



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **16TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2016** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fritz and Novick, 3.

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

The Consent Agenda was rescheduled to November 17, 2016.

		Disposition:
COMMUNICATIONS		
1260	Request of Chet Orloff to address Council regarding Forest Park (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
1261	Request of Phyllis Reynolds to address Council regarding Forest Park (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
1262	Request of George Milne to address Council regarding the liability of interfacing hikers and bicycles on the trails in Forest Park (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
1263	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)	PLACED ON FILE
1264	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)	PLACED ON FILE
TIMES CERTAIN		

November 16-17, 2016

1265	TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM – 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	[Council Work Session to be held Nov 28 at 11am] CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 7, 2016 At 9:30 AM
CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION		
Mayor Charlie Hales		
Bureau of Police		
1266	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 (Ordinance) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM	PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 23, 2016 AT 9:30 AM
*1267	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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)	188087
1268	Amend an Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County for the Sex Buyers Accountability and Diversion Program (Second Reading 1233; amend Contract No. 30002122) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)	188088
Fire & Police Disability and Retirement		
*1269	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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)	188089
Office of Management and Finance		
*1270	Pay claim of Randall Cummings in the sum of \$6,554 involving the Portland Police Bureau (Ordinance) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)	188090
*1271	Authorize leasing of commercial office space at non-City owned buildings to temporarily relocate business operations during the Portland Building Reconstruction project (Ordinance) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)	188098

November 16-17, 2016

<p>*1272</p>	<p>Authorize a lease extension with Oregon Pacific Investment & 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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p>	<p>CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 7, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>1273</p>	<p>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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)</p>	<p>188091</p>
<p>1274</p>	<p>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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)</p>	<p>188092</p>
<p>1275</p>	<p>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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)</p>	<p>188093</p>
<p>1276</p>	<p>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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)</p>	<p>188094</p>
<p>Commissioner Steve Novick Bureau of Transportation</p>		
<p>*1277</p>	<p>Authorize the Bureau of Transportation to execute a temporary easement with Oregon Health Science University as part of the SW Bond Avenue Project (Ordinance) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)</p>	<p>188095</p>
<p>*1278</p>	<p>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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)</p>	<p>188096</p>
<p>Commissioner Nick Fish Bureau of Environmental Services</p>		

November 16-17, 2016

<p>1279</p>	<p>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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 23, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>1280</p>	<p>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 11th Ave., SE 12th Ave., SE Stark St. in the amount of \$113,936 (Second Reading Agenda 1243) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)</p>	<p>188097</p>
<p>REGULAR AGENDA</p>		
<p>Mayor Charlie Hales</p>		
<p>Bureau of Planning & Sustainability</p>		
<p>1281</p>	<p>Restrict bulk fossil fuel terminals (Previous Agenda 1259; amend Title 33, Planning and Zoning) 1 hour requested 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: Moved by Hales and seconded by Novick. (Y-3)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED DECEMBER 8, 2016 AT 2:00 PM</p>
<p>Commissioner Steve Novick</p>		
<p>Bureau of Emergency Management</p>		
<p>*1282</p>	<p>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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)</p>	<p>188099</p>
<p>Bureau of Transportation</p>		
<p>1283</p>	<p>Authorize the Bureau of Transportation to allocate \$500,000 to the Portland Parks Foundation for construction of the Footbridge Over Burnside (Ordinance)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 23, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>1284</p>	<p>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) (Y-3)</p>	<p>188086</p>
<p>Commissioner Amanda Fritz Portland Parks & Recreation</p>		

November 16-17, 2016

<p>1285</p>	<p>Amend provisions relating to possession of cannabis in parks to conform to State law (Ordinance; amend Code Section 20.12.040) 10 minutes requested Motion to replace “marijuana” with “cannabis”: Moved by Fritz. Housekeeping motion. No vote taken.</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED NOVEMBER 23, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>*1286</p>	<p>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) RESCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 17, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)</p>	<p>188100</p>
<p>*1287</p>	<p>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>188101</p>
<p>*1288</p>	<p>Designate and assign the Mt. Tabor Annex from Portland Parks & 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>188102</p>
<p>Commissioner Nick Fish Water Bureau</p>		
<p>1289</p>	<p>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>PASSED TO SECOND READING NOVEMBER 23, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>

At 12:41 p.m., Council recessed.

November 16-17, 2016

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **16TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2016** AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fritz and Novick, 3.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Susan Parsons, Acting Clerk of the Council; Linly Rees, Senior Deputy City Attorney and at 4:00 p.m. Lauren King, Deputy City Attorney; and John Paolazzi, Mike Cohen and Jason King, Sergeants at Arms.

The meeting recessed at 4:10 p.m. and reconvened at 4:16 p.m.
The meeting recessed at 5:15 p.m. and reconvened at 6:15 p.m.

		Disposition:
1290	TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 & 6:00 PM – 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	CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 7, 2016 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN
1291	TIME CERTAIN: 4:00 PM – Diverse and Empowered Employees of Portland Leadership Development Program (Report introduced by Mayor Hales) 30 minutes requested Motion to accept report: Moved by Fritz and seconded by Novick. (Y-3)	ACCEPTED
<u>WEDNESDAY, 6:00 PM, NOVEMBER 16, 2016</u> This meeting was a continuation of Item 1290 Residential Infill Project Hearing 2 hours requested		

At 8:20 p.m., Council recessed.

November 16-17, 2016

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.

	Disposition:
<p>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</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: https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/71964</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 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 <p>For more information: See Bureau of Planning and Sustainability website: www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/pdxcomplan</p>	<p>CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 22, 2016 SPECIAL MEETING AT 9:00 AM TIME CERTAIN</p>

At 4:36 p.m., Council adjourned.

November 16-17, 2016

MARY HULL CABALLERO
Auditor of the City of Portland

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Susan Parsons".

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 16, 2016 9:30AM

Hales: Welcome to the November 16th meeting of the Portland city council meeting, please call the roll.

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

Hales: Good Morning everyone we have one council member out of town and another ill so we are going to still conduct the council meeting because we constitute a quorum but we cannot act on emergency items so as a result of that, we are going to -- we have things on the regular calendar that are emergency items, so we will go ahead and have those heard today if you want to speak on those, you will have the opportunity to do that. But we won't act on them until no earlier than tomorrow, and we're in hopes that commissioner Saltzman will be recovered enough that he will be back with us tomorrow and we'll have four people that we can act on emergency items because it takes four votes to do that, the consent agenda, you may or may not be here about that, those are more ministerial, but I will set the consent calendar over for tomorrow because again, we cannot act on those items most of those items without four people so without objection that's how we are going to proceed. Welcome, if you are here to speak on an item, let the clerk know. If you have not spoken before you need only give your name, you don't have to give your address, we follow basic rules of decorum which is that we don't have applause for verbal demonstrations in favor or in opposition to our fellow citizens' points of view, a polite hand gestures in favor or against are fine, we make exceptions for visiting dignitaries and students, so if you are one or more of those you might get a round of applause, and then we generally give people three minutes to testify, looking at the size of the group, and the agenda before us, I don't think that we'll have any trouble doing that. So with that let's take our communications items. We have five people signed up and we'll take 1260 first please.
Item 1260.

Chet Orloff: Good morning mayor and city council, I am Chet orloff. I am a former parks foundation member and I am testifying today with regard to the forest park management plan. In 1903, John Charles Olmsted arrived in Portland and made a report many suggestions for us. Took us 100 years to realize most of them one significant part of the recommendation was that the west hills of Portland become a forest preserve, what we call forest park, Olmsted wrote, a visit to these woods would afford more pleasure and satisfaction than a visit to any other sort of park. It requires the shutting off from the interior as completely as possible, all city sites and sounds and exclusion committee exceedingly popular means of amusement, which in those days meant bicycle riding, primarily. He continued this place of wild woodland character should be intended only for passive recreation, walking. And will afford mental refreshment which can only be derived from the quiet contemplation of natural scenery. 45 years later, Thornton t. Munger, a wonderful man, the father of forest park, wrote this wilderness within a city is not a place for speeding. There will be requests for active recreation, but this is not the place for such active recreational uses. The feeling of an uninterrupted forest sanctuary must be preserved far from the crowd. And finally, in 1995, the forest park natural resources management plan of our city's parks bureau was published, clearly stating the goals for the

November 16-17, 2016

park that harken back to the words of Olmsted. Forest park wrote represents an unparalleled resource where citizens can enjoy the peace, solitude, ruggedness, variety, beauty, unpredictability and unspoiled naturalness of an urban wilderness environment, a place that maintains this wilderness quality while allowing appropriate passive recreational and educational use without degrading natural resources. In other words, America's premiere urban ancient forests. As a former planning commissioner, and design commissioner, and parks board member, I urge you to stick to the plan. Thank you very much.

Hales: Thank you. Thanks a lot, chet. Ok. Let's hear the next person please 1261.

Item 1261.

Hales: Good morning.

Phyllis Reynolds: Good morning. I am Phyllis Reynolds. First thank you mayor hales for your comments about the election. And now onto forest park. I am here to talk about the flora and the fauna, and as your two absent members know, I am an author of two books about trees in Portland. I am heavily into trees. I am worried about the trees in forest park with biking. The tracks that will be made, and if any of you have ever hiked the Tillamook trail between seaside and cannon beach you know what I'm talking about, no bikes are allowed there. But the bikers tear down the signs and proceed to use the trails, which makes huge ruts given our wet climate, huge ruts in the trail. Now this can happen very easily in forest park, and what happens to these ruts, sever the tree roots. The trees eventually die. Now you might say that that's not many trees but it will be a lot of trees. Think of the upkeep of those trails to get rid of those ruts, and you cannot walk on trails with heavy ruts. Now to the -- the other thing, there is no such thing as a taproot in trees, in the west. They all, all the roots go out under the surface, so that's why these tire tracks can just really sever the roots. Now onto the flora -- the fauna. I live close to the forest park. I live close to the wild wood trail. I have had in the last four years at least two different bobcats on my deck. I live three miles from here. I am very worried that the biking, the bikers careening through forest park and wildlife, which has been a wildlife corridor, we all know that, that wildlife, those two things are not compatible. I am very worried that the wildlife will suffer and I will never have another bobcat on my deck. And now I am a member of the Portland garden club. You all have received a letter in September, and I am just -- I want to read a bit of it right now. The management plan calls for passive recreational use. It does not degrade the natural resources and requires the trails be safe for all users, however this habitat and many of the species is threatened by the unauthorized use of trails. The Portland garden club supports efforts to uphold the goals of the forest park natural resources management plan, which states there can be no bicycling on trails that are less than 8 feet wide. Finally, I am old and rickety. I use a cane but I still use the trails and I hope the hell you keep me from being hit by a bike. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you very much. Thanks for being here this morning. Ok. Let's hear from the next person, 1262.

Item 1262.

Hales: Good morning.

George Milne: Good morning everyone. I am George Milne. I am the president of the federation of western outdoor clubs. Past president of the trails club of Oregon. Both of these organizations were key in the formation of forest park. The president fwlc that means who we are, was garnet d. Cannon. He was a tremendous gentleman and several other people. My case is if they had very good intent to keep that as a quiet, passive area where people could come and enjoy the peace and quiet on the trails, we have had several people in the trails club, have been injured by bikes coming down already. One of them resulted in a broken ankle. And I brought a paper here today, the federation meets once a

November 16-17, 2016

year. We look at issues in different areas. We -- I should say that we involve 40 clubs in six states. So we travel around. But we pass resolutions, and those resolutions tell what the federation thinks. I gave you one that deals with forest park, and I am going to let it speak more for itself than me trying to sit here and stutter. But thank you for the time to talk and I would ask that you look carefully at the resolution. It took some time to get that formed. Thank you.

Hales: Thanks very much. 1263 please.

Item 1263.

Hales: Good morning.

Barbara Dugan: Good morning. I am a retired Portland public school teacher. I am a native of Portland. I also ride a bike. And I want to thank you first for your service. I know being on the city council is a heavy load. Lots to deal with. I am speaking as a senior, and I hike in forest park for health reasons, emotional, physical, and spiritual. I no longer feel safe there. I've been hiking the parks since I was young. And in the last -- since the bikes started riding on other trails, bikers have started riding on pedestrian-only trails. I have been injured twice, and been run off the trails multiple times. One time I fell down a steep embankment and seriously injured myself, I still have a scar from that. It's just a matter of time before someone sues the city based on this. One of the things that I am aware of, there is not signs, I don't know if it's just been stolen or not being put up or maintained about trails that bikes are not supposed to be on. And that concerns me. I also know that -- my understanding is that enforcement by the rangers is difficult, and I am hoping that -- I submitted some things to you which I will that you will read, I made it really short and I highlighted things, so it should take you not a lot of time because I know that you are very busy but one of the letters is from another senior, and I could have entered a lot of letters but I didn't want to clog up the time. But this person -- these people suggest that perhaps licensing bikes would be useful, and since the city puts quite a bit of money into safety and so forth for bikes, and they use the infrastructure, then people having a license on their bike, seems to be not only provide revenue for park rangers, but I am -- I certainly am willing to pay for something like that. Some fee. But it's a way of identifying people because I do know, I heard people say, we just don't carry your i.d. And you don't get a ticket or you get a false name and that concerns me. I am concerned about safety, and I -- I live near Gabriel park right now, and when I moved there 20 years ago there was a very serious erosion problem from bikers. I talked to an employee in the city, that is in park management, and they told me that 15 years later, after extensive rehabilitation, that there's still areas that have not rehabilitated due to the compaction and so forth, and being in an understory, and it has been harder, and I encourage you to check with people in Gabriel park. I am hoping that you take into consideration that 4% of the trail users are single traffic bikers, and I want you to consider that this park is for all people. And the fact that they are not Complying with the laws, I hope that you will take that into consideration, and in terms of policy-making and decision-making, in terms of recreation and preservation, and not let a small group of users dominate policy-making.

Hales: Thank you very much. Ok. And we have one more, 1264.

Item 1264.

Hales: Come on up, please. Yes. Any chair will do there, thank you.

Alex Schay: I am Alex schay. Some of you may remember me for the work that I have done with renewable energy but when I am not doing work with renewable energy and with my family I like to escape, some of the same reasons that, the other speakers from discussed, and health reasons, and emotional reasons, and spiritual reasons, and when I do that, I typically go hiking in places that I can access via tri-met, and that includes Powell butte and forest park, and highlighting some of the differences, Powell butte is a place that

November 16-17, 2016

you can hike three miles whereas forest park is a place that you can hike 30 miles. And in September I set myself a challenge as a blind person to independently hike with help from my dog, the entire trail from the Oregon zoo to northwest Newbury road near sauvie island. And we accomplished that goal on September 5. Now as a blind hiker, I face enough challenges. Trail related impediments, knowing where I am and where I am going on the other. The last thing that I need are Additional challenges that would prevent me from hiking safely and enjoying the hiking experience. When you encounter a bicycle on the trail, and they will have varying degrees of control, Cliff and I we take up the trail because he has to walk next to me so I can be successful so we will have to yield for those bikes, and we may be able to yield safely and step off the trail and may not. We may inadvertently step off the trail off an embankment or something steep or high up, and at the very least it would be unpleasant and at the worst it could be, you know, I could suffer an injury for no reason other than I had to yield for someone that has access to lots of other places like leaf Erickson drive and northwest Saltzman road and the spring water corridor. As my predecessors, the previous speakers indicated I encourage you to please leave forest park for passive use, ie hikers and walkers only. Thank you very much.

Hales: Thank you, appreciate you being here and thanks very much.

Hales: So appreciate this process that we have, and it's unusual to have five people on the same subject so a brief report back from the bureau that's working on this. There is an important meeting coming up which is the project advisory committee meeting on December 15, and it's from 4:00 to 6:00 so it's important you raise these issues to the council and also important you participate in that process, and it's our intention that first, what we are working on is a city-wide document. The city off road cycling master plan it is a city-wide effort. Policy guidance and planning for our system so we need to take that approach. Anything in terms of forest park will be grounded in the vision and desired outcomes of the, of that master plan but also as you mentioned of the forest park natural resource management plan. So we have to make sure that again we take a city-wide view and that we take -- pay attention to the master plans that have been done for specific parks or specific parts of the system. So again this is an ongoing effort that nobody decided but your right to raise them and I hope you raise them on the 15th and the planning bureau staff and parks bureau staff and the transportation staff that are all supporting that effort, you know, I appreciate hearing you from, as well as we do.

Fritz: Do we know when they will be furthering a recommendation to council?

Hales: I don't know that, if we are having an advisory committee meeting in December it will be next year but -- oh, there she is, good morning.

Michelle Kunec North, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: Michelle Kunec-North project manager. We would be bringing a proposal to city council approximately May or June of 2017. Still plenty of time for community input.

Fritz: Thank you.

Hales: Thank you for leading this pretty important piece of work. Thank you.

Fritz: I also mentioned one of the first things that I did When I was the parks commissioner was to finalize a project screening tool for what mitigation would be required for anything in forest park when the proposals come, so that would also guide any outcomes from the committee.

Hales: Good. Thank you all very much. We look forward to the next phase of the process. Thank you. Ok. We're going to move onto the rest of our council calendar and we're not going -- if you came here late we will not do concept today because we don't have four of this morning and we might tomorrow so we're laying that until tomorrow. And there is some council calendar items we will hear today but can't act on but the first item on the

November 16-17, 2016

regular agenda item 1265 is a resolution, and we can hear and act on that today so let's read that. Please.

Item 1265.

Hales: Commissioner novick.

Novick: Colleagues, before the team begins their presentation I want to thank our community partners who provided feedback and Michael Harrison from ohsu, and Allen park from zidel, Mr. Pasquale Pacuzzi, the south waterfront business association, the south Portland neighborhood association and residents of John's Landing South Waterfront and Lair Hill, the city continues to plan for the future and it's important you stay engaged and I am sure that you will. Take it away.

Andrew Aebi, Portland Bureau of Transportation: Thank you commissioner novick. I am Andrew Aebi, south portal project manager. Joining me today is Kurt Krueger from PBOT and Jen Bachman from DKS Associates who is our traffic engineer on this project. I will turn it over to Kurt to give you the context for how the south portal came about and we will move into the presentation.

Kurt Krueger, Portland Bureau of Transportation: Good morning, thank you. Kurt Krueger with the Bureau of Transportation. My comments will be brief just giving a little history. We have had a south waterfront street plan in place for a number of years, we have made a few changes along the way, as the district has redeveloped and we need to make tweaks, and we are here before you today with a substantial tweak to the street plan. We had a project identified a decade ago that was unbillable with funds that we did not have. Andrew will get into those, but we took a new look at this area of south waterfront when the Lake Oswego car discussion was tabled. We've been working with developers pre and post-depression that have struggled with this street plan because it puts streets through existing buildings, it had significant costs associated with them so we went back to the drawing table and realized that we could make rather lower costs, cost improvements to the street plan and really provide certainty that the development community that they have been looking for. They would approach me and have discussions with my staff. We would have a lot of unknown questions, and that's not good business. They need to know what it is that we are asking for, and I think what we have before you today is a plan that really provides certainty and the need for transportation improvements that will help this district continue to thrive and grow. I will turn it back to Andrew and I will be available for questions that you may have.

Aebi: Thank you. So if we can switch to the presentation, I really want to emphasize that we went into the project with the open mind, and we went where the traffic study guided us, and it significantly shaped the final proposal, and what is shown above here is the evolution of the south waterfront street plan. You can see we've been at this for 20 years now. The south portal project was launched in 2013, three years ago, and before you today with a resolution. And I want to emphasize if you approve this resolution, this resolution in and of itself does not actually update the street plan so what council will be considering tomorrow is part of a comp plan implementation, is an amendment to the TSP that would affect the changes contained in the resolution. That's already in your packet. The purpose of the hearing today is to take all the testimony and air this out in detail before, as part of a larger package. That you're going to be considering tomorrow. So just to kind of recap the robust public outreach on this, we have had 10 public meetings in 2013, we have made it a point to reach out to the fact that the property owners in the area. I am particularly pleased that some of our most significant refinements to those street plans has come after the second open house that we had in January so between January and November of this year we have been busy refining the street plan to make key changes based on feedback that we received. Kurt was mentioning the cost estimate for

November 16-17, 2016

the current street plan, a very high level estimate, I think that this is probably low. But the 2006 estimate was 50 million. If I pretty conservatively plug in 5% a year inflation, that would be 80 million today. And the proposed street plan changes would reduce those costs by nearly half to a range of 36 to 45 million. And just to put this into perspective, 80 million is equal to nine years of city-wide pbob system development revenue, so in theory if we could pay for 100% of this project, the status quo, with pbob sdc and we did not spend any money in the city we would take nine years of pbob sdc for a single project. At this point I will turn it over to Jen and she will walk you through the details of the proposed changes.

Jen Bachman: Thanks, Andrew. I want to start just by helping everybody understand what some of the challenges and constraints of the south portal area are, and for anybody unfamiliar with that term, we're referring to the southern end of the south waterfront area. On one side, it's constrained by a freeway. On the other by a river. And south of Bancroft there are no streets that connect to the south side, so it's very isolated area. There is limited access. There is, there's been a lot of development in that area in the last several years, so growing congestion. Vehicle queuing. Especially trying to get in and out of the district at peak hours, and lack of multi-modal connections to and from the area. Pointing towards a need for improvements, and furthermore, the beginning of this study, we looked at, you know, what would happen 20 years out if we did not do any improvements to the area, and the intersection is down, and at the southern portion of that area exceeds capacity, significantly, so all of these point to signs that, you know, improvements are needed in this area. As -- go ahead. The next slide. As Kurt and Andrew mentioned this is not the first time that the city evaluated this area. In 2006 a street plan was adopted, that street plan definitely had some issues as Kurt was referring to get everybody familiar, that the street plan realigns, and in this picture north is to the right and it realigns hood avenue to come in at Hamilton street. And creating a seven-lane cross-section in that area, and it's building a road through steep terrain, forested, so there would be some significant costs and risks associated with that. There is a lot of right-of-way take and certainly a long time frame to implement partly because the -- as Andrew is saying, the funding is so significant. Go ahead. So with that, the city wanted to take another look at that area and see if there was another option that would still benefit the area, but at a lower cost, and less impactful, and the project team and stakeholders identified four goals right off the bat that are -- served as our evaluation criteria. The first one is to improve the vehicle access, multi-modal mobility to and from the area. The second one was to provide a cost effective solution; so cost was definitely an element that we considered. Third minimize the physical impacts, so both right-of-way takes and buildings in challenging terrains and meeting the needs of future development. So these goals are what the team used to move forward and evaluate different alternatives. Here's where I want to say there is no magic bullet. There is no perfect solution for this area with the constraints that we talked about, you know, there is the development, there is a freeway and river there are definitely elements that limit what can be done so shy of the freeway or doing some crazy tunnel option which would blow the cost effective goal out of the water, there is no, there is no perfect solution but what we did do was found a -- an alternative, calling it a direct alternative that meets, that achieves the project goals, and at a lower cost, and less impactful from the currently adopted alternatives, so what we're going to get into now is detailing what are the key components of the alternative. There are three main components. The first one in the middle of this is an improvement to the macadam Bancroft intersection and I will detail these, but these are the three overarching components of the, of the project. If you move north you see an extension from Lowell street between moody and macadam which provides improved access into and out of the district, the third extending moody avenue

November 16-17, 2016

south of Bancroft down to Hamilton court providing another point of connectivity to the district and neighborhoods.

Hales: That section of Lowell does not exist today, right?

Bachman: Correct. Ok, thank you.

Bachman: Correct. That is unbuilt today. Let me get into more detail. The first one is an improvement to the Macadam Bancroft intersection and what we are -- doing is a simple signal phase changing. So minimal impact, significant benefit. Right now traffic can come down hood avenue and enter at Bancroft or turn left and continue on macadam. This changes that so traffic coming in from hood avenue would have, would turn left onto macadam instead of entering the district of Bancroft. By doing that we eliminate a traffic signal Phase and can allocate significantly more green time to the other phases as needed so depending on the time of day and whether it's ingress or egress traffic, this would help address during the p.m. Peak, the q that builds up the moody avenue and flushing that traffic out. We'll talk more about, there would be a signal at Bancroft, Moody that would be tied to it.

Fritz: To clarify though, does that mean Bancroft is one way at that point?

Bachman: No.

Fritz: So where would the traffic going into the district come from if hood not allowed to go?

Bachman: So if you are coming north on macadam you could turn right onto Bancroft, it's only affecting hood avenue traffic.

Fritz: Thank you.

Bachman: So that brings me to -- and this is the next slide details that, that change. You can see here in this slide, you know, north is to the right, and the picture on the left is the existing configuration and on the right the proposed configuration and the only change is that traffic from hood avenue now all turning left onto macadam.

Hales: If I am driving from the east side I come across the ross island bridge and I want to go by car to this district, I don't do that straight across macadam anymore? And I would, of course, always follow the traffic laws but if I was not going to follow the traffic laws, what is stopping me from driving across that intersection other than the presence of a police officer?

Bachman: There would be improvements to the intersection that --

Hales: Curbs?

Bachman: Yes.

Hales: Or turning guides?

Bachman: You could provide guidance with improvements to prohibit that from happening.

Hales: Thank you. But how would I make that trip by car? You will get to that?

Bachman: So that brings us to the second component, which is key because we're omitting that movement.

Hales: Oh, I see, that's why you have got the street, ok.

Bachman: Yep.

Bachman: So if we are admitting that, we need to provide an adequate access for those and it would mean going up to curry which is a third of a mile out of direction travel, and especially if they are headed for the southern end of the south waterfront district. So by extending Lowell street you are creating -- you are kind of correcting the grid system because right now there is a disjointed grid if you go on Thomas, that's just to the north and not, not really adequate for that volume of traffic that would need to access the district there. So the improvement will include a northbound right turn pocket, and a, an improvement signal at the Moody-Lowell intersection. Lowell would be two ways, in the scenario so traffic could enter and exit so we're improving connectivity to and from the

November 16-17, 2016

district with this extension. It requires some right-of-way, and you know, Andrew can speak more to this but he's been working diligently with the property owners in that area and laying the path for that -- those agreements to take place.

Fritz: If you are going north on i-5, used to be able to get off and go straight into the district, and now you have to go past and back again, is that going to stay?

Bachman: Go past -- yes.

Fritz: You have to get off on the Hawthorne bridge and then swings around?

Bachman: This is, this does not change that.

Fritz: Ok.

Bachman: Yeah. The next slide, did you want to speak to that?

Aebi: Commissioner, we had quite an extensive crash history with the right turn movement, and when I say we, I mean pbot and odot and I'm not going to get into jurisdictional issues, the reality coming onto macadam and making the right turn across parallel traffic, didn't work very well, or wasn't very safe. We had -- odot told me that there were 14 angle crashes. 14 angle crashes from the vehicles turning right from the freeway ramp onto curry, and from 2007 to 2013. And since the separator was installed, there had been -- there were no reported angle crashes back in 2014, and there were a lot of near misses. I remember going out this one day, and even after everything was installed and somebody wanted to go that way anyway and I heard a loud screech of the tires, so that's just not a -- not a safe situation that we would not want to restart.

