



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 26TH DAY OF JUNE, 2002 AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, and Saltzman, 3.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Harry Auerbach, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and Officer Peter Hurley, Sergeant at Arms.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>DUE TO THE ABSENCE OF TWO COUNCIL MEMBERS NO EMERGENCY ORDINANCES WERE CONSIDERED THIS WEEK</p> <p>ALSO, ITEMS WERE NOT HEARD UNDER A CONSENT AGENDA</p> <p>COMMUNICATIONS</p> <p>702 Request of Dave Nadal to address Council regarding public acquisition of PGE, professional hockey, and the public hearing scheduling process. (Communication)</p> | <p>Disposition:</p> <p>PLACED ON FILE</p> |
| <p>TIME CERTAINS</p> <p>703 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Approve annexation to the City of property in case number A-1-02, 7301 SE Clatsop St. (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> | <p>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 3, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</p> |
| <p>704 Authorize an extraterritorial service extension from City to the property in case number SE-1-02, 9899 SE Tenino Court (Ordinance)</p> | <p>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 3, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</p> |
| <p>705 TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM – Accept Portland Police Bureau Public Information Office Website development (Report introduced by Mayor Katz) (Y-3)</p> | <p>ACCEPTED</p> |
| <p>706 TIME CERTAIN: 10:30 AM – Authorize the Office of the Mayor to develop a process to streamline and update the City building and land regulations, and improve regulatory-related procedures and customer services (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>Motion to amend to add development of customer service protocols: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and gavelled down by Mayor Katz after no objections. (Y-3)</p> | <p>36080 AS AMENDED</p> |

| REGULAR AGENDA | | |
|---|--|--|
| Mayor Vera Katz | | |
| <p>707 Appoint Janice Wilson and Matt Hennessee to the Portland Development Commission for a three-year appointment to expire July 10, 2005 (Report) (Y-3)</p> | | CONFIRMED |
| <p>708 Adopt a new classification and compensation plan for Nonrepresented classifications and administrative staff of Elected Officials, specify the effect upon employees moving to the classification and compensation plan and establish an effective date (Ordinance) Motion to suspend the rules return to item 708: Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman. Motion to amend exhibit A with a substitute exhibit A: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi</p> | | PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED JULY 3, 2002 AT 9:30 AM |
| <p>709 Adopt the First Amendment to the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Plan to incorporate language regarding sustainability (Ordinance)</p> | | PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 3, 2002 AT 9:30 AM |
| <p>710 Amend the fee schedule for land use applications and related planning services charged by the Office of Planning and Development Review effective July 1, 2002 (Previous Agenda 593)</p> | | REFERRED TO COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION |
| <p>711 Authorize an agreement with Oregon Arena Corporation for sharing revenue if a National Hockey League franchise plays home games at the Rose Garden (Second Reading Agenda 670) (Y-3)</p> | | 176602 |
| Commissioner Jim Francesconi | | |
| <p>712 Assess benefited property for the costs of constructing street improvements in the Lents I Local Improvement District (Hearing; Ordinance; C-9986) Motion to prepare an ordinance and bring it back to the council: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.</p> | | PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 3, 2002 AT 9:30 AM |
| <p>713 Assess benefited property for the costs of constructing street improvements in the Lents II Local Improvement District (Hearing; Ordinance; C-9987) Motion to overrule the remonstrances: Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman.</p> | | PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 3, 2002 AT 9:30 AM |

JUNE 26, 2002

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>714 Assess benefited property for the costs of constructing street improvements in the Boise/Earl Boyles Park Local Improvement District (Hearing; Ordinance; C-9998)</p> | <p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 3, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</p> |
| <p>715 Waive requirements of City Code 5.68 and contract with Elders in Action for \$63,890 annually for the operation of elders programs through June 30, 2007 (Ordinance)</p> | <p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 3, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</p> |
| <p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p> | |
| <p>716 Authorize an agreement and provide payment for services for Bull Run Conduit Corridor Landslide Assessment and Monitoring Project (Second Reading Agenda 675) (Y-3)</p> | <p align="center">176603</p> |
| <p>717 Amend contract with MWH Energy and Infrastructure, Inc. to authorize additional work for the Bull Run Dam No. 1 Outlet Works Improvements Project (Second Reading Agenda 676; amend Contract No. 33861) (Y-3)</p> | <p align="center">176604</p> |
| <p>718 Amend contract between Bureau of Water Works and Raleigh Water District for the sale of water (Second Reading Agenda 677; amend Contract No. 18458) (Y-3)</p> | <p align="center">176605</p> |
| <p>719 Amend contract between Bureau of Water Works and Palatine Hill Water District for the sale of water (Second Reading Agenda 678; amend Contract No. 18577) (Y-3)</p> | <p align="center">176606</p> |
| <p>720 Amend contract between Bureau of Water Works and Lusted Water District for the sale of water (Second Reading Agenda 679; amend Contract No. 18682) (Y-3)</p> | <p align="center">176607</p> |
| <p>721 Amend contract between Bureau of Water Works and West Slope Water District for the sale of water (Second Reading Agenda 680; amend Contract No. 18684) (Y-3)</p> | <p align="center">176608</p> |
| <p>722 Amend contract between Bureau of Water Works and Valley View Water District for the sale of water (Second Reading Agenda 681; amend Contract No. 19151) (Y-3)</p> | <p align="center">176609</p> |
| <p>723 Amend contract between Bureau of Water Works and Lake Grove Water District for the sale of water (Second Reading Agenda 682; amend Contract No. 19289) (Y-3)</p> | <p align="center">176610</p> |

JUNE 26, 2002

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| <p>724 Amend contract between Bureau of Water Works and Pleasant Home Water District for the sale of water (Second Reading Agenda 683; amend Contract No. 19313) (Y-3)</p> | <p>176611</p> |
| <p>Commissioner Erik Sten</p> | |
| <p>725 Apply for a \$1,578,699 grant from the U.S. Department of Justice for the Bureau of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services to purchase communications, decontamination and personal protective equipment (Second Reading Agenda 684) (Y-3)</p> | <p>176612</p> |
| <p>726 Allow Port of Portland Airport Fire Department and other public or private agencies to inspect occupancies under Fire Bureau jurisdiction (Second Reading Agenda 685; amend Code Title 31) (Y-3)</p> | <p>176613</p> |

At 12:39 p.m., Council recessed.

JUNE 26, 2002

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,
OREGON WAS HELD THIS 26TH DAY OF JUNE, 2002 AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, and Saltzman, 3.

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

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>727 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM – Adopt the action charts of the Marquam Hill plan (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz) Continued to June 27, 2002 at 2:00 p.m.</p> | <p align="center">Disposition: CONTINUED TO JULY 3, 2002 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</p> |
| <p>728 Reaffirm the Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan, its implementing measures, and include the Terwilliger Parkway Design Guidelines (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz) Continued to June 27, 2002 at 2:00 p.m.</p> | <p align="center">CONTINUED TO JULY 3, 2002 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</p> |
| <p>*729 Adopt and implement the Marquam Hill Plan (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz) Continued to June 27, 2002 at 2:00 p.m.</p> | <p align="center">CONTINUED TO JULY 3, 2002 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</p> |
| <p align="center">Mayor Vera Katz</p> | |
| <p>730 Accept and implement the Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan urban design map, voluntary neighborhood design guidelines, and action items (Previous Agenda 688) (Y-3)</p> | <p align="center">36081</p> |
| <p>731 Adopt and implement the Portsmouth Neighborhood plan vision statement, policies, and objectives, Comprehensive Plan map and zoning map designations (Second Reading Agenda 689) (Y-3)</p> | <p align="center">176614 AS AMENDED</p> |

At 6:00 p.m., Council recessed.

JUNE 27, 2002

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,
OREGON WAS HELD THIS 27TH DAY OF JUNE, 2002 AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, and
Saltzman, 3.

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

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>732 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM - Possible continuation of Marquam Hill Plan from Wednesday, June 26th Agenda Item Nos. 727, 728 and 729</p> | <p>Disposition: See 727, 728, 729 CONTINUED TO JULY 3, 2002 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</p> |
|---|--|

At 5:17 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love
Clerk of the Council

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

JUNE 26, 2002

Closed Caption Transcript of Portland City Council Meeting

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

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

JUNE 26, 2002 9:30 AM

Katz: Good morning. The council will come to order. [roll call] commissioner Sten is on a learning mission. He will be coming back July 1, and he'll teach us everything he's learned. All right. Let's take 702.

Item 702.

Katz: You have three minutes.

Dave Nadal: Okay. Sounds good. I'm from Multnomah neighborhood, 3024 southwest Florida court. I want to address what she mentioned, those three topics. Council hearing process with respect to the Marquam Hill tram, and I have three short paragraphs. With all that's happened with PGE and Enron I have myself craving to see the headlines say metro area partners cooperate and bid to buy PGE. Energy is a highly regulated utility, prices are through the roof and there's an opportunity for civic leaders to think fast and grab it. Now is that time. If one small local government can come close to making a bid for PGE, certainly a group of all our local metro governments could pull it off. I don't have any more trust of a private group now proposing acquisition than any other private group that can sell their interests out of state. That would -- this would be a good time for that. Regarding professional hockey, I believe while there's strong support locally for athletics, if you polled city residents there's widespread alienation. Professional athletes no longer represent the cities or regions they're from, athletes are bought and sold like trading cards. Please put our city resources into things that foster local athletic venues like high school and college level programs as well as parks programs. Third, hearing has been scheduled for July 10th at 2:00 p.m. Regarding the overhead tramway proposed to connect OHSU with the Macadam Riverfront area. My objection is that it is first not an evening hearing. As for the Marquam hearing this afternoon, both I and hundreds of others who want to testify have to be at work in the afternoon. As to an issue I'm hard put to think of a recent issue with more widespread controversy and citizen interest obviously calling for an evening 6:00 p.m. hearing. Further, and finally, the ODOT report that announced the hearing time and date came out only last Thursday. The breadth and scope of the issues it covers required detailed analysis, moreover, after reading that report I find that it glosses over all the main public concerns in alarmingly simplistic fashion, has inadequate footnoting, so anyone who wants to independently research the issue is somewhat hindered from doing that adequately. The last sentence, this report, which appears to have been hastily thrown together, is transparent in how it glosses over all of the main issues of public concern about the tramway. So I urge council to slow the tramway analysis process down, commission entirely new analyses, and send it back for the full planning commission consideration that it deserves. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. 703.

Item 703.

Katz: Come on up. Tell us why you're doing it.

Laura Butman, Office of Management and Finance: I'm with the office of management and finance. And Ken is here to give the staff report today.

Ken Norton, Office of Management and Finance: This is one lot annexation of the city. It's right on the county line. It's on the edge of Clatsop Street south of sure it, west of 75th and contains

JUNE 26, 2002

.31 acres, one single family dwelling, a population of one, and is valued at \$84,000. The reason for this annexation is the property owner wants to split that lot and make a second house there. When it comes in the city it will come in as an r7 zone. There is a request here to add the street right of way if you do approve this annexation, that's an appropriate way to take in the rest of that clatsop street. And we also would urge that you would draw this from clackamas county rfpd number 1 and mid-county service district for street lights. It meets all the requirements in the metro code and in the state statutes, and we would recommend approval.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. Questions? Did you have anything you wanted to add?

*******:** No.

Katz: Anybody want to testify on this item? Fine. Thank you, everybody. Passes to second. [gavel pounded] 704.

Item 704.

Norton: Under the metro code, which applies to all cities in the area, extraterritorial sewer line extensions have to be reviewed in the same annexations. That's why you're reviewing this proposal.

This is an extraterritorial sewer line extension to serve a single family dwelling. This is located in clackamas county, but is within Portland's urban servicing area and ultimately would annex into the city. It's located on the south edge of the city edge of suncrest drive and south of clatsop street. It has an existing single family dwelling on it. The services available from the city service will not be extended until the applicant signs a petition for annexation and records that with the deed, and that's in process right now. We would recommend approval.

Katz: Anybody want to testify on this item? When I first glanced at it it was late at night, I thought it was extra terrestrial service extension. [laughter] I didn't realize where we were going. All right. Anybody want to testify? If not, it passes to second. [gavel pounded] all right. 705.

Moore: That is a 10:00 a.m. Time certain.

Katz: Oh, yes, and we don't have our players yet. All right. Let's take -- let's go then to 716. 716, all the way to 726. Wait, let's take 711.

Item 711.

Katz: Okay. Roll call.

Francesconi: This is a good opportunity for the city. It brings -- has the potential to bring a major employer here to our city at a time that we could use the benefits from a major employer in terms of tax revenues. It's a way to activate the coliseum area that needs more activation. It's a way to provide recreation to our citizens in terms of working class entertainment at a more affordable price than some other tickets. And it's a way to provide some needed revenue for the city at no risk to the taxpayers. So this is a good thing. And this is another way to -- what's terrific about this is that we're not subsidizing a new arena, we're coming up with a lot of tax -- or coming up with a lot of taxpayer dollars, utilizing what we have in a way that benefits the city. Thanks for your work, mayor. Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] I see that matt hennessee is here, so let's jump to read -- stay with me, karla, we're going to jump around. 707.

Item 707.

Katz: Mr. Hennessee, why don't you come up here. Tell us a little bit about yourself and why you said yes when I asked you. [laughter]

Matt Hennessee, Appointee to Portland Development Commission: Good morning, madam mayor, members of the council. For the record, i'm matt hennessee. I said yes because I -- you gave me an offer I couldn't refuse. That was off the record. I feel very strongly about livability of the city. I love Portland immensely, have had many years in public sector administration, and also in the private sector. And I really appreciate the work that's been done between this body and also the Portland development commission. Certainly the commission has many things that can be

JUNE 26, 2002

spoken positively about. I consider it really an honor to have been asked to be a part of the Portland development commission. I look very forward with your blessing for the opportunity to serve, because serving to me is a really important thing as well. And I believe there are many wonderful things that will happen. Again, meshing public-private type of partnerships we have here in the city.

Katz: Thank you, matt. Questions?

Francesconi: I don't have any questions, but I have 20 witnesses outside that want to testify in opposition. [laughter]

Hennessee: Let's leave them outside.

Katz: Thank you, matt.

Hennessee: Thank you.

Katz: Thanks very much, and thanks for saying yes.

Hennessee: You bet.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Actually, all kidding aside, this is a terrific appointment, mayor. Because as we're struggling to remain one community, matt brings experience from a variety of perspectives. Not only the public and private as he mentioned, but he's also been very active in the community. He is a pastor of a church as well as a business executive, so as we're seeking to use economic development and housing in other development strategies to build a vibrant community, we also want to make sure it's a city with opportunity for all, and matt's life has demonstrated that he understands that. Aye.

Saltzman: I want to thank matt for accepting a term on the pdc. I'm sure the meetings are about to take a more lively turn. A much more dynamic environment. Aye.

Katz: I agree with both of them it will be much more -- it will be lively and commissioner Francesconi, I thought you were going to say, and he's a pastor and we need a little prayer to help us along with all of the challenges, and matt certainly can give that to us. I'm very pleased that both of them have accepted the invitation. Aye. [gavel pounded] all right. Let's go back jumping around. 716.

Item 716.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 717.

Item 717.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 718.

Item 718.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 719.

Item 719.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 720.

Item 720.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 721.

Item 721.

JUNE 26, 2002

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 722.

Item 722.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 723.

Item 723.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 724.

Item 724.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 725.

Item 725.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: I just returned from Washington regarding some after-school money we were trying to get as well as money for transportation, and the streetcar. But I was told that chief wilson was there in the last couple weeks regarding this grant, and some other things, and he did a really terrific job in his testimony at congress. So this -- I think this will improve our chances for commissioner Sten and for the city, and for the region to obtain some important money that needs to come to this community to build our infrastructure. Not only fight terrorism, but to meet the public health needs.

Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 726.

Item 726.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] let's go back and see if there's anything else we can pick up. I don't think so. Is john southgate here?

*****: Yes.

Katz: Okay. Let's do your 709 since you were in such a hurry to leave.

Item 709.

*****: Oh, no. 709.

Katz: Let me ask you, john, do you think there will be other people coming to testify?

*****: I don't think so.

Katz: Okay, go ahead.

John Southgate, Portland Development Commission: This is a request actually commissioner Saltzman introduced this notion very soon before the formal council adoption of interstate urban renewal plan in august of 2000, and we certainly agreed this is an important set of principles to embrace, but we had finalized the urban renewal plan and as you all know, we've had a lot of active engagement from our community, so rather than going back and trying to quickly convene meetings of our community partners, we said, let's agree that we'll work on language with the commissioner's staff as well as the staff of bureau of environmental services and the office of sustainable development, and the bureau of planning. So a couple months after formal adoption, we inaugurated those discussions and over a period of a few months refined language, we took that to the interstate corridor advisory committee, which endorsed the proposed language changes unanimously without any objection or contest. And then took it to our commission as well as the

JUNE 26, 2002

planning commission for their endorsement. This is has lagged a bit because we thought it was a minor amendment that did not require coming back for city council action, but our attorneys, to play it safe and because it affects the goal language in our plan, we are now bringing it before you for your formal approval. I guess the only thing side say is that -- i'd say is we at pdc as well as our community partners all certainly want to embrace the sustainability as one of the very few core objectives that guide what we do in interstate urban renewal area. So we fully support it.

Katz: Good work. Anybody else want to testify? Passes on to second. Thanks, commissioner Saltzman.

Saltzman: Can I make a statement?

Katz: Oh, sure. That means you can't make one next week.

Saltzman: Okay. Deal. I just wanted to thank pdc and john southgate in particular and b.e.s. And office of sustainable development for putting this language in our agreement. I think we've come a long way as a city in recognizing the importance of sustainable development and not only have we since -- since we started this language has been incorporated into gateway and north macadam. I really do think it indicates the importance of getting development right, new development in particular, and I think since spring of 2000, the city has come a long way, not only by putting language in our urban renewal agreements, but also by adopting a green building policy, both the city and pdc have adopted green building policies that are best examples of meaning what we say. And that is -- this language talks about what we mean, but the policies mean what we say. And that is that all city and city funded facilities will meet the national green building standard and be independent certified to that effect. It's been a long time in coming for the council, but it will go much further in term of long-term impacts. Thanks for your work.

*****: Thank you.

Katz: Okay. Thank you, everybody. Passes on to second. [gavel pounded] i'm going to take 710 now, and let's read it.

Item 710.

Katz: You recall -- thanks, karla. You recall we had this discussion with regard to the land use review fees. I'm going to ask the council to approve me pulling this back to our office. We will increase the normal cpi fee for the land use review. We don't need an authorization for that, that's the way we normally do our business. But the remainder of the dollars that came to us through increased fees will be received by drawing down on the reserve. So that their budget is balanced and we will not be increasing their fees other than the cpi. I just want to flag to you that, until we know what the implications are for next year or the year after, I can't promise you that they -- there will be no increase at some point. But right now it's just limited to the cpi. All right. Is there any objections for taking it back to the office? You're not going to see it.

Saltzman: Oh.

Katz: We won't act on it. All right? Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [gavel pounded] thank you, everybody. All right. We've got about nine minutes, so let's -- if you promise me you'll be back in eight, we'll take a recess for eight minutes.

At 9:51 a.m., Council recessed.

At 10:00 a.m., Council reconvened.

Katz: Council will come back to order. 705.

Item 705.

Katz: I'm going to let the chief start, though I do want to thank the chief for taking very seriously our e-commerce and the fact that we are in a new era that we communicate with our citizens through a variety of ways, and one of the ways available to most of our citizens, not all, is through the internet. And we are probably the number 1 city in the country, though there is debate whether we're 1 or 2, but we're the -- one of the top cities in the country in the number of people that are connected to the internet. So it's important in the notion of community policing that we have the

JUNE 26, 2002

ability to communicate often and on real time issues with our constituency. So let me just add one other point. Very early on, when commissioner Hales and I came to the council, we talked about a 24-hour city hall. And we're slowly beginning to get to a 24-hour city hall, where citizens can make the contact with the government, their local government, on a regular basis. And this gets us a little closer. All right. Chief.

Mark Kroeker, Chief of Police: Thank you, mayor, and good morning members of the city council. I'm mark kroeker, chief of police of Portland. I'm very pleased to present to you this day our expansion of the use of technology and its marriage with our community policing efforts in our pio website. It is very axiomatic. Community policing depends on communication. People who depend on us for information need to have accurate, timely, up-to-date information. So what we have developed is a system here that is an attachment to our web, a website, as it were, for public information. And this information will be serving both the news media representatives and our community, and I believe it is a first in being able to take what we have by way of information and make it available to an ever-increasingly thirsty community in the age of information. This is the information age, and we depend not only on information, but on the use of technology to produce that information for people. We have a system that has been developed over a number of months now, as I speak, has just been turned on. So people now can check on the information that they need to, can sign up for information as you'll hear in a presentation shortly. But the people that I really need to thank who have done the greatest work on this is our greg hill and steve minnick. We're going to hear from them in the discussion of how this all will actually look and how to access this information, but i'm very pleased that once again the Portland police bureau has first, and we've stepped out in front of the field, as it were, in the age of information, to provide information for our people in yet another community policing initiative for Portland. Thank you.

Katz: Go ahead. I'm watching it from over here.

Kroeker: Okay. Steve is going to actually take us through the demonstration of how it works to show us how a person out there, news media representative or a neighbor can have the same information, but tailored in a way that is most helpful for them. So steve, you can take it away.

*******:** Steve minnick.

Katz: Grab the mike.

Steve Minick, Portland Police Bureau: The public information site actually has been developed in a joint partnership with the Portland police bureau, and the bureau of information technology, a corporate gis division. We're especially appreciative of rick and his group for all the work they've done on the site. It's essentially available from the bureau website in three different ways. The first way is from a pull-down menu that we have, and you can pull that menu down and select Portland police bureau news to go to the site. The second way is from a link that's on the "what's new on the site" link or a third way, a direct link right from the home page, just one click and you're taken immediately to the site. We have some additional information that's available for first-time visitors that they may like to check out, and that's available from the faq page link that's on the site. The website is essentially broken down into three different areas. The first area and probably the -- will be the most popular is the ability to go directly to our press releases and bureau news. From this area of the site you'll notice that all of the content is by default grouped by date, but it's very easy to select a category and see the content grouped by the two categories that we currently have on the site, which are crime stopper alerts and if you scroll down, bureau news releases. We have currently loaded about 150 archived press releases and, believe we have all of our current crime stopper alerts available on the site. You'll notice that there's -- under the category of crime stoppers we have them by subject, then we also have them by subcategory. And also we have a small amount of text that briefly describes the content of the -- either the crime stopper alert or the press release. You'll also notice that some of them have a small camera icon next to the title. The icon is in this case a small camera which indicates that there's an attachment to this crime stopper alert, and

JUNE 26, 2002

that particular attachment is a photograph. The site also has the capability to attach additional documents, and when those are attached, they'll show up as a paper clip attachment next to the title of the release. But when you click on the appropriate crime stopper, in this case crime stopper alert, you'll see that you'll be presented with all of the information related to this particular crime stopper case. The date that it was released, the incident or case number that's been assigned, additional investigators that may be assigned to the case with contact information, telephone numbers, pager numbers, cell phone numbers, and also information for contacting our public information officer, an e-mail address. So we've tried to include a number of different ways to pass along information on how to contact the individuals related to each of these cases. Scrolling down further, you'll see the text of the alert. In this case since we knew there was a photograph associated with this release, we can click on the attached photograph and download a high resolution image that will print, that can also be used by the media and certainly a much more efficient way of distributing attachments, in this case photographs, but if it was an additional attachment it would download in the same way. It's very easy for the users to just click those related links and move around the site, download attachments and photographs for these individuals. The second part of the site is the ability for a user to sign up for immediate notification via e-mail whenever new content is added to the site. Immediate is the default selection, but you can also select daily, weekly, or monthly options, depending on how often you would like to receive e-mail. What happens is that when new content is added to the site, it will automatically notify anyone that has subscribed to the site with a short e-mail message that new content has been added. It will contain the title of the press release or news alert and will contain a link back to the site so the person can click on the link for more detailed information and to view photographs or other attachments. The third part of the site is the ability for the public information office to load content on to the site without going through a bureau webmaster or other technical individual. This allows the pio to directly add content to the site 24/7. They can get information posted to the site immediately, they can easily go back and edit, add additional photographs as those become available, they can add additional contact information as that information becomes available. So we've developed a site that's very easy and efficient for the public information office to be able to add content to this site. One of the final features that we've added is links to our translation service, which allows the site to be translated into eight different languages. In this case we've selected spanish. And once the site is translated, a person can click through the site and maintain the spanish translation without any additional interaction. This makes it very easy for someone in this case in the spanish translation, to both view the content and navigate the site.

Saltzman: Are you going to do that for eight languages?

Minnick: Eight different languages, m-hmm.

Katz: Which languages did you choose?

Minnick: We have spanish, chinese, french, german, italian, japanese, korean, and portuguese. I think that would wrap it up.

Cornelius Swart, Grant Director, Portsmouth Vision 2020, 46 NE Monroe, Portland 97212:

My name is cornelius, and i'm the grant director at portsmouth vision 2020, a community organizing project in north Portland. North Portland and portsmouth neighborhood has a reputation for crime, but in our neighborhood alone, there are 20 organized block watches and an active foot patrol. We are a neighborhood of vigilant citizens in all possible capacity. If something goes wrong in portsmouth, you're going to hear about it. And this web page has tremendous potential to empower the citizens of our neighborhood. With coupled when community policing it can be a powerful tool. As long as it's integrated into a human network of human contact, this tool can do great things. For example, when coupled with the block watch system, you have a group of already vigilant citizens further empowered to report and actively work to maintain peace in their neighborhood themselves and to investigate crime to watch it its movement through crime mapper,

JUNE 26, 2002

and to know what's going on in their community and to know how to do something about it when something goes wrong. When coupled with the neighborhood liaison officer, who goes around to neighborhood meetings, it becomes again a powerful tool where you have human contact, where already vigilant citizens who have taken the extra step to become involved can become further empowered. This website is like baseball. When you take something like this and add it to solid fundamentals, you've got a winning team. And when coupled with a system that has open police stations, the capacity to hold suspects, and the capacity to address emergencies with high response times, this web page will make a solid system remarkable. We're really looking forward to using this system in portsmouth, and thank you for giving us this opportunity to talk about it.

Francesconi: That was a good analogy.

Swart: Major league baseball. [laughter] thank you.

Rick Shulte: Good morning. My name is rick, and i'm the corporate gs manager. I'd like to say thank you to the council, the chief, and everyone involved with steve and jane for putting together a wonderful piece of technology that's actually being used, and we hope will continue to be worked on and enhanced. One of the things i'd like to bring up, this is actually not necessarily a new development, it's been an ongoing development of technology here in the city. One of the reasons we were able to bring this together in a fairly short order with the sophisticated means of communication is, the way that we've developed these technologies. We're actually leveraging things wed done in the past, be it crime mapper, carpool match, Portlandmaps.com, all those technologies we've built were actually reusing parts and pieces of them to continue to enhance the functionality. So we're really getting a very good return on our investment by developing it once and using it many times. And this is an example of that. Some of the things we want to talk about are -- that I wanted to bring up is the way that we see this moving forward in the future is the ability steve was talking about, allowing people to a wider audience rather than a technical person provide information or content. That's really what we're trying to empower the staff and actually the community to provide the information rather than having to go through a technical means of getting it into a site. So we're really pleased to see the ability to do that. The other thing is that we have hopefully developed this in a way that we'll be able to expand this citywide, so it will not only contain crime information, but it can also contain all the other types of information as far as projects, work in the neighborhoods, those types of things, kind of an e-notify solution. That's part of our e-government plan which we'll be bringing forward. The other part is that this is the first building block in the evolvment initiative, and this is one of the most important components that we'll be building upon. I just want to say thank you again, and it's been an exciting project.

Katz: Rick, let me ask you a question. On the crime data, how are you progressing on that in terms of real time information and how are you progressing if at all on overlays?

Shulte: Well, we've actually done very well in that we're continuing our updates, our regular updates to crime mapper. The one thing that will be coming forward hopefully in the near future, we've been working on traffic accidents and traffic data. That will be a new layer that you will see very shortly. As well as street lights and those other types of layers. So those are currently in development, and we -- at the last time we brought crime mapper forward we heard that traffic and traffic accidents was very important, and we have about 15 years worth of traffic accident data that we have mapped, and we'll provide an exciting tie-in to crime mapper with that as well.

Katz: Okay. I'm going to hold you to a time line, so come back at our regular meetings.

Schulte: You got it.

Katz: For two second was a time line.

Shulte: No problem. Thank you.

Katz: Questions by the council? Anybody want to testify?

Saltzman: I have one question.

Katz: Okay.

JUNE 26, 2002

Saltzman: How frequently is information loaded into the website?

*******:** I think the pio's office generates about 24 news releases a month, and I would imagine probably ten or 15 crime stopper alerts.

Saltzman: Are those entered -- are those available on the website as soon as they're available hard copy --

Minick: We hope so. We hope it will be loaded on to the site even before -- I think they're still going to use a fax backup system for a while, but long-term I believe this website will take the place of that system. So they should be available immediately.

Saltzman: Great.

Katz: Good. Thank you very much. There's nobody else to testify, we will vote in accepting this report and congratulating all of you on your hard work. Roll call.

Francesconi: This really is good work. Information is power, and so if we can help empower the citizens by giving them information in an easily accessible way with eight languages, including italian, this is a major league improvement. Aye.

Saltzman: Great work. I really want to commend the chief and the bureau for continuing to move ahead into the e-government, evolvment arena. It definitely helps people -- brings them closer to the issues of public safety, public security that you all deal with every day, and that really gives people more power, more ability to be directly involved in assisting all of us in the mission of public safety. So it's great work. I did want to say i'm encouraged to hear eight languages. I didn't hear any slavic or russian languages, and that's maybe something you need to work on. Otherwise, it's a great site. Aye.

Katz: Absolutely. We need to add russian on to the list when we look at the demographics. But one of the reasons the chief is here in Portland at least right now, is that he shared with me a real interest in technology, and an interest that I personally had in how do we use technology not only to educate the bureau and the officers, but how do we educate and provide information to the citizens of this community. And many steps have been taken, and this is a very important one for the community at large. So chief, thank you, and I want to thank i.t. As well as the bureau and portsmouth. Aye. [gavel pounded] all right, everybody. We have about nine minutes, so let's come back in nine minutes. We've done every other piece of work we can. [recess]

At 10:22 a.m. Council recessed.

At 10:30 a.m., Council reconvened.

Katz: Previously, which is amending the fee schedule for land use applications, was sent back to my office in that the fee schedule will automatically increase by cpi, which does not need an action by the council. The remainder of the funds needed to manage the bureau was taken out of their reserves. As I said earlier, I don't know what the implications of that are going to be for next year or the following year. We'll have to see what the work is going to entail that we're going to start on this -- when we get to this new item. All right. 706.

Item 706.

Katz: Thank you. As you just heard, what we're doing today is adopting a proposal for a process. You'll hear details about that in a minute. There's been a lot of concern about regulatory reform, and improvements that need to continue. They started with blueprint 2000, but they haven't been completed. And we need to commit ourselves to a serious and sustained effort in those improvements not only our regulatory related procedures, but also our customer service. I want to underline the customer service part. I also have to say that Portland is one of the most live I can't believe cities -- livable cities in the country, and it didn't happen by accident. It has been a result of a lot of the regulations that our predecessors worked for, that citizens came and worked with the city and required, and that's the result of many of them in terms of our quality of life. Regular reform, at least for me, and I hope for the council, is not about lowering our expectations for the kind of place we want the city to be. But it's about finding reasonable ways, smart ways, cost

JUNE 26, 2002

effective ways, to meet and to exceed our expectations. Our high expectations. The process that we'll be embarking on is not an easy one. But I think we have people in the bureaus in the city, citizens who can think out of the box, who clearly understand what creative thinking is all about, who are willing to do some hard work, and I think as a result, and I want to say it's going to be a while, this is not anything that can be done in the short run, though there will be things that you're going to hear about and time lines you're going to hear about in terms of some things we can do immediately, but I think all of these folks can do the work so that we can have a livable city with great neighborhoods. And though this item came about from the discussion with the business community, I want to make it very clear that this is a discussion that's going to have to happen with our neighborhoods as well. And our neighborhoods will have to be involved in this conversation, because much of the work that's been done over the years has -- is because of the kind of quality of life our neighborhoods are demanding from us. So I know there are people here representing neighborhood associations, you're not going to be ignored in this process. Let me introduce -- let me introduce Gil Kelley first. Did you want to come up? I don't know how many of you know my chief of staff, Sam Adams, but he -- since the bureau now is in my portfolio in our form of government, I assigned this task to Sam Adams to work with the individuals sitting in front of you as well as with citizens to get to some resolution on many of the issues that have been raised over many years. So who wants to start?

Sam Adams, Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office: I'll start by going through the resolution, and then I guess Gil and Margaret. This resolution acknowledges this as you have, Mayor, the city's commitment to sound urban planning and development consistent with the regional planning goals, the 2040 goals, statewide land use goals, and our continuing assurance that we'll meet federal, state and regional mandate. It also restates our equally important goal of promoting sound business and economic development policies that support a healthy business climate to produce the kind of business development and job creation that this city and any city needs to be successful, while at the same time it restates this resolution, restates our commitment to protecting and improving the quality of life in the city, enhancing neighborhood livability and improving the ecological health of the environment. And this resolution points out that the city government seeks to accomplish these objectives, and I think this is important in terms of providing some context for this discussion not just with regulations, but also other policies and the provision of public facilities and infrastructure that we build. In terms of the regulations themselves, which is a focus of this, although the possibility of looking at incentives and other related issues are also a -- potentially part of its scope, some city regulations have been identified that conflict, that are overly complex, that are out of date, unclear, duplicative or disjointed, and can provide unintended results or costly and time consuming for city staff to implement, can be a source of confusion for permit applicants, and regulatory constituents for those people that are seeking to comment on an application as well, and can be a source of instant interpretation by city staff. So this resolution re -- commits ourselves to a two-track but related process of reform. One is on regulatory reform, and as you mentioned, the other is on organizational and customer service improvements. And Gil and Margaret are going to talk more about the work they have been working on in these areas, but in terms of what the resolution talks about on the regulatory side, it does authorize the Mayor's office to work with all the pertinent bureaus within the city to develop a proposal for you to consider, a proposal for a process that would review regulations to streamline, update and improve them, especially those that hinder desirable development. This resolution directs that the proposal describing the initial scope, goals, priorities and processes for the regulatory review process shall be presented to you for consideration by August 14th. I want to underline the word "initial." in those weeks we're not going to be able to deliver a work plan that goes into all the details, but I think we can give a clearer sense of the deliverables and the time lines for the process ahead. I also want to state that in doing this we're going to at your direction -- in doing this, at your direction on June 5th on the same day that

JUNE 26, 2002

we'll be further discussion on the issue of moratorium, exhibited a is a result of a survey we did of all the regulations in the pipeline, and you've committed yourselves to looking at the regulations in the pipeline and what regulations might move forward, what regulations might be delayed. You sort of given to us as your criteria that you'll prioritize for implementation those regulations in the pipeline that are mandated by state, federal, or regional action that's streamline existing organizations necessary to accomplish high priority city objectives. And a number of you have told me on my 101 discussions with you that you would appreciate some sort of staff analysis of the regulations in the pipeline against this criteria, and further discussions with bureau managers and other outside stakeholders and to give you that information back prior to your decision-making on august 14th, which we will seek to do. This resolution also requests that we -- because as you alluded to in your opening comments, these regulations can impact every single person and property in the city, this resolution makes it very clear that the process for reviewing building and land regulations include public review, involvement by interested parties, including neighborhood associations, business associations and other stakeholders in the process of reviewing the regulations and the customer service organizational issues. And I want to thank those folks that gave me input on this draft resolution. I got input from business folks and neighborhood land reps, environmental folks and others that provided input into the resolution before you. Item c on the resolution also calls for us to put together a process of better assessing the impacts of regulation that's are going to be coming before council. This is going to be a tough thing to figure out, but I think that we are committed to doing it, both all the potential impacts as you're considering them, both in terms of impacts to city staff and being able to implement them and also potential impacts to the community, both positive and negative. That's the regulatory side of this resolution. The organizational side begins on section d, and it authorizes the mayor's office to immediately again proposing regulatory related operational improvements for those bureaus responsible. And exhibit a reminds people that it's -- there are a lot more bureaus than simply the bureau of planning that are writing regulations, and there are some people other than opdr, though they have the bulk of it, that are responsible for monitoring and implementing some of the regulations. So in terms of the organizational side, this resolution calls for the further development of workload, work quality, effectiveness with regular report to the public and city council, a regular debriefing and tracking of individual applicant and constituent experiences, I think this is very important because there are bureaus outside of opdr that have regulatory responsibilities and we need to debrief on projects not just through opdr and planning, but projects as they experience the city in all of its bureaus. Number 3 calls for regular customer service training and evaluation which you mentioned, and a review of best practices to improve city operations and other -- based on the experience of other municipalities. There's no reason for us to reinvent the wheel if other cities can show us the way of best practices. And finally to reduce confusion over that we often experience between these two bureaus, to come back to you on august 14th with a name change to opdr confuses the public because it has the word planning and that title was chosen when at that time it was proposed that they would actually be combined. So we've been contributing around names and we'll come back to you with some proposals. This draft resolution went out to about 5,000 people on our e-mail list. We're at that stage of listening and looking for the best ideas, good or bad. In terms of feedback that we received thus far, we received a lot of positive feedback. We received feedback in terms of what's going to make this process different than the previous processes that were noted in the 1997 and other reports. We've had a lot of offers to help, and others that want to get involved, which is greatly appreciated. Other entities that are working in this area, the state is undergoing some sort of regulatory reform process. The auditor is doing an update on their 1997 audit, the city club is interested in this planning and regulation issue as a potential issue that they might pursue. There's a subcommittee of the local aia chapter who is looking at this, and we've been in discussion was innovation partnership using their resources and expertise to help with this project as well. There

JUNE 26, 2002

have been concerns raised, concerns the august 14th deadline is too soon, that a neighborhood -- that neighborhood associations take a hiatus during the summer months or don't meet, and that the july 14th deadline might not give them adequate time to comment on it. There have been concerns expressed about individual regulations in the pipeline, concerns expressed include those over the northwest plan river renaissance, the demolition and denial, north macadam, marquam hill, healthy streams and pleasant valley. There's also been concerns raised in the next track that it should include an outside audit of the regulations. And a debrief, a suggestion which I think is a good one, a debrief on what worked and can't work -- didn't work in the past, and there's also been a suggestion in terms of approaching and scoping the work that we come up with a top list of the short-term regulations that cause the most trouble for the most people and work on those up front. That's been a suggestion. And then there have been a number of people who have requested as part of this review that it include a discussion of the sdc costs and the impacts on development.

Katz: Let's go ahead and proceed with gil and then with margaret. Identify yourself.

Gil Kelley, Director, Planning Bureau: I'm gil kelley, planning director. I'll speak very briefly. One to lend my endorsement to the resolution, and to explain a little bit about my perspective on the issue and some of my philosophy and approach here. I'm happy to have been invite the by the mayor's office to participate in the effort here, because I think it's important that we look at the -- as well as the operations side of it, margaret's job. Some of the rules don't come from the planning function and are not in the zoning code, but a number of them are. And I think it's important to have this as a participant here. I'm happy to be invited. I also want to say I think it's an important issue that you've identified and that you're taking on. And I take the issue to be how we do regulations meaningfully. And to examine alternate ways to achieve the same kinds of policy objectives, even when we recognize the importance of effective regulation that's there are often other ways to get at the same goals. Philosophically I wanted to make clear, as my staff will readily confirm and as community members i've worked closely with would also confirm, since arriving two years ago i've been a strong advocate of about three points in this area. One is that the planning bureau ought to 1st be a planning agency, not a regulatory agency first, and we need to do good planning. Secondly, that regulations are one but only one set of tools in our tool kit, and we need to continue to look for other ways to effectuate desires on the public's part and the council's part to achieve public goals. And thirdly, we should be opportunistic in the sense that even as we've had predefined workload for the last two years, that as regulations come forward to you as part of planning efforts that we ought to take the opportunities there to be more effective in those sets of regulations, even when not taking on the whole big picture. I think our work has demonstrated that even when we've had fairly complex issues to bring in front of you, like the land division code, we really tried to reorient that set of regulations to get at a more design oriented set of goals there. We tried to strike a balance, for example, between land use review and administrative review regulations not having everything be in the permit findings and the land use process. That was a very controversial issue we brought in front of you. In all of the area plans we're bringing forward, including one you'll hear this afternoon, we've tried to identify what are the most important policy objectives and what are the ways to get at that. For example, you'll have in front of you this afternoon not only a policy document, but a set of fairly streamlined regulations and then a notion of memorandum of understanding which is a different way to effectuate a partnership to get a lot of those goals implemented. And even with the well-known healthy streams proposal, there are actually embodied in that document a number of improvements to the existing permitting process. And finally, we have through the endangered species act program funded work in opdr over the last couple of years to examine more effective ways to do environmental regulation enforcement, and that work is coming forward. I wanted to say also that i'm very happy to be working with this team. I have the utmost respect for margaret and the job that she does. She doesn't get to write the regulations. She has the burden of implementing them, and that's an unenviable position to be in.

JUNE 26, 2002

She and I have had a very good working relationship since my arrival here, and we've always been able to figure out the creative compromise or solution, and I look forward to my work with her, taking this issue square on. I'm very confident that sam has a grasp of the whole set of larger issues here, and will help us bring together the various bureaus to -- that will need to be part of the discussion here as well as members of the community to bring you back the right proposal. I'm particularly looking forward to the very first phase of this, which is the scoping phase. And I say that for a couple of reasons. One is that I think it's important for us during that time to hear from a number of constituents, but then to focus this effort fairly quickly so that we can deliver on expectations. I've had experience in this area in a previous life and know that taking on a whole regulatory scheme and the operations scheme and the cultural organizational adaptation that goes along with it is a long-term effort and it has to become a part of a way of life, the way we all do business, including the council when it hears and on regulations. So we're all in this together, and that's a particular outcome that needs to come out of it as well as specific kinds of reforms coming forward. I also know that it's going to challenge both margaret and I and other bureaus because we have other projects to deliver on, planning for the river, planning for the central city, planning for neighborhood centers. Many other efforts that are ongoing in opdr and other bureaus. So it will be a challenge for us during that scoping period. What I particularly on the policy making side would like to see come out of this, and margaret can describe more from the operations side, a set of principles that articulate more clearly the philosophy I said a moment ago about how we actually approach regulating in the future, as part of planning efforts and other efforts ongoing in the city. So we have some clear set of guideline that's we remind ourselves of as we go through, from the beginning of any effort. And that we have a targeted look at existing regulations, sort of that sam alluded to, picking up that quadrant that have a high cost but low return, if you will, in terms of low return on public policy -- if we can isolate some of those and work on those over the next several months to me that would be a very effective outcome. There are many issues we need to take on in the scoping, and we'll be returning as sam indicated in august or perhaps september with a clear road path of how we do this. Within this project and also a sense of how we will imbue our thinking in other projects along these lines.

Margaret Mahoney, Director, Office of Planning and Development Review: Margaret mahoney. I wholeheartedly agree with comments that gil and sam made, particularly about the team and the ability to tackle this project. I think we all recognize service improvement is a lifelong effort and I think the resolution here demonstrates that. We've engaged in a number of efforts over the last 15 years to look at the development review process, and those efforts have resulted in changes. We now have combination inspectors who work on residential projects, we've established process managers who work on complex projects, we now develop a specific review schedule with the applicant that meets their design and construction time line. We've brought on a new permit and land use tracking system and we're continuing to add enhancements to that system. The majority of staff involved in development review are located in the 1900 building and for those who aren't the customer focus is in that building. We've made changes in business practices to focus on assistance up front, getting good applications in the door and tracking our work on those. We've been developing more staff training as well as customer education, and we're working currently with gil's staff on a proposal for how we could actually limit the number of times each year we implement new regulations, which would be helpful both internally and externally. Though we focus order process improvement, staff training and customer education and we will continue to focus on those, there's been less effort to actually look at the regulations. The growing volume of the regulations that affect land development and building construction are key factors in how long it takes us to review projects. While it's going to be a very difficult and challenging task to look at our existing regulations, maybe somewhat less difficult to look at how we adopt future regulations, I do think there are opportunities there to make improvements and I think we have the knowledge and

JUNE 26, 2002

experience to tackle this project, and we certainly have lots of offers to help. So I too look forward to taking on this task and coming back with products for you.

Katz: Thank you. All right. Let me -- as you look at the attachment a, you will see many, many projects that are ongoing with some time lines, and that's going to have to be a discussion probably in a work session with the council to make very clear what the guidelines ought to be and which ones on the list and which ones aren't, which ones can be delayed, and which ones have high value for this city that need to be acted on. That's probably for us as a council, will be the more difficult immediate task.

Saltzman: I want to ask some questions on that very issue, the moratorium. I want to get a sense of timing, abuse I think timing is everything on this. I appreciate the need for work sessions and other things to really tackle this difficult issue of what to impose a moratorium on, I also appreciate there's a sense of urgency. If we lose this particular aspect of it, I think we're going to lose a lot, and it's all too easy to lose, because each one of these proposed regulations has a constituency, and once we start hearing from them, the greatest sense of why we need to do this, which is twofold, is to -- we need the moratorium, there is an increase of regulations, an impact on development, but we need staff time to tackle these other issues of reforming the process. If they're also in the process of developing regulations and getting those through the process they're not going to have time to devote to this time out. So you've said august 14th we will have a list in front of us to vote on that will be a proposed -- we'll actually go through and decide up or down? Subject to these criteria?

Adams: We'll do it every -- whatever you tell us to. The way it's written right now, on august 14th we would be -- we would have before you both written in the resolution and offering now, we would have before you a compilation of staff and key stakeholder response to each of the regulations in the pipeline for to you have information to make a decision about whether regulation, pdc 2, or planning 3 would be part of the moratorium, what that meant, or it would be scheduled to be started or stopped. I encourage you to look at each of the regulations individually, and in your last discussion that seemed to be the direction that you as a council were taking. Some of these are mandated by state and federal law and local actions. We need to get in and talk to bureau managers and give you the information on implications for each one of these. Some of them --

Saltzman: You will -- that's one of the criteria for --

Adams: Correct.

Saltzman: You will have applied those criteria, so august 14th we'll be looking at a narrower list -- that could be subject to a moratorium legally.

Adams: A ranked list. A list in terms of you would know how each regulation falls under the criteria, including whether they're mandated. We would also give you comment from stakeholders and from inside the city from experts in the city, implications of delay or going ahead. We're going to try to give you the information you need to make informed decisions on each item on the list.

We'll do that work for you and we'll probably rerank them in terms of there's -- this is going to be a section we have to do by mandate, a section that would probably streamline code, that might be another tier that would serve the high priority of the city. I'm making it up, but you get a sense --

Saltzman: Conceivably as early as august 14th the council could make a decision if it chooses to about which of those to impose a 12 or 18-month moratorium on.

Adams: That's what's written in the resolution, yes.

Saltzman: And this list will be available to the public before the 14th?

