive employment-related uses, we would still prefer the land to remain zoned ex so the buildable development justifies cleanup cost of the site. However, if the full-time decision to rezone, we would request the following to maintain the liability of our vision.

Number one, retain the current gateway plan district bonus Florida area ratio and height limits. These are on maps 526-2, 526-3. Under these maps, the maximum f-a-r is 6 and maximum height is 120 feet. The zone eg1 with a 45-foot height limit and 3 to 1 f-a-r makes it difficult to fulfill our vision for these properties. Number two, a new street through our properties in the gateway master plan. Again, if we're going from ex to eg1, that's a pretty marked shift in usage and this represents a huge expense on top of the clean-up costs. Number three, allow conditional residential use within the prune dale eg 1 area. Our properties are located 500 feet from the southeast side and 102nd max station. And in close proximity to cx property outside 122nd with a potential f-a-r up to 14-1. And number four, allowed f-a-r and height bonuses and residential use as part of planned development on project sites greater than two acres. This is similar to a mixed use zone project. This would be a perfect fit for potential parcel sizes in the prune dale area.

**Hales:** So what's the total size of this?

**Cole:** Just about two acres for all three lots.

**Hales:** Each of that? Okay. Yeah. All right. Thank you very much.

**Cole:** Okay. And if I could just want to make one final remark. There's been a lot of planning for the gateway district. We like to be part of a revitalized gateway. We know there's a lot of planning. We encourage the city to keep up the good work and focus on this important area.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay. So let's move on to the list of folks that signed up today.

**Moore-Love:** I have a total of 48.

**Hales:** We'll get as far as we can, folks.

**Doug Klotz:** Doug Klotz. I'm a Richmond resident. I'm testifying on removing the parking requirements and mixed use zone. I was at the planning commission briefing Tuesday on inclusionary housing. There is some concern that the housing program as it now sits will work in the central city but may have a hard time in the mixed use zones. And that's property because there's a full property tax exemption which there's not going to be in mixed use. I think some of the planning commission members are thinking the same way. The removal of parking requirements would help that. To help allow for more affordable housing. Up zoning from r5 to r25, I support the up zoning of all the areas of mostly southeast where the comp plan designation has been r25 for decades and now the planning bureau has studied them and decided which areas could be up zoned to r 2.5, I support that. The ground floor height bonus that the neighborhood spoke about, I support



October 13, 2016

that bonus which allows for taller ground floors and gives an extra five feet on the height of the building but also extra five feet on the step back. Wouldn't make sense to have the floor plates back down to accommodate and not have the additional height there. But have it on the main part of the building. I support the major city bikeway designation on northeast 7th. I support keeping the f-a-r at 4-1 in the rh areas. I know it's difficult to work with historic designations but we need to get the density in that area. Makes the most sense to have the density there. I do oppose further down proposing. It was critical and we need to get the density to have a center in southwest. I also support cm2 at 60<sup>th</sup> and Belmont and hawthorn 50th.

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

**Rick Glick:** Good afternoon. Mr. Mayor, members of the council, my name is rick glick. And I'm here today with several of our neighbors to discuss the removal or urge you to remove segment 3892 from the major public trails zoning map. That's southwest dosh park lane and southwest Campbell court. We submitted a letter from the homeowner's association and almost all of the residents within the neighborhood. Our point here today is that these streets are private roads, always have been. The city did not construct them. Did not pay to maintain them. The homeowners paid to maintain them. In the mistaken belief they were a city street, the southwest trails organization put up signs guiding people through the neighborhood which is resulted in a noticeable increase in vehicle and foot traffic through as people use it as a shortcut which was not our intent. There is no public right of way. And arranged for the signs to be removed. I want to express appreciation for the courtesy and responsiveness of city staff in helping us to work through this problem. I want to leave you with a thought that this is not just a line on the map. This designation has consequences. And if you look at the September 16 notice, it says that this line on the map could affect future uses, could affect the value of the property, and it could be a marking of a future easement acquisition of the city. Our homeowners are not interested in an easement and would oppose imposition of one. Thank you so much for the opportunity on comment today.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thanks very much. I have your written testimony as well.

**Jim Driscoll:** Good afternoon. Jim driscoll and the institutional memory for the dosh estates homeowner association. My wife and I live in a house at 4825 southwest dosh park lane. We also own the adjacent unbuilt undeveloped lot in dosh estates. I was the original owner in 1978. One of the developers. In 1978 we worked with the city planning staff to design a planned unit development. One key feature which was the roads in there would be private roads. We did that because at least at that time as a private road, it only had to be 28 feet wide. City street had to be 44. There was no way to snake road down through that property without taking out many, if not all, of the large specimen trees that were on the property. Those trees had historic significance because henry dosh was one of the pioneer horticulturalists in Oregon and that was his residents and many of the trees had been planted either by dosh or by the original homestead albert Kelly. We wanted to keep the trees and could president do it with a city street. So the project was developed with everybody understanding and knowing that those roads were private roads. There was no public right of way acquired by the city. And there are no sidewalks. So this has the practical consequence that if you are going to put a public trail through there, you've got to either locate it in the street or you've got to take out a bunch of people's front yards. If you put it in the street with a 28-foot wide street, there's no room for cross traffic for cars to travel in both directions if you've designated 8 or 10 feet for pedestrian. So as a practical matter, there's no place to put a trail. As a legal matter, the city has no right to put a trail in there. And as mr. Glick mentioned, it's frightening when you look at the public recreational trail's provisions in the planning and zoning code. If you once designate this on the map, the city can do all kinds of things and make you do all kinds of things. Including, we couldn't build on our vacant lot without first creating building. They can make you build a section of trail.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Driscoll:** I'm out of time.

October 13, 2016

**Hales:** as I recall, I have trees in the middle of the street and worked around them.

**Driscoll:** Precisely. We snaked around them to save the trees.

**Hales:** Turned out well. Thank you.

**Driscoll:** Thank you.

**Hales:** She's here.

**Moore-Love:** I'll hold it right there.

**Hales:** Go ahead, john.

**John Calhoun:** Good afternoon, mayor and commissioners.

**Hales:** You are on deck frieda. Go ahead.

**John Calhoun:** My name is john calhoun. I'm also a resident of dosh park lane and current neighborhood association president. I want to echo what my neighbors have said and let you know that I have 17 of the homeowners which is more than majority who signed on with our request. And the city approved bylaws require 75% approval to change any of the regulations. So as board president, I don't have the authority to do anything other than object to what has been attempted by the city or suggested by the city. So I'm just here to support what the others said.

**Hales:** I appreciate getting this testimony and hearing this. So you still have the homeowner's association. It's a private street. Therefore, it developed as a p-o-d. And homeowner's association for shared assets like the streets?

**Calhoun:** Correct. We maintain the street. We just spent \$7,000 putting on a new ceiling to maintain it.

**Fritz:** Did anybody contact you about this trail?

**Calhoun:** There was some discussion in the past. We objected at the time. We thought it was going away and got this notice.

**Hales:** Appreciate you calling it to our attention thank you. Welcome.

**Brian Dapp:** Thank you, my name is Brian Dapp I'm here today to bring to your attention serious problems with the proposed down zoning of mixed commercial property on marquam hill located immediately west of ohsu as part of the 2035 comprehensive plan project. Many others I know from the neighborhood are completely against the proposal the homestead neighborhood association has already weighed in on the matter, but unfortunately we do feel that the interest and concerns of many neighborhood residents have been taken into consideration by the association and by planning staff. I am now speaking of the many renters who live in the west portion of homestead above ohsu on marquam hill. I have included for your review a small collection of letters which illustrate their interest, I urge you to please carefully read and consider those letters they represent many, many more people who did not have the opportunity to submit letters today. After reviewing the 2003 plan marquam hill plan, 2035 comprehensive plan guide and 2035 comprehensive plan early implementation. We find no justification for the proposed downzoning in fact these documents overwhelmingly support increasing development potential and not restricting it. The 2035 comp plan guides state that Portland can expect 260,000 new residents in the next 20 years. Where are these people going to live, do we want increase possibility for people to live close to where they work? I kindly ask to you keep in mind important indisputable fact, Ohsu employs 12,000 people on the Maquam hill campus. In light of the following circumstances we believe that the downzoning will have overwhelmingly negative impact on our neighborhoods and on our city. Portland faces an unprecedented housing shortage. I'm going to skip ahead since I'm running out of time we feel that the proposed downzoning will only exacerbate the problems of which you are already aware we urge you to please either amend the proposal or reject it. I would be available to consult with you or any of your staff at any point in the future to better explain concerns that people who live in our part of the homestead neighborhood should the opportunity present itself. Thank you very much.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Appreciate the letters and the testimony. Thank you. Welcome.

**Issac Dweik:** Good afternoon. Mayor, commissioners, my name is Issac Dweik I am the home owner and resident of 7008 southwest capitol hill road in southwest Portland. Zip

October 13, 2016

code 97219. Just I have missed a window of opportunity for the comprehensive change in planning, so I'm here to submit and make my case for the change should you consider new adoption whether prior to the implementation or in the near future. Since I don't have for this, this is my property, it is surrounded by -- on the north is an r1, my property zoned r7 currently. On the east side and north side, they have been adopted to on r1 and r2 which leaves me an r7 just by myself. If the zoning stayed the way it is, it will really diminish my home value and there will be very minimum impact should it changed to r1 which that's what I wish it to be or at least r2. In that particular area, it's a really very low density and in dire need of additional more affordable homes. One particular point I'd like to make I know the time is over, it is in close proximity to the Jewish temple which is, if anybody knows about the Jewish faith, one of their requirements is to be on foot. So it's real dire need for extra additional, more affordable homes.

**Hales:** Thank you. Could you give the planning bureau staff a copy of that?

**Dweik:** I am going to leave this. I will be e-mailing testimony.

**Hales:** Great.

**Fritz:** Thank you for making it nice and large so people at home to see, thanks so much.

**Hales:** That is helpful. Thank you.

**Greg Moreland:** My name is Greg moreland, I own a property on 14716 southeast Powell. And 147th. I also own property behind that. I bought this, this is being changed, this property is in a very small pocket, a long and thin pocket with about 60 houses on Powell. Most of them very close to Powell. I bought this bare lot with the intention of building 12-plex there. I can bring access from behind on Rhine which is really handy. This particular property wouldn't make a whole lot of sense to build a single family house there. With the expense of bringing access from Rhine so that is really, I just have really narrow interest here. That revolves around that.

**Hales:** What's the proposed zoning at this point?

**Moreland:** It's r2 now. It's being proposed to move to r5. Again, it's in a very small pocket that, I don't know, 60 houses or so. Or 60 lots. As a bare lot I bought this as an investment. This was really the no brainer thing to do would be to build a 12-plex there. The zoning -- I don't know if I can make it by the time the zoning comes around. I don't know if I will be -- I can get my ducks in line.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Welcome, good afternoon.

**Frieda Christophers:** For the record my name is Freida I'm a member of the David Douglas school board. Superintendent Richardson sends his regrets he was unable to make it today. But we wanted to thank the city council and bureau for engaging in conversation with the David Douglas school district to address our critical infrastructure needs relating to capacity. We have completed our facility plan with the need for district in the next ten years which include building two new elementary schools. But we like to thank bureau planning and sustainability for collaborative approach in recognizing how population growth can impact school capacity and the district school by providing higher quality education opportunity for students now and in the future. The miscellaneous zoning amendment package in the comp plan has given the school district the ability to review and deny 11+ lot land division applications and zone map applications. We wish to note that these two provisions only give us access to small portion of potential new housing. There is much more potential new housing in the mixed use zones and multi-dwelling zones for new apartments that tend to bring higher amounts of new families and children to our schools. Currently neighborhood associations receive notification when five or more unit's development is being planned. They receive this notification early in the process. We feel that the school district could receive the same notification from the developer it would be beneficial for us in the planning process. Currently we only find out about the buildings because an administrator drives by, sees something being built has to stop and ask what is being built and how many bedrooms, et cetera. I have provided possible language

October 13, 2016

changes to the code, 33.120.050 with this testimony. We feel that this is a simple change that could be beneficial to all school districts for planning and enrollment each year. We're not asking to stop anything from being built just to get notification. In addition, there is a change being considered by council in elimination of the conditional use requirement for indoor agricultural and ce and cm3 zones. There are zoning changes being considered that would increase amount of ce and cm3 zones in east Portland and David Douglas community. Indoor agricultural includes indoor marijuana grow operations. We are concerned about the indoor marijuana grow operation in close proximity to our future schools. Our request to ensure that the conditional use process is required before any indoor marijuana grow operation is approved or placed. We would like an opportunity to provide input and share our concerns during the conditional use process. Without this conditional use process, we'll have no voice in the placement of these businesses. Please consider keeping in place conditional use process to ensure our schools and communities have a voice in the future. We would appreciate your consideration on these two items. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thanks very much.

**Fritz:** We might take a look at the marijuana growing applications in a different process we'll check in on that.

**Christopher's:** Okay. It's a zoning -- it's a code change is my understanding.

**Hales:** Mostly been looking at the retail question.

**Hales:** Thank you. I hadn't thought about that aspect of it, I'm glad you have. Thank you. Welcome.

**Jim Labbe:** Hi there. My name is Jim Labbe. I'm speaking also on behalf of mark who just asked me to speak for him, we both served on the title 11 oversight committee last year and my testimony -- our testimony is about the need to remove exemptions the 10 and 11 exemptions for commercial industrial zones in the process of updating the zoning maps and codes. It's critical that this council consider impacts of trees when -- as it goes through the zone changes especially the comp plan. This is a particular important piece for couple of reasons. You might recall that a number of commercial industrial work is exempt from title 11 when it was adopted. Both because they might potentially limit the capacity of unemployment lands and employment land supplying needs were low at that time. I think first reason was never really justified because title 11 doesn't require tree preservation, there's an option to pave. And the density standards are really equal to the landscaping requirements in these zones anyway. There's really very little situations where -- I can't imagine situation where title 11 would displace employment land. But that aside, we know now with the city's economic opportunities analysis that there is a shortfall and at least commercial land, commercial employment land there's significant surplus, I included the page from the economic opportunities analysis that illustrates that. So the other real important reason I would advocate that the council remove these exemptions is, the city wide tree project, it was intent to develop policy city wide it's exactly the commercial industrial zones and actually public right-aways where the city farthest behind in meeting its target. I included that copy of the action plan that illustrates that. I guess lastly, you look at the -- the research on areas where we have heat island -- worst heat island effect and impacts on vulnerable populations in terms of public health. It's in the commercial industrial land, along our corridors. I think for all those reasons probably more it's time to remove these exemptions, thank you.

**Hales:** Thanks very much. Take the next three please.

**Hales:** Welcome.

**Kiauna Floyd:** Thank you. My name is --

**Hales:** Pull that microphone just a little bit towards you.

**Floyd:** My first rodeo here. My name is kiauna Floyd I am third generation owner of Amalfi's restaurant located on northeast 47th and Fremont. We have been a member of

October 13, 2016

the Beaumont business association for 30 years, we're very strong in our philanthropic effort giving back to our community, our local schools, nonprofit organizations and supported many other community causes and events over the course of the years. For nearly sixty years we have been the corner stone of our community, Fremont street. We came to the planning commission as a unified group of nine property owners to request cm2 zoning for our properties, however the neighborhood association believes that cm1 zoning was better for our properties and subsequently our request was turned down. This is a little hard for us to understand considering just a few doors down east of us as well as few doors down west of us, those properties were granted cm2 zoning. Just a little small stretch of us about three blocks where we were not granted the cm2 zoning. And we know that it's good to listen to all of our neighborhoods we know that there's very active and caring people within these neighborhood associations who make their voices heard. But we're here today we'd like our voices to matter as well. The voices of long term family owned businesses that have been active in our communities for decades, I know Amalfi's for nearly six years that we've been in business, we've certainly given back to our community and created a lot of jobs for people. We've certainly helped make Fremont the vital place that it is today. We're just asking that these old guys, Amalfi and Staniches small little stretch of three blocks be granted the same consideration to grow and prosper as the rest of Fremont and all the new kids on the block have been granted and considered. Please accept our request for cm2 zoning.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Steve Stanich:** Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Steve Stanich. It's an honor to be here representing Gladys and George Stanich who opened up the restaurant in 1949 to pay large medical bill from 49 to 66. They worked three jobs and in '66 went full time at staniches, I am here to represent Gladys and George. I was born and raised in the Beaumont Wilshire, I guess now we have three zones, Beaumont, Wilshire, cully and rose city. I believe Beaumont Wilshire is what I grew up on 33rd where Wilshire ended on 57th was the end of it. I believe there was only one association. But that being said, I went to Beaumont grade school, played baseball at Wilshire little league and have lived was raised as I said in the area my entire life. The reason that I'm here is that my parents taught me at a young age, they were the original pay it forward. They never advertised, word of mouth. Any money they had put aside for advertising was spent on little league teams, on high school teams, et cetera. We've had numerous little league teams over the years since '49. In fact, over 20 years ago Wilshire little league field was named George stanich. I changed it to Gladys and George to honor my mother who was the cook, my dad was the Fremont philosopher. And was the front guy, but my mom was the person that was making the burgers and allowed them to go from three jobs to one in 1966. I strongly believe that the three blocks from 47th to 50th should be the cm2 zone. We have a cemetery behind us and I think it would -- if anything, it would just be as Kiauna said there's same zones to the east and the west of us. I'm still -- I believe a member of the Beaumont Wilshire neighborhood association which now is -- still live in the area, I thank you for your time. Thank you for allowing me to testify on behalf of my parents.

**Hales:** Thank you. Just a speculative question, maybe. Planning and zoning is about what you want to keep and what you want to change. So what would you expect to see change as a result of going to cm2 as opposed to leaving it at cm1 with these properties over time?

**Stanich:** Just the opportunity to maybe go up one more level and have more people living in the area. As an option, I'm not certain that we would ever even do it. If it's to the left and right, but also I was wondering if the council, since we've been doing it since '49 and we have all these little league teams, we don't go on the food channel, because that costs \$5,000. We take that give it to the community. I was wondering if before you make your decision if our little leaguers from '49 to the present could have a vote. I'm just joking

October 13, 2016

**Hales:** Wilshire little league doing quite well as you know.

**Stanich:** We were -- went to the world series last year, we had a big celebration.

**Hales:** We met them at the airport when they came back it was a lot of.

**Stanich:** I yes, it was.

**Stanich:** Thank you for your time.

**Novick:** Mr. Mayor, doesn't the code provide somewhere that lapped use planning disputes --.

**Hales:** There's a special place in land use for little league sponsors. Thank you very much.

**Hales:** Welcome.

**Jan Brittan:** Good afternoon. My name is Jan Brittan. I am representing the woods creek homeowner's association in southwest Portland. A few weeks ago was the first that we were aware of the planning proposal that would go on in our neighborhood for an addition to a trail. Let's see, just so you can place it, the notice was given one of our home owners at 7525 southwest 64th place. The proposal, as we understand it, is to be able to connect various trails that are in pieces, somehow this portion of our area was seen as a good place to connect. We strongly disagree with it. Our woods creek development is 31 houses, three cul-de-sacs, and the cul-de-sac in question has no through access. The home owner who received the notice, the trail as it starts goes through their front yard where there is already a fire hydrant and large multi-use utility box. Only way I can describe it. 64th place sifts a steep street to woods creek down to the creek, it's too steep for foot traffic, especially elderly, disabled or bicycles. It's obviously slippery when wet and treacherous with ice. Most of the people down in the lower cul-de-sac have to park up on the main road of Canby street in inclement weather. The street narrow, so theres really no room for public parking would impede flow of residential traffic be a hindrance to ambulance and fire or rescue vehicles. The proposed trail, it got down from this neighbor's house down to the creek, across the bridge, and it goes through a green space that is currently private property of the homeowner's association and is bordered by homes on both sides. It completely floods in the wintertime, so it would not be safe for hikers going through. We're worried that building trails would cause possibly erosion and interfere with the established system of absorption and drainage for that area.

**Hales:** I think -- the only notice of this that you got was a mailing to the one homeowner?

**Brittan:** That was the first we heard about this. This was a couple of weeks -- maybe three weeks ago. It's taken us by surprise. We were sort of scrambling as to how to proceed from here.

**Hales:** I should know this, you're in the woods creek homeowners association, which neighborhood association are you in?

**Brittan:** To be honest with you I don't know.

**Fritz:** Ash creek.

**Hales:** We'll check up on this. Fact that you found out so late is kind ever concerning to us, too. Thank you very much. Appreciate it. Welcome, whoever would like to go next.

**Jackie Strong:** I'll go next.

**Jackie Strong:** My name is Jackie strong, I'm representing the strong family. We're a long time resident of Portland. Residents of Portland, we've been community activists for a long time. We own significant piece of property at the corner of Williams and Alberta in the area that is really just turned around as far as growth and some say has been gentrified. Initially our property was zoned cm1, we fought really hard. We work with planning and sustainability commission to be able to get it upgraded to cm2. Would greatly appreciate of that. All the folks in our block came together we all joined and we advocated for this new zoning to happen. Even the department of Oregon, who is situated across the street from this department was in agreement that it should be up zoned to cm2. We have approximately an acre there which would allow us to be do considerable size project, we are in the process of trying to develop that property. In our efforts we conducted with pdc.

October 13, 2016

And pdc had mentioned to us that they have a north-northeast economic initiative program which created to generate wealth for African Americans, especially those that have been displaced by gentrification, also to just pay back to the African American communities that have been so wrongly affected by gentrification. Started thinking about we could have entitlements similar to what is happening with all of those buildings that are going up all around us on Williams and Alberta it would be great. Create generational wealth for my family. Would also help us with the developmental process to add affordable housing for marginalized communities like veterans, for seniors, for African Americans to come back into the community. We thought about why not come here in front of you and see if you are really serious about the city's efforts to combat the ails of gentrification see whether or not you could with the stroke of a pen say, okay, we're going to give you this additional entitlement. So, that's the nature of my coming here to testify in front of you today as an African American and a person that is strong advocate. And I trust that you will do the right thing. Thank you so much for your time.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. It's currently proposed cm1 I assume?