Fritz: Thank you for providing that. I was not arguing just wanted to understand, it's really good to know that and it's a good example of getting to vision zero, in a very simple, low barrier that says you cannot make that right turn, and as you said, just eliminated the crashes that's really good to know.

Aebi: But candidly I would say that decision was not particularly popular. We certainly heard a lot of feedback from the business owners that it's a bit problematic when people have to kind of go out of a direction to get to the businesses, so it is certainly not without trade-offs.

Fritz: And it was a surprise at the time and as you pointed out, before the barrier was there I was like, I don't know how to do this is going to turn right anyway, so that on a Sunday when it was not united and we did not have a crash, but I agree that we have to look at the whole safety of the whole system.

Bachman: Ok. So onto -- was there anything else?

Aebi: I think we covered the Lowell street and going to go into the third change.

Bachman: The third component is extending moody south from Bancroft down to Hamilton court which provides another point of connectivity to and from the district at Hamilton court. Moody would be two ways through this section, so if you are heading northbound you would get up to Bancroft and at that point hit the couplet over to bond to continue traveling north, by doing this the bond avenue extension can be removed from the proposed street plan, which cuts down the cost significantly, and there would also be a traffic signal installed at Bancroft and moody and some slight lane configuration, and this is where that new signal and the signal improvement at Bancroft, macadam, the signal right now that's there is very old, and could be upgraded to much newer technology with far greater capabilities. So those two could work together and help to flush traffic in or out of the district as needed. Another advantage of the moody avenue extension is that it connects to the johns landing neighborhood, so now people have johns landing can get to the south waterfront district without having to get on a major arterial and vice versa. In looking at this we looked at bike lanes, multi-purpose path, you could the conceptual drawing is one idea of incorporating the bike lane and having a multi-purpose path on the east side of moody

November 16-17, 2016

south of Bancroft. This helps address the multi-modal component as well. Andrew did you want to say a few things about this?

Aebi: I think the key is right now, is that the bike facility and the Bancroft street, so it's a bit awkward, if you are riding a bike to sort of find your way over to the greenway trail so the moody extension would complete that missing link, if you will, and a new signal could get bike traffic across moody and connects to the greenway trail and onto the newly rebuilt, so we think that would be a major bike connection into the south waterfront area.

Hales: You are talking about the streetcars and bikes so help me out with a couple of issues. So if you are taking a bike trip South, through this area, you run alongside the streetcar tracks as I recall and asphalt section of the trail. You take a left turn and run down a sidewalk to the waterfront in front of the office building, and take another one right turn to keep going south. Is that going to be the same or run this bikeway all the way up to where the two come back together again? See my point? There is this weird diversion to that section of waterfront trail and what's the plan? A continuous waterfront segment and a bikeway on moody or --

Krueger: I am glad you asked this question, I am excited about this. If you have not been down there, there is a new segment of trail conducted on the ben springs property so that's just south so that extends, eliminates that 90-degree turn for -- it connects to the existing trail along the spaghetti factory property. The other exciting piece is that it opens up doors to development stalled so the Prometheus property has renewed conversations about going through the land use process. The exciting piece is that they will be required to construct a trail which will connect the next segment, and two other large property owners represented here today you will hear from are the zidels and the ohsu property. We get those properties connected and that built and we will have a trail connecting all the way from the sellwood bridge to downtown.

Hales: What about the streetcar tracks?

Aebi: The existing tracks are not streetcar tracks, but I wanted to clarify that for the record. I have a slide coming up, and I can address that question. Jen do you have anything more to cover on this one?

Bachman: No.

Aebi: A perfect segue into the next slide.

Hales: Ok.

Aebi: This is an example of what moody avenue might look like, and I really want to emphasize this is a conceptual design so what we have here is two-way vehicle and streetcar traffic, and one lane in each direction and a two-way cycle track on the east side of the street, Safeway separated from traffic. And I want to make it really clear, while we did have discussions with the community about the potential extension of the streetcar, this project does not contemplate the streetcar being extended further south than Hamilton court. I will also tell you that I don't recall a single person from Johns Landing in support of extending the streetcar further south than Hamilton court, I just wanted to make that clear, however I did hear a fair amount of interest in extending the streetcar down to Hamilton court just to sort of put that area within a walk-shed distance if you will, the newly extended streetcar. Once you get south of Hamilton court, the costs are exponential and the benefits decrease, I am not here to say that there is no possibility of the streetcar being extended. We felt, what we were trying to land on with respect to the south portal was get to a place where it was ok to extend the streetcar to Hamilton court and stop and call it a win, and accept the terminus of the north-south line at Hamilton court, so the one other thing that I will add to that is actually there would be in some locations, center turn lanes on moody avenue, and as the right-of-way permits, I would to underscore we were trying to take a fresh approach to how we laid this out. So instead of throwing lines on a map and

November 16-17, 2016

effectively condemning the buildings, we started with the premise of what can we fit within the footprint? So thanks to a 50,000 grant that we got from our good friends at odot, and we surveyed this area, and we surveyed all the existing buildings, and we came up with the design, and that fits within the existing building. And I think that really is the difference between the amended street plan as opposed to what we have on the books, this is something that once we get the funding, we can, in a reasonable amount of time implement.

Bachman: So bringing it all back together, what this represents is in blue you see the three key improvements that we talked about. And there is some other accompanying elements that are highlighted in green or a light orange to represent when they were added to the plans. That's the only difference between those colors, you know, as we talked about as we went through this, we had kind of an recommended alternative, and feedback, and we were able to bring that information back and incorporate more so that just represents the coloring difference on this, so that people can see the new components that have been added, but again, combining the improvements at the Bancroft with the Lowell avenue extension and the moody avenue extension, achieves the four project goals, at a lower cost and with less impacts than the currently adopted plan.

Aebi: So this is what the tsp update would look like if you approved this, and also approved amendment no. 41 in the council packet for tomorrow. And this in my view is one of the most important slides of this presentation. I was pretty astounded to find this out, but you know I heard a lot of feedback from people in Johns Landing about gee, we don't have any public streets, it's really hard to get here, and etc., et cetera. So what I did here was I sort of arbitrarily carved up this area between the Ross Island bridge and Carolina street in into five polygons so polygon number one at the north end is what we know as develop south waterfront, and robust infrastructure, and polygon number two, between Bancroft and Hamilton court where the moody extension would go, and number three is Hamilton court to boundary street, and four is boundary to Pendleton and five is Pendleton to Carolina. And what I found absolutely astounding was if you are Driving northbound on macadam from lake Oswego and you pass Carolina street, you don't get to another public street until you drive 5,506 feet which is over a mile. I was really amazed that we had no public streets in the area. And this really is underscored by the pie chart, so the area at the very north is south waterfront, with 49% of the area. It has 93% of the street in these areas combined. If you look at polygon number two, where the moody avenue extension would go, that's 13% of the area, and has 7% of the streets. You get it down to polygon no. 3, 4, and 5, and there is absolutely no public streets. So one of the key changes of the moody avenue extension is that it provides public streets access to polygon number three, it does not do anything for number four and five, but at least it starts to provide connections for area no. 3, and I might add that this is an area that has to maintain their own private water mains. There is just a lot of infrastructure areas here in this area. Here's my final point, just to inform council of feedback that we got. We are not proposing to change anything but based on the feedback it was important to inform council of kind of a way finding issue, so one way finding issue that we have in this area, is because we have just jumping back to this slide, because we have virtually no public streets, east of macadam Avenue, we have certain properties that are addressed off of macadam, and that are not physically on macadam, so the best example that I am give you is the river form office building. You go to the river forum office building, and you have an address on macadam, and you code it and drive up and you get to where you think that you are supposed to be, and there ain't no river form building there, and I had a friend of mine, an office there many years ago and I went there multiples, and even though I had been there before, I got lost going there, what you wind up doing is driving in and out of all of the driveways off macadam through

November 16-17, 2016

trial and error until you find where you are going, so one of the way finding issues that this project seeks to address is simply if the moody extension gets built, we would readdress the properties to macadam and moody. And the other way finding issue that I wanted to get into is as we have had more development occur, in this area of southwest Portland, that is east of Naito parkway and viewpoint terrace, they have leading through addresses, which from what I understand is unique to Portland, and part of what makes Portland weird, which is ok, but it just has some real way finding adverse impacts. So this is less than 1% of all of the streets in the city of Portland. You see that we have five city quadrants. We don't have anything special with respect to that area of southwest Portland, so it's very counter intuitive. The address numbers get larger as you get closer to the river instead of further away, the real tendency so people to want to drop the leading zero and they think it's redundant or a typo or something like that, and so full disclosure, i, actually, used to have a leading zero address so --

Hales: With experience.

Aebi: So here's an example of what I'm talking about, you have two halves, one an address with 16 southwest Whitaker street and one with 016 southwest Whitaker street, if you get to put in the leading zero you wind up with the one at the top. And no problem, right? You just drive down the street until you get to the other house. Not so simple. If you look at the left, there you can see that there is a freeway style median there in the middle of Naito parkway and a one-way grid which discourages cut through traffic. And I literally went here and my car won't gps 016 southwest Whitaker street, and my iPhone would not gps 016 southwest Whitaker street. I finally gave up and just sort of through trial and error tried to figure out how to get from one street to the other. I talked to one of the owners of the houses and they described it as living in the Bermuda triangle. So this is an example of how we might have a way finding problem and what we now know as north Portland if we had leading zero's similar to what we have in southwest Portland so if we had instead all of northeast Portland extending to St. John's, if you are going to university of Portland you would not be going to 5000 north Willamette boulevard but 05000 northeast Willamette boulevard, if you geo coded it wrong you would be 100 blocks out of direction. So in theory we would not have a leading zero issue if this area of southwest Portland had, instead, been prefixed with south Portland. So again I really want to emphasize we're not changing anything here. We're just simply informing council. What I did find out from the fire bureau is the 9-1-1 dispatchers do have a protocol that when somebody calls from a street, that potentially could have a leading zero there is an additional step by the 9-1-1 dispatcher to verify do you have a leading zero or not?

Fritz: Is this throughout the neighborhood?

Aebi: Yeah.

Fritz: Not just --

Aebi: Not just south Portland. So there is an additional dispatching step to verify, for example, 0 615 south waterfront, or 650 -- excuse me, Lowell street, 0615 south Lowell street, and south Portland or are you at 615 south southwest Bancroft street on top of the marquam hill? Part of the feedback I got from a few business owners down in the area, they have had delivery drivers, and come in with the vehicle and they are not used to it and they punch in the other address and they wind up in some alley up on marquam hill, and it's a bit awkward, I would not say that this is fixing this problem, would not be the be all end all in he remembers it of bringing up the capacity in south waterfront, just more of a way finding issue.

Fritz: It says, you're not changing that in this resolution, is there a concept for how the process to discuss that would be or --

November 16-17, 2016

Aebi: What I am trying to do at this point, I am trying to hand this off to the fire bureau and get a better understanding from them how this does or does not work for them. If there were any changes, there would be an outreach process and council have to approve that so we're trying to explore the options. One of the things in the absence of any street changes, we're trying to get to a place where we can do a better job of doing the vehicle routing. I gave you an example of my car gps doesn't work and iPhone doesn't work, and we're trying to explore the options for allowing the gps apps to get people to where they need to go, which we don't have right now.

Hales: I appreciate you highlighting this issue, with all due respect I think it has to be a joint bureau effort. Pbot has to be involved and perhaps planning but --

Fritz: And neighborhood involvement.

Fritz: Yeah.

Hales: It's a community decision, and you highlighted the problem in a way that I have not seen clearly before. So that's very helpful.

Fritz: I have friends who live in this area, and that was why I took that because I was afraid of getting lost. It's better now but also remembering the consternation about changing 39th avenue to Ceaser Chavez boulevard. I would think that we would get some concerns from people having to redo their address.

Hales: Sounds like there might be a lot of people who would like to change that.

Fritz: Might be.

Hales: Might be worth having that conversation.

Fritz: I know the neighborhoods have asked us to do this, right?

Aebi: Well, the transportation committee and I did bring this up with the Portland neighborhood association, and I tried multiple times to just tell them that we were getting these increases and I was not able to reach them, so we just informed them that we had a good discussion at the transportation committee meeting, a couple of months ago, and frankly commissioner I think that this is just a question of ripping the bandage off at some point, and yes, there is absolutely, there is absolutely would be an outreach process. I would also point out that we did an analysis, if you looked at the major street renaming from Portland, union avenue, 39th avenue, Portland boulevard, in theory, if these were to change, at some point in the future it would be roughly equivalent to all those. It is smaller than you might think, less than one percentage point of it.

Hales: Smaller than the great Renaming which occurred in 1916 after the city of Portland annexed St. John's, Albina, east Portland and Sellwood and there were all kinds of main streets and broadways and they deputized the city engineers to justify it. It was a simpler time.

Fritz: I'm anticipating my mailbox was filling up with people telling me why the zero was so revered and loved so we will have that discussion. Thank you.

Aebi: We just wanted to inform you what the issue was, very few people know how this really works or why it is an issue.

Hales: You have made this clear, that's -- yeah, it would involve a lot of discussion.

Aebi: In closing I wanted to know, I handed to sue, by the way she worked really hard not only with this but everything else. I gave her a copy of the power point presentation, which you all had a copy of, and the other thing, you have a memo to council, 14 written comments, I took the time to attempt to sort of respond to some of the issues that were raised, and I didn't characterize people for or against it just tried to address the subsequent issues. There was a piece of communication that came in this morning which has been handed out. I would really encourage you to the extent that you have time to sort of read this memo between now and December 21st when you presumably will give your final

November 16-17, 2016

approval to the comp plan implementation and don't hesitate to call me if you have any questions.

Fritz: I happened to be at the south Portland neighborhood association meeting when -- quite a long time ago when this was being presented and I was really impressed with the community outreach that you did.

Aebi: Thank you.

Hales: All right, thank you all let's take the public testimony.

Parsons: We have eight signed up for testimony. Please come up when I call your name.

Brian Newman: Good morning, mayor Hales and commissioners thank you for this opportunity to testify in the south portal plan, I am Brian Newman, vice president of campus development at Oregon health and science university, and I am here to offer testimony in support and I want to thank pbot staff and their consultants for their hard work in listening to the diverse stockholders and developing a proposal that will significantly improve circulation in and out of the highly constrained district. As Mr. Krueger mentioned the south portal was one of the infrastructure districts identified in the south waterfront plan that is required to convert this into a densely developed extension of the central city. We based our master plan in part on the road capacity and access modeled on a completed south portal project. As you can see for yourself we have four large cranes in the sky over south waterfront today. Building the next phase of the campus development and we have worked in partnership with the city and other property owners, every step of the way to align our facility investments with a phased buildout of the districts' infrastructure. We have 2,000 employees in the district right now. And that number will, just about double to close to 4,000 over the next three years. The original south portal project was too expensive and required too many property impacts to succeed. This revised plan is much more feasible and allows the two main components to be implemented in discreet phases as resources allow. Our top priority is seeing the intersection improvements and the related circulation changes to Bancroft hood and Lowell streets implemented first and the moody avenue extension, while important, in a key part of the project should be a later phase of work if resources are not available to it all at once. Once this plan is approved ohsu will continue to stay engaged with the city staff on developing a plan for all aspects of the project and we look forward to the day soon where we can celebrate the implementation of the project. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you. Good morning. Welcome.

Sallie Aldape: I am here to ask you to reject the south portal partnership plan. Andrew Aebi says that you should accept these findings because his traffic study foretells of traffic flow improvements in the south waterfront based on the number of proposed changes, most specifically the extension of Moody through to Hamilton court. I do believe that his plan would result in a reduction of traffic flow issues in the south waterfront, but the plan essentially just moved the problem south taking it off the publicly owned streets in the south waterfront and depositing them squarely on the privately owned and maintained streets in Johns Landing, a neighborhood that does not have the resources to deal with this new expected overflow. Unlike the city, Johns Landing does not get tax revenue nor development fees related to the growth even though the community is responsible for all the related infrastructure associated with that. Missing from this very detailed traffic study and four-year project is any statement that traffic congestion, pedestrian and bike safety overall in the entire community is improved. Again the study only mentions improvements in the south waterfront. Andrew asked the area association surrounding the south waterfront for evidence of written support of his plan. We balked asking him to provide a traffic study to give us an indication of what the impact would be on Southwest Landing Drive, the road that will see the brunt of the impact. Later he said he ran out of money.

November 16-17, 2016

Last night I received feedback from Novicks office that he said that we dropped the ball, that our neighborhood should have paid for the study. This is a bit like blaming the victim. Andrew included a line in his support documentation saying that the impact to landing drive can be reviewed at a later date after you voted. How convenient. I implore you to delay moving forward with this plan until you have all the data, the data that shows you the overall impact to all the neighborhoods from this proposal, not just the positive impact to the south waterfront, with no science whatsoever detailing the total impact of the entire community. You need to make an informed decision based on all of the information, not just the information that favorably supports your short-term goal. Andrew carefully notes that the resolution, in the resolution the area association that he worked with to bring about consensus on this project. The spna repeated presentations from December 2014 to September 2016, the Johns Landing Commercial Area Association, on June 23 of 2016, and the Heron Point Homeowner Association on September 2016 and River's Edge, finally. What he does not tell you that despite being asked, not a single board member issued a statement to support his proposal, and in fact, the spna voted unanimously against, likewise, I do not know the breakdown of the vote at River's Edge but reportedly they voted against the proposal, as well. You should have received testimony to this effect. I believe that the jlcaa is the only association mentioned in the resolution did not vote up or down on the Proposal. Michael Sullivan, actually, my friend, will reportedly testify in support, a member of the jlcaa, but I want you to know that he's testifying as a citizen and not a representative of the jlcaa. Mayor Hales has been in the news telling people to pull back on protests, and instead, getting involved in our area boards and nonprofits and contact your representatives and come to the council meetings and make yourself heard and be part of the democratic process. Well, I am here to tell you that we have done all of that and the overall majority of the people represented by the area associations that you have contacted are telling me that they do not support this proposal. Listen to us.

Hales: Thank you. Thanks very much. Good morning.

Justin Williams: Good morning. I am Justin Williams. I am a co-owner and operator of Matrix Integrated. Our business has been located at 4000 Southwest Macadam for over 15 years. And we were one of a handful of businesses operating in the south waterfront before it started expanding and growing. And I would like to address two concerns. As it pertains to Lowell Street acquisition. And Mayor to clarify one of the questions you had asked earlier. There actually is the southwest Lowell Street between Macadam and Moody now. The city owns roughly 25 feet of it, off of Macadam, and they gave up the remaining section of it to the property owner, a number of years ago. Now they want to realign it with the street that used to be aligned before the condos went in. Now trying to do that, to address that here with that. First issue is the southwest Lowell Street acquisition will require the city of Portland to purchase land, demolish a functioning business structure and relocate a well-established business that services the south waterfront neighborhood community, the project adds millions to the budget that could be avoided by changing the direction of traffic on two one-way streets approximately a quarter mile north on Southwest Macadam, saving valuable dollars to taxpayers within the city of Portland and Multnomah County. And this is just one of the potential options. We've been involved with Andrew and the organizations for the last couple of years in talks on this. Trying to provide multiple options but this is just one of the options. Southwest Gaines Street and Southwest Curry Streets, apparently a quarter mile north of Lowell Streets you can have one-way streets entering and exiting south waterfront, if those streets were rerouted to allow traffic to enter on Southwest Curry Street, which is the southwest street, and then have traffic exit south waterfront on Southwest Curry Street, just to the north most street, both Southwest Gaines and Curry Streets have connecting through streets, and to Bond Avenue which allow traffic

November 16-17, 2016

to flow north into the south waterfront as needed, that would save significant funds by just having to change the traffic lights around rather than purchase the land and move properties and businesses. The other issue is the safety concern, traffic will be negatively affected, psychological drivers to merge over two lanes of traffic and over 200 feet of highway, when coming from the proposed southwest Bancroft street underpass is not safe. We witnessed several accidents from drivers trying to make a quick lane change to get down near the southwest Lowell street or southwest street, having the drivers travel down to southwest Gaines street, would allow a safer distance for the vehicles to merge across macadam before entering the waterfront. Again this is just another option, but there is many flaws in the plan with safety, as well as cost.

Hales: If I could ask each of you, that have concerns or objections here, it sounds like you may be ok. With two of the three recommendations in terms of the three engineering issues that we just heard about, right? We have the Bancroft intersection change, the Lowell street change, and the extension of moody. You may be ok with one or two of those but have a particular problem with the third one, right?

Hales: And the moody street Extension you are most concerned about, right?

Aldape: We wanted the streetcar to go from Bancroft to macadam, and that's what's been the alternative.

Hales: Keep going.

Aldape: Well, just that we want the streetcar to go from Bancroft to macadam and so we don't quite understand why the money is being spent to do the extension if, in fact, that's the preferred alternative. We had Dan bower come and tell us that still was the preferred alternative to go on macadam not to come from Hamilton court forward.

Hales: But if it were the case, sallie, that the streetcar is never going to lake Oswego, but it might go a few more blocks into the neighborhood.

Aldape: It needs to get to the sellwood bridge, I think, is what you guys would like.

Hales: Maybe, maybe not, if it were the case, I am just positing this, a decision other people will make besides me but I have had a little to do with streetcars over the years. If the streetcar is never going to lake Oswego, if that's the reality, and if it might go a few more blocks into the neighborhood someday, why put it on macadam?

Aldape: Well, I think that you have other projects throughout the city that have greater needs on the east side.

Hales: I am not saying we're going to do this but if, if the fact is that the streetcar will never go more than a half mile south, throwing this out there Right, what if, and why put it on macadam?

Aldape: Well, why do it at all?

Hales: Maybe not, just saying -- let me play that back, I believe the streetcar is never going to lake Oswego. Personal opinion. I believe that the streetcar might go a few more blocks into your neighborhood someday, just like it might go from northwest, Northrop up into the Conway redevelopment someday, and maybe not, but I don't believe that any Portland city council, just my prediction, ok, as a guy who has had a little to do with the streetcar, my prediction is the streetcar is never going to lake Oswego, there, I said it. And I think it might someday go a few more blocks into your neighborhood if the people want it, but that's as far as I think that it's ever going to go, so the debate about whether it's on macadam or not, I think, frankly, is actually over, whether we have admitted that or not so I think the question for your neighborhood now is not how do we keep the street car away from pedestrian life, but how far do we want it to go? And I don't know the answer to that question. But I will tell you as a guy who has worked in ten streetcar projects not just Portland's, I don't believe it will go more than a half mile south in Portland.

Aldape: The sellwood bridge.

November 16-17, 2016

Hales: No, I don't believe it will get their personal opinion because there is no foot traffic on the sellwood bridge. You take streetcars to where people are, and so I don't think that it's ever going to go that far south. It might go a few more blocks into your neighborhood if you want it so I would encourage you in this planning process --

Aldape: We were told not to talk about the streetcar.

Hales: But nobody told me I can't talk about the streetcar.

Aldape: We were told they were not connected so I made -- I was directed by your staff not to do that.

Hales: Not my staff but I appreciate that, thank you. Other questions?

Williams: my opposition is more to the Lowell street part of it, section 2, as they have it labeled, and the additional costs there, there are other streets there, there is Abernathy, which I understand ohsu is not wanting that to be used as an entrance because of their loading docks there. But there are other street avenues that are a possibility that would also eliminate a large dollar figure in the funds when I know that we are in, you know, trying to keep the budget down but having to purchase property to align the street instead of asking traffic to go you know, a quarter mile or less, out of further down, which also makes it safer, I don't think is unrealistic and a better plan especially as commissioner Fritz was asking about the coming off of i-5 north, we're asking drivers to go out of the way because it's safer, this is a prime example of the same thing, there's been a number of crashes if you want to call it that from people trying to get over and it's not safe.

Hales: Ok.

Williams: Thanks.

Hales: That's helpful and I appreciate you being in a discussion here as well as testifying. Thank you. Ok. Let's take the next

Hales: Good morning.

Madelyn Stasko: Hi, thank you for the opportunity to talk today. I have a map --

Hales: Give us your name.

Stasko: Madelyn Stasko, and I live on landing drive. And I originally supported the extension to moody and now I am questioning it. And I have a map, can I share it with you because I want to do this quickly.

Hales: We can pass it around. That's fine.

Hales: You have a copy.

Stasko: Quickly the pink -- this was given to us last night I was on, at an hoa meeting and Dan bower was there, and while he stressed that the Portland streetcar was not a part of this, and while this is what Andrew also said, I need to talk about it a bit but the pink line is where moody is. And you can see where the tracks are right there, ok. And so the two points to make, one the project, the fourth goal was to look at the future development of the area. And that's one thing we need to look at and the second is the congestion that will come with moody being opened up to Hamilton court. And I am going to just adjust that first, and on this it looks like if you see the x's and the Two green ones, it looks at the new construction being done down in the landing area. That hasn't been completed. When that's complete we are concerned with how much more congestion will be there, and the johns landing area, we may need Hamilton court as a way of relieving some of the congestion, and if we open up the south waterfront to Hamilton court, we are giving away some of the, some of the base is we may need when everything is open, and what I would like to see is to wait on that piece of it to see what happens down on landing drive and to see what happens in that area and to determine if it makes sense, I would also like to see a traffic study done because when you put the bikes, if you do bring the train and streetcar in, just what would happen to that area? I don't think that we can forego this section of landing drive for -- to save the south waterfront area. And then the second point of meeting

November 16-17, 2016

the future, you did ask about how far into landing driver to put the tracks. Nobody there wants it. They don't want it, and I would be fine with it going to the moody if the extension is there but then what happens is we're just setting ourselves up for the future because if you look at the orange little dot, that's right where the tracks are, so where the moody is, it's across the street, is the tracks, and so I think that we have to be careful today of what we allow for tomorrow.