Adams: It's available right now. We e-mailed it out to 5,000 --

Saltzman: After you've done the application of the criteria. Will that be available before the 14th? Or will we be seeing it for the first time --

Adams: Our goal would be to get it out ahead of the 14th so stakeholders can comment for instance on what the inside city experts think.

JUNE 26, 2002

Katz: Let me make it very clear that there was a mixed review on the moratorium on the council. And i'm more nervous than maybe some of the others on it, because I know what the work that's going on, what it means to the community and what it means to the mandate that we have. But if we're ready by august 14th, so be it. But if they need a little bit more time to go through that and get the comments from the community, i'm going to ask them to take the necessary time, because 12 and 18 months is a long time for neighborhoods and for plans we've been working on for years to sit and wait. Some of them actually will clean up the regulations, will improve the regulations.

Francesconi: Let me make an editorial comment. I think the word "moratorium" may have been first used by me, and I was thinking 12 months. The purpose -- not 18. Because of the reasons the mayor just expressed. My purpose was just to get focus on some of the issues in terms of performance measurements, customer service training and outside look at this. The mayor has taken this even further. I think we may have to come up with a different word than moratorium now, because via feeling there's going to be so many exceptions, the --

Adams: It becomes a work plan.

Francesconi: So I think it's really a work plan as to which -- how we're going to proceed, and I just appreciate the focus i've just heard that we're going to start with a focus on what are our priorities here, and how do we execute those priorities, and which rules are not as important and which are important to maintain the environment in the neighborhoods, and how do we execute it, and how do we enforce it. So that was my intent in the beginning, frankly, and I think we're on the path, because the mayor is executing it. I need to hear testimony. I'll make more comments later.

Katz: Thank you, everybody. Let's open it up for public testimony.

Rob Maloson, Association for Portland Progress, 520 SW Yamhill: Good morning. Rob from the association for Portland progress. Today i'm representing both the app and the Portland metropolitan chamber as you I think know we're merging next week to become the Portland alliance. I'm pleased to be here today to support the resolution. As the mayor mentioned, Portland is revered as being one of the most livable communities in the country. We've achieved this goal through a quirky and sometimes messy process that is called the Portland way. It's based on a sense of true public private partnership, where each appreciates the goals and aspirations and the challenges of the other, and works hard to achieve those goals and solution that's work for everyone. In a way it's like a family where the debate sometimes gets contentious, but at the end of the day everybody stays at the table and works to find a solution. Our business community does not inherently object to regulation. What we do object to is regulations and reviews that are disproportionate. A store front to renovate should not take so long to permit. We object to duplicative processes, money is money, time is money, consult apartments are money, the higher the true cost of a project and the longer the time the less likely the project is to move forward. Big or small. It is an issue that affects neighborhoods and neighborhood business centers, as well as central city and the new 25-story tower. It is a matter of balance. We applaud you, mayor, for your quick and substantive initiative today. It demonstrates you appreciate the severity of the program and encourage us that solutions will be forthcoming. We applaud you commissioner Francesconi for continuing your commitment to performance standards and regulatory impact analysis. As you've stated in making your judgment, the council needs to know what the true impact of new regulations are. We applaud you, commissioner Saltzman, for recognizing importance of incentives overregulations, for recognizing the urgency of the program and calling for regulatory spigot to be turned off so we can solve the problem. We look forward to working actively in this process to find a balance that allows us as a community to achieve all of our goals. In closing we offer one small addition. One that sam actually mentioned. We believe it's important that the city council add to the project an independent review of the development processes and impacts. Including a case study approach that would follow a specific prototype project through the process. We believe

JUNE 26, 2002

those fresh eyes would go a long way to identify opportunities for improvements. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you. Just grab the mike and introduce yourself.

David VerMeulew, 4115 N. Longview Ave., 97217: My name is david, i'm a small business owner. My business is vermeil and remodeling and renovation. My business address is 1936 north killingsworth. I'm testifying today because of i've dealt with the city's planning and review department quite a bit. I've had some wonderful experiences with them and had some good dealings with some good people. I think the resolution is wonderful. A great step in the right direction. The biggest problem I have is as a small business owner, time is the biggest most critical thing in our success, and that is the thing that delays me the most when I deal with the planning and review commission. So from a standpoint of us we would love to see a way to streamline our permit process, if there's -- in getting questions answered. The biggest thing we had, I had a project where we couldn't get an answer of what the city really wanted in the zoning -- in the zoning. So from a standpoint of a small business owner, I would love to see more emphasis put on streamlining time and getting the plans through the permit process. And a way to have the planning commission be able to take responsibility, or have some way to have accountability to small businesses such as myself.

Katz: Thank you.

Ken Turner, Chair Alliance of Portland Neighborhood Business Association: Good morning, mayor Katz. Members of the city council, I am ken turner, the current chairperson of the apnb, alliance of Portland neighborhood business association. On behalf of apnba, I want to expression our wholehearted support for this resolution. We think this resolution has embraced many of the concerns that have been expressed by the members of the business associations. And mayor, you are individually should be acknowledged and commended for taking this aggressive lead in bringing this issue to the table. And in a format that may very well bring about positive changes. This resolution and its results improvements in the process and procedures should help create that more friendly -- customer friendly atmosphere we're all seeking. And as commissioner Francesconi has stated several times of the importance of establishing those performance standards, this may be -- may very well be that vehicle. And we agree that the independent auditor is very important in this process. If I may, I would like to read from three separate business -- individual business owners, e-mails or faxes that i've received in the last couple of days. With your permission. One is from lents body shop, by the owner. Dear mayor Katz, I applaud your efforts to streamline the city's building and planning department, which is represented in the current resolution before city council. I do remember the frustration in undertaking a recent development of my block and hope and trust that the new regulations become user friendly and less expensive for the consumer. From wayne stoll at century associates in parkrose, regarding the fax I received from apnba concerning the mayor's proposal to streamline and update, I fully support this proposal from the mayor. As a business owner and current vice-president of the parkrose business association, I support this proposal. From luis martinez, an architect in southeast, I am writing in response to the proposed resolution to authorize the office of the mayor to develop a process to update the city building and land regulations and to improve regulatory related procedures and customer service. I believe this to be a bold step in the right direction. The process for review and the involvement of interested citizens, neighborhood associations and business associations will bring out all the concerns and issues to the table for discussions. I'm going to ask your permission on this, apnba over the last year and a half has been working on a business survey that's related to a lot of the issues that have been brought up in this proposal. One of your staff people notably sam adams have attended those meetings, and he became more aware of some of the concerns. The action for Portland business i'd like to pass around --

Katz: Okay.

JUNE 26, 2002

Turner: Then we'll be making a one-on-one appointments --

Katz: Good. Hi an opportunity to read it, and it's interesting. I'd like to talk to you about that as well.

Turner: Again, I encourage city council to pass this resolution.

Katz: Thank you, ken. All right.

Pat Di Prima Lehrle, 5904 N Concord Ave. 97217: My name is pat, I just opened a small business on killingsworth, david vermeil's building. He handled all of my permit process. All of the remodeling for my business. It was like other businesses, a great risk to me personally, financially. However, it's in the urban renewal area, where I live, and it was important to me to locate in that neighborhood. The process was so prolonged, I almost didn't open. I was considering maybe not pursuing the business and cancelling it midstream because of really in my opinion, petty issues. We did everything by the book, the health inspector came and was just thrilled with everything we did, and because of a parking permit, we were held up for more than five months. So we have light rail coming in less than three blocks from where my business is, and for parking we were held up for five months. I personally think that's ridiculous. I think this whole process, and I pride my self in living in a city where we want livability and have prosperity for all and so on, and work cooperatively which you're very -- you're an advocate for yourself, mayor, but in this process it seemed like there was a lot of conflict, the person was -- that was particularly involved with was not helpful, didn't give direction, customer service was very poor. David has had tremendously positive experiences in the past, and he does this all the time with the people he works with. His contracts. So he's dealing with the city, dealing with permit process, constantly. And this was really an exception, which is good to know, but it still was something that held up our business, and our going forward. So I think anything you can do to expedite this process is --

Saltzman: What kind of business?

Lehrle: It's an italian bakery.

Katz: Thank you.

Jennifer Johnson, Portland Development Commission: Good morning. Mayor Katz and commissioners, as a small business advocate for the city of Portland at the Portland development commission, it gives me great pleasure to be here today to express my support for a resolution that a fully -- if fully implemented will benefit the Portland business community. I applaud your efforts, mayor, as well as margaret mahoney, tim grewe, their staff and sam adams in taking on this important challenge. I think it is important to start by acknowledging that the small business advocate position was created through actions taken by this council and demonstrate that the city is making concerted effort to reach out to the small business community. Since assuming this role in january, i've become keenly aware of the concerns and frustrations expressed by many small business owners with regard to the city's permitting process and the complexity of an increasing number of regulations. The business community has complained about a system that is broken, identifying problems such as delays, conflicting information, duplicative or conflicting regulations, a lack of predictability, inefficiency and the need for customer service. The resolution being considered today is an important step in addressing these issues, and to building an environment that nurtures entrepreneurship and encourage business formation, growth and expansion which will contribute to the overall economic vitality of Portland and the region. Small businesses are the core of our community and tribute to -- contribute to our economy, the diversity of neighborhoods, and the quality of life we enjoy in Portland. Over 95% of the businesses in the Portland metro area are firms with less than 50 employees. This resolution is a significant effort to make Portland more small business friendly and I hope we will continue to look for ways to continue improving the business environment in Portland. We all know cash is king and time is money. Complex regulations, delays and an inefficiencies item hurts business, particularly small firms that often lack the human and financial capital of larger businesses. Announcing this resolution is an important

JUNE 26, 2002

step in defining a process so we can begin to address the concern raised by business. Mayor Katz and commissioners, thank you for listening and for your quick action to this issue. I stand committed to helping you in this effort and offer my support and assistance as you move forward with this important undertaking. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you, Jennifer.

Thad Fisco, 50800 NW Monarch Lane, Banks 97106: My name is Thad, I'm with adaptive construction. I'd like to thank you for taking the time to listen to me today. I grabbed at this opportunity to sort of express my opinions and some experiences I've had at 1900 Southwest 4th with the OPDR. I represent almost exclusively small business owners doing improvement projects and landlord improvement, so the portion of the job we'll go in and do seismic upgrades. And what I've experienced is in the permit review process, quite a bit of inconsistency in application of code, and I can speak to individual projects at any time. Lack of customer service, it sounds like a broken record, but it is the truth. And more specifically, no accountability, so what can happen is plans can disappear into the process for months. And it can take several phone calls just to track down who may have a set of plans and why nothing is being done with them. And the entire process seems to me to be not really result-driven, which if it were, I think the entire process would speed up. What I would suggest I guess is some things that could be done rather quickly, would possibly be put a fax machine in the plan review area for individuals that come in there and need information immediately, they would be able to talk to their engineer, their architect, simple written letters, so forwards could be faxed over, given to the planning review people instead of having to make another trip. Some of the things that I would suggest would be probably more complex, I don't know how you deal with the inconsistency issues. I've had projects go in for single property owners, for instance, that owned buildings on two sides of the street. One building will go through no problem, the other building will run into a quagmire for some reason, the permit fees will be twice what the first building were. For all intent and purposes the projects are exactly the same. Store front improvement, new glass, paint the building, put some tile on the front, and I don't say anything when I'm down there, but I guess this is my opportunity to say it. It doesn't seem fair to my clients to have to be subjected to an inconsistent system down there. And lastly, the amount of time it takes. I concur completely. Five months, I haven't dealt with that yet, but for my clients to have a set of plans go in and disappear into the system for what is supposed to be maybe three weeks, four weeks, turn into eight weeks, ten weeks, every single day they're not open for business it costs them money. And it costs my company money because we can't do anything on the project.

Katz: Thank you.

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

Katz: Thank you for coming this morning. Thank you.

Katz: You're going to show us the size, right, among other things? Go ahead and start.

Beverly Bookin, The Bookin Group, 1020 SW Taylor, Suite 760, 97205: Good morning, I'm Beverly. I'm here today to support the resolution. I'm not quite clear and I'm very -- I'm a planning consultant with over 20 years experience, but unique to most planners I have done all of that planning in the private sector so while I share my training and values with my public counterparts, I have had the experience of helping developers and particular large institutions to shape their development to meet the regulations of the code and therefore really understand how it applies on the ground. Moreover, I do about 60% of my permitting here in the city of Portland and probably not the code as well as anyone at the city, but I also do permitting in 25 other jurisdictions, so I know how the jurisdictions do it as well. Based on this experience I've concluded several years ago that I think the city of Portland overregulates when it comes to land use planning. I think our code is necessary -- unnecessarily complex and duplicative, and as it becomes more complex, there's a lot of room for internal conflicts. I brought a copy just to show you the heft of it, and if you look at Mr.

JUNE 26, 2002

Adams' list of what's in the pipeline, I will be in my second volume very quickly. I as a planner because I do a lot of work with institutions, have applications that often have 50 pages of legal findings in which I detail the regular regulation and how we apply them. On behalf of pdc it took me over three years and three permit applications to get a surface parking lot approved under the marquam bridge to serve the under park south waterfront district. In addition to concerns about the size and complexity of the code, I think we have some systemic problems about the way code is written. I think it's very positive that opdr, that the current planning division or the development review planners now work with their building permit counterparts so that we can have a seamless process, though I think the benefits of blueprint 2000 haven't been fully realized, the down side is that the long-range planners who write code are even more isolated from the development review planners who implement the code. The result is we often have regulations that on the ground really do not work. There is a maintenance function inside of opdr where they can look at the existing code and do some housekeeping cleaning up, but they are not allowed to deal with any changes that have policy implications. My understanding is not only do they really have any input into the development of new code, but when they identify serious issues, there's no systematic way for them to work with their counterparts at the bureau of planning in order to correct them. For this reason I do support taking a couple of steps back, not only to look at our code and look at ways to streamline it without affecting the quality of development, but we really do need to look at the systemic way in which these regulations are developed. I do really support having the scoping done by an independent agent. Many of our planners have neither experience in other jurisdictions or in private sector.

Katz: Thank you.

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

David Weislogel, GBBA, 3216 SE Milwaukie 97202: Hi. I'm david wiselevel. I am a real estate broker and a general contractor. I run a small property management firm. We've been there for 22 years. I'm president of the brooklyn business association and a member of a few miscellaneous coalitions. This will be short and sweet. I based on personal experience with a number of individuals and businesses i've spoken with over the course of time, would I like to say any efforts on your part to simplify, streamline, and make more efficient and certainly make more friendly the processes outlined in the resolution will be a large improvement for all. And any -- these efforts in implementing these changes is greatly appreciated by me and a number of people i've spoken to over the course of time, since this has become available, and i'd like to thank you very much.

Saltzman: Thanks.

Cindy Catto, Associated General Contractors, 9450 SW Commerce Circle, Wilsonville 97070:

Good morning. I'm cindy from associated general contractors. I'll be very brief because we've provided written testimony. However, i'm here on behalf of the agency contractors to support the resolution before you today. We appreciate the fact that the mayor and city council has moved rapidly in listening to the complaints that we had three weeks ago, and so we wholeheartedly support the resolution, and the course of action that has been outlined by sam adams and the other city staff. We would like to see, however, as has been mentioned several times, some mention in the resolution of an outside review of the design review processes by someone who's familiar with design review processes in other jurisdictions. Because we do think that independent view is very important. It has nothing to do with not trusting the opdr staff or any of the other internal review processes or people that you could put on this task. We just believe somebody from the outside who has a bigger world view could be very helpful to the process. As always, agc stand committed to be part of the resolution. We won't stand on the outside, stay silent and then throw rocks at the end. We're looking forward to being an active participant in this entire review and our -- we're very happy to be part and supportive of what you do here today.

JUNE 26, 2002

Saltzman: I have a question. There's a lot of talk about this outside review. It was referred to as an audit. Could somebody elaborate what exactly -- who exactly does this? Give me examples of -- are we talking planning consulting firms coming in and doing this? Are we talking --

Bookin: Let me take a crack at it, because as part of my private practice I do a lot of code revision for cities. I've just supervised as a project manager a complete overhaul of the coding of the cities of Tigard and Vancouver, Washington. And I think that there are two pieces here. One is a content piece, is really taking -- having planning consultants with broad experience, not only in our own region and with Oregon state law, but with cities of comparable size. I think it's unfair to say that the city of Portland's code should be like the city of Fairview, when obviously the scale is so different. But certainly to look at the code as content and to see if there's ways to streamline it and still maintain the basic requirements. There is another, which is a whole process issue, of how permitting is done. And I think the big concern, the development community is not just the land use piece, which happens to be my area of interest, but the whole process from the time you go in for your land use permits to the time you get your building permits. You need people then who -- you need a team, people who are very, very knowledgeable about planning and building technically, but also have some organizational management, customer service, and/or process management kinds of experience. I would suspect that there may be some local people who could do that teamed up, but I think you could also attract national or regional folks who could do it and maybe with local people who have local knowledge. That's how I --

Saltzman: One part's code review, one part's process review.

Bookin: I think so, but others could give --

Catto: I would agree with that.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. I'm sorry, hi to step out for a second. All right.

Katz: Ben, I don't know if you were on the 2000 -- blueprint 2000. I know the other two were. I hope you will address some of the issues you were hearing about.

Tomasina Gabriele, GDS, Institutional Facilities Coalition, 3334 NW Vaughn, 97210:

Tomasina, northwest Vaughn. I'm sitting here before you wearing many hats. I'm the current chair of the development review advisory committee. This group succeeded the blue print of -- 2000, I also represent a coalition of institutions, all of the major health care centers in three -- and three higher ed institutions and I also in my spare time run a business that does process land use and building permits to the city, particularly for urban affordable housing projects. Wearing all of those hats, I'd like to say that I really support this resolution wholeheartedly. Blueprint 2000 talked a lot about what we called regulatory discipline. I suggested that maybe you want to use that term rather than regulatory reform. What we were talking about really was you can do as good a job as you can do given it's a lifelong task to streamline your permitting process, but really that's an implementation function that follows having the policies written and developed. And truthfully, lately it's just -- it just feels, that expression of trying to drink water from a fire hose, it seems like as much as the development review advisement committee is trying to work with the OPDR staff to make sense of how you get a good permitting system that's streamlined, just as they sort of start doing that, there's more regulations that they have to -- than put into their process -- that they have to then put into their process. As a specific example, one of the things that we looked at the development review advisory committee was the new subdivision code when it came to OPDR for implementation, it still isn't really ready to be implemented, and it -- at last count it took something like 150,000 dollars worth of staff time trying to get it in a place where you could actually implement it and explain it to people to know what they were supposed to be doing. That staff time meant that there were plans reviewers that were not reviewing plans and taking care of current casework. And then I do have to say, however, as much as this is a great resolution and we're all sitting here at the beginning of this process, having been through a number of these processes before, I do think we have to stop saying, at least this time around, that we're only going to deal

JUNE 26, 2002

with the process and we're not dealing -- going to deal with the policy. I think it's really time to deal with the policy side of the thing, because you only can do so much with the process without touching policy. Is that three minutes?

Katz: That was three minutes.

Gabriele: Can I have five minutes?

Katz: No. But why don't you go ahead and give us one more point.

Gabriele: Okay. In terms of policy, I think we really have to look at the land use policy -- look at the land use policy. It's hard to do some of the things that the business owners that have been before you have testified about, because you -- sometimes you really can't make the decision that makes sense because the land use laws really prevent from you standing there on site and making that decision. So that's I think an area that we are going to have to focus on.

Katz: Thank you.

Dan Yates, Portland Spirit, 110 SE Caruthers, 97214: My name is dan yates, i'm representing the Portland spirit. I testified a couple weeks ago and I wanted to thank you all for taking the group of us that came and testified so seriously and for moving ahead so quickly on this. I wanted -- I felt obligated to come down and voice my support for the resolution, and I would encourage you to continue looking for an outside source to do some -- a proper review, and I would also encourage one element that hasn't really been brought up, I know we talk about it being complex, but I think the code should be written so a layperson can actually read it. And understand what they're reading and that you don't -- you're not required to go on hire -- required to hire a team of professionals to get through the permit. I don't -- this is not supposed to be rocket scientists stuff, this is supposed to be your normal course of business and interacting with the city, and it really -- I can't see why it needs to be so fantastically complex and complicated. So i'd encourage that part of the process is to make it reader friendly and small business friendly. But i'm very encouraged and very hopeful that this process will result in some significant change. Thank you for taking it seriously.

Dick Cooley, 141 SW Wright 97205: My name is dick cooley, i'm a developer who develops just for myself. For investment. I have been a planning commissioner for eight years in the city of Portland, I was chair of the blueprint committee. I serve on the advisory committee now. I am here in support of the resolution. I agree with so many things that i've heard today. But I don't know how to order them. But I will make two emphases here that I think are really important. One is that I the deepest culprit is complex regulations. I say that with humility because I love ideas, I love the ideas that this city has had, you can go to the river and you see these wonderful ideas. But we also have an attic full of ideas that have lost their usefulness. That complexity is the real culprit. And I don't want to lose track of that. I agree what tomasina was saying. It is a process that should be the focus, although it's a piece of it, it's policy. It isn't the ambitions are bad, it's just that we accumulate it over time way too much policy. And we've got to figure out a way to deal with that, now and in the future. And I think the real solution here, my second point of emphasis, the real solution here is that we have to put real resources to work on regulatory discipline in a smart way. There's never been money spent people put to the task of watching ourselves maintaining our regulations. And it's time. We've just reached the point that it's time to do that.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: How many mere people we have?

Moore: That's all.

Katz: We're going to have a long afternoon and evening tonight.

Patty McCoy, Columbia Corridor Association: Good morning, mayor Katz, dan. I'm patty mccoy and i'm here on behalf of the columbia corridor association to comment on the proposed resolution authorizing the commencement of regulatory reform and organizational process improvements. If resolutions must be passed to embark on process reform and improvements, so be it. I'm here to say that we give you the double thumbs up. We support the provisions outlined in

JUNE 26, 2002

the resolution. Like others, we feel strongly that a commitment to undertaking an external audit or review, whatever we want to call this, belongs in the resolution, and independent review performed by a team of persons who possess technical policy and code skills and real life working knowledge of the permitting and process management spheres will produce a faster, truer and more actionable end result. We encourage its consideration as the process moves forward. We do agree with you that staff is capable of outside the box thinking, and we expect that to be a part of the process as well, but we still support the external review. Realistically the resolution before us all today is a wedding ceremony. Some pomp, circumstance, and serious promises. Now we'll all begin to roll up our sleeves and the real work will begin. Our sleeves are rolled up. Our business outreach interviews have already begun. I believe the city's sleeves are rolled up as well. We see evidence of that today in the resolution. If we do this right, all of us, we'll make Portland a place everyone wants to live and do business. I wish us all the best of luck.

Katz: Thank you. I do need to add that we received a copy of an outside review, and before we commit to that, i'd like to look at it to see if it's worth all the expenditures that may be required. So we'll look at that and sam and his team will analyze that. Okay. Go ahead.

Jacqueline Stoeckler, NWDA, 2375 NW Northrup: I feel like a token here because I won't quite go --

Katz: But you need to identify yourself.

Stoeckler: Jacqueline Stoeckler, I work with nwda and planning. Also on parks and a lot of other things. In the consideration of the moratorium, I would like to know where is the permitting process a pleasant process anywhere in the world, and where is jumping through hoops an empowering event? It is my understanding in order for any thought, vision or plan to be a successful one, one must always review and edit to achieve clarity for all participants. This should be an ongoing effort not one that is stopped or started or restarted in reaction to pressures rather than a sustained dialogue. A moratorium symbolizes a unilateral action on the part of the council which necessity gaits the time, energy and public monies already spent in the researching and establishment of a number of planning directions and desires for types of development. This is achieved often through sometimes aggressive and thoughtful processes of public input in the work of many bureau professionals. By voting for a moratorium, which is not a process, you negate the public's own work and the public resources already spent. Why is this good governance to force a review of permitting from the citizens at large? Perhaps the neighborhood associations themselves have not asked for it, but rather a distant constituency. Portland has had difficult economic times before. Much worse in some -- and some would argue the city bent too far the other way in favor of business and development. We experience add great period and I wonder whether the city has benefited. I believe the consideration and the timing of the moratorium and the place of its hearing set in august guarantees an imbalanced voice as so many citizens will not be in the city to testify. This is a consideration for the few on some level, not for those greater numbers which have invested energy, intelligence and again, public money for the public's work. In the resolution and all -- does it mention in the people and the neighborhoods and of the hours are our elected officials about the people's business or about business people. We all are participants and recognize that. A moratorium is a recognition of defeat in the face of a stitching together a plan which serves many interests, so many intelligence in the city has been expended, it seems odd to reorder priorities. If the argument is economic downturn, the answer is not a short-term, but the refining of the ongoing discussion with the follow-through required from every corner. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you very much.

Gale Castillo, 5750 SW Alfres St. 97219: Good morning. My name is gale castillo, i'm the executive director of the hispanic metropolitan chamber and also a small business owner of a retail store in downtown Portland. I'm here to support the resolution. The hispanic chamber is a local chapter of the hispanic -- u.s. Hispanic chamber in Washington, d.c. The local chapter dedicated to

JUNE 26, 2002

advocate, promote and facilitate the success of hispanic businesses has over 380 members. These members include hispanic business owners, hispanic managers and public and private sector, and corporate members. Like everyone else, our members have been discussing the Portland economy and what could be done to get our economy going again. The hispanic chamber supports this proposal because it sends a strong message to current and future business owners in Portland. The message is we want your business in Portland, and we will help you as much as possible. This does not mean lessening commitment to the environment or quality of life. What it does mean is that the city will give clear concise and consistent direction on how to do business in Portland.

Unfortunately we have all heard numerous examples where business owners have been given conflicting directions which brings frustration and anger. Portland businesses value the quality of life and the livability of our community. Therefore, we understand that some regulations are necessary. Businesses just want to know what the rules are so they can move forward. We hope the city council will support this resolution, the hispanic chamber and other -- with other members of the community will continue to work to keep our economy going, and we will work to protect the quality of the city in which we all live, work and play with our friends and our families. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you. That's it. Anybody else? I've got -- margaret, sam, gil, do you have anything you want to add? Okay. Commissioner Saltzman, you had an amendment.

Saltzman: Yes. I'd like to add an amendment to the last page of the resolution, and it's basically to add a new bullet point. Under the -- under looking at how the process aspect of things, i'd like to add a new number 3, and we -- and renumber 3 and 4, 4 and 5, and that new number 3 would also have a look at development of customer service protocols. I think we've all heard a lot about -- we all know about the Portland way, and many of the stories that have been related to me really speak of some situations where we're not delivering the right message in terms of service oriented, and just plain old fashioned politeness. I think that needs to be looked at too, just consistent customer service protocols that all of us through our government should employ, but since our development office is on the front line, this is something we need to look at.

Katz: Thank you. Any objections? Okay. Adopted. [gavel pounded] all right. Roll call.

Francesconi: I have six suggestions or requests to the team. Before I get to that, let me make a couple preliminary comments. One is actually gale said it at the end. Regulations are important and it's firm regulations we need, because it's the ambiguity that causes difficulty. But this is not about weakening regulations or weakening environmental protection, or neighborhood livability. There's actually four important stools that we're trying to balance here. I actually -- it is a question of policy, and it really begins with the city council, not opdr and not planning. So it is policy and folks, the issue lies with the council, not with our staff. And what we have to do is not balance, but integrate environmental stewardship, neighborhood quality of life, economic vitality, and government efficiency. These are the values that have built this city, and we have to work together, all of us, to continue to allow it to succeed. So the first thing that really needs to happen is the city council needs to have a strategic plan. That then is reflected in what gil kelley said about a set of principles that then is implemented in the combination of long-range planning and the development practice. But we would appreciate you beginning to work on it for us, because we haven't quite got there yet. And then we need to adopt it and as our own policy and strategic plan as a city council, so that's the first statement. The second is, and sam adams said it the best, as well as gil kelley, that there has to be a broader set. We need you to focus on the regulatory side. But we need a broader look, including the Portland development commission, that includes the incentive part, the infrastructure part, and the public facility part. So really there's four ways that you accomplish this. One is through regulation, the other is through incentives, the other is through infrastructure, and the fourth is our public facilities. And all that has to be reflected in the strategic plan of the city. The reason this is important is not just the economic vitality, but at the last hearing remember, we

JUNE 26, 2002

had sam chase testifying from the low-income housing side about how important this was to meeting our low-income housing policies. We had dee walsh write a letter from reach about the impact of conflicting regulations on reach's development, as well as the cost of fees on reach's mission. And then we had gale castillo testifying just now about the importance to our ethnic communities about economic opportunities and small business. So I again, I won't get into this -- I wanted this 12-month moratorium to focus some attention on these issues. That was the primary purpose of this. I tried with this major policy review that the council adopted on a 4-1 vote a year ago, to try to get some advance looks at new rules and regulations, but frankly, we need the power of the mayor and the cooperation of all the bureau managers. Margaret was the most helpful in that process, so I really appreciate the added emphasis in trying to make that tool more effective. In terms of turning to -- before the request, let me say one other thing. I want to thank the blue print 2000 folks, dick and tomasina and the whole committee. I appreciate your help as you've tried to focus on this. I appreciate margaret -- finally you got some help on the issue you've been raising, which is the conflict in the regulations for a very long time. But in the meantime, have you done a lot of good things. The process managers, the facility process, which really could serve as a model for some other things, the tracking that you tried to implement. Implementing new regulations at one period in time. Turning now to my suggestions, the first one is I do think there is a role, I don't know if we call it an outside audit, but for outside eyes to work with this team. The reason you don't want to do it just externally is because the key is implementing this thing. If you just do an outside audit, they don't have the ability to implement it given our complex system of government and system. But adding an outside pair of eyes to the powerful team of -- led by sam adams and the mayor, gil and margaret, would really compliment the team. So that's -- actually I have seven suggestions. That's one. The second is, a team of people considering -- I think dick, tomasina, two, we can continue some of the expertise from the prior process, and put them involved as part of your team, but sam, you were probably already thinking that. So that's one. We'll stick with six. That's one combined suggestion. [laughter] the second is there has to be a special focus on small business. I appreciate jennifer johnson, this is the first time she testified, the mayor has appointed me as the small business liaison to pdc. The truth is that -- it's not a fair system, but some of the larger developers are able to hire architect and get through the process because they can get special attention. And that's not the way you want to design a system. So we want -- I want special focus on the issues raised here by the small business community. I don't know if you can have special claims processors assigned to small business, but there has to be a way to specifically address the issues of small business. Related to that is my third request. I believe that there are some thresholds that could be raised on some things in our permitting process. And I think the threshold may be too low. \$25,000, for example, on some of the landscaping requirements may be a little too high. And that would be a way -- a little too low. That would be a way to immediately help some small businesses. The third area is -- the fourth area is the zoning code. Looking at what should be in the zoning code versus what should be in the rules and regulations in the bureaus. This reminds me of the old workers' compensation debate in the '70s, which -- in the '80s, which was my first exposure. We had such a complicated code that it actually -- litigation went on forever and the benefits to the workers never made it, because it got eaten up in the system. And I think part of it is what's in the code versus what's on the regulatory side. The next area, and I guess my last area, is there does have to be a communication strategy. Not only to the customers, but also to the public. But primarily there has to be a communication strategy to small business folks as to how they're trying to use this system, so they know ahead of time what to expect. There has to be then a larger communication strategy to the broader business community and to the public just about how important these rules and regulations are to preserving the neighborhood livability and the environmental health. I don't think we really communicate very well. And then my last request is to the -- not to the staff, but to the business community. You do need to work with us. I

JUNE 26, 2002

appreciated the testimony they -- of app today, as well as kent turner by offering us the positive suggestions to help us stay together. I'm being -- I am concerned, not a little, a lot concerned about some of the polarization that's beginning to happen, and that can make this more difficult to find a solution we all want. So mayor, thank you for your leadership on this. I look forward to doing my part to helping this effort succeed. Aye.

Saltzman: I want to thank the mayor for bringing this forward, and I think as much as we are part of the problem, we are now the city council, we have to be part of the solution. And that means we have to be engaged -- we wouldn't be here as soon as three weeks after a major protest about development permits, we wouldn't be here three weeks late we're a resolution before you if it weren't for the buy-in of the three of us up here to get done and get it rolling. I guess that's my admonition, we've got to keep the ball rolling, keep this momentum, because otherwise, the -- it reaches a point if momentum dissipates, primarily the business community walks away from the process and they lose faith. And this is about economic development. As much as we want to dress this up as anything else, it is about that. And it's also about -- it's not just developers with a capital account. It's all sorts of developers, the person that wants to remodel their house, and the person that wants to put -- the small business person that wants to put up an awning. We can't walk away from that idea. It needs to be fixed. And I think an important step forward of this whole process is for the first time probably in the city's 150-year history, we have a list of regulations from all the bureaus going on. I don't think we've ever had that before. That's a tremendous breakthrough right there. It gives us an idea what the full picture is. I think we can't afford to fail and we also have to be careful we don't let a galaxy of other committees get going and dissipate the momentum. I appreciate the efforts of the city club, other groups to want to get involved, form their own committees, but we can't wait and if we have to wait until such and such a committee is done, that's a potential failure point we have to be careful of. So it's going to take us involved, it's going to take us rolling up our sleeves and staying with us. It's going to be a contentious process. A lot of things we deal with are contentious. But it does demand decisions, and that's what we're here for. That's what we get paid for. Don't lose the imperative to act, don't lose the momentum, and time is of the essence. We hear that over and over from the regulated community how important time is with all due respect to those of us here in government, time doesn't have that same sense of urgency that -- the sense of time or timeliness. We don't have profit and loss statements to worry about. So we've got to make sure we do this in a timely manner. Finally, I want to close by saying one of the e-mails the mayor received was from one of our own employees in opdr, and touting the facilities permit program we have. I know this program exists primarily for large developments, but I think this is something we need to look at as a model. It's been a success. I think margaret when you talked to us about this program you said it was an unrivaled success by all accounts, and this employee calls it the les schwab of building permits. That's a good analogy. In fact, having gone to les schwab yesterday myself and being astounded when they ran up to my car, he says, we work as a team, we goal the job done as quick as possible, we process permits, do plan review, make inspection and final projects. We're available all hours of the day or night. And we charge appropriately. When asked questions, we find the answers. Not pass it on to others. When asked what they need to do, my clients expect and receive an answer as quickly as possible. Clients just want to know what they need to do to comply with the code and get their project rolling. That's the sentiment that. Spirit exists. We know our employees have that sentiment as much as the regular community has the concern that it's not there. We just need to come up with the right ideas, the right solutions. Thank you. Aye.

Katz: I don't want to put any dampers on any of this, but, folks, we're not going to rewrite the entire code, and we're not going to throw out every policy out the window that made Portland the way we want it to be. But we will look at some of the nagging issues that we have been hearing about over the last several years, and you as a city council will have to make some hard decisions

JUNE 26, 2002

about some of the issues dear to you, whether it's green buildings or blue buildings, or parks, sdc's, all of the issues that we've worked together and agreed that are important to our neighborhoods and important to the city. So having said that, I want to make sure that we have a sense of reality about what the outcome of this is going to be. We will work as hard as we can, and knowing the team, you will -- you know that that's exactly the result you will have. And we'll come back to you and identified for you the issues that we need to deal with immediately. Then we hopefully will identify for you those that will take a little longer time. Organizational change, and these huge policy issues that have been about Portland for the last 150 years don't get changed or resolved overnight, plain and simple. This is hard, hard work. I recall the hours and the years blueprint 2000, the preparation for blueprint 2000, my conversations with former commissioner Hales on what the vision was to get us to the point where we wanted to be. So high expectations for final results, but a little bit tempered by the timing of it and the complexity of the task ahead. And remember, one of you will eventually end up with this bureau. I'm not going to tell you who right now, i'm not going to tell you when, but one of you -- one of these people in these seats will eventually have this bureau. Thank you, everybody, for listening to the council, and putting this resolution together. Aye. [gavel pounded] all right. 708.

Item 708.

Katz: Let me start by bringing people up to what's been happening. This has gotten enormous media interest, and I need to replay the history, because we have myths, we call them the urban myths that float around here. If you recall, we had a first reading of an ordinance in december -- on december 19th, 2001. It was to implement a reformed nonrep class comp structure. We -- and we did this because we hadn't done it for I think it was 12 years, and actually, the charter calls for it on a regular basis, and 12 years isn't what I call a regular basis. But we finally made a decision to go ahead and proceed. As you also recall, the council was in the middle of a budget at that time. And there was real concern about implementing reform structure given the budget shortfall, and the resulting budget cuts faced by bureaus. I also have to be very honest, I think council got a little concerned with all the media play about people getting raises. And so the council requested the following actions to occur. That we put this ordinance on hold, which we did, and bring it back at the end of the budget process, which we are. The bureau of human resources surveyed bureau directors and obtained a list about standing issues that the council flagged that needed to be addressed. They did that as well and then the work session to be scheduled in late january, to explain some of those issues and that also was done. If you recall, yvonne had a couple of options for implementing the structure and the timing of the implementation were discussed to reduced implication of costs, including and let me underline this, including the option of not implementing this reform. Which at the time that we had the last hearing, we didn't quite know, because nobody was smart enough up here, including myself, to ask the question of evon, what is -- when would happen if we didn't do anything? Yvonne later came back and did some research and in fact it would cost more, and she'll explain that, if we didn't do anything. So the council expressed interest in dealing with this issue once the budget was approved, and the council expressed interest in dealing with it so that it would be cost neutral. The budget's been adopted. We've done the study. If we wait any longer we'll have to do another study, because the study will get old, and remember, we're market testing all of these issues. And we've made some changes actually yvonne has made some changes. We've had long conversations, and I think she's also had conversations with your execs and hopefully with you as well. The implementation -- do you want me to go through all -- *****: If you like.

Katz: No, I think i'll stop. And give yvonne the opportunity to explain the changes that were made and why they were made.

Yvonne Deckard, Director, Bureau of Human Resources: Okay. Good afternoon, mayor and commissioners. For the record, my name is yvonne deckard, the director for the bureau of human

JUNE 26, 2002

resources. Before you is an ordinance for the adoption of the completed reform of the nonrep employees classification compensation structure. We've referred to this in the past as a nonrep study, and the nonrep study was a tool in order to get through the reform of the class comp structure. But I want to start by giving you history of why we're doing this and what bhr has been charged with over the last three years. I told -- in october of '99 you charged the bureau of human resources with rebuilding a comprehensive hr system that would be responsive to the city's current and changing business environment. Excuse me. In january of 2000, we contracted with akt to conduct a comprehensive review of the city's hr functions. Akt's review indicated that many of the same problems existed in 2000 as were reported by the city auditor's 1993 hr audit review report. The report confirmed that our hr functions in practices were outdated, fragmented, and inconsistently administered. And that we needed reform in the areas of the citywide human resources policies governing employees, affirmative action, human resources information systems, recruitment and selection and classification and compensation structure. In august of 2000, council boldly moved not only to support the restructure of our affirmative action program, but to call for the development of a citywide diversity program. In february of 2001, you moved to adopt a new hr site team based service delivery model. In september of 2001, you approved a resolution to adopt the city's first affirmative action diversity development strategic plan. In december of 2001, you adopted a resolution for the first citywide human resources strategic plan establishing the city's human resources mission, vision, values, and goals. In march of 2000, council -- 2002, council documented an ordinance -- rules governing city employees. Also in march of 2002, council adopted a reform classification structured for the copea employee group. In april of 2002, bhr transitioned to the new site delivery model as mandated by council. In may of 2002, you ratified the copea contract, establishing a compensation structure completing the class comp reform for this employee group. If you will recall, you adopted a new reform class comp structure for the dctu employees in 1999. Today we're here for the first reading of the ordinance covering the completed reformed classification compensation structure for nonrepresented employees. If adopted, it allows the city to complete and implement a new classification compensation system that fixes citywide pay equity issues currently we have city employees performing the same work in different areas of the city, but being paid at different pay rates. It puts in place an adequate system responsive to our changing business needs. It supports the operating bureaus and their continued need to reorganization in order to meet their service delivery objectives. The bureau of licenses, because the regulatory changes, bhcd, the auditor's office, office of sustainable development, are all currently undergoing reorganizations. Our current classification compensation structure does not have the needed classifications to support these reorganizations. Continuing to operate the current system is both inefficient and costly. Our current structure does not adequately support the operating bureaus. The work employees are performing has changed since 1990, which was the last time the job classifications were updated. We continue to run costly multiple recruitments in our financial, engineering, administrative and program classifications in order to provide bureaus with a viable list of qualified candidates. There is a need for new job classes associated with the changes in our business environments such as piac, the streetcar, and the superfund. Doing nothing will cost the city \$1.3 million to fix approximately one quarter of the nonrep employees currently performing work out of classification. This ordinance calls for a cost neutral implementation.

Katz: Before you get to that power point, go back on the doing nothing. What is beginning to happen already?

Deckard: The problem with doing nothing is that as you mentioned, the charter calls for us to look at our system in a consistent manner. 12 years has passed and we haven't done anything. So what's happened is that we've taken more of a fragmented approach and we've tried to fix where we thought were the gaping holes in our classification compensation structure for this particular employee group, so we tried to fix pockets. And that's just exacerbated a failing system. We've had

JUNE 26, 2002

a number of reclass requests from bureaus as well as from employees, and that's mandate bid charter for us to look at their job classes because it's been such a long period of time. When we started to look at the nonrep as a group, we put a hold on, because it's very difficult to try to deal with in the visual request -- with individual requests you're -- as you're doing a comprehensive study, as of June first of 2000, we stopped looking at individuals and started the study looking at -- taking the comprehensive approach. What it means is if we stay with our current system, for those people that we know are working out of class, which is approximately 300 of the nonrep employee, and we have approximately 1235 of nonrep employees, we would have to reclass them, we would owe them back wages to the point in which we actually put things on hold. That would cost us about \$1.3 million just to deal with those 300 people.

Katz: Okay. Go ahead. Thank you.

Deckard: This ordinance calls for a cost neutral implementation approach. It requires bureaus to be responsible for absorbing the cost of the classification compensation system through efficiencies. Bureaus will not receive an additional budget allocation. It also requires bureaus to review efficiencies to off-set the cost of implementation of the reform system with their commissions -- commissioners during fiscal year 02-03. Citywide performance appraisal and pay for performance systems are supported by the implementation of this classification compensation structure. The reform of the classification compensation system is consistent with council's total comp policy. In order to be responsive to the city's changing business environment, recognize changes in work which has occurred over the last 12 years and address citywide recruitment problems, I recommend that we move this ordinance forward for a second reading on July 3rd, 2002.

Katz: Questions by the council?

Saltzman: I think it's -- I think just to distill us to respond to the sense of apprehension some of us felt about doing this before was in fact we are in tight budget times and it didn't look good to my mind to be increasing administrative salaries a total of a million dollars. 600,000 to a million dollars. So what we've come up with, we're going to go ahead and implement the new classifications and all the increment adjustments to salaries will come out of their existing approved budgets for each one of the bureaus. Rather than taking new money it's going to come out of existing money.

Deckard: Correct. Remember, we had a general fund said-aside, what we could do -- would do is turn that back over to the council to reallocate as they choose.

Saltzman: Thanks that's approximately 600?

Deckard: Approximately \$425,000.

Katz: Don't spend that money yet.

Saltzman: I'm not.

Katz: Not you, she was going to. We still don't know whether we're out of the woods yet.

Deckard: Right. I'm turning it back over to the council. That's what I mean.

Francesconi: Let me, before 60 my two -- make two points, adding to commissioner Saltzman's summary, it would cause us -- cost us money anyway if we didn't do this. Because workers have claims that they're going to file. Right?

Deckard: It would cost us more if we don't do this. Right.

Francesconi: Here are my two issues that have to be addressed before I can support this. One is a small and one is bigger. And we're not voting today. With the smaller one I'm doing on behalf of commissioner Sten, because he's not here, and I'm not additional it's his bureau, but I'm very aware of the issue of chief grace and what that does. And I'd asked this issue to be addressed before. In talking to the police and fire chief I don't think it's been addressed. This guy does a tremendous amount of work. He -- his pay is going to be less than the battalion chief or at the same level. It's going to create a real problem in the fire bureau. I'd ask that be addressed before it has to be addressed.

JUNE 26, 2002

Deckard: We did. We've set with --

Francesconi: Has it been done --

Deckard: We've sat with the chief --

Francesconi: Since friday? I talked to him on friday. Has it been since friday?

Deckard: I talked to the chief late on friday.

Francesconi: At 9 o'clock on friday night.

Deckard: Okay.

Francesconi: The only reason I know, we were at a function. You think it's addressed?

Deckard: Commissioner, I think it's addressed probably the best we're going to be able to address it. There is going to always be --

Katz: What's the issue from your perspective?

Deckard: I think the issue from my perspective is that where we have aligned the position within internal alignment is correct. But that because battalion chiefs are eligible for overtime, that throws it -- a monkey wrench in it. What we do have in our new rules is an assignment pay policy now that I think we can use to address that issue more long-term. But the problem is if you look at straight internal equity and because of -- you've got some bargaining unit people that get overtime, that kind of puts it askew, so we're looking at how to address that through the new assignment pay issue that we have available to us in administrative rules that would allow us to pay a position up to 20% more than what's in the plan.

Francesconi: Okay. And the second one is not really aimed at you, yvonne, this is just for the information of tim grewe and for the mayor. And for the public. There are no efficiencies in parks.

In the other bureaus i've talked to all my bureau managers, in parks, this means a cut in services of \$120,000. Flat out. That's what it means. So it means that at a time we just closed community schools, eliminated summer programs, we're talking about eliminating another \$120,000 in services in parks, period. And that's a problem. Now, that doesn't mean that there wouldn't be some elimination anyway, because of claims that could be filed --

Deckard: It would be about 103,000.

Francesconi: Okay. But that --

Deckard: If we did nothing. The hit to parks would be about 103,000 versus 120.

Francesconi: My number was off. I've checked with all my other bureaus, past and present, and it can be handled in the way you suggested. So we're trying to be team players, but the issue of parks, it can't be handled. So i'm not asking for a response from you, because it sounds like -- but this is a conversation I need to have before next week. Thank you.

Katz: All right. Does anybody want to testify on this? This moves to second. [gavel pounded] we may not be able -- it may have to move further on eventually. Okay.

*****: Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Let's move on to 712.

Item 712.

Andrew Aebi: Good morning. I'm andrew aebi, local improvement district administrator. We have three l.i.d.s today for which we're taking action on final assessment. So i'll try to keep my remarks brief. The first one that we're considering today is the lents 1 l.i.d. I just wanted to thank mayor california for honoring us with her presence at the street paving celebration.

Katz: That was fun.

Aebi: I would also like to thank matt brown and linda berth in the Portland office of transportation as well as carol herschelberg of the Portland development commission. Their hard work made these projects possible. I'd also like to thank the Portland development commission for funding these projects. As well as the property owners. I'm very pleased to report that we have received no remonstrances among any of the 56 property owners in this l.i.d. Perhaps that should not be too surprising -- surprising given the extraordinary level of petition support we had for the l.i.d., 82%.