**Strong:** Yes, cm1 current proposal, we're asking for the additional floor.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Greg Astley:** Mayor hales, commissioners, I know that you received couple of letters, one from the national association of mutual insurance companies on the drive through prohibition regarding safety with bicycle and pedestrian. But also one from the united states business leadership network, which happens to be a national nonprofit, 50 business leadership network helps build disability and inclusion in the work place, the marketplace, I'm just here to ask to adopt the staff recommendation on the drive thru's, that was talked about previously in April. They provide easy access for both of those communities to important services which does include food and beverages. I know there was permitting process back in April that we're amenable to, we would like existing restaurants to be able to remodel in the future not be nonconforming. I'll leave my comments with that I appreciate the time today. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you all.

**Martha McLennan:** Good afternoon. My name is Martha McLennan, I'm the executive director of northwest housing alternatives. I want to speak to the issue of reduction in the far in the alphabet district. The first thing I want to talk about just the policy issues. We know that restricting capacity for housing development contributes heating up of the market which contributes to increased rents, restricting the capacity and high opportunity neighborhoods contributes to concentrations of poverty. Both of those issues are serious concern in Portland right now. We need to have more housing in general in the market. And we need to have economically integrated neighborhoods. With that, we can have a healthier city, healthier communities, healthier families. In the particular situation that we're in we also do have an interest in a sight in this neighborhood on 18th between Hoyt and Irving on the east side of the street. Most of that half block is vacant for parking right now. There is a contributing historic resource in that block as well. We do have site control from the owners of that control to see if we can put together a development project there. So that would be our project, not the owner's project, just to be clear on that. When we're looking for a place to site housing we look at neighborhoods that have the resources that the residents would need. So the walkable neighborhood, the access to services, the access to transit, to downtown to, medical facilities is critically important to us. Parted of why we're very excited about it. When we learned of this proposal in September it really threw a wet blanket on us in terms of the capacity to develop that site. What I would say is that the approach that the neighborhood association proposed and the partial acceptance that have approach by the planning staff and planning commission lacked nuance. I think the council has the opportunity to look to the process that currently exists through his particular design review to consider properties keeping in mind that this overlay has

October 13, 2016

existed since 1980. And continue to exist despite historic district designation in 2000. Other opportunities are to look at property by property instead of the blanket approach that they did or other adjustments besides just cutting it in half. The two to one ratio will be infeasible for us we'd have to withdraw our interest in this site. I know the council last week talked about, could just get in early, say just a couple of things about that.

**Fritz:** I was just about to ask you about that.

**Hales:** We also react to another thing as well maybe, that is it was suggested today that we consider three to one. So maybe react to giving early tonight three to one notion.

**McLennan:** The get in early is problematic for a couple of reasons. One in order to get in early you have to have a complete packet before the implementation -- before the permit application before implementation. Because this district got historic design review process, the expectation is you need to go through iterative process.

**Fritz:** Your grandfathered as soon as you get a complete application.

**McLennan:** But to do a complete application without having first gone through historic design review process, puts you at risk of having to redesign as it's tweaked. There is an expense associated with that. Probably more important than that is the issue that to get financing for a property on nonconforming use is also difficult and may be less favorable. We would need to get our -- not just the permitting in place, but the financing in place and closed and have those financing partners understand that as soon as the thing is built it will be nonconforming. And with that nonconforming status in the event of catastrophic loss there's no certainty that it could be rebuilt. So that's the financing partners' concern. So, for our purposes it would be much better to have a clear expectation, clear and durable expectation of what the capacity of the site is. In terms of the three to one, that's better. We haven't had an opportunity to evaluate that or pencil that specifically. Our belief is that we weren't going to get to the full maximization of the four to one ratio in any case, that that was not going to satisfy the neighborhood or the historic design review. So, three to one has some potential.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Susan Emmons:** My name is Susan Emmons. I am executive director of northwest pilot project, my husband and I have lived in an apartment in northwest Portland for 36 years. And we raised our twin sons in the neighborhood, they went to the local high schools. I know I don't need to tell you about housing crisis, but I'm going to mention the number again which we keep updating, shortage of 24,000 units in Portland for those who we serve at northwest pilot project, the poorest of the poor. I think it's very interesting to have a son, an adult son living somewhere off and come and shrift we put him on a plane yesterday, one of our sons, but his shock he hadn't been in Portland in two years, we usually to go visit him. What has happened in Portland, mom, there are people sleeping all over the neighborhood. What are you doing about this? Why are there so many people out? So, I'm here again to talk about the floor area ratio and this proposal to lower from four to one to two to one. We were quite thrilled when we met Marco Donald, he expressed his interests in doing some housing, introduce them to northwest housing alternatives. They do beautiful buildings; they will do a beautiful building that's a beautiful neighbor. They're going to do it for people who we serve. Very, very low income seniors. So it seems to me with all that we're dealing with and we said we need many different approaches a private owner making land available, one of our very best nonprofits coming together to do this and I think the bigger issue of whether its 3 to 1 or 2 to 1 is, is this a neighborhood that should have more housing and should it have more affordable housing. Is compatibility with a historic district really defined by height? My husband and I lived for two years in Vienna and a year in embow and I would say no I love northwest Portland, don't accuse the neighbors of nimbyism come from us didn't come from northwest housing alternatives, but I really think this is a significant project 160 units I would really be disappointed if this project didn't go through.



October 13, 2016

**Hales:** So let me get both of you to comment a little bit further, the council I am I think we all are trying to find our way through the dilemma here obviously we already had one proposal for this site that was rejected. And it seems to me that we're in an unfortunate situation of being asked to aim a shot gun at an area that would have pernicious effects on historic preservation all over the place in order to address one or two development projects that we otherwise like. I'm speculating we're not conducting a land use hearing here, but I don't believe we've done enough in terms of a city in historic preservation. We've had a lot of losses lately and we're having them every day, you mentioned Vienna and embow, but it's hard to tear down a historic building in those cities at least the ones that weren't lost in Vienna in the war. So I'm eager for us to do a better job of hanging on to the historic resources that we have so the 4 to 1 ration in its potential affective incentivizing demolition and replacement is what's got at me worried. Your thoughts about that beyond the boundaries of your property.

**McLennan:** So I would comment on that again the 4 to 1 ration has existed for 36 years, the historic district for 16 I think the development proposal for this site that I have that came through earlier was one that peaked a lot of concern, but I don't think there is a way to build sensitively. The fact that, that was not approved through historic design review, that is was not approved by the city council actually demonstrates that those are good checks on analyzing an nuance way on a site specific way what is appropriate and what is not appropriate so you could take your argument and turn it on its heel and say leave the potential there and then look at the projects on a case by case basis through the existing procedures that exist. The council could also ask staff to go back and look at what the development potential is where are sites where there is capacity for housing that could be about that 2 to 1 ratio that might be good opportunities for development. Our site does have a contributing resource on it our proposal is to retain that resource and build around it on the site so again kind of a hybrid model of meeting both the historic preservation goals, but also the affordable housing goals.

**Emmons:** I mean you have a landmarks commission, you have a checks and balance in place for anybody who comes forward and wants to develop it 4 to 1 and it's very arteriosus. So we don't think imposing this far 2 to 1 is the solution since you already have something in place. Yes, I think the concern about historic preservation is real, but I think when we have people sleeping all over our neighborhood including this property I don't see how that's better for the neighborhood and the homeowners and us as a city when we can actually get housing and put people in it and they are going to preserve the historic building on the property it will be beautiful building and it will be a good neighbor that I promise.

**Fritz:** The counter argument to that is we should set the reasonable expectations. If you basically can't do a 4 to 1 because it's not going to fit in, shouldn't we be setting more clear boundaries so you don't spend a lot of money going through design review, getting to a council and then being told no you have to start all over again? That doesn't seem to be helping by anybody.

**Emmons:** I mean unfortunately we started this process in the spring. We learned in September the neighborhood association had come forward. There's considerable resource and time put into it. Yeah, it came in on us in mid-stream. And I think, again, as you know, we have a dire use for units.

I started my day listening to the receptionist answer the phone to seniors who call in everyday trying to get a shelter bed. Not an apartment, a shelter bed. We have seniors living outside. Because my office is right by the receptionist, I hear this call every morning and it's very sobering.

**Hales:** Understand. Thank you.

**Novick:** One additional random comment. Historically, Portland has been an affordable place to live and that part is being erased. To some extent there is conflict between

October 13, 2016

maintaining the historic character of our historic physical character and historic social character.

**Hales:** Thank you. Appreciate your helping us think through that. Welcome.

**Martha Cox:** My name is Martha Cox. Chief executive officer of Columbia steel castor company inc at 10425 north blas avenue north Portland. I'm here to testify about the miscellaneous zoning code before you and in particular the proposed public trail alignments. I'm here to request that you don't adopt the proposed trail alignment on our site which is a proposed amendment to zoning map 1924. And instead adopt the revised alignment which would avoid operational areas. I've submitted written testimony that explains this request in detail and before you is a map showing the proposed trail alignment in red and requested revision. Our plant requires a substantial amount of equipment. We rely on roadways to move large cast steel parts and other materials around their facility. We maintain large outdoor storage areas and have a substation on our site. The city's proposed trail alignment runs across many of these areas. Construction of the trail in the location noted in red would undermine our trail operations and circulation throughout our site. We're also concerned the close proximity of the trail to our operational area presents theft and danger to trespassers. We understand that when required, the alignment would be established in the park's department. However, having the trail alignment through our operational area in print as a starting point for that negotiation is problematic because it suggests to all parties that the trail should be where it's shown on the map. Also having the trail routed across active industrial area creates significant problems if we seek financing or ever wish to sell the business or property. Our requested alignment solves many of these problems by placing the trail closer to the slew and away from operations. At the same time, it avoids the environmental zoning and will provide better pedestrian experience. We developed this proposal in cooperation with the bps staff and bps staff developed compromise alignment before you. We appreciate the willingness to work with us and sincerely hope you'll support our request.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Fritz:** Do you own the property where it's shown in yellow?

**Cox:** Yes.

**Hales:** Thanks a lot.

We'll make room for you in a minute.

**Fritz:** For those of you who are upstairs, there's some room downstairs now if you are going to be called soon.

**Moore-Love:** We're on numbers 21, 22 and 23.

**Hales:** All right. Making progress.

**Hales:** Welcome.

**Damien Hall:** I'm 24. Not sure what number you are.

**Deanna Bitar:** I'm 25.

**Damien Hall:** Mayor, members of the commission. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I'm here on behalf of Joe Angel who is a property owner. I've submitted written --

**Fritz:** Give us your name.

**Hall:** Damian Hall. I've submitted written testimony that touches on a number of topics. There are two site specific zoning requests. General opposition to the ban on drive-thrus east of 80th and expressing concern with the 80% reduction. I'd like to speak to a different issue today here in using my two minutes. That is nonconforming uses. So the mixed use zone project is a large scale rezoning of the commercial zones in the city's corridors and centers. A lot of good objectives there on how to shape the environment and new construction and creating new dense mixed use zones. The side effect of that is a lot of the existing commercial space that is currently affordable and certainly has rent rates that are

October 13, 2016

less than what new construction will be that will be cause to become nonconforming uses. You've heard a little bit today and in various testimony about the impact on property owners and the businesses operating out of buildings that have become non-conforming situations. That impacts existing small businesses. The planning and sustainability commission recommendation identifies the need to maintain affordable commercial space. And even a -- I would call it a place holder for affordable commercial bonus in the commercial zoning. But no real clarity on how that is to be achieved. I don't think there's a promise of administrative rules to be created. Not really a framework of those yet. So I think that there's -- trying to create this environment. And on the other hand, trying not to negatively impact the existing businesses and property owners who have invested in these sites that would be inconsistent with the new development under the code. There's a simple solution and that's adding language to section 331-285 which I've included at the end of the letter handed to you. And I would say the mixed use zone not intended to create nonconforming uses. So you need to develop under the new code. That allows us to separate the policy debate and separate that from existing property owners and existing businesses.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thanks very much. Welcome. Good afternoon.

**Deanna Bitar:** Hello. Members of the council. My name is Deanna bitar. 9820 E Burnside I'm here today for my father who is unable to attend due to a family emergency. So I'm going to read his testimony. I have lived and worked in east Portland for 50 years, over 50 years.

Now we see the planning commission wants to ban all drive-thru restaurants because they want to eliminate fast-food east of 80th avenue. Is that really fair for the people in east county? How can you stop people from having something they want? Do you remember New York city's mayor placing a ban on august sugary drinks larger than 16 ounces? The New York supreme court ruled against the ban and now the drinks are back in stores. Let's look at the bigger picture of east Portland. I feel our elected officials should not be putting emphasis on fast-food drive-thrus. Grocery stores have closed. Target at 122nd has closed. Why is this happening? The median income is too low to support them. We need a better mix of low income and market rate housing to raise the overall income level. I am sure you have all shopped at trader joes, whole foods and new seasons. Would be nice to have one in our area. You should be finding ways to support and encourage quality food stores to operate in east county. They are the heart of any neighborhood -- excuse me, inside the limiting access to fat. In closing, our company is losing 19 potential drive-thru locations under the new code. Not all of these properties would be workable for a drive-thru. But nevertheless, we are losing the drive-thru zoning designations. We currently have two fast-food restaurants that will be nonconforming if the proposed zoning plan gets adopted. One is at 82nd and Fremont and the other is at 92nd and Powell. I ask you to please retain the current drive-thru zoning for these two properties. I have listed their addresses and legal descriptions. I object to the new zoning proposals that limits the use of these properties. Again, may I say the residents are entitled to drive-thru access here just as in any other parts of the city. I'm requesting that you do not make any of the designation changes.

**Hales:** Thank you. And our regards to him.

**Ian Nackenzie:** Hi. Ian Nackenzie. I'm here to talk about the zoning. I agree with the testimony you heard -- likely to come into effect. We should be careful about removing capacity in opportunity-rich areas. Implementing the comprehensive plan often has policy objectives.

Much of the testimony you received was from people who care about protecting the historic character of the district. I would argue in this case capacity for housing are not in conflict. The alphabet district is very different in Portland. They are almost exclusively made in single-family houses. The contrast in a nomination for alphabet district is

October 13, 2016

described as unique in Portland, multi-family structures. Many of which are designed by the premiere architects. I, myself, live in such a structure. Was built during the period of significance by noted architects.

Comes in 3.2 to 1. There are a great number of multi-family buildings in the district. Many of which were listed on the national register. Most of these come in f-a-r between two-to-one and four-to-one. Indeed, 29% of contributing historic resources and only the historic resources have f-a-r of 2-1. This is not obvious to me why we need limits well below what we were building in the early 20th century. The character of the district is protected by the fact all new buildings go through review of the landmark's condition. A project at northwest 21st which is approved by the -- will have f-a-r of 2.69 to 2.

**Hales:** Submit that, if you can. Thank you very much.

**Hales:** Okay. Good afternoon. Welcome.

**Erika Yoshida:** My name is Erika Yoshida. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My family owns commercial land at 836 and 904 southwest Gibbs. I'm here today to address our concerns that our property proposed downing from cs to cm1. There's a tremendous housing shortage. Next to ohsu especially for medical staff, students, patients and their families. We have carefully been planning a mixed use apartment project that would cater to those needs. Both for short and long-term housing needs. With walking distance to ohsu. The proposed zoning change would actually cut our plans in half. Which would limit the amount of housing we can provide for those in need and also negatively affecting our plans to incorporate affordable housing in the project as well. We respectfully request for the cs and cm parcels to be up zoned instead of down zoned to cm 2 or 3.

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

**Brian Lessler:** Good afternoon. I'm Brian lessler and I'm going to be brief. I'm here on behalf of the family also. I have submitted written testimony early this morning which you probably haven't had a chance to look at yet.

**Hales:** We'll get to it.

**Lessler:** Just a couple issues I wanted to emphasize though. With respect to this neighborhood up there surrounding ohsu, it's a very special area and there's about 2,000 residents that live in the homestead neighborhood. About 70% of those are renters. So it's a bifurcated neighborhood. And the commissioner Fritz is very involved with the plan. And this concept of village center which directs the concept of living and working and shopping without driving is directly overlaid within the properties that yoshida owned. So this down zone. You heard a lot about affordable housing. I'm not going to reiterate that. I am fully aware of the depth of the problem as a developer. I also understand that by constricting the yield out of a piece of property, the ability to cover debt when you have to reduce that yield becomes very questionable. So likely, no affordable housing. Can be very positive. But, what we really want to see is a cm 3 designation on this property to allow a really well developed project that allows for commercial services as well as both market rate and affordable housing.

**Hales:** How large is the property roughly?

**Lessler:** It's an interesting property. It is going to require bifurcated streets that would need to be vacated. At Sw Gibbs and Southwest u.s. Veteran's hospital road. It would be about 20,000 square feet with 3,000 feet relative to street vacation.

**Hale:** Interesting problem in that I think it's the only place in the city that actually meets this description. Which is obviously there are a lot of places where we complaint expand capacity even if we wanted to. You are one of them. But also the other mode of transit is an aerial tram reaching the limits of its capacity. We have a transit system that can't get any bigger. We can add buses or upgrade. But we can't add extra cars.

**Lessler:** Allowing a higher density helps to mitigate that problem of people trying to commute from off the hill.

**Hales:** And trying to shorten commutes, then your point is well taken. Ore. 1887, Vol. 1.6, page 5590

October 13, 2016

**Fritz:** What was the reason given to you for the choices cm1?

**Lessler:** Well, we've been trying to investigate that. Our sense is it's really a response to the concerns raised by the neighborhood association which I'm not sure represents.

**Fritz:** What were their concerns?

**Lessler:** Their main concern is traffic and parking. And we think that their limitation or their desire to limit the density there actually works in reverse of their concern.

**Hales:** They have not been antigrowth. There may be a different view of the problem there.

**Lessler:** Right.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Appreciate your testimony.

**Hales:** Susan, I think you are on.

**Hales:** Oh, sorry. We jumped ahead of you.

**Zoltan Piwter:** I'm in-house council for fresh produce. We had the facility at 9243 north river gate boulevard. We trace our business back to the late 1890s and been in Portland since 2000.

We have 52,000 square foot facility where we employ 180 to 200 lower middle class individuals that work throughout the year. And right now, we're here to oppose the additional I-zone overlay. As we see that, it imposes additional restrictions on our property. The operations and future what we can do affecting our property values. And in our view, what's happening is the city is predicting the future today by doing this overlay. Which won't be the ability for change in the future. Essentially we're giving up our rights today. It targets certain businesses while other businesses. For example, the airport are not part of this. So for that reason, we oppose the overlay.

**Hales:** Thanks very much. Welcome.

**Anthony Calibrie:** My name is Anthony Calabrie. I'm an employee of DelMonte fresh produce. I've been driving out to north Portland to go to work every day with a lot of various people. The area I work in has a lot of buildings that are empty. A lot of places that could be developed and an opportunity for capital investments. And I agree with my associate. Adding additional overlays on to the zone may prohibit more development in the area. Thank you.

**Hales:** Okay. Thank you, both. Thanks very much. Good afternoon.

**Susan Lindsay:** Okay. There we go hi, I'm Susan Lindsay. I had the pleasure to be able to be on the pac or the sac for the mixed use zoning project. I'm here today that I've heard amendments have been raised and there's a desire to remove the parking minimums that were set and I don't think that's a good idea. For one thing, we don't even really know what adequate parking is. Never been a substantial look at this. And I've noticed that from years of being on different committees, the concern about parking consistently comes up. Now, one thing I do know is oftentimes parking raises an issue that if we provide more parking, it just gets filled up. One thing I'd like to point out is the planning bureau told us if we accepted a lot of density in the city that what would happen is keeping housing affordable. And the opposite has taken place. We have this tremendous crisis around rental affordability that is disconcerting to many of us born in Portland. The first house I rented with four other house mates back in 1974 cost \$90 a month. And it was on southeast 6th and mill. And my first house I rented on my own was \$75 a month. You can see why I'm concerned. And I haven't noticed that many of them that don't have parking has brought those rents down and created more affordability. I don't think an argument can be made that if we eliminate parking that we'll have more affordability. I don't think that's true. And that's just a giveaway the city should not do and we'll lose more livability.

**Hales:** Thank you all very much.

**Rebecca Biederman:** Hi. I'm Rebecca Biederman. I'm here about the tsp and the green way proposed on northeast 7th. I lived in Irvington for almost 11 years. I'm a mom. I have a third grader at Irvington elementary. And we walk and ride our bikes back and forth every

October 13, 2016

day. As a parent I'm concerned about not being involved in the decision about the proposed green way on northeast 7th. And what the design would look like and how it would impact the safety of the neighborhood. Opposition to this decision still exists among the residents on both sides of northeast 7th as well as the streets that will be impacted by the reduction of traffic. Increased congestion on northeast mlk and northeast 15th is not optimal. Increased speed through the Irvington neighborhood and around Irvington elementary is dangerous. I and other residents would like to be allowed to have our concerns addressed. We would like the design work to proceed with full integration of the residents. I would expect multiple meetings as design work moves forward so a solution can be designed. Pbot we wish does not move forward unless they have a plan to hold meetings with the public to ensure the many concerns already brought to you in the spring through the public testimony process. I think our major concern is not having a voice as the design process moves forward. And that it was between northeast 7th and northeast 9th. So I think that's the main concern we have is having a say in how that integrates into the rest of the neighborhood.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Fritz:** So there wasn't a process to decide between 9<sup>th</sup> or 7th. Is that what you are telling me?

