



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

OFFICIAL  
 MINUTES

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 3RD DAY OF JULY, 2002 AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, Saltzman and Sten, 4.

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

Item No. 798 was pulled for discussion and on a Y-4 roll call, the balance of Consent Agenda was adopted.

<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>	<b>Disposition:</b>
733 Request of Joe Johns to address Council regarding a neighborhood presentation award (Previous Agenda 548)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
734 Request of Ron Braithwaite to address Council regarding the future relationship of Portland General Electric and the City (Previous Agenda 657)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
735 Request of Norman D. Wicks Sr. to address Council regarding an assault and tow on private property (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
736 Request of Norman D. Wicks Jr. to address Council regarding an assault and tow on private property (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
737 Request of Bill White to address Council regarding a prayer to ask for blessings on the Council and City (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>TIME CERTAINS</b>	
738 <b>TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM</b> – Accept the Implementation Strategies for the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area (Report introduced by Mayor Katz) (Y-4)	<b>ACCEPTED</b>

**JULY 3, 2002**

<p><b>739 TIME CERTAIN: 10:15 AM</b> – Accept and adopt the Central Eastside Development Opportunity Strategy (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendment to include elements that may differ from the Central City Plan and introduces concepts that may require a revision of the Industrial Sanctuary policy and the Strategy includes a vision, goals and objectives that provide a framework for additional work to implement strategies outlined in the document:</b> Commissioner Sten moved and Commissioner Saltzman seconded.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>36082</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>740</b> Adopt the 8th Amendment to the Central Eastside Urban Renewal Plan to establish authority to acquire property at 424-436 East Burnside Street (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendment that the authority to acquire the property located at 424-436 East Burnside Street granted by this Ordinance shall be automatically rescinded and become null and void on December 31st, 2002, unless either the Commission and the property owners have reached an agreement for the sale of the property or the Commission has filed a condemnation proceeding to acquire the property:</b> Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Sten.</p>	<p align="center"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED JULY 10, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>CONSENT AGENDA - NO DISCUSSION</b></p> <p align="center"><b>Mayor Vera Katz</b></p>	
<p><b>*741</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Portland Airport Interagency Narcotics Team and the Portland Police Bureau to provide access to the Portland Police Data System (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176615</b></p>
<p><b>*742</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement between City of Tigard and the Portland Police Bureau to provide access to the Portland Police Data System (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176616</b></p>
<p><b>*743</b> Agreement with Western Identification Network, Inc. for participation in the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176617</b></p>
<p><b>*744</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement between Washington County Sheriff's Office and the Portland Police Bureau to provide access to the Portland Police Data System (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176618</b></p>
<p><b>*745</b> Extend contract with Cascade Occupational Medicine Physicians, Inc. to perform medical evaluations for applicants to the Community Police Officers and Police Corps Program and increase compensation (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 33222)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176619</b></p>

**JULY 3, 2002**

<p><b>*746</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Gresham Police Department and the Portland Police Bureau to provide access to the Portland Police Data System (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176620</b></p>
<p><b>*746</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Oregon Health and Science University Department of Public Safety and the Police Bureau to provide access to the Portland Police Data System (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176621</b></p>
<p><b>*748</b> Authorize financing of housing preservation (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176622</b></p>
<p><b>*749</b> Amend labor agreement with AFSCME, Local 189 representing 911 Operators in the Bureau of Emergency Communications relating to terms and conditions of employment of certain represented employees (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176623</b></p>
<p><b>*750</b> Amend Special Downtown Services Agreement with Association for Portland Progress (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 51670) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176624</b></p>
<p><b>*751</b> Pay claim of Barbara Giering (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176625</b></p>
<p><b>*752</b> Pay claim of Aleksey Gossen (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176626</b></p>
<p><b>*753</b> Pay claim of Khalil M. Zonoozy (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176627</b></p>
<p><b>*754</b> Authorize a contract with Carleton Hart Architecture for architectural and engineering services for design and renovation of Fire Stations 8, 19 and 20 and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176628</b></p>
<p><b>*755</b> Authorize a contract and provide for payment for renovation and remodel of Fire Stations 5, 13, and 42 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176629</b></p>
<p><b>*756</b> Authorize a contract and provide for payment for the construction of Fire Station 9 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176630</b></p>
<p><b>*757</b> Amend contract with HDR Engineering, Inc. for continuation of track inspection services at Union Station (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 32716) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176631</b></p>
<p><b>*758</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University for the purchase of vehicle fuel (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176632</b></p>
<p><b>*759</b> Authorize a contract and provide for payment for elevator cab upgrades for five Smart Park Parking Garages (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176633</b></p>
<p><b>*760</b> Extend agreement with A&amp;N Technical Services (Ordinance; amend Agreement No. 34180) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176634</b></p>