JUNE 26, 2002

And that pdc was able to offer 70% subsidy and a fixed price to property owners. In closing it has been a privilege and pleasure to work with such a diverse group of property owners who have worked collaboratively and cooperatively with the city to make this project happen, and to greatly improve neighborhood livability. Lents has offered a model for sdus around the rest of the city, if funding for street improvements should become available. The report reflects no remonstrances were received for the lents l.i.d.

Katz: Does anybody want to testify? If not, i'll accept a motion to prepare an ordinance and bring it back to the council.

Francesconi: I would like to move that.

Saltzman: Second.

Katz: This is the ordinance.

Aebi: The ordinance is in front of you.

Katz: Yes. This moves to second.

*******:** You move -- there are no --

Katz: It moves to second. All right? [gavel pounded] 713.

Item 713.

Katz: Go ahead.

Aebi: Andrew aebi, local improvement district administrator. I'll try to keep my remarks brief. There are some complex issues to cover and we do have two property owners with us who will be testifying. We have several remonstrances here in lents II, so we didn't do quite as well as we would have liked as we did for lents i. Three property owners written remonstrances raised instruction related concerns. I would just like to thank chris arms in the office of transportation who managed construction for this project. In the event that the street in front of my own house is ever improved, there isn't anyone i'd rather have manage or work with the contractor than chris arms. Specifically the three remonstrances addressed planning strip issues which we planted in november. We did the best we could that time of the year. However, november is not the best time to be doing planning strips, so we will be going out and reseeding where necessary, although ultimately the property owners will be responsible for maintaining the planting strips. Similarly, there was? Concerns raised with respect to the street trees that were planted. The street trees have a two-year warranty, so if anybody halls to them during this time, they will be replaced at no expense to the property owner. The more complex issue is a remonstrance I received from mr. Miako, and he raised a concern regarding the assessment of his neighborhood, mr. Lindsey. Mr. Miako asked why his assessment is twice as much as mr. Lindsey, although from appearances his lot is the same size. Let me start out by saying that the final assessment ordinance in front of you today consistently for all property owners, uses Multnomah county tax records as the basis for the final assessment, which is based on square footage. We did find mr. Lindsey's square footage recorded with the county is obviously wrong. It is about half of what it should be. So that wouldn't result in a decreased assessment for mr. Miako, it would just result in a near doubling of the assessment for mr. Lindsey. And --

Saltzman: So lindsey's property is less than what's recorded?

Aebi: It's actually -- mr. Lindsey's property is double what is recorded with the county. And for another property owner who is with us here today, this gets interesting, peter patel, his assessment would increase, but to a much lesser extent. Given the magnitude of the potential increase, 92% for mr. Lindsey and the fact he is out of the country as we speak, he might not be aware of this 11th hour increase in his assessment.

Katz: Thanks to his neighbor.

Aebi: Yes. And given the fact the property owner's assessments are fixed at 62 cents per square foot, my report to council recommends that no change be made to the assessments. For one, no single property owner's assessment would go down since the rate is fixed at 62 cents per square

JUNE 26, 2002

foot. And if we were to postpone the final assessment hearing in order to renotify every one, and just a little over a month we would have spent as much money delaying the process as we would collect in additional assessment. Therefore, I recommend to council what I think is a pragmatic approach which is to leave two assessments alone rather than increasing them. And also just to note, I have personally reviewed all of the assessments within all three l.i.d.s that we are considering today and have verified there are no other obvious mistakes with the county records. Finally, would I like to also briefly add that the marine drive l.i.d. That council approved earlier this month was based on gis square footage which is to say geometry we get from our gis information system, not county records. So we hope to avoid this problem again in the future. What I do need to say is we didn't have the gis data readily available to us at the time that we formed this l.i.d. So there are some real concrete advantages to computerizing processes. And this is certainly one of them. And I believe mr. White and mr. Patel will also be wanting to speak -- speak on this issue.

Katz: All right. Let's have people who want to address us on this issue.

Katz: Come on up. Who wants -- mr. White, why don't you start.

Richard White: Okay. I'm richard white. My address is 10922 southeast boise. I guess we'll just review what I went across a year ago with you on this. The fact the cost, and I guess basically where it began is the statute they pulled up, which is interpretive, but this would have tab taken care of in a court of law as to how we want to interpret this at 62 vents to the square foot. Since mine is a flag lot, I have 22-foot frontage, which means i'm paying for 22 by 13 feet, and we're going to go into the fact that I got 42 years experience in building trades, so I know what i'm talking about. I also pulled up the figures I went over last year with you, asphalt and some flat work concrete workers, basically states my flat work in the street that I have in front of my place comes to between -- since we have to update since last year, between 1300 and \$1500. So where do we get \$10,800 from? Not only that, but the first figure of 36,000, kick in 70%, that's ridiculous. We could take this up with the state board building board and you could -- they would laugh you out of the place. But the basics of the other thing, my other property that i've sold off that add joined my property that stretched out to holgate in order to keep up this -- as i'm in retirement now, selling that off and having what I have now and being assessed at \$10,800 for 22 foot of frontage, I don't have the money to pay that. I'm locked into an income from my social security of \$10,000 a year until I get to be 65, and by then I don't think anybody is going to give me a job, \$50,000 a year. And I don't have any way of really seeing how I can pay this on an interest rate. It would take me all my life. And I don't want any fool tell me that I can just go ahead and let this go and pass it on to my children. I'm not that type of person. But the main thing is that cost figure. Also, there seems to be 275 feet of street missing. The original plan called for 107 to 112. It's not completed. What's happened? And like I say, I don't seem to get any realistic figures as to people telling me all these people that voted for this, and my section on this map, because I find looking at this I already know in discussing with other people on my street, the great percentage of us weren't for this. I never have been because of the cost factor. Knowing what I knew about what it should really cost. And wondering where do you come up with this? And giving me this fact they can show me figures -- i'm going, no, you can't show me figure costs, because I already know --

Katz: Thank you.

White: You can take any figures you want to, any book and work it any way you want to. The realistic thing is, I have time and knowing exactly what it does cost to do a street.

Katz: Thank you. Your -- excuse me, your time is up.

White: I want to make one last final statement.

Katz: Hurry up.

White: That being my family and I find that Portland development commission to be without credibility and to be without honor.

JUNE 26, 2002

Katz: Oh, those are strong words, sir. All right. Thank you.

*******:** As English is Mr. Patel's second language, he's asked that I assist him with this.

Katz: Okay.

*******:** He has two concerns. The first was the legitimacy of assessing any of his property at all. He is having -- would like some verification on 50% or more of the property owners concur for the project. People that are located contiguous to the project. He owns -- he's looking at one side of the street that he's on, and he has been against it, and he knows there's several others on the other side that are, so that's a serious concern of his.

Katz: We'll ask staff to respond to that.

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

*******:** I'd like to add one thing --

Katz: Identify yourself for the record.

Peter Patel: I'm Peter Patel, 21 -- northeast 28th. From the beginning I denied that I wouldn't be participating, not improving on my side, and it's not benefits on my side. And if they can join that 92nd all the way -- I will be willing to help, but they never joined the street and the back of 92nd. And only on -- I own more than half of the site, and they never improve anything on my side. At all.

Katz: Okay. That's it? Is that it? Okay. Thank you. Let's get -- thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Let's get a response to both of the issues raised.

Aebi: Andrew Aebi, local improvement district administrator. Before I respond, let me just thank Mr. Patel for how gracious he was when I informed him of the possibility of an increase in assessment. I just want to reiterate my report to council does not recommend an in-depth assessment for him. I'd like to address some of the issues that Mr. White raised.

Francesconi: Our neighborhood mediation center would have been busy if you had.

Aebi: Thank you, commissioner. I just want to emphasize one thing, which is the requirement of assessment for L.I.D.s doesn't even cover the construction costs. We did a lot of outreach with the community before we put this project together because many of you remember that we had some problems with L.I.D.s which led to the creation of my position, and it -- adoption of a council report in 2000. This was the first project that we went out the door with after that resolution was adopted.

We've spent a lot of time working with the community to develop this project, and again, we received 82% support, the assessment methodology based on square footage was not something we pulled out of thin air. That is the most commonly used methodology for L.I.D.s not only in Portland, but around the state of Oregon. And it is something that the Lents Urban Renewal Advisory Committee recommended to us. In the case of Mr. White in particular, if we just assume a hypothetical argument that we had split this assessment equally among all the property owners in the L.I.D., his assessment based on an equal share would have been approximately 87% higher. I think what's important to note is Mr. White's property is substantially larger than the rest of the properties within the L.I.D. and has significant redevelopment potential. Linear footage is not a method. Mr. White cited that. Linear footage is not an assessment that I can recommend in good conscience for areas that have flag lots because it doesn't accurately capture the benefit that accrues to the property. Again, his assessment is about 87% higher than if we had done an equal share method, but he has a much larger lot, and I might add the city is going to be taking over maintenance responsibilities for the street, and you get a lot less general transportation revenue for maintenance from one property owner on about 27,000 square feet than you do on property owners with 5,000 square foot lots. With respect to Mr. Patel's issue, first of all, city code requires for there to be a valid petition that you have over 50% support of all property owners within the L.I.D. Not in any particular portion of the L.I.D. If we carry Mr. Patel's argument to the extreme, that would imply that any single property owner within an L.I.D. who didn't support the project could opt out of helping pay for the improvements that benefit everybody. I don't think that was the intent, but

JUNE 26, 2002

even that said f. We look at lafayette street in particular, we had 53.05% petition support along lafayette street. Even if you look at the discrepancy in the county square footage, that still only reduces the petition support down to 52.22%. So we still would have had a majority support on lafayette street, and with respect to boise street, it's a little more ironic because the support level would have gone from 64.66% up to 66.52%. So overall, there was no decrease in support and certainly nothing to put us below the 50% threshold. Finally what i'd like to do for council's benefit is read a letter that I received this morning that is not included in the report to council. I'll just read two sentences, because I want to keep this brief. The property owner across the street from mr. Patel wanted me to inform council, quote -- I could not represent my four flex prior to the great job the city did on our street at laffayette and 88th. I think I speak for my neighbors when I say that the whole complexion of our neighborhood is greatly improved. Thank you for all your hard work. We love it. And that's mr. Patrick jenkins at 8826 southeast lafayette.

Katz: Thank you. All right. Questions by the council? I need a motion to overrule the remonstrances.

Francesconi: I'll move that we overrule the remonstrances.

Katz: Is that the -- okay.

Saltzman: Second.

Katz: Any objections? Hearing none, it's passed to second. [gavel pounded] thank you. All right. 714.

Item 714.

Aebi: I have a little better news to report on this one. We had 100% support on this one, no remonstrances. The report reflects there were no remonstrances. I might quickly add we do have property owners waiting for the next phase of street improvements which would be known as the lents iii l.i.d. That project is on hold because of the shilo urban renewal tax ruling and we hope if we get clarification on that issue, we will be able to honor that commitment and meet the demands for street improvements in the lents neighborhood. Thank you.

Katz: All right. Anybody want to testify? There were no remonstrances. Okay. This moves to second.

Francesconi: If I could just say, you've done a nice job. I've been looking forward to meeting with you to learn more, but you've done a nice job today and in the neighborhood.

*****: Thank you.

Item 715.

Katz: 715.

Katz: All right.

David Lane, Director, Office of Neighborhood Involvement: I'm david lane from the office of neighborhood involvement. I'm pleased to present this contract that extends and renews the city's partnership with this remarkable organization. It's an example of a successful transition from a government-run organization to a nonprofit community partner funded together with public dollars.

And together today with me are several members from elders in action.

Katz: All right. Let's make this very quick.

*****: We will.

Katz: Thank you.

John, President, Elders in Action: I'm john, the current president of the board for elders in action. I'm here to advise you that we're working very hard trying to diversify our fund-raising. We're looking primarily at grants, and -- and individual contributions. We have other things in the works. I want to thank you very sincerely for the support we've had in the past. And we hope that we can depend upon you in the future as our needs -- thank you.

Katz: We make no promises here for the future.

*****: And another thing -- [laughter]

JUNE 26, 2002

*****: We'll talk to you about that later.

Katz: Yeah.

Becky Wehrli, Executive Director, Elders in Action: High name is becky, executive director of elders in action. It was five years ago we moved to the private nonprofit world. Basically so we could diversify our funding base and expand the amount of services we were providing to older adults in our community. I want to say that over the five years we actually have gotten to the point where outside fund-raising now accounts for 40% of our budget, 60% of our budget is 60 and county funds, and actually last year it was 50% that was outside money, but this year we have had a struggle with the 9-1-1 raising as much outside money. A few things that are happening, I want to alert you to, last year we started our first major fund-raiser, timeless treasures, an antiques road show. This year we're starting another outside fund-raiser and we're calling it silver. It's a benefit for elders in action and we have secured the sponsorship of northwest natural, and what we will be doing is recognizing the contributions that older adults in the metropolitan community make to the health and vitality of our community. So I hope you will participate in that. That will be in the fall.

Additionally, I wanted to let you know that our elder friendly business certification program is growing nationwide, it is not covering costs of all of the program yet, but it's on its way. And just last week I was in ohio where we opened up our seventh project. That one was really exciting because the mayor was very involved in the kick-off. We had a press conference and he also host add lunch for businesses there. So i'm looking forward to a lot happening in toledo. This week we're opening up the program at our eighth site in montgomery, alabama. And now charles will just make a comment or two about the commission.

Charles Kurtz: Thank you. My name is charles kurtz, i'm a volunteer, i'm currently chair of the elders in action commission, which is our advocacy arm. As I -- I want to speak on behalf of all of the volunteers associated with elders in action. This is a great organization. It's a pleasure to be associated with this group. This is a staff who's committed, and they really do help seniors in this city have a better life. And that's something I think we need more of. These folks do a great job, and you get a tremendous investment, a tremendous benefit from your small investment in this program, because thousands literally thousands of hours have of volunteer hours go into helping seniors with problems with housing and transportation, elder abuse, elder crime, things that make this city a much better place. My colleagues on the commission spend countless hours advocating with our representatives in congress and the legislature to keep programs for seniors growing and active here in Portland. Although I have to say these days that's going to be -- getting to be a tough job. We've also been active in supporting some of the issues that you folks support. We supported the park levy, for example, this past election, and look forward to supporting it again in the fall. Again, thanks for your past support, and we hope that you'll continue to support us. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you. Questions? Anybody else want to testify? Fine. Thank you. And thank you for waiting this long. This item passes on to second. [gavel pounded] we're going to adjourn until 2:00. I just want to flag to the council that we may be here through the evening, and --

Saltzman: Through the evening?

Katz: If -- anyway, we're going to be here in the evening. [gavel pounded]

At 12:39 p.m., Council recessed.

JUNE 26, 2002

JUNE 26, 2002 2:00 PM

[roll call]

Katz: Mayor is here, commissioner Sten is on an educational mission. All right. Item 730 and 731.

Item 730.

Francesconi: I want one of those.

Katz: 730, roll call.

Francesconi: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 731.

Item 731.

Francesconi: This is an example where business in the neighborhood, the environmental community and the growing ethnic community have come together to shape their community. There are some issues with the hope vi project which are actually going to greatly improve the neighborhood, including that smaller size rezoning. So this is a great opportunity actually not only for portsmouth, but for an example of what we need to do to move forward as a city. Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Katz: I too want to thank the community. We did hear some conflicting testimony in my hope that the community can come together as they work through hope vi projects and the vision and the dreams of portsmouth. Aye. [gavel pounded] all right. Let's read 727, 728, 729.

Item 727, 728, 729.

Katz: Let me welcome everybody here and thank everybody for being here. I think it's fair to say that the council is prepared to stay as long as it takes to hear the testimony of those present and those that will be coming in in the next few minutes. I do, however, hope that the testimony is concise and that it's not repetitive. I want everybody to know that if they support the testimony that they hear, that instead of clapping or cheering, since this is a deliberative body, we have developed -- the man tells will show you we've developed a way of showing our appreciation for the words that are being said by raising our hand or in some cases people like to wave them. Before I turn this over to the staff, let me provide a few points. The marquam hill plan is about more than just ohsu's future. It's about the future of the institution, but it also about the future of our neighborhoods, the future possibilities for north macadam, a science and technology quarter and the future for the city of Portland and the region as a whole. I just want to let everybody know that we have two mayors who are here from the region that will testify after the formal presentation is done. As I said last september, nothing is more important to our future pros parity than the success of ohsu. Nothing. It is the foundation for business growth and biotechnology, medical technology, cancer research, and specialized medicine. If we make the right decisions, it will be our next silicon forest. We all know that the institution's been on the hit for almost 90 years, and it's a major employment center for the city of Portland. The health sciences university identified expansion needs to support their research and their clinical and educational bioscience advancement needs in their 30-year plan. They came to the city to determine how best to plan for that future. And what we have today is the marquam hill plan. And they agreed that that would be the best way to go. That it would provide certainty for the institutions up on the hill, and certainty to the neighborhoods surrounding them. This plan also helps Portland to position itself on the cutting edge of the bioscience movement. What this will mean for Portland residents is infusion if we are

JUNE 26, 2002

successful, of high-wage jobs, knowledge-based industry that works in support of and with our state university systems, systems, I underline "systems," the opportunity and resources to reclaim the willamette river bank for our enjoyment and for our preservation of the river. The city in examining the issues surrounding this plan identified key areas that required further understanding.

People said they weren't experts in several fields. To better understand of the synergy between land and transportation assumptions made by ohsu, additional information was needed. We needed information and the community was asking for the information as well, and this work went into the development of the staff proposal and if you look at all your material, there is one final document that provides you with all the information that was received, additional information in addition to information from our own pdot, which i'll mention in a few minutes. The work went into the development of the staff proposal and into the recommendations by the planning commission. In addition, the planning commission didn't have all the information that they needed, specifically about the potential impacts of a suspended cable transportation system, and other possible connectors, the hill and north -- for the hill and north macadam. And so council directed the office of transportation to develop an initial report and draft recommendations that would provide everybody additional information. That was done and you received the report, I think you wanted it on the 19th I think you received it on the 20th. If i'm in error, please somebody let me know. We will be hearing a brief update on the pdot's draft report and recommendations today, but we will not be acting on it until july 10th. So I really appreciate that you don't testify on that report today. You'll have an opportunity for testimony on july 10th. I expect that we will get through all the testimony today. Tomorrow at 2 o'clock the council will meet again to discuss the testimony and the plan and provide some direction for the staff. I hope that during some point today, and probably toward the end of the testimony, because i'm taking a long time which I usually don't do, and i'd like for us to begin the public testimony, i'd like the council to begin thinking about the issues that you want staff to come back and address tomorrow. Amendments you might want to present. The public will again be able to testify next week on any of the amendments we're considering, and then we'll move all of that to the following week for action. Let me close by saying that a lot of hashed work went into all of this by our own staff, by the neighborhoods, by ohsu, by gil kelley and especially susan hartnett, by matt brown, and all the people who work order this project. This is how the presentations will be made. Gil kelley will have five minutes to open the discussion, susan will have 15 minutes to give us the highlights of the plan, matt brown will have ten minutes to give us highlights of the transportation report, and i'm asking that council not -- to query matt about those, jot them down, you'll have plenty of opportunity to talk with him about this issue later on. Don't take time away from the citizens. Let me just finish that we aren't necessarily going to agree with everything that the planning commission decided, and we probably will have some of our own ideas as well as some of the ideas presented by the citizens of this community. Keep track of that. After matt brown we'll hear testimony from ohsu, then homestead, and then cth. Each one will have 15 minutes, and then i'm going to turn it over to our two elected officials, mayor judy hammerstad from lake oswego, and mayor tom hughes from hillsboro. All right? Gil?

Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning: Good afternoon. Gil kelley, planning director. I think the most important thing that staff can do here at the outset of the hearing is to faithfully and accurately portray and summarize the actions of the planning commissioner to -- commission, their recommendations. They spent many hearings and work sessions on this and susan will do that in just a few moments. I wanted to just take the opportunity to explain some of the underpinnings of the approach that brought this project before the planning commission, and are bringing it forward

JUNE 26, 2002

to you now. The mayor has indicated why the project is important to the economy and the community. I just wanted to add a couple of thoughts to that at the beginning. I believe this is essential to the future and very important to the essential -- to the future of the economy here in Portland and the region in general. When I arrived two years ago, it struck me as an enormous opportunity to really start the seed of a part of the economy that has potential to really create the foundation of a knowledge-based industry in the center of the region. That was certainly our 19th century. That was confirmed by -- our hunch. That was confirmed by the report, and served as the economic premise for much of the work. As the mayor indicated, that is more than just about the institutional needs of Oregon health sciences university. It is about the potential to spin off as many as 10,000 or more jobs related to that research and clinical function there over the 30-year period that they institution -- that the institution buildings out. While the star jobs or the principle investigators in the research arena, there are many other jobs available to many others in the region potentially that fall out of that kind of economic stimulus. We are aware of the courtwright report and others that are more cautious about the future of bioscience in Portland and the Portland region. And those have their reasons for that cautiousness. I would just say that those -- that report and others often represent a snapshot in time of what is right now, and to some extent downplay the kind of inches, the kind of research trajectory that's already demonstrated at ohsu, and the presence of the combination in this region between biosciences and information technology that perhaps gives us a unique position in that industry with regard to other major markets in the country. I also think this is important because it has the potential to form a nucleus of universities and research functions in Portland. As many of us in planning are fond of saying, every great city has at its heart a university. In our case that's probably a collection of several universities, which may have the opportunity to really grow in what we've begun to call the science and technology corridor south of downtown in Portland that includes marquam hill, certainly would include ohsu and psu, potentially ogi, other state universities, as well as professional schools and feeder and complimentary institutions such as pcc and omsi. Finally, I think it's important because this might be the project that finally ignites development in the north macadam district. That was certainly in the doldrums a couple of years ago, and now seems to be by contrast a very real possibility. Because of the efforts of ohsu, because of the efforts of new property owners in north macadam, and in some part due to efforts of city staff. I believe that the ohsu expansion in north macadam can be the key economic driver for that district and for the science and technology corridor in general. I think that also by the way disproves what some believe has come to be an axiom that the high-tech jobs only occur at the periphery of the region and not in the central city. And I actually 30 there's a positive synergy between the high-tech economy occurring in hillsboro and Washington county and what might occur in central Portland. We also felt it was very important in this project to create perhaps a different kind of approach or model to community and institutional relationships when it gets into the land use and physical building arena. In that regard, our job has been very difficult because we feel both the institutions on the hill and the neighborhoods have had a lot of stretching and learning to do, and a lot of difficult decisions to wrestle with internally. On the part of ohsu, they've certainly had to come to terms with what is their long-term vision and what's really important to them. In terms of the neighborhood, they've also had to struggle with internal politics and to articulate what is most important to them. And that has been difficult for all of us. But we have tried to stay a steady course here and allow the best aspirations of both of those entities to come together, because we reject the notion that quality of life is defined as something that comes after the economy or is -- plays a second role to the economy. We really feel that both neighborhood integrity and livability and the institutional vitality and growth are key components

JUNE 26, 2002

and twins in a coexistent that we think can be improved by the project, not just mitigated. Our approach was to really look for win-wins and to take a larger view of what the stakeholders were and wanted. We also looked in harkening to a conversation we had earlier today about regulations. We've looked at regulatory and nonregulatory approaches to further the desires of both entities, both the neighborhood and the institution. So you will hear about the memorandum of understanding that's proposed, we've given you an outline of what might be included in that and would hope to conclude those negotiations and return to you in september with that. That's a signal that there's a different kind of partnership here than often exists in a simple quasi judicial permitting process and can go beyond the typical mitigation limits or mentality. Finally we have attempted to balance the need for certainty on both the part of the institution and the neighborhoods with flexibility, and its companion of some rigorous follow-up efforts and evaluation and monitoring. To do this let me just say it was very important for us to do a -- take a number of steps in this process which are sometimes forgotten about now, but I want to remind you because they really are the cornerstones. First of all, we needed to understand what the university's mission and focus was and what eyes needs are and understand those in a very specific way. We also needed to understand and listen to what the community was saying and to record that and often to try articulate that in terms that could further fit within the structure of the process. We finally needed to do independent assessment of information that was provided to us that was about the critical premises for underlining the process. Those were three critical components, and they're really all intertwined. One was to examine the potential for additional spin-off research and employment from the university's expansion. And secondly and as a companion, to investigate the notions about the need for synergy or close proximity of the research clinical and teaching functions within the university and between different activity areas within the university. That was done through the patel report and its review. We needed to really assess the transportation constraints getting to the hill, and around the campus. And look objectively at the notion about connecting the hill to an off site or an extended campus, whether it be north macadam or elsewhere. And actually even prior to that we needed to look thirdly at alternative sites. That made many people nervous. In fact, north macadam wasn't a predetermined outcome of this process. It turned out it was the most logical choice for an extended campus, and I can say quite honestly I was skeptical about the tram when I first entered this project, over any aerial system. I came to believe that one is indicated and needed. That was only after an independent review of transportation experts and a lot of testimony on the part of a lot of different people. Finally, we mocked up ideas in a number of different ways, presented those to the community and technical advisory group, talked about them in open house and dealt with them in hearings and deliberations in front of the planning commission. And that's how we got to the proposal that susan will describe. I would like to add two final thoughts. One is that this has been a very deliberate process. It has been one year almost exactly since you adopted the resolution asking us to prepare this plan. The one year runs july 11th, so I think we'll beat it by a day if you conclude on july 10th. That has been we believe enough time to excavate the issues and the information needed to make the judgment that's are in front of you today, recognizing matt brown's process will continue past today. And to give those a fair discussion an airing. It has not been so long the people have lost interest or have -- that some critical opportunity hasn't been missed. Certainly people have asked for more time throughout the process, and we've tried to respect that, but we've also tried to keep it moving along to bring it to you within the time frame desired. Finally, i'd just like to echo the mayor's sentiment and thank susan in particular for managing this project. Her work has just been beyond belief on this, and clearly beyond what's expected of any civil servant to deliver this on time and in a form that is understandable and ready

JUNE 26, 2002

for your action. She's been supported by some wonderful staff and a very impressive interbureau team to bring the recommendations in front of you. But would I like to give special credit to susan. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you, gil. Susan.

Susan Hartnett, Bureau of Planning: Thank you. Karla, can you turn on the power point, please? I am going to use power play -- power point. For the record my name is susan hartnett, I would like to take a second to thank the mayor and gil for acknowledging the work that not only I and matt have done, but the marquam hill team members and the interbureau coordination folks. It's been quite a joint effort here. So let me begin by making sure i'm clear that what i'm wanting to put in front of you is the planning commission and design commission recommendations. There are a number of places where some suggestion for changes have come from various city bureaus, and they've asked me to make sure that I bring your attention to what's already in the record from them so you're looking out for those memorandums from them. There's something from the office of planning and development review and something from bureau of environmental services. So i'll bring those to your attention when I get to that point. Let me start with just a quick review of the dates the mayor mentioned. I am anticipating I will have the package of amendments that the council is directing staff to prepare available on july 1st. My goal is for noon on july 1st. As many people in this project know, I practice just in time delivery, so it won't be 11:59, it will be noon. I will make them available in the city clerk's office if members of the public are interested in getting them. They'll also be available at the planning bureau office. July 10th is the date that's scheduled for the city council final decision on this project. Just a quick review of what's in your package. You have the ordinance and findings, exhibit a is the marquam hill plan volume one, which is the planning commission recommended marquam hill plan. Volume 2 of the marquam hill plan is the design commission recommended marquam hill design guidelines which is exhibit b to the ordinance. Exhibited c to the ordinance is a list of prior conditions of approval. We're trying to make sure we give clear indications to the office of planning and development review, which of the prior conditions of approval for ohsu's previous conditional use reviews and other land use reviews carry forward on this project and which ones do not -- there are also two resolutions, one is to adopt the action charts and to reaffirm the terwilliger parkway corridor plan and its implementing document, the terwilliger design guidelines. An overview of the marquam hill plan is that it was a long-range planning project. We have been following a legislative procedure for it. We have examined a spectrum of needs and ideas that were identified by the institutions, by the community groups, by individuals, by the city council through the resolution that gil mentioned. And it has included a significant coordination with other city bureaus and other public agencies such as trimet and odot, Oregon department of transportation. Some of the needs and ideas that were part of our review were the institutional expansion, factors that might be limiting growth on marquam hill and a particular focus on that was transportation. As gil mentioned, alternative central city expansion locations and the transportation connections needed for that, and the protection and enhancement of neighborhood livability, terwilliger park way and environmentally sensitive land on marquam hill. This map and the aerial photograph behind me provided an indication of the proximity between north macadam and marquam hill. This is the marquam hill planning area and this is the north macadam area. The two areas are very closes to one another. Ohsu's initial identification of north macadam is their preferred expansion location brought these two projects, the north macadam planning project and the marquam hill plan, into close coordination with one another, and there has been ongoing overlap in these two projects, and i'm sure you'll hear from folks about their concerns about some of the north macadam issues. There are two separate

JUNE 26, 2002

projects, however, what's in front of you is the uphill side, the marquam hill plan side, my understanding is that the north macadam piece will be before council sometime in the fall, I think september is the projected date. The key investigations that we've done as part of this project, and they've been quite voluminous, are included in volume 3, which is the two-inch hunk of paperwork in front of the mayor. That's the one. The key reports were the building bioscience Portland, which was done by the patel memorial institute, an alternative location analysis, which focus order land availability within the central city, and a transportation peer review report that was done by a panel of 5, transportation experts from around north america. Some of our public involvement highlights, we've been meeting with neighborhood associations on and off since the fall of 2000. We did have a 26-member community and technical advisory group that involved participation from neighborhood associations, the community, the institution and a number of city bureaus and public agencies. That group met 18 times between february of 2001 and march of 2002. We had a pedestrian connection working group. There were seven meetings for that group and i'll talk about the outcome of that process. We had a newsletter we distributed to over 5,000 addresses in the planning -- plan study area. And to the various mailing lists we've been developing over time. We did provide the opportunity to send us written comments as a result of the newsletter we received 62 comments. We held two community open houses in february of this year. We had 67 people who attend and 45 of them responded to the survey we provided asking them to tell us what they thought about the approaches we were considering as part of the marquam hill plan. There were eight planning commission briefings beginning in april of 2002 and ending in march of this year. There were five planning commission hearings in april and may of this year, and four design commission hearings in may and june of this year. The recommendations for the marquam hill plan can be chunked into -- sorry. Can be chunked into seven categories. Regulations for institutional development, building and site design, preserving and enhancing open space, addressing traffic impacts on terwilliger and local streets, improving pedestrian connections, assuring we have ecologically sensitive buildings and construction techniques, and some methods for ongoing monitoring and public review. And i'll try and hit each one of those as we move through this specific -- the specifics. The marquam hill plan contains as most of our long-range planning documents do, a vision for the area, a set of policies that try and set a framework or road map, objectives that talk about specific ways that we can achieve our desired goals, and also attached to that are action charts which provide implementation strategies. The policy areas covered in the marquam hill plan include land use, transportation, the marquam hill community, open space and natural resources, and building and site design. All of these apply to the specific area defined as the plan area, which is shown on this map. It primarily includes the institutionally owned and developed property, plus a sort of a finger going up to the connection to the regional transportation system at 405, and it's a relatively small plan area. Comprehensive plan map and zoning map amendments were proposed and recommended by the planning commission to recognize the institutional development through the application of ex or central employment zoning, and to preserve 45 acres of undeveloped land through the open space or os zoning. And here's the map that shows this. This is the area of the ex zoning. This area is currently zoned r1 or residential 1,000. This is the area for recommended for open space zoning. Which is a portion of it is currently zoned r1 or residential 1000 and another portion is zoned r10, which is one unit per 10,000 square feet. Within the zoning code, which is title 33, the plan recommends the creation of the marquam hill plan district, which provides us a zoning tool to create special regulations to address the needs of an area that has unique characteristics that relate to the economy, to the natural environment, to historic issues, that kind of stuff. What we're doing in the marquam hill plan

JUNE 26, 2002

district is first of all allowing but also limiting institutional development. The zoning code proposal -- recommendation also creates two new land use reviews, marquam hill parking review and marquam hill site review, which are geared toward assuring the desired outcomes are achieved and also towards limiting the undesired impacts. And i'll talk more about both of those in a moment. This map shows the plan district area. It is essentially equivalent to the ex zoned area that I showed you just a moment ago. The plan district has special use and development regulations. It's also divided into five subdistricts so that we can match appropriate use and development standards to both the existing and expected future development as well as paying attention to the environmentally sensitive areas. So the zone e in the subdistricts, which is primarily environmentally overlay zones, really has essentially very, very limited uses and very limited development standards. We're also proposing -- the planning commission is recommending that height limits be set to meet specific areas, and i'll show you the map in a minute, but also to do something different here, and that is to measure them as an above sea level measure, asl is what it's shown as in the code. It's a different approach, but it's propose yacht -- appropriate given the topography on marquam hill using our existing measures for height in the zoning code would be a very awkward application. When I start talking about height I want you to keep in mind these are above sea level and not feet above grade. So this map shows the plan district area and its subdistricts. You see these areas of subdistrict e. Those are the areas on marquam hill that are primarily environmentally zone overlay and intended to be protected through the regulations further protected than what the environmental overlay provides through use and development limitations. This is the map of height limitations. You can see they're stated as 710 asl, this is, for example, the va hospital at 675 feet above sea level. One thing I want to mention to you, you do have a letter from the design commission in your packet. The planning commission had asked the design commission to provide council with some advice on the height limitations. The issue about what to set the heights at came up as part of the planning commission's testimony from the public and they did have some discussion about it, but they felt the design commission was probably in a better position to assess some specifics around that since they were also looking at design guidelines. So the design commission has forwarded to you a proposal to amend this table, this map, and it is attached to a letter from the design commission.

Saltzman: I just got the letter.

Hartnett: We'll make sure you get the attachment. Sorry about that. I do think this is something that the design commission is willing to come and talk with you about if it's something you'd like to hear more about. They felt -- what they were trying to do is be more sensitive at the edges, particularly in the area around terwilliger parkway and at the western edge near the neighborhoods, and also to make sure there were no circumstances where nonconforming heights were created. Let me continue then within the plan district there's a limitation for f.a.r.s. There's a requirement for a minimal amount of formal open area, and that's specifically defined within the zoning code as to what that is, and it's also referenced in the design guidelines to make sure that these open areas are functional, comfortable, connected to the pedestrian environment, welcoming, designed to incorporate people as well as plants, that kind of stuff. The last item i'll mention about what's in the plan district, i'm sorry, another item I want to mention is the notion of environmental review being required for any development activity within the environmental overlay zone. You also have in your packets a memorandum from the office of planning and development review in which they request that the zoning code text that implements this requirement be deleted. One of the reasons that they're asking for that is that that requirement is inconsistent with state law. So it creates a problem for us within the zoning code. And again, opdr will be available to answer questions on

JUNE 26, 2002

that tomorrow if you want to talk with them about that directly. Let me talk about parking regulations, because that's been a major item of discussion at the planning commission and throughout this process. The recommendation does suggest limiting the allowed parking to 900 new spaces beyond what's currently allowed. 150 spaces in subdistrict a and 750 in subdistrict b. Requiring that new parking be developed only in conjunction with new building square footage. This is -- there is a one-time exception for that in the subdistrict b, the intention there is to allow the possibility of ohsu expanding a parking structure to develop the western plaza, which is seen as the edge between the residential neighborhood and the institutional area. That development may take place only with parking development or it may take place with building development, but we wanted to leave the opportunity open and planning commission concurred with that. Planning commission recommends limiting new parking spaces to one space per 750 square feet of building area. They propose requiring land use review under this new review for proposals that include parking. Marquam hill parking review is actually divided into two different reviews, type a and b. Type a is required for all proposals that include any parking after the effective date of these new regulations. It's intended that marquam hill parking review type a would be handled through the type 1 land use procedure, which is a ministerial procedure, a staff decision that is then appealable to the land use board of appeals. There is no local appeal on a type 1 review. The approval criteria requires compliance with single okay pans vehicle rates for employee and student traffic, as well as meeting certain traffic volume maximums on specific local streets such as homestead, homestead drive, hamilton and hamilton terrace and condor lane. In addition, the type a parking review approval criteria requires that the applicant show consistency with the site development concepts. And one note on the sov rates, they do decrease over time, the intention being to require the institutions to continue to move forward with their transportation demand management efforts and reduce the number of single occupant vehicles, increase the number of transit and other nonauto mode access to the hill. An aside, on the memorandum you have from the office of planning and development review, they are requesting that the final approval criteria, the consistency with the site development concepts, be eliminated from the type a review. Again, because the type a is intended to be a relatively low level review. This consistency with these full set of site development concepts which i'm going to talk about is a fairly significant findings exercise, and probably not consistent with that level of review. They also point out in their memo that most likely any project that is going to be subject to the type a parking review will also be subject to design review, which is looking at some of the same issues. So they don't think there's going to be any loss of review here, it's just a matter of trying to scale back on what's required in this first type a review. The type b review is recommended for all proposals that are in excess of the maximums, so we're allowing for a proposal in excess of the 900 spaces allowed, but they would have to go through this type b review. Any proposal that came in for parking after ten years, even if it was within the 900 spaces, would have to go through the type b review, and any proposal that was subject to the type a review but not able to meet that approval criteria, would also have to go through this type b. The type b would be handled through the land use procedure type 3, which is the largest, the highest level of discretionary review that the office of planning development review involves, it includes a hearing before the hearings officer with appeal to city council, and subsequent appeal to land use board of appeals. Type b parking review approval criteria addresses the desired character of the area, the transportation system capacity, and capability issues, and also requires consistency with the marquam hill plan vision policies and objectives, as well as consistency with the terwilliger parkway corridor plan. Again, the office of planning and development review in their memorandum requests that we merge that final two criteria consistent

JUNE 26, 2002

with the marquam hill plan vision policy et cetera, and terwilliger parkway park way into a single tie year that that speaks with area plans. That is a similar approval criteria that exists for other land use reviews, and will assure that the office of planning and development review applies all area plans, for example, the way it's written right now it would be unclear whether or not the policies objectives from the southwest community plan would need to be included. If it says area plans, the southwest community plan applies, to those criteria would apply as well. So I think it broadens the review and makes it more consistent with other regulations that opdr currently implements. The plan -- the marquam hill plan recommends two special features, the pedestrian connection vision plan and three site development concepts. The functional area site development concept, the vehicular circulation site development concept and the pedestrian circulation site development concept. Just a little bit of information on the pedestrian connection vision plan. It was created by that pedestrian connections working group I mentioned earlier, which was made up of a number of neighborhood and community representatives as well as city staff. Our intention was to capture the community's idea about -- ideas about pedestrian connections that should occur both within the institutional area but beyond the institutional area, the kinds of connections that would create good linkages between marquam hill and downtown, north macadam, other areas on the west side, as well as the recreational trails in the area. It's intended to provide a starting point for future work, and the plan does have in the action testimonies a number of suggestions for ongoing refinement and implementation of this. The vision plan itself identifies 29 routes and nine street crossings, some of which are very close to one another, so part of what would be happening in the refinement process would be identifying which of, say, two choices might be the better choice to serve the varying needs of the area. The site development concepts capture the key elements of the activity and access reorganization that was a key part of ohsu's expansion plan and we believe is really critical to managing the traffic impacts and ensuring that better integration with the institutional development occurs with its surroundings, as well as making sure that there's an ongoing promotion of efficient movement within the campus. So the first one is the functional area site development concept, which seeks tone courage institutional synergy, seeks to create an interface with the village center on the western edge of the campus area, seeks to establish a compact urban form, and seeks to make sure that first-time visitors sort of have a rational -- can quickly grasp the arrangement of activities in the area. The pedestrian -- the vehicular circulation site development concept seeks to reinforce that employee and student access will occur via sam jackson park road and that patient ask and visitor access will occur by terwilliger boulevard and campus drive. A key come opponent sent creating this limited access section of campus drive, and this is a very important component of assuring that over time the traffic impacts on terwilliger boulevard are better managed. We are talking about actual growth in traffic on terwilliger, but we are talking about a decrease in the pm peak traffic, and that's because patients and visitors arrive at different times of day than employees and students, and employee and students will not be able to access terwilliger boulevard. The other intention is that patients and visitors not familiar with the road system are less likely to use local streets as cut-through routes and they're less likely to go down terwilliger boulevard south of the campus area because they're not going to be -- they won't know where that takes them. So the intention is that while there will be some increase in traffic north of campus drive, south of campus drive, there will be a decrease in traffic and even north of campus drive there will be a decrease in pm peak congestion traffic. The pedestrian circulation site development concept seeks to encourage connections to the neighborhoods, to the river, to downtown and to the trails in the area. Also trying to connect pedestrian pathways with the required formal open areas, and also seeking to make sure we create good links with the transit that

JUNE 26, 2002

is and will be available in the campus in the future. Going back to some additional zoning code recommendations. The new land use review, marquam hill site review, applies most -- would be applied to most development within the plan district. It would also be a type 1 review process that ministerial process I mentioned, and the approval criteria would require consistency with the goals of the three site development concepts. In opdr's memo, they're requesting that the goals of the site review process be incorporated into design review which is an additional review that's going to be applied in marquam hill. I'll talk about it in a minute. Their goal there is to first of all reduce the number of reviews and secondly, merge these two reviews that are very similar in what they're looking at. Design review looks at building by building development, but the site review is asking, what's happening on the site as a whole, are you making sure that the reorganization and the development of these access both vehicular and pedestrian access systems is occurring. So there's sort of a natural fit between those two. And again, opdr will be here to talk about that, and I know gil and I are ready to talk about it as well. I'm trying to go as fast as I can here. Creating the marquam hill design district occurs because the ex zone requires the application of the d design overlay. And one other very clear recommendation coming from the planning commission is to make no changes to the existing terwilliger parkway design district or guidelines. So this map shows the proposed marquam hill design district, which is equivalent to the ex area, and it shows a portion of the terwilliger design district, this continues farther south than I can show on this map. We're not changing that area. We're not changing where or how the design guidelines for terwilliger applies. As a matter of fact, the design guidelines we're trying to make sure that there's a better fit between these. We will be applying new marquam hill design guidelines, which are contained in volume 2, design commission recommends your adoption of those. Design review on marquam hill will be through a type 2 review, which is a staff decision and the opportunity to appeal to the design commission and then to luba. The design guidelines are intended to create a dense urban environment, encourage that pedestrian friendly system we talked about, make sure that those formal open areas are comfortable, functional, attractive, make sure there's better integrate with the natural environment or surrounding it, including terwilliger parkway, and also to respond to the visual prominence of the institutional development on the hill. This is unique, but something that we felt was important in the design -- and the design commission concurred. Those building are very visible and we'd like to try and improve some of the design elements. There's two primary implementation tools in the marquam hill plan. One is the action charts, they are adopted by resolution, implementers are voluntary, there's no obligation for those to take place. It sort of sets a course work but doesn't necessarily guarantee anything will occur. The other piece that gil mentioned is the memorandum of understanding. And we'll be talking about that more I hope over the next couple of days. Some of the mitigations that are included, roadway improvements that include improved access to the regional road system by making improvements on sixth avenue between sheridan and broadway, there's action items in the mou speak to working to advance other regional network improvements such as ideas contained in the south Portland circulation study and the south Portland transportation alliance report. The mou speaks to very specific projects. Traffic mitigation includes traffic calming or access limitations on local streets such as condor lane, hamilton, and sixth drive homestead drive. Speed enforcement and education on terwilliger boulevard, and again, the mou references specific projects. More traffic mitigation, again, the reorganization of institutional functions and roads to separate the traffic. Extensive use of signing and education for employees, students, contractors, patients, employees, everybody who comes to the hill will get information about preferred routes and how to get there without impacting the surrounding area. The pedestrian improvements, again, the refinement and

JUNE 26, 2002

implementation of the pedestrian connections vision plan, improvements to the existing system and development of new links which will happen both through ongoing development on the hill as well as moving forward things like the pedestrian connection vision plan, the pedestrian network and pedestrian environment are specifically included as part of the design guidelines, and again, the memorandum of understanding would speak to specific projects. Ecologically sensitive buildings and construction practices. There are two policies, five which is open space and natural resources, and 6, which is building and site design, include objectives and action items related to this opportunity. The mou would also reference specific projects and overall approaches, and I do want to mention that you have in your pack fret b.e.s. A request to add that there be no net increase and -- and that's something we can talk about more tomorrow. I have two more slides. Monitoring the ongoing public review, the required land use reviews I talked about. In the mou we're proposing a periodic assessment probably to occur about every five years in which ohsu would provide a rendition of everything that they've done over that period of time to implement the marquam hill plan. They would provide it to the bureau director, to the planning bureau director, who would review it with other bureau and bring it to council for council's information, and potential input. As gil mentioned, we hope to bring the refined mou back to you in september of this year. The last thing I want to mention is the project record is available in its entirety in the room today. It's against the wall why all those boxes and file cabinets. If you'd like to know about something on the record we'd be happy to tell you about it. And this slide summarize what's in the record, and i'm done.

Katz: Thank you. Before we get to matt, let me just -- because i'll forget -- let's make sure that we go over the mou tomorrow, because there are elements in the mou that are very important to the community. The south circulation plan, and other issues that you've identified. Because i'm sure that will come up during our testimony. Second of am, on one sheet or cut and paste, however you want, make sure that we have all the amendments proposed by our bureaus, and then we'll deal with them tomorrow.

Hartnett: My intention is to have all amendments regardless of who proposes them, available to you tomorrow before 2 o'clock.

Katz: Okay, good. Matt.

Kelley: If you don't mind just one moment, on the issue of the mou, we'll describe that in more detail tomorrow, just to help set the context, we had many, many good ideas from the neighborhood, lots of people came forward with lots of good ideas. We had initially drawn, i'm saying this because it's partly not in front of you in the planning commission's recommendation, we initially had drawn a larger boundary for the plan area that included much of upper homestead neighborhood in line with the philosophy that we wanted to create this sort of enlightened coexistence between the institution and the neighborhood there. Because we felt in that way we could sort of apply policies on the ground as it were that would further neighborhood protection and improvements. For understandable reasons, many neighbors were nervous about including their area within the plan boundary, and by a close vote on two occasions they requested that the boundary, official boundary be narrow to the institutionally owned property. We were able to do much of the external impact mitigation through the plan district by looking at trip generation and so forth, and by requiring a set heavy aside for hope -- a set-aside for open space zoning there. Are many more measures which are more proactive and not given to regulation that we know where everyone's policy and intent but need to find their home now in the mou.

Katz: Okay. We'll get to that tomorrow.

Kelley: If people don't see it in the document here, the plan document, it's because --

JUNE 26, 2002

Katz: It's in a separate document, and if you haven't read it please do so, but I want to discuss it --

Hartnett: Just so the public knows, there are copies of Gil's transmittal letter with the list of ideas on these two corners.

Katz: All right. Let's get to Matt then I'm going to turn it over very briefly to the other two, my council --

Francesconi: Since these other folks may not be here tomorrow, if Gil could briefly explain maybe you did, a little more why and -- an mou, because that's not normally done. Why did you think it would be important in this circumstance?

Katz: Briefly.