**Biederman:** This in the spring there was testimony around this. Seemed like the plan had not chosen to be northeast 9th or northeast 7th. But I believe right now northeast 7th is designated as the preferred route.

**Fritz:** And you're saying the neighborhood wasn't involved in that discussion?

**Biederman:** Not since the spring. I mean, I think it was put on the back burner and we recently found out what the preferred designation was. And there hasn't been any meetings or design meetings yet. I know we were told in the spring that once the process started that the gas tax was passed that there would be meetings around what that would look like in terms of the diverters or stop signs or speed bumps or different measures throughout the neighborhood. Our main concern is just being a part of that process as this moves forward and not being uninformed about what's happening.

**Novick:** We still have to make the decision whether it's northeast 7<sup>th</sup> or northeast 9th. Definitely, once that decision is made, we would you not to involve the neighborhood.

**Fritz:** How would the decision be made?

**Novick:** I think it's up to us. We have a recommendation. But I think it's up to us.

**Fritz:** As was stated when we had the discussion in the spring. There was an expectation that community folks were going to be involved in that. Thank you.

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Peggy Moretti:** Good afternoon. I'm Peggy Moretti. Executive director of restore Oregon. Non-profit who works statewide to pass forward the historic places that make our communities livable and sustainable. I'm here today to endorse the proposed amendments to lower the height limits. This is highly important if we want to fulfill the comp plan policy objective of preserving historic buildings and the character of our historic districts. In that need is the assurance of compatibility of the new construction. I would further point out this adjustment does not conflict with the city's other worthy goals of density and affordability. To say that preservations in conflict is a false dichotomy. The alphabet district is already the densest district. With proposed transfer bonuses that the far for new development could still reach 5-1. We're not limiting new buildings to two stories. They have that transferable far is still going increase their height to be in line with what already exists in that district. And if we leave in place current zoning that is going to generate proposals that are going to be rejected by landmarks commission, we are setting up a case after case coming before city council for resolution. I don't think that sets the landmark's condition up. Taken all together, all of Portland's historic districts represent less than 2% of our total land area. We are not talking about a huge part of this city. They contain the majority of our

October 13, 2016

resources. So giving them protection is not going to stop our quest for affordable housing. It makes little sense to me that advocates pick some of the most expensive real estate to relocate. That goes against my logic. And I kind of have to throw out the question request is the central city bearing the bulk of the burden while outlying neighborhoods that are crying seem to be going wanting here? We should be focusing on making Portland's outer neighborhoods as lovely and livable as the inner city. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Richard Allan:** Richard Allan. I'm here for American waterways.

My testimony concerns property at 110 southwest curuthers. From that location, American waterways has for 20 years. Specifically, with the mapping of the major public trail across the river front of the property. And how the city's desire which dates back to the 1987 Willamette greenway plan conflicts with American waterways obligation applicable to our operations under a post-9/11 federal law. Mtsa requires covered vessels to submit a facility security plan to the coast guard for approval. Under the mtsa, the passenger capacity of at least two of our vessels triggers the requirement for a facility security plan and we have to be able to operate in compliance with that coast guard approved plan in order to be able to operate our vessels. A few key points about the security plans. First, they have to fully describe security measures to comply with. Second, homeland security and the coast guard can add requirements as threats change. And third, this is really the kicker, is that American waterways is prohibited from disclosing provisions to the security plan except in limited circumstances. I've been doing work for them since 1997. I don't know what's in the plan. They've never discussed it with me and they can't. Unrestricted public access trail is going to make it very difficult to operate in compliance with the mtsa. We would either like the trail removed from our property or in the cc 2035 process to have provisions in 33272 which deals with trails to exempt mtsa subject properties or to allow mtsa subject properties who have a special type of easement where you can close it off.

**Hales:** I might ask you, maybe you've already had this discussion to follow up with the planning bureau staff. I've heard this concern. And I'll confess to not understanding the technicalities of it. I do spend a lot of time on the water. There are lots of places in the united states where it's possible to walk along a river bank and still get to a ship. So I must assume other carriers are somehow surmounting this security requirement. So, again, looking at the context you are talking about national regulations here. Again, spent a lot of time on a lot of water fronts. Boston comes to mind. Baltimore comes to mind, san Diego comes to mind and so on. Somehow the public is allowed relatively free and open access up and down those water fronts while still having ships subject to these regulations docking at proprietary docks that are perpendicular to this. The technical conversation on with our staff. We don't want to be contrary to federal law.

**Allan:** There may be a difference between what we see when we see the public seeming to have free and open access and having a recorded easement that says we have a legal obligation to give the public access. The rules are from 5 a.m. To 10 p.m. It may be a different situation. We'll work with staff on that.

**Hales:** It would help us to understand what our boundaries here are. Thank you, all.

**Tamara Deridder:** Good afternoon. My name is Tamara Deridder. I'm representing rose city park association as chairperson and also representing myself as the principal for tdr and associates planning. First off, I'll be representing the neighborhood association. And they have requested your support for the planning and sustainability commission decision in 2011 not to rezone the 60th street station area just yet. Right now the density that's being called for will change r5 to mixed use commercial 2 and r1 higher densities. And the 60th avenue between sandy boulevard -- between halsy and the station at i-84 has two-foot wide sidewalks. So to rezone it, then you'd have improvements with the development but nothing consistently all the way through. I've been working with pbpt in looking at funding for that area. Once the improvements are in place, it won't be a safety

October 13, 2016

hazard and we can rezone. It's one of the few areas in the comprehensive plan that has not rezoned over the last 20 years. And for good reason because working class housing and some other streets do not even have sidewalks. Second, the board has awarded revised requirement for off-street parking where you need to have three parking spaces for every four dwelling units for mixed use. And this is in support of your own study on how many dwelling units have housing, rental housing. Have dwelling units. 70% of all renters have one. And the requirements for 500 foot setbacks from sandy boulevard are minimum like right now 19 parking spaces for 89 and as tdr and associates. Excuse me for going over just a little bit I want to draw your attention to title 33 that does not include the policy number 9.58 requiring adequate parking for off street parking, it does not include that in any of the documentation and therefore does not comply with the comprehensive plan and I therefor request continuance of this public hearing until such language can be inserted and reviewed by the public.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Fritz:** Can you give me that code number again?

**Deridder:** Yes the reference number is 9.58 off street parking of the comprehensive plan.

**Fritz:** What's the zoning code piece that you think doesn't comply with it?

**Deridder:** It's the elements of title 33.266.110b

**Fritz:** Thank you

**Hales:** Okay. Thank you very much.

**Hales:** Welcome.

**Donna Bestwick:** Hi. I'm donna Bestwick and I'm a 35-year resident of Multnomah village. We're all painfully aware that you are in the constant tug of war between citizenry, development and interest of Portland. And while I'm compassionate of that, I won't let you off the hook on your parking requirements. The lady next to me mentioned every neighborhood is distressed about the parking situation. And we don't wear the suits of lawyers, of developers, of people with a personal financial interest. What are people here in Portland? We've paid taxes that support all of us and take care of all of us. And we are a majority of Portland. A single-family dwellers that paid our taxes all these years. And it looks to us like we have the least voice in the system of a city that's supposed to work for us. The only thing standing between developers and I won't call them mercenary or anything like that.

This is America and they have the freedom to make as much money as they can. But once an area is over developed, it's not going to go back. And this business of not having enough parking for a one-to-one, you say it has to do with mass transit. And the mass transit is fabulous in Portland. I rode the bus down here and it's wonderful. I am not going to take a bus to visit my aunt. I'm not going to visit my cousin in Montana on a bus and not have a vehicle when I get there. We are all in that position. I'm going to ask again how many of you on the council have cars? You all do. We all do. And so what you are doing is you are putting incredible pressure on neighborhoods and street parking. People are going to be parking in front of our homes. With reference to the parking policy, I'm going to use the quote again, please stop peeing on our shoes and telling us it's raining.

**Hales:** Thanks very much. I think it's important to note this is a difficult issue for the council on the parking issue. But most of the advocacy we're hearing on the other side is not from developers. It's from transportation advocates like parking reform who are disinterested in the question. But believe that we should be working towards the future where we are walking more and using transit more and driving less. So it really isn't a tug of war in this case between neighborhoods and developers. It's tug of war between two different visions of how the transportation system should work that I've been hearing from. We've had a lot of testimony on the plan on the other side. But I think, actually, none of it from developers. So I don't want you to think of it -- I hope you don't think of it as that's the debate. It really isn't between neighborhoods and developers. It's between neighbors and neighbors. Did



October 13, 2016

you want make it any easier for us. But that's a more accurate characterization of the debate.

**Bestwick:** I agree 100%. But what the lack of parking allows the developers to do is increase footprint. So if they were going to build a structure and had to have one-for-one parking, they couldn't go as big on the footprint. That's where they gain the advantage.

**Hales:** I understand that.

**Bestwick:** And mass transit and driving a car are two separate issues. Please don't tie them together. Because I walk everywhere. I still have a car. That's not going to go away.

**Hales:** Understood. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Martie Sucec:** There's so many people parking now, it's hard to walk in the neighborhood. But I will start my testimony now. Marty Sucec. I'm representing the Multnomah neighborhood association. And I find this disconcerting that all of these things are just one council agenda item. Each one of these we should be able to testify on. I know we can send it in. There's something different about actually being here. We have a big problem with the mixed use issue. We don't want to be a center. We said we want to be a corridor but we don't want to be that. We want to be a main street and we're sorry metro decided to let Portland do away with this quant concept that reflects our village. But I also want to comment on previous issues. I don't want to be the one to tell smile that a design overlay doesn't get them anything. They need a plan district. You and I were sitting in this very room. I think the commissioner Saltzman was there. And Vera Katz, James Francis, et cetera. When you said in 2001, you called the planner in and said is there a height limit on a design overlay? And he said he didn't have the code then. But yes, he thought it did. So you said let's have a design overlay. And then the mayor agreed. And it was therefore done. I was reviewing the testimony. Design overlay hasn't helped us preserve our own character. So I think what we really need is a plan district. And the mixed use process has taken this thing like a chainsaw clear across every neighborhood in the city. They came to Multnomah had two groups and walked around the city. Went down to southwest 40th and where the last surface is and said what about a Wal-Mart here? So what we believe is the planning commission and the principals in the planning bureau have a different idea what it should be. What we would like to see is a planned district. We get businesses together, people together, et cetera. And the other thing, I really compelled to say all the time is there's a false dichotomy set up. It's a logical fallacy between trees, for example, density. Single family housing. It's not one or the other. With intelligent creative planning, we've had great planning. The other thing I hate is this nimbyism. I'm really getting sick of that. There is some in the 20 odd years I've been busy in this activism, I've seen about 20 nimbies'. We want some of the things in our front yard. I think when you attack people for being nimbies, that's logical fallacy number 7 as I remember. It's saying you attack the man, you attack the messenger and do not engage the argument. I'd like to see all of this accusation blank. They seem to be smarter than we give them credit for. And even us, they were not that. We want creative planning that keeps our neighborhood a walkable place. And lets it develop in a smart way.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Sucec:** It's nice to see you 20 something years later. Yes, and we should tell smile they should ask for a plan district. Maybe we can get one. Nice to see you.

**Fritz:** Thanks for continuing to be involved, I've always said that if you don't care about what goes on in your backyard, then who will? So you have to come and advocate for yourself. Thank you.

**Sucec:** Right. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you, all.

**Hales:** Welcome.

**Katherine Christensen:** Thank you. My name is Katherine Christensen and I am from the

October 13, 2016

Multnomah neighborhood. I appreciate you listening to my testimony today. They wanted to talk to you about what the cip should maintain a list of communities and I'm going to read you what I want to say about this. We're concerned the August 2016 recommended draft of the community involvement program allows the city to determine what is a community without public transparency. It is so broad that without further definition the public cannot understand which groups of people with shared identities and belonging have standing as communities. Basic questions about who is any given -- who any given group of people with a shared sense of identity. What is the name of the group? How is it determined that people in the group share the sense of identity or belonging? Who speaks for the group and how the group makes decisions or left unanswered. The cip needs to be more transparent. The neighborhood association is requesting that the cip at minimum maintain a list of communities that have standing in the cip as communities. Provide procedures to add and remove from the list and clarify how membership is determined so any individual may determine whether or not they belong to a given community and whether they belong to more than one community. And a report on the annual basis of the funding that communities on the list received from the city. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Fritz:** Ms. Christensen have you already sent that in?

**Christensen:** We will send it in.

**Hales:** I appreciate it. Thank you.

**Hales:** Welcome.

**Sean Green:** Thanks. Sean Green. A longtime resident. I have several points that I'll include in my email testimony. I'll mention the most important one right now. There's a psc proposal that the city council accept northeast 7th avenue as quote, the preferred route for the greenway alignment that was northeast 9th avenue. And pbot language around this issue is quote, staff responses that we need to conduct a proper study of the effects of various diverter treatments in the area of question. And a detailed traffic analysis. Pbot would need to conduct a full public process and weigh the benefits and impacts to the public. During the major projects adoption process, city council amended the greenway project to identify both roads as potential alignments to subject study. The designation of 7th avenue is the preferred route and inappropriate given that study has never taken place. There's been no community involvement. I think that this should be deferred until that traffic analysis and study has taken place and opportunity for community input.

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

**Debbie Geffard:** Good afternoon. Debbie Thomas Geffard. I'm here to talk about the f-a-r modifications proposed. There are 9 c zones on this list and five of them are upgraded. One stays the same. Three are downgraded. The city is talking all about the density needs mainly in housing but also in commercial and services. We talk about new codes and requirements for unreinforced buildings. We talk about bonus f-a-r to encourage certain kinds of development. The zoning changes proposed suggest changes that would lower density in many areas that we as taxpayers have spent many years improving and put many resources into infrastructure in those areas. My comments are not spot property accommodations as someone suggested. It's not just Irvington and Portland. Northwest, northeast, St. Johns where they desperately need density. You are suggesting devaluation of properties and lessening the use of our structure. In your proposed modification, they are the only ones the f-a-r is penalized. The others have been increased. I hope this is an oversight that will be recognized and changed and not adopted. Specifically regarding cf to cm 2. My first question is why? It penalizes owners that haven't done a recent development. I believe it will create less design diversity since everyone will create boxes that maximize what they can do. Going from cf to cm2 reduces f-a-r far more than it appears. 31 versus 2.5 to 1. You have limited the bonuses. So it could have a huge reduction for some properties or planned developments. I'm not sure a lot of people

October 13, 2016

actually realize that part has been slipped in. And do you realize that in some cases if the property is deemed uneconomical to reinforce, with this change you might not even be able to recreate what is there now. Makes no sense to me. Goes against our coveted boundary and I'm in strong opposition to this and several other elements such as cn going to cm 1 and limited retail services and office.

**Hales:** This is very -- you understand real estate better than most people. Hope you can give us that statement in writing. I think we should --

**Geffrard:** I wrote it down.

**Hales:** Thank you. I'd like to take some time and look through it. Rather than you finish it now. If you can send it.

**Geffrard:** Okay. I really was almost finished. My closing is with inclusionary zoning requirements, gross sales taxes that we need to create jobs in our market along with this suggestion, Portland is going backwards. We need our officials to focus on legislation that will encourage methodical growth. Thank you.

**Hales:** Please send that us. Particularly, your analysis of the transitions from cs to cm 2 and from cn to cm 1. I need to understand that better. Thank you.

**Geffrard:** Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you very much the.

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Hales:** Welcome. Go ahead.

**Eliza Greenstadt:** Hi. Eliza Greenstadt. Another person to talk about the green way proposal on 7th avenue. I live on 8th avenue. I don't have anything written. I just want to kind of explain that we're concerned about this because we don't feel like we have -- we feel like this has been framed as if it's about which is a better avenue for the green way and who is on what side or something. And it's been strangely acrimonious you recollect. We really haven't. We haven't received any reply. We haven't actually seen the plan, a physical plan for this. And our concern is just that -- I should also say I'm a bike commuter. I bike to work every day. Our concern is that when mlk is blocked with traffic, 7th avenue is right there. It's a two-lane street. It's one of the few active two lane streets in our neighborhood. And I've seen it just recently that cars will just go right on there and it is terrible. They'll zoom along the street when mlk is blocked. And I understand that the residents on that street are alarmed by the increase in traffic that's happened there. But then if there's a proposal to turn that into a green way or a bike commuter and there's also some confusion about which it's going to be, because those are very different kinds of streets, then what's going to happen to the traffic that's going along there now? That's what we're concerned about. And I'm all for -- and we as a community that's been thinking about this, we are all for having more different kinds of transportation, better bike routes, better pedestrian routes. We're just trying to have more input and more say to have that be done safely in a way that's not going to cause more problems for our whole neighborhood.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Novick:** I'm disturbed to hear you haven't received response for request for information. Would you mind dropping by my office and leaving your contact information? And we'll get back to you and make sure you get answers.

**Greenstadt:** Yes.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thanks a lot. Good afternoon.

**Mark O'Donnoh:** Good afternoon. Mark o'donnoh. I own property at 1727 northwest point. And we're here today in opposition to the reduction in far from 4 to 1. I dread coming here to see you today. I really do. I grew up in northwest Portland. And I was the last graduating class of saint Patrick's school in 1957. And at that time, I was on the wrong side of the poverty issue. My single parent mother raised the four of us and got to go without paying tuition. And we all got to be something in life today because somewhat of the neighborhood we lived in. I'm not going to get into it today about this idea of we see in our

October 13, 2016

presidential campaign of fear. Like if you don't reduce the far northwest Portland is going to lose all of its historical designations. I've been here before and I'm sure you remember us. We went out and got one of the most competent impeccable persons to come in here and said the building didn't work, et cetera, et cetera. And also offered to take care of 100 seniors a year. And we didn't meet the criteria. You have well in place ordinances and criteria that protect buildings. Now, what I would like to talk to you about is the 160 people that would live in this project. And we have a tendency in this world today to talk around circles. And I realize you can have a clash of values. I'm perfectly understandable of that. We have a housing crisis as you well know. The number is 23,295 units that we need in this city.

We need this for people of extremely low income which means you make less than 15 or \$13,000 a year. Our project would be primarily occupied by people in that income category. On the larger scale, I tried to think of why someone who makes less money is economically excluded from living in northwest Portland when people come along and have alternatives for them to live there. If you are an elderly citizen, medical concerns are quite a bit. If you are four blocks from the hospital, that gives you a piece of mind. That's atop of the fear of having one foot out the door for no housing. Also, you can walk two blocks to trader joes. You can walk five blocks to freed Meyers. Walk two blocks to the William temple house. And all kinds of churches and facilities there for people. If you don't make the economic criteria of affording a \$1600 a month rent, we're going to shift you to the west side, east side. We're going to shift you to east county. You can slice the bread anyway you want to slice it. And since we're limited on time, I can't develop this in depth for you. So I'll give you the conclusion. The conclusion is this reduction in four-to-one is economic segregation. When you close safeways, that has nowhere near the impact when you close safeways, target, Albertsons in the east county. If you have to take a bus for 20 blocks, that's a lot different than hopping in your car and going down there. So, look, there's plenty of control. I'd ask you to remain the flexibility that you have now. The oversight that you have. And that you do not do this. And I will send you a letter on this process. We had no notice that your planning and sustainability committee entertained such a drastic measure. Under the measure 49, we got notice. Thank you. Any questions?

**Hales:** That's good. Appreciate it. Thank you, mark.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Hales:** We might get everybody in.

**Karen Karlsson:** Hi, again. As you know, nwda provided a lot of testimony.

**Hales:** Name on the record.

**Karlsson:** Karen karlsson. President nwda. We provided a lot of testimony. I don't even know how many times. We've requested work with staff for changes in northwest. We've received many of them. We're very thankful. And there's a few we haven't. I've handed in written testimony to ask for your consideration on a couple other things. However, what I guess I would like to address is the f-a-r. Not the first time you've heard this. You know, I think right now we are so offended by all of the accusations. And I know there's been article upon article in the newspaper. You know, we're experiencing great growth in our neighborhood. And for the last couple of years, we've added 1200 units. Our biggest dislike is none of it is affordable. Right now we have over 800 regulated affordable housing units. We've been asking them even when other neighborhoods were saying no. In the medium income is just under \$35,000 and we have a lot of market affordable housing we were going to lose in that core. The northwest district plan is the only plan outside the central city that has an affordable housing bonus. We have an affordable housing bonus in our planned district. A few blocks north, you could build up to 7 to 1 f-a-r if you do affordable housing. We've been promoting for a long time. You know, we were as surprised as they were that there was a project going on. We didn't know anything about this project that's been happening since the spring. And actually, I think that we may be

October 13, 2016

able to find a solution. So I am leaving it as the reason we're trying to do this. We want to provide certainty to developers and property owners.

**Hales:** Thank you. And I guess I just want to urge you and the others in this debate, doesn't mean we can't settle it. But if there's further conversations that could be had among people that might be able to get -- that would be most appreciated.

**Karlsson:** That is our plan.

**Hales:** I hope so. Thank you.

**Hales:** Who would like to be next? Go ahead.

**Greg Theisen:** I'm Greg Theisen. I'm here on behalf of the northwest district association and planning committee today. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. This is not about the f-a-r. We have been working also on the zoning project. And hard copy testimony for me and in the email testimony. And our work has led us to conclude the best response to the challenge of planning for service growth. It is not to include it in the cizp. As currently drafted, does not reflect the unique nature of the campus as it functions in the neighborhood. As drafted, it has this integration into the neighborhood. Even psu with its integration to other parts of the city with the block structure has blocks in it and streets that are blocked off. And only has one that's like that. So it's unique grid development pattern provides for multiple access and building sizes and locations. And the surrounding built environment. By not acknowledging the characteristics, the cizp will fail to serve the northwest community. And continue to grow and evolve together. What we like to see is opportunity to amend the northwest district plan and by doing so addressing the issues with the legacy good Samaritan campus, if you'll call it that. And better serve all interests involved. So thank you for your consideration.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Thank you. Welcome.