**JULY 3, 2002**

<b>Commissioner Jim Francesconi</b>	
<p><b>*761</b> Apply for a \$19,970 grant from Metro's North Portland Enhancement Fund to do trail improvements in Kelley Point Park (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<b>176635</b>
<p><b>*762</b> Amend contract with Pacific Coast Construction to provide emergency soil stabilization and emergency structural corrections at Hillside Community Center (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 32888) (Y-4)</p>	<b>176636</b>
<p><b>*763</b> Contract with Nike, Inc. and Portland Parks Foundation to renovate and resurface outdoor basketball courts (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<b>176637</b>
<p><b>*764</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Washington County to provide up to \$45,000 in roadway crack sealing on Washington County roads by the City (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<b>176638</b>
<p><b>*765</b> Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Metro for improvements of the turtle nesting habitat in the Smith and Bybee lakes Wildlife Area adjacent to the North Marine Drive Extension--Phase 2 Street Improvement Project (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<b>176639</b>
<p><b>*766</b> Authorize settlement of condemnation claim of Bradrick Company, Inc. associated with Lower Albina Overcrossing project (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<b>176640</b>
<p><b>*767</b> Authorize contracts as required with nine professional, technical and expert service firms for engineering support for transportation engineering, traffic signal and street lighting projects (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<b>176641</b>
<p><b>*768</b> Authorize Interagency Agreement with the Portland Development Commission for 2002-2003 professional and technical services for transportation improvements (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<b>176642</b>
<p><b>*769</b> Approve the Intergovernmental Agreement with Tri-County Metropolitan District to utilize the coin processing services provided by Tri-Met, and authorize payments (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<b>176643</b>
<b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b>	
<p><b>770</b> Authorize separate agreements with Herrera Environmental Consultants, Inc., Camp Dresser &amp; McKee, Inc. and HDR Engineering, Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$25,000 per firm to provide engineering services for water quality and provide for payment (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 10, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>

**JULY 3, 2002**

<p><b>771</b> Authorize separate agreements with URS Corporation and KJM &amp; Associates Ltd. for an amount not to exceed \$25,000 per firm to provide engineering services for fiscal management and provide for payment (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 10, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>772</b> Authorize separate agreements with David Evans &amp; Associates, Herrera Environmental Consultants, Adolfsen Associates, Beak/Jones &amp; Stokes, and Shapiro &amp; Associates for an amount not to exceed \$25,000 per firm to provide engineering services for natural resources and provide for payment (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 10, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>*773</b> Appropriate funding for contract with Mayes Testing Engineers, Inc. for overflow materials testing, special inspection, and engineering services for the Materials Testing Laboratory for FY 2002/2003 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176644</b></p>
<p><b>*774</b> Authorize the execution of lease documents with Sulzer Pumps U.S., Inc. for office, shop and yard space for the West Side Combined Sewer Overflow Project (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176645</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>Commissioner Erik Sten</b></p>	
<p><b>*775</b> Agreement with Albina Community Development Corporation for \$125,000 for the rehabilitation and development of affordable rental housing and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176646</b></p>
<p><b>*776</b> Agreement with Central City Concern for \$332,992 for the CHIERS Outreach Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176647</b></p>
<p><b>*777</b> Agreement with Central City Concern for \$105,000 to support its affordable housing projects and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176648</b></p>
<p><b>*778</b> Agreement with Portland Community Land Trust for \$193,000 for home buyer financial assistance and acquisition under the land trust model and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176649</b></p>
<p><b>*779</b> Agreement with Peninsula Community Development Corporation for \$50,000 for the development of affordable rental housing and home buyer opportunities for low income residents and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176650</b></p>
<p><b>*780</b> Agreement with Portland Community Land Trust for \$102,300 for the Portland Community Land Trust acquisition and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176651</b></p>
<p><b>*781</b> Agreement with Neighborhood Pride Team for \$60,000 to support microenterprise assistance programs and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176652</b></p>