Kelley: I think the premise is twofold. One is we have a major institution in the city who really need to view this as a partnership, and that is a little different than the typical kind of permitting process or the typical area plan where you have multiple parties. Here you really have one major party. So you have an opportunity with publicly minded institutions to create a partnership to effectuate some actions. And have you some resources to do that with when you look at the city and the institutions. And the ability to leverage other resources. The second component is that I think there ought to be a recognition, and there is within the community, and a growing one in the part of the institution and the city, that the neighborhood has suffered long-term damages, not so much from the university, though that's part of it, but really from transportation -- regional transportation infrastructure that's been placed through it and over it and in the middle of it, and there's some need to historically redress those issues. And you can't do that through regulation that looks prospectively at new buildings. You need to take stock of what the circumstances are there and try to do something more proactive. So not every action and not every responsible party is contained within that contract, but it's a starting place to say the two major players are committing themselves to certain action that's will engender actions on the part of others.

Saltzman: What force and effect does an mou have?

Kelley: It's essentially a contract between the two institutions. And we will be detailing out some of those provisions both tomorrow and when we return with a negotiated mou for your consideration.

Saltzman: Tomorrow maybe you can elaborate. If it's a contract, what are -- how do you compel performance? I think those are issues that matter to a lot of people. And I just -- this concept of an mou, I think I need to understand fully what it is we should expect or -- in terms of performance.

Kelley: Okay.

Saltzman: On both sides.

Kelley: Okay.

Katz: I'll wait until tomorrow. Go ahead.

Matt Brown, Project Manager, Portland Office of Transportation: Matt Brown, project manager of the Portland office of transportation. I know there's a lot of people here to share some ideas and thoughts. I'll keep my comments brief. Just to backtrack one step, back in the spring when planning commission was going through the Marquam Hill plan hearings and deliberations, there was a real struggle on their part to understand how these transportation system policies fit in. They didn't have a lot of information at their hands about specific information about what the impacts were, what the benefits were of some various alternatives and in response, we basically crafted a process, presented it to them for advice, during that hearing, and deliberation process. And on May 23rd presented that process here at city council for your direction to proceed. At that point you directed us to come back with a report by June 26th, although I heard June 19th at the

JUNE 26, 2002

hearing. And we did get the report to you as well as messengered to some of the neighborhood groups, including no-tram homestead and cth on June 20th. The report looked at six different alternatives including a shuttle bus alternative for connecting the Marquam Hill campus to North Macadam. And these alternatives were basically stacked up against the set of evaluation factors that we had presented as part of our process, and out of that we came up with our recommendation for this, which was essentially to construct the Begin Street tram, linking Marquam Hill to North Macadam, and then also to look at a second tram linking Marquam Hill to Barbur Boulevard and to the regional transit. And our recommendation was based on a number of factors, including things like travel time between the two areas, transit access, both today and in the future how well does the system integrate with the regional transit system. Neighborhood livability and the relative impacts of these different alternatives on the neighborhood. Maintenance considerations of the various alternatives, a long-term cost analysis, what will it take to cost -- to build and operate the system over time, as well as the development impacts of the various alternatives and what could you expect to see happen or not happen as a result of choosing one direction or another. We're not saying that the recommendation that we propose is without impact. But we are saying that that recommendation that we made provides the best balance that benefits against the impacts that the system has. The information in that report then is going to be presented on July 10th at a 2:30 time certain. There will be a public hearing and we'll be presenting a resolution at that time asking council to accept the report and recommendation to direct us on to the next steps of the process. So again, at that point I think we'll expect to hear public testimony on the specifics of the report and our recommendations as well as the alternatives and the analysis that we undertook. One last thing.

I would say again at your direction we return with a report last week to better inform the discussions that you're about to undertake here on the Marquam Hill plan, including any policy decisions or findings that you may need to make that would support the implementation of an sct between Marquam Hill and North Macadam. I'll be available for questions throughout the process.

Katz: We'll leave you alone until July 10th. Commissioner Saltzman, did you have just a brief comment?

Saltzman: I made a few comments, not to delay the hearing, but to sort of set out the lenses I'll be taking to consider the comments made on the Marquam Hill plan. Obviously one of those will not be that I have read this -- these plans from cover to cover and understand every detail, because until I figure out a way we can put our hand on it and absorb it, I'm never going to be in that category. What I'm looking at is recognition of the need that we have a great institution here in OHSU, and we want to keep them here in Portland. But we also need to look at -- I'll be looking at a couple other lenses as well, the commission overseeing environmental services, water bureau, sustainable development, I'm going to be concerned about making sure the sustainable building practices, storm water and erosion control issues are dealt with, and I invite testimony on these aspects as well. Clearly because I think a public institution like OHSU, which aspires excellence, needs to aspire in these areas as well. I look at it as a father and resident of Portland. We need to look at what is the importance of a diversified economy and jobs in the future that will keep smart people like my daughter seems to be, here in Portland. And finally, simply as somebody who used to oversee the office of neighborhood involvement, understanding the legitimate concerns neighbors have about impacts of institutional growth on the quality of life and their areas. And these are legitimate issues. But I guess it would be one thing to not totally neglect what this is all about. What is OHSU about, what is all this about. It's about patients, people who need medical care and health care. And that's -- people that are spending the worse days of their life, the last days of their life, or too many days of their life in medical facilities. They need the best care and the best

JUNE 26, 2002

educated people around. And that's what this is really all about, is how do we strike that balance that will achieve that for those that this is really all about.

Katz: Thanks. Let me also ask you, this is awkward. We've got a planning staff who makes recommendations to the planning commission, and we have a planning commission who makes recommendations to us. And question tend to ignore the planning staff. But there is a whole document here of the staff's original proposals. So i'm going to ask you at some point, i'm asking you, you did not offer voluntarily at some point, be it the end of all of this, to identify where the differences are, and then we'll be able to give you some feedback as, yes, we're interested, i'll tell you right now one of them is I think you need to put the economic development goals back in. I don't understand why the planning commission took it out. That's just one. There are others. Okay. Ohsu. Homestead, and corbett-terwilliger lair hill. And that's the order of presentations. We're missing a body.

Dr. Peter Koller, OHSU: Let me thank you for the opportunity to testify here today on the marquam hill plan. I think this is particularly important to continue to bring to a conclusion that everybody agrees with. I guess I am growing a little bit concerned that we keep hearing about what we can't do here in Portland or in Oregon, and particularly in the area of biotechnology and i'd like to comment a bit on that later on. Wayne to commend you, mayor Katz, for your leadership in bringing this forward. I think it is a time that leadership needs to be demonstrated, and I think trying to find out how to get to a positive conclusion to this is going to be very important. So thank you, mayor Katz, and thank you members of the council. I don't want to take up a great deal of time today, but I do want to make three quick points. The first is, why does ohsu need to expand and why does it need to expand now? We have talked extensively about our commitment to excellence, which we sincerely believe we have. We think it's very important to have the highest quality health care, education for the health care providers, and research. Along with the community service that we provide extensively. We also want to make sure we're not leaving any opportunities on the table. Somebody described our approach recently as sort of in baseball terms, looking to let the fence and trying to do whatever it takes to hit the ball out of the park. I think there's some truth to that. Despite our steadily decreasing rope rations from -- appropriations in the state, which are now in the form of a grant since 1985, and our turning into a public corporation, we have add 4500 employees at ohsu. I think that's a number to remember when there's a question about employment. Nearly doubling our annual operating budget from some 50040 million dollars to over a billion dollars per year. The most important thing perhaps in terms of the prospects for the future are awards -- are grant awards, which are merit based, and we have increased from 85 million in 1996 to 220 million today. We have been climbing steadily upward through the ranks of research institutions in the country. There are a lot of polls, but the one that we look at most carefully we are number 29 out of like institutions, and our goal is to get to the top 20, which we will be able to measure. Our scientists are making new discoveries all the time, and I think the one that's received the most publicity lately is clearly the brian drucker breakthrough in leukemia treatment. That is a phenomenal new approach to cancer and I think it's one that we hope shows the way for things we can accomplish in the future. As we look at the economy of Oregon as a whole, we now bring in from out of state over 250 million dollars a year. Much of that is for research, some of it is for clinical care. Our effect on the budget is more than \$2 billion by conservative estimates annually. So we have been for the last seven years creating jobs trying to find cures and educating tomorrow's health care providers and I think at the same time importantly contributing to the economic health and well being of the state. But we believe there is still a great deal more that we can do. The human genome project has recently come to a conclusion, and it is

JUNE 26, 2002

in fact the way to find out the future for a number of cures that can occur. I just heard brian drucker speak at lunch today, he was talking about this as a blueprint as -- for new approaches to cancers and other diseases. We have merged with ogi. But our real problem right now that we have been wrestling with for about a year is that we're out of space. We really don't have places to put people who could come to Oregon and bring their money with them, which is the way we try to recruit faculty members. So we need to find a way to expand our capacity, both in terms of research capacity as well as clinical capacity. Question of who benefits from this? Many people benefit. A huge number of Oregonians come to us from all around the state for care. At last council approximately 150,000. We had many health care professionals that you know about who received their training. And work on our hill. We believe that in the very near future we can take the Oregon opportunity money and bring construction, jobs into the economy and -- in very large numbers. And finally, as a result of our expansion in terms of the job market, we will have more and more office workers, technicians, research assistants and scientist who's will be aiding our endeavors to create a biotechnology business. So many people I think have a stake in where we end up going with this particular project, and most everybody in this room knows somebody or whose somebody in the family who has received care at ohsu. So these are the people who will benefit. Many people will benefit as a result of this. I want to close just by saying that the brookings report has recently gotten some notoriety, and has raised a question about whether Portland can in fact be successful in biotechnology. I think it is true that we are not on the map right now in terms of the biotechnology industry. But what's neglected in these reports is the great strides that are being made in our research programs. We are in fact I was talking today to one of our scientist who's was about to launch a brand-new company which will be announced in about a week, but our growing research strength is our real credibility here. The ability to create new knowledge that can be turned into biotechnology companies and advances. In making my rounds around the state, I thought there was a very good analogy made in one of the logging communities who said that in a way what we're doing with our intellectual property is very analogous to exporting raw logs. What we do when we do that, and we have frequently sent off our invention and patent to pharmaceutical companies in europe or out of state, we're not allowing us to capture the value of the translational research that can convert the most basic discovery into something that will be useful in human treatment. That's what dr. Drucker did. The market for his drug is probably ultimately going to be in the range of \$500 million a year. Wouldn't it be nice if we had kept all of that here in Oregon. So in the future, when we believe that dr. Drucker and his companions have many more discoveries to come, I think that we are -- our goal is to capture that here. There are many things I think that Oregon has done that have been innovative. The light rail, people said folks wouldn't ride that. The bottle bill, there are many things I think that have been innovative in Oregon, and frankly our history is one of doing a great deal with relatively little in the way of resources. Again, I point out to you that the discovery of glavic was made right here. Last week I was in san francisco at a large scientific meeting with about 3,000 people in attendance. Dr. Francis collins, who will probably receive the nobel prize within the next three years for his work on the genome project, singled out dr. Drucker as creating a new approach to cancer. One that ought to be able to utilized by many others in the future. So in contrast to the brookings study, we also have specialists such as mark rogers, who has said ohsu and Portland can in fact be ready to take part in the biotechnology development. And I want to remind you that even before biotechnology companies get launched in larger numbers, the grant revenue that can come here will be relatively immediate, and that will be many millions of dollars. We believe that we can grow our grant revenue between 10 to \$30 million a year if we have the space in which to put

JUNE 26, 2002

people. I want to close by saying ohsu and Portland have been partners for many years. We began as a tiny converted grocery store in 1887. More than 100 years later we are trying to reenergize the partnership and I think due something that will bring untold benefits to our citizens and region for decades to come. I urge to you support the marquam hill plan and help us move forward into the future. Thank you.

Francesconi: Two questions. The other problem with the brookings report is it underestimates the link between high-tech and bioscience that you're pursuing with ogi. I think some of the concern is can we really get a pharmaceutical question. But that's into the -- can you talk more about the link between high-tech and bioscience and where you're going in that regard? In terms of equipment so -- and that whole arena any don't think that's story has gotten out.

Koller: Absolutely. Let me use an example of this, what I was just talking about. They're going to take amniotic fluid and turn it into a chip which will be able to do diagnostics. The chip technology is somewhat but not drastically different from the silicon chips used in high-tech. The diagnosis of the future will be much more dependent on chip technology. Frankly the treatments of the future will be more dependent on chip technology. And the other huge advantage that something like ogi brings to us is the capacity to handle prodigious amounts of data. If you think of the human genome, it's got literally an alphabet of 3 billion letters. You've got to go in there and fish out the comparable part of the gene to somebody who has a disease so you can know what's wrong. Handling that amount of data is a huge chore, and the ability of computer scientists to help us devise ways to approach that would be a great benefit in terms of this combination and again, the overused word, convergence between high-tech and biotech, which is taking place.

Francesconi: And my last question, I liked how you started on a positive instead of us always dwelling on the negative. So in that spirit, look forward five years and tell us a little bit about what you expect at macadam and how that would benefit you and benefit the city.

Koller: Well, I have great plans for macadam. I don't know whether it's appropriate to go into them in detail yet. We are going to be looking for ways to expand our research programs, but beyond that --

Francesconi: I'm sorry, let's include marquam hill as well.

Koller: Marquam hill, first of all, the most important thing we're talking about today is being able to get start order a research building. We need laboratories, and we need it rapidly and we believe we have sign 'tises from around the country waiting for a place to put their laboratories before they sign up with us. We would like to break ground on that late this summer if at all possible. That will provide us with a number of very important ingredients to move our research programs forward. We also need clinical expansion. We are partly because of the clientele we serve, chock full. We're on divert 40% of the time in our institutions. So we need an ability to expand our clinical facilities as well. Those two projects we anticipate being done on marquam hill. Now, as we look farther into the future, there are both academic and research and incubator activities I would envision as part of the -- north macadam area, what I would envision being in north macadam, including things we've been talking about how can we use the most modern technology for education and put that in fact down on the river in such a way that our various schools can link together more effectively. Research programs, incubator space that is managed better than we have done in the past I think will become increasingly important. These are other things that would be I think very compatible down there. I see, for example, an opportunity to have housing on the river in which our students and employees live and can move rapidly back and forth to ohsu while part of their education and part of their work will actually be done on the river and part of it will be done on the hill. We do need to be able to get back and forth.

JUNE 26, 2002

Francesconi: This is just a follow-up. You're on divert 40% of the time. I'm not sure we know what that means.

Koller: It's a little misleading in that there are all sorts of categories. It might be that we're on divert for children --

Francesconi: What's divert?

Koller: The ambulance can't come and leave anybody off at our place because we have no place to put them. Basically there is a fairly good ambulance system in town where they call ahead, they find out what's full and what's not full, our hospitals tend to run very, very high occupancy, so frequently we have to send them to another hospital. Fortunately the system is relatively good, but there are certain things that are unique at our institution people need to be seen there and we need to find a way to get them in.

Francesconi: Thank you.

Katz: We did stop the clock. We were at six minutes left.

Christie White, OHSU: I'll talk fast. Good afternoon. I'm christie white, land use council for ohsu. I think it's fair to say this afternoon represents the culmination of probably about three years of long, hard work that progressed with continued diligence and collaboration of many voices. Ohsu began this process with a bunch of long-range planning principles and a thoughtful evaluation of what is it they would need. The result of that analysis told us that we need about \$2 - - 2.5 million square feet to accommodate the needs you have just heard about. We recognize that process that the benefit of ohsu's growth on the hill will accrue to the city in a region and a -- as a whole and make the -- that the perceived costs can be felt by the local community that directly surrounds the campus. Through the establishment of the marquam hill community and technical advisory group, and the monthly meetings with homestead, planning, the planning commission and ohsu, identified those local impacts and we believe they're successfully addressed in the plan. Some of the neighborhood mitigation measures include placing trip caps on local streets to reduce ohsu traffic. And maintain levels of service. The designation of ohsu's land as open space for passive and active recreational uses, subjecting all development on the hill or almost all development to design review, and requiring an additional 2.5 city blocks of formal open area in the dense core area. Of course there are other provisions in the code in the action charts that further these mitigation measures. But to be certain, this proposal doesn't do all things for all people. Some are going to agree with the marquam hill plan, some are going to disagree. As we developed the 30-year plan, we looked at your comprehensive plan to guide our efforts and provide benchmarks for growth on the hill. As a council, you're under the similar charge. The plan, the comprehensive plan by its own terms, is intended to be dynamic, able to inspire us, to guide us and direct growth in the city. While responding to change through amendment and refinement. No goal of the plan is intended to be predominant over the other rather all are viewed in balance to achieve our vision. The marquam hill plan then amends this comprehensive plan within a tensional balance between what are sometimes competing objectives. While some policies and goals will be at the focus of the testimony, we urge you to continue to balance that testimony with other equally important goals of the plan like economic development, energy, environment, citizen involvement, urban design. Let me cite one example of the balancing act in the plan. There was a request made very early in the planning process from some neighbors and the city that ohsu protect and designate a large part of the campus as open space in order to pursue the policy objectives under goal 8 environment. The area would be protected and not be developed. In response, ohsu agreed to the designation. The plan codifies this agreement by designating the 45 acres as open space. That's nearly 45% of ohsu -- 40% of ohsu's ownership. That land also has roughly the same

JUNE 26, 2002

topography as the existing built environment and was anticipated for growth over the long term by ohsu. In exchange for that designation, we needed to be able to accommodate enough density in the core to accomplish our objectives. Plan did that by setting appropriate building massing limitations in the core. It is in that context that we offer to you our amendments to the planning commission's recommended plan. In some areas we concur with the planning commission and other significant areas, we disagree. We believe that some of the planning commission amendments were made without reference to the downstream impact of those amendments on other components of the plan. In these latter instances we seek to restore the balance. We have provided with you a summary of our request and a detailed narrative and that should be distributed to you today. There are a few general comments I would make, but a number of ohsu representatives will speak specifically to you about those amendments. As dr. Koehler just stated, this plan is a vision for ohsu and the city as a whole. People may question whether we can achieve the vision or whether we should even try. Of course we can. And of course we should. It is vital to recognize in this plan that it is not just about ohsu. The city and economic advantage. It is about the needs of the many that are served by ohsu's mission. Of the 150,000 patients who come to ohsu from all corners of the state, 39,000 or about 25% of these patients are children. And a full 43% of these patients can't afford their care. That is ohsu's indigent care rate is twice the state's average. These patients, it's these people as well as the future patients, who will directly benefit from the additional facilities that we are here to permit under this plan. The city of Portland's work with ohsu can be a success and we believe it is one. In good planning and public collaboration. There is no conclusion or aspect of this plan that has not been confirmed through either an independent expert analysis or significant evaluation. The importance of this plan and the process shouldn't be understated. It is a plan that gets to a yes. It is a plan that is driven by the balancing act. That is the hallmark of the city of Portland's comprehensive plan. I urge you to adopt the plan district and the proposed amendments and send a strong signal that the city of Portland and ohsu are prepared to proceed with what is a historical partnership.

Katz: Thank you. Let's talk about the amendments. We will acknowledge all the amendment that's are going to be proposed and there -- they will be noted by susan. Tomorrow -- leers the problem we have. There's only three of us. For anything to pass, you have to have three votes. Commissioner Sten will be back by the time that we finally volt on it, so I -- vote on it. So I would like to deal with the amendments tomorrow and have at least a concurrence on the part of two of us on whether those amendments should go or no go. And then we'll see what happens when commissioner Sten comes back. At least that will give the amendments a chance to be heard. And then we'll set aside those amendments that don't have two votes. If you think of anything better after we hear the testimony, let me know. Okay.

Francesconi: If I could ask two questions, later i'm going to want to ask some question about the amendments I guess. But --

Katz: That's tomorrow.

Francesconi: But of ohsu and christine in particular. So the periodic assessments, what's ohsu's position on them? Both the need for them as well as the frequency as well as what would be covered?

White: I appreciate the question. One of the reasons we entered into the plan district process was to provide long-range certainty for ohsu given that it was contemplating \$1 billion in investment over a 30-year term. So we were trying to do a lot of upfront study, expert study and independent evaluation of the facts to avoid a lot of those interim discretionary reviews. We believe that p dot has set the appropriate time frame on the parking reviews at ten years. In other words, under 900

JUNE 26, 2002

spaces the reviews should be minimal and we support bops proposal that that type a review just have one criteria. A check on the decrease in the sov rate. After ten years, after 900 spaces we concur with what pdot has been asked to include in the plan and what opdr has asked with regards to amendments. Design review is also something that to be honest, we swallowed hard on. We have now subjected every building on this campus to design review. That was not the case before. Only certain buildings were subject to design review, those located in the terwilliger design zone and visible from terwilliger. So the trade-off was, okay, we agree, that breed as good neighborhood benefit that there will be a certainty about a high level of urban design but we need a reasonable exemption so you'll see that one of our amendments asks for a reasonable exception and to raise the threshold for that exemption in the inner core of the campus. Otherwise, I think the plan has done a good job of balancing long-range certainty over impacts to neighborhood issues and other livability issues with the one exception which is site plan review and we concur in opdr's amendment to remove site plan review and merge it into design review.

Katz: You'll be here tomorrow?

White: I will.

Francesconi: My last question, on the mou, what's ohsu's position on the need for an mo you and the things that should be covered?

White: That's a difficult question at this stage, but i'll answer it this way. We agree that this has been a pioneering process for creating a good and strong and long-term partnership between the city and ohsu. And to the extent the mou can speak to that partnership, yes are very supportive of it. We also believe that there's a lot of things that should not be in code language. That could be addressed in an mou and create common goals between the city and ohsu. Some of commissioner Saltzman's mention here of storm water and trying to achieve better reduction strategies is an example of that. So we think the mou is a good area where we can have those discussions. I don't think we've had enough discussions and we haven't negotiated that obviously and that will happen over the rest of the summer.

Francesconi: Thank you.

Saltzman: What do you view as the force and effect of an mou?

White: I think it's a contract. And I think it has a lot of trust inherent in it. If we're performing a partnership and we agree to an mou, both know where we sit at the table.

Katz: Okay. I want to thank you both. You'll be here, peter I don't think you'll be here tomorrow.

White: That would be fine with me.

Katz: You'll have to make that decision. But we'll be dealing with the amendments and we'll be getting recommendations from our own staff on the amendments as well, and some rationale as to why you would recommend one way or the other. I want to thank the neighborhood associations. They have agreed to allow the two mayor that's are here, mayor hammerstad and mayor hughes to come up and testify.

Judie Hammerstad, Mayor, Lake Oswego: Thank you very much. I'm mayor of lake oswego, and we have written testimony for you. I -- we as a city and a city counsel certainly value the contribution that ohsu makes to our community and the future contribution that it can make. The goal to become one of the 20 top medical research institutions in the country is visionary, is achievable and it's critical to the development of the biotechnological and medical industry in our region. We know that ohsu can be very successful in being able to attract world class medical and biotechnological dollars and personnel, but they do need more space and this is to us a viable proposal. What's our interest in lake oswego? Why do we even care? First of all, we care because

JUNE 26, 2002

of the economic benefit. We also care, because having served with three of you, jobs housing balance comes up a lot. Where do people work and where do they live? I think one of the most important things we can talk about is jobs transportation and housing. When you can't live next to where you work you need a good way to get there. What is the residential possibility for the north macadam area with ohsu? Housing there certainly. But also in those southern suburbs. Dunthorpe, lake oswego, west linn. But not under current conditions. Not under the conditions of highway 43. It's now nearly at failure. But we have with the participation of Portland, trolley tracks that we have kept the right of way, and we envision this as being a viable link into the streetcar system. We can actually make this a transportation corridor off of the roads that can link into the ohsu and the north macadam site. From there, it could be the tram, it could be the streetcar on into Portland and linking up with other light rail and other transportation veil bills. We feel tying this transportation and land use together makes the most out of the goal that you saw earlier creating links to transit. It contributes to a compact urban form and maximizes what we have already invested in. Sometimes we as elected decision makers have to make very difficult and controversial decisions and you're spending a lot of time too this one. And I congratulate you for it. Sometimes we have to choose to do things that are unpopular with some groups of people, but our job is to make the best decision we can for the most number of people in the long run. And I urge you on behalf of lake oswego, and on behalf of the people in the region, the state and in fact the nation, do a forward with this extremely bold visionary and important project.

Katz: Thank you, judy.

Tom Hughes, Mayor, Hillsboro: Mayor Katz and commissioners, my name is tom hughes, the mayor of hillsboro. I thank you for the opportunity to come this afternoon and talk to you about this. I hesitated coming down and -- it seems presumptuous for one elected official to be telling other elected officials what to do, but we do it to each other all the time. Particularly when you have to take the heat for it. But I come for two reasons. First of all, this decision is really very, very important as it turns out to my community, hillsboro, and I think beyond hillsboro and beyond Portland to the region as a whole. And second of all, there has been mention occasionally of hillsboro as a possible alternative to what ohsu plans to do at the macadam site. And I wanted to talk about that a little bit to sort of put that to rest. I think that from our standpoint, that's not a viable alternative and i'd like to talk a little bit about why. First of all, in terms of the regional, hillsboro and Portland have been linked economically since the 1840s. We actually at one point in time held the charter to your community out in our city, so we feel like we have that -- had a little help in giving you birth. The building of the plank road over canyon road linked our fertile farms in the tualatin valley with the port facilities in Portland, made Portland a major port facility and made our farmers extremely wealthy. That was good for both of us. In recent years, the growth of high-tech, the silicon forest in hillsboro, has taken place really as a result of a regional effort to build that cluster. We have no doubt at all, we understand fully that if hillsboro was a range of hills away from detroit, we wouldn't have the kind of development that we have in hillsboro in terms of a high-tech community. It is the proximity to Portland that makes our high-tech community successful. And it is obviously very successful for the region as a whole. 40,000 jobs, about 8 billion dollars worth of investment in our high-tech communities, including perhaps as much as \$2 billion that will be made during this year which is a notoriously bad year for high-tech. That has taken place because we're partners. And I think that it's important to understand -- underscore that and to really make that point. The move into biotech is a risky move. Everybody recognizes that. And I think dr. Koehler's point is important. Where we feel we play a role in that is the marriage of biotech to high-tech. And the merger of ogi, which has its major facilities in hillsboro, and ohsu,

JUNE 26, 2002

has really been an important event for the future I think of this region. Because it does marry that high-tech with the biotech. We anticipate that the so-called west campus in hillsboro will eventually develop as part of an ohsu master plan and will develop with major jobs for the region and will continue our successful economic development out there. In order for that to happen, ohsu has to be successful at the center city. They have to be successful at the marquam hill-north macadam site. They have to make that move into the next tier of research facilities in order to really make biotech a viable alternative for any of us. The thought that they would move some of that out to hillsboro really reduces the likelihood that they're going to be successful at moving into that next -- into that next tier and really jeopardizes the future of biotech and the region, so even though it looks like in the short run that would be a benefit to us, we recognize that in the long run, that would not be in our best interests and we would really have some difficulty in trying to work that out. I think we'll get our development further downstream, and I think it will be compatible with what you guys do and continuing to work in a partnership with you and with the other partners in the region. We think we will continue the vitality of the hillsboro -- the Portland-hillsboro metropolitan region for the foreseeable future. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you. Both of you.

Francesconi: Let me -- I want to say something. Mayor Hammerstad, first of all, I appreciate your testimony on the importance of the streetcar link to lake oswego. And it being part after regional transportation structure. As the new transportation kid on the block, I just wanted to tell you that it is an important priority for pdot and for me as we proceed. So i'm going to look forward to further conversations about how we finance that.

Hammerstad: We will look forward to that to, thank you.

Francesconi: Mayor hughes, you have a very good reputation as -- i'm aware of it on economic development types of issues. You've just demonstrated why through your testimony. The fact -- this -- since i've been on the council this, is the most regional expression of joint cooperation since i've been here. We also have to have some further conversations about how we finance that since we -- this is a little risky, but important, so we have to talk about how we can cooperate in a regional economic strategy. But I really appreciate you coming here.

Hughes: Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity.

Katz: Thank you.

*******:** We'll miss you guys at impact.

Katz: Yeah.

Saltzman: Say hi.

Katz: Homestead and corbett-terwilliger.

David Rutledge, President, Homestead Neighborhood Association: I'm president of homestead association and for logistical reasons the ctlh neighborhood and our neighborhood have agreed to exchange our time slots.

Katz: Okay. You each have 15 minutes. You can do it however you want to do it.

Janet Kelly, President Corbett Terwilliger Lair Hill Neighborhood Association (CTLH NA): I'm janet kelly, president of ctlh neighborhood association.

Katz: Just watch your time so you don't take each others or step on each others' toes.

Kelly: Two representatives of this neighborhood, jim davis, who was our land use committee chair, and larry beck, who represents the many residents in our neighborhood, who will be truly injured in some manner if an aerial rope way is forced upon them, wish to address concerns regarding the north macadam -- marquam hill plan. The remainder of our allotted time which I understood to be 15 minutes, is donated to representatives from the homestead neighborhood.

JUNE 26, 2002

They live within the plan area and are deeply impacted by the decisions that will be made regarding it. We absolutely concur with and support the points that will be made by the homestead representatives. The problems they will address including institutional traffic, respect for parks, building height limits, and easy sacrifice of existing neighborhoods for the tantalizing dream of financial gain, are problems that transcend neighborhood boundaries and impact our entire city. Jim?

Jim Davis, Land Use Chair, CTLH NA: My name is Jim Davis. I'm land use chair of CTLH neighborhood association. I would mention to you that land use chair now is looking at about \$6 billion worth of development and we're doing it for free. In terms of neighborhood involvement, OHSU's Marquam Hill plan has been a travesty in its planning process. Rather than striving for openness and transparency, it is hidden, concealed, camouflaged, distorted, and suppressed information that neighbors and neighborhood associations have needed to make an informed judgment of the plans impacted upon themselves and their communities. Only by rushed but still concentrated deep research has it been possible to tear away the secrecy in which this plan has been wrapped. The Portland office of planning and development review has aided and abetted OHSU in their outrageous activities. Planning accomplished its part by misinformation, delayed response to inquiries, by releasing thick documents only days before the hearings, and in one case, only minutes before a hearing, and even today we are still getting information that was released on the 21st and we have not seen until we showed up here today. All of this was done with such contempt and condensation, that only the most determined citizens continue to search for the truth. Quite frankly, OHSU's Marquam Hill plan is not so much a plan as a half-use nation resulting from an overdose of hubris and greed on the part of its authors. There is no basis in fact to result -- by simply rebuilding their physical plant they'll become the 20th, the 20th best research hospital in the nation. Not the third, not the seventh, not even the 12th, but the 20th. Best hospital in the nation. We do know that the \$400 million that OHSU has for this project is not even 20% of the funds needed to buy into the high stakes biotech crap shoot. And quite frankly, we don't know where they'll be getting the rest of their money. The economic definition of fascism is government forces its citizens to ensure the profits of industry. The question before you now is not the Marquam Hill plan, but if you're willing to allow the degradation of the homestead neighborhood and the destruction of Lair Hill so as to improve the financial well being of one of Portland's largest employers which provides an average wage of \$11.23 to its nonprofessional, nonadministrative employees. Up on public buildings throughout this nation is the motto -- the voice of God is the voice of the people. In my religion, we are taught that to have faith we must act as if we do have faith, and then faith will be given to us. The people have spoken on this matter. Their response has been an overwhelming no to the Marquam Hill plan. All I ask of you, you, Commissioner Francesconi, Mayor Katz, Commissioner Saltzman, is that you have faith in the voice of the people and vote your conscience. Thank you.

Larry Beck: Larry Beck. My comments are probably going to be different than what Jan had said and what Jim had said. So I want to say that from the outset. I have submitted some written testimony that I submitted to the planning commission that go into a little more detail about the process problems with the Marquam Hill plan. But again, my focus will be different today. I think I would agree with Jim and this was a flawed process from the outset. The trail that you sent us on July 11th last year and Bureau of Planning and OHSU were only too happy to pick up on that and run with it. Here's what I would have to say. Planning commission did a lot of work and they did a pretty good job on this plan, at least as far as the tram elements of the plan. So there's something positive that I'm going to say. I hope you will remember that. They heard hours of public

JUNE 26, 2002

testimony, read over hundreds of pages of written testimony, they worked hard, reviewed it, they made very positive amendments. And I would say having attended all those sessions that 80% of the testimony dealt with the tram, and 90% of it was negative. So keep that in mind, as jim mentioned, the will of the people was expressed and it was very clear. I think from my perspective as somebody on the ctag committee, and concerned about the tram, certainly the majority sentiment is that we oppose the tram but I would say the version of the plan now is a much better version than what we saw in march. And I would say it's a much better version because the planning commission recognized we need to take out the tram component in the marquam hill plan. Ohsu if it goes down to north macadam, needs a connection but they said it doesn't have to be a tram, it doesn't have to be a bus. That would travel outside the area plan, so it doesn't need to be there. Take it out. And so that's a positive thing. Many of those objectionable parts were taken out. If you do document a plan, I hope you do support what planning commission had to say through all of its work. Your planning commission did a lot of work for you. Some of the positive aspect which may seem minor but are important, keep the reference to the trams out of the plan. It doesn't need to be in there. The plan now says there needs to be a convenient connection and that could be accomplished in many ways. We have this separate tram process. The planning commission was unanimous in saying that trams are not basic utilities. Unanimous in that. They all believe that. They don't share the characteristics of sewers and power lines that benefit people along the route. They're just not the same. So support that. In the plan as well, bureau of planning and ohsu had proposed that basic utilities could be built as an allowed use, not as a conditional use and the planning commission says no. They're going to be a conditional use there just like three where else. There shouldn't be special rules for basic utilities. There's also talk about ohsu -- os, open space zone land owned by parks to the east of campus drive and terwilliger, and that was taken out of the plan and the main reason it was included was to make it easier for ohsu to build a tram over parkland. So that's now out. It should be remain out. Rick michaelson and planning commission had sent a letter to you may 23rd when we were here about the tram process saying there needs to be full alternatives analysis done for transportation links, and you gave matt brown 3 1/2 weeks to do it. It's just not enough time. He salt here and said it would take -- could take up to a year and you said, no, it's not. But it does take that long to do a full analysis. We'll be back july 10th. There are other things we need to look at. There's this -- some of you will remember the underground elevator that goes down below ohsu and the underground people mover system that seemed to be rearing its head. It wasn't study and I they with some of the cost that's matt was looking at in his report, it's within the range of what it would cost to put a tram in, and it would not take away the sky, would it note take away neighbors' privacy, it would give ohsu everything it wanted. We need to think outside the box. So that's important but we'll be back on july 10th. Some areas where the plan did fail and I will concur with what has been said before, the needs and desires of homestead have not been dealt with. They'll speak to that. They need help with transportation, with parking, with views, with protections of terwilliger. And they did not get very much help from planning commission on that. And they need more help from you. I guess i've mentioned terwilliger, but it's a great treasure for all of us. It needs to be protect ed. I'm glad you will reaffirm the plan, but when you do, let's make sure we don't gutted it by building or proposing to build trams in it which defeat the entire purpose of the plans. So let's be careful about that if you're going to readopt that resolution. Other neighborhoods, hillsdale and that area need help as well to keep regional traffic off their residential streets and avoid institutional park and reads out of their neighborhoods. That was very important and I don't think they got help with that. I guess what I would say in conclusion is, let's keep the good parts of the plan that planning

JUNE 26, 2002

commission has sent on to you, let's not put back in all the things that they determined were a problem and should be out. Let's recognize the importance of their work. Protect our neighborhoods. We recognize as residential neighborhoods that we have to compromise with ohsu in our area and ohsu needs to realize it's got to compromise too. They don't get everything they want. It was interesting to hear the mayor of hillsboro to say hillsboro wasn't a good option, so maybe that calls their bluff about where they're going. If they're going to succeed they can do it in the inner city. I would say as well, respect the will of the people. We need you to lead and we need you to lead in a way that respects our historic neighborhoods. Dr. Koehler mentioned ohsu has been here since 1987. We've been here before that, we deserve to be respected. We're your oldest neighborhood. Keep that in mind. I think we've got other time left, ten minutes left or four minutes left? Thank you very much.

Francesconi: Larry, you're -- have you ever done this -- you're a terrific advocate for the neighborhood.

Katz: He's a lawyer.

Beck: I've been spending way too much time in front of this commission.

Francesconi: You're a terrific advocate.

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

Katz: Let's start the clock. 15 minutes.

Rutledge: Good afternoon. My name is david, i'm president of the homestead neighborhood association. I have to admit that my comments here are going to be a little off the cuff as my computer chose this morning to crash in a very big way. So there are some down sides to high-tech as well as up sides. Basically what we're going to speak to today is the incompatibility of ohsu's expansion in the format that it is reflected in the marquam hill plan before you with both the terwilliger park way and the surrounding residential neighborhoods. I think it's appropriate to remind you that the hippocratic oath first instruction is to do no harm. I think it's appropriate that you have a similar responsibility to first do know harm. Previous councils have demonstrate add lack of vision when they located the i-5 freeway on the east bank of the willamette river, when they decided to carve up a goodly portion of the west side of downtown Portland with the i-405, decisions now that we've lived to regret. We did have one minor victory, we managed to kill the mt. Hood freeway, but one out of three is not very good odds. There are some real ironies involved with this plan. We're talking about in north macadam creating new neighborhoods. But at the expense of existing neighborhoods where citizens is and voters live today. We're talking about the same thing with parks. It's also ironic that the city of Portland heavily promoted a parks bond measure to get new parks funding, at the same time if allowed -- if this plan is allowed to go through, it will in effect destroy one of Portland's crown jewel parks. There is no park in the city of Portland as unique as terwilliger. It is a regional resource. Is it a legacy that has been handed down to us by a previous generation's intact and we have an obligation to future generations to do exactly the same thing. The 100-year anniversary of the park, centennial, is going to be conforming up. It would be a shame to hand it on to future generations degrade it to such an extent that its functionality of a park disappears. When this process began, the homestead neighborhood association went to ohsu and said, look. Within the existing campus footprint, we will give you virtually a freehand as long as certain height limitations and design considerations consistent with city policy are recognized. All we asked of ohsu was that they be a good neighbor and that they don't transfer on to us their neighborhoods, burdens generated by their pursuit of their goals. Unfortunately, particularly in the transportation element of this plan, that's all we're getting, is burdens. No benefits, just burdens. The homestead neighborhood has proposed, many practical

JUNE 26, 2002

cost effective solutions to allow ohsu to pursue its goals. Unfortunately, ohsu's attitude has been an essentially it's either our way or the highway. In this process, the bureau of planning has been acting as a facilitator for ohsu. Specifically, while there are many elements in this plan that the homestead neighborhood can support on the whole, we will have to reject it. We offer these specific amendments. Number 1, instead of increasing the parking capacity on the hill, we should reduce the parking capacity. The ultimate controlling factor of traffic through our neighborhood is whether or not there is a place to park on the top of the hill. And it's incontrovertible that the primary generator of traffic in our neighborhood is in fact ohsu. To allow ohsu to get on and off the hill, what we're proposing is an ohsu paid-for shuttle system, including satellite parking lots around the city to bring their employees on the hill. This is consistent with city policy that is encouraging alternative transportation modes. Particularly mass transportation. We also propose to disconnect the campus drive front door concept from southwest terwilliger. We propose that a viaduct be created at that point and the campus drive actually pass underneath terwilliger and connect the barbur boulevard where the patients and visitors that are going to use that front door would have a direct connection to the transportation regional region wide -- regionally. The other proposal that we had to protect the neighborhood was the creation of a wall at the south end of the campus. That would disconnect the campus from the residential streets that are adjacent to the campus. At the same time, our suggestion would allow for connectivity for the residential portions of the neighborhood. Unfortunately, whether by design or accident, both the bureau of planning and the peer review group completely misunderstood our proposal. And called them unworkable. The fact of the matter is, they're entirely workable and entirely practical, and in many cases far more cost effective in long-term than the tram. The economic card has been played by ohsu very heavily. Well, there's another economic card, and that's our neighborhood's livability. Study after study, poll after poll has indicated that the primary reason people -- companies move to Portland is the livability of our city. The livability of our city is not confine -- defined to trolley cars downtown and max. It also means our neighborhoods. By throwing away that, by setting the precedents within this plan that will apply neighborhoods around the city, we will seriously degrade the livability of our community and hence, its economic viability in a broad-based fashion. Dr. Koehler mentioned the brookings institution report, and I think that's appropriate. In a nutshell, what it says is that almost all of the funding in the past and most likely in the future is going to the top tier institutions. There's approximately nine of them. Ohsu is at best a third-tier institution. While it's moving up the food chain, it's not moving as rapidly to overtake the lead that these nine centers already have. The other point that the brookings institution report made that's pertinent to our discussion today is the fact that there is very little in the way of actual job creation in biotech. That's been the pattern so far and they forecast that while it may improve, it will not improve in a significant way. The economic impact derived from ohsu is primarily from their payroll. And that payroll is distributed all over our community. If ohsu were to exercise a threat to move out to hillsboro, that payroll would pretty much remain where it is today. People do not decide where to live and spend by where their employer is located. If that were true, in fact there would be no such thing as rush hour. You have a responsibility backed in the best interests of the community that you represent, an argument can be made that in fact this massive investment in biotech needs a great deal more investigation before we dump literally hundreds of millions of dollars and sacrifice neighborhoods and parks to this one particular industry. Lastly, would I like to say that -- I would like to say that i've been talking to neighborhoods all over our community in the last month and a half, and there is a great deal of resentment in our neighborhoods over the way we deal with the bureau of planning, the bureau of planning and the bureaucracies downtown deal

JUNE 26, 2002

with us. Neighborhood interests are always placed well down the list of criteria. Time and time again, we've taken it literally in the shorts. I think the resentment you see in the community was reflected in our recent election, when metro had to go to great lengths to defeat measure 2611. It's also interesting to note that the challenger to david brag don did rather well, considering she was a one-note candidate. And had virtually no money, and started rather late in the game against a well-stabbed politician. The point i'm making here is, let's not have public policy become like the tax prices of the '80s. Where white knight comes along through a measure like measure 5, throws out the good things we've done through community planning, land use planning in our community, literally throwing the baby out with the bath water. Last I have this comment -- either this council take care of the neighborhoods, or perhaps the neighborhoods need to take care of the council. Some of you have hopes for higher office. And I think it would be extremely disquieting to many neighborhood in Portland if the precedent set in our neighborhood, which would be applied to theirs, through the marquam hill plan, is allowed to go forward. With that I introduce anton.

Francesconi: Before you do --

Katz: Hold the time, karla.

Francesconi: Just -- your reference to that we can't destroy an existing neighborhood in order to build a new neighborhood, especially one that's been so damaged by transportation, infrastructure, is a very valid comment. But you should know that it's the gondola that would cause a problem to terwilliger parkway and that the park bureau has come out against the gondola because of that. And you should know the tram does not destroy terwilliger park and the fact you have said this, which is a false statement, causes me a great deal of concern about some of the other things that you said.

Rutledge: With all due respect, the biggest impact on the terwilliger parkway is the traffic that is currently generated by ohsu. This plan allows for approximately a 58% increase in traffic on the surrounding residential streets --

Francesconi: I was talking about duniway park, i'm sorry. Your statement about the park.

*******:** My reference --

Francesconi: That the tram destroys the park. That's a false statement.

Rutledge: I said it impacted it, but the major impact is going to be the traffic. As I said, the traffic already has greatly impacted the functionality of the terwilliger parkway as a park experience, and as a scenic drive, and further, that the increase of approximately 58% that this plan will allow, and this is taken from ohsu's own figures, will simply for all intent and purposes destroy the parkway as a park. We might as well be honest and call it ohsu drive. And the video that we'll play will demonstrate that.

Katz: You've got five minutes. I don't know what your --

Rutledge: My understanding is cth gave us five minutes of their leftover time.

Katz: I see.

Rutledge: I've got ten minutes.

Katz: You've got five minutes if I allow them to give you the time that. Will be all right. But I need to know how many people are going to testify here. I just don't want to stay here until 10 o'clock at night. You're cool.

Anton Vetterlein: Okay. My name is anton, i'm the homestead neighborhood land use committee chairman. I think the planning commission has done an outstanding job of bringing a measure of balance and fairness to the marquam hill plan. I don't agree with what larry beck said, I think they actually have improved it greatly, and the homestead neighborhood association has made its concerns quite clear from the outset of this process, but we found that the city bureaus in crafting

JUNE 26, 2002

the plan seem to be stubbornly resisting addressing these concerns in a meaningful way. I don't understand why. The first draft of the plan went to the planning commission was heavily weighted toward granting ohsu the development rights it seeks, but contained hardly any commitments to mitigating the impacts they create. Perhaps because of this reason there was a strong sentiment on the commission that an ir zone with its requirement for an impact mitigation plan, was a more appropriate zoning for ohsu property than the ex zone. They agreed, the planning commission agreed to the ex zone only after some crucial changes to the plan were offered, including specific binding limits to traffic impacting and protections for terwilliger parkway. These changes are necessary I think to meet the citizens' needs for meaningful impact mitigation. Otherwise, a legislative plan district process becomes a method to esteem roll legitimate livability concerns in order to grant special development privileges. The ir zone assisting kind after yardstick to measure how successful this is at least as far as the neighborhood is concerned. I think the site review retirement that they -- requirement they add was an important component. It provides a review of campus development tone sure it's adhering to the development concept, the policies and the objectives in the plan and to ohsu's own stated goals. This is critical because the neighborhood -- to the neighborhood because these development concepts contain the most important impact mitigation strategies that ohsu offered to justify its expansion on the hill. And I think you can't just substitute design review for this site review process unless there's significant changes to design review. I think the design review deals more with more subtle aesthetic issues, building, the quality and space and pedestrian environments and that kind of thing, and what we're talking about here in the site review is the circulation concept plan being implements that creates the traffic mitigation that's have been promised for this plan. Another improvement the commission made was the traffic impact monitoring procedure that creates a link between the goals and policies of the plan and the development review process. This is contained in the parking review requirement that's are part of the zoning code section of the plan, and which ties approval of new parking to reductions in single occupancy vehicle trips and to prescribe limits on institutional traffic using terwilliger boulevard and neighborhood streets. The zoning code portions of the plan are what really established development rights and responsibilities. The marquam hill plan clearly grants ohsu the right to pursue its expansion goals, so it has to be equally specific I think about defining their responsibilities and setting explicit limits to those impacts. The planning commission pushes this plan, we endorse the standards and time line that have come out of that as well as the limits to traffic on neighborhood streets. As part of the parking review requirements. This is perhaps the single most important feature of the plan without which I would say that the plan is unacceptable. Several things that need to be added to this are limits to traffic on marquam hill road going west from ohsu up to fair mount and to the neighborhoods around council crest. This road carries 5% of total ohsu traffic and is projected to increase significantly due to expansion on the hill, and that's been left out of the process. I also think that we need to measure the traffic on terwilliger boulevard on terwilliger and not at campus drive as is proposed in this proposal. Because we need to know is that traffic going north, is it going south? Simply just knowing how many people are going up and down campus drive doesn't give us an accurate picture of the ohsu use of terwilliger boulevard. The planning commission tightened up the floor area ratio to keep 90 mind with what exists on the hill. With up to 1 million new square feet being added on the hill, the parking space ratio of one space to 750 square feet allows well over the 9 hundred new sparking space that's they're requesting. Controlling park assisting the most effective means to control traffic on the hill, and maintaining this ratio will continue to encourage their successful demand management program. I'll skip a few things. It think the use regulation that's they asked for, conditional use for

JUNE 26, 2002

housing and limitations to retail and industrial uses are important because those aren't critical to the core mission of ohsu. I think it's very important to limit institutional impacts on terwilliger boulevard to the northern section of the parkway. Adjacent to the institutions themselves. These impacts include a 58% increase in ohsu traffic on terwilliger boulevard, north of campus drive, one or possibly two trams crossing the parkway in marching designated views and new buildings immediately adjacent to the parkway towering up to as much as 300 feet over the boulevard. It's vitally important to strictly protect terwilliger parkway south of campus drive from these impacts and provide enhancements to compensate for the impacts felt farther north. The biggest impact on terwilliger south that the plan contains is the -- once they close campus drive to employee traffic, they're going to seek other means to get south and homestead drive, sixth drive, is there and ready waiting for them, currently 70% of ohsu traffic using campus drive comes and goes from the south. Fully a third of their total 24-hour volume is coming and going from the south via terwilliger, and we need to see some better protections. And i've listed -- i've submitted some amendment requests so I won't go into that.