**Rachel Gihocchio:** Hi. My name is Rachel Gihocchio. You have to own that with that kind of last name. I'm the community liaison for the business association. And earlier, you heard from David and Ellen from smile. It's a pleasure to sit here today to present an unidentified neighborhood testimony. We urge the psc to recognize two vital aspects of our community when finalizing the zoning codes. The first is at the commercial corridors run right through the residential streets in our neighborhood. That's what makes it so lovely and charming. You can walk to everything and anything you need. But what this means is residential and commercial properties often abut one another. So height becomes the overriding issue that comes up. Oppose the additional 2 feet of tall first floors and oppose the bonus height to the step down height when commercial properties abut residential properties. If additional height is acceptable if it's a commercial property abutting another commercial property. This gets me to the second vital aspect of our neighborhood. Our business corridors also intersect one another. So commercial properties also abut one another. This means one commercial property can have an overlay and shares a wall. That commercial property might not have an overlay. Having a design overlay or main street overlay on some properties but not all commercial properties creates the situation of have and have nots and can impact the property values of the building that are right next to each other. And so we recommend an D overlay and we recommend applying it uniformly to the neighborhood. And I know the person that just spoke talked about a plan district. I'll have to connect with her and find out what that is about. Thank you for this and other opportunities to provide neighborhood input into the zoning process.

**Hales:** thank you. It will be interesting to look at the numbers. I suspect almost all the commercial properties abut residential properties.

**Gihocchio:** They do.

**Hales:** I can't think of very many that would.

**Gihocchio:** Nope. And there are some commercial properties that abut other commercial properties and we're saying great, that's a great place to add density and height. But adding height to commercial properties that is blocking the light and invading the privacy of

October 13, 2016

residential. That's where the conflict comes. We finally have worked together. And we realized that's what the issue was. It was the height of new buildings. Our neighborhood is a little peninsula. And from park to park, it's all right in there. Which makes it wonderful to live. It's been great working together to get to this place.

**Hales:** Well done. Thank you. Thank you very much. Good work.

**Rich Michaelson:** Welcome. I'm here to talk about the alphabet district. I want to start more generally. I believe providing affordable housing is one of the most important things we can do. I made a donation to support the campaign. However, I'm really concerned at this time of crisis, affordable housing has trumped every other goal. I want to remind us we're planning for the next 100 years. While we have a crisis today, we should not allow one goal to trump everything else. To abandon our system of corridors and centers and do other things that are not consist apt because we need to all work together. This proposal is about one historic district in a city where only 3% of the land is historic district. 27% of Manhattan island is historic district. Doesn't make very much difference. The proposal is about truth in development. Too many times they have calls saying they have this great property. And I can build f-a-r four-to-one. I know better. I know the conditions come down and reduce that. But others don't. And they get into the process, they don't know there's demolition denial potential. Don't know anything about this. They look at the map and says f-a-r affordable. One thing I've got is change the map to say f-a-r two-to-one. One way of doing it. In terms of this particular project, I think I can find enough additional density to transfer on to that site to make the project work. Other options would be to extend the city's inclusionary zone to that site so they can get the density. Finally, we can include the nwda affordable housing. But the most important thing is that the zoning reflects the closest reality to what's desired and what's there today and does not mislead people. I urge you to do the two-to-one.

**Fritz:** That's helpful.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Appreciate your offer to try to figure out a solution. Thank you. Welcome.

**Jim Tsoumas:** Hi. First time in front of the city council. I want to talk about properties in northwest Portland. 2123 northwest nicoli. 3004 northwest Roosevelt and 3032 northwest Roosevelt.

**Hales:** Give us your name.

**Tsoumas:** Jim tsoumas. One of our city council members explained to me how he's going to change my zoning. And made me really anxious. So I engaged him slightly more and was not interested to find out but found out he was seriously going at me tooth and nail. There's a development coming next me. And then my other neighbor has. And what you do on the other side of the street, I can give a damn. That's not my problem. But changing the zoning from what is there now to what's proposed is going to negatively affect the whole damn industrial part. If it negatively affects them, it will negatively affect me. I'm really disgusted with the way I was going at this. I was not given any opportunity to make a comment on it. Was not notified by anybody. Was not notified by council. And recently, none of my neighbors in the industrial park do anything about this. There is a lot opposing. I mean a real lot. I was at the last meeting and nobody saw this as anything good. We all know once you erode the industrial park, it's a boundary shorter and shorter. Pretty soon we have something called the moss in the trees that made that lady cry on television. Nobody offered her any solution to the problem. Kate brown didn't say well, you need scrubbers. Here's \$8 million. Fix it. Keep your employees. I didn't hear that from anybody. I'm more than disgusted with this. It seems you go nowhere quick.

**Hales:** It's not done yet.

**Tsoumas:** I'm really hoping that this will go.

**Hales:** If you can follow up with just an email to us with those addresses. What's the zoning that's proposed?

October 13, 2016

**Tsoumas:** He knows.

**Hales:** So just send us the addresses.

**Tsoumas:** He damn well knows.

**Hales:** send us the addresses.

**Tsoumas:** I will. Thank you. Thank you for your time.

**Hales:** We've made a decision and we may not have gotten it right. That's why it's good to hear.

**Michaelson:** If I can have one more comment. Martha was concerned about vesting rights. The project vest not when they provide for the building permit.

**Fritz:** So that's what I thought, but what about her point that it would be a nonconforming use after we changed it.

**Michaelson:** I think that's more of an issue. The projects that are nonconforming that i've financed. If there's a way to get that out of the way, they'd be better off making it conforming.

**Tsoumas:** So I do have a question. Since you did discuss this, what was the decision?

**Hales:** Well, I think the property was changed to r1 on one portion of it and cm2 on the other. Don't trust my memory. That woman right there, get her card and send her we'll follow up.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Hales:** Come on up. Thank you for waiting.

**Brainard Brauer:** My name is brainard Brauer. I own property on southeast 13<sup>th</sup> and Powell. And this is a commercial property. Just want to make the observation this is the first notice that I think I've received. Any specific changes. So just chiming in that was someone else's comment. Also someone else's comment we want to the point that preserving an owner's rights even if the zoning has changed. It seems like an idea worth thinking about. I had been in the property owner since 1995 and worked hard to my properties in the neighborhood and to continue to improve it year to year.

**Fritz:** Just give the address again, please.

**Brauer:** 3205 southeast 13th avenue.

**Fritz:** Thank you.

**Brauer:** there's a couple surrounding it as well.

**Fritz:** Thank you.

**Brauer:** And proud to have been an active participant. Crime has been reduced significantly and with the help and cooperation of many Portland police officers. My current zoning is cg and it proposed to go to ce. The change adds many more restrictions including but not limited to set backs to residential property. So 3205 southeast 13th abuts residential. The new ce zoning may have its place. In this situation, it reduces the incentives for revitalization at least I can see them at this time. I request my zoning to be left at cg. Or if not, provide real incentives. I don't know. This is a critical time to get it right. As a point of perspective the properties directly to the north of me and north of powell and east of southeast 11th avenue. Those properties are owned by the fire department. Which are being moved. Partly pdc interest. And in private development. That's being proposed to go to ex zoning. And that's a landlocked property from the north by the train. And to the south by Powell. And those properties are probably not the best use for that kind of zoning. But at least that concern should be taken into account. And to push ahead, there was an idea passed on by a friend of mine that made a suggestion. And those properties, perhaps they would turn into a park area. One thing that whole region doesn't have is a park. That park could be a park zone that was a hub for pedestrian traffic possibly even out of the norm with a park and ride. Central spot for pedestrian access and relieve tension. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thanks very much.

**Allen Brown:** Thank you. Good afternoon, mayor, and commissioners. My name is Allen

October 13, 2016

brown and I live with my wife at 1115 northeast 60th avenue in the southeast part of rose city park neighborhood. We are east of normandale park. We are currently zoned r5 and the proposal is r1. East normandale is 126th year old neighborhood making it the oldest section of the rose city park neighborhood. We might even have the oldest house in Portland. In the area, residents oppose rezoning as does the rose city park neighborhood. And you heard from our chairwoman earlier. East normandale cannot handle increased density without degrading the neighborhood's quality of life. A 2011 study by the poured land bureau of transportation of another proposal to increase density concluded that increased density would cause traffic to fail in our area. Instead of rezoning our area, I would like you to focus on working with the residential infill proposal. Like others, I was not in favor of this. But as I looked at how development happened over the last century, I have to admit it worked out well for east normandale. So-called middle housing is located in places that make sense and had a scale that works for the neighborhood. In contrast, some recent east normandale projects developed on a current zoning regulations are out of scale, poorly sighted and poorly located. I ask you not to rezone and instead to join with neighborhoods to develop, refine and implement residential infill so it works as well throughout Portland as it has worked in east normandale.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. What was your address?

**Brown:** 1115.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Scott Eaton:** Mayor, commissioners. Thank you. I'm Scott Eaton. I'm with the development group that is also involved with the naito piece that was referred to. I'd like to clarify those properties are not in the giles lake industrial sanctuary. They never were. You did make a decision on these properties during our process with the comprehensive plan where we worked with the northwest neighborhood association and you have received letters of support from the northwest neighborhood association for the rezone that has taken place there in the comp plan. We worked together to come up with an r1 zone where we did middle housing. And then kept the ability to do virtually the same uses that are there now but also do potentially more residential there as well with the properties to the north. So I just want to clarify and speak on behalf of the neighborhood and the work we are trying to do there because this area was identified as an area that for the past four decades has been underutilized. It is a place where improvement needs to be made.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thanks very much. Any others? Is that the whole list?

**Moore-Love:** that's everyone who signed up on the list.

**Hales:** Thank you, all. All right. Amazingly, it is 5 p.m. On the dot. So we'll close the hearing.

**Eric Engstrom, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Hi. Eric Engstrom Bureau of planning and sustainability. The decision you have to make now is if you are ready to close the oral hearing. And staff has recommended that you hold it open until midnight Friday essentially since there's little bit of time.

**Hales:** At least that long. We have been inviting people to send in testimony that they pro plided today.

**Fritz:** Assuming you are not going to work on it over the weekend. How about 8:00 on Monday?

**Engstrom:** 8 a.m. Monday is fine as well.

**Hales:** Let's do that. Let's leave the record open and that way if people over the weekend want to send in email or other correspondents that they won't be forced to get that done.

**Fritz:** We'll let you take the weekend off Eric.

**Engstrom:** And we will, of course of course put all that into the record in one of those boxes. And then another next step was we will be coming back to you on October 25th. I believe we have a work session scheduled. And so as you are reading through the testimony, we would like you to be preparing your amendment list and be prepared to talk



October 13, 2016

about that on the 25th.

**Hales:** That gives us a week. So keep the record open for written testimony until 8 a.m. On Monday the 17th. And then we'll stick with our schedule as planned for work sessions and subsequent hearings.

**Engstrom:** Right. And we would also note that the in the present time was you then would reopen the record for testimony on your amendments for the November 17th hearing.

**Hales:** Right.

\*\*\*\*\*: Also note that the testimony that's been added to the box.

**Engstrom:** We did also add testimony that we collected since last week to the box. That was put in there earlier.

**Hales:** Okay. We all have a lot of reading to do. Excellent testimony today. And hopefully hear more from people by electronic or other correspondents. Thanks very much. We're adjourned for the week.

**At 5:03 p.m. council adjourned.**

**PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL AGENDA  
City Hall - 1221 SW Fourth Avenue  
WEDNESDAY, 9:30 AM, OCTOBER 5, 2016  
THURSDAY, 1:00PM, OCTOBER 6, 2016**

**Items 1091, 1096 and 1097 were taken October 5, 2016.  
All other Wednesday items were taken October 6, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.**

October 5, 2016. THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding;  
Commissioners Fish, Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 5.

October 6, 2016. THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding;  
Commissioners Fish, Fritz and Novick, 4.

**Disposition:**

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**1091** Request of Michael Withey to address Council regarding homelessness  
(Communication)

**PLACED ON FILE**

**1092** Request of Lightning Watchdog PDX to address Council regarding evict  
the Clinton Foundation from the Whitehouse (Communication)

**PLACED ON FILE**

**1093** Request of David Kif Davis/Multnomah County Copwatch to address  
Council regarding war on copwatchers by the police and City  
(Communication)

**PLACED ON FILE**

**1094** Request of David Gwyther to address Council regarding 10<sup>th</sup> and SW  
Yamhill Parking Garage project (Communication)

**RESCHEDULED TO  
OCTOBER 12, 2016  
AT 9:30 AM**

**1095** Request of Douglas Peterson to address Council regarding 10<sup>th</sup> and SW  
Yamhill Parking Garage project (Communication)

**RESCHEDULED TO  
OCTOBER 12, 2016  
AT 9:30 AM**

**TIMES CERTAIN**

**1096 TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM** – Proclaim October 10, 2016 to be  
Indigenous Peoples’ Day in Portland (Proclamation introduced by  
Mayor Hales) 1 hour requested

**PLACED ON FILE**

**1097 TIME CERTAIN: 10:45 AM** – Presentation from A Home for Everyone  
on Scaling Response to Need: Early Wins in Expanding to Scale  
(Presentation introduced by Mayor Hales) 15 minutes requested

**PLACED ON FILE**

**CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION**

**Mayor Charlie Hales**

<p><b>1098</b> Extend term of Street Closure Program in Old Town/Chinatown for a period of one year (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>OCTOBER 5-6, 2016 PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>Fire &amp; Police Disability and Retirement</b></p>	
<p><b>*1099</b> Amend the Fire and Police Disability, Retirement and Death Benefit Plan in order to comply with an arbitration decision, regarding final pay calculation for members of the Portland Police Association (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188016</b></p>
<p><b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p>	
<p><b>*1100</b> Pay claim of Mary Haney in the sum of \$20,956 involving the Bureau of Environmental Services (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188017</b></p>
<p><b>*1101</b> Pay claim of Samuel Sachs in the sum of \$130,000 involving the Parks Bureau (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188021</b></p>
<p><b>1102</b> Extend contract with Hyas Group and increase compensation in the amount of \$115,000 for investment consulting services for the City Deferred Compensation Plan (Second Reading Agenda 1073; amend Contract No. 30001011)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188018</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Steve Novick Bureau of Transportation</b></p>	
<p><b>1103</b> Rename a segment of NE Couch Ct and name a segment of unnamed public right-of-way as NE Couch St (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1104</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation for inspections of City-owned highway tunnels (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1105</b> Authorize contracts as required with three service firms for Right-of-Way Appraisal and Acquisition and Relocation projects not to exceed \$250,000 each (Second Reading Agenda 1076)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188019</b></p>
<p><b>1106</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Port of Portland to allow the Bureau of Transportation to administer the design, right-of-way and construction for the NE Columbia Blvd: Cully Blvd &amp; Alderwood Rd project (Second Reading Agenda 1077)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188020</b></p>
<p><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b>  <b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b></p>	

<b>Office of Management and Finance</b>		
<b>*1107</b> Authorize a contract with Labyrinth Solutions, Inc. for implementation services for SAP Enterprise Asset Management at a not-to-exceed amount of \$1,850,000 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested		<b>RESCHEDULED TO OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>*1108</b> Authorize CityFleet to purchase replacement Bridge Inspection Crane for use by Bureau of Transportation at \$811,932 (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)		<b>188022</b>
<b>1109</b> Ratify a successor collective bargaining agreement between the City and the Portland Police Association relating to the terms and conditions of employment of represented employees in the Portland Police Association bargaining unit (Previous Agenda 1065)  <b>Motion to accept Hales amendment regarding body camera policy as modified:</b> Moved by Hales and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)		<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b>		
<b>1110</b> Vacate a portion of an unnamed alley between N Midway Ave and N Columbia Blvd subject to certain conditions and reservations (Hearing; Ordinance; VAC-10107) 10 minutes requested		<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b> <b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b>		
<b>1111</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement between Portland Parks & Recreation and Portland State University to develop a citywide tree planting strategy (Second Reading Agenda 1082)  (Y-3; Fish and Saltzman absent)		<b>188023</b>
<b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b> <b>Water Bureau</b>		
<b>1112</b> Authorize a contract with the lowest responsive bidder and provide payment for the construction of the Cornell Road Services - Macleay Park Project at an estimated cost of \$600,000 (Second Reading Agenda 1085)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)		<b>188024</b>
<b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b> <b>Portland Housing Bureau</b>		
<b>*1113</b> Approve application under the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program for 9101 Foster located at 9101 SE Foster Rd (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Saltzman absent)		<b>188025</b>

<p><b>1114</b> Approve application under the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program for Koz 16<sup>th</sup> and Marshall located at 1015, 1033 and 1039 NW 16<sup>th</sup> Ave (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1115</b> Approve application under the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program for Koz 2211 SW 4<sup>th</sup> located at 2211 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Ave (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>WEDNESDAY, 2:00 PM, OCTOBER 5, 2016</u></b> <b>This meeting was canceled.</b></p> <p><b>1116 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b>– Authorize a surtax to the City’s Business License Tax for publicly traded companies subject to U.S Securities and Exchange Commission disclosure and reporting requirements if a subject company reports that the ratio of compensation of its chief executive officer to median worker is equal to or greater than 100:1 under the Commission’s Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Novick; amend Code Section 7.02.500) 3 hours requested</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>THURSDAY, 1:00 PM, OCTOBER 6, 2016</u></b></p> <p>THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, Novick, 4.</p>	
<p><b>1117 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 3 hours requested</p>	<p><b>CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 13, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>

**NOTE:** “Time Certain” indicates that an item will not be heard by Council **prior** to the time specified.

Communications items are three minutes each. Regular Agenda items taking longer than five minutes have the time estimate noted next to the item.

The \* indicates an emergency ordinance, which takes effect immediately if passed. Non-emergency ordinances require two readings and a 30-day waiting period before taking effect. Resolutions, reports, etc., adopted by Council are effective after adjournment.

The above summary is published by the City Auditor as provided by Section 2-113 of the Charter and Ordinance No. 130672.

Council Chambers is equipped with a sound system for the hearing impaired. Assisted listening devices are available from the Clerk.

The City of Portland will gladly accommodate requests for an interpreter or make other accommodations that further inclusivity. Please make your request at least 48 hours before the meeting to the Council Clerk 503-823-4086. (TTY 503-823-6868).

City Council meetings can be viewed at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/video>. The meetings are also cablecast on CityNet 30, Portland Community Media television.

Mary Hull Caballero  
Auditor of the City of Portland

=====

Testimony is taken on all Agenda items *except* Communications and Second Readings. To testify, sign up on a testimony sheet as you enter Council Chambers on the day of the meeting. Individuals have 3 minutes to testify, unless otherwise stated at the meeting.

Written testimony may be emailed or mailed to the Council Clerk prior to the meeting.

To schedule a Communication, email or mail your request to the Council Clerk. Include your name, address, phone number and a brief description of the subject you will be addressing. For full details, see Testimony Policies and procedures. <http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/index.cfm?&a=63123&c=34447>

Clerk Email: [karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:karla.moore-love@portlandoregon.gov)  
Council Clerk Testimony: [cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov)  
US Mail: Council Clerk, 1221 SW Fourth Ave., Room 130, Portland OR 97204

=====

Declaration Required by Lobbyists. Portland City Code 2.12.060 states: Prior to offering public testimony before City officials, at the beginning of any meetings or phone calls with City officials, or in emails and letters to City officials, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent for that communication.