**JULY 3, 2002**

<p><b>*782</b> Agreement with Central City Concern for \$541,642 to provide homeless services, including alcohol and drug services, employment services, and homeless facility maintenance and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176653</b></p>
<p><b>*783</b> Agreement with Northwest Pilot Project for \$423,063 for housing assistance for seniors and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176654</b></p>
<p><b>*784</b> Agreement with Neighborhood House Early Head Start for \$131,677 for early childhood development funding and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176655</b></p>
<p><b>*785</b> Agreement with Community Energy Project, Inc. for \$107,415 for the Weatherization Workshop and Senior Weatherization Programs and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176656</b></p>
<p><b>*786</b> Agreement with JOIN for \$234,749 for outreach to homeless campers and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176657</b></p>
<p><b>*787</b> Agreement with Human Solutions, Inc. for \$60,000 to support the development of affordable rental housing and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176658</b></p>
<p><b>*788</b> Agreement with Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Program for \$44,556 to conduct citizen participation activities in Bureau of Housing and Community Development target areas and Housing and Community Development-eligible neighborhoods and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176659</b></p>
<p><b>*789</b> Agreement with Catholic Charities for \$24,697 to provide the Southeast Asian Youth Outreach Project and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176660</b></p>
<p><b>*790</b> Agreement with ROSE Community Development Corporation for \$111,577 to support affordable housing efforts and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176661</b></p>
<p><b>*791</b> Agreement with Multnomah County Health Department for \$62,953 to administer the Lead Line as part of the Portland Lead Hazard Control Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176662</b></p>
<p><b>*792</b> Agreement with Metro Home Safety Repair Program for \$138,105 for the Senior Home Repair and Maintenance Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176663</b></p>
<p><b>*793</b> Agreement with REACH Community Development, Inc. for \$71,610 for the Community Builders Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176664</b></p>
<p><b>*794</b> Agreement with Housing Development Center for \$53,043 for the Contractor Support Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>176665</b></p>

**JULY 3, 2002**

<p><b>*795</b> Amend the text of Ordinance with Portland Community College to develop an employer linked health care job training and placement program for low-income residents and provide for payment (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 176574) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176666</b></p>	
<p><b>*796</b> Amend Environmental Protection Agency Brownfields Showcase grant to carry out environmental assessments in the North Macadam District in the amount of \$200,000 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176667</b></p>	
<p><b>*797</b> Authorize application to Environmental Protection Agency for a grant of \$45,000 to coordinate development of a Smart Growth Handbook for the North Macadam District (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176668</b></p>	
<p align="center"><b>City Auditor Gary Blackmer</b></p> <p><b>*798</b> Approve contract with KPMG LLP for financial audit and other professional services for FY 2001-2002, and provide for payment (Ordinance) <b>Motion to accept amendment to paragraph 7 and B to read 25 percent:</b> Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman. (Y-4)</p>		<p align="center"><b>176669</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p align="center"><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b></p>		
<p align="center"><b>Mayor Vera Katz</b></p>		
<p><b>*799</b> Apply for a grant from U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance to reduce crime and improve public safety (Hearing; Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176670</b></p>	
<p><b>*800</b> Approve an Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County District Attorney Office for the Police Bureau to provide supervisory services of the joint Family Services Division Lieutenant (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176671</b></p>	
<p><b>*801</b> Accept a \$15,000 grant from the Oregon Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Division for Marijuana Eradication Project (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176672</b></p>	
<p><b>*802</b> Extend Legal Service Agreement with Cable, Huston, Benedict, Haagensen &amp; Lloyd for outside counsel (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 33228) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176673</b></p>	
<p><b>803</b> Amend City Code relating to authority to sign rental and lease agreements (Ordinance; amend Code Section 3.15.080)</p>	<p align="center"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 10, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>	