Katz: It's going to be important, so you are referencing these?

Vetterlein: Yes. So I won't specify those just --

Katz: Do you have them, susan? You don't have them?

Vetterlein: I've submitted copies to the clerk.

Katz: Okay. Make sure that the council has them as well. I have them in rough handwriting. All right.

Vetterlein: I guess one thing we -- david did mention was we had proposed -- made a proposal to realign sixth drive where it meets gibb street in order to better serve homestead neighborhood traffic needs and discourage ohsu traffic on that street. This proposal was rejected by the peer review panel without adequate study I think, and little attempt was made to investigate the problem, or work with us to find some alternative solutions. So i'm asking that we amend the plan to add an action item to study the possible realignment and access limitation of sixth drive, homestead drive. And finally, just in wrapping up, i'd like to say that the open space protections on the 45 acres of the south campus i'm certainly very pleased with that, and we need to understand also that I believe that a private party such as ohsu can request to have that changed back to some other zoning in the future. So it's not permanently protected, and i'd also like to see some way that we can include the policies and objectives and action items that were taken out of the plan that related to further purchases and protections for undeveloped natural space up there. That wraps it up. Thank you very much.

Saltzman: Did those latter action items refer to ohsu purchasing future --

Vetterlein: No, it was taken out of the plan when the neighborhood voted not to include those areas within the plan area. I think those are very important objectives to protecting clean water and protecting the habitat. There's free-flowing creeks, there's a lot of acreage and I think we need to have a policy that directs future action to try to preserve that.

Katz: Thank you.

Saltzman: One other question.

Katz: Go ahead.

Saltzman: Have you had a chance to see the amendments ohsu has proposed?

Vetterlein: I have not.

Saltzman: One I want to ask, I asked this yesterday when I was presented these amendments, they're asking to remove the action item, the transportation policy about using on-street parking

JUNE 26, 2002

restrictions, traffic calm can techniques, et cetera. More or less on the basis that traffic cap alone will serve the purpose of controlling traffic in neighborhood streets. Do you agree with that?

*****: Well --

Saltzman: Do you support the use of traffic calming devices in your streets that are the ones --

*****: I think that --

Rutledge: Excuse me.

Vetterlein: They have to work together. If they don't meet the standards, something has to be done to limit traffic on those streets. And I think the action --

Katz: Don't interrupt him:

Vetterlein: -- suggest some ways to go.

Rutledge: That is a personal -- the position of the homestead neighborhood is in fact that we have no support at this time for any sort of traffic calming devices on our street. We prefer to control it by controlling the parking on the top of the hill, which is what generates the traffic in the first place.

Saltzman: So the neighborhood doesn't officially support traffic calming devices.

Rutledge: We reserve the right to take a look at that at a later date but we would prefer not to carve up our neighborhood to allow ohsu to expand on the top of the hill and put more traffic on our streets and on the terwilliger parkway. I go back to one of my original comments, what we support is controlling parking on the hill and hence controlling the number of trips that go up and down the hill. Because if there is no parking, then there is going to be fewer trips. We also have time remaining. Would you cue the video, please?

Katz: Excuse me. I run this council. Not you. Question?

Francesconi: On the trip caps, I wanted to -- you said they were the essential element. Are you satisfied with what's in the plan, that they're sufficient?

Vetterlein: I'm not sure if the numbers, the specific numbers are the right numbers, but i'm not sure what good numbers are. But I think it's very important to have some kind of limitations to traffic on neighborhood streets and so i'm -- I think they get a lot closer to what we're looking for. And I think they needed to be taken in conjunction with the action items for specific ways of dealing with reducing traffic on the streets.

Katz: Okay. We'll be dealing with your amendments as well as with ohsu's and planning's staff tomorrow. We'll go through them. So thank you. Let's run the video.

Rutledge: Would I also like to clarify that anton misspoke. The homestead neighborhood does not support any increases on the -- traffic on the terwilliger parkway either north or south of campus drive.

Katz: Anton I guess is here to speak for himself. Correct?

Vetterlein: Well -- I would -- was suggesting -- I wasn't saying one way or the other.

Katz: Okay.

Rutledge: They say that a picture is worth a thousand words. Video might be even worth a few more. What we're seeing here is a little bit of the neighborhood, the housing stocks, some of the views. But very shortly we're going to get to the crux of the problem that my neighborhood faces and what we've been talking about all along when it comes to limiting the traffic. This was made by one of our neighbors. It was not hyped to make the traffic look worse than it is. The traffic volumes you see on our streets are very typical on those streets that experience ohsu commuter traffic. This is sixth avenue between homestead drive and southwest gains. This is southwest hamilton, hamilton terrace in the morning. This is a typical morning in my neighborhood. The -- it lasts somewhere between 6:45 in the morning and 8:30. The important thing to remember, there's

JUNE 26, 2002

just five routes on and off the hill. Four of them use terwilliger parkway to some degree, all of them are narrow, two-lane streets, winding, none of which have sidewalks. The plan contains absolutely no infrastructure to address this. This is the intersection of hamilton terrace and southwest terwilliger. This is almost exclusively ohsu traffic. You can tell that in the upcoming scenes they all make a left-hand turn on to southwest homestead drive. We're looking north on terwilliger now about a block up would be the entrance to the va. And you will note there's a steady stream of traffic that makes a left-hand turn to cut through our neighborhood. This is a residential neighborhood, to access the south campus. This is one of the reasons we advocate disconnecting the campus -- campus there the residential street grid. That was the proposal that was so grossly misunderstood by the bureau of planning and the peer review group. A simple solution that simply means that we disconnect the driveway parking lots from ohsu into the neighborhood, route them on to veterans road or sam jackson. This is terwilliger at approximately southwest condor street. This is typical midday traffic. This is at capitol highway. This is typically the way traffic backs up. You could actually back it up even further if you decide to drive 25 miles an hour, which is the speed limit. I can easily generate lines behind me a half mile or longer simply by driving the speed limit. You can see this line goes behind the curve of the road, thanks approximate -- that's approximately where it owned, a quarter mile. Again, this is very typical of the traffic volumes where -- we're experiencing now. This is not on a day when there was some other sort of transportation disaster on the banfield freeway or anything like that. Again, this is just representative. I'd like to point out that I think most would agree the noise levels you're experiencing certainly do not lend themselves to a park experience. The parkway is used heavily by walkers, bicyclists, joggers, bikers, people that would like to enjoy the view. Actually, people would like to use it as a scenic drive, but sometimes the traffic volumes are so heavy and the drivers are so anxious to make you go faster, that I have actually experienced cases of road rage when I don't drive faster than 25 miles an hour, as a resident I like to enjoy the scenic aspects of the parkway. This is at capital highway. I'd like to point out that there is not video here -- this is veterans road exiting on to the terwilliger parkway. Most of this traffic will use either terwilliger going down to capital highway or it will be the reverse of what you saw at the beginning, where the traffic went down hamilton terrace to connect with barbur boulevard. This is again more veterans road traffic. I'd like to point out that the traffic you're seeing here is actually worse at the north end of terwilliger at the sixth avenue and sheridan street area. The sole major impact mitigation is going to be, according to the plan, is an expansion of -- by one lane width of two blocks north of terwilliger on sixth avenue.

Katz: Thank you. All right. Let's have -- .

Moore: Come up three at a time.

Joseph Schaefer, 1211 SW 5th, Land Use Planner, Terwilliger Plaza: Thank you. I'm joseph schaefer, a land use planner appearing on behalf of terwilliger plaza. With me today but not speaking are carl rosenberg, terwilliger plaza resident, and board member, and also ann powell, the human resources director. They've agreed not to speak tonight both as a courtesy to everyone else who is waiting, but also because I was able to explain that our primary concerns have been addressed in the plan, and for that i'd like to thank christie white and the ohsu engineering staff as well as matt wickstrom and susan hartnett at the bureau of planning.

Katz: Before you go to that, what was your primary issue they took care of?

Schaefer: A bus stop at the intersection of southwest sixth and sheridan at one point there -- they were working on how time prove traffic on sixth, which is what i'm here to talk about, and that bus stop served the seniors at terwilliger plaza, which is a nonprofit that provides housing and extended

JUNE 26, 2002

care for 275 seniors. So through their help we were able to get that bus stop upgraded to be fully accessible so there's a shelter for people with mobility devices to stay out of the weather and so forth.

Katz: Okay.

Schaefer: You heard Susan talk about improvements to Southwest Sixth. Those are going to be governed by the boulevard concept in the Terwilliger Parkway design guidelines. However, that boulevard concept really is addressed toward the boulevard on top of the hill and doesn't reflect the urban character of Southwest Sixth between Sheridan and Broadway. And we simply want to ask the city to include urban streetscape elements in this section, including decorative light fixtures and street lights, and undergrounding of the utilities as well as pedestrian crosswalks serving Duniway from both sides of Southwest Sixth Avenue.

Katz: Thank you.

Schaefer: That's it.

Katz: You've got it down. Who's next? Go ahead.

Kent Thornbert: I'm Kent Thornberg, I'm here as a scientist and professor from OHSU. And I'd like to give you one minute of the scientist's perspective on this issue. I'm the director of the Heart Research Center and the Heart Research Center is composed of more than 100 scientists and our job is to improve patient care and to find exciting new cures for heart disease and as you probably know, heart disease is the number 1 killer of men and women in Oregon and across the country. Many of our patients we see at OHSU are because of this disease. What many people don't realize is that the modern health institutions are rapidly changing in the way they're organized to enhance interaction between doctors and scientists. The best university hospitals are characterized by centers like the Heart Research Center where scientists work across traditional organizational boundaries. We know there's no substitute for actual face-to-face exchange of ideas which bring scientific energy to our mission and provide the very best care for patients to help find cures for the disease that we care about so much. Whether there is a discussion about a tough clinical case or new research ideas, or a full-blown medical discovery, doctors and scientists need ways to communicate face-to-face on a daily basis. So this plan becomes a very important issue for us. I can give you an example of my schedule and how difficult this is. My office is in the basic science building on the northwest corner, and every day I travel between my office to the southwest corner at the VA hospital across the bridge, where I meet with cardiologists and training for teaching other doctors and also for research discussions. And then I travel to Doernbecher Hospital where I confer with the cardiac surgery team, which is brand-new there you may know, and we're working on new research programs for congenital heart disease. And then I travel to the -- what we call the bioinformation building, and there we're working on computerized information and chip technology where we want to find genes that are the culprits in congenital heart disease, and back to the basic science building where I have my laboratory where we're working on the causes of coronary disease. Often if there's an issue in my laboratory that needs attention I have to walk back and forth across the campus and it's very important for us to have sort of ten-minute intervals for us to get from one extreme place in the campus to the other. In order to make this heart center ideal really work well. In order to be a top tier institution and the heart research center programs in the world, we have to decide -- design our plant so high energy physicians can work together to solve medical problems for our patients for generations to come. And because we are organized in this new way and have exciting interactions, we hope we can attract the best physicians from around the world to join our team to cure heart disease for you here in Oregon and to be part of the Portland community. Thank you very much.

JUNE 26, 2002

Adrian Roberts: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity. I'm going to be speaking in support of the ohsu plan, but not only for marquam hill, but for the north macadam area, because I see it's an integrated package. I'm a technology consultant. My name is adrian roberts. I live in Portland but over the years i've been involved in a number of economic development plans based on high-tech. Particularly new york, tennessee, Washington, and most recently in arizona. I would say we have a unique opportunity here in fact i'll be bold and say that in my opinion, the partnership between Portland and ohsu is our only chance to develop a clean, green sustainable economy. Why do I say this? What has been mentioned a couple times today, it's been lost in the arguments this merger between ogi and ohsu combined with the growth and potential of psu, has allowed us now to have a unique research organization and truly unique, nothing like it in the country, which will capitalize on the convergence of bioscience with information technology and electronics. And this is really where the future is, and it's beyond just health. In fact, we're just putting a down payment today in starting a 50 to 100-year process where we will see industries that we don't know today that will emerge from the convergence of nanoscience with bioscience that will converge from the use of bioproducts in new fuels to offset global warming that will create whole new materials, industries, that will be green and will have a much, much reduced foot print over what we use today with carbon based fuels. So real -- you really have to look beyond the bounds of what we see today, what comes out of the various institutes reviews and so on and look to the future and how this down payment here can create something huge for the region and for the nation. But what is required today is a critical mass. We have to be able to bring a critical mass into Portland. And that requires both marquam hill and north macadam and the aerial tram to ensure the synergy that we will need to put this technology to work. It's no good just producing good science, the science will escape. Patents can be mailed. Technology basically can be transferred out of state as it has in the past. To keep it here today, we have to have a combined integrated macadam and marquam hill plan that will enable ideas and innovations the scientists produce to be translate and transferred into real product and real new companies. So I urge the council to look at this as a package deal, and to pass it swiftly, because while we have a strong base to work on, competition is huge and we really do need to get on with it, and start all the discussion and get on with making it happen. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you, gentlemen.

Ann Bunnberg, President, Electrical Geodesics: I'm here as the president of electrical geodesics. We're a eugene-based manufacturer and developer of high resolution eeg machines. We make the machines that image the functioning of your brain. I'm also here in my capacity as cochair of the Oregon bioscience association. I guess the reason that i'm here to support the plan and to support particularly the plan in the package form that was just referred to including the tram, is that I have had the chance to experience directly the economic benefit to small companies that ohsu provides. Even though we're located down eugene, we have had the opportunity to collaborate with the excellent physician and scientific research teams at ohsu and I can tell you it has made a remarkable difference to company like mine to have that opportunity. The issue, though, is that proximity counts. We've been able to be successful with ohsu but it has taken a great deal of efforts to be able to make those collaborations work at long distance, and frankly, I think they would have been far more successful if there were opportunities to be near to ohsu as this combined plan would provide. And I thought that the proximity importance was perhaps something that was just about our experience. Until recently I had the experience of working with the Portland development commission in trying to recruit a biotech company to the Portland area. And it was interesting that for all the things we tried to show them about the wonders of Portland,

JUNE 26, 2002

you know what they cared about? They cared about the fact that ohsu -- at ohsu they got in to see the top level researchers and they said, geez, usually we go someplace and the top guy shakes your hand, but then you get bumped down the street to the post -- here we're working with the leading people. Is there a way that we could find to have our business located near those researchers so we could collaborate in the kind of ongoing face-to-face interaction that's necessary? It's one of the ironies of the digital age that four in -- for innovation, face time matters, and it matters a lot. So I urge you to take this plan with great seriousness. It's obviously not an easy set of decisions. The issues that have been raised by the neighborhood are profound, and yet I for one have come to the conclusion that this is not a nice to have. This is a have to have from a bioscience, biomedical industry perspective to be able to allow ohsu to realize on its economic development potential. It isn't going to work to have two silo campuses separated by distance. What's going to have to happen is we've got to be able to move quickly. We urge you to support the tram and the macadam plan.

Francesconi: I take it if we do that you'll be moving your business to Portland? [laughter]

Bunnenberg: Well, I live nearby, and nothing would please me more than to be able to have a branch office here. We also have strong ties to the university of Oregon. But this is one of the best places in the world. We do work with the stroke team and it's incredible how good those guys are.

Francesconi: Having your branch office in eugene --

Bunnenberg: You know, I think i'll be hung from a lamppost down there if I commit to moving today. But you can't underscore too much the importance of ohsu as a magnet. It is the only reason companies like ours would consider moving to Portland.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: Who wants to start? Grab the mike.

Richard Stein, President, Friends of Terwilliger: My name is richard stein, I live at 901 southwest westwood drive. I am speaking to you today as the president of friends of terwilliger. I became president of the board last january upon returning from a trip to amsterdam, and in order to spearhead our efforts to ensure the protection of terwilliger parkway. Amsterdam has achieved much of what Portland aspires towards. It has a lively urban core, it is tolerant, it is bicycle and pedestrian friendly, and it favors transit over autos. At one point during my visit there I stepped a block away from a business district and could hear the water lapping in the canals. When I returned to Portland, I drove along terwilliger parkway and was amazed. Here in my city's urban core we have 100-year-old untamed corridor of forest. I thought, what an absolutely extraordinary thing. When I am in nature, I sigh the patterns of life, and my own sense of belonging within that larger order is renewed. This parkway deserves our collective protection. When I received a copy of the proposed resolution to uphold and protect the terwilliger parkway corridor plan and terwilliger design guidelines, it made me happy. Because I felt that those who are crafting the marquam hill plan are committed to upholding the terwilliger parkway legacy. The friends of terwilliger board and I know -- the friends of terwilliger board I know stands with me in saying, we want to see ohsu flourish. We want to see north macadam developed into a lively new neighborhood. And to see a successful biotech industry create thriving enterprise in our community. We share these goals with you, and we feel that our city's prized livability can be preserved at the same time. We have taken a close look at both the resolution, which seeks to preserve the parkway, and the proposed marquam hill plan to see if they are consistent with each other. We find that there are three elements of the proposed plan which significantly contradict the resolution. Some of my fellow board members will follow me now with the specifics. Please

JUNE 26, 2002

consider what they have to say. With your help, we can fine tune the plan so we can all agree and move forward in confidence together. The terwilliger parkway in all its natural wildness is words preserving, for all of us to enjoy and for our children's children to cherish. These are the preexisting governing documents. We simply ask that you uphold and enforce it. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Krista Foxwell, Friends of Terwilliger: Good afternoon. My name is christa foxwell, I live on southwest viewpoint terrace. The first contradiction to look at occurs in policy 3, transportation. Reinforce the character of terwilliger parkway as described in the terwilliger corridor plan and acknowledge that traffic accessing marquam hill institutions from terwilliger is local traffic. We ask that you please delete the second half of the sentence which defines the traffic accessing marquam hill institution assist local traffic. This wording tries to subvert the distinction of -- of the terwilliger corridor plan makes about which type of traffic to allow and not to allow. The terwilliger corridor plan states the following -- there are six goals. Goal f states, to reinforce the primary transportation function in the park way as a leisurely scenic drive and a bicycle commuting path rather than a heavy used route for vehicular through traffic. The plan also states under the section titled land uses policies, goal one, preserve terwilliger parkway as a two-lane scenic drive and discourage its use by heavy volumes of through traffic, for example, trips having both the origin and destination outside the study area. The study area was the parkway. Clearly the traffic which goes to ohsu both begins and ends outside of the study area. The terwilliger corridor plan identifies two categories of automobile use; leisurely scenic drive and heavy used route for vehicular through traffic. We brought along a visual aid to help us understand the meaning of this distinction. Restorative. I might need to clear my mind at the end of the workday. This goes under the heading of leisurely drive. Perhaps there might be 100 cars a day that come from this. Alternative route to downtown, Barber boulevard is too busy so i'll use terwilliger this goes under vehicular through traffic. This could generate hundreds of cars, especially at peak traffic hours. Tourist attraction; I want to show my out of town guests views of Portland. This one is recreational and part of a leisurely scenic drive. This goes in this column and might generate another hundred cars of traffic each day. Local resident; I live on homestead drive. This is a local person and may generate four or 500 trips a day. It goes under this heading. Doctor's payment; I have an appointment with dr.Martin at 9:30. This person is using the parkway not for recreation, but to get somewhere at a certain time. The marquam hill plan calls for 12,400 cars to use the parkway for this purpose every day. This we can agree fits in the heavily used route heading. By defining ohsu traffic as local, the marquam hill plan contradicts the intention of the terwilliger plan. This is important to the character of terwilliger and must be upheld. This is why we ask you now to delete the second half of the sentence in the plan, which erroneously defines commuter traffic. Thank you.

Doug Weir, Friends of Terwilliger: Doug weir. Thank you for letting us come to speak today. I'd like to refer to the whole concept of turning campus drive into the front door for ohsu. This is outlined in two places in the marquam hill plan. The main references of the building and site design, and the vehicular circulation site development group -- concept, i'm sorry. The idea is to root all patient and visitor traffic to campus drive. Other institutional traffic employees and students would have to use the other routes. We've looked at this carefully over a along period of time and we've come to the conclusion it's a bad idea, and it's part of public policy and will degrade terwilliger's -- terwilliger parkway as a scenic resource. And we believe it's in violation of the terwilliger parkway corridor plan and goal f, which christa mentioned, which is to reinforce the primary transportation function as a leisurely scenic drive and a bicycle commuting path rather

JUNE 26, 2002

than heavily used vehicular through traffic. Moving all ohsu patients and visitor traffic to campus drive would change the nature of the section of terwilliger's primary transportation function as a leisurely scenic drive. It would basically turn the section from campus drive north into a driveway for the -- for ohsu. There is language talking about discouraging traffic off of veteran hospital road, and homestead, but I think it's going to be very difficult to succeed in those efforts. They've talked about some about traffic calming and limiting access, but I think there's several problems with that, including ambulances being able to access the hill. The more logical solution we believe is to keep campus drive as the current status as an auxiliary entrance, and maybe still close off campus but only allow traffic going up campus for, for instance, the doernbecher, just the doernbecher and casey and leave sam jackson as the primary entrance, which is historically has always been. The best way to limit institutional traffic on the hill and encourage traffic mode split is the traffic -- is keeping the parking lid, the restrictions in the parking lid. Furthermore, we think the marquam hill plan should have a long-term goal to remove all institutional traffic off of terwilliger. We know this is a very challenging goal and we know it's going to take some creative solutions and i'm sure lots of money, too. But we think it's really important to maintain this treasure. We ask that you protect the scenic function of terwilliger and thank you for your time.

Katz: Thank you.

Saltzman: A question on the change to policy 12 you're advocating, removing the reference to local traffic. You're basic point is that the plan, the terwilliger corridor plan and local traffic are two inconsistent statements.

*******:** Exactly.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Katz: You got that, citizen? -- you got that, susan? You'll come back to it. All right. Let's keep going.

Walt Amacher, Friends of Terwilliger: My name is walt, i'm a member of the friends of terwilliger, and also a resident of terwilliger parkway with 107 feet of frontage on the park way. I'll keep my comments brief and i'll present a graphic representation of the impact of the marquam hill plan and the proposed tram and the proposed tram will have on the parkway, terwilliger parkway. One of the goals enacted in the terwilliger parkway design guidelines was, and I quote, to maintain and enhance the unobstructed views from terwilliger boulevard and trail. The guidelines for the landscaping on page 15 under the views it says, preserve or improve views and special natural features identified in the terwilliger landscape concept plan. Here are two views of -- from terwilliger parkway. The one on the right shows the only decent view of downtown Portland from the parkway, and the other is a view of mt. Hood. It so happens these are the views from either side of the ravine that the proposed tram is to be built on. And these are these views right here on the original map that was enacted in 1983. I want to show you the impact of the proposed tram. Since we don't know what the tram looks like, i'll use the next best thing. A bus to show how this is going to affect the views. [laughter] you're being asked to squander these magnificent views to subsidize an industry that's portrayed as expensive and risky in a june 11th Oregonian article a. June 10th article in the new york times said, biotechnology may not be the economic salvation some envision because the industry does not employ that many people. As mayor and city council, you are the stewards of the park. All I ask that you enforce the parkway design guidelines and help ohsu find another solution. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Marilyn Hoth, Friends of Terwilliger: My name is marilynn, i'm a member of the board of friends of terwilliger and I live at 911 southwest westwood drive. The friends of terwilliger board

JUNE 26, 2002

endorses and supports your retention of specific provisions in the recommended marquam hill plan. There are three specifically. The first is to continue the parking capacity restrictions, the second is to go forward with rezoning undeveloped land in ohsu's self campus -- south campus to an open space designation, the third is to restore the forest corridor treatment to the terwilliger parkway at the campus drive intersection. To do go back to point number 1 about parking capacity restrictions, the marquam hill plan allows for an increase parking capacity for ohsu institutional use on marquam hill by 900 spaces. The correlating trips that involve increase traffic on the terwilliger parkway will certainly exceed the minimal 1800, doubling those 900 spaces being used for an entry and a departure once every 24 hours. It will greatly exceed that minimum. We're very concerned about this large increase in institutional traffic, which should be decreasing in its proportion of traffic use on terwilliger rather than increasing. We acknowledge, however, that the plan also includes several restrictions to proposed increases in parking on the hill. Parking restrictions have proven to be the most effective method of expanding the modal split away from single occupancy vehicles so we support these restrictions and we feel if anything, that you have the justification to strengthen the parking capacity restrictions. Regarding the rezoning of the south campus land to open space, we support this wholeheartedly. However, we recognize that zoning can be changed. This land could be rezoned to a developable designation at some future date when ohsu needs to expand even further. Therefore, we are asking you to provide for a transfer of ownership of this land to the city with the parks and recreation bureau assuming its management as a natural area. This transfer of ownership is further justified because ohsu has neither the intention nor the resources to manage a natural area. And on point number 3, the provision in the recommended marquam hill plan that we wish to support is the restoration of the forest corridor treatment to the terwilliger parkway at the campus drive intersection. We strongly support this provision for remedial action and we request full enforcement. Force corridor designation has been upheld by the implementing ordinance at this location since 1983. Institutional development above the slow indication, however, has continued to increase during intervening decades. It's highly visible from the intersection throughout the construction the city has been unable to enforce the terwilliger parkway design guidelines b, which addresses landscaping requirements and the accompanying design guidelines c, which addresses style, scale, siting, materials, and color. The result is a, quote, great wall of bright buildings that conflicts with the natural setting instead of complimenting it as required by the design guidelines. An exception to this historic call inability to enforce the design guidelines occurred during the doernbecher hospital development. Some of the forest corridor treatment was restored due to a concerted effort by friends of terwilliger that convinced the design commission to see this accomplished. Now great -- accomplished. Now great building heights are proposed which will make future development from this -- visible from this site on the parkway. We're hoping for some assurance the city will consistently enforce adherence to the terwilliger parkway design guidelines by marquam hill institutions. Included with the marquam hill plan's provision for restoration of the forest corridor as viewed from the terwilliger parkway at campus drive, must be a process to ensure its successful implementation. Thank you very much for your attention, and for the hoped-for retention of these three provisions while enhancing them with the adoption of language to take the actions that we are requesting.

Katz: Thank you.

Frank Orem, Sierra Club: I'm a sierra club volunteer. I serve as the conservation for the columbia group of the sierra club, which means I watch over the environmental concerns of the sierra club members in Portland. I want to make clear that's not a threat, just a fact. The sierra club's interest --

JUNE 26, 2002

Francesconi: We're used to being threatened.

Orem: Actually we find great reason to cooperate with the city in lots of things.

Katz: Yes, we do.

Orem: Any way, our interests are a nonpolluting sustainable transportation system. We've been following in making discussions to the development plans for the last year and a half some of our suggestions have been incorporated. My issue today here is the connector from marquam hill to north macadam district. Jim howell and I pose an underground solution for the connector a year ago. We talked to pdot, pdc, to ohsu, and to ohsu's transportation consult apartments, gordon davis.

Gordon actually went so far as to get a rough engineering estimate for such a connector which came to \$15 million, a big ticket. It apparently stopped further consideration. We have more data from the just-published pdot study of other connector that puts the annual operating cost of the tram at \$2.8 million a year. With such a high operating cost, it's clear that we should be looking beyond first costs. I gave you a table which contains a couple of things. One is time estimates for travel time for three modes -- a tram, a moving sidewalk, walkway, and a people mover. And corresponding cost estimates, first cost, annual operating costs, and life costs over a 30-year time with a 4% interest rate assumed. And it's fairly clear that the underground solutions are competitive, very competitive. Further, those solutions give good access to barbur boulevard transit corridor from both top and bottom. And they don't provide a -- an attractor in the north macadam area which we do not need, don't want to have by direction -- I think wove decided not to include in north macadam, which would require more parking and have parking -- traffic impact. So I hope you'll give these solutions the attention they seem to deserve. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Mandell.

George Pernsteiner, Vice President, Portland State University: Mayor Katz, commissioners Francesconi and Saltzman. Thank you very much for the opportunity to talk with you today about the marquam hill plan. For the record, my name is george, i'm vice-president of Portland state. We have -- we really appreciate the work that you, your staff, the neighborhood representatives and ohsu have done over the last year to bring the plan to this point. We've been involved in the planning process and in the investigation and we support the general plan. We further support the development of a science and technology corridor and we would urge you to amend comprehensive plan goal 5 to state clearly the city's support for economic development and for the development of a science and technology corridor. We would ask you also in that statement to encourage participation by not only ohsu, but also ogi, psu, osu, and others in that effort. Both dr. Koehler and dr. Roberts have talked to you about some numbers. Dr. Koehler has spoken about the growth of research over the last 15 years, and it has been phenomenal. He has spoken with you also about the human face of that. The improvements which are been made in extending life, the improvement that's have been made in improving life. We also have involved in the kinds of scientific research which underpin the kinds of breakthroughs which we hope will occur in future. Like ohsu, we have seen marked growth in funded research. The last two years alone the funded research in our engineering program has grown by four times. We are now at a point where we've had double digit growth in science and engineering enrollment in each of the last three years, and we expect it again in this coming year. We have grown to the point where we will have 23,000 students at Portland state this fall. We recognize the confluence of the disciplines which both dr. Roberts and dr.Koehler talked about earlier. The fact that in today's research, engineering science, medicine, come together in the work that is done by researchers in laboratories and clinics and this other settings. Recognizing that, two years ago an agreement was signed which was a framework for doing education and research together called the metropolitan collaborative, and we intend to

JUNE 26, 2002

continue to follow that as we move forward into the future. With the growth which we have had, with the growth which ohsu has had, with the opportunities that we have for collaboration on research, we recognize that our futures lie together in the development of the north macadam area. And we have committed to joining in that development as we go forward into the future. But for that to happen, for that research to occur, for that education to occur for the commercialization of the discoveries to occur, we need to have strong transportation links. We have to have a method of getting people from ohsu to north macadam, and to us that means the tram. We have to have a way to get from psu to north macadam, we would have ask you to look at those transportation options, thank you again for allowing me to share psu's perspective on the marquam hill plan, your decisions will shape the future of ohsu, of psu, and the 21st century economy of this city. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Glenn Bridger, SW Neighborhood Inc.: Good morning, council. My name is glen bridger, i'm here speaking on behalf of southwest neighborhoods incorporated, swini. It's a coalition of 16 neighborhoods in southwest Portland, and I personally live on vincent place, just off terwilliger. The dialogue that's taken place in our organization over the past year and a half and -- and our actions on behalf of sweeney and a number much letters have not just been those of the directly affected communities of homestead and cthl, but of represented heart felt thoughts of our larger organizations. They relate to process, timing, they relate to opportunities for public input. They relate to concerns regarding terwilliger and the great asset that that is and also parking and other aspects in our local streets. Please listen to what our neighborhoods and friends of terwilliger have said on these issues, because they represent our community. I do appreciate the extensive effort that has produced the marquam hill plan, having salt up on the ctag group that work order that, I have much respect for the staff that have done a marvelous job on this product. Many of these concepts and decisions are really outstanding and they will help build a better Portland. I am somewhat disappointed that ohsu lacked the foresight to undertake their planning process concurrent with the southwest community plan, because that in fact would have created a better product for both of our organizations. Now, one decision I ask you to respect the -- I want you to keep the tram separate from the marquam hill plan. The tram is a totally separate issue and let me suggest why you need to separate this out and how you may wish to address that topic. I was present here about two years ago when your body passed the south Portland circulation study. If you will recall, this is a \$50 million project that will remove stars from a historic communicated. Right now the tram if it were built as proposed would slash a new scar through that very community that you thought was worth \$50 million saving only two years ago. Now, how should you address the issue of how do we weigh the balance of the community and the needs of this research institution? We know that marquam hill and the macadam district are not natural areas for transportation hubs. And I think that you need to address this in a businesslike manner looking for benchmarks that would establish a need for some innovative connectivity. The benchmarks i'm looking for ask that you consider are look to north macadam and let them get to a specific threshold of specific investment in that area of new improvements. Look for what a well-planned shuttle can do and is actually accomplishing as far as necessary linkages between those two terminals. Once have you that information, you will have the kind of information that will help you make a good meaningful decision that you can feel comfortable with as a council in destroying some of the communities that you have vote to the preserve as well as helping to maintain a viable institution there. So please look forwards this tool to move forward and keep the tram separate from the needed improvements on marquam hill.

JUNE 26, 2002

Katz: Thank you.

Lili Mandell: Lili mandell, 1511 southwest park avenue. Here we have a tale of health, hearth, and wealth. The health of our city figuratively and literally, is what's at stake in the battle of the tram. Unquestionably, ohsu's expansion will add to the health and wealth of our city. Equally unquestionable, ohsu needs rapid transportation between its campuses. Their arrogant view that it's either the tram or we will scam, lies at the heart of the debate. Equally arrogant has been the planning bureau's -- bureau initially -- equally arrogant has been the planning bureau's initial double bypass of the planning commission and the public process. How we arrive at the mode of transportation is as important as a transportation -- as transportation itself. There are other art rigs of travel available, and they should be considered and not surgically cut off. For instance, the streetcar going to macadam can burrow beneath the skin of the neighborhood and grow a new arterial route to the marquam hill brain. As can the underground people mover. All I ask you to do is what is done in all good research. Explore alternative possibilities and not the usual dismissal. It costing too much. It is -- it's a boring cliché and self defeating answer. The following quote from randy graggs sunday article, we act like surgeons up here, we may be wrong, but we're never in doubt, makes my blood pressure flip its lid. It is a very dangerous view. You may end up killing a patient, slash, neighborhood, and yet perform very advanced successful surgery. I would rather leave you with a better prescription. The statement attributed to renowned chicago architect daniel burnham, make no little plans, they have no magic to stir men's blood. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: That was nicely done. I may not agree with all of it, but it was nicely done.

Katz: How many more want to testify? Oh. The hands seem to be growing. All right.

Art Lewellan: My name is art, I do not live in the neighborhood, I live across the river in the brooklyn neighborhood. I have a written comment that I will also submit. I want to read from it and add to it. And my comments will be confined to the program. I don't want to comment on the growth, how that is proposed for the -- the hospital district on top of the hill or the manner of -- the traffic that has to be negotiate order terwilliger parkway. I'm going to try to read and get through it. I should be able to do it. I support the tram. I have the right to support because car traffic bound for ohsu goes through my neighborhood or any other neighborhood. I am like any person in this region that is affected by traffic headed for ohsu. Any travel option that can reduce traffic is a regional decision, not one bound by neighborhood or local discretion. Maybe that's not the right word, discretion. It's a regional concern. Incentives for compromise should be considered, planting new large street tree was obscure the passing gondola, tram, and add to the urban forest. Placing telephone poles and -- poles and utility wires are highly desirable. Reconfiguring the ross island bridge ramps on overdue. I prefer the small gondola -- following the southwest grover street alternate 6-b. This alignment has less visual impact to the neighborhood. The extra stations provide needed transit access and encourage development at naito parkway. I believe access down to macadam district is also necessary from barbur boulevard and that middle of the district, that macadam district development needs more access, more transit access and I think it needs to be connected at barbur. Ohsu does not need a private tram line between the campuses. One or two stations between campuses will not detract from critical travel times. Overhead wires are sometimes labeled visual pollution. I have little sympathy for those who prefer the breathable exhaust and water contaminating emissions or water contaminating drippings from their automobiles when they protest transit systems like the tram that reduce their exposure to real pollution.

JUNE 26, 2002

Ron Swaren: My name is ron, i'm a resident of the sellwood neighborhood. I don't think that there's a lot of weight to the argument that the ctlh often raises that the property values would be diminished in the area. I think the opposite is probably the case. I think the urban redevelopment that's gone on has probably benefited that neighborhood to a greater degree than most other neighborhoods in Portland. Mainly because they're very approximate to some really outstanding efforts at urban redevelopment. So I think because they're close to ohsu and if that becomes a premier type of development, that they'll benefit, their property values will continue to increase and I don't think the tram really has that great of an impact. I noticed a comment from one of the developers that possibly there could be compensation if a certain property owners were in fact impacted by the tram, but from what i've seen, it seems to be a fairly low impact design. I'm sure there's going to be disagreement by the neighborhood, but that's how it appears to me. I think one thing that's important to consider is that this is an industry, health care and research, that's a very commendable industry. [brief lapse in captions while a backup captioner takes over.]

Swaren: Here we have something really commendable. And I think that if this is given support and encouragement by the city, that it could produce another industry, and that would be providing leadership to other cities in urban issues. We're gaining recognition because of innovations that have taken place here, but we have to remember that Portland is a very small city and there's a lot of other urban regions that would be competitive in providing solutions to urban problems. So, i'd say we need to keep up the good work and that we might see some offshoots very beneficial from this project.

Tom Miller: Good afternoon, city council. My name is tom miller. I live at 3422 southwest 11th, just above the medical school, a house by the way built in 1873. As a designated neighborhood association representative to the c-tag, there are two main points in the plan before you I must address. I have abbreviated the written testimony in front of you. First, to drive to ohsu you must either drive along terwilliger or fair mount boulevard. Fairmount is the western access to ohsu district, which connects to the marquam hill road. This western access, if you can believe it, is not even recognized in this plan. This unrecognized access will be worsened by two factors. One is the marquam hill plan designates sam jackson park road as the main access for employees and students. Sam jackson becomes marquam hill road to the west, which leads to fairmounts. Also, the completion of the eastbound exit off highway 26 at sylvan could lead to huge amount of traffic along fairmount and humphrey, then marquam hill road, ohsu. The vehicles presently using this western route are primarily single occupancy vehicles of ohsu employees. Unfortunately, this group is the most likely to know such neighborhood cut-through routings. Please note this western access also leads to pattan road, dosch road, syan boulevard, vista, et cetera. Unlike terwilliger, marquam hill, pattan, these others do not have bike lanes or walking paths. Most don't have curbs let alone sidewalks, yet they all have direct resident driveways accessing them. In my written testimony I have included specific inclusions and additions to the marquam hill plan which will address and hopefully mitigate this huge unrecognized impact via local street objectives, action items, fairmount, marquam hill road should also be included as a local access street to parking qualifications. A second point that I unfortunately have to address is the curbs and sidewalks along 11th street. 11th street is the only north-south connection through the village area second only to -- hospital road on the western border of ohsu. 11th carries a huge amount of traffic during the week, including 1300 weekly tri-met buses, residents, ohsu parents, employees, visitors, students, and continuous pedestrian. The problem has only been worsened by the installation of speed bumps on veterans hospital road. Now most ohsu-owned vehicles use 11th for intercampus travel. These

JUNE 26, 2002

vehicles are not limit to do pickups, paneled vans, unlicensed pickups, shuttles, backhoes, security vehicles, lawn mowers, the list goes on. The employees should be told, not suggested, to not cut through the neighborhoods and streets. The previous plan did recommend continuous pedestrian access via sidewalk --

Katz: Finish your thought. Your time is up.

Miller: Unfortunately, it looks like i'll be here tomorrow. I've been involved in every step of the way. All these are plans ever written for the marquam hill plan. They've fallen on deaf ears. Find that unfortunate. This is just a citizen who cares and would like to see some of these amendments incorporated into a plan that so affects not only neighborhood livability, but community workability.

Katz: Just out of curiosity, were these amendments presented to the planning commission?

Miller: Yes. They were changed in the last draft we've seen and I understand once again there's an amendment plan for tomorrow I haven't seen. It's disconcerting. But, yes, they were --

Katz: Nobody has seen them because we're waiting to hear from everybody today.

Miller: That too.

Saltzman: I want to ask you, I understand the issue about humphrey boulevard and fairmount, the western access. Why will the completion of the eastbound sylvan interchange make that problem worse?

Miller: I know many, many people that live skyline, over by st. Vincent hospital that make it -- find it much more direct and easy to take this route over fairmount. It's not far fetched. It's currently used as a cut-through street for neighborhood surface streets.

Saltzman: Won't completion of the interchange at least conceivably make traffic onto u.s. 26 easier?

Miller: Onto 26 sounds great. The problem is, unfortunately, those that would get off there and come over the hill rather than dropping down into town and going up sam jackson from dunnaway park, for instance. Did you follow that?

Saltzman: Okay. People coming eastbound on 26 heading towards the hill would get off at sylvan, go humphrey boulevard as opposed to going down the duniway?

Miller: Yes, I would like to think it wouldn't be the case, but it could be a huge problem.

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

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: Okay. Come on up. Go ahead, mr. Goodman.

Goodman: Good afternoon. My name is greg goodman, and i'm chairman of the app policy committee. My address is 920 southwest 6th, and i'm happy to be here. I'm here to urge the council to support the original bureau of planning marquam hill plan and reject the planning commission's amendments to that plan. The city has long focused on biotechnology as an important growth industry for our future. We are fortunate to have such a well-respected medical research institution as ohsu in our city. It certainly offers Portland the opportunity to capitalize on bioscience and biotechnology. The economics -- economic impacts of ohsu's expansion or potential expansion are phenomenal. Upwards of 229 million dollars in annual revenues and 380 full-time jobs. The fundamental question is whether this growth will occur in our central city or in the suburbs. Despite policies to the contrary, our central city has based substantial job loss to the suburbs. With ohsu, we have perhaps our greatest real opportunity to reverse that trend. It is an opportunity the city simply cannot afford to miss. Certainly this growth will come with impacts on surrounding neighborhoods and includes the controversial proposal for an aerial tram. The

JUNE 26, 2002

planning bureau has done an admirable job in attempting to balance impacts. It has sought to find ways to enhance the surrounding neighborhoods while minimizing the negative impacts. The rezoning of 45 acres to open space, the proposed village center and enhanced traffic controls essential go a long way. Bop's original marquam hill plan is a reasoned and balanced proposal that helps build community while facilitating ohsu's expansions. Unfortunately, in reviewing bop's work, the planning commission made significant changes that would undermine this balance. Planning commission changes include elimination of policy statements, supporting the creation of a science and technology district, and technical amendments that essentially prevent an aerial tram from occurring. These changes basically eliminate the potential for ohsu to expand and stop development of biotech, bioscience industry, and the central city and north macadam. I and app urge you to reject the planning commission's amendments and return to the bop's market hill -- marquam hill plan. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Ray Polani: Good afternoon, mayor Katz, commissioners. My name is ray polani. I live at 6110 southwest ankeny street in Portland. I speak as co-chair of -- we are in favor of the project. But we have serious problems with the proposed technology with the limits, the limitations of the proposed technology. We believe there is a way of marrying ohsu objectives with the concerns and interests of the neighborhoods and of the citizens at large so that everybody benefits from this community investment. We believe some sort of a high-capacity elevator and an underground people mover deserves serious equal consideration, which must include both the initial capital costs and the operational and maintenance costs over time. The high-capacity elevator would be very similar to the one operating between max westside light rail and the zoo. The underground people mover would be quite similar to the airport people movers of seatac, seattle-tacoma airport, and Atlanta, two that comes to my mind an experience. We believe the following pluses would ensure -- to ohsu. It would be faster, as fast or faster and more efficient and likely of higher capacity than the tram. Elevators and people mover cars would come at quicker intervals than a tram. Also, an elevator will distribute people closer to their destination than a single tram stop. The connection to existing transit would be much better for ohsu employees. The annual operating cost would be much lower, leading to sizable cost savings over the years. An underground system is safer and more secure than an overhead tram. On the other hand, we believe the following benefits would flow to the neighborhoods and to the community at large. It would connect the several points with private transit to reduce traffic in the neighborhoods. It would allow easy access for neighborhoods to the north macadam area and greenway. And it would not visibly mar the neighborhoods like a tram or gondola. We therefore recommend full and equal analysis of such a system, and it is essential that the two alternatives or more be analyzed thoroughly, professionally, without bias, for both the capital costs and maintenance and operational costs over the reasonable lifetime of the project. Some rough ball park figures should be capital for the tram, \$60 million, versus \$50 million for the people mover. Obviously substantially higher cost of capital. But the operational costs over time, operational and maintenance over time would be 2.8 million per year for the tram versus around 600,000 for the people mover and elevator.

Katz: You're --

Polani: It is -- the savings over time on top of the advantages mentioned earlier that warrant serious consideration of the people mover and elevator alternative.

Katz: Thank you. Ray, you're --

Polani: In the interest of all the parties involved -- i'm sorry?

Katz: Your time is up. So finish up.

JUNE 26, 2002

Polani: May I close?

Katz: Oh, you're over your two -- three minutes.

Polani: In the interest of all the parties involved, including the citizens of this metro area, we expect that this will become the win-win compromise consensus, solution of source. Thank you for the opportunity to help you on somewhat controversial issue.

Katz: Thank you.

*****: Do I go first?

Katz: Go ahead.

Malea: Good evening, since it's now evening. My name is malia, and i'm here to speak mostly on a personal note since I live in the lair hill community, and my home -- my husband's home and my home were originally in the -- in the original plans to have the tram coming over our rooftop and our backyard. So, i'm here to support the rest of our neighborhood. And in regards to that, my husband purchased our home about 13 years ago, and when we married about six years ago, he was really excited about keeping this home. I was not real anxious to stay in the home because it was his home prior to me living there. I'm nervous, yes. I don't usually speak here. But at any rate, it didn't take long for him to convince me about the historic neighborhood and coming from the fitness profession, i'm involved in the health and fitness industry, I thought, you know, what a wonderful area to live in. So needless to say, we put just about everything we own into our home. It's 1400 square feet. It's not a big house, but we put everything and more into it. And with the intention of staying there. As a fitness professional, I might add that I also have the opportunity to work with visiting guests who are local hotels as an extension of their concierge. So therefore I have the opportunities to take individuals walking, hiking, biking, and seeing great summer days like today and one of the primaries is to terwilliger. And it's great because I live there, so I also know a lot about the city. I'm a native Oregonian. And it goes without words -- I mean, any of us that have been up there, the view is one of the most spectacular views you'll ever see. Probably anywhere in the world. And we have the opportunity to share these sights with many individuals that from all over the world, and it's from this standpoint both as a neighbor in the ctleh neighborhood and a homeowner and as a fitness professional that I have to say no tram, i'll say it the t-shirt. I thought this was our dress attire today. But at any rate, I have, you know, the position to state that I am obviously against the tram because I do not feel that it is beneficial to a residential neighborhood, and I think that it's going to take one of our most beautiful, historic sites and neighborhoods away from those who do come to visit the city. I know my three minutes is already -- they've started it again. [laughter] so, we're not debating that ohsu has not made contributions that are beneficial to our city, but the key word is our city, not just one institution's. And I think that we need to really look at that, and I believe that the city council listens carefully to the knowledge and suggestions that they've heard from many of the individuals today, that they will find other avenues to pursue. And I understand that it's much easier for other neighbors, such as lake oswego, to be in favor of the tram because they're going to look at more of the financial standpoint with ohsu and the city, but it won't be coming over the rooftops. It won't be coming into their neighborhood.