Pasquale Pascuzzi: Pasquale Pascuzzi, mayor Hales and commissioners, I want to thank you for the opportunity, I am here representing Pascuzzi investment llc, the owner of the building at 4000 southwest macadam. The ordinance before you require the building to be deconstructed as a result of the proposed extension to southwest Lowell street between southwest moody and macadam. My father, Gabriel Pascuzzi, purchased this undeveloped property in 1949 and finished construction of the building in 1953. It is a building that is well construct and had maintained. Our tenants are respected auto technicians that repair Porsches and Audis and Mercedes vehicles. Approximately 30 people work in the building and it is strategically located for their business needs. My family is heart sick over this proposed loss to the building, and the compression of the subject tax lot from 29,197 down to 25,838 square feet. Staff believes our building stands in the way of a phased solution for relieving the severe traffic congestion in the south waterfront district, and I believe this action was the result of an approval by city of land use case. Lu 07 -153880 on block 49. This is better known as a gray's landing affordable housing facility on southwest Lowell between moody and bond. In 2007 the developers, the pdc and staff agreed that the established 200-foot grid alignment should be altered and Lowell should be pushed north by 50 feet. That objective was to increase the size of the grays landing footprint. This action created a misalignment between Lowell street east of bond and west of moody. No one believed at the time that this would create a problem because the plan recommends in 2006 Kittelson study alternative 4a, that was adopted by the city council on April 8, 2009, and envisioned southwest Hood avenue traffic to pass on interstate 5 and entered a district at the future Hamilton street. Fast forward into the project 50 million in 2006, greater in \$2,016. Pbot facing financial challenges adopted the Krueger plan modifying the Bancroft intersection to a two-phase signal change and diverting southwest hood avenue traffic to an extended southwest Lowell street. Unfortunately, had extension of Lowell requires a demolition of our buildings. We trust this resolution, if this is passed, the city will compensate our tenants for the significant inconvenience. I did not come here to remonstrate against this alternative. It has merit and will probably serve to reduce the growing traffic congestion at the macadam Bancroft intersections. Instead I came to suggest that council reject the proposal south side of Bancroft. The ordinance before you severely limit the possibility of future straight rail, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements by removal of the corridors from the current plan specifically establishes to remove the extension south of bond avenue, couplet, with a logical connection to southwest Hamilton street to the proposed extension of moody avenue. These alignments need to remain in the plan to provide street capacity when full buildout occurs, I am mindful this will impose hardships on the property owners, the desire to have the street corridors removed however it is clear sacrifices need to be made to increase the vehicular traffic capacity in the southern portions of the district. No one knows this better than the Pascuzzi's

Hales: I will ask you to wrap up.

Pascuzzi: I am done.

Hales: Thank you very much. Appreciate. Would you leave a copy of that?

Pascuzzi: It is in a packet.

Hales: Thank you very much.

November 16-17, 2016

Charles Johnson: Good morning. I think that the first question that I wanted to put before you is where are the lids? The lids, when we started off this conversation we talked about something like 90 million in the context of using up nine years of sdc charges. One of the ideas behind the city investment in areas is that they can become -- they should be self-sustaining so I would like maybe for, if not right now, at a time to hear from the commissioner about the dollar volume of the project in context of the greater street projects in Portland. I don't think that that's very popular. We finally elected a commissioner from the east side, that took a long time. And all of us are interested in an equity in making sure that transportation spending in a tiny little confused problematic section of south waterfront is not disproportionate to what we can do for the rest of the city. I think that you are going to -- the fact that you know, that we're weird but we should not be stupid, and having two streets that parallel each other was interesting. That may go away. If we look at the cde plan Hamilton street would go away and the court would stay, but when we talk about finding our way around down there, which I would only ever try as a pedestrian, I am not crazy enough to try that. I think that the greater you know, there are some three different pdfs with different possibilities but we don't want it to be cost driven but we don't -- if people, property owners have realized huge, at least on paper financial gains, then when we look at the context of the general city budge, the transportation, we want equity and fairness. Some other minor things more related to the general weirdness of Portland, you can't have five quadrants, you can have five pentance so when we get done we are not going to have quadrants but the six sextons of Portland or whatever the proper Latin would be. But I think that the zeros, as more newcomers come, is something that the community should have a robust discussion About whether they want to become instead of having confusing names like south portal and waterfront, it will be small but south Portland seems to be something that they should look at where, whether they keep the zeros or not, so I think that's my remarks. Thank you.

Hales: I think that we have two more people and then to staff, questions and action.

Hales: Good morning.

*****: Good morning.

*****: Sir.

Wayne Wignes: Good morning, I am Wayne. I didn't come here to contest anything specifically about the plan, but listening to the presentation, I wanted to clarify, point out that when the guy, the gentleman sitting on the right-hand side of the table mentioned that he went out of his way, his agency went out of their way to give public feedback, in the next line he said he specified property owners, local property owners, and the lady in the middle kinds of did the same, she was talking about feedback in the next line and she said stakeholders. I wanted to clarify there is a big difference between -- sometimes there is a big difference between the public and waterfront property owners. And when we are discussing publicly funded agencies who are contemplating the use of public dollars to effect public streets, we should probably be weary of what feedback we're getting. So that's all that I came to say.

Hales: Thank you, a good point, thank you, good morning.

Len Michon: Good morning Mr. Mayor and council members. I am Len Michon, the chair of the south Portland association, spna, the proposal that you have before you today is presented as a traffic congestion. Relief valve for egress from south waterfront driving south. Your exhibit b in the package that you have, is a lengthy traffic analysis which does not take into consideration the congestion created by northbound johns landing and macadam traffic, looking to move through the proposed moody avenue extension. Our letter of November 9 to you stated the spna position supporting certain changes to the south waterfront plan, the street plan, one, signal changes at southwest moody Bancroft

November 16-17, 2016

and hood. Vacation of southwest Thomas, and realignment to the southwest Lowell, and installation of a dedicated turn lane on macadam at Lowell. The Lowell realignment will go through an active business as we have heard, the pascuzzi family, while not happy with the taking of their property, realizes that this is good for the community. What we are not supportive of is the removal from the street plan, the southwest bond, south of Bancroft, and Hamilton street east of macadam. Removal of the streets limits the ability of the city to provide south waterfront with an efficient movement of the vehicles creates additional traffic congestion and safety issues. The proposal would stack four lanes of traffic and potentially two lanes of streetcar and bicycle lanes on only two constricted very constricted lanes of moody avenue, one southbound and one northbound. South of Bancroft. The connector between the south waterfront and Johns Landing areas of the neighborhood is welcomed. But there is no relief provided consider the following number one, three projects under construction or recently completed in Johns Landing add 600 plus rental units. Two four undeveloped riverfront blocks in south riverfronts central district owned by Prometheus two of which are proposed to contain 514 units. Three OHSU current construction in the central district of additional treatment facilities doubling capacity and in the north districts OHSU and Zidels development lands. Multimodal transportation solutions provide certainly help move masses for people, but it is not as if the car will magically disappear in the foreseeable future. Congestion will continue to build in the central district the resolution before you today has an estimated cost of 37 to 46 million dollars, do you want to spend that amount of money for limited results? Think through what I've said, find a better solution. Thank you.

Hales: Good morning welcome.

Michael Sullivan: I'm Michael Taylor Sullivan. In the year 2000 my wife and I along with our pet dog bought a home in the St. John's Landing complex. Multiple walks, games of Frisbee and explorations north and south Willamette park to the abutment of the bridge. On Sundays we would go to see vacant lots turned into bone yards such as the one that collected the unassembled parts of the tram. Destined to connect Pill Hill to the southwest waterfront area. Other connections like the overflow parking for Spaghetti Factory customers soon became weekend gateway venues for throngs of eventgoers, joggers and general tourists venturing towards Willamette park along the Willamette trail. Today, the only northward gateway for businesses and residents of Johns Landing is the Willamette trail. The remaining solitary corridor between Oregon Highway 43 and the river these 16 years of development of the north macadam district is a half mile long collector driveway called Landing Drive. That ends at the Hamilton Court approach to Macadam Avenue. The opportunity may be low pressure the opportunity to be part of the discussions in how best to conceive southeast an important passage point where pedestrians and vehicles of all sorts can connect north to neighbors, retail and public spaces is of great importance to the continued thriving and growing south macadam district. I know this to be true as I walk and run with our current pet Raj.

Hales: Thank you all very much. So I have a couple of questions for staff and others as well. I want to have a discussion with staff.

Fritz: I have a large number of questions. I appreciate this project has had four years of public outreach and 400 people involved. There's also the people city-wide who are now just learning about it for the first time. I wonder if we could carry it over to next week so we can go into details of the testimony we heard this morning.

Hales: What do you think?

Novick: The staff has already heard from it may be useful to have Dan Bower answer questions about streetcar issues.

Hales: It does feel like we need a bit of a work session and discussion with you. There

November 16-17, 2016

have been good issues raised in testimony that I think we want to bear down on but we also have other council business. I can't remember, Rachel and sue will remember what we have on the calendar next week. I can take some of the blame for that. So what is next week?

Parsons: Next week is a special meeting on Tuesday for the comp plan and then their morning is full with time certain until 11:00. The afternoon on the 23rd you have land use case that's expected to last till about 3:15.

Hales: Okay, that might be a good day for a work session even before it's before thanksgiving.

Novick: I'm not going to be here. Andrew has a 18-page memo responding to what we just heard.

Hales: You're not going to be here at all on this Wednesday, Steve?

Novick: No.

Hales: I won't be here on the 30th. So that's a problem.

Fritz: Can we put it over to a time certain or regular agenda?

Hales: We could set it over to regular agenda. I think there's need for discussion and further questions. I think there's has big picture philosophical debate about streets which we're obviously touching on and this neighborhood has had a history of that debate going back to an original proposal for a gated community which led to the first drawing of the street plan in the mid '90s and I had a little to do with that. Big issues here is the streetcar going any further and do we want that or not? As I raised in the conversation with Sallie. There's a question whether these particular engineering solutions should move forward now even if we don't resolve all the issues in the neighborhood. To me those are the big questions here. Maybe we should find a time and then put some things on the record we want staff to respond to. I would suggest at the end of a regular calendar -- you're not here.

Novick: Also do we have to address this issue because it's part of the comp plan amendment issues?

Aebi: If you approve the resolution today, it districts the comp plan be amended. You have between now and I'm not the planning expert but between now and December 21 to approve the comp plan amendment. One option is to approve the resolution today and adjust it as part of the comp plan. You can certainly take the options holding over the resolution and waiting to vote on it.

Hales: What about December 7th?

Novick: Busy day.

Hales: We're going to take final action on the next item we're hearing today but that may not take that long.

Parsons: The morning is landmark and then in the afternoon is the infill vote and Powell division. So in the afternoon between 3:00, 4:00, looks like you're booked until 4:30.

Hales: On Thursday, the 8th.

Parsons: On the 8th we have Inclusionary zoning.

Fritz: We have a couple of things in December as well

Hales: Let me suggest we may have work to do about figuring out when but we should continue this item. We'll do our logistics at later lengths and notify the community. I'm hearing an interest and I have one. I want to resolve this. I want to take action but I do want a chance for council to have perhaps a work session with staff rather than a lengthy council session. So that's another option. We'll bring in resource people. It's a public meeting but we don't have it back on the regular calendar.

Fritz: That's a good discussion.

Hales: Anything in particular you want to put on the record now?

November 16-17, 2016

Fritz: We heard about eminent domain issue, that's something we all take very seriously. I'm interested in how that might play out. I'm interested in Lansing drive and any possibilities of doing some work to address the concern of displacement.

Aebi: It's your call but I really like the idea of a work session.

Hales: We're going to continue this indefinitely but to be rescheduled. We'll schedule a roll up your sleeves ask staff and call in people appeared you can attend then we'll put it back on the regular council for action. We'll pick dates but have first a work session then have it back on the regular council session. Both meetings are public but we typically are inviting staff to work with us so you'll be able to watch that process happen. We'll continue this. Thank you for your work so far. We'll return to it soon. Let's take a two-minute break and return to the fossil fuel resolution.

Hales: We're going to get back to work here and move on to item 1281.

Item 1281.

Hales: Thank you so we had an excellent hearing on this proposal last week, we have people signed up that did not get to speak and we have a lot of interest in the room on continuing this discussion. Let me suggest a way we may move through this fairly quickly. I'm going to call staff up to walk through the amendments and we have a work sheet that has those potential -- the amendments put on the table last week plus additional ones based on testimony and we'll identify those by number and content. Thank you.

Tom Armstrong, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: Tom Armstrong with bps. As you said at last week's hearing there were four amendments put on the table that were corrections and clarifications as well as additional directions to staff for are follow-up in three years to see how things are going as well as following up on the seismic upgrades of storage tanks. Based on the testimony from last week's hearing council expressed an interest in looking at four additional amendments which we have before you today. The first one amendment number 5 was in response to testimony by the working waterfront coalition to add clarify the description of what we meant by storage capacity to make sure it's clear that it's storage tank capacity, so we have prepared a code amendment to make that clarification. Six and seven were sort of the conversation we got into around whether or not to allow for a 10% expansion with seismic replacement of storage tanks or if we did not do that would we want to consider allowing an expansion for fuel blending that is needed to comply with the state clean fuels program. So that's what amendment 6 and 7 are. Based on the outcome of 6 and 7 we have a revised ordinance in finding for you to adopt to support those amendments.

Hales: Make sure council questions about any of those but I'm prepared to make a motion to take a group of those as a package. See if we -- an agreement about that. If not, we can unbundle them.

Fritz: I need some clarification on amendment 5.

Armstrong: Yes.

Fritz: It looks like 33.114.100. b1 we're still adding the 10%'.

Armstrong: Yes. It's a sequence of amendments as you go through and so if you look at amendments 6 and 7 you will see the words tank has been included in there was we assume that was a straightforward amendment and would be made. You amended you recommended the draft in 5 to add tank. When you decide 6 and 7, that changes those will change depending on which outcome the 10% is applied or taken away. So they build on each other.

Fritz: I don't see where we're saying it's not 10% more.

Hales: She's looking at 33.141.007.1 where there's still a mention of 10%.

Armstrong: Under amendment 6, amendment 7 --

Fritz: Under 7.

November 16-17, 2016

Armstrong: Right. There's two options under 7. One is to option 1 is allow 10% expansion for seismic and fuel blending. Option 2, to allow it only for fuel blending.

Hales: But if we adopted amendment 6 those words would disappear from that subsection?

Armstrong: Well -- it depends on what you -- which outcome you want. If you want to allow no expansion, you adopt number 6 and reject number 7.

Hales: But then the words she's reading in that subsection, 10% --

Armstrong: Never comes up. You have not adopted amendment 7.

Fritz: So we're not giving any extra for blended.

Armstrong: If you say no to amendment 7 there would be no extra expansion for that.

Fritz: That's where I'm confused. Usually when we have amendments I'm ready to say yes to everything so you're just directing me to which ones you want to say no on.

Hales: Here's what I --

Armstrong: At the top of the cheat sheet is which outcome you want.

Hales: This is what -- suppose we keep track of this so the public can I want to make a motion to adopt a package of amendments including the first four, that is amendment 1 that clarifies the truck only terminals are not pluck fossil fuel terminals. Number 2, clarifies that fuel storage for airports and marine servicing facilities and railyards, filling stations for trains, planes and ships are not fossil fuel terminals. 3 clarifies our definition that non fuel petroleum based products like asphalt and lubricants won't get burned and put into the atmosphere those are not fossil fuel, bulk fossil fuel facilities. The fourth, requiring some follow-up actions from council next year. Those have not changed and those are included in my package. Is also want to include amendment 5 that does this clarification about storage tank capacity. Amendment 6, which deletes the 10% expansion and I'm not going to include number 7. It includes number 8 which revises the findings. Here's my rationale. Let me see if there's a second.

Fritz: Second.

Hales: One, we heard very compelling testimony from the advocates for this policy that we should be totally clear that we're not interested in incremental expansion and we also heard testimony from the fossil fuel industry that the hopes for result of that provision which staff was trying to be practical about was not going to happen. That is it's not a sufficient incentive of itself to cause people to make seismic improvements. We deem to deal with the issue whether by changing the state building code or by some other means but we're not going to get it done with an incentive. So including an incentive is not a good bargain for anyone and I don't think we should take that approach. That's the rationale behind this approach. If we're comfortable with that we can act on it and then see if any folks are still interested in testifying or ready to go home or whatever they want to do.

Fritz: I think we hear testimony.

Hales: Let's give the people signed up last week a chance to do so then see if we can proceed.

Fritz: Be aware the amendments on the table just passed and that continues the vote.

Hales: If you still want to speak, if you think we still don't have it right, don't hold back.

Hales: Got your first three.

Bob Sallinger: Good morning, I'm bob Sallinger, conservation director for the Audubon society. I was going to testify this morning in taking the 10% off the table, keeping it off without any additional changes. I appreciate your comments already this morning. That's huge. It eliminates a real loophole and something you have talked about how you want this to be replicable in other places. It's great that's out of there. That is the kind of thing that gets replicated. It becomes an entitlement, hard to get back out. Congratulations on that decision already. This is truly an historic moment, exciting to Audubon in part because it

November 16-17, 2016

restores the kinds of progression air leadership which Portland is known for. Sometimes I feel like we have gotten preventing really bad things happening but not necessarily leading the way. This restores that kind of role so it's an exciting moment. I think it's that kind of visionary leadership Portland is known for nationwide. The only thing I'll say is I hope we go to Salem and pass legislation to make fossil fuel companies do the upgrades they should have done decades ago. It's absolutely reprehensible they have been sitting on a ticking time bomb for decades and they have known it. These are some of the most wealthy companies in the city, the state, the country and the world. The world. They have the capacity of fixing these things with or without incentive and should have done it long ago. It's time to go down to Salem. I know a lot of folks would go with you to make sure it happens and happens soon. Thank you.

Marjorie Kirchner: Good morning. Marjorie kirchner from Oregon physicians for social responsibility has asked me to read her comments as she is unable to be here. Thank you, mayor and commissioners, for this opportunity to comment on groundbreaking zoning amendments that will protect our health and climate. Oregon physicians for social responsibility wholeheartedly supports the package. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you. Good morning.

Dan Serres: Dan serres, conservation director for Columbia river. Thank you for your leadership on this. On the first issue bob has already said we agree with bob on 10%. Thank you for taking that up. On amendment 5 there's just two issues that lucked out. First is coal is not stored in tanks. So there's a potential problem there with adopting amendment 5, which is just something we might want to consider. Then the second piece of amendment 5 if it's meant to address pipe capacity in all likelihood because pipelines that aren't pertinent to a large fossil fuel facility if they are a big transmission pipeline they are likely already exempt because of federal preemption at least for natural gas pipelines. So we strongly support amendment 6 and the amendments 1 through 4. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you all very much. Others?

Hales: Good morning. We have three.

Hales: Michael, stand by. We'll get you next. Good morning.

Don Steinke: Good morning. I'm don Steinke from Vancouver, Washington. I'm not perfectly sure if all my concerns got addressed. Methane is a main component of natural gas. It has a very potent greenhouse effect. The epa has recently declared that methane concentrations in the air have gone up 30% and this increases coincided with leaks associated with fracking. We get most of our natural gas from frack wells in British Columbia, 12,000 of them. Maybe 100,000 in the Midwest. Fracking endangers the water and endangers our climate more. I believe natural gas is almost as bad as coal in terms of climate. Corporations are required to put shareholder value above the greater good. Once the pension funds and investment banks have built infrastructure they will demand return on infrastructure for a long time. As of this month all gas stations in Russia are required to provide electric car charging stations at their own expense. The upper house in Germany has asked the European union to ban new cars that require diesel or gasoline by 2030 and Norway is planning to do that by 2025 and has already begun the transition there is no fixed demand for anything. Demand is created by supply. The alternatives are here. The lease payments on my new electric car are only \$130 a month. It won't use gasoline, biofuels, low carbon fuels. We don't need increased infrastructure for them or for blending. Keep your ordinance strong. I support amendment 6. Come back in a month or two and consider having a new construction make charging outlets accessible to all occupants and new infrastructure.

Hales: Good morning.

Paige Spence: Good morning, mayor hales and commissioners. I'm Paige Spence, the

November 16-17, 2016

organization of conservation network directors. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm particularly grateful to city council for continuing to work on mitigating climate change in light of recent national elections which have us very fearful of environmental protection robots under the administration. Ocn is very grateful to the work that has gone into passing the resolution a year ago. First with regard to allowing for the 10% expansion we appreciate you looking at this to in order to limit the potential expansions and we support your proposed package of amendments mayor hales. Second I will ask that you exempt new facilities less than 10,000 gallons. We urge you not to include a blanket exception for facilities under 2 million gallons. Third, please continue to reject northwest national's effort to be exempted. I'm exciting to see the positive results. Thank you for all your work to make this possible. I want to thank our groups. 350 Pdx, Portland Audubon, Columbia keeper, climate action senate for sustainable climate, oec and elcd. Tons of great work. Thank you.

Hales: Good morning.

Alona Steinke: My name is Alona Steinke, a retired teacher from there. Increasing the number of unit trains not only would increase the likelihood of derailment and explosion it also increases toxic and cancer producing. Mortensen Wyden and Merkley and congressman Blumenauer have referred to Portland's air pollution as a public health emergency. In Vancouver in Clark county we have failed air quality standards and last year we came within one bad air day of being declared noncompliant. Our Columbia river is the second most endangered in the U.S. The haze in the gorge is the worst in the western United States. The city of Vancouver has an ordinance that only addresses oil. Now you're a real climate leader by adopting a more comprehensive ordinance. You have set an example for the cities of Vancouver, Hoquiam and Whatcom county. You have already captured international attention by your bold action. Canadian members of parliament Elizabeth May has also addressed your resolution. You're leading us to a future where we have clean water and air that doesn't make us sick. A future safe for our children, our grandchildren and generations beyond. Thank you for supporting amendment 6.

Hales: Thank you all.

Hales: Good morning.

Micah Meskel: Thank you, council and mayor. My name is Micah Meskel I'm with the Audubon society of Portland, also a steering committee member for the natural hazard mitigation planning process. Plus, the terminals themselves. I appreciate the current set of amendment many times and would like to expand on what the presentation last week that was given. I would like to make a couple of points. The vulnerability is a big deal. Most of that was put in place before building codes and it is a ticking time bomb. We think that bolsters argument to remove the 2-million-gallon threshold for new facilities. We think adding any new infrastructure to that hub is a big mistake. Those new facilities are still vulnerable to explosions from the facilities that have not been upgraded. Because of the close proximity of that area and likelihood that it can all slosh into the river in the event of an earthquake. We think putting any new infrastructure there is only adding to that issue. Then one point Jonna may have been reluctant to advocate on but I will as a committee member speak up to is the need for bds fire and pbem to be adequately supported in the process of moving down to Salem to adjust the -- to look into proposals regarding building codes. They need proper staffing for that. They also need the political support of council. We think that's paramount in taking this process to actually looking at how we can really add safety to our community to requiring seismic upgrades.

Hales: Thank you very much. Good morning.

Mary Peveto: Thank you for this opportunity. I'm here with neighbors for clean air to support mayor your package of amendments particularly 6 and 1 through 4 with also the

November 16-17, 2016

consideration considerations for five already spoken to. In 2010 when we started to look at air toxicity it didn't take long to get to the tank farm on highway 30. There are seven companies, they include eight terminals and have a total capacity of 300 million. They admit just the storage tanks sitting there emit 1394 tons annually of volatile debris and compounds. For us it's the embodiment of the disconnect between ideals that have brought us to a 19% reduction in carbons and the state of our regulations which are caused by air pollutants which have only served to mimic federal regulations, antiquated federal regulations. This has put people in harm's way and are innovative and continue progressive infill in our cities and growth is just putting more people in harm's way. I have further testimony as the backdrop of obviously supporting. I think we have got to use every lever that we have to eliminate, to get rid of this dangerous juxtaposition. For its existing threat and for the future threat and catastrophic earthquake. I would also like this opportunity to give an opportunity for us to put a plug into your group to empower your representatives of the city of Portland's representative on the cleaner air Oregon advisory committee Susan Anderson so that she can help us maximize the authority the state has through errors omissions regulatory jurisdiction to modernize, to do what they need to do, to meet the ideals of our 21st century of goals and ideals.

Akash Singh: Good morning. I'm a student fellow at the institute of sustainable solutions and also in conjunction with neighbors for clean air. I am strongly in support of this entire proposal especially amendments 1 through 4 and number 6. Last weekend an industry representative invited me to a barbecue. It was darkly amusing that he imagined that he was part of the meet. Speaking of someone who is a part of that meet I cannot underscore for every individual who strives to make this world a more equitable place. A good chunk of that is in regards to environmental justice. From the effects of climate change we can protect everyone else. I believe today in part we can prove Portland has a reputation of being a liberal icon that is truly a beacon of hope. I choose to believe my elected city officials will stand with the basic scientific truth and existence of this planet for days to come. I beseech you to listen to the voice of our communities. Critical danger that fossil fuels pose to their existence. We cannot afford to ignore their concerns. The governor is holding her 80th birthday this year. I hope you will make sure that we reduce or possibly eliminate our dependence on fossil fuels. Today item implore you to use your offices to protect the citizens that put you there, to protect the power bestowed upon you with their votes. I implore you to stand with the planet in its greatest time of need. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you all.

Peter Wilcox: Good morning. Thank you, mayor hales, other commissioners. Nice to see you. I'm captain peter Wilcox, president of the Columbia river keeper. I'm also a co-founder and owner of sequential biofuels which for 15 years has made certified biodiesel who for 15 years has made over 8 million gallons a year from recycled food processing oil. Fully reclaimed product. This is a clean and low carbon biodiesel which can turn even Volkswagen tdies into true green vehicles. We and Columbia river keeper and I can see no reasonable justification for the proposed 10% storage tank expansion and I'm glad to hear about amendment 6 and we're glad to support that amendment. Form fuel use has been flatter and declined for many years in the policy we passed a while back was to make sure that continues and accelerates. The gradual market penetration of electric vehicles and increasing bio fuel mileage of newer vehicles will ensure this. Furthermore, there's a massive worldwide growth in the clean biofuels industry as well as a dirty biofuels industry that we have to be careful of including cost effective methods to make a biodiesel renewable vehicle that can be used in absolutely any diesel engine seamlessly, without any blending. The blending issue is its on its way from technology standpoint and development in the field of bio based fuel and lubricants. That's already happening in

November 16-17, 2016

diesel but it's going to happen in the gas arena as well. They are now make bio based fuels and lubricants around the world from cellulosic weight. The big prize is algae. Of course we have a global explosion of that. Overprotection of algae around the world. Oceans because of warming will create an opportunity to make an awful lot of bio based fuels in the future. One of the most important aspects of the new policy is as the first example anywhere is that it will be utilized as you said as a template around your world, around the country for policy and so we want to make sure the policy is the best one possible. I think you're now on track to do that so I support that. Thank you for your time.

Hales: Thank you very much. Good morning.

*****: I will defer to ms. Weber.

Patricia Weber: Well, thanks you. Good morning. I'm Patricia weber. I would like to thank you for allowing me to testify. I strongly support amendment 6 and urge you to adopt it. The reason is simple. Seismic upgrades of buildings and other facilities is not under the purview of land use code planning provisioning; they are regulated by building codes. My professional background includes working for over 20 years as a licensed professional engineer in Oregon as well as ten years in the land use planning profession. My experience is working as a private sector consultant though I have sat on both sides of the desk, so to speak. The purpose of land use planning is to develop vibrant and sustainable communities in a way that meets policies of the comprehensive plan. Beyond that regulations that apply are developed to promote capability between properties and their neighbors. Factors such as basic site design, impacts on traffic, parking, odors, so on are to be considered. Land use planning regulations traditionally stop at the exterior of the building or facility. Given the testimony that you received indicating that a 10% incentive would be ineffective testimony that jibes with everything in my professional experience and that the public testimony overwhelmingly rejects the 10% expansion, the appropriate mechanism by which to address seismic resiliency is through pbm and the state building codes revisions.