**JULY 3, 2002**

<p><b>*804</b> Amend the fee schedule for land division applications, demolition delay applications, and other miscellaneous planning services charged by the Office of Planning and Development Review effective July 5, 2002 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176674</b></p>
<p><b>*805</b> Amend City Purchasing Code to conform to State regulations, streamline procurement process and clarify existing procedures (Ordinance; add Code Sections 5.68.100 through 5.68.120; amend Chapter 5.33) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176675</b></p>
<p><b>*806</b> Authorize a contract with Daniel C. Smith and Associates/Vitetta and the Police Bureau to develop a conceptual program and site master plan for a Regional Public Safety Training Academy (Previous Agenda 577) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176676</b></p>
<p><b>807</b> Approve annexation to the City of property in case number A-1-02, 7301 SE Clatsop St. (Second Reading Agenda 703) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176677</b></p>
<p><b>808</b> Authorize an extraterritorial service extension from City to the property in case number SE-1-02, 9899 SE Tenino Court (Second Reading Agenda 704) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176678</b></p>
<p><b>809</b> 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 (Second Reading Agenda 708) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176679</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>810</b> Adopt the First Amendment to the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Plan to incorporate language regarding sustainability (Second Reading Agenda 709) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176680</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>Commissioner Jim Francesconi</b></p>	
<p><b>811</b> Assess benefited property for the costs of constructing street improvements in the Lents I Local Improvement District (Second Reading Agenda 712; C-9986) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176681</b></p>
<p><b>812</b> Assess benefited property for the costs of constructing street improvements in the Lents II Local Improvement District (Second Reading Agenda 713; C-9987) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176682</b></p>
<p><b>813</b> Assess benefited property for the costs of constructing street improvements in the Boise/Earl Boyles Park Local Improvement District (Second Reading Agenda 714; C-9998) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176683</b></p>
<p><b>814</b> 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 (Second Reading Agenda 715) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176684</b></p>



**JULY 3, 2002**

<b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b>	
<b>*815</b> Authorize conveyance of properties from Dennis Nguyen and Oregon Department of Transportation to the Bureau of Environmental Services, subject to certain conditions (Ordinance) (Y-4)	<b>176685</b>
<b>*816</b> Authorize the Director of the Bureau of Environmental Services to execute legal agreements for implementation of stormwater management demonstration projects at two Portland Public Schools (Ordinance) (Y-4)	<b>176686</b>
<b>817</b> Grant residential solid waste, recycling and yard debris collection franchises in the City (Second Reading Agenda 479) (Y-4)	<b>176687</b>
<b>Commissioner Erik Sten</b>	
<b>*818</b> Authorize service agreement with Portland Cable Access (Ordinance) (Y-4)	<b>176688</b>

At 11:43 a.m., Council recessed.

**JULY 3, 2002**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,  
OREGON WAS HELD THIS 3RD DAY OF JULY, 2002 AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi,  
Saltzman and Sten, 4.

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

<p><b>819</b>    <b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Adopt the action charts of the Marquam Hill Plan (Previous Agenda 727)</p>	<p align="center"><b>Disposition: CONTINUED TO JULY 10, 2002 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>
<p><b>820</b>    Reaffirm the Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan, its implementing measures and include the Terwilliger Parkway Design Guidelines (Previous Agenda 728)</p>	<p align="center"><b>CONTINUED TO JULY 10, 2002 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>
<p><b>*821</b>    Adopt and implement the Marquam Hill Plan (Previous Agenda 729)</p> <p><b>Motion to amend all items under Topic A:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Sten.</p> <p><b>Motion to amend all items under Topic B:</b> Moved by Commissioner Sten and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman.</p> <p><b>Motion to amend all items under Topic C:</b> Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Sten.</p> <p><b>Motion to amend all items under Topic D:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Sten.</p> <p><b>Motion to amend all items under Topic E, with the exception of E4:</b> Moved By Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.</p> <p><b>Motion to amend E4:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi. (Y-3; N-1, Katz)</p> <p><b>Motion to amend all items under Topic F:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.</p> <p><b>Motion to amend Topic G:</b> Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman.</p> <p><b>Motion to amend Topic H:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.</p> <p><b>Motion to amend all items under Topic I, with the exception of I4:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Sten.</p> <p><b>Motion to amend I4:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Sten. (Y-3; N-1, Francesconi)</p> <p><b>Motion to amend J2, add in the science and technology corridor or elsewhere in the City to the language:</b> Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman.</p> <p><b>Motion to amend Topic K:</b> Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Sten.</p>	<p align="center"><b>CONTINUED TO JULY 10, 2002 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN AS AMENDED</b></p>

At 4:49 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.