Katz: Thank you.

*****: Thank you.

Sean Brennan: I'm sean, 20 southwest gibbs. [reading testimony] mayor Katz, commissioner Saltzman, I am in support of the tram plan as it affects my neighborhoods -- who helped shape the neighborhood plan you have before you. There are issue there is remain in the plan we would like to see addressed, including the concerns our neighbors to the west have and will articulate. Cth,

JUNE 26, 2002

our issues have to do with the resistance to an aerial plan. We believe the planning commission intended to remove the references as they specifically recommend the tram between marquam hill and north macadam -- retained a few of these references we believe erroneously. These include on page 14 it states -- concurrent option and lineman options for the tram. In fact, when offered a linear alternative the commission stated it should be a linear process. On page 67, objective two states that the city must consider an additional fast reliable transportation system to link marquam hill and north macadam. We believe shuttle buses are that system and object to the language that any untried method of transportation must be policy. We'd like to see the word "additional" stricken from the objective. Also on page 67 objective four states -- framework for consideration of suspended cable ways. Although we agree the city must undertake such an effort before it -- the marquam hill plan is not the vehicle with which to do this. The plan -- no authority or reach outside of that reach area. This objective should be stricken from the plan. On page 183 we'd like to see all amendments listed on this page stricken from the plan. There is a substantial dispute whether the gazebo area -- overlook the view corridor or constitute the viewpoint. New corridors, we consider this to be -- defined view. The gazebo area has already been moved once to accommodate ohsu's needs, it should not be moved again, especially for the corridor. Other than these points we would like to see the plans go through as is, again with -- homestead has. We recognize and support ohsu's needs to expand, but we believe they should treat with equal weight the neighborhoods and livability most at risk. In conclusion, i'd like to commend the planning commission whose work was thorough and exemplary. They have been to date the only body in the city of Portland -- shadow of fairness and balance in this process so far. We call on the city council to respect their work, the knowledge of the subject and the recommendation they have placed before you. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Just somebody start.

Christopher Kopca, Design Commission: My name is christopher kopka. I'm sitting in my position as design commission. I guess my address is 9400 southwest fourth avenue. I want to let you know the planning commission asked the design commission look over the plan before you and ask specifically that we offer some observations on specific points such as building height. Commission did review the plan. I was overall generally impressed with the plan. Thought the staff put together a very reasoned and good plan. I heard reasoned and I thought that was one they used, in terms of balancing design issues for buildings, open space issues, connections between billings, and some transportation issues as well and felt it to be appropriately visionary. As I mentioned, the commission was specifically asked then to also address some height issues that the planning commission reviewed on but asked to us consider as well from two perspectives, one homestead neighborhood association and the other would be the overall skyline of the city. The commission undertook that work and, in fact, made some revisions, suggested revisions to the planning commission's approval of the document by reducing heights in a couple of locations and then specifically increasing the heights for a couple of buildings that otherwise would be nonconforming. Felt it was inappropriate to make good functioning buildings nonconforming buildings. Again, we increased heights to make certain billings nonconforming, in certain cases to better affect the skyline visioning for the document, reduce the height of a couple of sections of the district. I know you'll probably hear system from -- testimony from homestead and friends of terwilliger we didn't go far enough. We believe we took ourselves as low as we reasonably should, still trying to allow the kind of buildings that want to be on the hill. So the design commission offers up its recommendations to you in that regard.

Katz: Thank you, chris. Thank the work of the design commission.

JUNE 26, 2002

Gordon Davis, OHSU Master Planning Team: Mayor, members of the commission, my name is Gordon Davis. I'm part of the OHSU Master Planning Team. Susan characterized the plan as really fitting into seven functional categories, and within all of those categories the plan attempts to balance. But the one category that obviously receives the greatest amount of attention is really transportation. Let me just characterize for you what the plan does. It really has four strategies that are focused on transportation. First, it calls for a fairly dramatic reorganization of the campus.

To aid OHSU's internal functional sin energy, but also to enable us to better and much more effectively -- access. Third, to reduce peak hour traffic on Terwilliger specifically. The second strategy is it splits access between the very limited number of access points that do exist on the hill, particularly Campus Drive being allocated really for patients and visitors and Sam Jackson being allocated as access primarily for employees. That's a significant change from what exists today. The third strategy is that the plan places very specific traffic caps on individual designated local neighborhood streets. And the fourth strategy is the plan allows for limited but restricted amounts of growth and parking on the hill. With these four strategies, then, in the plan, the transportation analysis that looked at the plan both in the peer review and the city's traffic studies and OHSU's traffic studies concluded the one that there was sufficient capacity on the road network, even allowing the fact there would be growth in non-OHSU traffic. Secondly, that while 24-hour traffic on Terwilliger would actually increase north of Campus Drive, the peak hour traffic, both a.m. and p.m. Peak hour traffic on Terwilliger, would actually decrease over the future. And then third, that there would be no growth, in fact actually a reduction, of OHSU traffic on OHSU streets -- I'm sorry. On local neighborhood streets. That's the balance that the plan was trying to achieve, in a very, very difficult area of transportation and managing that access. Allowing OHSU some levels of growth, protecting neighborhood livability and protecting the Terwilliger Parkway. Allow me in my remaining seconds to quickly speak to the people mover proposal that you heard a little bit about. It is true that, in fact, that was proposed a number of months ago, a year or more ago, and we did, in fact, take a look at that. We had Hoffman Construction actually take the kind of concept and provide some cost -- rough cost estimates for doing that system. They actually came back with a range, 50-75 million was their belief on what it would take. What it represents is the equivalent of a tunnel that's about 3400 feet long going from North Macadam under essentially the Ctlh neighborhood, under Barbur and into the hills and under Terwilliger, and then about a 250-foot elevator rising from that point up to the top. It's a significant project, roughly equivalent to probably a third of the max tunnel through the West Hills.

Francesconi: Thanks for your testimony. I have several questions on this. First, I am concerned about Terwilliger Parkway. First, can you explain how the reorganization of the campus reduces traffic on peak hours on Terwilliger?

Davis: The OHSU has one of the most successful travel demand management programs in the region. But the greatest amount of its success is with its employees. It's much more difficult to manage the travel behavior of patients and visitors. We can do lots of things with employees for incentives, in transit, passes and so forth that allow us to achieve these kind of reductions in single occupancy rates. Right now all streets on the hill can be used for all people for all purposes at all times. So it's very difficult given that to manage specific points of access, whether they be on Terwilliger or Sam Jackson because we don't know who's going to use them and everybody can use them. The reorganization of the campus really says that as the campus is rebuilt, Campus Drive is going to be the principal point where patients and visitors enter the campus, where they enter OHSU. Employees will use Sam Jackson. So by disconnecting, if you will, the linkage between Campus Drive and Sam Jackson, turn over the campus, we can much more effectively manage the employee

JUNE 26, 2002

traffic on sam jackson and the traffic from campus to terwilliger. What we know about patient traffic is they are not peak hour users, that they are really spread through the course of the day. So we can spread that load on terwilliger much more effectively.

Francesconi: Can you say -- so how are you doing on your traffic management plans in terms of your own employees? Can you say more about that?

Davis: Presently the marquam hill transportation partnership, which includes ohsu, v.a., shriners, city of Portland, c-tran and tri-met, meets to actively develop techniques to manage access and transportation. Right now the single occupancy vehicle rate on the hill is right at 50%. That means 50% of the employees of those three major institutions do not come by automobile. Now, how they come is a combination of transit, through bus service, carpooling, biking and walking, and in some cases other techniques than walking and so forth. The goal that the transportation partnership has laid out is a goal that continues to reduce the single occupancy vehicle rate. That's an important part of the plan. The reduction of that rate. We disagree and have offered an amendment about the way in which we do that in terms of measuring it and the way in which we decrease it. But fundamentally, inside the plan, the plan continues to cause ohsu to work on that single occupancy vehicle rate. We're actually going to get down ultimately to 39%.

Francesconi: Can you get at that goal faster than the bureau planning talked about, do you think, or do you need that whole time?

*****: No. 50% is very achievable, and we've been able to do that. We're very confident about our ability to go beyond 50%. But it's like -- the last 10% of anything is the most difficult 10%, and that's not the last 10% here. Every percentage we reduce in single occupancy requires greater and greater effort, greater money, greater techniques to be able to do. We're confident we can get to 39%, but not in the time frame that's been suggested 24 the plan. Nor is it necessary in that time frame, according to the transportation forecast.

Francesconi: Thank you.

Saltzman: I have a question. Go ahead. I have a question of gordon. Why don't you go ahead and finish.

Cindy Littrell, 5481 Mohawk Ct. S., Salem 97306: My name is Cindy Littrell and you mentioned earlier the importance of the element of the patient. I am a patient. I have had chronic myelogenous leukemia and with standard treatment, there's an 80% chance that I would not be here today. But thanks to the ohsu and dr. Druker's miracle pill of gleevac, I am. I can't imagine anything more important to this community and to this state than the city council's approval of ohsu's expansion of marquam hill and their new facility on the waterfront. I was diagnosed in 1993 and I had a bone marrow transplant, but I had to go to seattle and move there for five months. My leukemia returned in 1999. But I didn't have to leave home. I went to ohsu, where I was able to receive excellent care and because of their research, I was able to participate in the clinical research of dr.Druker's, which saved my life. And it has also been proven to be very beneficial to many people around the world, actually. I'm afraid if we don't act now and increase the research opportunities in Oregon, more Oregonians, such as you or your family or friends, would have to leave Oregon to seek treatment. This opportunity to expand the research facilities is so important to patients, too. I urge the council to approve the marquam hill plan and allow ohsu to be able to continue their excellent care and expand their research abilities in order to all of us to maintain a healthy and productive life. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you very much.

Saltzman: Gordon?

Katz: Gordon, stay put.

JUNE 26, 2002

Saltzman: The testimony we heard earlier about friends of terwilliger about transportation policy 12, reinforcing the character of the terwilliger parkway as described in the plan --.

Katz: What page are you on?

Saltzman: Page 68. By acknowledging that traffic accessing marquam hill is local traffic. They pointed out that's a contradiction in terms. How does that call it local traffic? First of all, what is the significance of all this and that it does seem to contradict the corridor plan?

*****: Well --.

Saltzman: They're suggesting leaving that last part out.

Davis: The question is, what is local traffic? And the question -- as you would define local traffic, I think you would say that terwilliger has a function of providing access to those uses and activities that are accessed by terwilliger, that -- and ohsu is clearly accessed by terwilliger. There's just no denying that. So I guess we would argue that, in fact, ohsu traffic is local traffic. Granted that --.

Katz: You're getting some help.

Saltzman: Why do we bother by saying it reinforces the corridor plans if it doesn't.

*****: We should -- we should probably delete one-half of that statement or the other. It's local traffic, that's fine. I'm agree with you. It doesn't reinforce the corridor plan because it talks about a scenic freeway. Why try to reconcile two things that seem to be openly inconsistent?

Davis: That may be. I'd have to get in and really look at the specific proposal. I think the terwilliger plan when it was crafted did so with a very clear understanding ohsu was part of that local environment there. A lot of terwilliger was given to the city by the predecessors of ohsu with the understanding that it would continue to be able to be accessed via terwilliger and have the full rights to access. So I don't think we're really talking about anything that's that inconsistent. It is an integral part of terwilliger. It's an integral part of the neighborhood. I think what we've done in the plan is divide some strategies that have not been available to us before to really, truly narrow the range of impact associated with ohsu's lowell presence on that street.

Katz: So you are a part of the local traffic?

Davis: That's correct. That's correct.

Katz: All right. Thank you. Karla?

Katz: All right. How many more?

Moore: I have two more after that.

Katz: Two more, and then we'll either take a break or put a close to it. Go ahead.

Tony Koach, OHSU: My name's tony coach. Mayor Katz and councilmen, the reason I felt compel to do testify today is that I can offer the council perspective from two intimate vantage points. First, i'm an architect and a planner, and from 1983 to 1998, I worked in the facilities department at ohsu. I began with the construction of the neuroscience laboratory for the institute, and I ended with the development of the bed-to-bedside concepts that were incorporated into the hatfield research center. But secondly, more importantly, i'm a resident of the homestead neighborhood. I get to drive on terwilliger to go to the store. I get to run the nature trails up behind ohsu. During my ten year at ohsu I was fascinated by the history. I have an aerial photographs that document the history. First, these photographs show a very clear pattern of development on the hill, having established it's boundaries ohsu has always contained its growth within its boundaries. It has not spread into the neighborhood. Second, the photographs show from the beginning ohsu has always been an integral parts of the homestead neighborhood. It is not an recent intrusion but an integral part of the hill for the last several years. As you see from the photos you will see the residential-commercial sections of the neighborhood grew up. As the neighborhood grew, so did the density of the surrounding neighborhood. Beginning in the '80s my

JUNE 26, 2002

work centered on the planning required to the -- 20 years later, the cooperative efforts of the neighborhood, city, and university have been hugely successful and have brought us to this next threshold. The marquam hill plan builds on the elements of the past and is an excellent course for the future. It maintains ohsu's institutional boundaries and provides new opportunities for space and commercial development for the surrounding neighborhood. I also support the marquam hill plan as a homestead resident of even it's most controversial element. If the tram is approved and built I would be able to walk to the tram, ride to north macadam, enjoy the waterfront park, take the streetcar downtown and get a bite to eat and return home without ever getting into my car. The plan provides new and significant opportunities for open space through both the formal open area requirements and the new 45 acre open space. The hike -- and caps will assure us what the building massing will look like in the future. The design guidelines will assure all of us great attention will be paid to the design of the campus and its relationship to the neighborhood many I am convinced these essential elements will assure the quality of my neighborhood. In closing, i'd like to emphasize that obviously cities across the nation are vying for a piece of the a biotech pie. We have a thriving campus, one of the most desirable neighborhoods in the city and undeveloped land a stone's throw from the university. What an amazing opportunity and i'm excited it's happening in my own backyard. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Francesconi: Those photographs and that history is very helpful. That's interesting.

Koach: It's an eye opener.

Francesconi: Very interesting.

Katz: Thank you.

Clerk: -- wild and martin.

Katz: Is he here? Okay.

Martin Slapikas, Chair, Transportation Committee, Corbett-Terwilliger Lair Hill

Neighborhood Association: Good evening. I'm marty. I'm the chair of the lair hill transportation committee. And I submitted previous written testimony to you folks yesterday, and I just want to read the statement of the problem that I see. It remains the same. Ohsu has been invited to expand to the north macadam district, a city development designed major transportation and traffic problems. No solution to these problems have been offered that match the land use development, fast tracking request by some of the north macadam stakeholders. So the comments I have is I heard and listened to major hammerstead from lake oswego with some very great encouragement because one of the proposals to solve this two access problem with north macadam district, that will impact any business that goes in there, ohsu, intel who cares. Whatever goes in there is going to be hit by problems with traffic and transportation. And I was pleased to see that she's willing and interested in exploring opportunities for the lake oswego streetcar down to west linn. However

--

Francesconi: The Portland streetcar.

Slapikas: Okay, the Portland streetcar. Call it the corbett-terwilliger streetcar. [laughter] the issue, though, is will it be done and will it be in place at the time the first shovel goes into the dirt in north macadam to do any development? And, frankly, I think that's a false reach. I don't think that's going to happen. What do we do to get something going? And i'm suggesting that maybe we think of a water taxi. The design commission is going to be looking at north macadam district and one of the things that they were mandated to look at was the continued maritime theme of north macadam district. So far I don't see a maritime theme in north macadam district. If you put a water taxi in had or ferry all the way from downtown Portland, stop over at north macadam district when

JUNE 26, 2002

the time comes and on down to lake oswego, I think you could continue that and have a unique piece of transportation, that would alleviate traffic almost -- i'd say almost immediately, I would say within a year of the development. There are other recommendations I have made and given them to the transportation system plan and also the north macadam hearings. But i'm concerned that we are creating a traffic jam for whoever, whatever business goes into that district. One of the things that -- I don't believe anybody has said they wanted to disconnect at campuses, and it's the mode of connection that's in dispute. And this is not necessarily a tram hearing. I'll reserve those comments for later. But until I see the tram solving a transportation issue created by the north macadam districts, i'm just holding off judgment. Show me.

Katz: Thank you. You want to come back up again in you're tired, I know. But come on up. You wanted to say something before we work through the next steps? Grab the mic. You don't have to talk if you don't want to. But I thought you wanted to respond.

Kelley: No, I think that we'll probably use tomorrow's session to just -- I think we were very care. To record, not me so much as susan, and troy and matt were writing furiously, and I think we prefer to sort of organize what we heard today, that would translate it as an amendment request into some clusters of issues that we could walk you through tomorrow and deal with in that way.

Katz: All right. How do you want to handle -- that's fair enough. I want everybody who at least stayed to understand that the amendment concepts were the ones that were discussed today that were raised by the neighborhoods and representatives of the neighborhoods, ohsu. How do you want to deal with the staff issues? Some of them are the same as the bureau.

Hartnett: We'll include everything that's come in, whether it came from the city bureau or from the public or from ohsu.

Kelley: And from your own.

Hartnett: As well as the three housekeeping items we proposed.

Kelley: We started categorizing those on the list.

Katz: All right. If you change your mind on any of them that you had proposed to the planning commission, just yank them off.

Francesconi: So you'll present them all to us, all the amendments?

Hartnett: Yes. My goal is to get it to your offices by noon tomorrow so that if you're not otherwise occupied, you could look at it in advance. Otherwise, we will --.

Katz: We'll walk through all of them, and we'll have -- the way we've done it before, we'll have a representative from -- i'm thinking out loud. If it's not a good idea, i'll scrap it. But we'll have representatives from the neighborhood and we'll have representatives from ohsu and some of them, their questions, we'll turn to them and others we'll just proceed.

Hartnett: We've also asked staff from several bureaus to be here, a number of the issues that have been raised.

Francesconi: After i'm done spending the evening coming up with more amendments, who do I give them to? That was a joke. I'm kidding. [laughter]

Hartnett: Send them to me, commissioner, Francesconi, as quickly as you can.

Saltzman: I think i'm going to need some legal counsel on mous in the contract. What does that mean, performance and remedies?

Katz: That just remind me --.

Saltzman: Can somebody provide us with that before tomorrow?

*******:** Why don't you do it now, kathryn.

Beaumont: I was going to say i'd be happy to talk with you after the meeting or before the meeting tomorrow, in whatever fashion you want.

JUNE 26, 2002

Saltzman: I really want it on the record.

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

Katz: Okay. There were other -- thanks for reminding me. There were other legal issues that are buried in some of these reports, whether this is a -- or not. I'd like for those to come out as well. Not that they were amendments, but commissioner Saltzman just reminded me we need to clarify those.

Kelley: In going through, what we organized by topic area, but within those I think we tried to annotate which of the amendment requests we feel are simply housekeeping and, frankly, some of those came from us, which are sort of major policy decisions that may be the same or different from the planning commission's decision, which are really sort of about tweaking of regulatory structure that may not rise to the level of a major policy decision. And which may be some new ideas that have some problematic aspects from the vantage point of one of the implementing bureaus, to try to give you some way --.

Francesconi: That would be helpful, actually. That would be very helpful. You're going to have to sort out -- this will be hard. I'm going to request it if nobody else does and I think the mayor hinted at it. We're going to need the planning commission's opinion and I'm going to ask you your opinion on these. I don't know if you want to categorize them that way or wait for me to ask you.

Katz: I've asked to categorize them that way.

Hartnett: We have flagged on the amendments table which we've already begun which are issues the planning commission previously heard and either didn't recommend or recommended with a different approach than the amendment request.

Katz: And why.

Kelley: I haven't necessarily included that.

Katz: You don't need to do that, but share that. Because we respect their work, but as I said, we not always agree with everything -- every detail of it. The transportation issues with regard to -- Matt did analysis of the shuttle. Do we have anything that we can look at for people movers or any of the other ideas? I don't know if anybody is interested in them, but it's come up a couple of times. I don't know how stable the hill is.

Kelley: We were just talking about that. The peer review panel did look at the idea of putting in an underground passage way or people mover. So we have that reference point. I think it's also important that we talk with Matt tomorrow or possibly for the subsequent session to really fix the notion a little. On the cost side are we comparing apples to apples.

Francesconi: We have to have realistic limits. I don't think I need Matt Brown to tell me how much that's going to cost.

Kelley: I think one of the okays I heard in the testimony from a couple speakers today is we were counting only capital costs with some alternatives and discounting other ones because of operational. So I think we wanted to make sure --.

Katz: It was the maintenance costs, the maintenance costs.

Kelley: Apples to apples.

Katz: Okay. Tomorrow 2 o'clock and we'll stay until we're finished. And then that will flag for everybody that's here all the issues that at least there are two of us will be kind to each other, but there'll be two of us that will have to support the amendments to rise to being present at a public -- for the public to respond to them the following week. Okay. Good night, everybody. We stand adjourned. [gavel pounded]

JUNE 26, 2002

At 6:00 p.m., Council recessed.

JUNE 27, 2002

JUNE 27th, 2002

2:00 PM

[roll call]

Katz: All right. Karla, why don't you read all the items.

Item 732: Items 727, 728 and 729 Continued

Katz: Why don't we have gil and susan up here. This is what we're going to do. Have patience with us. We've done this before. We'll get through it. It will take a little bit of time, and as I said yesterday, we'll go through each individual amendment. Some will take absolutely no time, some will take time. And I predict there's about six or seven that will take major conversations between us and staff and even some of our guests. I'd like to get a hint from the council as we go through each one of them which ones you want to come back to, because you think there is conversation that needs to be had, and which ones we can make decisions right away. Is that okay with you?

Francesconi: Do you want a hint? Is that all you want?

Katz: As we go through them. This one is troublesome to me, or this -- and we need to come back for further conversation. And then we can come back to the six or seven of them.

Saltzman: And we need our discussion on mou.

Katz: Yes. Don't forget the mou. Memorandum of understanding mou item 8-1. -- a-1.

Susan Hartnett, Bureau of Planning: Would you like me to quickly walk you through the table so you know how it's organized?

Katz: Quickly.

Hartnett: What I tried to do is chunk things together. The topics are miscellaneous, which is a, economic development, which is b, suspended cable transportation system, c, in d you have all the transportation policy objectives and action item amendments, and think there's 39 of those all together. There's 39 of those all together. So then on page 8 you'll find topic e, which is parking regulations and reviews, on page 10 you'll see plan district regulations, which are sort of the general plan district regulation that's were discussed. Topic g, site review, topic h, design review, topic i, environmental issues and reviews, topic j, land use policy objectives and action items, topic k is the marquam hill community policy objectives and action items, and top I can l is the open space and natural resources policy objectives and action items.

Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning: We also have dean marriott here and members of other bureaus.

Katz: We'll call them up when there's the issue that we want to come back to talk about.

Kelley: I just note the environmental issues are pretty deep into the agenda, so --

Katz: Dean, what's -- do you want to stay? Okay. Let's go through a-1, a-2, a-3, which appear to be housekeeping items.

Hartnett: That's correct. Those were the items the bureau of planning staff proposed. The first one is to correct an error in the code language as we originally presented it. We were not consistent with what the planning commission's intent was. It was actually brought to our attention by one of the planning commissioners, so it is a correction to make the text be what it should be to say what they want. The second one is just a missing word, and the third one I think I mentioned yesterday, the introduction section for -- to the recommended design guidelines. We had tried to have a more streamlined document, but that means there's some inconsistencies between what we put in front of you and what are typical -- our typical design guideline document looks like, and it was brought to our attention that we should have more consistency, so we propose to replace the entire introduction rather than give you a bunch of strike-through, underlines. It just provides more information to the public.

JUNE 27, 2002

Katz: Okay. A-4, let me kind of make a decision right away. A-4 was a recommendation to reject the planning commission changes to the proposed marquam hill in its entirety, and i'm going to recommend that we set that aside, and there will be items that I know appeared on a list that we may want to consider, but I don't think we're going to sit here and --

Hartnett: If the council wants to direct us to not prepare that amendment, we're very happy to take that direction.

Katz: We'll get to the issues. We'll go through the issues i'm sure that are -- I think are the critical ones.

Kelley: As I recall, the speaker yesterday, in his verbal testimony, really talked primarily about the next two on the list, b-1 and c-1.

Katz: So we'll cross off a-4. All right.

*******:** A-1, 2, 3 are fine.

Hartnett: You want an amendment on those?

Francesconi: Yes.

Katz: Okay. B-1.

Hartnett: This is the policies and objectives that were initially proposed to amend the comprehensive plan goal 5 on economic development. And the proposal is to reinstate those. And psu asked specifically that we include the amendments to the action charts that they asked for, which made them implementers on several of those.

Francesconi: I think the mayor commented yesterday, I think this is important that we add this back. I also like the addition of psu.

Katz: I would like to reference the science and technology quarter, we identified that. It's not bad to do it. Don't make it -- let me just recommend that we don't take the whole language that was at - - that ohsu had proposed. Just -- this is an economic strategy. We have it in other plans, I have no idea why they took it out. So you'll draft some language?

Hartnett: I certainly will.

Katz: I like the idea of referencing psu. And if you think we need to do ogi or not --

Hartnett: Actually, staff had proposed amendments to our own language to the planning commission doing just that. We had wanted to expand our references instead of saying ohsu to talk more about medical and research and educational institutions in general, and talk about their partnering and their expansion and how that feeds our economy. So that's what i'll look to do in this revision.

Katz: Is that all right with everybody? All right. C-1.

Hartnett: This gets into the suspended cable transportation system revisions. The first one is the request to reinstate the policies objectives and action items regarding the suspended cable system that were included in the proposed marquam hill plan.

Katz: We sort of got to this almost quickly. Does the council want to flag this one to come back for discussion, or are you ready to talk about it now?

Saltzman: I guess I -- i'd like a little discussion. What's the significance one way or the other, given we're developing a separate policy around suspended cable transportation systems? Am I missing something here?

Kelley: No, you're not. Let me take a crack at what I understand --

Katz: That was the same question I asked you the other day, why -- that's a good question.

Kelley: Let me take a crack and ask susan to fill in. The planning commission felt that neither the -- as a whole, and i'm characterizing roughly the whole group here, felt that neither the documentation about the need for a system was sufficient to justify policy language in a plan, nor

JUNE 27, 2002

that specific impacts about the potential systems were known in sufficient detail to warrant making a policy statement that some kind of aerial system ought to be contemplated and in fact allowed. In the plan document, even though the proposal before them had been to allow it subject to a subsequent process it could evaluate specific impacts. Therefore, they deleted those references except to say that some additional convenient reliable fast transportation system of some kind ought to connect the two parts of the campus. They then were comfortable having the pdot process evaluate that and return at some point during that process to either them or to you to say, okay, now we have the discussion about those policy statements, and whether they ought to be reinserted in the plan. I think one objective in having the update that you asked for, the update yesterday from matt brown on where along the process pdot was, in terms of at least the level of justification for some kind of aerial system. So if you feel that was sufficient or feel differently than the planning commission, you could insert this language. It would still require the completion of the pdot process. What it wouldn't require is coming back and amending the plan to allow for it. Did I get that right?

Hartnett: I would insert one additional piece. The planning commission felt we need a brand-new citywide policy on suspended cable transportation systems as a whole, and a work program to examine them and then classify them in the zoning code. And I would mention that the office of transportation provided them, a couple of memos that indicated they disagreed with that assessment about the lack of sufficient citywide policy. The office of transportation, steve is here, feels strongly that there is sufficient policy to evaluate this question within the context of the marquam hill plan and make a determination on the appropriateness of this kind of system, and they did concur with the proposal that the bureau of planning presented to the planning commission.

Katz: We may want to hear from -- are we all three prepared to deal with this right now? I'd like to hear from steve.

Saltzman: I guess -- maybe this helps the understanding, it seems to me this decision should be made on july 10th, when we make a decision about the suspended cable transportation system, or not.

Hartnett: I think the decision that I need from you today is whether or not you want me to prepare amendments for the marquam hill plan. But I also think that the question about the adequacy of citywide policy and whether or not we need to not --

Saltzman: I'm not concerned about the citywide policy.

Hartnett: That would be -- insertion of the policy statements would be based on the adequacy of existing policy. It's the question about which system that the pdot process is providing you information on. What the marquam hill plan provides is a policy framework within the marquam hill plan to say that it is an appropriate system for the purposes of connecting marquam hill and north macadam. The marquam hill plan does not speak to which kind of system. It simply says, if you're going to create the kind of connection needed, it needs to be a suspended system that. Was the proposal bureau of planning presented to the planning commission?

Francesconi: Can I ask a question now? Can you tell me, this is -- why did you think it was important that I think the language in the request. C-1, 2, and 3 be in the proposal that you submitted to planning? The planning commission? Why did you do that?

Hartnett: Well, I think there's -- i'll add a little and gil will probably jump in. First of all, we felt that there was pretty broad and overwhelming evidence that the connection, the travel time connection that ohsu had premised in their expansion plan had been confirmed through both the report on building bioscience in which patel used a process of benchmarking travel time needs at other institutions to assess the veracity or the certainty of ohsu's statements about needing a 10- to

JUNE 27, 2002

15-minute travel time. Secondly, we felt that the pedestrian survey work that we did independently on marquam hill also confirmed that, confirmed that the people who work at ohsu right now rely on that. And you certainly heard testimony about that kind of travel time need. We were also pretty convinced by the transportation peer review panels assessment that there wasn't going to be a ground-based system that was going to provide the kind of travel times reliably, and they really stressed reliably part, that yes, there are times of day you can make that trip by vehicle from marquam hill to north macadam, but there are also times of day when you can't, and it's the issue of the reliability that the report the talked about that if researchers and doctors are going to do their jobs, they need to know that the trip across the hall or down the street is only going to take ten minutes and isn't going to take a half an hour, 45 minutes. And there was actually someone who testified about that yesterday. I don't remember which one of the ohsu doctors it was that testified about that. Do you want to add anything?

Kelley: I think that for a variety of reasons, the way the regulatory structure works, we felt there needed to be changes in the regulatory structure up front that would allow some kind of system, even if that system was to be specified in a subsequent process. Otherwise, you were bound to come back and loop through the policy making legislative function to grant the -- even the authority to effectuate it. So we had tried to do sort of one pass at that and then leave the details, including the final decision in front of the council before a public hearing, not the one scheduled in july, but even a subsequent one to be able to say no to any specific system if you felt on balance it wasn't either sufficient for its purpose or had too burdensome an impact on the neighborhood that you could deny it. And that was understood by ohsu and the other parties involved. What it didn't require was then having a subsequent legislative finding at that stage, at the plan level, to authorize it. That was the distinction we were trying to make. The planning commission, just to be clear, wasn't convinced about the information that susan just described, and they felt that -- they felt hesitant to make a policy statement that would even conditionally allow this kind of transportation device, because it was such a unique thing in the city, until they understood more specifics about a certain system and its impacts.

Katz: Let me ask you, would you reference back to the staff recommendations on page 71, and the action items on page 76, or would you --

Hartnett: In the proposed document? The proposed marquam hill plan? Or the recommended?

Katz: The staff -- the staff. Is that what you want?

Hartnett: What were the page numbers again?

Katz: Page 71 and page 76 on the action items. Is that what you would -- if we decided yes that we wanted that kind of language back, is that what you recommend?

Hartnett: Yes, it is.

Kelley: It was in the staff draft.

Katz: It's in the staff document.

Hartnett: It's objectives 2, 3, and 4, and action items 26, 27, and 28. On the pages you just quoted. That is what we would propose to reinsert.

Saltzman: Would there be a problem with adopting a subsequent legislative finding when we make that final decision? Does that present a problem? Lodge -- from a logistical point of view?

Hartnett: Other than reversing the time certain on the july 10th date, no it would not. Well, actually it does, because the time frame right now looks to the council making a decision on the amendments on july 3rd. And the july 10th is just the final decision on the package as a whole. So it would be -- we'd either have to come back and amend the marquam hill plan sometime after -- sometime after july tends. I think the point gil was making is really important, because just

JUNE 27, 2002

because we put this policy language in, and even if we put the regulatory language in, it doesn't mean it has to happen. The pdot process provides two additional opportunities for council to say, no, a suspended cable system isn't the right thing. On balance, the --

Katz: Even though it appears --

Hartnett: Absolutely. This allows it to occur. It doesn't require it to occur. There's nothing that says you must do this. It simply says the door is open for you to do it.

Kelley: To answer your question more directly, I think it would require a different notice and a different form of your action.

Saltzman: I'm comfortable with putting it back in now.

Katz: Okay.

Francesconi: I am too.

Katz: Okay.

Hartnett: Do you want amendments on c-1, 2, and 3?

Katz: Right. Wait a minute. You want amendments on c-1, and objectives 2, 3, and 4 and the action items. C-2.

Hartnett: Amending the boundaries of the marquam hill plan to include a portion of the terwilliger parkway east of campus drive, as was contemplated in the original proposal, and again, that's to apply regulation that's would allow a suspended cable but not make one a certainty.

Katz: By agreeing to c-1, we would need to agree to c-2.

Hartnett: It would make sense.

*******:** And c-3.

Hartnett: It's the implementing language that does that in c-2 and 3. I would like to have a short -

Saltzman: Otherwise it would be a conditional use in open space?

Hartnett: Correct. And the other piece of that is that the office of planning and development review, their read of the zoning code is even were you not to put that regulation in there, that the portion of the system, if it's a tram, that would go over terwilliger, would not likely be subject to any land use review because it isn't -- there's no structure associated with it. And that really leaves a lot of confusion for the office of planning and development review and the public, and they think it's important that we clarify. If the council is supporting the notion of this system, do it in both the policy and the regulatory framework.

Katz: Okay.

Hartnett: I would like to ask you briefly, on that boundary issue, initially the boundary that we had proposed to include in terwilliger parkway was fairly extensive, because at the time we really were not sure what kind of system we would be looking at. If you look on page --

Katz: Whose report?

Hartnett: You'll need to look at the staff proposal.

Katz: On page --

Hartnett: Let me find a page. Let's see. If you look on page 35 of the proposed document, the one -- march 22nd, you'll see, this is a map of the plan district. Have you all found that? You'll note that the jagged edge piece on the upper right-hand corner of the plan district boundary, the portion beyond terwilliger boulevard is the parkway, and we had done a fairly broad swath of land, because we really weren't sure at that point what kinds of system options we'd be looking at. What I'd like to make suggest is that we cut that back. I'd like to use the six options that pdot has looked at and use the -- the maximum amount of land that might be impacted by any one of those systems. In other words, not key it directly to the proposal in front of you, allow some leeway still, but cut

JUNE 27, 2002

that down a little bit. I know the bureau of parks and recreation was a little concerned about how large that land area was. So i'd like to make it a little smaller than what we originally proposed.

Francesconi: That would be good.

Hartnett: It would bring the north end down. Probably -- you see how it starts to stair step up? Probably two or three stair steps up and the rest of it I would cut off.

Kelley: By about two blocks at the north end or maybe even three blocks.

Katz: And tell me what the implications of that are.

Hartnett: Again, we're going to provide a regulatory opportunity, and if we narrow the land area, we are narrowing the regulatory opportunity.

Katz: Got it.

*****: We're still leaving it broad enough --

*****: It's narrowed a little bit.

Katz: All right.

Hartnett: We had done this intentionally to be able to talk --

Katz: We'll hear testimony about that.

*****: That's not on pdot's --

Katz: Is that all right with everybody? Okay. So we've agreed on c-1, c-2, c-3, c-4. Could you explain to me the linear process to a concurrent process?

Hartnett: Yeah. Where do I have a -- can you get out the two processes that the planning commission looked at?

Katz: This is planning language?

Kelley: No, actually it was reference to a graphic.

Saltzman: Engineering language.

*****: Do you remember matt brown's diagram he had up here with the resolution?

Hartnett: We took two -- we took pdot's recommendation on the process to the planning commission. The planning commission said there's two steps missing here, one is this citywide policy development, and so we then showed them two alternative ways that that policy development phase might be added in. One was side by side with the pdot process, concurrent with the pdot process. One was to stick it in between two steps of the pdot process, and they referred to that as the linear process. So one was concurrent side by side, and one was linear.

Kelley: I think this may be moot now with your sense of c-1, 2 --

Hartnett: I think it is. I think it would be perhaps inappropriate to amend -- the -- none of the planning commission members feel the document in front of you misspeaks to what their discussion was, and I think it might be inappropriate. I think you guys -- matt --

Katz: Forget it. That's not included.

Hartnett: Okay. It's so hard to describe a visual aide without the visual aide.

Katz: C-5.

Hartnett: This would not be appropriate. You have now decided that objective 2 is being replaced with something that came out of the staff proposal. So what's in the current document as objective 2 will not appear in the amendments. So this -- I will not prepare this amendment.

Katz: C-6.

Francesconi: Conflict.

Hartnett: Right. This is another one. If we remove objective 4, then it's conflicting --

Katz: All right. C-6 is out.

*****: Okay.

Katz: All right. D-1.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: These get hard.

Francesconi: On this one, there's a split in the neighborhood, and I think it should be in the memorandum of understanding. So it should be through the negotiation process.

Hartnett: Which one are you talking about?

Francesconi: D-1.

Katz: Was there a vote on -- anton, was there a vote on this one?

Anton Vetterlein: Not on this one.

Hartnett: On the traffic calming? Is that --

Saltzman: I want to keep that one in there, the traffic calming.

Hartnett: D-1 is ohsu's request to eliminate the traffic calming action items. That's what it says. Delete t-13, 14, and 15 which call for traffic calming on various streets. And what they're saying there is we sort of have two things happening here. In the type a parking review, we are now requiring the institutions to show that their impacts on these local streets remain below a certain level. And those levels are pegged to the 2,000 traffic counts on those streets. Action items t-13, 14, and 15 specifically seek to reduce the traffic on those streets. So there's a little bit of a conflict and contradiction between those where on the one hand we're saying, let's implement action items that reduce those traffic counts, and then let's monitor them on top of that. So I think it's a legitimate thing to bring to your attention.

Kelley: I'm not sure there's a conflict, because to do the traffic calming we would need a process with the neighborhood and -- there may be cases where you couldn't do effective traffic calming.

Saltzman: I read t-14 as keeping that as an option, if compliance with the caps is not otherwise working. This is an option --

Hartnett: We'd need to rewrite the action items to say that. Right now they're very explicit --

Katz: What page is it? Can you talk while I look at it?

Hartnett: If you look on page 71 and 72, we very specifically added as the result of the planning commission discussions on all of these begin planning process by january 1st, 2004 and complete improvements by december -- we're very explicit in these action items that they must be done, and these are on the list of items to be included in the memorandum of understanding with a specific note that we think an intergovernmental agreement on funding needs to be included. So again, if we're actually going to involve ohsu in a traffic reduction scheme, and I agree with gil, that if the community says we don't want traffic calming, I think that's kind of a catch-22 for ohsu. If the neighborhood says we don't want you to limit our access and at the same time limit ohsu traffic access to reduce the impacts, then over time asking ohsu to monitor it when there then is no solution, again, I think that's a bit of a catch-22.

Francesconi: And here's where i'm coming from. If i'm missing this, transportation stand up and tell me. It seems like there was some negotiation going on in terms of the trip numbers in order to put a cap on the amount of trips coming out and some compromise was reached on that. That's one factor. The second is that there's some split at least in the neighborhood on traffic calming, but the three is, we're going to have to be negotiating with ohsu about things we want from them through the mou process. They're going to cost money, and so I want to make sure that in the mou process, for example, is it storm water? Is it traffic calming? Is it the conservation that we need on the ozone? What is it we want? We need time to set some priorities and negotiate after some conversations with the neighborhoods so we're clear about what we want in the mou. If we mandate this, which as I interpret it, if we leave the current language we're mandating it. Then our ability to use the mou process to get other things are not going to happen. That's why I think this should be deleted. Argue with me.

JUNE 27, 2002

Katz: Let me just say this is more than just traffic calming.

Hartnett: I'm sorry?

Katz: It's more than just traffic calming.

Hartnett: Yes, it's various techniques to restrict or constrain access via the local street system.

Katz: I just wanted to clarify that. Argue with commissioner Francesconi.

Saltzman: I'm trying to suggest we leave it in as an option. Don't say the planning process begins

--

Hartnett: That's what i'm hearing --

Saltzman: Then it begins --

Kelley: Why don't we put in language that gives us leeway depending on the outcome of the mou.

Katz: Did you want an answer?

Francesconi: If you've solved the problem without answering the question, no. I don't need an answer.

Hartnett: What i'm hearing commissioner Saltzman say, and I think it does address your concern, is that if we modify t-13, 14, and 15 to eliminate the language that directs when this is going to be done, it puts it into the same category as all the other action items, we keep it in the mou, it's a negotiation on the table, and then at some point if we're going to keep the traffic volume approval criteria, we may need to come back to the plan district and figure out if that's still appropriate.

Katz: Okay. So modify those items, keep them there, but remove the dates.

Kelley: We may still be getting them on the dates but we would want to go through the mou process --

Katz: Okay. Show us different language, then. All right D-2.

Hartnett: D-2 and D-3

Katz: And d-3.

Hartnett: Request that fairmont marquam hill road be added to these two action items. And I need to tell you that I think there's a problem with this. Fairmont marquam hill road are -- is a neighborhood collector segment. It's not a local street segment. It's also a primary emergency response route, and we cannot use traffic calming or traffic access limitations on a major emergency response route.

Saltzman: What about humphrey boulevard?

Hartnett: I'd have to look to see what it's --

Saltzman: If you can deal with the problem on humphrey, you won't have the problem on fairmont.

Hartnett: I'm not sure where humphrey is. Fairmont joins up with patton.

Saltzman: Humphrey -- it gets complicated around council crest. If you're westbound on u.s. 26 and you're getting off at sylvan, you're going to be taking humphrey boulevard.

Kelley: It does not appear on the emergency response street map.

Hartnett: It's also probably eight miles from --

Saltzman: But it's the way -- if you believe that people do get off at sylvan to go to ohsu, there's a credible argument, humphrey boulevard is what you want to keep them off of.

Hartnett: You might want rob burchfield to step up here and offer information on that.

Katz: Come up and tell us a little bit -- i've walked humphrey over and over again. It's a rather narrow -- it's a winding --

Hartnett: Are you familiar with what the discussion was yesterday?

JUNE 27, 2002

Robert Burchfield, Office of Transportation: I think I am in general familiar with what the discussion or what the intent was. We're actually currently in discussions with residents of humphrey boulevard about a speed bump project for their street. It's complicated somewhat because there is a parallel route of hewitt, which though it's more narrow and more winding, does get you from the same origin to the same destinations, connect, and is an alternative route. So we're trying to come up with a process that's win-win for folks and doesn't potentially push traffic from one street on to another. That's background. To answer your question, you have quite a network of neighborhood collector streets that are really coming together in that area. Do you have patton, there's alternative routes people could be taking to get to, from, destinations on the west side. They could be coming b-h highway and coming up routes like hamilton, they could be coming across from scholls ferry, from u.s. 26, I don't think it possible to say that you're going to really control access or mitigate traffic on any of those routes, or all those routes.

Saltzman: But those are all connectors and probably emergency response routes.

Hartnett: Most of those are.

Saltzman: Humphrey isn't.

Burchfield: I think humphrey isn't an emergency response route, but it is a neighborhood collector. Functionally it's meant -- what you have is basically between beaverton hillsdale highway and the sunset highway, you don't have anything but neighborhood collectors. And when you're bounded by scholls ferry on the west. That network of neighborhood collectors has to serve a variety of trip purposes, and you --

Hartnett: Humphrey is a neighborhood collector street.

Burchfield: So it's difficult to say that functionally those are inappropriate trips when they're on that street. You can't get from the sunset highway to ohsu without -- you either go through downtown or take one of those neighborhood collector streets. So there's a lot of legitimate trips that could be occurring on those streets.

Saltzman: Those are legitimate streets on -- trips on a neighborhood collector?

Burchfield: Well, yeah. You have to serve a broad diversity of trips because there are no other streets of higher classifications as an alternative.

Kelley: Do you recall the percentage numbers of ohsu-related trips coming off fairmont and marquam hill road?

Burchfield: I don't, but that's something I could research and potentially come back to.

Hartnett: I seem to recall that the number of ohsu trips on fairmont, marquam hill road has been decreasing since they started taking the counts in '85 or whatever the time frame is. Does that sound right to you?

Burchfield: Yeah. I think it's been not increasing significantly.

Saltzman: Rob, the testimony yesterday was that when u.s. 26 and the sylvan interchange are finished, reengineered, the construction work going on, it will be more conducive for westbound traffic on u.s. 26 headed for ohsu to get off at sylvan and take humphrey and -- rather than go down to duniway park and go up that way. That was kind of the basis of the concern, was that westbound u.s. 26 to have -- do you have any thoughts on that?

Burchfield: No. I don't think it would be, but i'm sure some people might perceive it that way and some people might choose to make a trip that way. Again, you can't be certain of those choices people will make.

Saltzman: Just prepare an amendment and i'd like to look into this further between now and mechanics monday.

JUNE 27, 2002

Katz: I'll support that. I'm not yet clear as to the impact of it, but let's at least prepare an amendment on humphrey boulevard.

Francesconi: Has anybody suggested this before now? Through this whole process? Has anybody suggested any amendment regarding humphrey?

Hartnett: Homestead neighborhood actually in particular tom miller has raised concerns about fairmont, marquam hill road throughout the process.

Francesconi: Now we're talking about humphrey.

Hartnett: No, no one has mentioned it.

Francesconi: I think it's dangerous. The idea much us making amendments up here at the last minute is not the way to do a process.

Hartnett: And i'd like to understand what the mayor and commissioner Saltzman are asking for --

Katz: I'm only doing it as a courtesy --

Hartnett: Are you asking for a new action item that would seek to implement traffic calming --

Saltzman: No, but to add rather than adding fairmont and marquam, i'd add --

Hartnett: I wouldn't add it, because that speaks to local streets. So it would be a new action item.

Saltzman: I do think -- I want to educate myself a little more --

Katz: Commissioner Francesconi, that will give you an opportunity to sit down with transportation staff and review that.

Hartnett: Then you're not -- you're not asking for a specifically d-2 and d-3.

Saltzman: Right.

Katz: All right. The next series of amendments speaks to I think there's three or four of them --

Hartnett: D-4 and d-5. They speak to not allowing campus drive to be used as a, quote, main entrance to ohsu or reassigning as the second one says, the patient visitor access to sam jackson.

Saltzman: I'm comfortable with the way it is.

Katz: Okay.

Hartnett: D-6 is objective 12, which -- there's quite a bit of discussion about this yesterday. It says reinforce the character of terwilliger parkway as described in the corridor plan and acknowledge traffic accessing marquam hill and -- acknowledge that it's local traffic. The amendment request would be to delete the second half of that. I'd like to say the first half of that sentence was intentionally added by the planning commission based on input that they received. So initially the statement had just to do with acknowledging that institutional traffic is local traffic, and the planning commission asked us to make sure that we were being cognizant of the terwilliger parkway -- terwilliger parkway plan as well as the nature of the traffic.