=====

*“Be a part of the picture...get involved with your City...volunteer for a City of Portland Board or Commission. For more information, a brochure, or a volunteer application, stop by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement in City Hall or call 503-823-4519.”*

**OFFICERS OF PORTLAND CITY GOVERNMENT**

**CHARLIE HALES, MAYOR**

Commissioner of Finance and Administration  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 340, 97204  
 (503) 823-4120  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/mayor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/mayor/)  
 e-mail: [mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:mayorhales@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>
Portland Police Bureau Portland Development Commission Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Fire & Police Disability and Retirement Office of Equity and Human Rights Office of Management and Finance Office of Government Relations City Attorney City Budget Office Oversight of the Willamette River Super Fund clean-up project

**NICK FISH**

Commissioner of Public Works  
 Position Number 2  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 240, 97204  
 (503) 823-3589  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fish](http://www.portlandonline.com/fish)  
 e-mail: [Nick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Nick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Environmental Services Bureau of Hydroelectric Power Water Bureau	<i>Elders in Action                      Portland Utility Review Board                      Venture Portland                      Portland's Centers For The Arts                      Regional Arts and Culture Council</i>

**AMANDA FRITZ**

Commissioner of Public Utilities  
 Position Number 1  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 220, 97204  
 (503) 823-3008  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/fritz/](http://www.portlandonline.com/fritz/)  
 e-mail: [amanda@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:amanda@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Parks & Recreation Office of Neighborhood Involvement	<i>Royal Rosarians                      Multnomah County Animal Control                      Portland Parks Board                      Urban Forestry Commission                      Golf Advisory Committee                      Portland International Raceway Advisory                      Committee                      Protected Sick Time ordinance                      implementation                      [continued next page]</i>

	<p><i>Council Lead on the City Coordinating Committee addressing the Department of Justice Settlement</i></p> <p><i>Visitors Development Fund Board (with Saltzman)</i></p>
--	---

**STEVE NOVICK**

Commissioner of Public Safety  
 Position Number 4  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 210, 97204  
 (503) 823-4682  
 website: [www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/novick/)  
 e-mail: [Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Steve.Novick@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Transportation Bureau of Emergency Management Bureau of Emergency Communications	<i>Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)</i> <i>Portland Streetcar Inc.</i> <i>Regional Emergency Management Group</i> <i>BOEC Users Group</i> <i>BOEC Finance Committee</i> <i>Taxi Cab Board of Review</i> <i>Towing Board of Review</i>

**DAN SALTZMAN**

Commissioner of Public Affairs  
 Position Number 3  
 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 230, 97204  
 (503) 823-4151  
 website: [www.portlandonline.com/saltzman](http://www.portlandonline.com/saltzman)  
 e-mail: [dan@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:dan@portlandoregon.gov)

<b>Bureau Portfolio</b>	<b>Liaison Responsibilities</b>
Bureau of Development Services Portland Fire & Rescue Portland Housing Bureau Gateway Domestic Violence Center Portland Children's Levy (formerly Portland Children's Investment Fund)	<i>Travel Portland</i> <i>Visitors Development Fund (with Fritz)</i> <i>Home Forward</i> <i>League of Oregon Cities</i> <i>Adjustment Committee</i> <i>Building Board of Appeals</i> <i>Design Commission</i> <i>Historic Landmarks Commission</i>



## **MARY HULL CABALLERO**

Auditor of the City of Portland  
1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 140, 97204  
(503) 823-4078  
website: [www.portlandonline.com/auditor/](http://www.portlandonline.com/auditor/)  
e-mail: [AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:AuditorHullCaballero@portlandoregon.gov)

### **Portfolio**

Assessments, Finance & Foreclosure  
Audit Services  
City Elections  
City Recorder  
-Archives  
-Council Clerk / Contracts Division  
-Records Management  
Hearings Office  
IPR - Independent Police Review  
Ombudsman  
Portland Multnomah Progress Board

### **BUREAU DIRECTORS**

Bureau of Development Services	Paul Scarlett
Bureau of Emergency Communications	Lisa Turley
Bureau of Emergency Management	Carmen Merlo
Bureau of Environmental Services	Michael Jordan
Bureau of Human Resources	Anna Kanwit
Bureau of Internal Business Services	Bryant Enge
Bureau of Planning & Sustainability	Susan Anderson
Bureau of Police	Michael Marshman
Bureau of Revenue & Financial Services	Ken Rust
Bureau of Technology Services	Jeff Baer
Bureau of Transportation	Leah Treat
City Attorney	Tracy Reeve
City Budget Office	Andrew Scott
Fire & Police Disability and Retirement	Samuel Hutchison
Office of Equity and Human Rights	Dante James
Office of Government Relations	Martha Pellegrino
Office of Mgmt & Finance –Chief Admin Officer	Fred Miller
Office of Neighborhood Involvement	Amalia Alarcón de Morris
Portland Development Commission	Kimberly Branam
Portland Fire & Rescue	Mike Myers
Portland Housing Bureau	Kurt Creager
Portland Parks & Recreation	Mike Abbaté
Revenue Director	Thomas Lannom
Water Bureau	Michael Stuhr

Updated 08-19-2016



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

**OFFICIAL  
MINUTES**

**Excerpt Item 1117.**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **5<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER, 2016** AT 9:30 A.M.

Items 1091, 1096 and 1097 were heard October 5, 2016.

All other Wednesday items were rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.

October 5, 2016. **THOSE PRESENT WERE:** Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 5. Commissioner Novick arrived at 10:14 a.m.

October 6, 2016. **THOSE PRESENT WERE:** Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz and Novick, 4.

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE OCTOBER 5, 2016:** Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Ben Walters, Chief Deputy City Attorney; and Jason King and Mike Miller, Sergeants at Arms.

Item No. 1101 was pulled for discussion and on a Y-4 roll call, the balance of the Consent Agenda was adopted.

The meeting recessed at 10:50 a.m. and reconvened at 11:00 a.m.

<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>		<b>Disposition:</b>
<b>1091</b>	Request of Michael Withey to address Council regarding homelessness (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>1092</b>	Request of Lightning Watchdog PDX to address Council regarding evict the Clinton Foundation from the Whitehouse (Communication) Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm.	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>1093</b>	Request of David Kif Davis/Multnomah County Copwatch to address Council regarding war on copwatchers by the police and City (Communication) Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm.	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>1094</b>	Request of David Gwyther to address Council regarding 10 <sup>th</sup> and SW Yamhill Parking Garage project (Communication) Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm.	<b>RESCHEDULED TO OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b>

October 5-6, 2016

<b>1095</b>	Request of Douglas Peterson to address Council regarding 10 <sup>th</sup> and SW Yamhill Parking Garage project (Communication) Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm.	<b>RESCHEDULED TO OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>TIMES CERTAIN</b>		
<b>1096</b>	<b>TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM</b> – Proclaim October 10, 2016 to be Indigenous Peoples' Day in Portland (Proclamation introduced by Mayor Hales) 1 hour requested	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>1097</b>	<b>TIME CERTAIN: 10:45 AM</b> – Presentation from A Home for Everyone on Scaling Response to Need: Early Wins in Expanding to Scale (Presentation introduced by Mayor Hales) 15 minutes requested	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm</b>		
<b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b>		
<b>1098</b>	Extend term of Street Closure Program in Old Town/Chinatown for a period of one year (Ordinance)	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>Fire &amp; Police Disability and Retirement</b>		
<b>*1099</b>	Amend the Fire and Police Disability, Retirement and Death Benefit Plan in order to comply with an arbitration decision, regarding final pay calculation for members of the Portland Police Association (Ordinance) (Y-4; Saltzman absent)	<b>188016</b>
<b>Office of Management and Finance</b>		
<b>*1100</b>	Pay claim of Mary Haney in the sum of \$20,956 involving the Bureau of Environmental Services (Ordinance) (Y-4; Saltzman absent)	<b>188017</b>
<b>*1101</b>	Pay claim of Samuel Sachs in the sum of \$130,000 involving the Parks Bureau (Ordinance) (Y-4; Saltzman absent)	<b>188021</b>
<b>1102</b>	Extend contract with Hyas Group and increase compensation in the amount of \$115,000 for investment consulting services for the City Deferred Compensation Plan (Second Reading Agenda 1073; amend Contract No. 30001011) (Y-4; Saltzman absent)	<b>188018</b>
<b>Commissioner Steve Novick Bureau of Transportation</b>		
<b>1103</b>	Rename a segment of NE Couch Ct and name a segment of unnamed public right-of-way as NE Couch St (Ordinance)	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b>

October 5-6, 2016

1104	<p>Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation for inspections of City-owned highway tunnels (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
1105	<p>Authorize contracts as required with three service firms for Right-of-Way Appraisal and Acquisition and Relocation projects not to exceed \$250,000 each (Second Reading Agenda 1076) (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188019</b></p>
1106	<p>Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Port of Portland to allow the Bureau of Transportation to administer the design, right-of-way and construction for the NE Columbia Blvd: Cully Blvd &amp; Alderwood Rd project (Second Reading Agenda 1077) (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188020</b></p>
<p><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b></p>		
<p><b>Mayor Charlie Hales</b> <b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p>		
*1107	<p>Authorize a contract with Labyrinth Solutions, Inc. for implementation services for SAP Enterprise Asset Management at a not-to-exceed amount of \$1,850,000 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm.</p>	<p><b>RESCHEDULED TO OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
*1108	<p>Authorize CityFleet to purchase replacement Bridge Inspection Crane for use by Bureau of Transportation at \$811,932 (Ordinance) Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188022</b></p>
1109	<p>Ratify a successor collective bargaining agreement between the City and the Portland Police Association relating to the terms and conditions of employment of represented employees in the Portland Police Association bargaining unit (Previous Agenda 1065) Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm. <b>Motion to accept Hales amendment regarding body camera policy as modified:</b> Moved by Hales and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Steve Novick</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p>		
1110	<p>Vacate a portion of an unnamed alley between N Midway Ave and N Columbia Blvd subject to certain conditions and reservations (Hearing; Ordinance; VAC-10107) 10 minutes requested Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm.</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b> <b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b></p>		

October 5-6, 2016

<p><b>1111</b></p>	<p>Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement between Portland Parks &amp; Recreation and Portland State University to develop a citywide tree planting strategy (Second Reading Agenda 1082) Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm. (Y-3; Fish and Saltzman absent)</p>	<p><b>188023</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b> <b>Water Bureau</b></p>		<p><b>188024</b></p>
<p><b>1112</b></p>	<p>Authorize a contract with the lowest responsive bidder and provide payment for the construction of the Cornell Road Services - Macleay Park Project at an estimated cost of \$600,000 (Second Reading Agenda 1085) Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b> <b>Portland Housing Bureau</b></p>		<p><b>188025</b></p>
<p><b>*1113</b></p>	<p>Approve application under the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program for 9101 Foster located at 9101 SE Foster Rd (Ordinance) Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm. (Y-4; Saltzman absent)</p>	
<p><b>1114</b></p>	<p>Approve application under the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program for Koz 16<sup>th</sup> and Marshall located at 1015, 1033 and 1039 NW 16<sup>th</sup> Ave (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm.</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>1115</b></p>	<p>Approve application under the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program for Koz 2211 SW 4<sup>th</sup> located at 2211 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Ave (Ordinance) Rescheduled to October 6, 2016 at 1:00 pm.</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 12, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p>At 11:19 a.m., Council recessed.</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>WEDNESDAY, 2:00 PM, OCTOBER 5, 2016</u></b> <b>This meeting was canceled.</b></p> <p><b>1116</b>    <b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b>– Authorize a surtax to the City’s Business License Tax for publicly traded companies subject to U.S Securities and Exchange Commission disclosure and reporting requirements if a subject company reports that the ratio of compensation of its chief executive officer to median worker is equal to or greater than 100:1 under the Commission’s Pay Ratio Disclosure Rule (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Novick; amend Code Section 7.02.500) 3 hours requested</p>		<p><b>RESCHEDULED TO OCTOBER 26, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>

October 6, 2016

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **6<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER, 2016** AT 1:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, and Novick, 4.

Commissioner Novick arrived at 1:07 p.m.  
Commissioner Fish left at 3:55 p.m.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Ben Walters, Chief Deputy City Attorney at 1:00; Kathryn Beaumont at 2:35 p.m.; and Mike Cohen, Sergeant at Arms.

The meeting recessed at 2:25 p.m. and reconvened at 2:35 p.m.

<p><b>1117</b>      <b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Amend the Official City Zoning Map, Planning and Zoning Code and Transportation System Plan to carry out Portland’s 2035 Comprehensive Plan; establish a new Community Involvement Program and Committee; amend related codes, the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and Plan Map to coordinate policies and programs (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales; amend Code Titles 3, 17, 33 and Ordinance Nos. 165851, 177028, 187832) 3 hours requested</p>	<p><b>Disposition:</b></p> <p><b>CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 13, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>
---	--

At 4:49 p.m. Council adjourned.

**MARY HULL CABALLERO**  
Auditor of the City of Portland



By Karla Moore-Love  
Clerk of the Council

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

October 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.

**OCTOBER 6, 2016 1PM**

**Excerpt Item 1117.**

**Item 1117.**

**Hales:** I've got information for folks who are coming to testify. I'm going to save that until they are here and have Joe and Eric set the stage for us, first of all.

**Joe Zehnder, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** I'm Joe, chief planner with the bureau of planning and sustainability. I'm here today with Eric Engstrom who is principal planner also the project manager for the entire comp plan package. Today we're bringing forth-- you're going to hear testimony on the package of action to implement the comprehensive plan policy document that you adopted in June. That includes zoning code changes, zoning map changes, transportation system plan, updates and community involvement program. Specifically, these are in the binders that we provided for you earlier, we're going to be discussing changes on the maps showing zoning map amendments, this includes changes to base zones, overlays, planned districts and trails you'll hear map testimony. We will be addressing the recommended zone code changes which are included in the report. New zoning code provisions and maps related to commercial and mixed use properties. Variety of changes to residential zoning designation and open space related zoning changes. Other relevant pieces of this the phase 2 transportation system plan report which has got 16 sections it's in your binder but includes the bike classification discussion. Finally, a public involvement program report and related code. These changes as I said implement the comp plan that you adopted in June, and to the extent that there is testimony about elements that change today would imply that we need to go back revisit a policy decision, we'll make sure that that's clear. Thank you.

**Eric Engstrom, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Joe said it all.

**Hales:** Let me go over some logistics, again we'll get people in here gradually, our apology folks for awkwardness but we were rudely interrupted in our work in this room now we have to exercise a little extra procedure for a while. I want to make sure people know about time limits and process. Obviously people can testify in writing or through e-mail or online with the map app as they have all along for some reason you don't get everything in. Limit testimony to two minutes just because of the number of people signed up. And the amount of time we think we have a quorum this afternoon. If you are testifying about a section of the zoning code, please try to specify the section, as that gives us more context. Obviously avoiding repetition of previous testimony is always helpful. We are scheduled to go until 5:00 I think we can probably last until 5:30 or 6:00 until we do finally lose a quorum. This is the first of two hearings, we'll be continuing this to 2:00 p.m. October 13 then decide some point next week exactly when the record will close. But we are now continuing to accept written testimony. We have a work session scheduled to October 25 to discuss the testimony and identify potential council amendments. And a hearing scheduled for November 17 to allow public comments on the amendments we propose. Obviously keep checking council calendar to check dates, times, places. So with that we've asked our planning and sustainability commission chair Katherine Schultz and Chris Smith to come first and then we'll take testimony after that. With that welcome, very much, over doing it volunteers. Thank you.

October 6, 2016

**Katherine Schultz:** Thank you very much, mayor haes and commissioners. As you begin to consider testimony today Chris and I would like to highlight a few things, emphasize our recommendation on these early implementation measures. As you're well aware, several elements of this package, that over the past year the psc held ten hearings and 12 work sessions to discuss these proposals. Our summary includes our recommendation and concerns regarding the changes that joe just outlined. There's a lot to cover we'll try to keep it condensed we've got a lot to go over and share with you. The beginning the mixed use zone. The psc voted unanimously for the mixed use zones. But there were a number of top things we discussed like to briefly cover. Regarding commercial mixed use space and far for areas provision we are supportive of the proposed base zones and bonus zoning structures in the commercial mixed use zone but we're concerned about the viability and effectiveness of the bonus structure to provide additional floor area and height when public benefits are provided. Specifically, we're concerned about the possible reductions in development capacity, if the bonuses are not utilized. Inclusionary housing program is important, since its critical to maximizing opportunity of developing housing units. That all ties together and if we can't figure out how to get that balance right we're afraid we'll miss some opportunities. We support the concept of providing bonus for affordable commercial space as well, we're concerned about the lack of clarity that is currently tied with that regarding the administrative aspects of the program. And we look forward to participating in a follow-up process to further define the program. We generally support stepping buildings down to adjacent residential zones in order to minimize the scale and height impact the neighbors, these are for mixed used buildings along the corridors. We support allowing flexibility in meeting building articulation and support providing extra five feet of building height when the ground floor has high ceilings order to create better commercial space. And support sufficient heights for mechanized parking stackers as an option. We did not support stepping building back along transit corridors due to the cost and effect on development capacity in code complexity. With regards to low rise commercial store front, we received a lot of testimony against the cm1 zones, areas that are today consisting of one and two story commercial buildings. We recommended changing the zone in all cm1 to cm2 except in three areas where there was strong community support for cm1 which was Multnomah, Belmont and Sellwood. We are concerned about the cumulative effects of the cost of the development on some of the proposed zoning and transportation provisions such as energy efficiency matters, building setbacks, tdm and other items. We recognize that each of these together are kind of small impacts but our concern that the cumulative impact of these may be large enough to inhibit development in a time where housing is in short supply. Therefore, we have recommended an economic analysis to understand cumulative effect on these proposed changes along with the inclusionary zoning changes that are being proposed. Go ahead, chris.

**Chris Smith:** One of more interesting issues in mixed use was drive-thru's, as you know the comp plan policy asked us to limit drive-thru's, we came at that from three different perspectives, the first was to get the location of the ce zone the auto accommodating zone right, and we chose to basically keep it out of centers and out of the inner-ring neighborhoods, we did allow it to be right at the edge of a few centers but we did not put ce zoning in centers as offset we did create some grandfathering provisions for existing drive through zones that don't otherwise accommodate drive-thru's. The second part of our consideration was whether the development types that typically accommodate drive-thrus are are actually helpful for parts of our community that are trying to lift themselves up, principally east Portland. And as a result, we included a provision that effectively prohibits drive-thru's east of the 80th avenue. And you will hear support for that from commissioner baugh from the east Portland action plan later today or next week that also makes drive-



October 6, 2016

thru's nonconforming uses in that area they don't enjoy the grandfathering benefits that will have the other parts of the city. Then the final consideration of drive-thru's was recognition that some businesses operate exclusively as drive-thru or for certain hours operate exclusively and we put in provision that basically does not allow those businesses to refuse service to someone who does not show up with an automobile. So, only way to get to business through drive-thru you have to find some way to accommodate the pedestrians and people on bicycles.

**Fish:** Chris on the drive-thru question if they're nonconforming, then aren't we in effect saying that for a certain period of time we want to discourage the owner from updating the site or making improvements which may make more attractive or create better fit to the neighborhood?

**Smith:** I think the argument of the folks who proposed that change for east Portland hope that those properties will redevelop in other uses that are more directly beneficial to the community.

**Fish:** For a period of time we're saying that if it's an eyesore and someone wants to update it, that would not be allowed.

**Smith:** Correct, if it's a nonconforming use if you are updating your building you can't retain the drive-thru. You have choice of updating or keeping the drive-thru not updating.

**Fish:** What is the third option?

**Smith:** I'm not sure what you're getting at third option --

**Fish:** There's a camp that loves those and wants Dutch brother's coffee on every street corner. There's people that don't like them. Some maybe middle ground where we are not discouraging people from making their property in a way that enhances the community that they serve. Is there a third option that can be debated?

**Smith:** I think in the rest of the city west of 80th we've done that with the grandfathering, Dutch brothers can stay, it can continue up to update their building, if they close it for three years in a row they would lose the privilege as long as continuously operating they would have that. Priority in east Portland is to make land available for uses that are more directly beneficial to the community. I think the strong proponents of that will testify and give you their logic on that. But the commission believes that that was an important conversation for the council to have so we forwarded it to you. Another provision of mixed use was tdm, tdm also shows up in the campus institutional zone, implementation piece is in the tsp. We believe tdm is very much a work in progress, but we're supportive of that progress continuing and we included hooks in the zoning to require tdm in both of those zones. We also gave a general recommendation and support of the title 17 language that would implement tdm but recognize that it will continue to be developed, also intersect central city plan that we're working on. And the last consideration mixed use zones is that we avoided revising the zoning in some of the areas near proposed transit corridors, as those corridors are becoming clearer, some of those areas may want to be looked at sooner since they won't be transit line, perfect example is probably the corner of Powell and Chavez that will not be part of powell/division transit line it would appear. You may want to look at reviewing that zoning sooner than you would have otherwise. We did not because it was still under consideration for the transit corridor. Another major component of the comp plan implementation was the tsp. This was our first opportunity to adopt the bicycle master plan classification under the tsp we did so, made some tweaks along the way, generally small changes to look at the network and local areas and make it more optimized. One major change we did look at was the 7th-9th corridor you grappled with that through your consideration of the project list. We did make a change there, we made the policy statement that the major city bikeway be on 7th rather than 9th. There was heated testimony on both sides but breaking that down the testimony for 7th supported the idea

October 6, 2016

that if you look at the topography and the connectivity it is the better corridor. The testimony in opposition was primarily lots of cut-through traffic on 7th and please don't move it deeper into the neighborhood. We believe that the correct policy is to be on 7th, the devil in the details will be to do implementation plan that actually takes that cut-through traffic puts it back where it belongs rather than inflicting it on other streets in the neighborhood. There is a challenge, but we believe it's one that pbot can look at in the implementation project. You're likely to hear testimony about Hayden Island-- a feature of the tsp and of the 2009 hayden island plan is, a path around edge of the island for pedestrian and bike access. There was testimony asking us to remove that fearing that it would cause mobile home parks to be removed or condos to be torn down, obviously it doesn't do that it's a feature that only applies if redevelopment occurs. We believe it was important to keep that marker down for access to the water in the future. Not knowing exactly what form that would take, there's a public interest in that, one interesting provision is that when that was examined in the 2009 hayden island plan, council opted to remove that path from the area around the bay. We put it back. We have a path around the whole island so you're likely to hear from the community about that again. There were a few issues in the tsp that we thought needed more time for discussion so we asked pbot to include them in stage three of the tsp. It's being done in stages. Those include looking at additional major city bikeways that would correspond with metro active transportation plan. On some of our corridors, moving several major city bikeways where development is pointed in a different direction since 2010. We have asked pbot look at policy around autonomous vehicles with strong preference for shared mobility—the robot taxi as opposed to the robot chauffeur and the desire to limit the miles of vehicles travel around with no passengers in them. And finally we asked pbot to look at work at home program we don't quite call that a mode but way of helping reduce demand on our transportation system. We also looked at the residential open space zoning, biggest part of that was simply aligning that zoning with other things that have happened, with new comp plan designations, trying to make patterns of zoning that were inconsistent in area of more consistent, and in particular trying to match the designations from the 1980 comp plan, with a number of areas going from r5 to 2.5 program. One notable feature that have project was some selective downsizing of the David Douglas school district to help them with their school capacity problems. While still at the same time retaining the comp plan designations for future growth, when they got those overcrowding issues under control. We also looked at the community involvement program, I will express a little bit of remorse that we change the name from citizen involvement to community involvement I support that change. But as an old neighborhood association leader I have nostalgia for the pro-active engagement with government that citizenship implies. The word is also associated with legal distinctions we clearly don't want to link it that way. Probably biggest issue we faced in considering that was concern from neighborhood associations that we were down playing their role and we did increase the language around neighborhood associations to try to show that we still have great respect for them. But equally we know that to engage our whole community we have to have other avenues where that is culturally specific or other vehicles for people to give government input and we strongly supported that. We also appreciate the program described is stronger than the current one it is going to take both funding and effort to implement that effectively. We hope you will support that ongoing basis. Then finally, there was the miscellaneous zones project which had two components, one was an update of the public trails map. I think we took a lot of input from the 40-mile loop trust, we also had input from property owners who had preferences about how trails will cross their property. Generally, have people happy about the tradeoffs that were made there. The issue in that project is getting a little bit of press right now is the 4-1

October 6, 2016

far map in the rh zone, as background the default far zone is two to one except where specific properties are mapped to four to one far. We had update that for number of technical reasons as zones change, properties were not in our reach any more, some were added. But we also had testimony about the impact on historic districts, Irvington was called out first in the discussion draft there were accommodations made to help protect the Irvington historic district. That led to the hearing phase for both goose hollow to say, what about us. We asked staff to look at that. Our recommendation was to remove a section of the alphabet historic district north of glisan from the four to one map in the interest of protecting contributing properties in that area. We looked at king's hill and assessment was that the buildings there are sufficient bulk that 4 to 1 was not going to change the character of that neighborhood. We did not make changes there. I think you will hear from people in the alphabet district because timing of our process, we got testimony saying, protect our historic districts, certainly cognizant of the historic preservation policies that Council added to or beefed up the comp plan in your consideration after our recommendation, I want to be respectful of that. But since testimony was over for us, individual property owners would not have heard of our decision or the issue until after we were done essentially would have gotten their notice and preparation for your process. I would say that you should probably listen closely to individual property owners in that district if necessary make adjustments to the map for individual circumstances.