Ted Gleichman: Good morning. Ted Gleichman today representing the Oregon sierra club. I gave copies of my testimony to the council staff. Also in collaboration with Gregory Monahan, who spoke with you last week right after the amazing teenagers.

Hales: Tough act to follow.

Gleichman: Exactly. On the other hand, as grandparents, Gregory and I and a huge percentage of the membership of sierra club feel strongly about the opportunities for everybody's grandchildren going forward and we really appreciate all the work you've put in. So what I have provided you with is the three open letters that we prepared, one last week submitted as testimony in writing, then one today focusing on looking into 2017 and beyond. The continue was improvement challenge for these issues. We of course associate ourselves with all the comments you've heard so far. I knew that engineer weber would provide us with an excellent assessment of the fact that there's really no true connection between seismic upgrades and fossil fuels use. It's a difficult and complex issue but you are experts on what's coming with the earthquake. So I know that this is an issue that is going to go well into the future. Beyond the direct really first rate work that you're doing right now. So three quick points from today's proceedings it's standard for agencies, I worked in municipal government for a long time -- to see things in a policy framework. The word emergency is not used often enough in this situation because it's generally such a slow motion catastrophe in terms of climate change, the earthquake is an emergency the likes of which none of us has ever seen and won't see it until we see it, then the new one that I referenced in my testimony, 2017 federal energy policy which as we know and was commented on at length will be disastrous. I think as you're working with community stakeholders referencing this triple catastrophe set of emergencies is very

November 16-17, 2016

helpful. Second, business as usual versus just responsibility for transition is very difficult for all of us. We're creatures of habit. I would urge you to think about that systematically going forward, especially with large enterprises and other stakeholders. Finally, bps and psc have done amazing work. I want to make life slightly more difficult for director Anderson by proposing the third item, amendment 4, the three-year report back, I would suggest should be looked at as a milestone, not a solution. And there's no reason, for example, that every building permit pulled in relationship to fossil fuels could not be posted. In a notification structure I get notifications every time there's a crash on the sunset highway. Once in a great while that matters a great deal to me. Same sort of modern tool structure could be used to improve the basic communication practices. Thank you.

Hales: Good suggestions. Thank you.

Charles Johnson: I want to thank the city for -- for the record Charles Johnson, Oregonians for food and shelter sanity, a very different than organization than Oregonians for food and shelter. I think that we have talked about 10% incentive cap is not going to work. What we have before us is pretty good. If the amendment with the three-year report that passes we don't need to change it here but in general terms I'm addressing only one of you that's going to be here in two months let alone two years, but when we restrict other people we should also talk about doing our best. So we also need to know how well the city is moving from fossil fuel powered vehicles to zero emissions vehicles. So it won't be part of Charlie Hales' legacy but the city should look to codify ways that we are working to wean ourselves off the poison is that fossil fuels. People talked about being able to lease an electric car, zero emissions vehicle, for under \$140 a month. In Portland we want to make sure the state holds governor Brown to the highest standards, better than in regard to nestle bottled water in the gorge that we move to the electricity that's powering these cars is the cleanest possible energy, not coal based. Some concern about hydro, grow wind and solar. When you pass amendment 4 and we report back I hope that everyone will keep in the discussion our own personal responsibility to match what we impose on that stinging fossil fuels industry.

Jonah Majure: I work on saavie islands. Honestly, you three are going to be dead by the time climate change starts to impact my generation. Even with no new infrastructure even with the Paris agreements we're still going to face an absolute climate catastrophe, especially in the global south. We'll see a lot of climate refugees coming here because of that. Unfortunately, clean fuels is something we're talking about today and that has actually made it easier for frack sources of fuel like gas and Bakken oil to come into our city, our state, and I don't really think that's something we should even be talking about today. I don't really see why we're fooling ourselves about just a 10% expansion if Donald Trump is going to be president we're going to see massive amounts of extraction even after the Obama administration has increased extraction across the country. He's president entirely because Democrats and liberals weren't progressive enough, not standing up for social justice, for environmental justice. Honestly I'm seeing a pretty different response here today than we saw just a few weeks ago during the police contract vote. I think that really shows the kind of privileges that the environmental community is afforded. Who are the police unions going to listen to when the vast majority supported Trump and many police officers supported Trump? They have all the military gear built up by not only you all but the Obama administration. Now we're seeing them cracking down on protesters, instead of actually investigating hate crimes and systemic violence. What we need to be doing is focusing on our rights to protest, our rights to fight for a livable future for everybody. Since we're here because of the shell no protest that you all cracked down on a year ago it's really important to recognize there's always a time for protests. We need to be going to

November 16-17, 2016

actually dismantle all the fossil fuel infrastructure we have as quickly as possible by creating a just transition for workers, for people in our communities who have been disenfranchised by the fossil fuel economy. Making sure they have unionized jobs, safe energy, safe transit and safe agriculture. Most importantly we need to make sure that we're continuing to listen to tribes. Those who are living here on unseeded lands we need to make sure we recognize all of the treaties and needs of the indigenous peoples of this area. I really don't think the city has been doing that. Now is the time for local and state governments to be using all the tools in the pool box whether it's eminent domain or mutual aid to make sure we're able to resist a trump presidency and increased extraction. Thanks.

Hales: Thank you. Good morning.

Lightning: Good morning. I'm lightning. I represent lightning watchdog pdx. If we continue to incentivize fossil fuel industry and they are going to continue to make a tremendous amount of profits they are going to continue to do what they are doing, we need to again focus on a carbon tax. We need to have an understanding that they have a hidden subsidy of about 5.3 trillion per year. The incentives to do fossil fuels is so great right now they are going to continue to do it. One of the issues I see along the riverfront we had the superfund cleanup there. We need to remove these storage tanks off the river. We need to understand they don't need to be there. They should have never been placed there. We need to work with these companies and consider somehow, some way to buy them out and get them out of there. We're not doing that. We know if there's a major earthquake we'll have serious problems. We already have a superfund cleanup that in my estimate will go over 10 billion. Everybody wants to talk 800 million. You're in fantasy land. The amount of money it will cost to clean this river is so great we need to remove those storage tanks from the rivers. Plain and simple, another issue that I have is that we need to keep understanding that we all talk about going electric vehicles. Well, elon musk is an intelligent individual. Very smart man, but the reality is he can tell you too it's going to take many, many, many years and he's building his battery storage facility one and he predicts to go out 10, 20, 30, 40 of those facilities. That's going to take many years before you go sustainable. The reality is we need to phase it in. The reality is we need to do a serious carbon tax. Realty is it's going to take tremendous amount of time but there should be nothing on these rivers if we have a serious disaster that can flow contaminants into this river like we have done for the last 50-plus years that was allowed. We have to stop that now. Discontinue that now. Quit sitting there and going, well, we'll just keep you from expanding. That's not good enough for me. We need to talk to these companies and say what's it going to take for you to remove these tanks off the river? We already have a superfund cleanup in front of us. Now what are you going to do to us? As far as president-elect trump, get ready, Paris agreement, get ready, fracking. He's going to come in here in a whole different direction and you better get ready at this time.

Hales: Thank you all very much. I think that completes our signup sheet. We have a student here who we always make exceptions for students.

Hales: Yes. Come on up, please.

Hales: We began this hearing with students. It's appropriate you get the last word. Thanks for being here this morning.

Liel Voss: Dear mayor and commissioners. My name is liel. As more and more pipelines and trains and barges carry toxic coal, oil and gas to where it gets burned and animals and people are dying of the effects of global warming, you heard a lot of kids speak last time to stop adding more fossil fuels. I know you might think we are just kids who don't understand all the decisions and details that adults have to make, but think about who might be wiser here. Kids who have everything to lose in this world or the adults who got us in this mess

November 16-17, 2016

in the first place. We waited too long already. We need to stop using fossil fuels as quickly as possible. Please vote for no building new tanks or pipelines or anything that carries fossil fuels for any reason. Please, please listen to us and vote for the strongest law you can. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you. We make exceptions -- [applause] before we take action on the amendments I do want to clarify the issue that came up about amendment 5. That is does it properly cover the potential for a coal terminal here which is obviously something we were trying to make sure we didn't have happen. I understand that existing language may do the job but let's get that on the record and clarify that.

Armstrong: So under the language and we looked at it in response to that testimony, it would be possible for an existing fossil fuel facility to store coal. You could not have a new one come in, but if an existing tank farm wanted to start to remove tanks and have piles of coal on it, they could. Those existing facilities are from two to 40 acres so much smaller in site size than what we see in terms of the proposals for coal terminals elsewhere. But it would be limited -- the opportunity there is limited to the existing terminal under the current language.

Hales: It's not our intent to allow conversion of oil facilities to coal facilities. I'm certain of that. So is the use of the word tank sufficient to ensure that that won't happen or do we need to add language?

Armstrong: I would recommend that you actually look at amendment 6 which is where you were headed, and that to paragraph a, you just add a phrase at the end there, a new sentence that says storage of coal is prohibited.

Hales: So moved.

Fritz: Second.

Hales: We'll further amendment 6 to include that provision.

Fritz: The concern about pipes and if you had a big enough pipe you could essentially be moving more oil through.

Armstrong: In terms of turnover.

Fritz: Yes.

Armstrong: You know, I think they brought up in testimony that the pipeline regulations tend to be more in the federal realm, and at least right now the city and bds, we don't really regulate the amount of throughput. It's an issue we heard at the psc, and I guess it was beyond what we were looking at through this project in terms of is it a bigger pipe or how much turnover or throughput comes through these facilities. The pipe is -- it would represent a major investment to rebuild and expand the pipeline from Puget sound down to Portland and from Portland to Eugene. There would be a whole bunch of federal permitting involved as part of that process.

Hales: Again in term of there was some good testimony today about this is our zoning code, this is about that piece of land and that piece of land, so it's not the right tool to affect the pipeline issue. We may or may not have adequate state or federal regulation but it wouldn't be in this part of the law.

Fritz: So that's something we may want to look at again. I wouldn't like to just not storage it's just not a big enough pipe and loading stuff directly onto ships maybe we can consider that in our process. Thank you.

Hales: Other questions? Let's take a vote on the amendments package. Sorry as further amended by our last amendment about the coal issue. Sorry.

Novick: Appreciate all the testimony and the mayor's efforts. Aye.

Fritz: Once again I'm very proud of our community, proud to be one of your commissioners to do this partnership. Thank you for the bureau of planning and sustainability director Anderson and all the folks who worked very hard on this. We're not

November 16-17, 2016

done. We have to continue looking for ways that we can support our planet, support our community, make sure things are safe and we move as quickly as possible to renewable energy. I was struck by the Leah talking about it's our generation that has passed on many of these big problems and I'm thinking back to where we stopped using hairspray and banned Styrofoam which was at the time thought to be avant-garde and do the trick. Obviously we know that's not the case let's make many more changes in our lifestyles, we expect many more changes in our lifestyles as well as our approaches. Thank you, mayor, for leading this. I'm very appreciative of the amount of time you have put into this work. Aye.

Hales: Let me start with some thank yous. Elected leadership matters and I'm proud of ours but having excellent public administrators and staff matters as well. If it weren't for Susan Anderson and Michael and Tom Armstrong we wouldn't be where Portland is today. Susan has been an author of many of our path-breaking policies and her team turned it into real work that then become law and shapers of our city. I commend you all. Zach on my staff has been a fervent advocate for this and other environmental policies. I know this is a great day for you, Zach Klonoski. Thank you for your work. Let me say a little bit about democracy and Portland's role. We sometimes have people come to this chamber and say, we don't have a voice. That bothers us because we believe people should. Then we have actions like this one where we put something on the table, we developed it to a point we think is right, then the community comes in and says here's how to make it better. That happens in this discussion last week and this week about the 10% threshold or allowance and it happened just today in this fine point about are we really sure we have outlawed coal facilities. I hope you feel affirmed. I always do when the community comes in and helps do it right. At a time when we're worried about democracy, it's still here in Portland. Thank you for being part of that. Thank you to 350 PDX, river keepers, Audubon, all the others who have brought people here as community members to make the case. Secondly, I'm very proud that in the last part of my work in this city I will go from having been a dark brown haired city commissioner adopting the first climate action plan to being the guy I am today doing this, but also that at a time when we're really worried about will cities still be able to lead we'll be able to show that cities do lead. In fact, I will get to carry the message of this action first to the C40 conference in Mexico City, where I think our fellow city leaders from around the world are going to be wondering are United States cities still in there. We are still in it. United States cities that are climate action committees are still in this. We will continue and accelerate the work at the local and partnership level even if we don't have a responsible partner at the federal level and they need to hear that. All those cities, Rio, Sao Paulo, all the other cities need to know that we're still in. We're still responsible, still moving forward. Those are nice words but this will prove that that's true. That's enormously helpful to the credibility of this movement. I started a tradition last year of having all the west coast mayors talk about a couple of issues at the time. We're going to get together in December. I hope Mayor Wheeler when he takes office continues this tradition. Obviously this issue is going to be on the table because we have cities up and down this west that share our belief in the critical importance of climate action at the city level and the ability to work together. There has been a lot of talk about walls lately. I hope that those cities work together to build a green wall along this part of the United States' border that changes what we do and how we live but also changes the world. So thank you all. Proud day for Portland, for me personally. A proud day for all of us who advocate for doing the right thing. Aye. Thank you very much. [applause] thank you all very much.

Fritz: Let the record show that was a standing ovation.

Hales: We're going to take a recess. I want to thank this young lady here.

Hales: Folk we are going to resume the meeting feel free to continue any conversations in

November 16-17, 2016

the hall. For now, we're going to take item 1282.

Item 1282.

Hales: Commissioner Novick.

Novick: Take it away Jonna.

Jonna Papaefthimiou, Portland Bureau of Emergency management: I'm Jonna Papaefthimiou, and I am the planning and communications manager for the bureau of emergency management. I'm very pleased to present for your approval the emergency operations share worker agreement. It says emergency center responders in one jurisdiction can report to the emergency operations center of a different jurisdiction and work there during an emergency if transportation systems are disrupted and they can't report to their normal work location. So this agreement represents the shared commitment of emergency responders across our region to do the most good that we can following a major disaster and reflects the leadership of the regional disaster preparedness organization and collaboration between the city of Portland, Multnomah, Clackamas, Clark, Washington and Columbia counties. Implementation of this agreement will mean creating a shared list of qualified emergency responders who can report to any open emergency center. Workers from a lending jurisdiction will function as contract employees within the borrowing jurisdiction. No jurisdiction is obliged to accept workers nor is any worker obligated to report to another jurisdiction if they do not choose to do so. I would be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

Hales: Makes sense. Questions? Anyone want to speak on this item? Okay. Maybe not. This we cannot act on today so we'll continue this item for council action tomorrow.

Novick: I think it's not an emergency.

Hales: It shows as one on mine. Afraid it is, Steve.

Fritz: It's the kind of thing you wonder why we haven't done this before so thank you for getting it done now.

Papaefthimiou: Thank you.

Hales: Thank you. We'll put this on the calendar for tomorrow as a continued item. 1283.

Item 1283.

Hales: Commissioner Novick again.

Novick: These are funds that are budgeted in Pbot's current fiscal year budget. Pbot is intending to provide the final funds only when there's clear demonstration that there's adequate funds to proceed with the project. They have received \$1.7 million in private donations and Pbot is asking to transfer 500,000 dollars in a onetime donation. Portland Parks Foundation will lead the crossing project including working with stakeholders and we're pretty darn excited.

Hales: Should be. It's great. Anyone want to speak? This moves to second reading next week. 1284.

Item 1284.

Hales: Roll call please.

Novick: Aye **Fritz:** Aye **Hales:** thank you Steve aye.

Hales: 1285 is first and the others are read together, is that right? 1285 is the marijuana in parks issue. Separate. 1285, please.

Item 1285.

Hales: Commissioner Fritz.

Fritz: This is currently there's a park rule that says mere possession of cannabis in a park is an offense and obviously it's not now that it's legal. So Harry Auerbach has been working for this to make sure that our parks ordinances comply with state law.

Harry Auerbach, City Attorney's Office: Yes. After the passage of measure 91, which

November 16-17, 2016

legalizes possession of under one ounce by people over 21, we received concern about trying to enforce prohibition on that in city parks. After discussing the matter, we determined that it really wasn't a matter that concerned health, welfare and safety in parks if people who were otherwise legally entitled to possess it possessed it in an amount that was legal in a container that was closed so we proposed this amendment to conform to the current state law.

Hales: Okay.

Fritz: Like to amend this throughout to change the word marijuana to cannabis. That's a more accurate term.

Hales: Consider that a housekeeping change.

Fritz: We'll be doing it throughout the code.

Hales: Questions for harry? Thank you. Anyone want to speak on this item.

Fritz: A reminder, it's not legal to use these kinds of substances in parks or smoking or using intoxicants. Thank you.

Hales: Second reading next week. 1285. That's a housekeeping change to change marijuana to cannabis in every case. 1286 and 1287 together.

Item 1286.

Item 1287.

Item 1288.

Hales: Commissioner Fritz.

Fritz: The buckman community in Se Portland has been waiting for these improvements to colonel summers park. They are partially paid for with system development charges because it will expand the capacity of the parks and parks development program manager Lauren McGuire will tell us more.

Hales: Good afternoon.

Lauren McGuire, Portland Parks and Recreation: Hello. I'm Lauren McGuire, development program manager. We're here today for the two reasons read, to request council authorization to bid and to amend the contract with dell architecture, llc, in the amount of \$3500 to complete work on the summers gate design project. Results in an increase greater than 25% which is why we're before you today. As you know voters passed in 2014 the \$68 million bond measure to address critical needs without increasing the tax rates. The bond funding goes towards parks' most urgent needs including playgrounds, trails and bridges, pools, facilities for workers, pioneer courthouse square, accessibility, rest rooms and other urgent safety improvements. The summer parks project is to provide safe access to facilities. The existing summer rest rooms are not performing as desired due to increase in age and also accessibility impediments. They are also insufficient and are often supplemented with temporary rest rooms. So today I'm here to talk about the summers project. It has to facets to it. Improvements will provide a new accessibility Portland booth to supplement the currently inaccessible rest rooms. It will remove other identifiable ada barriers identified in the '88 transition plan. We'll be providing new accessible splash pad for the people in the area. We're also providing decorative gates which will improve safety. This project as the commissioner said is funded by both bond funding which pays for the loo and ada, also system development charges playing for the splash pad and decorative gates for the pavilion. You can see in a little more detail the red circle shows the location of the splash pad. The yellow shows the 4300 square feet of barrier free pathways. It's important because this project fulfills a commitment we made to the buckman neighborhood to address some of the chronic issues that were occurring in that area. We have had many meetings with both the buckman neighborhood, office of neighborhood involvement, social service providers and others and came to a plan for the improvements we're doing today. This slide shows what the gates look like, which are

November 16-17, 2016

really beautiful. Decorative security gates that will be going into the pavilion. This is a feature contracted and designed by dow architecture, a minority women owned firm. The second part of our council request is to ask approval for an increase to the current contract amount by \$3500. The increase combined as I said with the previous contract modification is 36% greater than the 25% requested. The original amount was \$26,665. Revised is \$36,275. The increase in cost was primarily because when we went to bid the first time we didn't get any bidders. We had to do more outreach and go to several metal fabricators to get bids, which we got three bids. Those gates will be installed in the spring of 2016. The other improvements by mid-2017. So that's the conclusion of my presentation. If you have any questions I would be happy to answer them.

Hales: Questions? All right, anyone want to speak on these two items? Again, they will carry over to tomorrow. 1286 and 1287. Then 1288 we have already read. Anything further on that one? I got different staff here to talk about that one.

Fritz: This is the one we discussed a little bit in the budget. We have been working for a while to work with the housing bureau to transfer this property from Portland parks and recreation to the housing bureau for development of affordable housing. We're going more into that. It then directs \$1.2 million into the parks memorial fund which I had hoped to allocate more park improvements in east Portland but instead it's been council decided to allocate it to make the match for the fema grant.

Zalane Nunn, Portland Parks and Recreation: Thank you. Good morning. I'll just give you a little background then turn it over to Kurt who can talk about future plans for the site. The mt. Tabor annex, at southeast 68th and stark was occurred in 1979. Since 1994 it has been used by the ymca to run a child care center. The building was built in 1918 and is quickly nearing the ends of its useful life. Needs a lot of maintenance that's expensive to maintain. In 2015 parks following the city's disposition policy determined that we no longer needed this for are our own needs and so we were going to go to the disposition policy and offer it to other bureaus. Turns out that when housing bureau found out we no longer needed it they thought it would be a great place for affordable housing so we have been working with the housing bureau to work out a way to transfer it. So I want to thank Kurt creager and carlton dinklespiel as well as dennis james in parks for their hard work on making this transfer happen. I will turn it over to you.

Kurt Creager, Director, Housing Bureau: Members of council, Kurt Creager, housing bureau. This is a wonderful site for affordable housing. Southeast 60th and stark as you may know has a little bit of a jog on 60th and we'll have to work with pbot on sort of a right of way to perhaps to help correct some throughput issues on 60th. I know Leah treat looks specifically at something much bigger and decided it didn't fit in their budget. We're also mindful this is an important community institution and we want to make sure it's a seamless provision of child care services by the ymca. Their program has been quite successful there. What we have been talking about is procuring a new developer to co-develop approximately 40, possibly 50 housing units with between five and 8,000 square feet of child care space in a new facility. So the y would be embedded in that program. Whomever we procure for development would be so retained with that understanding. So we think it's a win for the neighborhood because it can be continuous level of service. We think it's also an opportunity to help provide some more social equity into the mt. Tabor community that is not all that affordable. We envision this not being targeted to extremely low income people, probably something to develop with low income tax credits. The income spectrum is up to 60% of area median income and we want to work with the neighborhood on the physical design of the property ensuring that their concerns are satisfied.

Hales: This is property north or south of stark?

November 16-17, 2016

Creager: This is on the southwest corner.

Hales: Does the old building get retained?

Creager: Probably not. It's an unreinforced masonry building. Hopefully we can move quickly enough that it doesn't have to be reinforced. You know, I have actually talked with staff about whether or not there's any design elements of the old building that could be integrated because it does have kind of a neat facade but the building itself can't really be retained.

Hales: Can't save them all.

Creager: It's a tough one.

Hales: Other questions? Thank you both very much. We'll see if anyone wants to speak about this. If not, it will also move to tomorrow for action.

Fritz: Thank the director Mike Abbate for being involved in this.

Hales: Watching over us to make sure we do it right. 1289, please.

Item 1289.

Hales: We got certified as a salmon safe city and this is part of that. The water bureau has been working since 2010 on water restoration in the sandy basin, meeting regulatory requirements. Normally governments don't actually create log jams. In this case it makes sense. [laughter] welcome.

Mike Stuhr,, Director, Portland Water Bureau: Yesterday, good morning, mr. Mayor, commissioners, yesterday we had the salmon safe people visit our staff meeting. This is among the more cooler plaques that we have.

Hales: Yes.

Stuhr: It would look good sitting right up there. As far as our benefactors know we are the first salmon safe water utility in the country. This applies to our activities in the city. They decided that since the endangered species act and all were active up in the watershed it doesn't apply there. We're very proud of this. Trying to figure out a good place to put it. What we're here today to talk about is one of our hcp plans, conservation plan programs. I'm joined at the table by Steve Kucas, our Fisheries biologist and project manager for these programs. The habitat conservation plan is extremely important to us. It provides regulatory certainty for the future. If we didn't have a habitat conservation plan every single identifiable project that we do up in the watershed to operate the water system might be subject to nepa documentation and so on, both expensive and time-consuming so I think this was a very wise thing that was done led by our resource protection folks. Most of the habitat measures in the plan are kind of done in the front of the program so that we can make sure that they work. We have to complete most by 2024. Since 2010 when we started executing this program, we have done nine measures in the bull run including minimum flow levels in the bull run river. It's very complicated to do releases from the dams for power and for water use because we have requirements to meet downstream. We have put Fish passage on water creek culvert that Fish can swim through and we have a picture of a salmon swimming upstream not too long after we opened it. We do water temperature control in the bull run river and part of that was the dam 2 tower improvements. We also as part of this conservation plan work in the sandy river basin to enhance over all Fisheries. We have done seven different measures there including conservation easements for habitat conservation measures for placement of large wood structures, which is what we're going to talk about today. We completed a Fish ladder on alder creek, worked with the corps of engineers to remove the sandy river delta dam and have continued to fund what's called the habitat fund, a \$9 million fund used over several years with some of our partners in the watershed area to do habitat projects. The specific project at hand as has been stated is a 2.3 million dollar basically a log jam to create habitat and for salmon and steelhead that are covered under the endangered species act.

November 16-17, 2016

The price, \$2.3 million, total project cost 3 million so about 700,000 for design, contingency and so on and so forth. What I thought I would do was let Steve show you one of these projects. There not only interesting, but the way that there done is really interesting.

Steve Kucas, Portland Water Bureau: Good morning or good afternoon I'm not sure what time it is. What we have one the screen first is you want to know where the project is we're trying to do this project in two locations and the main stump is sandy river ones at Dabney state park and one at oxbow regional park so we're working with a very big system. This is one of the engineered log jams in construction what you don't see down below if you can imagine a series of about 15 to 20 tree trunks that are about 40 feet long and a big root at the bottom. The root was being at the very bottom of that there standing straight up and that the structure skeleton if you would, but we excavate down almost 30 feet to build these things. Then if you can imagine a big tinker toy type of project where the other logs are linked together actually pinned to this structure and then balances added to those and we build those in layers all the way up and then at the very end you only have four pictures I'll show you in the final looking structure. These are truly engineered logjams. We are putting those in the floodplain of the sandy river. They are designed to withstand 100-year floods. A lot of design consideration and forces go into these things, so you may ask, how does this help fish? These structures are just in the floodplain and what they are trying to do is make water go sideways and take a bit of the sandy river flow in the wintertime to activate historic side channels. And that's where the fish, the little guys need to go to get out of the high velocities in the winter, so this is creating habitat that's lacking out there, for fish like chinook salmon, coho and steelhead so that's the focus for the habitat improvements, so the structures create the habitat that they need. So that's it, and in a simply form. These structures could be, as you look down, 60 by 90 feet in dimension. They are quite large. We do fly materials in, sometimes, we double propeller helicopters, an easy way to get things there quickly. And lastly, we want these things to look as natural as they can. They are designed to accumulate other wood and to become obstructions, and again you can how the channel moves around with these things this place, and these are finished engineered logjams in other locations. So that is pretty much what I wanted to describe to respect your time. That's what they looked like.

Hales: Two questions, one is that the sandy river is, you know, is not, has not been channelized or, you know, heavily screwed up by human intervention, you know, in the way some rivers have, so why do we need to create logjams? Why is the river not creating its own?

Kucas: Mayor Hales it has been partially screwed up.

Hales: Ok.

Kucas: When we had the 1964 flood, the corps of engineers and the current thinking, they channelized a tremendous part of it, so they had a lot of habitat and they cut off a lot of the side channels that used to be planned, and this is an attempt to get a lot of that back.