**JULY 3, 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.

**JULY 3, 2002            9:30 AM**

**Katz:** Good morning, everybody. The council will come to order. Welcome back, commissioner Sten, and we are -- I was announcing that you are on an educational mission, and so at some point, everybody is very interested at the educational mission and what you learned. So, maybe we can take a second this morning. Roll call, please.

**Francesconi:** Here. **Saltzman:** Here. **Sten:** Here.

**Katz:** Mayor is present.

**Sten:** I was gone for three weeks and had the great honor of being a fellow at harvard so, I spent three weeks with 72 people from around the country who work in state and local government, and really doing lots and lots of role playing and case studies and trying to put yourself in the positions you usually are not in and think about things we can do as a community to do more work. That's a real simple way to say it, but to get past some of the things that block us, and so it was really, really helpful. I am not coming back with a whole prescription of things to do. One thing that people are clear about, you come back and say here's the ten things we are going to change, that won't work. But, did learn a lot, and hopefully can share some of those lessons along the way.

**Katz:** Okay. Thank you. Already, let's get to communication.

**Sten:** I appreciate the council, with only three members giving me three weeks to be gone. That was a sacrifice.

**Francesconi:** We are going to give you an opportunity to make it up, don't worry. [ laughter ]

**Francesconi:** And the weather is going to be good when we do it.

**Katz:** All right. 733.

**Item 733.**

**Katz:** Hello.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Hi. How are you today.

**Katz:** All of you who are communicating have three minutes.

**Joe Johns:** The reason i'm here is to talk about -- I represent the [ inaudible ] let me see here. It looks like a complaint here. Mean dan Saltzman, is he here? I guess that's the guy. [ laughter ]

**Johns:** The reason we are here, we are going to present something but we want to tell you how it came about, and when dan Saltzman was the commissioner for Multnomah county, one of the problems we had, the libraries were closing, and one of the once that was going to close was the sellwood moreland, and when we were talking about it one day, they said well, what are we going to do, and I mentioned the group, I says well, do they have any papers. They said no, I said well, we get a court order and stop it. But instead of that, we got a hold of dan Saltzman, see, and he was such a mean guy, he made us work, really hard. And one of the things he did was we had meetings once a week. He attended the meetings. We had to notify all the churches and the residents and the schools and the businesses, and then we decided that we are going to earn money to go ahead and keep our library open. So, dan Saltzman developed a resolution to go to the Multnomah county chambers and to, to get permission to earn money to do this. Well, what we did was we had these barbecues and et cetera, and we had the thing three or four of them, one of them was at my home. We had that and et cetera. The people when, we had the barbecues, we kept track of the people, where they are from and how much they did. And they gave an average of \$85 per person for that

**JULY 3, 2002**

little library. Well to, show you how effective the sellwood moreland was. Bill Stewart from the Oregonian. He was doing articles and every week he would do an article on the sellwood and moreland library. He would tell them how we are doing. He called me on the phone and I explained what was going on. And I asked, how are the other libraries doing, and he said, they are upset with me. And I said, well, what's the problem, he says we don't write anything about them. I said well, what are they upset about? Because we write everything about the sellwood moreland. They asked him why, and they said because sellwood is not witchy, and they are doing something, and it was caused by him, he was making us work. And all of a sudden Dan Saltzman quit, he went to work for the city of Portland, so we are stuck doing the rest. But then what we did was we went back to the board, the county commissioners and we asked them that we wanted to put this measure on the ballot, and they looked at us, you know, that's a cost, cost. We said well, that's not a cost factor, it's an investment factor. Because if you put it on there, it's going to pass. If you can get people to pay \$85 for a free hot dog, something means they want their libraries. Well, before I came here, I tried to figure out how would you describe --