**Schultz:** You said finally, that was finally for Chris. I'll try to be brief. Next item would be employment zonings. We confirm code changes of the proposal with a few exceptions. One was to be consistent with metro allowances we recommended allowing nature preserves in prime industrial overlays, we supported removing various metro owned submerged properties near Smith and Bybee Lake from the overlay. Additionally, we supported a zone map change in the Giles Lake industrial area, from industrial use which is ig1 to eg 1 minimize the impacts of the adjacency to the mixed use neighborhoods to the south. But we recognize transportation impacts of northwest Vaughn needs to be mitigated, therefore we limited far on office use to one to one. They can get a bonus by is putting money into transportation fund to help mitigate impacts on that intersection. With regard to campus institution zoning we recommended adopting two new base zones for campus and institutions to replace conditional use master plans impact mitigation plans. This was done with a 9-1 vote. And the reasoning for that was that there was a lot of testimony from both the size of the campus and institutions as well as neighborhoods with regards to this item. As we were working through issues, staff spent some time try to understand what the campus and institutions concerns were to work through those but we didn't have a chance to reach out to the neighborhood and make sure that they understood how those changes are happening. You may very well see in your process the neighborhood now reacting to our response to that. Those were all with regards to tdm. In conclusion, we just like to note that these changes strive to ensure that we can accommodate and expect the expected housing and job growth in ways that advance our community goals. For more affordable housing, for more livable wage jobs and to meet our climate action plans. Thank you for hearing us out.

**Hales:** Thank you both. We're at that 90% point whatever you want to peg where we've been working on this massive effort for a long time. These volunteers have put a lot of time in, you raised bunch of issues that I want to probe further. But we got lot of people to hear from. I'm going to torture you further ask to you meet with me and Camille trummer again in my office go through some of these there. Obviously answer council members questions now and later, but want to schedule some more time with you so I can come back to the council, I delved interest these that you raise right out of the gate. Obviously we want these bonuses to work if we haven't calibrated them so that they will -- that's a big deal.

October 6, 2016

Raise a lot of important issues just appreciate you and the rest of the members of this body that's spent a great deal of time trying to figure this out, most of the way, for the five of us who have to ultimately decide it.

**Schultz:** There's still work to be done. We'll meet with you upon request.

**Fish:** I want to, if I could just take liberty of having two leaders from the commission here, put you on the spot on something that divided this council. Tomorrow is October 7th. It was the day that the council set as deadline for entering into a contract for temporary shelter at terminal one north. The contract has not been finalized because the parties have been unable -- parties meaning housing bureau and developer have apparently been unable to come to terms so it is still an open question. But what the council initially said we were going to do short term use, which is allowed upped the state of emergency. That short term use could last six months longer but could be as short as six months. The longer term possibility that's been discussed and debated is converting prime industrial land to some other use, in this instance to housing. My sense about the comprehensive plan that we adopted very carefully balanced. We already have a shortage of industrial land that's referenced in the comprehensive plan. If in the next couple of years there was future council or action taken to try to convert prime industrial land at terminal one north to say housing, where we find the replacement land to backfill the 14 acres that we would be taking out, given the protection, is that we built in, how is it even legally possible to take that up?

**Schultz:** Excellent questions. I know you want to weigh in. I would just say, the questions that we have, robust discussions as well, but I would say in general we're always very supportive of protecting the industrial lands for just for the reason you're talking about. I can say personally, because this is not item of that we've discussed. I would support maintaining as industrial land. Perhaps consider temporary use for short term need but that's why I would land. As far as finding other land --

**Fish:** We have to find 14 acres to replace that.

**Schultz:** There is really robust discussion on west Hayden island which is taken out of discussion. There is certainly one option. Then of course the other areas that we have looked at were the golf courses. Then I think it's getting and we certainly have that targeted. But brownfield redevelopment it's probably getting serious how many more we can start pushing forward.

**Fish:** Probably I would say just my own view. We are particularly aggressive about brownfields. We can add to inventory but given how difficult it is to convert brown fields it's been pretty aggressive. Chris, you want to add anything?

**Smith:** I think Kathrine identified the three potential places. First clarification we don't have shortage of industrial land we have exactly as much as we need. If we take some away then we have a shortage, right now --What plan?

**Fish:** In the sub district in which terminal one is located I believe there is shortage, you're saying overall the city overall.

**Smith:** There is a delicate balance. Having been a very vocal participant in the conversation annexing west hayden island, zoning that for industrial use I would really like to try to avoid restricting that.

**Hales:** Other questions?

**Novick:** Not a question just a heads up along the lines of the heads up the mayor. I hope to engage in discussions about particularly actions of the district at Irvington and the cm1 designation for those three areas. You'll get a call.

**Schultz:** Fabulous.

**Hales:** Other questions? Thank you both.

**Schultz:** Thank you.

October 6, 2016

**Hales:** Look forward to more discussions. We'll be moving to testimony here again some of you weren't in the room when we started but reiterate some things we'll take people in -- ask you to confine to two minutes. Just so week hear as many people as possible we suspect we'll lose quorum in the neighborhood of 5:30 or 6:00 we'll hear as many people as we can today. If you are standing by either in the Portland building or here, farther down the list you don't get heard today you'll be scrolled up for the October 13 hearing which is continuation of this hearing. If you don't get everything in that you want to say today or think of something else or want to skip verbal testimony, submit testimony by writing, you can still do that, of course we'll accept written testimony through the closure of the hearing which we'll figure out when that is some time after next week. Again we'll try to hear as many people as we can today. If we don't hear you, you are already on the list for next week. In the meantime, of course you can submit testimony in writing. Miss anything, staff in terms of the process?

**Fish:** Just say to all the friends that are here, we had originally hoped that this hearing would start earlier, we would have the full day. Circumstances beyond our control have cut into that, I have an excused absence at 4:00 because I have to meet my son from school and take him to soccer practice. But I regret I won't be here past 4:00. I will review the record and will get a briefing.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Let's proceed, please.

**Moore-Love:** First three please come on up. Terry parker, Rebecca mode and tony Jordan. They will be followed by Alan Kessler and Kiel Johnson.

**Hales:** Good afternoon. Welcome. Mr. Parker I think you're first.

**Terry Parker:** Yes, sir. Thank you. My name is Terry parker I'm a fourth generation Portlander I'm speaking as an individual today. Regrettably the tps was developed under a cloud of bias discrimination. The one sided stacked deck policy expert group that helped develop comp plan policy was assembled with overwhelming majority of citizen members that were vetted to represent or lean towards supporting special interest's alternative mode, anti-core groups, three members for freight interest. As with nearly all pbot citizen committees, nowhere is there specific proportional representation for primary financial stakeholders who tsp projects, motorist who pay gas taxes and other related motor vehicle fee. On sandy boulevard any removal of motor vehicle lanes will increase congestion and emissions. With bidirectional weekday traffic volumes that exceed 26,000 each minute added to the average motor vehicle travel time will result in increase of more than 440 hours of daily emissions. Any removal of on-street parking will have negative impact on the small and minority businesses that line the street with that said, the rose city neighborhood association has continually opposed bike lanes on sandy. Instead favoring alternative routes being developed. Rose city park is a working class neighborhood, unlike the more affluent neighborhoods of Laurelhurst and east Moreland the city is forcing the up zoning of nearly 20 blocks of mostly affordable r5 single family homes near the light rail stations. Meetings with home owners now appear to have been ignored. At 51st and sandy a developer with reputation of a villain wants to build 89 unit six story apartment building with only 19 parking places. The area already has a tight supply of parking giving the city's own study where there are -- where are the other 45 cars -- will have going to be stored when not in use. Implementation of what the city pushing will be detrimental to livability of my neighborhood. This is prompted strong feelings by many home owners that the doesn't care about them all too often working with you through the system less than marginal result. Instead of ramming through the status quo, pbot and psc edicts what will it take for motorist and neighborhood associations to receive priority attention for positive decree of resolution thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Welcome.

October 6, 2016

**Rebecca Mode:** I strongly oppose the --

**Hales:** Your name.

**Mode:** Rebecca Mode.

**Fish:** That whole thing can be pushed closer to you.

**Mode:** I strongly oppose the Portland city council adopting the psc recommended zoning code map and zoning code changes for my property at 506 northeast Thompson street, Portland, Oregon, 97212. The zoning of my property from r2 to r25 is inappropriate for my lot of 9,375 square feet. The current r2 zoning allows this property to add more units on existing lot with the existing duplex. If this property changes to r25 the most that can be built without lot division and there for tax reassessment would be adu. This could only happen if duplexes are allowed and adu is proposed in the residential infill project. The down zoning violates amendment 345 and encourage middle housing, downzoning will add more cost to the lot division, tax reassessment from the lot division thus making it too expensive for a homeowner to add housing on their existing lot. The land use committee initiated this proposal with the assumption that everyone who wished to add housing to the community when it's demolished. Simply not true. Creates huge financial burden on anyone wanting to add housing and keep their existing homes on larger lots such as my own. I also want to see the historic character of Elliot preserved. I don't agree with the one size downzoning, is the best way to deter home demolition. Elliott neighborhood consists of many varying lot sizes that should be looked at individually when considering downzoning. The financial hardship of this proposal to individual property owners affected were not presented. Some Elliot residents were allowed to be removed from this proposal even though are also in the Elliott conservation district. This is inequitable. My lot is perfect for keeping r2. Large, close to public transit, parks, grocery stores, everything many residents value living in Portland. Downzoning this property takes great possibilities out of its future.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Welcome.

**Tony Jordan:** Hello my name is Tony Jordan on behalf of Portlanders for parking reform. We encourage council to trade parking requirements for more affordable housing. By eliminating minimum parking requirements in the mixed use zones. We ask council members to propose an amendment to allow new mixed use development to be built without off-street parking. The Obama administration recently released housing development tool kit which argues that, quote, parking requirements have disproportionate impact on housing for low income households. Because these families tend to own fewer vehicles but nonetheless burdened by the extra cost of parking inclusion in the development. The significant cost of developing parking from 5,000 to 60,000 per space is incorporated at the start of the project which can impede viability and affordability of the construction. Portland's current requirements not only make housing more expensive but also harder to find. Hundreds of homes may not have been built since 2013 as parking thresholds distort the cost benefit calculations for new apartment buildings. These requirements will undercut effectiveness of incentives for affordable housing and any eventual zoning rules. Furthermore, bps modeling revealed that additional required parking limit utilization for affordable housing bonus due to high cost of structured or underground parking, as most Portlanders can testify, off-street parking minimums also fail in their attempted goal of making curbside parking convenient. We can require developers to build garages but we cannot require people to pay to park in them. The only way to make curbside parking more convenient in busy neighborhood to charge more for. If the city prices permits and meters properly, developers will be forced to build -- forced to provide adequate but not excessive off-street parking as the comp plan asks. In new building without the city having to guess what that level is. Parking requirements for more

October 6, 2016

affordable housing in Portland, eliminate minimum parking requirements in mixed use zone, thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Thank you all.

**Moore-Love:** Next is Alan Kessler, Kiel Johnson and Chris Rall. They will be followed by Charlie Tso, Joseph Schaefer and Michael Robinson.

**Alan Kessler:** I'm Alan Kessler. I'm a member of the Richmond neighborhood association board although I'm speaking myself. I was here to testify when the council was considering adding parking minimum to the northwest district. And there was really compelling argument at the time that there is inequity, unfairness that the northwest has this tool that the rest of the city doesn't have. But I didn't think council made the right choice, they realized that this tool is the last go-to tool in stack of really great tools for parking, decided to postpone it use some of the better tools to alleviate parking. Now we have a chance to fix the whole city as part of the zone we can undo the damage we did in 2013. We can give the other tool sets that going to give to the northwest to the whole city. I think that argument is really compelling. The rest of the city should not be burdened by bad policy if the northwest isn't so burdened. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you. Welcome.

**Kiel Johnson:** My name is Kiel Johnson. Four years ago I came up with the idea to put bicycle parking amount the bottom of the tram. At that time the bottom of the tram was actually used as a goat field there are a few goats that were trimming the grass. We came up with the plan to turn it in to bicycle parking. Now four years later that's the largest bicycle parking area in north America in the space where you can fit 20 cars we fit about 600 bicycles. And so it's very efficient and my main message is, whatever you build, people will use it and that's what they will use to get around. The bicycle valet has been really successful so few years ago I was able to purchase a condo in the Lloyd district. I chose building specifically because it didn't have car parking, because I didn't want to have to pay for the maintenance and maintaining car parking since we didn't own a car. I'm here to testify against or support eliminating parking minimums in mixed use zones. Because I think that it will increase affordable housing better development around the city and encourage more people to use other means of transportation. Thank you.

**Chris Rall:** Members of the commission, my name is Chris Rall. I work for national transportation advocacy organization but today I'm testifying as a dad. I have my twins turned nine yesterday and I've also got 5-year-old. We're a one-car family we live in southeast Portland, 54th and division, my kids to go Atkinson the neighborhood school. The reason I'm testifying as a dad is decisions we're making in this comp plan are about what our city will look like in the future. What is that vision, it's a walkable city that isn't choked with traffic where people have lots of option and good housing options. And off-street parking requirements work at cross purposes to that vision. Makes housing more expensive, incentivize car ownership after these negative impacts parking on street won't be any easier because we will have failed to address the issue of on-street park can directly. People will always park on the street if it's free or insanely inexpensive whether there's off-street parking or not. Thankfully there's lots of tools for managing on-street parking, only just begun to tap those tools. Even approaches that give existing home owners grandfathered parking rights. Let's manage on-street parking where it's an issue, just deal with it directly. In ten or 20 years which is amount of time many of these decisions will substantially impact the way the city looks, my kids will be looking for their first apartment. Will there be enough housing for them? Or only for cars that they won't even be likely to own. Will the streets be choked with traffic because we doubled down on the suburban model or will we have walkable city? We can chart the right course with this plan so please eliminate off-street parking requirements. And thank you.

October 6, 2016

**Moore-Love:** The next three are Charlie Tso, Joseph Schaefer and Michael Robinson. And they will be followed by Sam Noble, Margot Black and Paul Niedergang.

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Charlie Tso:** Good afternoon my Charlie Tso. I'm here today with Portlanders for parking reform. To ask city council to propose an amendment removing minimum parking requirements in the mixed use zone. Our request supported by policy 9.58 in the comprehensive plan. Parking requirements have exacerbated Portland's affordability crisis adding significant cost to development and limiting housing supply. A recent white house support states that parking requirements generally impose undue burden on housing development, particularly for transit oriented or affordable housing. Indeed, since 2013 Portland lost untold number of homes due to parking requirements restriction and housing developments. Minimum parking requirements will add more congestion to neighborhood streets. The mixed use zone are in many neighborhoods vibrant commercial corridors that are walkable and trends accessible. If we build parking spaces for every housing development we're incentivizing people to bring their cars with them. If we want to grow without adding more congestion, we need to stop requiring parking and start giving people more mobility options. At the hearing on July 6 regarding parking requirements for northwest Portland, city council agreed that there are better parking management tools to be explored. Commissioner Fish reminded us that the 2013 parking mandate was solution never meant to be the final product. But now thanks to the hard work of pbot and bps staff we have more tools at our disposal. We're at a crossroads we can either build a city that puts housing for people first or city that puts storage for private automobiles first. Trade parking requirements for more affordable housing in Portland, eliminate minimum parking requirements in mixed used zones, thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Joseph Schaefer:** Good afternoon. My name is Joseph Schaefer. I'm here on behalf of Michael Foster and Tim Ramis who own abutting properties at 1435 and 1512 southwest 58th. This is in lower Sylvan. These properties are unusual that they are zoned R20 which is for half acre lots, even though the comprehensive plan is R2 which is a townhouse style density. We are asking for the zoning to be conformed to the comprehensive plan and changed to R2. At the planning of the sustainability commission there was concern raised that if this was approved legislatively, the city might not be able to get street improvements including a sidewalk built that they would have more leverage if they had zone change. Apparently the concern may be that the property owners would elect to use the new fee in lieu provisions instead of paying for the sidewalk and street provisions in part because there's some gaps in the sidewalk and neighborhood. Those gaps are getting filled in rapidly. Our neighbor immediately to the south has a hearing on a seven-lot subdivision for townhouses next week. And the property at the intersection of 58th and Montgomery is also been approved for development of apartments with full frontage improvements on southwest 58th. The property owner are happy to agree whatever form city would like to provide a full half street improvement when their properties do develop we just ask that we not be required to go through the full rezone to get to the comprehensive plan designation of R2. This is a terrific opportunity for missing middle housing we hope you can help us provide it more quickly and more efficiently. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thanks. Welcome.

**Michael Robinson:** Thank you. Good afternoon, Mayor Hales, members of the council my name is Mike Robinson I'm here on behalf of Richard Pasentini. Richard and his family own about 30 properties in the city of Portland that are affected by the rezoning. Richard submitted a letter on October 5 asked city council to consider changes to 11 properties. All I want to do just summarize those properties I think the letter is self-explanatory and I don't



October 6, 2016

need to give detail given your schedule today. The first property is southeast 65th and Belmont, planning and sustainability commission agreed with the request recommended that those two properties be zoned cm2 and cm1 we appreciate that recommendation hope council will follow it. The second group of three properties is cm1 and we asked that it be zoned ce, reasoning behind that request, they're in appropriate locations for increased density allows more development which in turns supports better transit and we think it encourage more walkable neighborhoods. The second group of properties are four properties they're in inner-city, they're proposed to be zoned cm2 we request that they be zoned ce the letter explains why that is the case. The last single property is at -- make sure I get, southeast 12th and Belmont just outside of the central city, its proposed to be zoned cm2 we think it makes sense to be to have it zoned cm3. Right across the street from the end of the central city the property is appropriated for development and with the different zone you have additional -- additional floor area. We appreciate your time we'll hope you consider the request that richard put in his letter.

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Moore-Love:** Next three are Sam Noble, Margot Black and Paul Niedergang. And they will be followed by Jan Denney, Elizabeth Moore and Susan Whitney.

**Hales:** Good afternoon welcome.

**Sam Noble:** Good Afternoon, my name is Sam Noble I live at SE 62<sup>nd</sup> and stark in the Mt. Tabor neighborhood. I drive almost everywhere I go, I just want you to understand that when I say that I want to speak categorically against parking minimums in the mixed use zone, anywhere else it's relevant. I don't think it's fair or reasonable to expect residents of new mixed use building to pay more rent in order to subsidize my on the street parking. The right way to address parking shortages by charging a fair price for parking in the right-of-way. Without inherent costs in forcing developers to include those parking costs that they can't recoup the city leaves plenty of room to extract other concessions from developers in exchange for the right to build. Maybe that looks like inclusionary style subsidies, maybe it just means that when we have down time rents will go down. Don't know. That's up to you guys. But as I said I drive almost everywhere I go. That's because they just aren't many commercial services in my neighborhood. Certainly not around 60th and stark. So, I want to talk about vacant lots at southeast 60th and Belmont that you actually just heard about. I really want to show as cm2 building, I came to talk to you at the comp hearings so my testimony then is still relevant. I think that the density is really important to support any kind of walkable services for me. This area like one of the very few commercially zoned areas that I can actually walk to, since this council has not elected to provide more commercially zoned areas, particularly undeveloped ones this one really critical that it be developed that it be valuable enough to be developed soon. I think that you might hear maybe from my neighborhood association that there are many good reasons why you shouldn't do this. I just want to suggest there is going to be more detail in my written testimony. What I want to say that every one of those concerns can be addressed in different ways, be they better signaling system or just retiming, maybe there's some concession to extract from the developer. But please don't -- please respect the psc recommendation.