Hales: Ok. And second question, and you can see the question in the background because there is a boat over there so this is a very popular recreational river, and I assume that we are placing these in a way that is not going to create a safety hazard for where there are a lot of drownings and there is a huge amount of recreational use.

Kucas: Yes, sir. And we're working very closely with those two parks. We're planning to put these projects, and this is not a picture on the sandy. Where we're working is out of the most of the boat traffic. We chose those locations with that in mind.

Hales: With the marine board or somebody to figure that out.

Kucas: A serious consideration for boating safety and the other recreational stuff.

Hales: Having been swept under a log once when I was canoeing on the river, I know that there is a danger there.

November 16-17, 2016

Kucas: A serious concern, in the lower ball run we had a fatality for the same reason.

Hales: So how you do this really matters for those folks. Other questions?

Stuhr: One other comment to share, this is a big construction project so the 20% of the total bid amount goes to the disadvantaged minority women owned and emergency, emerging small businesses and 14% of that is dedicated to disadvantaged and minority owned businesses. Suppliers in those categories can also contribute to the construction goal. That concludes our presentation. If you have any more questions --

Hales: I don't have any more questions. Do you have any more questions? Thank you very much. Anyone want to speak on this item? If not, it passes to second reading next week. And we're --

Parsons: Mayor, the director abbate has asked to hear the presentation for 1283 over Burnside.

Hales: Oh, good, yes, please.

Parsons: He's here now.

Hales: All right, let's do that then, please. Let's return to 1283 and hear from the bureau and partners.

Item 1283.

*****: Come on.

hales: Welcome.

*****: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Dan Layden, Portland Bureau of Transportation: Good afternoon, sorry we're late. Or early or whatever we are. I am Dan Layden, the capital program manager for the bureau of transportation, and the ordinance before you today authorizes the bureau to provide 500,000 to the Portland parks foundation, for the foot bridge over the Burnside project, the project will provide a bridge for the wild wood trail over west Burnside, and currently when you use the trail you have to descend down to west Burnside and cross at a difficult location, in order to get across on west Burnside. This will improve the safety of the trail and the road, there is a partnership with significant private financing and pbot is excited to see it move forward and provide a lasting contribution to the project. Jeff Anderson from Portland parks foundation, and mike abate the director are here to talk a bit more about the project, and it will be short and sweet.

Hales: Welcome.

Mike Abbate, Director, Portland Parks and Recreation: Mr. Mayor, mike abbate with the Portland parks and recreation and to say this is an incredible project that has been on our cip list, and of unfunded projects for many years at least since 2008. And it is part of the regional trail system, so in terms of the benefits to all Portlanders this Extends our trails and as you know, building trails is one of the most difficult goals to achieve that was laid out in our 2020 vision, so this is a very significant project. We're so grateful for the parks foundation to bring it to us and say could we help with this, and with that I would like to turn it over to Jeff Anderson, the executive director.

Jeff Anderson: Thanks, mike. Good afternoon mayor hales and commissioners. So I am Jeff Anderson, executive director of the Portland parks foundation, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you a bit about the foot bridge. I think you had been briefed from time to time about our progress, and I will skip some of what I was going to say, given that you all have taken some action on this already. But I would just -- reiterate that this is a locally driven project several years ago, the neighborhood leaders approached the parks foundation to be a part of it, and the steering committee at that time researched various options for trying to remedy the safety issue there, and concluded that a foot bridge, permanent foot bridge elegantly designed was the best long-term solution, perhaps a little more expensive up front, but better in the long run for the city and for the users of the trail.

November 16-17, 2016

Just to briefly recap what's happened in terms of the fundraising, the commitment of 500,000 last year by the city council has really been a galvanizing commitment, and it's already leveraged more than 1.3 million in private contributions, as well as 100,000 from metro. We're working hard to raise the balance, so it's a terrific example of the city funds, inspiring private contributions to put together a public asset like this. When people have heard the city has weighed in that way they are very appreciative, so we are working to complete the fundraising. We will -- we anticipate a crowd funding campaign in 2017, so that the people in the area will have a chance to give small amounts, and increase the breadth of public buy-in. We're looking forward to working closely with the transportation and parks teams, already beginning to do some of that project and implementation, and our goal is to keep the burden on city staff to a minimum and deliver a great turnkey project to the city, and hopefully sometime in 2018. So with that I just say again, thanks to the staff and to you all for the commitment you have shown to this, and I am -- I am happy to answer any questions you might have and Kim Knox from our project management firm is also here in case people have questions.

Hales: Questions or comments?

Novick: No question but I wanted to say I am so glad that you came over here before we adjourned because I thought that it was inadequate for us to pass on this project by just saying we are excited about it, which is what I did 20 minutes. This is a fantastic public-private public Collaboration and I wish you well, raising the remainder of the money but you have gone a long way. This is just fantastic.

Hales: I appreciate the partnership between the bureaus and the parks foundation, which is exactly what the community had in mind when the parks foundation was created, so this is the kind of leverage that we hope that we would get and that Barbara walker in particular would have loved to have seen.

Anderson: Thank you.

Hales: Thank you very much. I appreciate you. This is a great way to end the morning session, so thank you. Great work. Ok. So we're going to recess until 2:00 p.m. [gavel pounded]

Hales: Then we'll be at it for a while.

At 12:41 p.m. council recessed.

November 16-17, 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.

NOVEMBER 16, 2016 2pm

Hales: Good afternoon everyone and welcome everyone to the November 16th meeting of the Portland city council, would you please call the roll? We're going to continue this meeting in a moment. One of our colleagues is ill, the other out of town, we have a quorum, but just barely and we'll continue with that all afternoon and evening. I want to thank you all for coming. For those of you that were on the list for the November 9th hearing that we didn't hear from, you're on the list first. If you had a number from last week we're going to continue to use those numbers. If you didn't sign up the today day, last week, we'll go until four, take a break and come back at 6. We're going to ask you to limit your testimony to 2 minutes just so we can hear from everyone. Obviously my colleagues and I are going to listen carefully to public testimony. We'll have questions with our staff and summarize, so they can begin the nuts and bottles of whatever is going forward in 2017. We have some volunteer commission members present. Any elected officials to speak? I don't think so. No. Okay, and then I think we have landmark commission members here to testify, so we want to honor their enormous amount of volunteer service by letting them go first then we'll move back to the sign up sheet from last week. Land mark commissioners, welcome and come on up.

Kristin Minor: mayor hales and city council members my name is Kristin minor so I'm here to represent the historic landmarks commission. I hope you received a copy of the letter from the landmark commission wrote on this. I'd like to start out by saying that the landmark commission does strongly support increased density across the city by way of internal conversions. We support in historic districts but also across the city, including the east side which is most of the focus from today's hearing. You also are aware that there is a demolition going on. Many of the houses being taken down are older, smaller, they're the most affordable options available in our single family zones. So development is already intense. We believe that pressure will increase as a result of the residential infill project. I realize you can read the recommendation that the landmark commission has in this letter, but I'd like to highlight a couple of them. The first two that is most important that is the increased density should not apply to parcels unless they have been vacant three years or they have houses less than 50 years old. Otherwise we'll see quite a few of these being demolished. The second point I'd like to make is we believe much of what is contained in this report is workable with some tweaks. We're looking for support the opportunities that the bureau of planning and sustainability identified in the internal conversion report to make it easier to add increased units inside housing. The other is to simply add some our community design standards so that new structures going up are compatible. Thank you so much so much for allowing me to come and speak.

Hales: thank you and thanks to the landmark commission coming and letting us take a look at this. Let's return to the list from our last hearing. We have numbers that people had. If you don't remember the numbers, you had you can check with sue. We can start out that way.

Hales: Going by names instead of numbers. That's better.

November 16-17, 2016

Jim Labbe: Hi, I want to talk about the proposal to improve the proposal with respect to trees, but I want to start off by saying generally I understand the concerns anxiety Portland has about change in the city, I've lived here my entire life I've lived all across the city in different types of housing, but I really think this package is important in preserving the character of our neighborhoods particularly with respect to the people living in our neighborhoods, in Portland mixed income neighborhoods and creating those opportunities for that. I think it could be a better proposal and I think -- I would ask the council to ask staff to go back and make changes to allow for the preservation of trees the proposal is actually pretty neutral with respect to trees. It allows conversion of existing structures. Those are slightly tree positive. There are three proposals that the urban forestry has made the title 11 oversight advisory committee basically requested those there was broad support for modifications for adjusting trees among the rip sack as well. It's basically allowing flexibility in those rear setbacks so there's room to accommodate for trees, it's reducing some of the parking requirements to allow more trees or allowing that parking to be in a setback to preserve trees. And then adding trees as a density bonus a unit bonus for tree preservation, large tree preservation. We'd ask you to consider that as well I think addressing these issues around trees is a great way to address some of the anxieties about grown and change in the neighborhoods and I think we need to be thinking about bringing this structure across all types of zoning changes and staff is not going to address these issues unless the council asks them to. Thank you so much.

Fritz: Mayor are we going to two minutes.

Hales: Yes, we are.

Eric Thompson: Thank you. Eric Thompson. I'm a member of the hba and also a member that was on the rip sack. So a special thank you to you Charlie for pulling that together the rip sack of which I Sat on for the last several months.

Hales: Thanks for volunteering, all of you.

Thompson: You're very welcome. I know a lot of the city staff are here today. A very big thank you to them and to the concept report's recommendation. As a building developing and a member of the hba and in addition to the rip sack member I fully support the staff's recommendations that you have in front of you, the concept report. I think it's a testament to mayor hales. This includes several neighborhood associations including 1,000 friends, habitat for humanity, and of course the hba which often times those groups are not on the same side of any issues and I think that speaks very much to the collaboration that came out of the rip sack.

Fritz: I'm sorry can you tell the people at home what hba stands for.

Thompson: The home builders association of Portland. As a builder I can attest to the need for additional housing options that will help address affordability concerns we're all experiencing along with addressing the supply and balance that is currently out there. I can personally say as a builder developer I would take advantage of these new rules which would enable me to build and provide additional houses, smaller houses, and less expensive houses to address the affordability issues that we have in the city. I look forward to working with the city staff via the hba. Wish you well on your next endeavors and appreciate your time and support of the project.

Hales: Thank you, we appreciate the hours that you that the commissioners and all these other volunteers put together.

Doug Klotz: I'm Doug Klotz. I live in the Richmond neighborhood I support the residential infill proposal I also support the Portland for everyone platform and I'm proud to say that the Richmond neighborhood association has endorsed key parts of this proposal as well. I'm not on the board yet, but I should get a letter soon. With climate change unlikely we need to reduce carbon impact. Some have said we already have enough zoning for 20

November 16-17, 2016

years of growth. That is only if every one of those sites is scraped and built on. Builders prefer the areas that are most in demand. I support allowing a house with two adu's on a single family lot and a triplex on corners but I also support an additional unit per lot if it is accessible or affordable. That would add an element that ensures some affordability at least for those sites. I support the modified height limits on house size in r 5 and r 7. I support keeping the height at 35 feet in r2.5 as long as they're attached houses and lower to 30 if they're not. I would not increase the front setback to 10 feet. Or maybe lower it to five. I do not support parking in front setbacks. I think we could easily remove it.

Hales: Thanks very much. Thank you all.

Jory Aronson: Mr. Mayor, members of the council, I've been asked to read the testimony of Jory Aronson who cannot be here today. I'm turning 65 in June. I've had a lucrative career in early childhood education not really. I've scraped by like all early childhood educators. I ran a creative home childcare centers for 10 years. 2-1/2 years ago health issues forced me to rent my house out as a school and go share an apartment with another girl four months later the landlord kicked us out so he could increase the rent. I found an apartment in Southeast Portland and happily lived there a year plus until the landlord sold the building and the new landlord evicted us all. Now I live in my friend's house renting a room, but I can move back in my house the end of June. I've discovered many, many other people my age who have worked hard like me when I get back into my home I have to make a earned income, either by sharing it, adding to it or renting it out and finding an affordable option to myself. I don't have a pension, but my value and contribution to this city speaks for itself. Let's share housing as an online organization full of people like me. We need flexible, low-cost housing I don't want to have contributed my career, my life, my time to Portland only to have to move away from the city I love in my golden years.

Terry Parker: Terry parker, fourth-generation Portlander and a member of the unr steering committee. With a broad stroke of possibilities community overlay zones allowing properties to divide narrow lots that don't require off street parking and with large apartments complexes being build adjacent without on street parking action storing cars on the street long-term on the street is precisely what bps is proposing for nearly the entire inner east side raised by participants at the infill open houses, the city continues to ignore this issue. Off street parking needs to be required to all residents, including for infill on narrow lots. This is an equity issue as it relates to existing homeowners where the context of single family neighborhood homes includes driveways and garages, its also an accessibility issue. Front loading garages need to be optional for required off street parking space. If the garage doors are required to have windows and be weather proofed coupled with the allowance of an 18-foot parking pad between the sidewalk and the house being counted as the off-street parking the garage can also be utilized as a bonus room on the flip side tuck under garages need to be tightly regulated in that all too often they encourage of scale development and plain jane cookie cutter big box houses unbefitting to neighborhoods have their own uniqueness, history. Finally, one size does not fit all. Any application needs to take into account a neighborhood's distinctiveness. Part of that includes the following statement. This would allow each individual neighborhood the opportunity to test the overlay concept. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you. Welcome. Good afternoon.

Jack Bookwalter: Good afternoon. My name is jack Bookwalter and I'm testifying for neighborhoods for reform on the narrow under-sized lots. Many neighborhoods in Portland contain what rip sack calls historical underlying lots which were platted most of them over a century ago. The most common configuration is to have two 25x100 lots that are vested in one standard 50x100 lot. Rip sacks proposal seeks to elevate these undersized parcels

November 16-17, 2016

to the level of legally created, legally buildable lots regardless of present zoning that requires larger lots. Rip sack proposes to further legitimize these under sight parcels in r5 zones in the overlay by rezoning them to r2.5 regardless of where they are in the neighborhood or their immediate context or proximity to transit. And the other factors that we normally consider we are dealing with rezoning including the proposal's own language concerning our 2.5 as a transition from higher densities to lower density areas. Instead, with rip sack we are planning historical accidents. Rip sack's, the state law requires the city to recognize these undersized lots as legal discreet parcels. My attempts to gain legal state laws references from bps staff have been unsuccessful. On my own I found that while city's must recognize historic street parcels for title purposes they still are subject to zoning or any other local regulations indeed I have found luba rulings confirming just this. It would appear the whole legal underpinning of the rip sack proposal needs to be seriously revisited or the concerning undersized lots.

Hales: Thank you all.

Simeon Hyde: I live and own a house in the Multnomah village and I have witness firsthand the reality of the new Portland. Last spring, I rode my bicycle east on division street, southeast from about 10 straight out the fiftieth. I was told that this is a good example of what the new Portland would look like four story apartment buildings sighted next to 100-year-old single story bungalows. This is jarring it cast a shadow over the comparatively little bungalow. The new apartment buildings, many constructed without off street parking filled the surrounding neighborhood with cars. This same physical environment has been created on north Mississippi avenue, lack of street parking can be measured by the constant flood of cars all cruising the main street desperately searching for that one space. The surrounding neighborhood streets quickly fill with non-resident cars, when the issue of parking comes up this city responds by saying citizens will have to give u other cars and depend on public transit, when public transit is asked about their plan they respond they do not have the finances necessary to extend transit hours on existing lines never mind establishing new routes. The end result is the city is failing in its attempt to deliver well thought out complete plan for the development of the city. Analogy comes to mind of a jigsaw puzzle missing critical key pieces. I see three key pieces missing from the proposed plan. Number one, interface new buildings with existing ones. Parking, and number 3 would be public transportation. It is time for the city planners to slow down and take a critical look at what they created so far and objectively categorize what has and what has not worked well. The winter presentation has shown us what has been done well in our towns and should be used as primary reference by city planners. Why not hire Mr. Winter and his company allow to consult us on planning efforts? The citizens of Portland deserves a well thought out plan on that keeps a high livability factor as a prime objective.

Susan King: Good afternoon. I'm Susan king. My neighborhood has different housing types from small 800 foot bungalows built in 1921 to 3000 both old and new homes. We have some duplexes on corner lots as is now allowed. It's an r7 zone which supports trees, gardens and places for families to play and live in. We heard a lot about housing choice, but I want to make the point that I support my own housing choice. While I support of housing choice, this proposal is an overlay form of taking without consideration of impact, loss of predictability, effect on price point of all types of housing, lack of infrastructure, including sidewalk, et cetera. The city staff continue to say that this doesn't change the zoning which is dishonest in my opinion. This rampant liberal use of the overlay is exactly that. I attended one meeting in the summer and responded to the online survey. I would refer to a very well thought out report by a group calling themselves rip sack seven to further describe the concerns I have. Nothing in this set of proposals talking about affordability, guarantees or even addresses it real estate is embedded in a market

November 16-17, 2016

economy and that will not be affected by these proposals despite the proponent's assertion or desire. My final comments are I strongly oppose the quarter mile high density along corridors, the map is not clear enough to read that distance would encompass a home that own on a 7,000 square foot lot and many other single family homes. I would add that proposal was made in the southwest community plan a decade ago and was resoundingly rejected. High density on the corridor which is a part of this plan is appropriate and is already occurring along Beaverton Hillsdale highway. Although services and transit are very limited. I oppose the cluster development with adu's this is beyond reasoned and would significantly destroy neighborhoods that have lots to accommodate the number of units.

Hales: Susan, I want you to wrap up.

King: I want to make a final point. I did provide written testimony last week, but I do want to talk about parking. Nothing specifically related to this proposal, but many of us work and invest in this community and we have to drive our cars to do that. We need cars for livelihood and daily life and the use of mass transit is not a reality for a large portion of our population. There's already an alarming high density without adequate parking finally in southwest Portland as many of you know we don't have the luxury of sidewalks. I grew up in southeast Portland where we did. If we don't require parking we end up with cars parking on both side of the street, which makes our streets far more dangerous. I strongly urge you to reject this report in favor of a much more limited experiment with the so called middle housing I'm not exactly sure what that is and a proposal that is consistent with current zoning codes and the will of affected neighborhoods and small businesses. Thank you.

Hales: Good afternoon. Welcome.

Arlene Williams: I'm Arlene Williams. I live right next to fourplexes, duplexes and triplexes. I don't mind middle housing. What I do mind is too much middle housing that can completely consume a block. These proposals do not have any mechanism to limit the amount of middle housing in single-family zone and that could lead to unintended consequences. Dead end streets are inherently dangerous because there is only one way out. During a fire or gas explosion people can get trapped. That is why dead-end streets are treated differently in the code to ensure public safety. Last spring the council voted to not make our street r 5 blocks on my street to r2.5. The street doesn't meet the far code and it already has twice the density of the dwelling units recommended for dead-end streets in chapter 33.654 of the code. The unintended consequence of the rip overlay would be to add to this street the potential for more than three times the 18 recommended unites in the code it's not safe to do that. I have 15 signatures on the street. We oppose the rip proposals as drawn. I have a few ideas. Do you have the money to pay for the added strains on city resources from all that density? Will demolitions unfairly target the less after affluent neighborhoods? As the economic analysis might suggest such as my neighborhood, south Woodstock, where modest homes on historically narrow lots will probably be lost and finally, is there no way to find a way to cap the number of allowed new duplexes per block to help contain the neighborhood character. I have some ideas in my gem comments my testimony. I don't know if they're workable but try to consider a way to make it really a good mix of middle housing and not just a runaway development.

Joel Shaper: Thank you. Good afternoon my name is Joel shaper and I come before you today in voice against the overlay plan in its present form. I've lived in Multnomah in the maple neighborhood where my family has since 1954. The year I was born in 1970 the majority of the west hills was annexed into Portland as most of you know and except for the unincorporated presenarys we have today, today annexing continues for example west Hayden we want to annex also to the city. My first issue is last week we heard testimony

November 16-17, 2016

from a developer backs for this overlay plan pre-1950 existing zoning. That is one of the main reasons for rezoning. In that thought process most of the areas annexed post 1950 weren't including in that planning or development and design process. In this overlay I don't think it considers any of that if all the neighborhoods that were developed post that and didn't want the infill that's why they were developed outside of those areas. I would really like the council to think of these matters, I would also like them to consider there's no consideration in this plan for the urban forest and that was last week was testified to we continue to cut down our old growth trees and do not replace them. Our standards for replacing them is with root controlled trees that grow into a certain height, which doesn't actually -- it makes us a city of a nursery. That's not what I grew up with and that's not why my parents had moved here in 1954. I moved to west hills because I think most people understand you couldn't buy property; as colored folks accept in areas like that. Just means a lot to me the way things are going. I work in construction and I don't believe after a year's process we should have no coding that could be related to what you're wanting to enforce. This whole plan should be complete long before you vote. If this process goes forward, there can be adjustments made. I just don't think in its present form its good. And to your answer last week commissioner Novick I don't think people when they're developing the 700,000-dollar home and there developing two 204,000 homes I truly believe what is happening is homes being bought up for 550 cash. I've seen it over and over in our neighborhoods. Kid are trying to buy homes, they're 35, they're not going to have the money for a down payment. Just be realistic with the numbers you're dealing with. This is not a plan for affordability. Thank you for your time.

Hales: Thank you so much.

Soren Impy: I'm Soren Impy and I'm a tenant's rights organizer and also involved in transition advocacy, but I'm not testifying on behalf of the organizations I work with. I'm testifying as almost a 17-year resident of se Portland the buckman neighborhood I have rented a one-bedroom apartment in this neighborhood the entire time I've lived in Portland and so I want to talk a little about the character in my neighborhood 80% of the people who live in buckman rent and this cohort comprises almost all of the lower income residents in my neighborhood based on census data. I personal, I'm not lower income, but I live in a five-plex. Most of these people have arrived there many years. People who rent actually have a longer tenure than the people that live in homes the character of my neighborhood represents the types of housing that are now illegal under the status quo and would still be illegal under the proposal advocated by the rip stock seven. I'm talking about duplexes, small apartment buildings, garden court apartment buildings, et cetera. So I support the psc version of the rip sack proposal. Portland is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis. Eviction, involuntary eviction is one of the largest contributors to houselessness so in addition to a tenant bill of rights and regulation Portland develop needs affordable recently units and we need them in the short term, not 30 years from now. To addressing the critical need, I call the city to increase the number of affordable bonus units for duplex and triplexes.

Hales: I want you to wrap up.

Impy: I'm almost done. Owner occupied homes are not really affordable housing. These units sell quickly, they're expensive. So I think we need additional incentive. The market really is not enough to encourage diverse and affordable housing. I have a couple final points. I also would like to urge the council to not include any parking minimums because of the effect of parked minimums on affordability.

Hales: Thank you so much.

Madeline Kovacs: My name is in Madeline Kovacs. I'm the coordinator for Portland for everyone. I want to thank the landmark commission for their excellent testimony and say

November 16-17, 2016

we agree that proposal before you that it is generally headed in the right direction and with some tweaks which we're excited to talk about with both them and restore Oregon. It's really interesting actually how much we have in common including incentivizing adu's conversions things not included in the johnson economics report that are actually as important as part of the proposal. The internal conversions report is another fantastic assets if you haven't read it yet, one of the things I learned from it is that 90% a renovation that preserves 90% of the structure should not be classified the same as a renovation that demolished 90% of a structure. We he really need to think in terms in that level of detail. First a quick summary of what the proposal before you does currently. It reduces instances of demolition by limiting scale of new constructions, it outlaws one to one replacement of existing homes with enormous ones, and it can do better in those ways. It re-legalizes a few small scale missing middle housing options in Portland's oldest and walkable neighborhoods in some places. We agree with this general direction we think the proposal could go a lot further, first missing middle housing type proposed needs to be allowed in all neighborhoods. East Portland should be allowed to become walkable and transit enabled and homeowners everywhere should be able to down size in their own communities or offer a unit to friends and family. Two, we should provide not only more affordable options, but also offer nonprofits and others a bonus unit or bonus size if they can provide permanently affordable housing to Portland residents. Three, the city should take the tsteps outlined to make such undertakings the easier. Four, though currently neutral on both we need to make sure that tree preservation is present.

Hales: Thank you. You've submitted that in writing I hope?

Kovacs: Oh, yeah. Welcome.

Ellen Gentry: Good afternoon. I'm Ellen Gentry and I want to balk today about the effects that the middle housing proposals would have on the quality of life in some of our neighborhoods. The southwest neighborhood lie in the midst of an urban forest with tall trees, gardens and landscaping. It's very disturbing to think about the elimination of plant life and habitat that these proposals would bring about. What my neighborhood the Multnomah neighborhood is particularly unsuited to the proposed increase in density our streets are not maintained by the city, they are narrow and in very poor condition. Because there are no sidewalks, residents use these streets to walk on. On any given day you'll see people walking, walking their dogs. Many of us use these streets to go into Multnomah village or to bus stops in the neighborhood. Converting to the multiple unit model would bring in many more people and the additional cars that come with them clearly that would create an unsafe situation for pedestrians on these streets and the neighborhood would no longer be the walkable area we have enjoyed. My husband and I chose this neighborhood because of the availability of public transition and we took the bus here today as we always do when we come downtown, I fear that we will no longer be able to safely access bus transportation if it means walking on street clogged with traffic and cars. The infrastructure in our neighborhood works well for the city family model that we have had, but it is not suited to increase density. It's hard to understand why a neighborhood of this kind would be targeted when there are SW areas where increased density would be appropriate, Barbur Boulevard is an area that needs a face lift in my opinion is a road that stretches from terwilliger to Tigard and has been identified for lightrail and other transportation. Another factor is metro's projection that 53% of the jobs will not be within Portland. I acknowledge that Portland needs more housing options, but I sincerely hope that the increased development will be done in areas that can handle the traffic, thank you.

Houston Markley: thank you. My name is Houston Markley. Thank you for the opportunity to allow me to speak on behalf of southwest neighborhoods and against the residential infill proposal. This is my wife, by the way. I live in Multnomah neighborhood up until three

November 16-17, 2016

or four years ago the Multnomah village was an affordable middle class neighborhood many retirees and senior citizens purchased homes their homes which on average are around 1500 square feet. They were not only interested in affordability, but also the beauty, walkability, mature trees and rich urban ecosystem which exist in SW Portland. Homebuyers often cite that the urban forest was the primary reason they moved into the neighborhood. Senior citizens in our area enjoying caring for the environment, the mature trees, gardens, butterflies, beehives and chickens. Not only is this a benefit to our own personal well-being, it's also a benefit to the city. Many persons in their 70s and '80s who own homes in this area. I've provided pictures of homes within a couple blocks of where I live of people who are in their 60's, 70s and 80s and own these homes. Retirees live in all of the homes on the block we live. All are between 1500 and 1800 square feet, all on 10,000 square foot lots, filled with trees, fruit trees, gardens, beehives and a variety of related habitat. All the owners would like to live and die on these properties. If one of those properties is sold, even under the current zoning and even you under the rip sack proposal, the lot would likely be split, two 2500 square foot houses will be built two duplexes, adu's ect.. when this happens the trees, gardens, the bee's go. I'm wondering if the proponents of rip sack fully understand the health of the mature tree canopy. How many tons of air pollutants are trees removing from the air in Portland? A recent university of Chicago research study indicates having 10 more trees on average improves health perception in ways comparable to being seven years younger. Quoting from the just published urban forest, the natural history of trees and people on the American cityscape trees nature's largest and longest lived creation plan extraordinarily important role in our cityscape. They are the dominant component of what is now called green infrastructure defining space mitigating storm water, cooling the air, soothing our psyches and connecting us to nature and our past if you approve this infill plan can Portland legitimately call itself a green city, thank you.