Francesconi: This one, I was confused yesterday, and I am concerned about terwilliger parkway, I don't understand what this does one way or another, i'm sorry.

Kelley: I've been confused about this myself. Let me try and these two can probably fill in the gaps. Terwilliger parkway allows local traffic, and the question here, I think the debate has been about whether ohsu is considered local traffic. Clearly traffic traveling along between beaverton ton hillsdale highway and downtown cutting through terwilliger and not going through would be through traffic. Even though it's substantial, traffic would be considered low traffic by pdot because it's only access -- its only access is from terwilliger parkway or its primary access is from terwilliger parkway. So it is local traffic for that purpose, and it's important to make that clear. The second question is whether that policy conflicts with the intent of the terwilliger parkway plan. I think -- i'm asking for additional clarity here from these two about whether there is a --

JUNE 27, 2002

Katz: I just received a letter from christie on that particular subject, because I think I raised that issue. I don't know if you're all -- you all have seen it.

Saltzman: I've seen it. It seems to imply the parkway plan makes a similar acknowledge that accessing marquam hill is local.

Katz: And I think that's the issue, and there probably is disagreement --

Hartnett: It's the use of the term "through traffic" there are several places where it says reinforce its character as a scenic drive and not a main thoroughfare for through traffic. A lot of the folks in the community consider ohsu through traffic. We felt in this process to help clarify, and to help clarify the council's policy decision, that it was local traffic according to pdot's transportation policies, and therefore consistent. In addition, I just wanted to mention the d restrictions, the deed allowances in terwilliger parkway that specifically allow the successors to the donators of that land to use terwilliger as access and ohsu is one of the successors to the original donators.

Saltzman: That was the nature of the research.

Hartnett: Steve is interested in --

Katz: Identify yourself.

Steve Gerber, Office of Transportation: Steve gerber with Portland office of transportation.

One more thing I would add to that, the transportation policies of the terwilliger parkway specifically define local traffic, and that does include traffic to the facilities there on marquam hill.

Francesconi: So pdot's opposed to this amendment, is that what you're saying?

Gerber: Yes.

Francesconi: Okay. Thank you. Stay right there, pdot, for now.

Kelly: The other aspect here, though, aside --

Francesconi: Or you can sit right here. We have an empty seat.

Kelley: I think the other aspect here, aside from how we technically classify things, the testifiers were saying it's the -- regardless of how you qualify it as local or through, it's the volume and speed of traffic destined for that use that is of concern. And we have tried to do that not by trying to change the terwilliger parkway plan, but by to do other traffic mitigation efforts through the plan itself, through the marquam hill plan to get at that issue.

Katz: Okay. D-7.

Hartnett: The answer on d-6 is you do note want this in the amendment.

Katz: Right.

Hartnett: D-7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are all similar in what they're asking for. They're looking for either additional policy or action items or something that goes farther than what we've done to require limitations, reductions, on institutional traffic on terwilliger parkway. I'll give you a minute to read all of them.

Francesconi: There's a fine.

Katz: Any interest in adopting any one of these beyond what's in the plan already? We can't forget that --

Katz: There's quite a bit in the plan already.

Saltzman: Fine.

Katz: Okay? All right.

Hartnett: D-12. D-12, 13 and 14 all relate to satellite parking and the use of shuttle systems to link satellite parking. So the first one is a new objective and action item that call for specific development of a satellite park and ride facility connecting marquam hill by shuttle buses. We do have language already in the plan that is more generalized in its encouragement of transportation

JUNE 27, 2002

demand management efforts, specifically it includes satellite parking. What's looked for here is a very specific and more directive amendment that says do it rather than just encourage it as part of the range of transportation demand management options.

Katz: Talk a little about that.

Kelley: There was discussion about this at the planning commission. I think the planning commission generally felt that the key regulating device here is the limitation on new parking on the hill, and the requirement of keeping the single occupant vehicle rates very low and decreasingly lower over time. That that regulating mechanism would force other aggressive means, whether it's increased shuttles or park and ride, and whether prescribing those solutions up front, those would be left to the institution to devise based on the need at the time because they would have to meet those other standards. And so I think that there was a hesitancy on the part of the planning commission to prescribe specific solutions that were a little more far-flung that got at the notion of decreasing trips other than that central regulating mechanism. It wanted to add measures about particular local streets to calm the effects of any traffic there, whether it met the standard or not. But I think in terms of prescribing how you would reduce trips, they wanted to leave some flexibility in that and just say, you got to meet this standard. You figure out how to do it.

Francesconi: That would be true for 12, 13, and 14?

Hartnett: Yes.

Katz: Okay. Leave that out?

Hartnett: I wanted to point something out very briefly. I tried to mark items that were previously discussed by the planning commission or design commission, and unfortunately in the transportation area I just ran out of time. In some of the other topic areas you'll see an asterisk next to the item number that will tell you it's something that the planning commission discussed previously. So i'm sorry it's not here on this one, but gil and I will try and catch those for you and highlight where the planning commission has already discussed items.

Saltzman: Just on d-13, this is a request from ohsu to specifically reference the satellite parking lots. I thought there was a lot of support from that -- for that from the neighbors too. I'm confused why we wouldn't want --

Hartnett: Amend t-13 to specifically reference the development of a shuttle bus system. D-13.

Saltzman: It doesn't reference satellite parking lots. It seems that's what ohsu --

Hartnett: What ohsu is asking is that we clarify the purpose of the shuttle bus system. I think initially in this staff proposal -- no, actually planning commission asked us to add this as a specific new action item, and particularly adding the language to meet public and institutional needs. And if i'm remembering correctly, there was some concern on ohsu's part about trying to meet the public need for shuttle bus systems, so i'm thinking what they're asking for is a little bit of clarity on t-39. You might want to ask them because i'm not 100% certain.

Saltzman: That's what it sounds like. I think that's appropriate clarity.

Hartnett: So that one is a yes. And then the last one, d-14, is a -- changing the time frame on that one to adopt with the plan. The difficulty with doing that adopt with plan is that that's actually -- it's a column that's exclusive for council action. It's when you're adopting things like the zoning code amendments. So it wouldn't be an appropriate thing to include in that column.

Saltzman: How about under complete or ongoing?

Hartnett: I think "ongoing" might be appropriate. So we'll change that one to an ongoing?

Saltzman: Yeah.

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

Katz: You're changing which one to "ongoing"?

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: D-14. Action item t-39, amendment d-14. So it will say, enhance the shuttle bus system, modifying it to facilitate the use of satellite parking lots and it will be an ongoing action.

Katz: Okay. All right. Let's talk about d-15. Mode split.

Hartnett: D-15 is objective 15 in the transportation section, which is on page 68. Encourage marquam hill institutions to continue participation in the marquam hill transportation partnership to achieve the program's 2003 mode split goals and to set more ambitious transportation demand management goals beyond those stated for 2003. What ohsu is asking for is to clarify that while the goal was stated for 2003, it is actually a goal that they intend to reach by 2030. For the purposes of stating it for the marquam hill partnership, it was a strategic goal, it was a, let's set our aspirations high, and not necessarily intended to be an immediate implementation in the year 2003.

And that's actually been an ongoing confusion in our discussions, is that the transportation analysis that ohsu presented, and it's been peer reviewed, did rely on those goals stated in that partnership, but did also assume that they were not met until 2030.

Katz: How did that get into the action plan that that would be met by 2003?

Saltzman: A typo.

Hartnett: I think it's also just taking the transportation partnership goal, which is again, a strategic goal, at face value and turning it into an implementation goal. So I think what ohsu is asking for us is to either say, 2003 was aspirational --

Katz: What's the goal?

Hartnett: 2030 is reality.

Katz: What's the goal -- you identified here that the 39% mode split in 2030 is a very ambitious one even for the central city.

Hartnett: That's part of ohsu's text for their --

Katz: Right.

Francesconi: On the first part of the sentence, the first long sentence, I take it the way you're saying this, susan, that's necessary. There is confusion in the language. Is there confusion?

Hartnett: I think there's confusion, yeah, I do. I think there's confusion between the transportation partnership goal and how that's been translated into the marquam hill plan as an implementation goal.

Katz: What's the mode split now?

Hartnett: Right now i'd have to look.

Saltzman: For 2003 --

Kelley: 51%.

Francesconi: So there's a --

Kelley: We may want to defer this item until we get to e-6, which is the table of reductions.

Katz: Yeah. That's a good idea.

*******:** And go back and reconcile this with whatever --

Katz: That's a good idea.

Francesconi: The idea of putting -- i'm sorry, mayor. The idea of clarifying this then needs to be there. You need to determine where it needs to be.

Katz: Let's attach that discussion to e-6. Which actually has a single occupancy rates decrease, and there's discussion about whether that's too ambitious, not ambitious enough.

Francesconi: But my next question on this, though, the second sentence, further recognizes 39% is an ambitious objective. It is ambitious, but why would we put this language in the code? What's the point of that? I see the point of the first sentence, but what's the point of the second sentence?

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: I'm not sure that we should include it, to be perfectly honest. You might ask ohsu if you want to hear directly from them why they're asking to include that.

Francesconi: We should acknowledge it is an ambitious objective, but I wouldn't expect that language in a code.

Hartnett: This is not proposing code at all. This is proposing that it's the objective be amended.

Francesconi: I am still not sure that's necessary.

Hartnett: Let's come back to the whole thing when we get there. So action item t-1 speaks to looking for ways to improve regional transportation system, and ohsu amendment request here is to indicate that ohsu will not necessarily fund regional transportation roadway improvements. I don't think this is necessary. If you note, the definition of implementer is really just someone who says they have interest and support the notion, not necessarily that they're going to fund it.

Francesconi: We're assuming they're going to fund all of our regional transportation --
*****: There you go.

Hartnett: That might be why they're asking for this clarification. [laughter]

Francesconi: Streetcar to Lake Oswego, here we come.

Hartnett: Do you want to include that or not?

Francesconi: I'm not sure it's necessary.

Hartnett: I'm hearing no. D-17. Include the shriners as implementers on these items. The one thing I would like to point out, we have not put anybody on action charts who does not agree. So the one thing I would want to do would be between now and when you actually vote on the amendment, if you ask for this amendment, talk to these institutions to make sure they're comfortable being added to it.

Katz: I agree.

Hartnett: You do want the amendment.

Katz: Yes.

Hartnett: Same with the next one, d-18, which is on t-16. Same thing?

Katz: M-hmm. Does everybody agree with that principle?

Saltzman: Yes.

Francesconi: What's t-19?

Katz: Hold on.

Hartnett: T-19 is on page 72.

Francesconi: Who is lead responsibility on that? Is that p-dot?

Hartnett: Yes. We could simply clarify pdot as lead by reversing the two.

Kelley: Reversing the order of the institutions.

Saltzman: The order makes a difference?

Katz: Yeah, well --

Hartnett: Whoever is listed first is considered lead implementer, for all that really means. So i'll amend it in that way. T-28, t-28 talks about developing new sidewalks and retrofitting existing sidewalks. What ohsu is asking us to do is to clarify that this will occur through building development in so far as the design review process specifically speaks to the pedestrian network and the pedestrian environment. In other words, clarifying that the implementation of this action item comes through new development, not that there's some specific effort to do it just throughout the campus.

Katz: Is that necessary to include that?

Hartnett: It's a clarification. It doesn't leave an expectation in the community that there's going to be some program to go about improving sidewalks.

JUNE 27, 2002

Saltzman: Is that consistent with the pedestrian concept in this plan?

Hartnett: Well, that starts to overlap with the discussion about site review and design review and how all that fits together. The site review process right now, and the design review if you choose to meld them together, would be specifically looking at how the site development concepts are being implemented. So either yes to site review or yes to design review if you roll them together.

Kelley: I also think the item just above that, t-27, calls out some critical pedestrian improvements that wouldn't be bound by the process in t-28. Those are high priority regardless.

Katz: What would your recommendation be?

Kelley: I think its fine to add the clarifying language in t-28.

Hartnett: I think it's helpful for the community as well.

Katz: D-20 is approved.

Hartnett: D-21, then, is to remove ohsu as an implementer on t-30 --

Katz: Which is --

Francesconi: Bancroft.

Hartnett: Seek to provide continuous pedestrian access by sidewalks along bancroft, homestead drive to persian gulf boulevard. This is an area south of the campus. We don't put implementers on here until they agree, so --

Francesconi: Is that a process? We could talk to ohsu through the mou process.

Hartnett: The mou includes discussion about pedestrian connections and which ones might be considered high priority.

Katz: All right. T -- d-22.

Hartnett: To amend t-46 which says establish a motor pool at ohsu, to read investigate and implement if practical. I think that's actually -- the way it's written right now, the -- there's a clear expectation that ohsu will create a motor pool for employee work related trips. I think it is part of a transportation demand management scheme and they ought to be given some flexibility on whether or not they do it or implement some other transportation demand management measure.

Katz: And t-45, you have implement -- investigate --

Hartnett: A flex car program, right.

Kelley: Comparable language.

Katz: Does that make sense to the council?

Saltzman: M-hmm.

Katz: Okay. D-23.

Hartnett: Add homestead neighborhood as an implementer to t-47, and encourage the use of alternative fuels by all residents of marquam hill. [laughter] I think it's quite appropriate to expand the use of alternative fuels to everybody accessing the hill. I'd be happy to ask homestead if they're willing to be included.

Katz: Is homestead willing to be included in this? [inaudible] if you've got a fuel pack on you.

Hartnett: It does specifically say alternative fuel vehicles.

Francesconi: Let's stick to our principle, you'll talk to them.

Hartnett: I'll talk to them. D-24 is to adjust the action chart time frame for a whole series, and there is an attachment at the back of your package that shows the change in the time frame that ohsu is seeking. In there amendments --

Katz: Which --

Hartnett: It's following page 13 of the table. You'll see six pages. I have lost you?

Katz: I'm a little slower today.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: D-4 is looking for adjustments to the time frame for a whole series of action items. Instead of writing them all out, I attached at the back of the table, the six pages of action charts that shows the amendments. So t-7, they'd like to change from next five years to ongoing --

Francesconi: Can we do this at the end of our transportation ones? This might take a while.

Hartnett: Amendment is essentially prepared with those tables. If you'd like to just discuss it as part of the amendment package, that's fine too.

Saltzman: I just caught one of them. One is a slip in the implementation of the critical pedestrian connections we just talked about. T-27, from sixth to ten years rather than the next five years.

Hartnett: Yes.

Saltzman: I'd have concern about that. In they are in fact critical high priority pedestrian connections, high priority means five years to me.

Katz: Their request is a desire to make changes in the time frame?

Kelley: Yes.

Hartnett: And in their transmittal of their amendment request to the council, what they point out is that almost all of the transportation items where ohsu is shown as a lead implementer indicate a five-year implementation time frame. And there's a huge number of projects on here, and the reality is nobody could do them in five years.

Kelley: We'll take a look at this list and come back and make -- some we may agree you should be slipped, others we would say --

Katz: It's hard. I don't know how much time the planning commission took on this, but it's hard for us sitting here to make a decision whether showers, for example, should be five years or six to ten years.

Hartnett: What I would say is the planning commission by and large responded positively to every request to move the time frame up on transportation action items. So the staff's original proposal did stretch these items out more.

Francesconi: Does this relate to -- even though we struck the language, we do have an ambitious plan here. Is this that same time frame, or is this --

Katz: This is a different one.

Francesconi: Then I need p dot's advice on the time frame, so before we have that discussion, it would be good if pdot analyzes this and gives us their opinion as to what would happen when.

Katz: You'll work together on that. On this one we're going to discuss the mode split time frame.

*****: Right.

Francesconi: Okay. I'm sorry.

Hartnett: D-25, new objective and action item calling for an extension of the streetcar --

Francesconi: We've got enough. This shouldn't be --

Katz: This is not the right place. I think it's a great idea, but this is not the right place.

Francesconi: No, it's not.

Kelley: You'll have another plan in front of you shortly.

Katz: Thanks a lot. D-26.

Hartnett: New objective and action item calls for -- calling for decision connection of campus drive with a tunnel to connect to it barbur boulevard. This is actually something that's been discussed several times in this process, including with the transportation peer review panel.

Kelley: The only thing I would say is that we got a sort of graphic clarification yesterday from a principle testifier here. I wanted to double-check with pdot that there was a concern by the testifier that we had collectively had -- had missed -- had misunderstood the proposal, and I just think that -

JUNE 27, 2002

- I wanted to clarify what pdot -- whether we clearly understood the proposal or not. In fact there's a sketch here, so we could do that this afternoon or do it at your next meeting, but I just wanted to allow that conversation to occur.

Katz: Steve, you --

Hartnett: I just handed it to rob, who's the engineer. You might want to --

Gerber: Rob Burchfield is the engineer but I feel absolutely convinced we reviewed this in significant detail, and certainly in sufficient detail, particularly through the peer review panel, which I think had a full understanding of the request.

Katz: Okay. Is there any interest?

Francesconi: No.

Katz: There's no interest to pursue that right now. D-27.

Hartnett: Calling for disconnection of homestead drive at gains street and reconnection at southwest ninth. This is another one where gil was given a drawing last night by david redlick that he thinks is a clarification of what was intended. Again, there's been significant discussion about this. The drawing that was provided last night simply moves the roadway farther north into ohsu's existing parking lot as opposed to the previous drawing that had it outside of their parking lot, which is what was examined by the peer review panel.

Saltzman: And the peer review --

Hartnett: They concluded it would have significant environmental impacts and be very expensive. And that it probably wasn't going to serve what the neighborhood was looking for. So the peer review panel said there was no purpose in pursuing it.

Katz: Council? Okay. We'll cross that out. D-28.

Hartnett: Action item to implement realignment and access limitation of homestead sixth drive. That's essentially the same request.

Katz: Let me ask a question. Are these coming from the homestead neighborhood association, were those presented to the planning commission as well? Or are these new ones?

Hartnett: I honestly can't remember specifically whether there was an amendment request at the planning commission. It was talked about at the transportation -- as part of the transportation peer review. It was presented to the transportation peer review panel by homestead as a specific --

Katz: But not necessarily to the planning commission?

Hartnett: I don't think they raised that as an amendment request. I could check that.

Katz: That's all right. I'd like to know if it's -- if it just came --

Kelley: We were just showing this graphic to rob for 26 and 27.

Katz: And?

Kelley: And he believes 26 was understood and studied by pdot ask the peer review, and he's looking at 27 right now.

Katz: Why don't you just do it and report to us at the end of the day. D-29. This is d-29.

Hartnett: D-27 and d-28 you want to wait until you hear from rob?

Katz: We've crossed it off, but we'll hear from rob.

Hartnett: Oh, okay. D is crossed off unless --

Katz: Right. D-29, 30, 31, 32 --

Hartnett: This is a whole series asking us to add fairmont and marquam hill road as a specific reference in a variety of statements. Number 8 says limited negative impacts of traffic volumes and peak hour congestion on terwilliger parkway, so we would add and fairmont marquam hill road by encouraging, et cetera, encourage marquam hill institutions to continue and enhance efforts to educate, et cetera, to use marquam hill, and avoid traveling on, again, add fairmont, marquam hill

JUNE 27, 2002

road, et cetera. So there's two others, d-17, limit impacts on terwilliger boulevard, they want us to add, and fairmont, marquam hill road, and d -- objective 18, continue to regulate the amount of on-site parking to manage traffic impacts on surrounding streets. We would add marquam hill, fairmont marquam hill road at this point.

Kelley: Susan, on 17, for example, it says limit traffic impacts on terwilliger boulevard and neighborhood streets. Is fairmont and marquam hill road, are those not considered neighborhood streets?

Hartnett: No, they are. We could -- if we list fairmont, why wouldn't we list gibbs -- Those are considered neighborhood streets.

Katz: For mr. Miller, who was, you know, really moved by this issue, the intent for neighboring streets in the document is to include fairmont and marquam hill road. Is that an accurate transportation analysis, or definition?

Gerber: Yes it is.

Saltzman: In terms of minimizing traffic.

Katz: So whatever wherever you say minimizing traffic on neighborhood streets, that does mean those two streets.

Hartnett: Right. The notion here is that by making improvements to the sam jackson park road connection to the regional system along sixth avenue, that becomes a preferential direction, that by reorganizing access on campus so that employee and students can't access campus drive, that you take traffic off of terwilliger, that through a program of signage and educational outreach type activities, that you reinforce that behavior. So first you make it a preferential route, then reinforce the behavior through some other things. And the intent there is to keep them on the preferred route and off of all of those other nonpreferred routes.

Katz: Okay. So --

Francesconi: Should there be some action items reflecting that as opposed to --

Hartnett: There are.

Katz: The issue here, jim, is to -- where the action items say neighborhood streets, to show the intent that they are to include gibbs, they are to include --

Hartnett: That was the discussion that we went through on the action items. T-13, 14, 15, where actually actual, 13, and 14 where request was to add fairmont marquam hill road to those streets that were getting traffic calming, that would be the implementation of this. You've already said you don't want to add those streets to the implementation, so you should than be adding them to the objective statement either. And if you're going to decide to add them to the objective statement you need to go back and add them to the implementing statement.

Saltzman: As long as it's clearly spelled out neighborhood streets equals marquam hill, fairmont, gibbs, whatever. Is that spelled out?

Hartnett: No. It's not. We'd have to list out every street --

Katz: Why would you need to do that? This is the intent when you mention neighborhood streets on objective 8, 9 --

Kelley: 8 and 9 are particular to terwilliger boulevard. So they don't list neighborhood streets. 17 on the other hand, lists both terwilliger and neighborhood streets. So it would apply there.

Katz: Okay.

Kelley: And 18 seems to zero in on terwilliger and not neighborhood streets.

Hartnett: It does say surrounding streets in that case.

Kelley: I wasn't sure what that distinction was there.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: We could change surrounding to neighborhood. I don't think we're trying to make a distinction between any of the nonpreferred routes. We wouldn't want to call out one of them and not call out all of them. The notion is to designate when the preferred route is, and then to say, don't use the other routes. Any of them. Regardless of what you -- what names they fall under.

Francesconi: I see. That's fine.

*******:** Is everybody having fun out there?

Francesconi: Are we all having fun? Are we awake out there? Just checking.

Hartnett: I'll look at the language in those objectives and see if there's some need to conform them to each other.

Katz: Okay. Come back and let us know for d-29, 30, 31, 32 --

Hartnett: Just through d-32.

Katz: Right.

Hartnett: We're almost done with the transportation policies and this is by far the longest category. Duplicate action item 15 for the intersection of 11th and gibbs. I think 15 speaks to an intersection redesign. Consider intersection changes to prohibit northbound 6th drive right turn on to gains. So this is saying for 11th and gibbs. 11th and gibbs is actually a neighborhood collector, neighborhood collector intersection. I'm not sure we'd want to be making turn limitations. I believe that's the bus route as well.

Katz: Yeah, i'm -- we're not going to make those -- yeah. D-33.

Hartnett: Add 11th and gibbs to action item t-30, which t-30 says seek to provide continuous pedestrian access by sidewalks along sixth drive. The one up above says provide continuous pedestrian access via -- it's already there.

Katz: It's already there. D-35.

Hartnett: This is a request to make an objective, objective 10, which says encourage development of a freight service access circulation plan. To say develop. And one thing I would point out is that we routinely avoid words that are as directive as "develop" in the objectives. The objectives are adopted by council by ordinance, so by using that word you're giving it the power of law. We usually then use those kinds of words in action charts, which you adopt by resolution, and require a willing -- require willing implementers. So again, usually we try to use words like "own courage" or "support." I would suggest you not change encourage to "develop," but adding the language about terwilliger boulevard is reasonable.

Saltzman: Okay. I'd say do it.

Hartnett: You want an amendment that does the second part but not the first.

Katz: Right. D-36.

Hartnett: Include additional streetscape amenities this. Is a new request in the plan we proposed to extend the terwilliger parkway boulevard concept which is a tree planting concept to that section of Sixth Avenue that's going to be improved as part of the implementation of this plan. The request that came in, i'm sorry there's a blank, "came in from terwilliger plaza to add additional amenities such as maintaining the crosswalks, undergrounding utilities, installing decorative street lights and traffic signals to that.

Francesconi: Well, this is good, and we'd like to do it for the whole city. The truth is, and this is terwilliger boulevard is more special than most, but they also have more amenities than most. So we have some equity questions here for other neighborhoods. We can't even patch the potholes.

Saltzman: The point about maintaining.

*******:** -- crosswalks?

Saltzman: That sounds reasonable.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: I'm not 100% certain there's crosswalks on both sides of sixth to duniway park. And I -- I would invite to you ask rob to speak to you about how traffic engineers view crosswalks and when and where they --

Katz: No, no, no.

Hartnett: Okay, don't ask rob.

Francesconi: Who's paying for this?

Katz: You.

Francesconi: Pdot?

Hartnett: That's part of the mou discussion.

Francesconi: I'm serious.

*******:** It is. Let's put this in the mou.

Hartnett: It's on the list of mou items, and very explicitly says this item probably needs an iga. So I think if you add these kinds of amenities, that negotiation may get more challenging.

Katz: And then you'll need to explain why in the mou and not in here.

Hartnett: You're saying no to this one?

Katz: No to this one. Let's talk about it at the mou.

Hartnett: D-37, include enforcement mechanisms to ensure forest corridor concept along terwilliger boulevard. I'm not sure what those would be. The forest corridor concept is called for as part of the design guidelines, the design guidelines are implemented through design review by the staff or the design commission. I'm sorry, by the design commission, that's because a type 3 review. So if there's an implementation problem, it's happening at the quasi judicial review level, and i'm not sure what we can do in this project to take it farther than that.

Katz: Off. D-38.

Hartnett: Include objective and action items to connect marquam hill to north macadam by an underground connector.

Katz: Okay. Off the table. Correct?

Francesconi: Yeah, pull it off.

Katz: We're going downhill.

Francesconi: It's an inside joke.

Saltzman: On the underground connector, it's an interesting concept on paper, but the challenges, both engineering and costwise are going to be a lot higher than \$50 million. The operational savings will not pay for this soon.

Hartnett: The transportation peer review panel did also look at that notion.

Katz: Remember, we were challenged to deal with people who were deceased when we bore a hole.

Hartnett: That's correct.

Katz: For the light rail. Imagine the changes of the living. -- the challenge of the living.

Hartnett: Include references to marquam hill road in the existing conditions summary. I'd be happy to do that.

Katz: Okay. All right. E-1. Now it's our favorite topic.

Hartnett: Now what we get into is the implementation --

Saltzman: Did we go over open space already? Are we coming to open space?

*******:** We will be.

Katz: What page is e on?

*******:** Page 11.

*******:** Open page is on 13 and --

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: It's the environmental issues and reviews that's on page 11 that is the issue I think commissioner Saltzman is looking to get to.

Saltzman: What I wanted to get to was --

Hartnett: The b.e.s. Proposal?

Saltzman: No. I want to get to that too, but there was one anton talked about yesterday, find a way to restore policies, objections -- objectives and action items that sought to purchase or protect additional undeveloped land --

*******:** That is on page 13. That's at the end --

Katz: Let's go to e-1. What page are we on?

Hartnett: Page 8.

Francesconi: Steve are you our parking guy?

Katz: I know that, but where does it reference -- I got it.

Gerber: Pdot is involved in that, i'm your guy.

Francesconi: Thanks.

Katz: It's page 1 --

Hartnett: 155. E-1. This is a request to amend some of the code language. Specifically the purpose statement of the parking section of the plan district to add reducing traffic impacts on terwilliger park way and surrounding neighborhoods. I think there needs to be a very clear connection between what the purpose statement says and what the regulations do. Right now there isn't a direct regulation that seeks to reduce traffic impacts on terwilliger. It is the underlying reason why we're putting this -- the whole structure in place. But there isn't anything that you could necessarily point to in the regulations. So, for example, we talk about encouraging the use of transportation demand management techniques, and then we have the sov rates in there, and the other one is the volumes on the local streets.

Saltzman: If it's -- if it underlies almost everything we're doing, is there any harm to putting it in this section of the introduction?

Hartnett: I'm not certain about that. I'm willing to put the amendment together. It obviously here already. Would I like the opportunity to talk to opdr and the city attorney about whether they have any concerns about adding that language.

Francesconi: What do you think?

Saltzman: Do you have concerns?

Francesconi: Steve?

Hartnett: I'm not certain whether we're actually implementing that statement.

Gerber: Yeah, it's -- to me it's essentially putting the rationale in the regulatory statement. It's not something we typically do, and I cannot point to a specific problem that I believe would occur at a later date. But when we start mixing apples and oranges, problems do occur at a later date.

Hartnett: The intention of the plan objectives is to sort of lay that policy ground work and then the code implements --

Katz: Why don't you check it with the city attorney to see if there are legal issues that could crop up later on and then come back. Unless you can give us an answer right now.

Kathryn Beaumont, Sr. Deputy City Attorney: The only comment I would add is to probably echo what susan said, which is there is no -- if you add this additional language, there is no -- nothing in the regulations that follows that connects back to that additional language. Which raises the question, why add it if you don't have regulations that specifically connect to it.

Francesconi: The goal is important. But we're doing it as susan just said, a couple of other different ways.

JUNE 27, 2002

Kelley: We're trying to state the goals in the plan, and on the regulations there's specific implementing devices along with some other implementing devices.

Francesconi: I don't think it should be there.

Katz: You --

Francesconi: Unless you decide you want to change the tools and change the regulations.

Hartnett: That is a question before you a little bit later on in here, whether or not you want to add specific volume measures on terwilliger parkway. If you add volume controls on terwilliger parkway, this statement would be appropriate. If you're don't, this statement would not be appropriate.

Katz: You're correct.

Francesconi: Let's keep it out for now.

Katz: Let's leave it out for now, and when we decide we can come back.

Hartnett: E-2, reduce institutional parking below current 11th. This request in various forms came before the planning commission, and they did choose not to do that and leave the proposal as it was in front of them 900 additional spaces.

Hartnett: This is an amendment from ohsu, this is a new item. The way the regulations are structured right now the parking limits are by subdistrict. So within subdistrict a we're allowing an additional 150 parking spaces, and within subdistrict b we're allowing an additional 650 parking spaces. Ohsu believes that if we regulate by what street those parking spaces are accessed from, that they will have more flexibility. Their proposal is to specify a certain number of spaces with access from sam jackson park road, and a certain number of spaces from campus drive. I'm concerned about what -- about writing what I think is complicated code in a short period of time. Douglas hardy is here if you want to ask opdr specifically.

Francesconi: My interest is to make sure the parking maximums are enforceable. I'm less concerned about the locations. However, it is important that we have a code we can administer. So I guess I do need to hear from opdr.

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

Francesconi: Can you enforce something by parking access -- instead of location?

Douglas Hardy, Office of Planning and Development Review: Right. As susan indicated, for the record, douglas hardy, office of planning and development review. We do have concerns in terms of what the term access street means. It's certainly not proposed to be defined. Our concern is in terms of interpretation of that term, every time a building permit comes in, there may be -- there could possibly be circumstances of a multiple access, be accessed via two driveways off of two different access streets, how do you calculate that. In terms of tracking it over time, it's certainly a more difficult process than what was previously included in the plan. In terms of determining the number of parking stalls per access street.

Saltzman: I guess I thought what I understood as being one of the rationales for this, maybe i'm wrong, is that given the interesting terrain up there, there could be underground parking lots who could cross more than one district boundary underneath the ground. Cross more than one subdistrict, I should say. In an underground sense.

Hardy: I guess that's theoretically possible.

Francesconi: I suggest we leave this out f ohsu can talk to you and you can come back and say to us they've got something that you -- revenue got something you can enforce, maybe then we can entertain it. Until I know you can enforce it, I don't think we should put it in. For what it's worth.

JUNE 27, 2002

Kelley: I was just asking if what commissioner Saltzman said was the principle rationale of the part of the requester, I got a brief indication it wasn't, there were additional reasons -- we haven't had time to understand this --

Katz: Let's leave it out and if you can figure out -- can it be enforced -- there's no sense in having a regulation that can't be enforced.

Hartnett: Revise the parking ratio. It was the planning bureau's initial proposal to the planning commission. So the planning commission revised it to one per 750.

Katz: You need five minute break?

Hartnett: I'd love it.

Katz: Go take your break now and come back to this one. I suggest we all do it, because you may not get another chance. [recess]

At 3:32 p.m., Council recessed

At 3:43 p.m., Council reconvened

Hartnett: Rob did look at the drawing that gil shared with him that david had shared with gil last night, and what the conclusion was is that item d-27, your conclusion to not include it, they concur on that. Item d-28, however, they propose that we go ahead and present you with an amendment that would combine this language with action item t-15, and instead of say "implement" we say "study." the intent is essentially the same as this, so it's basically describing another option to what's already described in t-15.

Katz: All right. So don't do d-27, change the language from implement to study on d-28 and combine it with t-15.

Hartnett: Correct.

Katz: Anybody watching us understand anything we said? Let me know.

Saltzman: Anybody up here?

Kelley: We did get confirmation on d-26 that in fact the proposal that was explained to me yesterday and to you at the testimony was in fact the notion that both pdot and the peer review body considered and found to be impractical.

Francesconi: Commissioner Saltzman, how come you have two staff here and I have none? What's the deal?

Saltzman: I don't know, they must all be out working.

Kelley: You haven't had time to whip them into shape yet.

Katz: Let me -- let's do e-4, and then bring -- lay this alone for a minute, and do the environmental sections since dean marriott is still here and as I said, he's too expensive to hang around here, we'll send him back to do some work in his office.

Hartnett: E-4, you'll note the asterisk this, was considered by the planning commission the parking ratio of one space per 600 square feet was what was proposed to the planning commission. They chose to amend it to one per 750 square feet, ohsu is asking us to return to it what was originally proposed.

Katz: What do you think, gil and susan?

*******:** What was the other name?

Hartnett: One per 700. What we had looked at what's the existing -- approximate existing ratio, what the allowed ratio would be under the ex base zone, and we felt the 1-600 was an appropriate number. The 1-750 is a pretty constrained parking ratio for the type of use you're talking about. It's a medical university --

Katz: Give me a little discussion with the planning commission, why did they land where they landed? Gil?

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: I think it was pretty --

Francesconi: Pretty what?

Hartnett: Let me pull out my notes.

Kelley: Let go back to the record.

Hartnett: My notes indicate -- this is more constrained than downtown, even.

Katz: That's what I have a note here, that it's more constrained than medical center in the city. That is transit -- is transit rich.

Hartnett: It was a motion and passed. There was no discussion.

Francesconi: Is there anything in the record on this supporting 750?

Hartnett: I think one of the things that we talked about was what the existing ratio is, which is around 1-780, or something like that. But one of the things we said to the planning commission is, the report clearly documents that the existing parking ratio is too narrow. They have a 260-space deficit of parking right now under that existing ratio. That's part of the reason why we wanted to allow a little bit more liberal, but not as liberal as the base zone. We were trying to find something reasonable but better than what they're dealing with right now.

Katz: I'm not terribly sympathetic, but I have two other council members that may be on this one. What were you going to say?

Kelley: I feel the planning commission wanted to be more restrictive just on the basis of trying to acknowledge the traffic flows in and out of the institution there, and to try to keep those limited and saw this as reinforcing the other measures. I'm not sure there's an exact science to how any of these numbers was derived.

Katz: There isn't. The exact science is you look at where other medical institutions are located. What is it for -- what is it for --

Hartnett: 1-750 would be approximately 1.25 per thousand. Downtown the most constrained number that we have is .7-1.5. And that's for the core of downtown. That's for this part of downtown. For the outside edges of downtown, it's 2.5 per thousand.

Katz: So even more constrained than downtown.

Hartnett: Exactly. It is as constrained as the core of -- the heart of downtown.

Francesconi: I'd like to request this amendment. I'd also like to request a post-game debriefing with the planning commission by which we kind of just sit down and formally and -- informally and talk about this process afterwards, after we're all done. We used to do that. We haven't done that for a long time.

Katz: What's your feeling on this?

Saltzman: I could go with the amendment. The 600.

Katz: Okay.

Hartnett: We were going to turn now to page 11, I believe.

Katz: Just one for the record, I support the planning commission on this one.

Kelley: Would you like any more information about comparables than what we just gave you?

Katz: That would be helpful. I would be willing to change if I was convinced.

Saltzman: I'm basing my support on what you just told me.

*****: Okay.

Katz: You know my prejudice on this. You all know my prejudice on this issue. E-5.

Hartnett: I thought you wanted to move to the environmental --

Katz: You're right. Thank you, susan.

Hartnett: Page 11.

Katz: Direct us in our book.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: It is page 141. This is essentially the amendment that the planning commission made to require environmental review and disallow the use of the environmental standards for any development within the environmental overlays within the plan district.

Saltzman: Can we go to b first?

Hartnett: Number i-4 on the next page, number 12. Page 12, number i-4. Add zoning code regulation, no net gain in effective impervious area in the marquam hill plan district.

Katz: Grab the mike, please.

Francesconi: Was this -- never mind.

Katz: Why did you do it?

Francesconi: And when?

*******:** And what did I know?

Francesconi: And when.

Dean Marriott, Director, Bureau of Environmental Services: My name is dean marriott, environmental services director for the city. This district is an interesting district in that it already comprises almost 54% of this district is impervious. Rooftops, parking, sidewalks, roads, the water all flows into our combined sewer system. As you know, as well as I do, we're in the midst of spending hundreds of millions of dollars to find ways of getting storm water out of our combined system. This idea of capping the amount of impervious, the effective impervious surface within this district is really comes from the notion of trying to limit any growth in addition -- in additional storm water we have to then accommodate in our cso control program.

Katz: So what -- because ohsu is still growing up on the hill, what's the impact of that and what would they have to do to get to a no net gain?

Marriott: There's a variety of techniques. They -- if you look at an aerial photograph of the so it, there's a lot of surface parking. If they wanted to build a new building and take up space that's currently occupied by surface parking, that would not trip the cap, because they're essentially removing one form of impervious surface and replacing it with another. So there would not be a net increase. They could mitigate existing impervious surfaces by handling more of the storm water on site and develop credits so in the future if you wanted to -- if they wanted to build a building they could use those credits to offset the increase in impervious surface. So there's quite a variety of techniques they could use I think if they're -- if they're innovative and thoughtful about how they manage storm water, which is what we're trying to encourage everyone to do, they would have no problem meeting this requirement.

Saltzman: With the 110,000 square feet of open space to be ordered, that open space can serve multipurposes, open space and also storm water mitigation, just like we've done with jamison park.

So it's trying to -- it's that reconnection of the built environment to the natural environment too.

Katz: Gil?

*******:** I think --

Katz: Grab the mike.

Kelley: I'm not sure we have a philosophical difference. I think the concerns we've heard are from opdr, they had two concerns in terms of trying to translate this into a specific regulation. One is that it's difficult to calculate effective impervious surface, and the second is that it's difficult to regulate and enforce it, because there are many activities that can add to impervious surface that don't require any kind of permitting, including a building permit, so they can be done -- they wouldn't normally be caught through that screen.

Katz: How -- susan, are you the opdr person today?

Hartnett: Douglas hardy.

JUNE 27, 2002

Katz: How would you measure to see whether in fact they violate that or not? How would you get to say to the council, well, over the last five years they've been no net gain?

Saltzman: And what would be an example of something exempt from your review?

Hardy: I think that's the question. Number 1, what would be included in that impervious surface calculation and what would not be included. As Gil indicated, there are -- there are significant amount of different types of development that would increase impervious surface that don't require other building permit or zoning permit. Basically paving and -- unless it's used for a vehicle area, it does not require a building permit or zoning permit.

Katz: So you wouldn't know e. Necessarily.

Hardy: Right. We would have a difficult time from that aspect in terms of tracking what is done. I think the only time we would be able to track it would be if -- a subsequent permit came in, two years, three years down the road, we made notice that wait, they paved something that didn't go through a permit. So it gets a little messy certainly in terms of knowing what exactly is on the ground in terms of impervious surface. I think there's some other technical things in terms of if there are some semipervious surface used, like grass creek, that type of thing, we certainly at this point wouldn't have a handle on what -- whether that would or wouldn't be included as impervious surface. I think that may be a detail that if this goes forth could be dealt with.

Saltzman: We bill for storm water charges for institutional uses based upon the amount of impervious square footage. So somewhere somebody must track that, because it affects how much you pay in a bill. Do we have a file on that? Or does b.e.s. have a -- who updates that information?

Marriott: We maintain those records for billing purposes. How precise they are is open to some debate, I'm sure, depending on who the land owner is. But certainly anyone who asks the question about that, we investigate those by sending people on site if necessary to do measuring. I want to comment, I think a suggestion for picking these up as projects come in for permits, if the owner knows that there's a net cap on the site for impervious -- for effective impervious surfaces, they can be asked the question, since the last time you were here, have you increased or changed your net impervious surface, and they can tell you if they've added pavement in some way, shape or form, they can identify that. They may have done some innovative things to take impervious surfaces off the system, in which case they could indicate they've got some credit in the bank. So I'm not troubled by the fact that every little thing that's done in this district would not be known at the time it was done by opdr. Again, I'm trying to send -- I think what we're asking is to send an important message to people who control significant parts of land in the city that this is a communitiwide issue controlling storm water, and they have an opportunity here, this is really an opportunity to at least prevent things from getting worse from our standpoint. Please don't send us any more storm water to --

Francesconi: It is a great opportunity. I need to ask you a couple questions, because we all want the river cleaner, we want less run-off and we want to do it in a way that's tolerable to the taxpayers. I guess we're updating the storm water management plan, have we presented this idea to that group? And if so, when? The idea of limiting institutions, has that been presented to the storm water management group?

Marriott: Frankly I have not attended all those --.

Francesconi: If it's an important item or important strategy, I would think that the place to do it at least to start would be there. When -- when did you first propose this idea?

Marriott: We have been participating in the discussions of this from the outset, and we have attempted to discuss our concerns about storm water, but as you have -- as you have seen for the

JUNE 27, 2002

last two hours, you have been talking about transportation issues, and they tended to consume most of the discussion.

Francesconi: Was this presented to the planning commission, this idea?

Hartnett: That's why I stepped up. I'd like to say yes, it was. There was a specific motion made by one of the planning commission members to add this code language to the plan, and it failed on a 5-4 vote.

Kelley: Let me clarify one thing I said. We don't have a philosophical issue from a planning staff point of view. We concur with dean's objectives. But we can't speak to the no net gain. It's very absolute and we haven't done calculation that's would say as a practical matter, since part of the goal of the plan is to accommodate a certain amount of the growth program for ohsu on the site, could that be done by only using surface parking lots or reclaiming now impervious surfaces as pervious and still fit that. We haven't had that discussion with ohsu and haven't done our own calculations. So the absolute nature of no net gain -- we couldn't vouch for the patrick cattle of that, though we think the objective of having no net increase in storm water input is a good one.

Saltzman: We do have this policy in place for the johnson creek watershed plan.

Hartnett: Johnson creek plan district calls for a 50% impervious surface limitation by site. It doesn't speak to no net gain and it doesn't speak to effective impervious surface. So there's two trenches. It's a limit on the total area, and it is a flat-out impervious surface. Doug can come back up and tell you, it's difficult --

Saltzman: A limit on the surface is the same thing as a no net gain. If somebody wants to do something differently they still have to meet that 50% -- keep it under 50%.

Hartnett: Correct. The other thing that douglas mentioned is there are probably sites in the johnson creek plan district that are beyond that 50%, because people can build a patio out of concrete, and we have no way of knowing that. And they could very well be on the 50% as a result of that. So it's an issue of yes, it's in the code in johnson creek, it's a difficult one for the plan -- for opdr to be implementing as it is.

Francesconi: I'm -- go ahead.

Saltzman: What I would like to suggest, given -- I didn't realize the planning commission vote was that close. I think it's correct, dean's point is that we all know this process has been dominated by transportation issues, and everything else has gotten scant attention in my opinion. And this is always one of them. There's an opportunity here, one of the lenses I look at this, as how this affects environmental impacts, and should public institutions like ourselves like ohsu be looked to to be leaders. To be held to a higher standard, whether it's a regulatory standard or just an aspirational standard. I guess I believe this is an opportunity to hold them to a high standard and to really instill at the top at the outset that this is something they should be mindful of in all their work. We're talking about an mou that has good-sounding language about things they want to do. This is an essence of measuring their progress, especially since i'm concerned about what force and effect an mou has. I think this is -- this sets a high standard but I think it's an important standard, given the amount of money we're spending to clean up the river, given the importance of our watersheds, and I think ohsu would be a very willing partner. I think the -- there may be some implementation issues, what i'd like to propose is maybe we take a look at that a little more and have a chance to hear more from opdr about that, and be asked to sort of caucus on that and come back with more information.

Katz: Can I suggest, because dan just raised the aspirational issue. It is an -- we're not disagreeing on the philosophy. We're talking about now a zoning code regulation. As opposed to an aspirational goal. I don't know if that's going to satisfy --

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: There are a number of objectives and action items in both policy for open space and natural resources and policy -- in policy 5, building and site design that speaks to the notion of creative storm water management and sustainable building practices. There's also a specific design guideline that speaks to the use of innovative storm water management techniques as part of the design review process. So we have put a lot into this already to try and get the aspirational part of it in there. We've stopped short of the --

Saltzman: What's missing is the no net gain. That could be dealt with in the -- in one of those policy and goals. The no net gain I think is a driver of a lot of these types of decisions, otherwise these decisions get relegated to last-minute thought.

Katz: I use -- are you suggesting rather than a zoning code regulation, that it be specifically identified as a policy and a goal?

Saltzman: I think we could put it in there.

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

Francesconi: Well, here's -- I think several things. One is I think we need a citywide policy on this, and that's why I was asking my questions about the storm water management. I think how we approach institutions large tracts of land, we need to look at that. So that other process may be should consider this for what it's worth. Then I think on the mou, we need to hear about that, but we need to address this and make sure that ohsu understands this is important to us, the city, and we need to include it in the negotiating process and I think we should do that too. And we should insist upon it. The problem i'm reacting on the no net loss, I thought I salt here on tuesday saying we weren't going to -- we were going to create a moratorium on all regulations, now we're imposing new ones that we're not sure we can enforce and we're putting new things in the zoning code when we just said tuesday we weren't going to do that. And now two days later we're doing that.

Katz: We've moved beyond the zoning code. We said can you put it as a policy or goal as opposed to a zoning code. Because I think you're right.

Hartnett: I have no problem doing that.

Saltzman: I'd like to come back with something.

Hartnett: I can absolutely create that as language.

Katz: Then I think the storm water folks ought to look at that in terms of a zoning issue. Go ahead.

Marriott: We're about this summer to start building a facility based on certain assumptions about storm water, and if everyone is free to continue to add storm water into the system, we're going to have a problem. And we want to make sure that we --

Katz: I understand.

Marriott: -- put a lid on any additions to the system. That's the real reason I feel so strongly about this. I want to make sure this system that we're all investing in now, the one that's about to go in the ground, is going to last for a long time.

Francesconi: That's fair.

Katz: And --

Francesconi: You got our attention.

Katz: And I think you're right. I just -- I don't -- commissioner Francesconi is right. The last thing we want to do is write more zoning code regulation that can't be enforced. I'm not going to do that anymore. But the notion in terms of a policy for us as a city is a very sound one, and I don't know whether putting it as part of the language is enough or it sends the right signal, whatever

JUNE 27, 2002

signal we need to send to ohsu and other large institution assist perfectly valid. How we do it is something that you need to -- smarter folks need to figure that out.