**Hales:** You are going to be submitting --

**Noble:** I'm going to be submitting additional.

**Fritz:** Where do you park your vehicle?

**Noble:** In my garage. Or my driveway.

**Fritz:** All right thank you.

**Noble:** When I drive to work I pay for parking permit.

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

October 6, 2016

**Margot Black:** Good afternoon, my name is Margot Black. I'm here today as renter and car driver to speak against anything at all that would possibly limit or more housing being built or increase the cost of more housing being built which would of course be passed on to renters in the form of higher rents. Specifically, I'm here to oppose minimum parking requirements and downzoning that is being considered. We know our population is growing, we shouldn't be doing anything but building more housing as quickly as possible. As a renter I hear a lot about how if we can't afford the rent now that Portland is cool, hip city that we should just move. I would say that Portland is growing up, it is becoming a bigger city and that has come with increased rents that are typical of big cities. But it also means that it comes with increased parking and traffic situations that are usually dealt with my big cities by encouraging more public transportation and bicycle use and not facilitating on the street car parking. Big cities make room for people not cars. And so I would say to the folks that are telling me to just move, I don't like the high rents, there are folks who don't like being not being able to find a parking place they should just move as well. We need to be making room for people and not cars. I also -- I want to say with respect to the bizarre nature of today's testimony and being escorted in I hope that city council will recognize as white folks and parents like I am that the people of color in this city who are being killed by police officers need to be heard on the police contract and not suppress their voices we should listen to their input and prioritize them. Thank you very much.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Paul Niedergang:** My name is Paul Niedergang. My wife and I own and operate small real estate investment business in urban Portland. Since 1999 we've owned and managed a mixed used property southeast 50th and Hawthorne boulevard. The property is currently zoned CS as the comp plan has evolved our property was initially zoned CM2 and is now slated to be downzoned to CM1 because of the amendment F61 sponsored by commissioner Fritz. I'm here today to ask you to reconsider the designation and return this property to its originally proposed designation of CM2. The draft comp plan shows that corresponding zone for CS is typically CM2. We feel proposed CM1 designation not only down zones our property but also misses an important urban design opportunity. The intersection of southeast Hawthorne and 50th avenue plays a special role in the urban fabric. Coming from south along 50th or from the east from Mount Tabor the intersection is gateway to the Hawthorne district. This gateway is an important urban design, opportunity to create strong sense of place and identity in the urban fabric. As an example of gateway zoning, if you look at the comp plan for division in 50th you'll see that all four corners of the intersection are zoned the same, creating essentially a gateway to division up there. Also deserves to be zoned in the same manner. The proposed zoning for the intersection of CM1 is unbalanced, property is along 50th on the west side is zoned CM2 but on east side there's zoned CM1. We feel intersection should have consistent zoning. We have no plans to take down the building. But we're concerned that if anything were to happen to the building, fire or natural disaster at some point we were going to rebuild the building. Then we certainly prefer to rebuild CM2 parameters. This corner is really a keystone to the neighborhood being at the end of Hawthorne we feel that it really deserves a higher density zoning than CM1. Just by way of background, I was president of Hawthorne boulevard business association for four years sat on the Hawthorne transportation plans for six years during that time I worked with the neighborhood association to support design and implementation of the Mount Tabor --

**Hales:** Need to you complete your testimony. We've have great written back up.

**Niedergang:** I appreciate if you would reconsider this really review it consider this one specific property for CM2.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. This is great. Given us all material we need.

October 6, 2016

**Niedergang:** Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you all.

**Moore-Love:** Next three are Jan Denney, Elizabeth Moore and Susan Whitney and they will be followed by Ruth Adkins, Arlene Kimura and Tim Ramis.

**Jan Denney:** Jan Denney with Portland Nursery and I'm here because I guess I don't understand the whole process. But I really feel that the inner section of 92nd and freeway or 92nd and division is underappreciated as transit hub. I recently got this notice of proposed zoning map and code changes which we participated with all of the comp plan hearings. This indicates that the one particular tax lot on 92nd and northwest corner of Clinton is going to go from r2 to cm2 and r2. This zoning predates any of the light rail. It also is going to be on the new express bus from Gresham to downtown, there's north-south bus. Freeway ramps I think that having the r2 really underutilizes this property. Now, it is designated to be r1 but we would like to see that r2 designation on that property and our property south of Clinton get the r1 designation. So that it doesn't get developed as r2. This is not property that we will be able to use as nursery under the comp plan we probably will do something with that.

**Hales:** Thanks very much.

**Elizabeth Moore:** Good afternoon my name street Elizabeth Moore. I own and reside at 5706 northeast 25<sup>th</sup> avenue Portland, or. Today I speak for myself as a homeowner in the Concordia neighborhood to be impacted by the proposed comp plan thank you for the opportunity to address the city council. In regard to this proposed rezoning for my neighborhood. I'm here today to oppose the zoning change from r5 to r2.5 in this area of Concordia. I have attended city residential infill proposal sessions, attended open houses, attended Concordia neighborhood association station meetings in the lutc meetings. I heard from divergent organizations and have concluded at this point that the intentions of the city of Portland to provide housing affordability are just that. If we daylight the word affordability in Portland, you will only find minimal opportunities to become just another renter with little security of rental costs and occupation. Where popularity -- where the popularity of the tear down build two expensive homes have been rightly challenged the urgency or, quote, moral obligation of providing housing for influx of thousands in the form of middle housing, as one group states has become new embrace. I have not heard that this proposal is anything more than additional apartment rental units built with a impunity in all residential r5 neighborhoods. Given extremely way given to property corporations to set rates and evictions. It does not represent my interests nor do I suspect majority of my neighbors affected by this proposal. I'm concerned with families that are not building equity and stability in our Portland neighborhoods. When only choice is to be renters. I would ask that you consider the missing middle class when obvious consequence of removal of modest homes leave possibility of home ownership in these neighborhoods out of the reach of middle income families.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. We've got the rest of your testimony here.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Appreciate folks -- not everyone has to supply letter with your testimony but very helpful when you do so and folks if you want to after this and you just testified verbally and you want to send us your remarks its very helpful to have both my notes and yours as I go back through all this so thank you. Welcome.

**Susan Whitney:** My name is Susan Whitney I live one SE 47<sup>th</sup> and Richmond neighborhood. I'm opposed to the rezoning of large portions of Richmond from r5 to r2.5 supposedly the city wants to create affordable housing a very laudable goal. In fact, what is happening in our neighborhood where there is already r2.5 zoning or they managed to get a zone change or a lot line change is that expensive housing is created. One unit a perfectly affordable wonderful middle class old hundred

October 6, 2016

bungalow is torn down and two behemoths are built in its place and each of those are twice as expensive as the one that was torn down. I have many examples this is what's happening in the real world, you can see this it is with my written testimony. This is a darling little bungalow on SE 49<sup>th</sup> Avenue it was amazingly sold to a developer for 620,000 way over market. What was built in its place is two lovely modern style homes, taller than the rest of the neighborhood, completely out of character. How much are these selling for each? \$800,000 each. This does not create affordability in the neighborhood. All this is used as comparable by the real estate agents and pretty soon every house on the block is going to be worth \$620,000. Here is another one. 4513 southeast Madison street about four blocks from my house, you can't really see but behind the trees is a darling little affordable bungalow. It was sold to a developer in July of last year for \$500,000. Again, over market. This does not fit in our neighborhood. R25 zoning is going to destroy the Richmond area it's going to destroy the Sunnyside neighborhood and 20 years from now this lovely neighborhood is going to be gone. People will say there's a neighborhood here? And look at this now 20-year-old house that was shoddily built. I was a construction lawyer. I know it's not going to have a useful life.

**Hales:** You've beautifully capsulized the problem.

**Whitney:** It is a problem. Thank you.

**Moore-Love:** The next three are Ruth Adkins, Arlene Kimura and Tim Ramis. And they will be followed by Travis Philips, Jim warren and mike Crean.

**Ruth Adkins:** Good afternoon. For the record my name is Ruth adkins. I'm with Oregon opportunity network. We are a statewide association and community develop nonprofit. I've been a homeowner in Portland since 1989. I want to appreciate the hard work of staff and the volunteers on the planning and sustainability commission and everyone involved in this massive and historic project. Here today to ask you to support changes that will encourage density and the development of affordable housing. I have two specific comments. This in general we know that neighbors in many parts of the city are upset about the pace of change and particularly in historic areas they want to preserve the character of the neighborhood but with the housing emergency that we are facing and the growth projected in the future, we are willing to share the opportunities in the wonderful Portland neighborhoods with new residents particularly those who will otherwise be shut out or displaced. The best character of Portland includes values like smart growth, good design and being welcoming and inclusive for all. Two specific pieces within this massive package before you. This is item m-42, supporting up zoning to mixed use on a stretch of north Fremont. This would help with avoiding additional displacement of African American residents and businesses. The second is asking you to oppose the down zoning of northwest, I believe commissioner smith alluded to this in his comments earlier. This is 27 blocks; it will be down-zoned from the currently allow four to one to two to one. We question that you pull that one. And you'll be hearing more about the specific project that will be blocked because of this change.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you.

**Arlene Kimura:** Thank you, very much. Good afternoon commissioners. I'm here to ask this you expand the ban on drive-thru's to include all ce areas or make more ce areas that are not east of 80th avenue. The map I've handed in earlier shows there's more than enough drive-thru's east of 80th. We don't need anymore. Unfortunately, our land use allows for bigger lots and we think this is not getting to the Portland ideal of community building, getting people out of their cars and walking through their neighborhoods. So we ask that you support a ban on all drive-thru's for new ones. The existing ones should be allowed the stay and they need to be fixed, fine. But we don't need any additional drive-thru's.

October 6, 2016

**Tim Ramis:** Thank you. For the record, Tim ramis. I'm here to speak to the proposal to substantially reduce available f.a.r. through a large part of northwest Portland on the impact on a specific project 160 units of low income elderly houses and including houses designed for individuals with special needs. The developer tells me that the project will not survive the loss of one half of the f.a.r. on the site. You will recall this site from a couple years ago where I brought to you a detailed multi-family housing. We needed a demolition permit that was not granted by the council the matters that day revolved around two important policies. One matter of public policy was the protection of the property and the other was affordable housing. We sat down and worked with northwest housing alternatives and they have developed a plan to save that building and provide 160 units of housing for senior low income individuals. That project is the one I'm here to advocate for and to point out that as you know those are very difficult projects to finance sufficiently and to make work. And in this case loss of half the f.a.r. Will down size the project to a point where it won't work. This is a project located in a place it should be, a walkable neighborhood where the city has spent substantial resources on transportation infrastructure, it's the kind of place where this housing should be located. And without your help it won't happen so I would appreciate your attention to this issue.

**Fish:** Can I ask you a question? So we are getting a lot of emails and letters and things and testimony that generally supports your position in this. I've heard from affordable housing advocates and all kinds of people. The question I have is timing. Assuming that council agrees with you, what -- is northwest housing alternatives under the gun in terms of the sequencing of their work on this and development? Is there a time that you and others would prefer we decide this?

**Fritz:** Let me ask this another way.

**Fish:** I will defer to my colleague who will put it in plain English.

**Fritz:** It was my understanding that the comprehensive plan doesn't go into effect until 2018 so if this project is more than twinkle in your eye won't it be able to be done under the current zoning. Was that what you were trying to ask commissioner?

**Fish:** You addressed up my question and it became even more grand but thank you. But that's one part and the second part is what is the timing issue here?

**Ramis:** With good luck that will happen but we have all been involved in trying to build affordable housing project.

**Fish:** As we know, having survived the worst recession in our lifetime the market could change and there could be some delay in which case the uncertainty kicks in once they adopt the comprehensive plan.

**Adkins:** If I could just make a very brief point I believe Martha Mcclenin the executive director of northwest houses is out of town this week, but shes planning on coming next week so she'll have additional input. It's that certainty piece as well as other projects in the future that could potentially be developed in this area.

**Fritz:** Yea that's the issue is you're using this as an example that what you're really asking about is underlying due respect by the planning commission or do you ask to us do something else?

**Ramis:** That's a choice. One further point to emphasize something Chris smith mentioned. If the council were to decide to implement the proposed policy of reducing f.a.r. In this area I urge that you take a careful look at the map. In the map as you will see is a kind of a checkerboard patchwork. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you, very much.

**Hales:** Okay. Let's proceed.

**Moore-Love:** The next three are Travis Phillips, Jill Warren, and Mike Crean and they will be followed by Michael Foster, Sam Stucky and Bruch Soiher.

October 6, 2016

**Hales:** Good afternoon.

**Travis Phillips:** Afternoon, council members. Thanks for having us today. I'm Travis Phillips. I understand the current growth in population and related increase this development may make many nervous about the pace of change in our city but I think it worth reiterating, the comprehensive plan must accommodate the anticipated future growth in our city while reiterating a theme stated -- it must accommodate anticipated future growth while retaining Portland values such as livability, affordability and vibrant neighborhoods that are welcome to all. So I'm here in part as a resident of northwest Portland and within the area proposed for down-zoning for a floor area of four to one to two to one. I ask that you pull this item for a separate vote and vote no. There are wide variety of building types and sizes within my neighborhood and protections exist and are enhanced in the comp plan to retain the historic fabric in one of Portland's most walkable, accessible neighborhoods. Please help us to keep this existing zoning. I'm also here on behalf of the organization I work for, northeast Portland's pcri, one that I believe all of you are familiar with. On behalf of pcri I encourage you to approve amendment m42 with similar logic this is an area of north Fremont that's proposed to be rezoned from residential to mixed use. In particular, the change includes incentives developing affordable housing. This can help mitigate the displacement that's happened in north and northeast Portland. And I think this particular change is one that is in a neighborhood that can sustain the additional density and the incentives will help provide affordable.

**Fish:** Is that fremont and Mlk?

**Phillips:** It's Fremont between Mississippi and Vancouver.

**Hales:** Thanks, very much.

**Hales:** Welcome.

**Jill Warren:** Good afternoon, mayor and council members. My name is Jill warren. I own two historic buildings in the alphabet districts, they're ten units of rental property. Back in 1996 we had this big flood and both of my basement units in both buildings flooded and we did a comprehensive mitigation for all the water and discovered that the municipal pipes are made out of clay. And so we did our mitigation, everything has been fine up until this past spring. And you probably don't remember but in late February, early march, we had a frisky little downpour. All the water just sheeted down into my backyard and flooded by basement unit again and I just moved my tenants in five days before. Fortunately, I had an empty unit upstairs. I moved them and all their belongings upstairs. We had to replace everything because when you have water you have mold so we had to replace drywall, flooring, cabinets. And it took six weeks and cost \$20,000. So the infrastructure is of concern to me that to always have all of this increased density it would be nice to upgrade the infrastructure system. So thank you, very much.

**Hales:** Thank you. Sorry you had to deal with that but you made your point. Thank you. Welcome.

**Mike Crean:** Good afternoon. My name is Michael crean and I reside 7707 SE 141<sup>st</sup> Avenue in the pleasant valley neighborhood in the city of Portland. I'm here to voice our strong objection to the zoning map amendment which has a major public trail through the properties of our homeowners. It's part of the master plan completed in 2014. As presently proposed the segments in question would pass immediately behind and contiguous to residences in our quite neighborhood and there by pose a significant intrusion. We have concerns that the trails may conflict with the city's environmental protection requirements. We believe there exists a much less intrusive alternative alignment around our property through publicly owned land. The public outreach process used in the trail routes by metro did not include a public hearing process such as this one whereby property owners directly impacted by a proposed trail route were appropriately notified. As a result, a consensus of

October 6, 2016

support, a stated metro goal from key stakeholders was never obtained. We strongly protest the proposed trails into the zoning document and request the council do what should have been done as part of the planning process two years ago. Work with us and discuss a much less intrusive trail alignment around our Portland neighborhood that both metro and Portland residents could support.

**Hales:** This is your proposed alternative?

**Crean:** No, these are both -- these are two options that were put into the metro report, both of which we object to.

**Hales:** There's another alternative?

**Crean:** We think there is.

**Fish:** Which of our bureaus has the closest connection to this? Parks, Bes?

**Crean:** I would say Parks.

**Hales:** Thank you, appreciate you calling it to our attention. Thank you.

**Moore-Love:** Next are Michael foster, Sam Stucky and bruch Soih. And they will be followed by mike Connors, peter Fry, and Tamara DeRidder.

**Hales:** Good afternoon. Who would like to go first?

**Michael Foster:** Good afternoon, thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Michael foster. I own half acre property right next to Mr. Ramis's property on southwest 58 in the sylvan area that joe schaefer spoke about earlier. I also own a house and live in the neighborhood of three parcels up the hill, I built the house in 1989. I've been in the neighborhood for 25 plus years. Sylvan, that area is an excellent place the live. Services, business districts proximity makes it very attractive. It seems a natural for redevelopment. And has part of that redevelopment what we need is for the zoning which is r-20, needs to conform with your plan to get it to r2 for redevelopment. The issue here is we need to on -- in order get it -- part of the redevelopment plan is making sure we get good sidewalks in the area so that people can get down to the bus stop or the light rail or in and out of the area. There are some restrictions but we need to get what we can in sidewalks during this redevelopment process. The properties that have been developed, they built their fair share of the sidewalks and the only way we can finish it is with redevelopment of the other properties that the city already has planned for redevelopment. If you can conform the zone for the plan, it would allow us to move ahead and start the redevelopment. I know there's a concern with the staff about somebody ducking the responsibility. Tim explained very easy to remedy. The properties that we would like to redevelop both of very old homes on them, one of them doesn't even have a foundation. A third one that's going to be redeveloped has already been bull dozed. The house that I own was built in 1949. It's a two bedroom with no historical significance. I know that's been a hot button lately.

**Hales:** That's very helpful. Thank you. You submitted written testimony as well?

**Foster:** Yes, I can.

**Hales:** Please do. Thank you. Welcome.

**Sam Stucky:** Hi. My name is Sam Stucky. Thank you for letting me speak. I grew up in historic Irvington. I currently live in the Buckman neighborhood I live and work there. My neighbors in my building are Portlanders through and through. A teacher, nursing student, musician. The neighbors outside my building are also Portlanders, they live in tents and sleep on beds of cardboard. We are in a housing crisis. You know it, I know it, everyone here knows it. And that's what I want to talk about. The city plan in my opinion is phenomenal for the most part, seriously. However, there are, I think you said we are at the 90% point. The 10% has details to undercut the whole deal. Like I said, I grew up in Irvington, it's a beautiful neighborhood but what makes it beautiful are not the big old houses. It's the people. And it's the schools and the parks and the block parties and the soup nights and soccer games. And the beauty in where I grew up does not come from the

October 6, 2016

fact that there's a house on the end of the block that sold for a million dollars. It comes from the fact that the same street has a 17-unit apartment complex with affordable units for the elderly and millennial alike, neighborhoods like Irvington and the alphabet district are incredible examples of the communities that can spring up when diversity and development and inclusion are encouraged or at least it used to be. For a time, Portland actually had had an incredible diversity of housing times in its urban core greater than any city in the country. That 17-unit building was built in 1929. Proposed zoning could bring back that piece of Portland historic character or it could protect the property values of a handful of Portland's wealthiest homeowners.

**Fritz:** Could you submit the rest in writing please?

**Hales:** Thank you very much, welcome.

**Bruch Sohr:** Thank you, very much. Sorry, I have a cold. I'm Bruch Sohr with Norris and Stevens. I'm a property manager. I'm here to ask to allow older buildings to retain allowance for office in the industrial sanctuary zones. I've been talking about the bureau planning, Steve koontz and there are five buildings similar. Colombia pacific plaza located on 21st and Colombia boulevard northeast. There are two two-floor office buildings square feet of 63,000 with warehouse underneath the buildings and under 22 buildings there's 46,000 square feet of warehouse. Building is approximately worth 8.5 million and the land lord doesn't want to tear the building down. Norris and Stevens took over the management leasing in late '90s. The property was developed as a bank office for savings and loans with needed warehouse to the bank. Since the loan crisis a single warehouse office user has not been found. Property has good parking ratio, limited bus service. We propose different types of tenant uses. One was a call center. Because of the out of core area it was rejected by the tenant. Our previous big box tenant was gsa census, temporary lease, gsa Portland maps military processing, in the west building that was terminated 2002 and we haven't had a tenant, one tenant in there. Multnomah county corrections is in the east building, they just moved out, they moved downtown in other areas of the city.

**Hales:** You said five buildings that fit this pattern?

**Sohr:** No, those are tenants.

**Hales:** Okay.

**Fritz:** Would you give the rest in writing, please?

**Hales:** If you can submit that to us in writing. You've given us enough to go on. Thank you, very much, and that way you won't have to speak any longer. Thank you.

**Moore-Love:** Next three are mike Connors, peter fry and tamara Deridder and they'll be followed by Wendy Chung, Mark Whitlow and Bob Lefeber.

**Hales:** Good afternoon, welcome.

**Tamara DeRidder:** I'm here, Tamara DeRidder representing rose city park neighborhood association. And the comments that I'm providing are on health and economic vitality of the tsp that is being proposed. First of all, both halsey street and sandy boulevard are being identified as city bike ways. That's a concern for us because we have sandy boulevard that carries over a quarter of a million cars annually. That's a huge amount. And it's a major truck route. And then we have got halsey which is now being identified as an industrial street. There's empirical evidence right now, scientific evidence that has proved that bicycling in major areas prove long and short-term health effects to the cyclists. Concentrations of compounds that are inhaled are significantly higher than the background levels after riding on paths that has high exposure to industrial areas and these are 100, 200% greater than those that are on low traffic residential streets. And so with your indulgence I had like to look at a change in the policy to add and health impacts based on air quality to 9.5.b of just city bike ways. Again it would read motor vehicle lanes and on street parking may be removed on city bike ways to provide need for width and separated



October 6, 2016

in road facilities where compatible with adjacent land uses and only after taking into consideration all roads based on air quality.