Hales: I think you're first.

Janet Baker: My name is Janet baker. I live in northeast Portland. I think in the best of all worlds I would be telling you to start this rip process over. Do it the way Ms. Winters described the work he's doing in I.a. and other cities facing similar density pressures, they approach the infill code changes by carefully considering contextual differences among neighborhoods. If you aren't familiar with his work, I've included a link to the October 17 materials that he presented in Portland. For whatever reason Portland. It's a completely different approach from the one size fits all approach that we've taken here, but for whatever reason Portland didn't choose this route. Politically and financial I serious doubt if you're going to throw out the work that's been done. So let's look at a few of the issues that have come up on questions the others have asked. We know there's a lot of questions about affordability and how we can create them given the underlying cost of land. If you tear it down or build two or three houses, it's questionable how the math is going to work. Part of the problem is we really have very little modern experience in Portland with middle housing. I'm going to skip through some of this, I think we need to see new middle housing and how it can possibly fit in contextually to existing neighborhoods. I could go on and on about what we don't know in Portland and how little this rip sack plan answers any of those questions, but I'd run out of time. I want to talk about unr supports. Besides the conversions of existing homes one of the things we've talked about in our group is doing a pilot study in this study the city would carefully need to analyze the costs resulting from the demolition existing homes and construction of new houses that are proposed in this bps proposal, so the analysis that needs to be done is how much materials is sent to the landfill how much is reused, what are the lead and asbestos issues associated with the demolitions. What kind of housing gets built, do the proposed changes in math really

November 16-17, 2016

work? What's the impacts of neighborhoods not requiring off street parking? What are the actual construction costs for these kinds of units and how affordable are the resulting units? I would propose we do similar designs for some of the middle housing. Why would we have it in hopefully some of the neighborhoods are most supportive of the plan may come forward in part of their neighborhoods. The big leap from what the plan is right now to something that can be converted to code. Possibly testing some of these ideas in a pilot study would give us answers to some of those.

Hales: I'm going to ask you --

Baker: Yeah.

Hales: Thank you very much.

Hales: I just want to play back that point you just made, which is we're certainly hearing from folks that are saying this is fine, like it is, we're hearing from people saying drop this, it's no good at all. Those are choices and what we're going to do in this council while Steve and I are still here is take a look at everything heard, everything proposed and send that in some direction forward. What you're doing and I like this, I like that to me is going to be most helpful. I'm inclined to send some version of this forward. We improved our fossil fuel ban because people came forward and said they didn't want this or that so I would encourage unr and other organizations or individuals that are in this discussion to keep over the course of the time that the hearing record is still open and we'll figure out when that is here this afternoon to keep that coming because I think that's at least where I'm inbound client to go. The pilot project approach, I guess I would push back a little bit. I would say we're doing that right now. So I don't think the pilot project we're conducting now is a success. It also is impossible to take old houses and make them into multiple units within the walls of the historic structure which I believe as a preservationist we should allow more often. I think I share that belief with unr. We have a lot of agreement about where we go.

Edward Barrow: Thank you. I live in north Portland --

Hales: I'm sorry, just put your name back in the record.

Edward Barrow: Hi, my name is Edward barrow. I live near Rosa parks away in an area that is completely, the streets around me, are all zoned r 5. Strangely my street extends there's a little bump-out that extending the r 1 d zoning on to my block. Everyone on my block is a single family home. An empty lot sold right next to my home and the gentleman that bought the lot had told the People in the neighborhood he was going to build a single familiar home for him and his wife. The proposal has been made that he build three, 3,000 square feet condos on a lot that is 40 by 100. The city is not disallowing that I've been talking to the building development department and sustainability. They say that as long as his proposal fits within their parameters, they'll let him go-ahead with this. So I as a homeowner am looked at a 5 feet off my property line going from roughly just off the sidewalk to the back of the yard, three units, with three front doors and six balconies, so my privacy is gone. One of the things I loved about my neighborhood is the quiet. I'm going to have a minimum of 6 people, you're going to have a lot more people. No parking has been required so that -- and again, if you're selling a 500,000-dollar condo it's ludicrous to think you're not going to have two cars going with each one. The cars that are owned by the people in these condos would just stay parked on the street taking up those spots.

Hales: Is that site zoned r 1?

Barrow: R 1 d and that suggestions there is conservation of neighborhood, enhancement and community involvement with the planning. Seeing none, of that in this proposed triplex, I was here last week and I've been here today, I do believe that triplexes on the corner have a place because your entry and balconies and all this are on a street.

Hales: Is this not a corner lot?

November 16-17, 2016

Barrow: not a corner lot. I'd love to have some recommendation on it if there's anything I can do to mitigate this.

Hales: I would recommend stopping in commission Saltzman's office. He's not here today.

Peter Meijer: My name is Peter Mijer, I am co-chair of the Laurelhurst land use committee and this is a difficult testimony because we recognize that as you have heard that there are neighborhoods that fully support this and there are neighborhoods that don't fully support it that there are components within it are supported, there are components within it that aren't supported. And we have written a letter of broad support of affordable and choice in housing whereas rental rates will be in the affordable range as you've heard throughout the testimony in Laurelhurst I don't know that. We have a triplex and this is a quick little diagram of our unique character of corner lots. If it transpired they were all triplexes, it would have an impact on it. I'm not here to say that we don't support this proposal if we had to vote on it today, I think Laurelhurst would say no because there are elements of it that we really like, but it's interesting I was going to today and am saying Laurelhurst would like to be a pilot project we are support this. It's interesting, I was going to today and am saying that Laurelhurst would like to be a pilot project. We are a designed overlay already. We are considering a historic district for defense purposes I don't think that's really the way our neighborhood should approach it that way. We are currently a design overlay and we feel that we can sit down with staff and under design overlay look at ways to increase that overlay in the current zoning so it doesn't proceed as a change in zoning because there is argument that this proposal is an underlying change in zoning and to work with staff and with yourselves about how you could. The biggest issue is the one-size-fits-all so we would like to volunteer our neighborhood as one that says we'd like to work with you and how we can make this work in a neighborhood like Laurelhurst. And the caveat is we add components to that design overlay and there could be things like triplex that may come off. But again, that is the way that we can see this going forward in a very constructive manner and I think it would be argumentative that we are a good neighborhood in which to work with staff on that.

Hales: That's a really interesting proposal and as a former resident of Laurelhurst I bet what you want to see happen on most of those corners is internal conversions of internal houses, the triplex or multiple units.

Meijer: We're seeing that now there are adu's there are basement apartments, there are current houses that are more than apartments. You'd be hard dressed.

Hales: So where are you in the historical process?

Meijer: We are evaluating that, but with real serious nature.

Hales: Good, thank you. Thank you all.

Rosalind Roseman: I'm rose Roseman I'm an example of a person living in increased density living in a adu and I support many pieces of the proposal. My family agrees higher density is needed. We would like teachers and baristas as the and childhood caregivers to live in our neighborhood. In the November SE examiner Don MacGillivray wrote about making up missing middle housing as long as great care is taken to preserve the existing neighborhoods. To me that means support, but on existing traffic corridors and support for public transportation and bike paths and very important, preserving the housing stock we have in Portland. We start with the most environmentally sound building is the good one you reuse stopping demolition of good single family homes and creatively reusing them as the alpha and omega of the best plan, ways to increase density include allowing more attached housing adjacent to commercial corridors like the row on 30th ave between Hawthorne and clay or the horton small homes on the main corridor at 43rd and division so we feel we have a flexible view. But, my main point is to retain use of housing and character of our neighborhood is not just to permit adu, but to actively, consciously develop

November 16-17, 2016

policies that greatly expand the number built to two or three units on lots of lots without taking good housing down or destroy the feel of the neighborhood. Building development need to allocate time, staff, and money for these particular policies. One, increase the number of units all over the city only if the original housing is retained. Permit up to 3 adus if one is an internal conversion basement our attic. Allow one attached or detached and one above the garage with code amendments that say requiring garage top units to use skylights and frosted windows as my neighborhood has asked me to do on some walls to protect their privacy. Allow internal conversions in to duplexes, but not tear down the houses. Policy two, fee waivers that exist now should not be extended they should be made permanent or given a long the term like 10 or 15 years so people can plan and feel like this is a real option for a long term. The third and most important thing that I can see necessary whether it's the internal conversion to duplexes or more adu's financing is key to a family's ability to adding. Building development services should work with local banks, credit unions to develop special type loans that roll over into new second or 30-year mortgages.

Roseman: Is that tell me to stop?

Hales: Wrap it up.

Roseman: All the relative low rates and fee's and well publicize this needs a lot of attention and in summary what are we against we're against tarring down houses ad we're for finding every possible way to increase density through internal conversions adu's and duplexes. Thank you so much for this opportunity.

Hales: Thank you so much. Good afternoon.

Midge Pierce: My name is midge pierce. Before I start I think I need a transparency to say that I am a reporter and I'm risking my reporting credentials and my future as a reporter by testifying. I feel there is a lot of good passion. I'll skip to my asks and I'll get back to my feelings. First of all, I think we need to slow the process down. I think concepts need to be tested first in limited areas before expanding particularly in southeast neighborhoods, which I live. A lot of people will be blindsided by this because they simply do not understand what is coming down the pike. Add more incentives for internal conversions. Provide housing choices that favor preservation. Preservation is not a dirty word. Restore truth in zoning the overlay is tantamount to up zoning without sufficient regulatory screening. Study economics and infrastructure impacts, monitor adu's to minimize loss of long term rentals, leave room for trees, families and growing children. Redirect development, services, goals and jobs. In summary, the concepts as Proposed would trigger a development tsunami that can bury our beloved city, especially in the southeast where I live. If you get it wrong, there's no going back.

Chris Dearth: Thank you so much. This afternoon mayor, commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I'll be brief and respect your time limits. Since we moved to Multnomah – Chris Dearth, I live in the Multnomah neighborhood I have lived there since the early '90s. We've seen a steady increase in density which I think has boosted the economic vitality of our commercial center and has increased the livability of our neighborhood at the same time I've seen our area steadily evolve from affordable to many to unaffordable for most particularly the young people in a minority community who are vastly underrepresented in our community. The residential infill project, proposal before you, I think will present a strong counter to this trend. Now a days most of us long time homeowners couldn't afford to buy our own homes let alone a younger more diverse generation we must find ways to open our community to a wider range of economic and racial groups. The proposal before you would do just that I appreciate that it's a progressive measure designed to restore modest housing opportunities, affordable to more portlanders. I particularly appreciate that it will scale down the size and mass of residential

November 16-17, 2016

structures to be more compatible with the scale of the neighborhood. I understand it will allow, but not force a mix of housing types. In fact, we plan to put our money where our mouth is and add an adu to our property while some in my neighborhood oppose this measure before you I think we can all agree that the housing status quo is not acceptable. I urge you to pass this reasonable measure as a modest step and finally I'd like to say thank you to commission novick and you, mayor hales, for the service you have given us.

Grant Sawyer: my name is grant sawyer. I'm 72 years old and I fully support the residential infill project because if we don't there will be much greater pressure to expand the urban growth boundary which results in paving over valuable farm land someday we will regret that. Your proposed building size, type and mix I think is appropriate. I live in the people's republic of southeast Portland and I save money from my retirement. Upon my analysis of the economy I saw that much of that economy is based on perpetual war and environment destruction. If I left my retirement savings in the banking system, my money would be used for those very things I abhor. There had to be a better way to use my cash savings. I found it thanks to you. I built in my backyard an adu, a net 20% energy positive adu. Now if I want to know where my money is and what it is doing I just look out my kitchen window and see my adu. It's good for community, good for my pocketbook and good for the environment. My new adu is 20% positive, all electric and much safer when the big one comes. New houses are safer and more energy efficient and can be carbon free.

Mike Dowd: Hi. I'm mike Dowd, I'm an architect. I live in the southwest mile street neighborhood along the Willamette river. Thank you for considering all our concerns today. There's lots of good work that's been done that I support in regard to increasing flexibility for some housing types. I'm here to comment on the restrictions on sizes and height. I understand the motivation behind them and they do make sense for typical situations. In those situations, trying not to block view, trying to save trees, build houses that accommodate extended families that don't want the grandparents isolated in a backyard adu, they can backfire. I bought my house that can't be remodeled feasibly several years ago planning to replace it with a new house. After opposing the demolition fee last year, I told my fiancé next we'll be fighting the regulations because our design is too large. If you make only one change today, please except houses like mine that are subject to flood areas. My neighborhood has 23 houses. All the new ones are three to four stories tall and have flat roofs. That's good. We can't have basement or living space on the ground floor we have small lots so we have to build up, it's illegal to increase our lot coverage because that would increase flooding. We have flat roofs. Eventually all the houses in our neighborhood will be replaced with new houses that are taller and usual larger than the restrictions would allow, but that's a positive thing, not a negative. So I'm asking you to understand, I think the rules are well intentioned, but there needs to be more thought to increase flexibility like in other situations.

Hales: I appreciate you raising that obviously your situation is unusual and I think you already acknowledged there can be other unusual situation maybe not in the same way right around the city. You and I have been at this long enough to know I think there used to be a more tuneable tool in the adjustment process where there was a right enjoyed by others so we ought to go look into that situation, I mean we tried to deal with that with this front yard setback it looked as if all the houses on the street could have a 12-foot setback then you could build to a 12-foot setback cause that's good architectural design. I built a house for my family in hayhurst where all the houses had been pulled up to the street because of the back slope so I used that while everybody else's 15 feet from the street even though it's an r7 lot so you raised a question that we got to look into further which is

November 16-17, 2016

what do we do about adjustments or exceptions in situations and you obviously described one.

Dowd: Even in my own case if I wasn't in a flood area I have a 40-foot setback because I'm next to a light rail route and the nearest building to one side of me is four stories tall and 160 feet long, so making my house two and a half stories instead of three or this many square feet is really nickel and diming me and without any real benefit.

Hales: Thank you.

Michael Withey: Mike Withey. I just want to thank you, Mr. Hales, for bringing this forward. I know you initiated this conversation about infill with tiny houses with different possibilities and single family zones. We're excited about this because we believe it could be a national example of how we do infill and keep everybody happy as far as aesthetics. We think it's extremely important we do this, not just the fact people are losing their homes and building adus or possibly multiple adus and other possibilities this would allow them to do, they would be able to stay in their homes. Also when it comes to seniors being displaced this would end that, too gentrification this would help with that. I think it's simple side and demand if you have 1000 houses then it's going to bring the price down. So I think that this doesn't go far enough a few years ago we had a meeting in our office and we talked about tiny houses on wheels, tiny houses on wheels are stick built their beautiful little homes they're very popular. They're internationally known now. They're not considered adus. I can see some additions to what This does. I don't see any reason to take out of it, but I can understand the neighborhood not wanting the four story monstrosity in their little neighborhood. So we need to be concerned about all of their concerns, but I look forward to seeing what happens in the next few months thank you.

Parsons: We have 13 more names from last week.

Hales: Welcome back. Good afternoon.

Mike Beamer: Hi, my name is Mike Beamer, I'm an architect energy consultant and homeowner, we purchased our house this year in southeast Portland. It's an 1100 square foot house built in the 1920s. We were able to afford the house we purchased because it had a partially finished basement and convert it to rent out to help with our mortgage payment. If we hadn't purchased the house it might have been purchased by a developer like the houses across the street where it could have been torn down and replaced with a house twice its size for more than what we paid for it. The flexibility of adding another living unit helped to save our small house from demolition. It impacted the character of our neighborhood far less than if it had been knocked down. These are corner lots just down the street that have been scrapped because of redevelopment. We would much prefer a triplex be built rather than a large single family house. If the proposals are accepted in this package we would likely build a detached adu in our backyard adding another unit with minimal impact on neighbors. If we went further, we would consider adding a fourth unit in our attic which there's space for and could even be done in an existing footprint. One thing I want to bring up a little more is how this all impacts cash emission reduction. Single family homes are the least energy efficient. Restricting 47% of the city area creates a significant challenge to a shared goal of reducing carbon emissions, allowing more units on each lot increases energy efficiency by creating more fish building forms which share walls and floors. It produces the energy required to keep cool and light. Increasing density improves walkability and transportation options in the neighborhood. There are a few ways, I think the proposal could go further to promote sustainability and resiliency.

Hales: Try to do that quickly.

Firtz: Mail it to us, we'll read it.

Hales: Could you do that?

November 16-17, 2016

Beamer: Yeah. Just one quick point is that energy efficient homes under the far unit are penalized its less usable area because the wall thickness and all the assemblies end up being thicker to get more insulation so it's at least five or 10% less usable area than in like a passive house or net zero house than a code built house.

Hales: That's helpful to know. Do send anything. Thank you so much. I think you're next.

Sarah Canhine: My name is Sarah Canhine and I'm a member of the residential infill sat committee, im a land use committee member for the Boise neighborhood and a citizen affected by the proposal and a licensed architect. On behalf of rip sack 7 I'd like to address the aspect of scale, the chief concern and complaint of the demolitions of viable houses and replace them with outsized speculative housing hence the city has been tasked to define a building mass for infill housing. I'm trying to understand what that massing would be and essentially the city has limited it 2500 square feet per 5,000 square foot of land in r 5. They're excluding basements and the attic spaces. If you actually do the math, what this means, which is 3-1/2 or more floors at 1250 square feet we get more than a 4500 square feet house. The 0.1 far increase bonus for detached adu's easily exceeds the maximum, so I just wanted to point that out. I don't know this proposal actually meets that requirement and while the current code allows a step in the right direction number don't bare out that it will change the arc of demolition spec development or affordability or equity. The subset of the sack advocated a contextual approach to development that reacts to scale and mass to neighborhood context some context is size of dwelling promoting smaller dwellings and keeping land cost relative to what a small house may yield, the smaller profit margins adding additions to renovations becoming more viable alternatives, district placement, reserving green space. The reverse holds true. Neighborhoods are larger developments or dwellings and particularly those adjacent to commercial development are limited to the same size structure as these often remote houses. I have a little more that ill submit in testimony regarding middle housing, but generally we support a contextual approach which I think is an achievable with recommendations by the rip sack, but it needs to be looked at with regards to neighborhood adjacency and local massing and finally I'd like to say just as a rip sack member this was a very difficult process and I think we were asked to—we were more of the text subjects for what would be allowable for different demographic groups rather than getting all these great minds together to work on a project that I think we all are good fair minded people and really wanted to come together with really good solutions and instead it pitted us against each other in a way that I thought was a little bit harmful for the city.

Hales: Thank you I want to follow up with you about if not 2500 square feet than what so I will do that?

Rod Merrick: Good morning I'm rod Merrick I'm a member of the residential infill project advisory and a member of the rip sack seven who served on the committee and devoted hundreds of hours to the process. We come from a diverse neighborhood perspective but, a shared concern that these policies and prescriptions are more ideology than planning. The rip sack seven provided detailed analysis of the document and the process in our own written testimony including recommendations for moving forwards which I will get to towards the end of this testimony. I'll be blunt. In my 40 years in Portland this is probably the most far reaching and misguided policy document to come out of our once respected planning process far worse than the skinny house policies that resulted in blocks of housing demolished, unsightly streetscapes and angry neighbors. I highlight the skinny, narrow lot policy because using the underlying historic lot lines to determine zoning and density is the most significant contribution to speculative demolitions in the code. Many hoped that the rip zoning based on the comprehensive plan vision would be restored in this process. That was one of the goals I believe of this discussion. Rather than removing

November 16-17, 2016

them from the zoning equation these lot lines are being used to dictate zoning. All skinny lots in the overlay, over 12,000 lots randomly placed are to be redefined r2.5 zone. This policy of diffuse and random density is at the heart of this report in every area of the city. Does not support the density around centers, rather diffuses density, diffuses travel patterns, reinforces dependence on the automobile. I'm going to ask for additional time for my hundreds of hours of working on this.

Hales: Go ahead.

Merrick: The report is also being presented as a policy report to council for council to politely accept as a cure-all for densification without demolition, equity, affordability and housing choice and by some calculation a way of preserving the character of our neighborhoods. All of those are worthy goals, but I'm afraid this report is actually a very detailed prescription, not a policy document, with complex and contradictory assumptions. A cure that may be worse than the disease. Appendix a, the economic study, is claimed to be the underpinning that justifies the recommendations. To be polite it's uninformed. The author uses 2500 square feet of salable area as its basis. As you've seen in Sarah's testimony the salable area on a 50x100 lot is about 4,000 square feet and larger on larger lots. These are not tiny houses or cute bungalows but large, overshadowing structures. The residential infill project produces far reaching real estate entitlements and lot value increases that will be difficult to claw back once they are granted. Appendix b, the internal conversion report, demonstrates that remodeling existing single family houses to multi-family though complicated and expensive is possible. But even with the promised incentives of additional height in area it fails to demonstrate why a developer would choose to save the existing structure rather than demolish and build a more conventional housing product. Independent researchers providing economic analysis and testimony today have found that far from producing affordable housing, it will remove the most affordable and desired housing types and cater to the upper end of the market. They suggest the result will be displacement, accelerated demolition, reduced affordability and marginal additional real density compared to other housing options. These policies will light a wildfire of demolition when the market is ready. Now, I would like to turn to our summary of recommendations.

Hales: Please summarize.

Merrick: Yeah. And request an extension of time which I appreciate very much that you granted me.

Hales: Go ahead and summarize. You can submit this in writing and I'm going to meet with you.

Merrick: This is all important. There are 10 recommendations we included in our testimony to address the three areas.

Hales: Let me ask you to not run through ten.

Merrick: I'm going to highlight. Just telling you there are ten recommendations that we have offered. One of them is to cease the recognition of the underlying lot lines except where consistent with the comprehensive plan zoning map. It's very easy. Should have been done as step one in this process. Another is to provide test sites for innovative code policies, cooperating with neighborhoods before applying them locally. I think those are two essential outcomes that whatever ideas that can be put forward are very important. We would like to leave you with these further thoughts. The bps needs to better understand how the current r1, r2 and r2.5 zones can be improved to accommodate middle or transitional housing densities. We need to implement the comp plan in the form of a modern flexible, easy to understand zoning code.

Hales: Thank you very much. I look forward to having a longer conversation with you.

Merrick: Let me just -- almost done. Once we have approved comp plan there needs to be

November 16-17, 2016

an ongoing focus on district and neighborhood planning. District and neighborhood planning is the next step in this process and this is a leap, a big leap in front of that. Place-based neighborhood and business associations need to be engaged to participate in decision making during these planning exercises. Thank you so much for your time.

Hales: Look forward to following up with you.

Fritz: When you have that meeting id really be interested in joining it because the skinny lot issue is one ive been involved with for 20 years.

Hales: Come on up. Go ahead.

Shedrick Wilkins: I'm Shedrick wilkins. Being in Portland for almost all my life it drives me crazy someday I might think about living in a treehouse. These zoning things do get -- these zoning things do -- I would demolish the treehouse and not hurt the tree when I leave. [laughter] I will say this as zoning is really interesting I used to read when I was in high school a stack of Ripley's believe it or nots, the only distinction Portland, Oregon had was the Fred Meyer on northeast 72 and sandy. When Fred Meyer zoned out this supermarket but a guy wouldn't sell his house so they kept the house and it was -- you see this guy's house cut out about one-sixth of the store this. Was in Ripley's believe it or not. This is Portland. When I was 10 I thought it was standard someday we would have roof parking and have houses inserted into supermarkets.

Hales: Thank you. That was a dubious distinction indeed. Go ahead.

Emily Kemper: We get five minutes now, right, because of rod? [laughter]

Hales: If you served on the committee you may get some indulgence.

Kemper: I did actually. Greetings mayor hales and council members. I'm Emily Kemper. I very much appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today. I'm a licensed architect and a master's in building science. I was appointed as an at large member both for my background and the energy efficiency of homes as well as working on the residential code board. Many of my colleagues have already discussed numerous advantages to providing more housing choices within our community including greater opportunities for affordable housing, accessibility for broad range of residents and the need to accommodate increased city growth. I agree with all of the benefits but today I wish to discuss one important issue that I believe needs more attention. That is the need for Oregonians to double down on our commitments to sustainability and resource efficiency. Two weeks ago we lived in a country where a majority of people believed in climate change and wanted to fix it. Seven days ago we woke up for the realization that our new federal government will likely halt any attempts to reduce our carbon emissions, possibly setting us toward inevitable, devastating climate change. We have heard from many in these chambers of homeowners who feel their neighborhoods are losing their character. I feel that our families, our neighborhoods, our city and our country have a lot more to lose than just our character. If we don't take every opportunity to lead on creating sustainable communities and reducing our carbon footprint. Having more housing types allows neighborhoods to develop organically and provides more opportunities for diverse populations. Smaller houses built to the newest building codes use less energy annually than either older houses of the same size or new large houses. In this the least dense for the most affordable city on the west coast Portland's carbon footprint and our most efficient zip codes is still above the average of 20 metric tons per person. Smaller houses which are easier to build with the current proposal use less energy and they can provide more affordable housing options for renters and homeowners alike. For these reasons I support the proposal with the caveat that I don't think it goes far enough towards our Core value of resource efficiency. Our committee process was iterative and very challenging. But I feel that we could have provided better recommendations with additional tools at our disposal such as potential incentives for existing homeowners to upgrade their homes, streamlining

November 16-17, 2016

of the permitting process, requirements for builders to provide a minimum number of accessible or affordable units and homeowner bonuses for sustainable materials. In this critical time, I'm counting on my fellow Portlanders to lead the charge on environment building practices especially in light of lack of national leadership on this topic.

Hales: Thank you all who worked on this committee and worked so hard.

Kemper: Just one more thing since I get five minutes. I do want to give special props to the gentleman who brought up the issue of tiny houses. I think that that and smaller houses in general is a really big opportunity for providing more affordable housing. I know that there are a lot of examples of builders who have come in saying that they were going to do one thing then not doing the other thing. I think that we need to find a way to allow for more small housing, tiny houses are a great opportunity. I would love to be a part of that discussion if it happens.

Hales: Thank you.

Novick: Mr. Merrick's group has the catchy name of the rip-sac 7 which for some of us brings up nostalgia. What would be the name of your side of the rip-sac? Rip-sac 14 or --

Kemper: The majority? I guess.

Novick: How many people total are there?