Saltzman: Let's try to figure something out by tuesday.

Kelley: Prepare the language and I would like to talk with ohsu between now and next meeting about how that might practically implement it.

Katz: There may be -- there may be stiffer requirements for some other action that -- I don't know. Let's talk about it.

Hartnett: One thing I would like to point out is that the existing nonconforming standards chapter for the parking lots, the surface parking lots, would require them to upgrade the landscaping to meet the new storm water management landscaping, so we know that at least in that direction there will be --

Katz: Building green roofs in the new buildings --

*******:** It's part of the design guidelines for them to look at that.

Saltzman: Is that in the code?

Katz: Not yet. This is maybe how we get to some of these issues with an understanding that if you're going to build a new building, which you are, and a new parking garage, that you build it green.

Saltzman: That certainly will reduce that impervious surface.

Katz: We may be able to get to it in a different way. I think you can get to where you want it -- want to go without mandating everybody yet to build green, but we can require them to build green with an understanding that they will build green. All right let's work on this a little bit. It's too important to drop.

Hartnett: We'll bring back some additional language for objective and action item.

Francesconi: While we're doing -- go ahead.

Katz: No.

Francesconi: Can I suggest another one?

Katz: No, no, no. Unless have you another high paid executive here, or staff. All right. We're on e-5.

Hartnett: Back on page 8.

Katz: Go ahead.

Hartnett: This is a request that came from opdr and ohsu to delete the approval criteria associated with the type a parking review, and i'll give you the page on that. It's page 177. The requirement is that the applicant would show that their proposal is consistent with the site development concepts. The functional area, vehicular circulation and pedestrian circulation site development concepts, and I think I mentioned yesterday in my presentation that opdr raised this as a concern in part because the type a parking review is going to be processed through the type 1 quasi judicial procedure, which is intended to be a low-level ministerial process, and this requirement here is a pretty significant findings burden, and probably not appropriate for a type 1. The associated amendment with this is the notion of merging site review and design review, which doesn't column up for a couple more pages, so I don't know if you want to respond to this one right now or hold this until you have that discussion.

Katz: Identify the items just so I can mark it.

Hartnett: It would be item -- it's topic g and topic h. Just topic g, the site review, on page 11.

Katz: Let's pull e-5 and come back.

Katz: Okay. Let's go to e-6.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: We -- from d-15. So d-15 was this notion of clarifying what the objective says about the relationship between the 2003 strategic goal of the marquam hill transportation partnership, and the 2030 implementation date that was actually associated with that goal.

Katz: Where is it in the -- where is it in the planning commission report?

Hartnett: 175 is the page in the planning commission document. And that steps the rates down on a more frequent interval basis, and also more aggressively in time. You'll notice they hit a 39% in a year -- in the year 2019 as opposed to 2027, and there are more increments, more frequent stepping down. So both of those are true, and they may be separate questions that you want to take on. What's the right interval to measure and step down in, is it 1 1/2 years, four, or five years? And how -- how soon?

Saltzman: Did bureau of planning originally recommend the 18-month step-down?

Hartnett: No, originally we recommended something that was more similar to the ohsu in terms of the number of years, what we originally proposed is on page 149 of the staff proposed document. We proposed four-year increments of 3% per four years, and that got us down to the 39% in the year 2016. Ohsu requested to the planning commission that this be revised to have a later implementation date, and they had a specific proposal, I don't remember what it was at the planning commission, I don't remember if it was exactly the same as what you're seeing. And the sort of compromise middle place that the planning commission decided was what you see in the recommended document, which is a more frequent stepping down, but a little bit later date.

Katz: A little bit later finish date.

Hartnett: That's correct. So it end in 2019 versus 2016, which is a little later, not a lot. But it does do that one -- 1% every 18 months.

Francesconi: Can I ask, what -- the original date, how was that set? What was the magic of the original -- I think we agreed it may have been -- it's ambitious compared to others. It had a longer implementation. I'm trying to understand why we would require getting somewhere 20 years early when it had been set -- it was set too long? I don't understand, so help me.

Kelley: I think the rationale for having an aggressive step-down -- we should preface this by saying they already have a very good track record in this area. They're -- they already have an impressive nonsingle occupant vehicle drive rate -- transportation rate. But nonetheless, because of the situation that exists where this institution exists within a neighborhood and with limited ways to get in and out, we felt that they ought to be more -- even more ambitious in getting that rate down quicker. And I don't remember exactly the calculus we did to get there, but that was the philosophy behind it. And the commission generally concurred with that, although gave them a little more time to get there.

Francesconi: How was the original date set?

Kelley: The 2039 date?

Francesconi: Yeah.

Hartnett: 2030 date?

Hartnett: The 2030 date is the basis for the analysis, the transportation analysis on which the entire plan district is premised.

Francesconi: Oh, I see.

Hartnett: It was the --

Saltzman: The 900 extra spaces --

Hartnett: Based. -- correct. The planning horizon ohsu was using in beginning their internal process and that was then moved into the public process as well. So the 2030 was based on that transportation analysis.

JUNE 27, 2002

Katz: So -- go ahead.

Francesconi: No. Go ahead. I interrupted you. Go ahead, mayor.

Hartnett: Rob, did you want to say something?

*****: No.

Saltzman: I'm comfortable with going with the amendment, the ohsu amendment.

Katz: Would you want to go with the ohsu amendment -- remember, it pushes it out to 2027.

Hartnett: One thing I would point out, I think it's important to keep in mind that this goal of 39% single occupant vehicle is the goal for downtown Portland in the year 2040. So even at 2027, we are asking ohsu to be more aggressive than we are asking downtown Portland, which has the most transit rich environment, and a number of transit improvement plans on the boards.

Katz: But let's remember that if we adopt the tram and the tram is in this document, we're doing that for a purpose.

Hartnett: And the 2030 achievement included the tram. So the tram is -- does not give them a leg up on reaching this 30 -- this sooner than 2030. The 2030 assumption of 39% included the tram.

Francesconi: Here's what I'd like. Go ahead and premier that amendment that commissioner Saltzman did, but we've got to have a little suspense. Take that amendment, sit down with ohsu and try to push that date up a little bit. And then I'm going to reserve how I vote. That's what I would like.

Kelley: I just -- on this one I'd prefer to be more aggressive and push the institution a little bit. They're already behaving very well, but I think the situation demands a pretty ambitious --

Katz: Would it be the staff's planning staff, or the planning commission's recommendations? If you were more aggressive?

Kelley: I think taking a little bit longer to get there is probably okay. The first couple step-downs that I would be more concerned about. We can look again at the numbers if you like.

Katz: Okay. I guess -- let's talk about the policy for a second. That will give them some direction for everybody to think about. Do you want to push them earlier and give them longer -- a little bit longer time?

Kelley: Obviously they can't do a lot in the first couple of years. That's understood. But the first increment in the requested amendment are 2007 and 2012, so we'd want to look -- if those are the date that make sense, we'd want to look at those percentages and see if 49 and 47% are the right numbers.

Katz: Okay. I'm not ready to accept -- I'm not ready to accept the -- I'm like commissioner Francesconi, I'm not ready to accept the amendment yet. These are dates that you pick from -- it's like a menu, one from column a, one from b, one from c.

Hartnett: I'm thinking that what might work would be for me to provide you a couple of different table options. I've done that in the past with the council when there's been some uncertainty about what to set the numbers at.

Katz: Okay. If the council thinks --

Saltzman: You're really asking for it.

Katz: If the council thinks early implementation is better but a little longer period of time, then now we have a little bit better direction.

Kelley: And I think having probably fewer steps rather than as many steps as are in the planning commission is probably more workable.

Francesconi: Well, yeah. We also need things that will work, that are practical and doable.

Katz: Okay. So we're not satisfied with staff, we're not satisfied with the planning commission, we're not satisfied with the health sciences center. Yet Mr. Engineer?

JUNE 27, 2002

Burchfield: For the record, rob, office of transportation, one thing I think would be helpful to keep in mind is that in achieving these goals, it really is a partnership. So it requires there be trimet service there to achieve these goals. So this is something, it's not just pushing the institution, but it's also providing the infrastructure to allow them to succeed.

Francesconi: Do you have an opinion as to what we should do, pdot? What's your opinion?

Burchfield: Well, i'll work with susan to come back with what we think are reasonable --

Katz: Wise man.

Burchfield: I would agree with what you say. We need something that is aggressive but achievable.

Katz: So let's come back and not make anybody happy, okay?

Hartnett: Rob that works for me as long as you realize tomorrow is your day to work with me.

*******:** I'm on vacation at 5:00.

Katz: All right. E-7.

Hartnett: Okay. E-7, revise the type a parking review criteria to measure traffic volumes on terwilliger parkway north and south of campus drive. This relates back to the purpose statement that we were discussing earlier as well. This was the -- a request from homestead. I'll also point out the planning commission had specific discussion about this. In the proposal that the bureau put in front of planning commission, there were no traffic volume measures on any streets, so the planning commission had some very deliberate discussions about which streets to measure traffic on, and the discussion around terwilliger was the fact it is a neighborhood collector, it does have a fair amount of through traffic passing traffic that ohsu has no control over, and there was also conversation with the pdot folks about the fact that if ohsu is successful in getting their traffic off of terwilliger, the gap is likely to be filled with other traffic. We see that happen on other streets. So the notion of requiring measuring traffic on terwilliger as an approval criteria for a land use review seemed inappropriate in the planning commission -- and the planning commission chose not to do it.

Saltzman: It does apply on campus drive?

Hartnett: On campus -- yeah. The planning commission proposes measuring traffic on campus drive, which is a street that is a private street for one thing, and ohsu has a lot more control, essentially complete control over what's happening on that street. And this really gets to that notion of reducing congestion by eliminating employee and student access.

Katz: What's the wish of the council?

Saltzman: Leave it as is.

Francesconi: Yeah.

Katz: No amendment. Okay. E-8.

Hartnett: The next one is to reduce the maximum allowed pm peak traffic that's stated in the table on page 175 -- no, 177. For both hamilton terrace and condor. Reducing hamilton terrace to 85 and condor to 48. And I actually would let rob add more to this, but I will tell you that those numbers that we established come from a single count. One count, one manual count on one particular day. So there's a little bit of discomfort in what we're using as our baseline, and there was --

Saltzman: Those are numbers we have?

Hartnett: The numbers in our table are based on a one-day, one-hour count. So we -- the numbers that are proposed by homestead neighborhood are the actual count numbers. On hamilton it was counted at 85, and on condor it was counted at 48. We felt on hamilton, hamilton is a street that's going to tend to see more fluctuation in daily traffic volumes depending on what's happening in

JUNE 27, 2002

other places in the system, and it's used as a link between barbur and terwilliger by other users other than ohsu and the institutions on marquam hill. So we wanted to allow a the variability in that number. And then the number on condor lane, we don't think condor lane is as -- is quite as vulnerable to those daily fluctuations in traffic activity, but we felt a little bit of wiggle room two vehicles per hour, was pretty reasonable, and we do like to try and use whole numbers in the zoning code. So that was our reason for changing -- to setting those numbers. And I -- rob, I assume you think we should leave them where we set them.

Burchfield: I agree.

Saltzman: That's fine. They're close enough.

Francesconi: That's fine.

Katz: Okay. No amendment.

Hartnett: E-9, include maximum allowable pm peak volumes for marquam hill road. This is similar to the discussion we just had about terwilliger. Marquam hill road is a neighborhood collector street, it actually serves a very large residential area, and again, asking the institutions be responsible for what's happening on that street, I think is a little stretching.

Saltzman: But isn't that inconsistent? We're doing that for homestead, hamilton --

Hartnett: Those are local streets. They are not intended to carry through traffic. A neighborhood collector street does carry through traffic. It's a very clear policy distinction in the transportation element.

Saltzman: Fine.

Katz: No need.

Hartnett: E-10, replace approval criteria c and d for the type b parking review. That's on the next page in the -- two pages, page 181 -- no, sorry. Page 79. It's b, approval criteria b --

Katz: 179.

Hartnett: 179, yeah. This is a request from opdr, I mentioned it yesterday. It's to merge these two criteria into a single criteria using language that is consistent with what is in other land use review approval criteria, so that opdr --

Francesconi: Let's do this. I vote for this.

Hartnett: I saw a head shaking yes. That's two.

Saltzman: How do you feel about it?

Hartnett: I think -- it makes complete sense to me.

Katz: Okay. F-1.

Hartnett: We're into plan district regulations.

Katz: Give us the page.

Hartnett: Go back to page --

Katz: We're getting there.

Hartnett: Page 131.

Katz: Okay.

Hartnett: This asks to add neighborhood livability as one of the elements that the plan district is seeking to preserve and enhance. And again, what I said earlier about, i'm not sure we really -- the plan area doesn't include the neighborhoods per se, but I would agree that the plan district in terms of how it's addressing traffic, is trying to preserve neighborhood livability.

Katz: I don't have any problem with this. Amend it?

Francesconi: Yes.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: The next one, f-2, is the height limitations. Again, this was a letter that came to you from the design commission based on a request from the planning commission. And Chris testified on this one.

Saltzman: I'm fine.

Katz: Good idea.

Francesconi: Let's do this.

Katz: Amend that.

Hartnett: The next two, f-3 and 4 came from homestead. And they were proposals that were specifically considered by the design commission and their process of coming to their conclusion and bringing you their recommendation. So they would be inconsistent with what the design commission is recommending.

Katz: Okay.

Hartnett: I assume they're both nos. F-5, reinstate the regulations concerning temporary construction stages that were included in the staging that were included in the proposed Marquam Hill plan. This is a request from OHSU. In their amend -- in their amendment request they're clarifying that in the -- I'm sorry. In the staff's proposal --

Katz: Do you need another break?

Hartnett: I don't think another break is going to help at this point. There's just so many different layers going on at this point. In the staff's proposal, a small portion -- a portion of Terwilliger Parkway was included in the plan district. And there were two reasons to do that. One was to address the suspended cable transportation system regulations, the other was to make an amendment to the regulations concerning temporary activities. And specifically, temporary construction staging. OHSU, because of the constraints of their site, have had to in the past rely on sort of creative and unique ways of staging for construction. And in the past they've used Terwilliger Parkway. In order to do that, they have to go through a parks permitting process, and in doing that parks is able to hold them to mitigation measures. I'm not sure if they can require a bond out of them for that, but I would assume they could do something like that. Their own process would deal with the implications, but without changing the zoning code to allow it, it didn't make any difference whether parks was willing to do it or not. And it was in the staff's original proposal.

Katz: And planning rationale?

Hartnett: Planning commission never talked about this particular regulation, because when they decided to remove the suspended cable transportation system they removed all of the Terwilliger Parkway.

Francesconi: It was related to the tram, wasn't it?

Hartnett: No, it's not specifically, but it requires land within the Terwilliger Parkway to be included in the plan district in order to have effect? And when they took that all out, because they took the tram out, then there was no land to attach this regulation to. To if it's okay with parks, it's okay.

Saltzman: Yeah, that's fine.

Hartnett: Revised limitations on retail industrial uses within the plan district to reflect those in the Marquam Hill plan.

Katz: What page are we on?

Hartnett: In the plan document it would be on page 139. And it's 33, 555120, a and b.

Katz: Okay. So they limit it to 50,000 square feet of retail space. Talk a little bit about why that particular number.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: The staff's original proposal was 25,000 square feet, period in any subdistrict. For both retail sales and service uses and as a total for the three industrial uses listed under b. The planning commission felt that with four subdistricts, that that was probably too much to allow within the entire plan district. So they set a cap within the entire plan district of 50,000 square feet, allowing up to 25,000 square feet in --

Katz: For the whole plan.

Hartnett: Correct. Now, keep in mind that -- .

Francesconi: What if I guess I looked into this one a little bit. What if ohsu wanted to do a community room or a meeting room or community center, scaled down version, and then that would I think classify as a retail use, wouldn't it?

Hartnett: No. Retail sales and service would not include those kinds of uses. Really the first question you have to ask is, would any of these uses be a second primary use on the site, or would they be accessory to the institutional use that exists? So, for example, if ohsu wanted to start doing laundry for their own hospital, I think I know right now they do it off site, but if they decided to do it on site, if it was an independent business doing that, we would consider that industrial service. But if it was part of their own operations and it wasn't a separate entity doing it, we would consider it accessory to the institutional use. To the -- so the first question that opdr would have to ask on any given proposal is, is this accessory or a secondary -- or a second primary use.

Francesconi: What are you recommending on this?

*******:** I think we were comfortable with the original propose yap of 25,000 square feet for any -- in any subdistrict with no total throughout the plan district. And I think -- i'll tell you why.

Katz: How many subdistricts?

Hartnett: Four. One of the reasons is there's such a limited amount of developable area up there. I think it's pretty clear that the institutions have not squandered land in the past, and we felt pretty comfortable they weren't going to do that in this case. These are potentially support-type businesses for the institutions and we wanted to leave that kind of flexibility.

Kelley: I think susan is right.

Katz: Okay. Amend? All right.

Hartnett: Captures e-5 as well. So g-1 is to merge site review, approval criteria into the design review criteria by adding an additional design guideline. This is coming from opdr with concurrence from ohsu. And gil and I concur as well.

Katz: All right. Design review.

Hartnett: So we want to go ahead and do --

Katz: Yes.

Hartnett: G-1. Can we flip back to e-5?

Katz: Yep.

Hartnett: And confirm that you do not -- that you do want to do what e-5 asks, which is to delete the consistency with the site development concepts from the type a parking review?

Katz: Yes.

Hartnett: Okay. Design review. First one, h-1, a request from ohsu to reviews revise upward the thresholds for exceptions from design review. Right now in the zoning code that's recommended by the planning commission, the exemption --

Francesconi: The mayor wants to eliminate design review. [laughter] across the city. As part of her new focus.

Katz: The mayor was the only one who recognized the importance, commissioner Hales and the mayor recognized the importance of this. But I think will all learn together.

JUNE 27, 2002

Francesconi: I was --

Katz: This is a collaborative effort.

Hartnett: My understanding is the triggers we've placed, which they're on page 123 if you'd like to look at them, particularly item number 1 and item number 2, we've said additions of floor area less than 15,000 square feet, and on item number 2, we're saying facade area 1500 square feet. What I understand from ohsu is that those -- that essentially means there is no real exception. That anything ohsu builds up there is going to be more than 15,000 square feet and involve a facade greater than 1500 square feet and their amendment request says if you're trying to provide an exception, then you don't have the numbers set right.

Katz: Gil?

Kelley: Well, I think we ought to be requiring design review on any substantial new building or building addition up there. I'm not sure what the request is.

Hartnett: 55,000 square feet for the building and I think 3,000 square feet --

Kelley: That's bigger than I would recommend.

Katz: It's bigger than a bread box.

Ketty: We could look at the 15 and see if there's -- there should be an adjustment there, but I wouldn't -- I think at the range of 50,000 you're dealing with a pretty substantial building.

Katz: That's huge. You're going to come back with -- you're going to look at the number?

Kelley: The default would be to keep it the way it is. If you'd like to us look --

Katz: I would support keeping it the way it is. But I don't know where the council is on it.

Francesconi: I don't have strong feelings on this. I'd like you to look --

Katz: Take a look and come back with a new number. All right. H-2.

Hartnett: Just a second. Yes. Include enforcement mechanism to ensure terwilliger parkway design guidelines are addressed. We had a similar one on this where I told you they are enforced through the application of design review, and through the review process. I don't know what else we could do. You said previously no to the one that was similar, so i'm assuming you'll say no to this one.

Katz: Okay. Council?

Francesconi: That's fine.

Katz: All right.

Hartnett: Environmental issues and reviews.

Katz: Page --

*******:** First one was --

Katz: I got it. 141.

Hartnett: Yes. This was the language we added in response to the planning commission's addition to the plan district based on their desire to make sure that any development activity within the environmental overlays be subject to environmental review, and not be allowed to use the environmental standards. And as I mentioned yesterday, that is contradictory to state law. State law requires the option for a standards tract.

Katz: Okay.

Hartnett: I think we have to take this out.

Katz: All right.

Hartnett: I think katherine has had a chance to look at this as well.

Katz: Katherine?

Beaumont: I agree with susan. It would be the language as is is inconsistent with the rule implementing statewide planning goal 5.

JUNE 27, 2002

Katz: Okay. Didn't the planning commission know that?

Hartnett: You know, this was another thing that happened very fast. Frankly, I --

Katz: Amanda didn't know that?

Hartnett: Apparently amanda didn't know it either. I would have warned them had I known. I gave them some other reasons, which --

Katz: Okay. Let's delete that. All right. 12. I-2.

Hartnett: 12 would conform with what the decision was that you just made up above, so I think you want to do that now.

Katz: That's 12.

Hartnett: Yeah. I'm sorry, i-2. And i-13 is the same thing. It conforms the plan policy to the decision you just made on the regulation.

Katz: All right. Hold on. I crossed it off when I should check it. We dealt with 14. J-1.

Hartnett: Delete the words avoided and impacted --

Katz: Give us a page.

Hartnett: This is the land use policy, which is on page 63. 1-c reads ensure the impacts of institutional development on existing neighborhoods traffic and the environment are avoided, limited and mitigated. Ohsu's asked that we take out the language avoid and limited, with the text of their amendment indicating that by having the word "and" in there you make it really an impossible sentence to meet, because if you've avoided the impact you, you certainly don't need to mitigate it, and if you've avoided it --

Katz: Why don't you put "or"?

Hartnett: That the other alternative.

Kelley: This was a particular concern to the planning commission. They did this with regard to some of the airport way language. I think the notion here is to have a preference in the order, the -- you avoid first, then you limit, then you mitigate so you don't have a free choice between them. The "and" doesn't make sense, but we'd want the language to be consistent.

Katz: Clarify --

Kelley: With the language we've done elsewhere, and we can do that.

Katz: All right. So did you say it was in the gateway plan.

Hartnett: No. It was -- airport.

Katz: Airport, i'm sorry. It ought to be consistent. J-2.

Hartnett: Delete objective 2 and the associated land -- action item number 7. Number 2 says, encourage institutional growth to occur at locations other than marquam hill to the maximum extent possible without compromising the interdependence of teaching research and patient care activities. This was another specific addition that the planning commission added. They wanted to --

Francesconi: Other than marquam hill?

Hartnett: Yes, other than marquam hill. Without specifying where, they didn't want to say in north macadam, they just wanted to say, to the degree that it was possible to build institutional development off of marquam hill, to the maximum extent possible, that was their specific words, that should be done.

Francesconi: Forest grove?

Saltzman: Do you want to add that in there?

Kelley: You could say within the city. This was very important to the planning commission also in the sense they thought a major thrust of the plan here was to not only accommodate the

JUNE 27, 2002

expansion of ohsu, but try to accommodate as much of that expansion as possible off the hill, where it wouldn't have as much neighborhood or traffic impact.

Francesconi: Where are we? Which number?

Katz: Can we say, other than marquam hill, but in the city of Portland?

Kelley: Yeah. Certainly.

Francesconi: Where are we?

*****: Page 63.

Katz: Objective 2.

Francesconi: And where are we on our list?

Hartnett: We're on j-2, item j-2, page 12.

Francesconi: I think we should amend it. What do you think?

Saltzman: We want some growth to occur.

Hartnett: I think at minimum we should include language that says "within the city of Portland." I don't think we want to encourage them to build anyplace else.

Kelley: They just meant within Portland off the hill as much as possible.

Hartnett: I'm also not sure about the language "maximum extent possible." I think that may be a stronger statement than we necessarily need to make.

Francesconi: Well, I thought -- one of the things we're trying to do is encourage density here so it doesn't spill off into the neighborhoods, and also it's a trade-off for the open space. And --

Kelley: I think this stems from the realization that the entire expansion can't be accommodated on the hill. There's just no way.

Francesconi: I agree with that.

Kelley: To the extent that relatively more research uses, for example, might be accommodated in north macadam --

Francesconi: I'm okay with that too.

Katz: Let's not have private conversations here. Sorry.

Francesconi: I'm okay with that too.

Kelley: That was the thrust of their concern here.

Francesconi: I like what you just said. But that's not what this just says. I don't think. Work on this one.

*****: Okay.

*****: You --

Katz: You want the growth to occur in other places other than the hill. That's the reason for north macadam and the reason for the discussion on north macadam. You don't want it necessarily out of the city of Portland.

*****: Right.

Hartnett: The flip side of that though is this plan does gear itself towards increasing institutional development on the hill. That's why we're doing this.

Katz: You know that you're going to have it up at the hill up to a certain, but you want the other as well.

Hartnett: I'll rely on gil --

Saltzman: If we read objective 1, that does it for us and we can delete objective 2.

Hartnett: Objective 1 says support the expansion of institutional uses both on and off marquam hill to acknowledge and continue the significant economic development contribution these uses make to Portland's economy.

JUNE 27, 2002

Katz: Well, yes and no, because the other one incorporates teaching, research, and patient care. It's a little bit more specific.

Kelley: The difference was not just to say do it anywhere, but to say, our preference is that you do relatively more than you might otherwise think of doing off the hill.

Katz: I love you, Oregon health sciences university, but for 20 years I said get off the hill and go and be part of the community. And so -- rewrite this so it reflects their need to grow -- still grow slightly on the hill, but also come down to the community.

Kelley: Okay.

Katz: Right?

Saltzman: Come down off mt.olympus?

Katz: And join the real people you're taking care of. [laughter]

Hartnett: K, k-1 is an amendment to action item mhc-4, which is on page 66. It reads, develop --

Katz: Before you get to that, commissioner Francesconi is -- doesn't believe what we just offered. We're going to rewrite it to get the intent that I just expressed. Yes, you will grow up on the hill, but you're also going to grow in other parts of the community. In the city. All right.

Hartnett: I'll look at it as a creative writing activity.

Katz: I'm writing "rewrite." all right. K-1.

Hartnett: K-1, page 66. Mhc-4 is the action item that's being asked to be amended. We noted in this action item that -- the kinds of activities that might occur to create the interface we're talking about as a student union and a recreation center. Ohsu's asked us to take those specific named items out and just leave it --

Francesconi: Do we limit it to those two?

Hartnett: No, it was given as an example such as it's not a requirement, it's not a limitation, it's a - - it's the kind of ideas that they specifically talked about.

Francesconi: Leave it in. I mean, don't --

Katz: Why would you -- why would they want to delete it?

Hartnett: Because they're concerned that the community will take this as a commitment from them and if they don't do it it will be held over their heads as one more commitment they didn't live up to. [laughter]

Saltzman: She got it straight on there.

Francesconi: We're going to do that anyway.

*******:** I'm get doing tired.

Francesconi: Forget it.

Hartnett: I think it's a legitimate concern on their part. But, you know, I also think it's a pretty loose statement. I don't think it will --

Katz: I'm not even sure those are the -- those are the kinds of uses that the community might be interested in. There may be other uses. I would take it out.

Hartnett: I'm fine with taking it out.

Saltzman: I could take it out.

Hartnett: I don't think there's any harm either way.

Francesconi: I don't care.

Katz: It's out.

Hartnett: Our last topic, our last page.

Katz: You're kidding.

Hartnett: Did you want more?

JUNE 27, 2002

Francesconi: I do care about some --

Hartnett: Open space and natural resources. Replace object 5. Current language says protect and i'm prove natural resources on marquam hill through stewardship efforts, including inventorying current conditions and creating an environmental management plan to integrate all development and restoration activities. I can't honestly remember at this second what our amendment was. I don't think we had the environmental management plan as part of it. I think the planning commission added environmental management plan.

Kelley: I think that was it. The planning commission felt fairly strongly. Some of them did.

Katz: What do you think?

Kelley: Well, I -- I think the objection is to creating an environmental management plan, that is, it's another obligation, another thing to do. Another task on the list for the institutions facilities people. It might be a good thing for them to have. I think this is something that personally could continue to exist in the policy language and something we may want to talk about in the mou. I don't think this occurs anywhere in the regulatory scheme in terms of having to have this to pull a permit. So I think --

Hartnett: No, it doesn't. Not at all.

Francesconi: So this is not mandated by this?

Hartnett: No. By making it a policy statement, it doesn't --

Katz: It's like chicken soup. It doesn't hurt.

Francesconi: The port has a good environmental management plan. I'm not sure we even do, the city. But it is something -- it's something we should have. We as a city. It's really benefiting the port. I actually think ohsu should have one now. The question is, I don't know how much that costs and I don't know all those kinds of things. Did katherine --

Hartnett: I wanted to double-check with her. She's fine with it.

Katz: I have no problem leaving it in. Do you?

Saltzman: No.

Katz: Do you?

Francesconi: No.

Hartnett: Then the next one, which would be removing the action item associated with it, you don't want to do that one either.

Katz: And the action item says --

Hartnett: It's actually -- it's action item 5, not 4. It's a typo. Yeah. So if you're not going to take out the objective, don't take out the action item.

Katz: Okay. If you really feel strongly about it, you'll come and testify. But you're going to have to make a good case for it. All right.

Francesconi: Are we on the ivy next?

*****: Yes.

Francesconi: Can we all all of forest park?

Hartnett: There are already action items and objectives and action items that speak to --

Francesconi: I was kidding.

Hartnett: Trying to do this. What's stated here is making it a stronger requirement.

Francesconi: That should not be there. As a requirement.

Katz: All right. No.

Francesconi: No, meaning you pull it.

*****: Meaning don't give you the amendment.

Francesconi: No -- right.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: Yes. We got it. Only three more. L-4, include means to include -- this was an issue that came up and -- in the planning commission and we actually added objective fundamental number -- number 2, which says maintain open space zoning that was applied and adopted in 2002 through the marquam hill plan. That's language that i've cribbed from another plan to do exactly the same thing, maintain zoning as it was adopted.

Francesconi: How about adding a conservation easement to this? Which is also the next idea. I'd like us to consider doing this. Is the place to do it here, or would you do that in an mou?

Hartnett: I wouldn't -- well, I wouldn't add anything to objective number 2, because it's a pretty clean, clear statement that will have strong force in any future quasi judicial or legislative. If you want to talk about some sort of conservation easement, we could talk about it in conjunction with l-6, which is a deed.

Francesconi: Okay.

Katz: So what --

Saltzman: This is the means to prevent?

Hartnett: The means is already there. Bits as strong as we can get it.

Francesconi: Conservation easement would not help?

Hartnett: On the os zoning?

Francesconi: Right.

*******:** Up --

Francesconi: I don't want to do things for show if it's not going to help. I think the zoning will do it.

Hartnett: That's an interesting question. I had a number of conversations with the three rivers conservancy about their property, which immediately south of ohsu's property, asking them if they were interested in participating in the plan specifically to rezone their property to os. And they felt the conservation easements that are already on their property were more constraining than any zoning could ever be for them.

Francesconi: That's why I raise that.

Hartnett: But -- they also then felt that the double whammy of the zoning as well made it even more difficult if they ever ended up in a situation where they needed to sell off a small piece of land, it would have zero value as os zoning. That's not the case for ohsu. So a conservation easement might add additional --

Francesconi: The trade hitch off is increased density in certain spots and a trade-off to get some assurances that the open space is going to be there. So if you could look at this conservation easement idea, and bring it back to us --

Hartnett: Okay. But that's not an amendment to objective number 2.

Francesconi: No. You tell me where it belongs.

Hartnett: When we get to number 6, we'll talk about it there.

Katz: We're not going to do anything with l-4.

Hartnett: That's what I understood. No to l-4.

Katz: Because of what you just agreed to.

Francesconi: Right.

Saltzman: That's a means. If that is the means, we may adopt --

Hartnett: Right.

Saltzman: Okay.

Francesconi: But he --

Saltzman: You are going to come back with something.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: We can talk about the specifics when we get to l-6, which is talking about an ownership transfer. We could talk about language that speaks to ownership transfer or conservation easement.

Katz: We're not going to do anything on l-5 --

Hartnett: We didn't talk about l-5. Do you want to skip to 6?

Katz: Yes.

Hartnett: L-6 was asking for provisions to ensure that the ownership of the 45 acres was actually transferred to the bureaus of parks and recreation. That is another way to further preserve that open space, so maybe an objective that speaks to further preservation through deed transfer or conservation easement would be an appropriate objective.

Francesconi: I think a conservation easement plus zoning do it. At least until november, we don't have the money to maintain what we've got.

Hartnett: Again, if we put it in as an objective, it's not that it has to happen. We can say seek ways, so it's not saying it has to happen that way. Ohsu may actually feel it's better to do it that way and may want to negotiate with you how to make that happen.

Katz: Do you want to give it to us? [inaudible]

*****: Either/or gives you the maximum flexibility.

Katz: Back -- so you are going to prepare language that's going to address the zoning and the conservation easement.

Hartnett: I think the zoning --

Katz: It's already included.

Hartnett: The zoning is taken care of.

Katz: L-5.

Hartnett: This is to add back objective and action items that seek to increase the amount of undeveloped land, preserved through conservation easements or other conservation methods. That objective and action item were here previously when we had a larger plan area. And this was one of the consequences of taking out the other portions of homestead neighborhood that they did not want to have involved. The bottom line is what additional land, undeveloped land still within the plan district would we preserve. There isn't any left.

Saltzman: Wasn't some of the land that's e-zoned possibly qualify?

Hartnett: We would have to do -- well, I think what you've got right now through the plan district, which all of the e zoning land is in that subdistrict e, which has a huge list of prohibited uses, a huge list of prohibited developments, so essentially nothing can occur anyway. I don't think os zone would go make any difference. I just don't see it being an advantage. And it would take some figuring out how to define it. There aren't any property lines against which you would apply that, and that's usually how we do this.

Saltzman: You're saying any of the other lands that would qualify under this are more associated with the neighborhoods that shows not -- chose not to be part --

Hartnett: Right. That's what that was in there previously for.

Katz: If they want to be included --

Hartnett: Right. And that was the vote that homestead took twice to not be included. So we will take that out. And we made that clear to the planning commission when they chose to take it out.

Katz: Okay. All right. That's a no, unless they come back and decide to be included. We'll talk about that. The next steps before we get to the mou and then I have to get ms. Decker's amendment in, the next steps before we get to the mou is next week, the -- the public knows that we've got a series of these amendments.

JUNE 27, 2002

Hartnett: Correct.

Katz: Okay.

Hartnett: I will have available at noon on monday, and I said noon, not 11:59 a.m., the package of amendments. So we'll include the specific language that you've asked for to flesh these ideas out, and in most cases it will include a staff recommendation. On some of these i'm concerned we may not have enough time to confer with -- for me to confer with gil or confer with opdr, pdot, if rob really is on vacation that's going to be tough. So we may not have staff recommendations on all of them.

Katz: That means that --

Hartnett: That means there may be a blank column that doesn't tell what you staff is going to say when we get here next wednesday.

Katz: Gil?

Kelley: I think that we'll have amendment language on all of them.

Hartnett: That's correct. You'll have amendment language on all of them.

Kelley: You'll have amendment language on all of them, and you'll be able to take a vote.

Katz: Mr. Gerber?

Gerber: Just one. I just wanted to let you know hi an extensive but hurried conversation with rob as he was leaving, and we will try very hard to make sure pdot has a recommendation where appropriate.

Katz: You're a wonderful man. Okay. So how -- is everybody -- do we have neighborhood representatives here? I know we have several of them. How do we get this information to the neighborhood?

Hartnett: We can send it out electronically to our community and technical advisory group list and anton is on that list, tom does not have e-mail, so we can't get it to him. We'll make it available --

Katz: He's here.

Hartnett: We'll make it available at the front desk at the planning bureau office and the city clerk's office.

Katz: Okay.

Hartnett: The usual method for making these things available.

Katz: And I think it was very clear that every amendment was going to be on -- was going to be considered today, and so they will be able to testify why didn't you include -- I want them to testify on the amendments we included.

Hartnett: That was my understanding. It's only the amendments that council specifically -- not this whole list.

Katz: Otherwise we open it up.

Hartnett: Right. You'll hear some of the same things again and you'll have to redecide those.

Katz: Okay.

*******:** It's only the ones you've said yes, bring forward amendments.

Katz: All right. You had another one.

Saltzman: I wanted to add one last implementer to open space, action item 7, the green buildings, add the office of sustainable development as an implementer there.

Katz: Good.

Hartnett: That was action item 7?

Saltzman: Under open spaces, yeah.

Hartnett: I do need to check with someone there?

JUNE 27, 2002

Katz: No, that's fine. All right. Mou. Let's talk about mou.

Kelley: I sent you a memo actually Carrie sent it for me to you on June 21st. It's in your packet. There's a brief cover memo. Then an attachment also dated June 21 that has a sort of skeletal outline of what might be included in a memorandum of understanding between the city and OHSU on ways to implement a number of the actions and aspirations that come out of the planning effort that are not regulatory in nature. These essentially take some of those action items out of the plan and actually some other items as well. And put them in terms of a more formalized commitment on the part of both the parties and Katherine can speak in a minute about the nature of this agreement, and its enforceability. Basically our intent is to have an agreement that both of us are committed to in terms of following up on these various aspirations and actions.

Katz: Let me just ask, is this a draft, or --

Kelley: This is essentially an outline. So the -- what would -- what I would intend to do is understand from you during this process between now and July 10th, if there are other items that you'd like added to this, and then I would propose that I negotiate directly with OHSU and return to the council in September with a draft -- a fuller draft negotiated agreement for your consideration and approval. We have put forward here notions that fall into really 12 categories, plus a 13th which has to do with a periodic reassessment of our relationship and of how well the plan is going.

But those include education and job preparation, building a bioscience industry, natural resource stewardship, Terwilliger Parkway stewardship, roadway improvements, Southwest 6th Avenue, regional transportation system improvements, transportation demand management, Marquam Hill access management, local street traffic calming, pedestrian and bicycle network and facilities improvements, the Village Center, high quality design, and then as I mentioned, a periodic assessment. If there are other categories or other items within any of those categories, it would be great to hear that from you this -- within the next couple of weeks.

Francesconi: You didn't -- go ahead.

Katz: Go ahead.

Francesconi: Storm water. You didn't mention that. It is listed under one item, under natural resources. But in light of this testimony, I think you should beef that up.

Kelley: Okay.

Hartnett: There are some items under there, but I've noted add the b.e.s. Request items.

Katz: I'd like to take some out and some --

Hartnett: That will be in the plan document, but this will be the August meant in the mou.

Katz: And the purpose of this is to --

Kelley: The purpose of this is to symbolize and make a more formal commitment of the partnership --

Katz: It sounds like a full employment act. [laughter]

Kelley: Well, there are things that are accomplished through policy and regulation and there are other things that can't be done in that way. This is an opportunity --

Katz: OHSU, how do you feel about this? Are you ready to sit down and work through these? You are? [inaudible] you know you're going to end up paying for it. [inaudible] I don't know -- did -- [inaudible]

*******:** Some could be big ticket items, so we need to know going in that we're not going to necessarily --

Katz: Okay. Before we get to the issue specifically, since I'm responsible to this gentleman's budget as well as for others, I think it's going to be important as we go through and work through

JUNE 27, 2002

the items whatever the items may be, there will be some added, some deleted, that we also understand who's responsible for what and -- okay. Now. You wanted --

Saltzman: Let me first mention one thing. I'd like to see maybe further addressed, they mentioned using the green building standards, the lead standards as a guide for new buildings. I'd like to see them meet the lead standard and have that independently certified. I'll throw that into the negotiation mix. The other thing I need to understand, what force and effect an mou has. It was all well and good to talk about -- talking about these issues, but if you can't reach resolution, yesterday both sides said this is a contract. To me a contract speaks to enforceability, remedies, dispute resolution, all that stuff. I guess somebody, Katherine needs to come up and --

Kelley: We'll ask Katherine to comment on that. I would say also this is somewhat analogous to what we did with the airport in terms of having an initial mou that laid out our mutual intent to be followed by very specific detailed igas, for example, in any of the -- when we develop more specifics around costs and time frames for certain roadway improvements, that might require a follow-on agreement. But as to the enforceability aspect in the -- and the sanctions, let me ask Katherine to address that. I think these can be written in a variety of ways.

Katz: Katherine?

Beaumont: Good afternoon. Generally the function of a memorandum of understanding is to sort of express the parties' commitment or agreement in principle, to pursue various actions or to undertake in activity. Typically they're the spring board from which intergovernmental agreements or more specific binding contracts are developed. In a sense, an -- if what you saw here presented as the draft or concept ideas was presented to you, I would say no, it's not a binding legal contract. If you want to include all the terms that you would normally see in a binding legal contract in an memorandum of understanding, then in terms of enforceability term, termination, remedies, things like that, it would be a binding legal contract. But generally it's a way the parties express their commitment to go forward and develop more specific agreements that can be enforced as binding legal contracts. In a sense, an mou is as strong as the parties' commitment to it.

Saltzman: So it would be the agreements that sprung from the mou that would have all those aspects of enforceability.

Beaumont: Yes. And it may be looking at the long list of things that would be addressed, it's conceivable you may have a number of different contracts or agreements that would spring out of this mou.

Saltzman: So I guess -- that helps. I guess what happens if you agree to talk about something here, but you reach loggerheads and somebody says, we're not going to do it? We've sort of bought into it long ago. We will have bought into this memorandum agreement and may have affected how we vote on various policy matters in the plan. How do we take comfort in many others who care about this --

Katz: Trust.

Kelley: I think it is. You have to have a level of confidence now knowing that we may not reach full agreement to our satisfaction on our side of the table on all -- any or all of these items. And you have to decide now going into it that you would be willing to pass on the plan documents and the plan district regulations knowing that this is not yet a completed task, but the draft in front of you was developed in a discussion between myself and ohsu representatives, so there are a lot of things to be hammered out in terms of details and responsibilities. Frankly some of the items probably between the two of us we can't afford to do and they're really expressions of having other parties serving as leverage to get other parties involved, whether it's building a larger bioscience industry or tackling the regional transportation improvements. There are some that are more

JUNE 27, 2002

wholly confined between the abilities of the two of us to effectuate. But I think you need to understand that this is not yet negotiated and so you -- you're going on some level of trust in adopting the plan. **Katz:** We couldn't sue is what Katherine says, right? This is --

*****: Pardon me?

Saltzman: I would think having some third party you could go to for lack of better term, mediation, arbitration.

Katz: I guess my hope, maybe I'm -- I've done battle with OHSU over the years, and I think we've made some relatively large advances in terms of identifying the bioscience industry as a broad industry that we as a city, with other partners, are looking at expanding and promoting and making more of a diversified statement in terms of our industries in this community. We've worked together on the Marquam Hill plan, I guess I'm willing to go that route because quite frankly I don't think we have any other route to go. I don't know what the other choices are other than an MOU with our signature, their signature, an understanding by the team, including the president, and working through those. I don't know what else -- where else to go. We've done it before, and we've had very good results in previous MOUs.

Saltzman: And from this MOU will emanate IGAs or legally binding contracts. That's what it says here in the beginning.

Hartnett: For those items where that's appropriate. Some of it may be commitment to work together in which case I don't know we need a binding contract.

Katz: And you get those through those IGA agreements.

Hartnett: Right. And on the list we've identified some of those already for potential IGA.

Francesconi: Plus we need each other. To be the kind of city we want, plus I actually know on some of these items that are talked about in the IGA, OHSU does a better job than the city of Portland.

Katz: No. [laughter]

Francesconi: A couple things, just on the MOU. I really appreciate the inclusion of education and job preparation. We'll talk about this at a later time, but -- for example, OHSU just adopted Robert Gray and is trying to help get middle school students. They have a whole plan for doing it. This is something we can talk about at a later time. The other important thing in this MOU is the periodic assessments, because what we're trying to do is create as we move to this next phase, when we move to it, some better relationships with the neighborhood too, and that will show we're doing some things and we have to have the periodic assessments to kind of measure it. So that's going to be really important. And we need to -- I want to emphasize not so much new things, but two things that are in there that are important to me when you're going through this process. Two other little things, one is on this -- this is unrelated, but since we spent all this time here, I want to add two things. One is on the second tram, there was a letter in our proposal that came from PDOT, so I don't know who, if I'm looking at you or PDOT, I think that letter that we got from the congregation, the synagogue where we've identified their property, I'm sure it's caused problems in that congregation, a lot of concerns. So I bet you've already followed up, but I think it's important that we follow up right away and give some face-to-face contact. Have you done that already?

*****: Yes.

Katz: Yes.

Francesconi: And then the other thing is when we start talking actually the senators inquired about this, and I've already talked to Vic in transportation, the issue of some of the other potential mitigation strategies, and how we proceed is something we need to talk about. So we'll --

Hartnett: You're talking about the tram.

Katz: The report.

JUNE 27, 2002

Francesconi: We'll talk about that down the road. Those are things that aren't covered in the scope, but it's very important if we're going to have this work for everyone.

Katz: Okay. So provide -- if there's things you want add or things you want deleted, let gil and susan know. This will be before us on the --

Hartnett: It won't come to you until probably september as an actual document.

Kelley: But I think we would like to hear from you by july 10th by the time --

Katz: By the time -- okay. Fair enough.

Saltzman: On additional things.

Kelley: On additional things.

Katz: Then you folks can agree or not agree depending on what the items are. All right. Don't go, because we've got another item. All right. Thank you. You're not quite done yet.

Kelley: See you next week.

Francesconi: Thank you for your terrific work. Staff has done terrific work.

Katz: All right. 100 items, done well. Next Ms. Decker, come on up. I need a motion to return to item -- suspend the rules and motion to return to item 708.

Francesconi: So moved.

Saltzman: Second.

Katz: Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered.

Item 708.

Moore: 708. Adopt a new classification and compensation plan for nonrepresented classification and administrative staff of elected officials, specify the effect upon employees moving to the classification and compensation plan and establish an effective date.

Katz: I thought when we do that we automatically adopt the amendment.

*****: Well --

Katz: I'm sorry, the exhibit.

Yvonne Deckard, Director, Bureau of Human Resources : Right. And I -- we do, but we had an amendment to exhibit a, and we did not move to replace or adopt the substitute.

Katz: And exhibit a, since we don't have the material with us, the amendment to exhibit a was --

Deckard: The amendment to exhibited a was we had moved the fire marshal and fire deputy chief from grade 13 up to grade 14. And so in the original -- it was in grade 13 and when we did the substitution, we were -- the substitution was moving them to 14. We didn't adopt that yesterday.

Katz: Was that something that you were going to give us on that date, or is some something you just thought about?

*****: This is what --

Katz: I it was just -- I just want to know.

*****: It was there. That's when --

Katz: That's why you were a little --

Saltzman: Somebody called it to your attention.

*****: Right. And I got --

Moore: It was handed out earlier in the tuesday memo.

Katz: All right. I need a motion to -- on the substitution to exhibited a. To adopt the adoption -- to adopt the substitution.

Saltzman: So moved.

Francesconi: I change my mind. I don't want to give grace the money. I'm kidding.

Katz: All right. [gavel pounded] now we need a formal vote on the amendment -- on the exhibit a.

JUNE 27, 2002

*******:** We had the first reading yesterday.

Katz: Oh, it passes on to second.

Katz: Thank you. I don't have my calendar. All right. You got what you wanted. Thank you, everybody.

At 5:17 p.m., Council adjourned.