**Hales:** Thank you, very much. Welcome.

**Mike Connors:** Thank you. My name is Mike Connors on behalf of Hayden Enterprises we do manufactured homes. We are here -- I'm here to testify in opposition to the proposed city bike path on the northern end of our park. We have several concerns. First of all, there's overwhelming opposition from not only my client, our residents in the park but also residents in the island and we object to the concept of proposing a public bike path on private property against the wishes of the owner and residents that live there. Secondly the impact, when this bike path is built it will require the removal of 40 to 50 homes because they are on the edge of the park and we obviously have residents concerned about this. We think you should be concerned about this. During the planning and sustainability commission process pbot staff noted that the back path won't likely be approved unless and until the property is redeveloped but there's a couple problems with that. Number one there's no guarantee. In fact, in their own staff report they quantified that as it would not likely be developed unless the property was redeveloped as a whole. And secondly, you should be concerned about the idea of proposing something on the anticipation of the redevelopment of an affordable housing resource. The recent comp plan that you passed included policy 5.37 that encourages the preservation of manufactured home parks to go to that very need. A bike path is inconsistent with that policy.

**Hales:** I'm not quite sure what I think of this particular ingredient in the plan and likewise with the portion on Hayden Bay and I want to talk to the planning staff further about this but there's an existing pedestrian walkway through now, right?

**Connors:** That's right, your honor -- mayor.

**Hales:** Then there's not an easement, right? It's just a walkway, right, on a piece of private property?

**Connors:** Correct. In the 2009 Hayden Island plan there was a pedestrian path adopted as part of that plan. But what is considered as part of the tsp amendment is an expansion of the nature and scope of that, extending it along to the eastern end of the island. If you are revisiting that issue as a whole, we are asking you to reconsider that.

**Hales:** It's ironic that you lapsed into your courtroom approach. I don't think this provision would ever come to bear unless the property were redeveloped and an easement were granted. It's just all you have there now is a line on a map that happens to be a walkway there. But it's a simple piece of real estate with a line on it, right?

**Connors:** Well there's a practical impact. First we of residents concerned about it --

**Hales:** I'm talking in terms of legal and planning reality. One single piece of real estate with a line on it.

**Connors:** But I understand for practical implications of refinancing the property that's going to be to have disclosed and it going to reduce the value of the property

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Peter Fry:** Peter Finnley Fry I'm here on Colombia Plaza. There are five buildings according to Steve Koontz at the bureau planning that had the same problem. These buildings were built back in the '90s and '80s. It's an office building over a warehouse. We are asking that in these older buildings there's a provision in the zoning code that would allow these office buildings to continue to be office buildings. Our argument is that they have been there for 30 years or more. They have not caused any real problems, I'm talking about traffic and that kind of impact. And we are not going to tear them down. And it does add employment density. And we are not going to get the downtown office type users on Colombia Boulevard. So it's a technical zoning problem and one that I wanted to avoid because every time they have a new tenant they have to call me and I have to do a

October 6, 2016

conditional use and I don't want to instantly be doing conditional uses. At some point I think they should just be fined and permitted.

**Hales:** We might want to take you up on your offer to follow up with testimony that contains your suggested code language.

**Fry:** Yes, I will. Thank you.

**Hales:** We always take free help when we can get it. All right. Who is next?

**Moore-Love:** Next is wendy chung , Mark Whitlow and Bob LeFeber and they'll be followed by Eric Hovee, Brent Ahrend and Chris Crever.

**Hales:** Okay. Who is ready first, proceed. There we go. Musical chairs and let her have technical support. Mark, why didn't you go ahead because that will take a minute.

**Mark Whitlow:** Thank you. We think you need to be concerned that the city isn't yet ready for high density mixed use citywide from downtown to its eastern edge. The market is not there yet. It's going to take years in some areas especially out east. The current mode split for traffic is 80/20 auto with pbots 2013 projection being only 76/24 so we have of a long way to go. That means there's a real need to accommodate the auto during this planning period. They make vertical mixed use, and that's also true for the ce zone, it's partially auto accommodating, mostly mixed use. In fact, the general commercial zone doesn't have a counterpart in the muz zoning mix. Yet the muz says it's multi-modal so we need an adjustment to provide zoning for accommodating businesses. But under this plan all existing auto accommodating developments become non-conforming, they are not favored for redevelopment, that causes blight, stagnation, it's bad for the local economy, owners and operators hate it, we address this issue last time and you gave us policy 7.17 saying phase things in, the pse missed that point. So we are asking three things. We proposed the detail zone map with good justification with 28 sites, we got two out of 28. On the big map we got virtually nothing. Number two, please revise the ce zone purpose statement to make it auto accommodating. And three, adopt our proposed drive-thru prohibition map and treat existing drive-thru's as allowed instead of non-conforming.

**Hales:** Can you submit that?

**Whitlow:** Yes, and I'll have a detailed stack for you.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Who would like to go next?

**Bob LeFeber:** Mayor hales, I'm bob lefeber with commercial realty advisors. Our office is fortunate to represent a number of grocers, a couple large affordable ones. Throughout this process we have pushed for more ce zoning because it's the only auto accommodating zone with which these retails require to locate in. The pse virtually ignored our request and the end result is it will exacerbate the food desert problem. And of course it will prevent hundreds of jobs from of occurring here. We ask for greater use of ce zonings, the drive-thru's for many of these businesses if you're Dutch brothers it's 100 percent of your business but for many others it has a material impact on their sales and profitability. It's also important for elderly, handicapped and families with small children. I was with a woman yesterday who said she drives way out of her way that goes to a particular outlet that has a drive-thru. We recognize the tradeoff with preserving urban forms and centers. However, the psc chose to implement a ban in areas that are auto oriented. Why? Because some fast food restaurants sells some unhealthy food choices? Also fast food restaurants are starting to have more healthy choices. What about all the other uses, all the other drive-thru's for banking, gas stations, et cetera. I please can to you look at both of these issues with greater detail and we would love to participate if needed to any further meetings on it.

**Hales:** Thank you. Thank you very much. Wendy, welcome.

**Wendy Chung:** Mayor, commissioners. I'm Wendy Chung, vice president of the northwest district association. And I'm testifying today specifically about one portion of task five early

October 6, 2016

implementation, the rh zoning issue in Irvington. As Chris smith mentioned and I think commissioner novick commented at the last hearing that he's the smartest guy he knows, he mentioned that the procedural posture of this issue which came to you, I'm going to discard most of my prepared remarks because I have to respond to some things that were testified earlier but I think there's been some sort of confusion because we are not asking for down zoning, we are asking for a correction or truth in zoning. Under the current code historic overlays supersede base zones. I think it was commissioner Fish opined that this particular parcel which I don't think is a good example given the fact that this body landmarks, bps, bes and the northwest district association all agree that that the four to one is more compatible and could never be built here. I think that the affordable housing is a red herring. Back to the amendment itself, one thing I want to point out is the reason it's incompatible, you'll see the age of these parcels above the green line are the ones that bps is changing from four to one to two to one. Most of them have black dots in them. So this idea of losing 27 blocks of housing and I don't know how many millions of square feet, it's disingenuous at best because most parcels contain historic properties. We are asking to implement the comp plan as you adopted in June specifically policy 4.49 which demands that we resolve conflicts in historic districts and refine base zoning in those districts.

**Fritz:** Thank you very much and thank you for giving your testimony in writing.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Moore-Love:** the next three are Eric Hovee, Brent Ahrend and Chris Crever and they'll be followed by Timothy Ray, Denis harper and Doug Klotz.

**Hales:** Good afternoon. Haven't seen you in a while.

**Eric Hovee:** I'm Eric Hovee. Analysis that we have prepared and submitted in testimony to the psc yields three observations for consideration with your deliberations for mixed use zones. First outside of the central city Portland is under retail especially in east Portland residents must travel further to shop or use convenience stores as a less healthy alternative. Second the food deserts are often subpar making it more challenging for investment in providing affordable goods and services especially for day-to-day needs, auto accommodating use is important for customer convenience and for business liability. Third, while transit, walking and biking are on the rise, auto use still accounts for more than 80% of the trips outside the central city. Development standards that work in higher areas with good transit service run the risk of proving counterproductive for residents with the poorest access to quality shopping choices. Phased implementation of mixed used zones becomes pivotal to encourage investment in sync with what the market will support today as well as over the next ten to 20 years. Thank you I

**Hales:** Thank you very much.

**Brent Ahrend:** Thank you. My name is Brent Ahrend and I'm a traffic engineer. I have a good handle on how things work as far as needing to have the auto accommodating uses and their customers needing to be able to travel there by auto. I testified both before council and the psc earlier on these issues and provided examples, one was the Costco that had been proposed in northwest Portland and indicated their existing customers have to drive out of town. A lot of extra miles for Portland residents to drive out of town to go to other stores currently where it would be nice if they could stay in town, not to mention the employment and the tax dollars that would stay in the city. I also mention about a lot of the larger areas, people driving extra miles out of their way to buy their grocery. I've seen it operate and most people are driving by car. And as was mentioned before, a lot of the lower income people, they shop at these places and they need to get there and they go once a week and going by auto is the best option for them. They can get everything they need in one trip as opposed to the smaller higher end grocery stores, a lot of these people

October 6, 2016

can't afford to shop there but that's what the zoning is limiting for in the city, is these higher end smaller grocers that don't serve those people well.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Chris Crever:** My name is Chris Crever and I own a property in the northwest district. And I'm here to strongly object to the down zoning proposal for my particular piece of property. Up shore is located in two vibrant employment centers. We are right near the street car, we have bus routes, shopping, restaurants, and a walkability score of 95. Clearly we are in a housing crisis and limiting the ability to potentially build affordable housing at my location is something that I deem counterproductive. I currently am surrounded by section eight housing between 26 and 27, and I have a unique piece of property that you could develop and take advantage of the current cm zone. Currently we are looking at going from cm to cm1. I have a 45-foot height restriction and that is being threatened going down to 35 feet in the cm1 going from a medium use to small use is something that I strongly object to. Looking at the map it is a checkerboard proposal. And when I look behind me one block closer to the core is a laundry mat which is still designed as a cm 2 and I'm closer to the northwest industrial district where apartment buildings and residential buildings are of the norm. I request that we revisit this and hopefully we can keep my zoning at cm or go to cm2. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Moore-Love:** The next three are Timonthy Ray, Denis Harper and Doug Klotz and they will be followed by Jozell Johnson, Vicki Skryha and Scott MacLean.

**Hales:** Welcome. Good afternoon.

**Timothy Ray:** Mayor, council man.

**Hales:** Put your name in the record.

**Ray:** Timothy ray. I'm here for a small piece of property, 3000 north Williams. We participated in some of the discussions for zoning of this area. It was zoned r1, unfortunately, it remains r1. I have submitted a letter of explanation along with a letter from city environmental services we got one of the first grants for brownfield remediation. This was a dry cleaning site where people had been literally pouring the chemicals out on the ground. One of the most -- it was one of the most contaminated sites in northeast Portland. We have been vacuuming and aerating the soil for the last four years. As an r1 zoning we may not be able to put housing on the first floor because of the contamination and the department of environmental quality they kind have rule any kind of particulate matter for residential housing. When you look at the map we are surrounded by cm2 and we thought we would be getting the same zoning as the rest of the properties around us. It's bizarre when you look at the map both to the north and south to us it's cm2 and there's a small piece of r1 that's us. We would like to see this be contiguous with the rest of the cm2 rather than going through sort of the uncertainty of not being able to develop with the residential on the first floor I think we'd go along with the mixed use.

**Hales:** That site is vacant now?

**Ray:** It is vacate

**Hales:** Thank you.

**Denis Harper:** My name is dennis harper. I was alarmed to find that a vast swath of northwest Portland was zoned rh with an far of four to one almost all of the affected area occurs within the historic alphabet district. Subsequently city staff proposed that only the southeast quadrant of the alphabet district obtain that zoning. I urge city council to designate all of the historic alphabet district f.a.r. Two to one. Property owners and developers will be enticed to demolish stronger building in the district to replace them with larger taller buildings. I request that the council reduce that to eliminate the owner developer enticement to tear down and build bigger. It would be a better fit for properties

October 6, 2016

with no structures. Tall out of scale new buildings, the northwest children's theatre would be damaged. Refer to page 120 of the miscellaneous zoning amendments. The commentary states the code provisions for no net loss of housing are to be deleted. It would not be in conflict to maintain residential capacity in northwest Portland. Thank you.

**Hales:** Thank you, thanks, very much.

**Doug Klotz:** Hi, doug, thank you for having me here. I support the majority of the proposed code and mapping changes and their effort to remove parking requirements in the mixed use zones. Now that we have a parking permit system, we have a housing crisis and we have the white house advocating for parking requirements and remove all parking requirements are for mixed use projects. As a member of the citizen advisory committee I support the cm one, two and three concepts but am concerned about the reduced f.a.r.'s in those zones. Housing may take over that and make use of the bonuses. But we should also look specifically at what happens on 5,000 square foot lots. 19 units can be built on these lots and it's currently being built in our neighborhood now. But the two and a half to one base f.a.r. Proposed is too small to allow you that to happen. I will graze the base f.a.r from 2.5 to 3.5 for lots smaller than 7,000 square feet just to address that one issue. I support the ban on drive-thru's use, the commissioner Andre Baugh made an eloquent argument at the planning commission as to effects of the drive-thru facilities in the neighborhood and I support his reasoning of that and what you heard here from Chris smith. I support requiring business that serve anyone any time they're open, not just in cars. In other words if the drive-thru is open, owner provide a safe way for those on bicycle or foot a safe way to use the atm.

**Hales:** Thank you. You've given us a great deal here so we will review. Thank you, very much. Okay. Who do we have next?

**Moore-Love:** I have jozell Johnson Vicki Skryha and scott MacLean, and then the last two in this first session are brad Hochhalter and pearl Meede.

**Hales:** Great. Welcome. I can't remember who is first.

**JoZell Johnson:** I'll jump in. Thank you. I am actually the face of an individual resident in the northwest alphabet district to owns my own home and wanted to speak on the changes from 4.2 to 2.2. I support this. I purchased my home in 95 because of the historical nature of the activity. One of the things that I have seen specific to my neighborhood and i'm on the corner of 18 and Hoyt is park 19. We were able to see the first large building in there and it completely cut us off from the park. As we continue to see these large developments come in we changed the character of the neighborhood. I've long-term tenants, tenants over a decade so in some cases I am affordable housing. I'm able to maintain that community and engage in it. What I'm concerned about is the legislation by headline I want us to work together as a community and ensure that what we have agreed upon we put forth and we don't cherry pick what we are doing. If I hear one more developer tell me it doesn't pencil out, the rules are there, the rules are there from the start. As an individual homeowner I have to follow those. I believe this recommendation supports that so it clearly lays out the outlines of what is available and what isn't, and stop getting these people coming in and say well it would pencil out if I had another 50 feet or 2,000 acres. So what I'm looking at, I'm a little bit concerned that affluence regarding having to chain down my front porch furniture doesn't count, we are a neighborhood in transition. I'm a community member that wants to engage in there, I'm living there. I'm tired of people creating things and purchasing property and not being in the neighborhood. I support the alphabet district. This is not supporting that community.

**Hales:** Thank you very much. Welcome.

**Vicki Skryha:** Thank you so much for hanging in there with this long day of testimony. I'm a property owner that is directly impacted by the f.a.r. Change. I proposed the change

October 6, 2016

that's recommended by the psb. I see it as Wendy Chung explained as a technical correction. And the real issue is the historic overlay which kind have tampers down what can be grown. I think affordable housing should not be at odds. I support the affordable housing project that is proposed on the lot across the street for me that got a lot of media attention but a development has to comply with applicable zoning requirements and be compatible with the neighborhood, that's just the way it works. The last neighborhood discussion about this site concerned a proposed luxury hotel and the site owner presented a concept that preserved the historic building. The neighbors praised the preservation of the historic building but pointed out the residential zoning does not allow a hotel and would require a zone change. When residents reached out to me a month ago I was delighted. Based on the last neighborhood discussion with the owners in nha's two most recent elderly projects, they each have 45 units on sites that are larger than the ones in northwest and were successfully developed and operated. One has 45 units, the other has 29,000 -- the sight in question is 20,000 square foot.

**Fritz:** There's a malfunction with the timer you've given us testimony and we've got this on the record now.

**Skryha:** I encourage to you look at this closely and consider the two to one.

**Hales:** Thank you. Before you start I think we have folks in the Portland building that may be standing by and I don't think we will lose the quorum until 5:00. I'm not sure about my colleague's plans or endurance but I want to be sensitive to the folks who want to speak.

**Moore-Love:** We have 35 people.

**Hales:** Please, sir, go ahead. We are going to keep going for a while.

**Scott MacLean:** My name is Scott MacLean. I'm representing a property owner Richard cherijino and he owns property at 102nd in southeast Portland. His property is zoned institution residential. The big change is zoning currently allows household living. The new zone will not allow household living so his property will be significantly down-zoned if this plan is passed. It's hard to get insurance and finances and sell properties when they're not conforming. So right now housing is pushing out 82nd we are seeing lots of sales of apartment land. This property is a little bit ahead of the game. If we change this zone he doesn't have a chance to sell it for an apartment at some point down the road, it's going to significantly impact the value of this site.

**Hales:** You say it's zoned institutional private now?

**MacLean:** That's correct. The new zone which is the campus institutional use will not allow household living and this property which is owned by an individual has two houses on it.

**Hales:** What do you think the zoning should be?

**MacLean:** I think it should stay the same as institutional residential.

**Hales:** Appreciate you highlighting this. That's an unusual situation.

**MacLean:** And it would have significant impact on this family.

**Hales:** Okay. Thank you, very much. Thank you all.

**MacLean:** The last two I have in this first session are brad and pearl meade.

**Hales:** Welcome, good afternoon.

**Brad Hochhalter:** Thank you. Mr. Mayor and commissioners, thank you. My name is brad Hochhalter, I'm a homeowner and I live in the alphabet district, northwest 18 and Glisan, and I'm a Portland native as well and was born just a few blocks away from where I live actually which wasn't planned. What I'm here to testify about is in support of the proposed change from four to one to two to one in the f.a.r. I think it's a great idea, I think it shows who ever does those comprehensive plans all that work, they're thoughtful about it. I think it's going to help the neighborhood. One of the strengths of the neighborhood for me and I've lived other places around the country, it's intimate yet it's still vibrant. It's still many people living there. I think this will help retain that quality in the historical nature of the

October 6, 2016

neighborhood and I'm surrounded by a bunch of historical homes as well so I'm really lucky. Anyway I wanted to say I support that change and I hope you do, too.

**Hales:** Thanks, very much. Go ahead.

**Pearl Meede:** My name is pearl meede and I don't even know why I'm here. So I'll let him tell it.

**Hales:** Welcome.

**Barry Bloom:** Mrs. Meade owns three lots and a home on southeast 83rd avenue and she also owns home across the street. You're proposing to change all that area from r1 to eg 1 and as far as I'm concerned it doesn't affect me but for the people up the street they are concerned. We got new people moving in and they just bought their homes and they read this as an eg 1 if they ever sell their homes it goes back to a vacate land rate of cost. Their home value will go down rather than up. The people across the street which it only involves ten homes are concerned that their home values at the present time which are r1 and will remain that will decrease because of the commercialization of the area. And I wish to thank you all for your service. And that's why we are here today, to try to work something out that will be comparable to the r1 rating of the homeowners and Mrs. Meade as a property owner which could be developed into small business which she's more concerned with the love of the neighborhood than the money.

**Hales:** Appreciate that. Appreciate you calling this to our attention, thank you very much.

**Moore-love:** We have one person who stayed, tony Schwartz.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** He just stepped out.

**Fritz:** I have a filler actually It gets to me that lots of those requests are on matters we did discuss so people are coming back for another bite of the apple as so to be said. So can you make sure that if other people came to testify before and they are opposing that they get specifically notified that what they thought was a done deal is now back on the table. There's a few other places where we heard lots of testimony. If I was there I would be like fine I'm done and now they're not done. Could you notify them, please?

**Engstrom:** We will give a courtesy notice.

**Fritz:** Will they know for next week cause are we going to have any more testimony after next week?

**Engstrom:** There's a hearing in November.

**Fritz:** Okay. The next time people need to come in if they support what we decided before is in november.

**Hales:** If we make a change or are considering a change. It's important to remember how that works. Thank you, welcome, thanks for waiting.

**Tony Schwartz:** Thank you. I'm tony Schwartz. I live in the alphabet district. I want to know quickly and you know the comprehensive plan does call for an additional 267,000 units. The forecast is half that. So the down zoning of four to one to two to one will not impact housing in a drastic way. Obviously there's concerns to people that it will. The vast majority of the housing stock is zoned as historic and it can't be developed anyway. There are a few parcels that could be developed but nevertheless it says all housing must be compatible with existing structures anyway. It should be zoned as two to one which is what we are asking for and to also allow folks like me who bought into the district in 2007 I came in to the historic district with expectations that those expectations of the district would be met in future years, that additional development would be in scale and scope to my house and other houses around. It's not just me versus Mr. Ramos, it's about the district as a whole so when I don't live there anymore and my children don't live there anymore that future homeowners and Portlanders will enjoy the area as well. Thank you, very much, and I'm the last one so you all have a good night.

**Fritz:** Thank you very much, for staying, really appreciate it.

October 6, 2016

**Hales:** We are going to continue this hearing until 2:00 p.m. On the 13th and we are adjourned.

**Fritz:** Just as a process check you said there was another 35 people there, not there but signed up. 34 so they will go first next week if they can come.

**Moore-Love** Yes.

**Fritz:** Then what happens if there's a lot more people who want to come next week? We'll deal with it when we get to it?

**Hales:** I think we should one plan on going till 6.

**Fritz:** And we probably should if we can let people know that there's an hour's worth of testimony before new people get to sign in.

**Hales:** Yes

**Fritz:** Thank you.

**At 4:49 p.m. council Adjourned.**