Kemper: There ended up being 24 of us. I think Morgan -- 24 of us. So 17.

Novick: The rip-sac 17. That would be appropriate if everyone identified themselves as such for the rest of the hearing.

Kemper: With all due respect, I think that there were a lot more commonalities and Morgan and Sandra will probably laugh at me because I sat in our meetings and said we actually have a lot more in common than we realize. There's just a few areas on which we disagree, and it's unfortunate because I really wish that those commonalities were reflected in our plan. Frankly I just didn't think that we had enough opportunity with the tools at our disposal to make better choices. So I'm not necessarily suggesting that we throw out the proposal I think we need to make some progress but I think there could have been other opportunities if we had had those options.

Hales: I appreciate that. I don't think those opportunities are lost nor that this process has ended with whatever we do with this report. Obviously not. If we can ask people for even more time going forward, there's still more work to be done.

Kemper: Certainly.

Hales: Thank you. Well come.

Evan Burton: Oh, okay. Mayor Hales, commissioners Fritz and Novick, I'm not a policy wonk. I'm speaking from my experience in my own neighborhood here. I'm Evan Burton. I live in what some residents refer to as the forgotten neighborhood of Sumner. A residential area comprised mostly of modest bungalows on lots zoned R7. It also includes the industrial area north of Killingsworth including Johnson Lake Natural Area. I'm here to speak in support of rezoning to accommodate middle housing in residential infill. Every neighborhood should do its part to accommodate a growing population. Portland and with a focus on affordable housing. Parking is an issue I have heard frequently raised. Sumner has an abundance of available on-street parking that could easily accommodate multiple use development along Sandy Boulevard as well as residential middle housing walk around Sumner for evidence. One concern of Sumner residents is the number of so-called zombie homes and vacant bank-owned houses sitting empty in Sumner. Quite a few of these houses are on corner lots boarded up and/or in much need of repair. Obviously present zoning that allows for duplexes is not of interest to builders however should rezoning allow for triplexes and/or courtyard style housing of reasonable design the city could address several needs in Sumner. One, make it more habitable for additional households. Two, create demand for more small businesses to serve the immediate neighborhood along the

November 16-17, 2016

sandy corridor. We have few amenities; most neighborhoods take for granted. We don't have coffee shops or grocery store nearby. Three, transition available green spaces into parks due to demand. We have not one park in our neighborhood. Four, reduce crime. Including home burglaries and opportunistic theft. This past summer our neighborhood proactively dealt with a notorious squatter house that is as of yesterday being cleaned up for eventual sale. Five, add needed infrastructure. We have few walkable sidewalks and not one marked and safe crosswalk that connects our neighborhood to each side of sandy boulevard. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you. You'll be happy to know that we have ended a 50-year paralysis in the city's foreclosure effort on zombie houses and are systematically moving through about a half dozen a month. The council just approved the most recent batch last week including a house directly across the street from Lents school. We have that machinery working.

Burton: Thank you very much, mayor hales.

Hales: Thank you. Welcome.

Philip Quarterman: Thank you. Mayor hales, commissioners Fritz, novick, I'm Phil Quarterman speaking as a homeowner in the Burlingame neighborhood outside of the study area so I guess I'm addressing residential zoning city-wide. I generally support the council's effort to encourage limiting the scale of new dwellings. Others have given thoughtful testimony on middle housing and maintaining the character of neighborhoods so I need in the dwell on that. I think council may be missing an opportunity for reasonable infill. I'm not talking about middle housing but modest single family homes as infill. This is my situation. I own a 10,000 square foot corner lot with a small 1927 house on it. The zone is r7. I love my house. I hope to improve it and live many more years in it. I looked at options for redeveloping the property. I chose not to demolish my house and build a duplex, which I could have, or to build and adu. I want to retain my house. It would be more affordable when I leave there than anything that would replace it. I would like the option of partitioning a vacant lot to sell at the time that I'm ready to move provided I live that long which I may not. There's plenty of room with setbacks to build a modest house, 2500 square foot house or maybe less would be fine and very affordable. There's as I understand it, I may be reading the code wrong, as I understand it I would not be able to partition off a buildable lot under the r7 zoning the way my house is positioned on the lot. There appears to be room for a lot of about 4200 square feet. So not being able to do that it seems somewhat rather unnecessarily restrictive when my plan would result in retention of an older home in keeping with neighborhood character and would provide new home both relatively affordable. So I advocate for more flexibility in the r5 and r7 zones to allow smaller minimum lot sizes but within reason and in keeping with the neighborhood. If I might go further, I might make a more radical suggestion and ask I ask what is the -- what was the specific purpose of the r7 zone. I believe the distinction between the two when you apply it on the ground is negligible. Right across 17th avenue from my home you look at the lot size pattern and there isn't very much difference. So why not merge the two zones? That would encourage infill and new design standards would ensure that the new homes are more in scale and more affordable. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you very much. Thank you all.

Hales: Hi.

Hales: Welcome.

Jan Wilson: Thank you. I'm Jan Wilson, the land use chair of the southwest neighborhoods, inc., the Sweeney group. Coalition group of a bunch of different southwest neighborhoods, you probably know. We have been very involved in this. Our land use committee has had -- we attended a lot of the rip-sac meetings. We attended open houses, studied the proposals both at the discussion draft level and the next concept proposal in

November 16-17, 2016

detail. We have had presentations from city staff. So we are really immersed in this and we submitted comments at the beginning which I attached and they are basically our main issue is first of all the southwest pattern area which is incorporated into the new comp plan would be thwarted by some of these proposals. Then the other part is that we really don't as the previous people have already said we don't have the infrastructure in our neighborhood for a lot of the new density, additional density. So we are asking and have asked originally and now again renewing that to make sure that the infrastructure, specifically the pedestrian infrastructure, which is very lacking for us in the southwest neighborhoods, pedestrian, safe pedestrian's infrastructure needs to be in place before allowing additional density which this proposal would do. As you know, mayor Hales, I spoke with you at our neighborhood association night out and we were really concerned about demolitions and we're very concerned about the incompatibility of the infill, huge houses going in, so we really support the first three parts, the smaller scale, the floor area ratio. We support adus. We have been really good about working with our neighborhoods to add additional housing but what we really want to do is not increase the allowable density on the lot because what happens there, the economic analysis with this concept proposal showed, it overvalues the lot and we end up with more demolitions. So that's essentially what we're looking at. I wanted to address the graph. You guys were showing we're underbuilding housing but what happened was that graph got cut off. If you look at like the five years before that we were overbuilding housing. So I think when you look at data you want to look at all the data so what's happening we overbuild, then we underbuilt houses. It takes a while for supply to reach demand. Demolishing existing houses is not going to help, it's going to make more unaffordable housing. We want to keep our small houses and we really would like your support.

Hales: Thank you. Appreciate your involvement in this. That completes the list of folks that signed up last time, right? So what's the process next? Remind me. We start taking new testimony for the remainder --

Parsons: We have a few people who said they have to leave at 4:00.

Hales: I'm open to staying until 4:15 or so. Let's take a few more people then move to our 4:00 item then come back at 6:00. If there are folks that are unable to come back let's take them first. Welcome. Go ahead, please.

Felicia Tripp: Okay. Hello. I'm Felicia Tripp, I'm the deputy director of the Portland housing center. Today I'm going to provide testimony to support the Portland city council in the residential infill project. I'll be quick so I don't take up so much of your time. I want to tell you about my agency first. That should take about two minutes' total. The Portland housing center with the help of the city of Portland was created in 1991 and our job is to help people achieve the goal of homeownership. We have helped over 7500 families prepare and successfully achieve the goal of homeownership. In the last few years' demand for services have grown but the housing stock in our city has become unaffordable. Especially for new families, young families, people that want to stay in the city. We want to be clear, we are generally supportive of the changes being recommended so far. We think that the relegalization of small scale housing options allow more flexibility and increase housing choices in neighborhoods, will expand access to opportunities for more people. Especially the families we serve. We don't want Portland to be a city where young families can't afford to put down roots and sends their kids here. We have heard time and time again over the last six months two family income thing. I want to buy a house in Portland but I can't afford it. We also think that Portlanders need more housing choices in between single dwelling homes, apartments and lawn centers, corridors or downtown. Economic analysis has shown how deep the market is for homes that can be provided in the 250 to 350 range. Right now a healthy housing market usually has six

November 16-17, 2016

months of inventory. We have been carrying less than one-month supply for a couple of years. This is one of the reasons our housing stock is so expensive. These options are zoned out of Portland right now for houses in that area that first time home buyers can afford, which is between 250 and 350. If you look on rmls, there's nothing in that price point for the average family. So we are coming forward to say we're asking city council to come up with affordable homeownership options for tax paying Portland residents. We would like to see deep incentives for real affordability. Adding to the current concept report we don't want to limit geography of these housing choices. We think east Portland should be able to develop the kind of neighborhoods that enable walkability and transit along with on the west side we want more flexibility in-housing options all throughout the city. This also will help with schools as well because there are certain neighborhoods because of zoning that families especially low to moderate families are intentionally excluded from. So as a gap between wages and home prices in Portland continue to widen we ask that you consider these choices because it will provide -- the city already helps with down payment assistance and financial products. We in complement the Portland housing center also provide those services with the necessary tools that are being proposed you will see an increase in availability for first time home buyers to be able to live in the city and for that I want to thank you for taking the time to listen to me today. I'll leave this with the clerk.

Hales: Appreciate what the housing center does. Welcome.

Carrie Richter: Good afternoon. Mr. Mayor, commission members I'm Carrie Richter, I'm a past landmark commission chair and also land use attorney. I want to let you know that I applaud the city's efforts to provide greater diversity of housing options but it is my position that the draft proposal needs significant changes to satisfy the recently adopted comprehensive plan policies and to reverse the demolition crisis. I have identified -- I submitted written materials but I also submitted testimony to the advisory committee and at the end of that August 12th testimony included a bullet point list of suggestions and those remain but I just want to reiterate a couple of those that appear on that list. First my recommendation is that we limit the additional density authorization offers to lands that are currently vacant or contain structures that are less than 75 years old. So this would be those houses built after 1941. So we would be able to capture the 1941 bungalows in those that would need to be preserved under this proposal. I have included a map that city staff prepared for me that is available that shows all of the purple areas on this map shows those lands that are vacant or contain structures that are less than 75 years old. There's a close-up of that on the second page that I just picked an area so you could see it close up. You see there the result would be a sprinkling of density and not all of this additional density in any particular one place necessarily. I would also favor allowing unlimited number of internal and external adus on existing properties if the existing home were retained. As part of that we could require historic designation to get design review for those externally constructed adus on properties thereby increasing the amount of historically designated resources while at the same time getting compatible designs.

Fritz: Thank you for your memo.

Hales: I appreciate the detailed proposals here.

Richter: Thank you.

Hales: Welcome.

Jon Wood: Thank you. I'm Jon wood. I speak today in opposition to the residential zone plan as written. I think it has some merit but it needs work. I don't believe it will protect vintage housing from demolition and I don't believe it provides the amount of affordable housing that we hoped that it would. Just from background I have been working on affordable housing in Portland since 1974. I was director of transition projects in an earlier incarnation. Part of my beginning work on vintage housing had to do with over dent PEDI

November 16-17, 2016

grow crisis of 1989. Those vintage homes were being advocated for as a form of affordable housing. It's good to remember the housing stock is or its vintage housing stock is the affordable housing. I do have some concerns about the proposal because I don't see incentives to make homebuilders actually want to build on those sites. What I have experienced with homebuilders is they like bare ground whether it's trees or old houses if it's in the way they want it flat. So I think it has to be more explicit if we're trying to really convince builders to save those trees and existing house and build around it has to be explicit. When I think of a walkable neighborhood I think of a place I want to go walking in. I want it to be interesting. I would hate to see that lost. I mentioned trees and I do think there hasn't been enough focus on the fact that we have pretty weak statutes or rules protecting trees. I do think that right now it looks like the major beneficiary is the homebuilder's association. I think there's some opportunities being ignored and I realize there's probably things about planning I don't understand but why we're not looking at major parking lots along transit corridors. Looking back at this process in 10 or 20 years they may be surprised to realize the residential infill process was a culmination of processes that started out being concerned about the demolition of built homes.

Hales: We're going to resume this item at 6:00, right?

Parsons: Right. We have three more who would like to testify now.

Hales: If we have three more I would rather hear those.

Hales: Welcome.

Bryнна Hurwitz: Thank you very much for allowing me to speak. I feel kind of emotional I have to admit. Bryнна hurwtiz. I live in the hayhurst the neighborhood and have lived in Portland since 1970 something. I feel emotional because I really see my home being destroyed in many ways. Just such rampant, uncontrolled development and so many homes being demolished. It's really painful. The process that I have involved myself in I have gone to the meetings for rip-sac and I have spoken and I have put in my evaluation, submitted that. What I fear because of where I live and what I see every day in Portland, is that it will kind of become a developer's dream in that out of state developers perhaps out of country developers will seek pieces of property which can be developed more fully. I really feel strongly about affordable housing. I have been a public school teacher at Boise Elliott for a while. I see my families moving out to the numbers. I want to have affordable housing. I don't think this is it. I see the homes going in my neighborhood are asking way more than I could ever afford. Nothing that's affordable at all. I don't think that will change that. I urge you to create a test situation. All neighborhoods are not the same in Portland as you know. Let's retain uniqueness of each neighborhood. Might work in some, might not in others. That's what I would ask of you. Preserve what we have that's unique. We don't have infrastructure in southwest world either. I'll second that. What I have heard over and over. Currently neighbors get together, pitch in money, buy gravel to fill in the paved roads as well as gravel roads that we have.

Hales: Thank you. Welcome.

Holly Huntley: Hi. I'm holly Huntley. I have never been here before. This is exciting for me. I'm going to come back. I'm here today primarily as a resident and homeowner in the king neighborhood. I built an adu for myself and created a below market a rate affordable long term rental out of the main house which my parents don't understand at all. If I could I would potentially create another affordable unit if any basement. I'm also an adu builder. That's my profession. I have three employees. We have built about 15 adus over the past few years. All of which are either owner occupied or a family member has moved into it or they are rented as a long-term rental also. Fair market rate. Just a coincidence. Nice people around here. My business will be fine regardless of these proposals. I'm not here to support an agenda that will sell my project pipeline. Having said that these types of

November 16-17, 2016

projects, adus have created new jobs and training opportunities for women earning living wage jobs in the trades and I'm not the only contractor with that story. Our zoning code addresses life as it was 60 years ago. I feel like we need to use dates and more to expand on them to reflect the future of Portland. I look forward to being part of this process as I know we can all affect a plan that will add in a responsible manner affordable, accessible, efficient housing in the best city in our country. Thanks.

Hales: Thank you very much. Please do come back. We like it when people come for the first time and want to come back. Welcome.

Roger Zumwalt: Good evening. This is my first time too. Thank you, mayor hales, for taking the time to take input and initiate this process. Thank you, commissioners, for your work and for trying to make the city great. I would say that -- roger zumwalt is my name. To commissioner novick I would say characteristic of the numbers I attended probably seven of the commission rip-sac meetings and it would probably be more like four groups of six is really how it worked out. Not a lot of time for thoughtful deliberations, tremendous amount of material, baseline stuff. It was rushed and pushed one way by a pretty vocal group. That would be my comment on that. What I'm opposed to parts of the rip-sac as it's currently written. But I applaud the attempt to make the city better. I would say that my first comment is we should slow down a little bit. I think it was joe zehnder repeatedly said we have capacity. There's no hurry. Example would be the johns landing area where they were asked to downzone and when they pushed back on that they came back with in the time that they have studied this they have used less than 50% of the existing capacity before zoning changes, which were not implemented. I would say I would love to see the 2035 plan begin to take shape and have arms and legs and have form that we can see what that looks like. There's a lot of talk in 2035 about neighborhood character, about the five districts and zones in the city and how they are different and instead what we're seeing is code with one plan. I think that's a mistake. I'm great with adus. It's a wonderful solution. Great with internal conversions. What I would like to see is a component of neighborhood character and I would also like to see truth in zoning and bringing the predictability that you know when you invest in a home for, what, 10, 15 years, that you know what's going to happen to that neighborhood and the surrounding area directly around you. I actually live in fear now that the lots that are to the one block to my side will be completely scraped and turned into row houses. My neighbor that's near is for sale who is not getting a sale right now has enough of a lot that I have seen builders come in, developers, doing what the market is asking them to do, which is to maximize the opportunity and build nice homes in nice neighborhoods. Nice neighborhoods add that value bring lots of small and little different things and mix that in you actually hurt the neighborhood which I think is not fair. That's my comments.

Hales: Thank you all very much. We're going to return to this at 6:00. We're going to take a two-minute recess and take this item.

Fritz: I'm wondering if the next item is that going to take the whole hour?

Hales: I don't think so. Less than that.

Fritz: I would rather have more testimony at 4:30.

Hales: I see. Are there folks here still waiting to testify on the residential infill project?

Yeah. So based on commissioner Fritz's constructive suggestion assuming that we can all do this we're going to take a brief break, hear this next item which is scheduled for this afternoon which is 1291. Then instead of waiting to 6:00 we'll immediately resume and hearing those folks that are here. Does that work for you?

Novick: Yes, but we are going to take a break for dinner?

Hales: At 5:00. You don't have to wait until 6:00 if you're queued up to testify on residential infill project. You have to wait until about 4:45 maybe. We'll hear a few more people. Two-

November 16-17, 2016

minute break and take up the 1291.

At 4:10 p.m. council recessed.

At 4:16 p.m. council reconvened.

Hales: Sue, would you please read item 1291 for us.

Hales: Thank you. Well, if there was ever a time when it was important for us to assert that we are a city that values diversity and does everything we can to practice inclusion this would be that time. So we are so glad you're here. [applause] let's hear it for our employees. So we appreciate this work so much and that all of you have put so much effort into being who we are and trying to be the workplace that we want to be for everyone that serves our city. So the timing is both ironic and terrible and wonderful all at once. We're so glad you're here.

Dante James, Director, Office of Equity and Human Rights: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, commissioners. It's truly my pleasure. I'm Dante James, director of the office of equity and human rights, diversity empowered employees of Portland deep sits within the structure of my office so I have the absolute pleasure of being here to introduce this leadership program that has been created. This conversation started, couple of years ago if not more, among leadership with deep to really have a conversation about how do we create that pipeline of opportunity for leadership positions in the city of Portland for communities of color, for staff of color, for women, for just lgbt, for the affinity groups that exist within Portland. Last this past year the leadership after continuing conversations took it and ran with it so they have done a phenomenal job of getting consultants to come in and assist and do training and create the best opportunity for folks to really get on a leadership trajectory and engage with mentors and other opportunities that exist in a formal way as opposed to an informal way. So if you look on our dashboard on our website demographically the city is about -- employees demographic is about 21, 22% people of color and about 6 or 7% of that are managers or supervisors. That is really the genesis of need for this process and this program. So also understand that each and every one of these who are engaged and involved as mentors and mentees as well as deep specifically are all volunteers. They get no work time to do this. They are trying to do this on their lunchtime for an hour in between running back and forth from their jobs. So once again I would encourage you commissioners to have this conversation with your directors that a part of the availability of their time should be allowed so that they could participate and do this certainly so the leadership of deep can continue this good work and even expand on it outside of worrying about whether they have to get back before the clock strikes a particular hour. So again, it's my great honor to introduce this great leadership program and the people engaged and involved in it. Thank you very much.

Hales: Thank you all.

Janice McDonald, Portland Bureau of Transportation: Good morning. Good afternoon. Mayor hales, commissioners, I'm Janice McDonald. I work with pbot in the safe routes to school program. I'm co-chair of deep. One of the leadership coordinators for the program, and also lead the women's empowerment affinity group. I do want to -- I will also be giving you stats but the city of Portland continues to make great strides in attracting talented women professionals and professionals of color to its work force, however more needs to be done to retain them. Nurture their career development. Over all the city of Portland employee's makeup is 73% white, 7% black African-american, 6% Hispanic, Latino, with a total work force being 56% male. For managers and supervisors those numbers are 82% white, 5% black african-american and 4% Hispanic Latino. With a total of the managers and supervisors being 64% male. Deep is dedicated to enhancing the work environment that is inclusive and supportive of the city of Portland's diverse work force. It is a network developed by city employees for city employees. I think that's really key to keep in mind.

November 16-17, 2016

We oversee the affinity groups and like Dante said they are voluntary and employee driven. These affinity groups are part of the solution to support employees in their professional growth and contribute to an inclusive and supportive work environment for city employees. I would like to repeat that because I think like you said it's very powerful right now. These affinity groups are part of the solution to support employees in their professional growth and contribute to an inclusive and supportive work environment for our city employees. The pilot deep leadership program, the focus of our presentation is an example of the affinity group's work. I would like to have you provided with an overview of our pilot leadership program.

McGodson Benonaih-Jumbo, Portland Bureau of Transportation: Good afternoon.

McGodson Benonaih-Jumbo I am a senior management analyst in the bureau of transportation. I also serve as the head of the african-american network which is our black community group here with the city. I'm part of the brain trust that helped create the leadership development program and I serve as one of the program coordinators. As an overview of the program, it was as Dante said some years ago that he suggested to deep leadership that we engage in creating a mentorship program for the members of our respective affinity groups. It was a couple years ago now, about a year and a half ago, that myself and along with Janice, Cynthia and the other leaders of our affinity groups sat together and said, how do we do this? We started to think about what we would want to have in a leadership development program with the goal of trying to get our members of our affinity group, minorities, women who work within the city of Portland, on the trajectory to be in leadership here within the city. So our program as we came about developing it we landed on three primary functions. The first was that we wanted to have a component where our mentees, our program participants would have mentorship so we wanted to pair them with mentors who were respected members within the community both as city employees and non-city employees. Second component was that we wanted them to go through a society of professional development trainings and subject matter expert training with the hope and the goal of sharpening the tools within their tool kit, adding new tools to their tool kits and also addressing some of the unique challenges that are faced by minorities and women both within the city and just in the nature of being in the work force. We built in evaluation activities to help us understand impact of this program that it has on the people who are going through it. And to help us also gauge for future purposes things that we might be able to change, make better, where we might find improvements. Group evaluation included pre-and post-evaluation via survey and working hand in hand with our evaluator who will produce a report for us at the end of our program. Mentee training where we contracted out training with different facilitators, Yvonne Chang is here with us today and bishop Steven holt have been a part of our training team and have led our trainings and helped to develop our program participants. We have also -- our third component was cohort lunches. Within our greater cohort we broke us down into our respective affinity group cohorts and had lunches with our leadership so that we could address some of the things that we were learning in training, things that were going on in the world around us, things that are impactful to our groups. We have had great success in doing that. I want to pass it along now to Cynthia, who will give you more of an overview of who we are in our groups.

Cynthia Castro: Can you hear me okay?

Hales: Slide that whole --

Cynthia Castro: Sure. Mayor, commissioners, my name is Cynthia Castro I'm the interim recreation supervisor for Charles Jordan community center, also part of ula's leadership team and co-creator and coordinator for the pilot deep leadership development program along with sonny, Janice, Debbie caselton, also co-chair, Christina nieves and also a

November 16-17, 2016

leadership team member and Carlos from pbot who is a leadership team member. There were 60 city employees who submitted applications to be considered for participation in the deep leadership development program. We selected 15 mentees from this pool of applicants. Six are members of the women's empowerment affinity group, six belong to can and three to ula. These affinity -- mentees represent nine city bureaus including omf, pbot, Portland parks and recreation, oni, fire, bds, bes, housing bureau and water bureau. As mentioned before each of our mentees worked with a mentor throughout this program. There are a total of 19 mentors. Some of our mentees had more than one mentor and we also had a couple of our coordinators who also had mentees. Our mentors are we have three city bureau directors. City middle managers as well as some business owners. I'm going to name each of our mentees. Mentees, if you are here, please stand up to be recognized after I call your name. Please stay standing. Mariana Iomonto, Miriam Urenda. Stefan. Toson. Christine artman. Pooja. Jay. Rafael, kim, jun. Tim, crystal, hun win. Ashley, tyco, sonny benonaih-jumbo, Janice McDonald. Thank you all for being here today. [applause] we also invited our mentors to be here but they are very busy individuals so i'm going to call out their names and if you happen to be here, please stand up. Leah treat. Amalia Alarcon-Morris. Mike Jordan. Fred miller. Maurice Henderson. Jim Fairchild. Ozzie Gonzalez. Yvonne Chang. Dora Perry. Tammie clays. Serena Boston Ashby. Krista overbee. Mark Lewis, Jennifer bell nam Williamson. Stacy triplet. Sobby wareach. Shelly hunter. Rebecca esau. Jane Braedon. [applause] as Dante mentioned this is a volunteer run operation and that includes the time that our mentors devote to our mentees. Thank you very much. We do have a couple mentees and one mentor who is going to follow up and share some of their experience. Jay Brannon, Ashley tjaden and Amalia Alarcon-Morris. Please come up.

Jay Brannon, Bureau of Environmental Services: Hello.

Hales: Welcome.

Brannon: I'm jay Brannon. I'm engineering technician for the bureau of environmental services within engineering construction services. I'm so pleased to be a part of the first and hopefully beginning of many cohorts through deep leadership development program. When I first heard about the program I was excited to apply to the program because diversity and representation is hugely important for any organization particularly the public sector. When I look around my bureau and division I'm part of a handful of minorities and women represented. This representation is even more stark within management. That is something I hope will change with the longevity of the leadership development program. While it's apparent that leaders are not made overnight and the impact of this program will not be recognized immediately prioritization of diversity and cultivating the city current city employees for success is something to be proud of. I hope to continue my career with the city and see that -- leadership development program. Being a part of the leadership development program within my affinity group has given me a broader sense of the opportunities available within the city. The trainings and meetings are helpful and prepared me for leadership roles in also how to make changes in my current role. Leadership development program has created a sense of community for me with my fellow black employees. All with a shared goal for success to better the city we love and work for every day. This community is something I wouldn't have had on a regular basis within my current bureau. For these reasons the readership development program is important to me and something I hope will continue. Thank you.

Ashley Tjaden, Bureau of Environmental Services: Good afternoon. I'm Ashley tjaden. I work at the bureau of environmental services and am part of this program with support and encouragement of my manager Megan Callahan. I'm going to speak about what I have learned from the program and why its continuation benefits the city. My immigrant family

November 16-17, 2016

instilled in me hard work and advised if I work hard I will make it. I was filled with pride when I graduated from Portland state in 2010 with a degree in community development. I immediately got a job working in government. But I quickly realized that college didn't teach me everything. Moving up the ladder is different for women and a person of color. My mentor, Stacy triplet, has taught me a different path. Her first assignment was to read my bureau's budget and organizational chart. At first I went into the assignment fearing I would be put to sleep. But instead a fire what lit inside of me. For the first time in six years I saw how the pieces fit together. Before I would never have engaged with leaders or elected officials but because Stacy triplet encouraged in eto take risks here I am before you today. It's because of Stacy that I found my voice. With the help of Yvonne Chang proud of our values of collectivism, community and culture. Steven holt demonstrated how as leaders we need to use our communication responsibly. We speak with boulders and it has an impact. Our population of racial minorities in the city is growing and the number of people of color in the work force is increasing. I encourage you to invest in the continuation of this program to put advancement opportunities in the diverse employees. Thank you for your time and this opportunity to share.

Amalia Alarcon-Morris, Director, Office of Neighborhood Involvement: Good afternoon, mayor, commissioners. I'm Amalia Alarcon-Morris, the director of the office of neighborhood involvement and a mentor through this program. I joined this program after I think it was sonny that approached me asking if I would be willing to do it and I'm someone who has throughout the course of my life benefited from people who have been willing to sit down with me and take that mentorship role whether formally or informally, who have invested in my professional future and have helped to lead me to the next steps as I grew professionally. Because of that I never turned down an opportunity to do informational interviews, to talk to people on the phone, to see them in person or to mentor either formally or informally. So I was happy to have the opportunity to do this. It turns out that I have reached an age where I guess I have some stuff to say about whatever obstacles have been in the way and how I have either overcome them, end run them or just persisted long enough to outlive them. So I was surprised in my relationship with my two mentees about how much there was in fact for me also to learn as a leader from that relationship. So in providing a safe space for mentees to trouble shoot areas that are challenging or vent about difficulties or ask for insights or advice on projects, that they are interested in moving forward, I find that I'm also learning. I ask myself where in my own bureau might these issues also be happening, where might people that work in my bureau have feelings that are similar to the ones that I'm hearing from mentees. And how does that impact how I lead and where the opportunities for me to take some of that and work with staff to create policies and an environment that's more conducive to people feeling valued and feeling like we support them in finding more and better places to contribute to the work that we do in the city. Being a mentor is nerve-wracking in that you want to do your best for your mentee. There are days when that can be a tall order. I know at least once or twice I talked to Janice saying I think I broke her: Can I have another one? [laughter] but it's been a wonderful experience for me. I think it's been helpful for my mentees as well as we -- as I hear from them. And I feel it's really critical as far as what we do in the city to live our commitment around equity, particularly as it pertains to our employees. Anyone out there who is interested in mentoring and has questions or concerns, feel free to reach out to me. I'm happy to share my experiences. And to say that this truly has been a wonderful experience for me and I hope that I have the opportunity to keep doing it as we move into the future.

Hales: Thank you.

Debbi Caselton, Bureau of Environmental Services: All the years I have been coming

November 16-17, 2016

here I never knew this moved.

Hales: There you go.

Caselton: Good afternoon, mayor, commissioners. I'm Debbi Caselton. One of the co-chairs of Deep. It's my 10th anniversary of volunteering to be the chair. [applause] Thank you. I volunteer because this work is extremely important as you know and I appreciate council support over the years. The specifically the time that commissioner Fritz has spent with our group as well as a mentor, perhaps, which I appreciate. I work for environmental services. That's my day job. We are excited to see the first leadership development program participants thrive and blossom into leaders. I witnessed several occurrences which makes me emotional of some of the participants from the last six months utilized new found skills and increased confidence I think that's a big part of it, increased confidence within the group, and stepping up in leadership roles with Deep, in their jobs and their day-to-day lives. One sign of success is one of our mentees wants to be a mentor next year, which I think would be great. To close out the presentation today, I would like to tell you about what is next with the program. We will celebrate everyone involved in the program and have our first graduation ceremony and celebration on Friday, December 9, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. In the Portland building auditorium. You're all welcome. I know you have a conflict. So -- the final report will be compiled and we will present to council potentially in February. I do want to point out that we had a very small budget thanks to office of equity to do this and we received excellent consultation from Yvonne Chang. At a very reduced cost from what she would normally provide. She has spent many hours with us counseling and consulting for us. Glenn Fielding, who works with her, doing all of our evaluations on a volunteer basis by the way. So thank you. [applause] We will be evaluating the program or Glenn will -- [laughter] and Yvonne and Glenn will write up a final report and we'll write up a new RFP, request for proposal, for the upcoming fiscal year. So you won't be here.

Hales: We'll make sure there's momentum.

Caselton: Okay. The first step is to open the program to more affinity groups. As you heard we have 60 applicants from all the different bureaus. That's a lot of people. They had -- it was really hard to choose. Our goal is to pull together a leadership committee and start the program in the new fiscal year, so this isn't the last of us. You'll see more. We'll see you soon. Thank you so much for your support.

Hales: Thank you. Questions for this great group of mentors and mentees if you have any? Other than what you've already said about how do we expand and keep this going. Barriers other than that that we have to fund and continue, but other barriers that we --

Caselton: The time, we did seek -- before any applicant could participate in the program even though it was a volunteer basis there were a few hours that we asked specifically like the initial orientation training to set them up for success. That was a couple hours. That was during work hours. We try to do everyone training during lunch. Employees all the way out from the Mt. Tabor yards and the fire bureau, from all different parts of the city that are coming to the training downtown. That takes time. You know, some people don't have desk jobs. Tekal is with Portland street car. Having the time to do this and having support from the managers to finance and invest in their future leaders in their bureaus, they are very loyal.

Hales: Good point.

Caselton: We'll be asking. Don't worry.

Hales: Debbie, you'll be so shy in asking I know. [laughter]

Caselton: Ten years. You get bold.

Hales: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak before we take a motion to accept your report? Is there anyone? Motion.

November 16-17, 2016

Fritz: So moved.

Novick: Second.

Hales: Let's take a vote, please.

Novick: Thank you so much for this report and for the work you're doing, which is vitally important and that's obviously absolutely critical that we retain our people, people of color, women, that they move into positions of leadership and it is embarrassing that 64% of our managers are male. I just did my best to shift that balance again by losing my last election but the deep graduation program is on my calendar. I'll be honored to attend that as my last act as a commissioner. Thank you so much.

Fritz: So in a month, eight days where we didn't shatter the glass ceiling that I hoped that we would, it's so good to see that in fact we're not going to build a wall around Portland, we're going to encourage people to come here if they agree with our ideals. Our whole state is a sanctuary state, that we know that people should be able to come here like I did, like you did, and be successful. To be careful. I want to thank you for your leadership of deep. [applause] When I first assigned the office of human relations we put in 2009 we put deep into that structure and it was not nearly as robust as it is today, let's put it right there. Thank you, Dante, for your support within the office of equity and human rights. [applause] thank you for all the mentors who are recognizing that actually you don't make change in one fell swoop you make it one at a time, by one promotion at a time, one election at a time. Thank you so much for what you do. Aye.

Hales: Let me start by making what might seem to be a strange comparison but since your smart professionals you'll get it. When I was first involved in public policy Portland decided to do some things that we believed in like not having like not have an urban growth boundary, transit, support bicycles. We became a beacon for those ideas then the whole country started following those ideas. Right now, there's a question about where is the beacon. I think it is once again in cities. It's in cities on social justice issues like ban the box or living wages. It's in cities on environmental issues like climate action. And it's in cities in terms of smart, inclusive growth. The world beat a path to our door as commissioner Fritz mentioned in that sense they said, I would like to live in a place like that and a lot of people moved here. But I think a lot of people will want to work here because ever the culture that you're creating that we're creating together. So that's why this work is so important. More important than ever because we will be a beacon of opportunity for people professionally and of healthy, safe, inclusive city where people will want to live and work. What happens when you're in a competitive environment and you're better than everybody else is everybody else looks at you and says, I guess I'm going to have to do that. So even at a time of national trauma and misdirection, to put it mildly, Portland will be a beacon and you're a big piece of that. Let me say something also as a manager. When your mayor you're the leader of this giant enterprise, thousands of employees reporting to multiple people. You get a diffuse view of the big thing but you're also a manager. I have a staff in my office and thanks largely to the good work of my chiefs of staff, we have built over the time I have been here what I believe is the most diverse mayor's office staff that has ever served in this building and I'm proud of that, proud that the achieving that level of diversity in my own office, but I'm even more proud that as you know some of those folks are now spinning off into really cool opportunities in city bureaus or elsewhere because we mentored them. And so I'm proud of that. But I have a message to that majority of white male managers that we have and that is having those smart people with cultural understanding that I never would have had without them around my table has made me a better mayor and a better manager of my part of this enterprise. Any manager that doesn't get that I'll repeat it, that if you have a diverse team surrounding you and your organization public or private will succeed much more greatly than you ever

November 16-17, 2016

would without that diversity. It's in your personal interest, in your organization's interest because you'll be better at what you do, and it's in the public interest that we do exactly what this program and all of you are doing. So I'm very pleased to bless the work that you've done so far and celebrate all the good work that is ahead. Aye. Thank you very much. Let's hear it for you. [applause] great job.

Caselton: Thank you.

Hales: Item 1290, we'll take more testimony, please, sue. Maybe not necessarily people weren't necessarily signed up. If you're here to -- what's that? Moment for process here. There's some people here right now. If you're here to speak on the residential infill project we're going to try to get you all in before our 5:00 break. The first three could come up we'll try to get this group in then we are going to take our one-hour mercy break on the council and come back at 6:00. But since you have been waiting we'll get you in now. So welcome.

Sylvia DePue: Just a little nervous.

Hales: Don't be nervous. You're welcome.

Depue: I'm Sylvia DePue and I live at 3914 southwest Baird street. I have lived there almost 50 years minus a few months. When I moved in it was rural. Then we had it annexed and brought us into the city even though we didn't want to be. The road is still gravel. Because of all the infill that is happening I have been supportive of that. They are putting three houses on a lot, they build will built a huge condo and now we have about an acre and a half next door to me, an acre, acre and a half, right now scheduled to do eight houses on that, which I can live with. I don't love it but I can live with it. He's apparently waiting to do it for the last few years to put apartments in there. He's just bulldozed down a 1920 house in there. There's about a 100-year-old house. He's gone in and he pulled out a bunch of trees. I had asked him to show me where he considers the property line. I showed him where -- what trees he plants. I think he's pulling out some of my trees. He won't talk to me. Where I live is describing it that way is a community. There's many people there that have lived there 30, 40, 50 -- I'm the longest living there on that street. It's a community in which we do get together. We know each other we support in the true community of supporting each other as individuals. That means if somebody gets sick for two or three years, we are looking out for them. We're taking them to the hospital. We're getting them food. The people that are moving in to the places down the street, they don't understand the rural community concept of people working with each other. When we're doing the infill, that's a piece I feel like is being overlooked a bit. I also have a rental place. I have taught for 45 years in Portland. I taught at Lents so I know that area, northwest, northeast, southeast Portland. I know these areas. I have a duplex in southeast, east Moreland. I have watched some people come in and they say, this is a rental. They ruin all the doors and things and walls in the house. They don't think they have to clean up anything. They run home forward. Home forward did nothing but say you might do this. But then the guy when he loaded up he didn't say what he was saying to me and to her when I went over there.

Hales: Thanks. Appreciate you putting the human side of this in play. Thank you.

Depue: Well, I think it's really important because it's diversity. It's a piece of the diversity I keep renters; I have only raised the rent -- I haven't even raised it in three years. I'm going to raise it \$25. I can raise it a whole lot more. So I am working and I also have helped one lady who is homeless get into housing. Took me three years to get her there. So I have been working on all these things and I worked in special ed. I know these populations. I have worked to bring the black community together with the white community in that area a number of years ago. The school district is like everything is about efficiency. Efficiency is important I don't underestimate that, but there's a people element when we had the people

November 16-17, 2016

connecting our community was going over there, they were coming here. I don't want us to lose that piece of humanity, social justice, because to me I love them. New people into the community. We have people that rent. They are welcome into our community.

Hales: That's great. I appreciate you raising that point. Thank you very much. Welcome, sir. Good afternoon.

Loren Lutzenhizer: I'm emeritus professor of diversity and planning at psu. I don't have a strong view of one side or the other. I want to expose you to some facts. I strongly support affordability and increased density but discovered the proposal doesn't provide much of either. Usually publicly available demolition construction, real estate census data in my ongoing research which has to do with carbon emission and replacements it was easy enough to ask a few other questions about affordability for example. So here's what I found. You incur costs and incomes that rezoning would produce owner occupied affordable to only about 20% of the renter population with highest incomes. This group doesn't have any affordability problems. Adus show potential for affordability but only for the 40% of households with incomes of 45,000 a year or more. The affordability crisis is hitting households hardest at much lower levels of income. Rental units are even less affordable in owner occupied units since renters pay 15 to 20% more than owners for exactly the same unit. Portland's demographic, means density from proposed new housing types is not significantly better than from non-demolition alternatives such as renovation of houses with added adus. Absentee ownership of multiplexes on lots with underlying lot lines rezoned to r2.5. This could create conditions of accelerated gentrification and erosion of social capital that could change relatively rapidly. Much more could be done to encourage already allowed adus with no pre-zoning required. Opportunities need to be created for households larger than one or two persons which is with we have in Portland. That's who is going to occupy the units. Fancy with school age children opportunities to own renovated homes in the city as more affordable alternatives than demolition and replacement, multiplexes. It should be better informed by social science, actual knowledge and rigorous analysis. While well intentioned we need to go beyond policy proposals and develop practical interventions grounded in real world data. There may be ideologically or political reasons but not really on the grounds of affordability or cost effective density.

Hales: Thanks very much. Welcome.

Susan Lindsey: Susan Lindsey, 625 southeast 17th avenue. What he said, you know, boy, he said it well, I certainly can't articulate it that well other than say I don't know that I think the process was particularly well meaning. I hate to have to say that in a public format but I am saying it. I have had concerns about this process from the beginning. I felt that there were way too many developers on the committee and that that created an inherent conflict of interest. Bureau of planning and sustainability has stated it will not address issues of affordability. What I believe we'll see -- originally the group was brought together because there were so many concerns by neighborhood activists about demolitions and about this giant houses being built in place of single family homes that were affordable. Down came the small house and up came the giant house, took out the yard, took out the trees and who moved in? Two people who had enough money to do that. So if you put this plan in, gosh, now we have the entire east side to be able to do that to. Is this the kind of Portland that we want? I really think not. I think that I ask you guys to take a look at the fact that we have given away the farm already to developers. Asked them to open their books. What do you think has driven up the cost of those rents? Do you think it's just the fact that people are moving here? No. It's not. It's that many of these new buildings have been built and then the rents have been just astronomical and then what happens with the existing long term renters who were renting, older structures and felt like, hey, what's the deal? We're renting for things for five or \$600 a month less. We should

November 16-17, 2016

raise our rates. It's been driven by the greed and I'm going to say it here, the greed of the development community and the people that have gone in there and I think you guys have been absolutely too lax and you should not be giving these things away. I think this proposal is another giveaway and that you ought to do a whole lot of process going back to it, taking a look. Reminding what we care about in Portland. We care about keeping the people that are here being able to keep those people, not having them have to leave.

Hales: Thank you very much. I think we had a couple other folks that were waiting then we'll take a break.

Fritz: I would suggest after these folks we take a break.

Hales: Let's hear from the three of you if we can.

*****: We'll let her talk and hopefully I'll get to talk in just a few minutes. [audio not understandable]

Andrew Burt: All right, hello. I'm Andrew Burt. I what us born and raised in Portland. I lived in the metro area for all of seven of my 40 years. I'm in the southeast Woodstock area. When I first looked for a place to live it was a priority to find a place with nice, old Portland character. I had grown up with nice old houses with wood floors. I had an idea what I was looking for. I didn't need a whole house so for me plexes are perfect. First was a quadplex on a street corner built in the late 1890s on southeast 16th and salmon. Later I moved to a nicer place, a duplex within a block of that which I believe was built in the late '20s or early '30s. These are classic, beautiful old buildings. It was difficult to find a selection of these to rent from but I biked, walked and shopped locally before I ever had to buy a car, which was lovely. Only drove very infrequently. Both were affordable and the right size, both two bedrooms for me since I didn't need to -- didn't have a large family or anything. I have had friends throughout my life who have lived in smaller scale old apartments, garden style or the kind you see in northwest Portland, especially the garden court ones southeast. They had higher ceilings, wood floors, good neighborhood character. They didn't feel like giant concrete blocks. The market is vastly more expensive, there are very few plexes available. I'm particularly fond of them I'll admit. The option seems to be living much farther out or living in one of the giant concrete blocks downtown. A number of my friends who are musicians or artists have had to move out of Portland because of the high rent. They are for me what makes it a vibrant place to live in.

Fritz: Are you supporting the proposal?

Burt: I am, yes. I would love to have more of these housing options available to me again as a Portland resident. I would love to have more affordable housing options available to people of all income levels including myself. I would expand the proposals to allow duplexes and triplexes and quadplexes throughout the city. I don't think it's a negative at all. It's a positive throughout residential neighborhoods.

Fritz: If you could submit your testimony that would be helpful.

Hales: Welcome.

Chris Browne: I'm Chris Browne. I live in the cully neighborhood. I'm the vice chair for the cully association of neighbors. I'm not necessarily speaking for the neighborhood but our neighborhood is mentioned in many articles about this issue. Some of the people in our neighborhood are pretty involved in the rip stuff. I have heard here how the Portland for everyone has lots of approval and neighborhood approvals. In July of this year, when the general membership takes its two-month break, our board met and approved the platform for the Portland for everyone. That is a violation of our written procedures, document. You're supposed to have a general meeting and the general public is supposed to weigh in on all these things. One of the board members quit in protest and I now have her job. That's why I'm the vice chair. The approval was put forth by our land use chair, David sweet, if you know him. And I tried to get them to go through the general meeting and get a

November 16-17, 2016

vote but nobody would do it. So I also called around the king neighborhood, who is another one. They approved Portland for everyone with the board meeting and not with a general meeting. So that's really all I had to say. Just appreciate that. I question some of the Portland for everybody's backing.

Hales: Thank you. Welcome.

Dave Johnson: Commissioners, mayor, thank you. Thank you for getting us in before dinner. We much appreciate it. Dixie will follow me, I guess. I'm Dave Johnson. I live at 055 southwest palatine hill road. I'm the land use chair for the Collins view neighborhood association. There's a letter that I had previously submitted but it may be helpful to look at it. A couple of quick notes on it, first, since writing that letter the neighborhood has now adopted that position. You should have another communication from the board chair with roughly identical items on it. Generally, and kind of quickly, we think that the overall procedure here should follow the usual procedure and go through the full legislative process before proceeding even with a concept. First it's too vague to respond to really intelligently, so the response is based on what we sort of read into it as best we can make it out. Second, we also think if the council decides at this point that this is a concept we want, it sort of is pre-decided and doesn't lead you to an objective determination after it goes through a legislative process with the details. We have laid out there some of the things that we think would go with the added density that this would apparently bring. We have in Collins view mostly r7 and r10 lots. We have very few sidewalks and other infrastructure. Our transit is available for pretty limited in fact we're anxious to testify now so we can get home before the bus stops running since we took trimet and the bus won't run by the time we would stay for the later session. So.

Hales: You put this in writing too.

Johnson: I realize that. I won't go through it in great detail.

Fritz: I'm sorry, but we have been in session for a long time. We need to get one -- in writing.

Johnson: Well, here we have it in writing. To just finish up I think the testimony today has shown that all the neighborhoods are quite different. So to do this as a one-over lay for the whole city maybe doesn't quite fit.

Hales: We understand that.

Johnson: We also think it should go back through the full process rather than going ahead this way. So I see my two minutes are up and if Dixie can be accommodated --

Hales: Dixie can you be real brief We really have to take a break.

Dixie: Thank you for accommodating me. Dixie Johnson, Collins view. David and I have been active in the association doing land use issues for 21 years. This is deja vu all over again, southwest community plan code rewrite housing, comp plan rewrite, so forth over the years. Every time we have seen the development community come in and take advantage of our situation. They keep saying we need more density. They don't always think of affordability. Right now we have developers fighting rent control. This is a money-maker for them. It does not build community. It does not build neighborhood cohesiveness. It is rather destructive and it should not be city-wide and it does go against our comp plan. Right here. So it will have to be rewritten. It's taken eight years. It will have to be redone. We found out last night there are 16,000 documents that have to go in with this document right here to -- before they will adopt it. We just found that out last night. It's going to take a long time to process it. There's no rush. Please put it through the correct legislative process.

Hales: Last word.

Jim Whittenburg: Yes. Sorry to see you go.

Hales: Thank you.

November 16-17, 2016

Whittenburg: It will be a loss. I just want to say I was horrified a few months ago when I turned on the television and saw Fallon Smart was killed. This little 15-year-old girl died on Hawthorne. We worked so hard on that street, and I was told that by people -- I quit working on that street because I thought people would get that thing slowed down a little bit. They are going 50, 60 miles an hour down that street and they don't care what they do to people. I walk all the time because I can't drive. I'm terrified on the streets here in town. If it keeps going I'm going to be one of those fatalities too along with my strokes and stuff. So you need to think about this as you infill the communities as you get more people in there, that means more kids, more kids got to get across the street to get to school and it puts more in danger every day going across the streets that are really filled up with cars. They are the worst I have ever seen. I have lived here 60 years. Just horrified mess. If you look on the paper, I had a little stroke yesterday, so I'm not talking very well. He talks about what happens on that street. There's two more people talking about what's happening. That was the copy I noticed. But people are not stopping for pedestrians. They are not. That's going to make some of them -- as fatalities on the streets. I'm worried about life for the people covered everything I had to say today here.

Hales: Appreciate you and be safe out there.

Fritz: Thank you for the documentation. That's very helpful.

Hales: We're going to take a brief break until 6:00 p.m. So we're going to break until 6:15. 6:15 it is.

At 5:15 p.m. Council Recessed

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

Hales: Good afternoon, everyone and welcome to the November 17th meeting of the Portland city council. Would you please call the roll?

[roll call]

Hales: welcome, everyone. Bear with us. We have some business left over from yesterday's regular council meeting because we were short of a quorum for emergency items and therefore, have to act on some things briefly today that we had to set over. First of all, we have our consent calendar from yesterday. Were there any requests to remove anything from the consent calendar?

Parsons: 1271 and that was Mr. Lightning.

Hales: We're going to take 1271 off the consent calendar and act on it separately.

Saltzman: I need to pull 1272.

Hales: The lease extension?

Saltzman: There's a conflict.

Hales: Okay. We're going to pull 1271 and 1272 off for separate action and if there are no further requests, we're going to take a vote on the remain of the consent calendar, please.

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

Hales: Okay. Let's take 1271.

Item 1271.

Hales: Okay. We have staff here to very briefly explain this item. I think it was pulled off by someone who was going to speak about it and I'm not sure if he's here.

Pauline Goble, Office of Management and Finance: Good afternoon, I'm the property manager for the bureau of internal business services and the purpose of this ordinance is to request council to grant the authority to the director of the bureau of internal business services, the authority to sign and execute all leases and other contract requirements that will be entered into and related to the Portland building reconstruction relocation project. This is in lieu of submitting a separate ordinance to council for each individual lease and due to the limited availability of space in the central business district, we are requesting this authority so that the leases can be secured without delay and potentially limiting the risk of losing available space.

Hales: Okay, questions about that? I just have one question; I just want to make sure we're following our sustainability policies in particular with respect to relocating our facilities if at all possible into buildings that pay a living wage to the service workers that serve those buildings.

Goble: Well, we have the green building policy that we're following and I was not aware of that policy.

Hales: We generally try to locate --

Goble: We try to maximize investment by relocating them into buildings owned by the city.

Hales: Right but then we also try to locate in building that pay living wages to the people that clean and serve those buildings as security guards because we've policy beyond our own employees to contractors. So it's important that we check on that.

Goble: Absolutely.

November 16-17, 2016

Hales: Don't have to answer right now, but as you proceed that should be a factor.

Goble: And I have a broker here from our commercial team. We will make sure we follow that, as well. Definitely.

Fritz: You could come back to us with a full list to report what was done.

Goble: Absolutely.

Hales: Okay. And is the person who pulled this off as a citizen, I don't think he is, Mr. Lightning, right? Other questions for these folks? Appreciate what you're doing. It's a big job. Thank you very much. Late then take action on 1271. I asked. I don't think there's anyone that wants to speak besides him.

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

Hales: Aye. Thank you and good luck. It's not an easy market out there. Okay. 1272.

Item 1272.

Hales: You're going to stay where you are?

Sam Hutchinson, Director, Bureau of Fire and Police Disability and Retirement: Yes, we had done some research with the help of colliers international who does the work for facilities for relocation. We're going to elect to stay where we are. We still have some issues of whether or not we're going to move into the Portland building so instead of moving now and later, potentially into the Portland building, we're going to stay in place, the lease will be extended to October 2020, which will be about the time if we do move into the Portland building we would move into the Portland building.

Hales: Okay. Questions?

Saltzman: I had this pulled because I must recuse myself due to a potential conflict of interest on this.

Hales: Does it still pass? It can't pass without four. So we're going to have to carry this item over until commissioner Fish returns, until next week, right? No crisis there? All right. Carrying it over until next week. [gavel] thank you. Okay. You don't have a conflict of interest. Oh, so you're not here next week. We're going to carry it over until we do have a quorum. We'll figure that out. A quorum minus commissioner Saltzman. That's it for the consent calendar. Now, going back to the regular agenda, we had 1282 I believe? To vote on?

Item 1282.

Hales: Okay we conducted a hearing on this yesterday, no one here to speak on this today. If not we will take action. Let's take a vote, please.

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

Hales: Aye. And then the next one that we have to carry over for a vote was 1286.

Item 1286.

Hales: Anyone want to speak on this item? Then we are ready to vote, please.

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

Hales: Great little project in a great park. Aye. 1287.

Item 1287.

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

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

Hales: And 1288.

Item 1288.

Hales: Okay. Anyone want to speak on this item? If not let's vote, please.

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

Hales: Aye. Okay. I believe that cleans up the items that we couldn't act on yesterday and have now gotten taken care of. So let's move on to this afternoon's item, which is 1292.

Item 1292.

November 16-17, 2016

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 is 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.

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

November 16-17, 2016

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. Som 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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 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.

November 16-17, 2016

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 ago, I spear-headed a survey 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 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.

November 16-17, 2016

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 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 hopsford abernathy 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

November 16-17, 2016

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., 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 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,

November 16-17, 2016

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 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.

November 16-17, 2016

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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 majority of that hoa 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 an 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 ban parking if 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 you're 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 weld salvage in

November 16-17, 2016

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 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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 Sylvia 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.

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.

November 16-17, 2016

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 Jantzen 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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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 ease 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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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, 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

November 16-17, 2016

reduction in the historic district. I would say I'm 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 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 period before you several times and I'm today in support your four amendments. The first two is to amendment 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 commission 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 state 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 really problem is how to get there. Failing to act on the amend will produce only delay. The argument for delay has been the strange assertion that absent a quasi-judicial zone change, the city is powerlines to condition the owners to build a sidewalk powerless. 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 pbob and says the site is well served by transit and comfortable and same walking results are available.

Hales: Thank you.

November 16-17, 2016

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 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-conforming 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.

November 16-17, 2016

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 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.

November 16-17, 2016

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 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

November 16-17, 2016

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.