**Katz:** Your three minutes are up so, why don't you kind of compress everything and --

**Johns:** You are really good, aren't you. [ laughter ]

**Johns:** Okay. To compress it, we asked a couple of questions how -- what type of guy this Dan Saltzman is, so I ain't going to go through all the things, except for one thing, they said that he has a rule. I said, what's the rule? Rule number one, is take one more step, and I said well, what's rule two. They said rule number two, when you don't think you can take one more step, refer to rule number one. So, you can see the type of guy he was. Well --

**Katz:** Is.

\*\*\*\*\*: Is, okay. [ laughter ]

\*\*\*\*\*: The other thing -- [ laughter ]

**Johns:** The other thing about the libraries, as you know, the county library is good. One of the things that we know from that association of libraries is that this -- we have one of the best libraries in the United States, the system because of Commissioner Dan Saltzman helping us, so Dan, we would like to present to you the following. Here. To the honorable Dan Saltzman, Portland City Commissioner, from the United States Senate. Dear Dan, please accept my sincere appreciation for your outstanding work on behalf of the Multnomah County Library System. When I hold meetings in Portland in Multnomah County, I always hear time and time again how proud the citizens are of their libraries. I also know you and your advocate and support have played a key role in making this system as successful as it is. It was once said a long, as long as books are open, mines never close. That great truth is very, is very hard for the Multnomah County system. As long as the system remains strong and the books are open, countless minds will continue to be open to great ideas and compelling stories. The bottom line is that the Portland Multnomah County is a better place to live, work, and raise a family because of the superior library system. I am proud to join in the many others to absolute your leadership and making us whole. Again, please accept this appreciation, and sincere congratulations, as always, and please continue to keep in touch and let us know. Gordon Smith, United States Senator, and on the bottom it says, thank you from the Sellwood Eastmoreland, West Moreland, and Garthwood neighborhoods.

**Katz:** Well, that's wonderful. [ applause ]

**Johns:** One more, please. One more. Sorry, Mayor, just take it easy. Relax. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** If it's the same one from Ron Wyden, you can just -- is it?

**Johns:** Same one but different -- do you want me to read it or just give it to him?

**Katz:** Is the words the same?

**Johns:** No.

**Katz:** All right, go ahead.

**Johns:** Well, thank you.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Johns:** To the honorable dan Saltzman, Portland city commissioner. Dear dan, I would like to congratulate you on your efforts to maintain the Multnomah county library system. I witnessed the tireless efforts by you and other colleagues to maintain the Multnomah libraries. As a result, you have secured for the city and our community a valuable resource. Public libraries are among the most important institutions in any great city. The willingness of many volunteers, business associations, and youth organizations to partner with the public officials to maintain libraries speaks volumes about the leadership, the importance of the projects and the inspiration of my home town. All who have contributed to those new library systems have supported a very worthwhile project that will benefit citizens in Multnomah county for years to come, sincerely yours, ron wyden, and on the bottom, it says thank you from the sellwood, eastmoreland, west moreland and garthwood neighbors. Thank you.

**Katz:** Mr. Johns, thank you very much. [ applause ]

**Johns:** Sorry it took so long.

**Katz:** Thank you. That's very sweet of you, and the sellwood moreland citizens for honoring dan. He deserves that award, and he is, he is persistent and we constantly keep going to number one over and over and over again.

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

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

**Katz:** All right, 734.

**Item 734.**

**Ron Braithwaite:** My address is 230 this morning. I finished moving into 2334 southeast main, and for my old address on texas street. I am a long-time resident to the city, and my parents, or my father, my grandfather settled here in 1911. I have observed this city evolve and change and grow over a period of time. And become a better place because of people on the council, among others, seize be an opportunity -- seizing an opportunity. Portland general electric and enron corporation would like to continue business with us. You have been bludgeoned with the facts and figures on all sides. 25% of public power, the power in the united states comes from public utility districts. You have heard all the figures, you know all the information. Portland is a great city because people have taken advantage of this. I would contend that Portland will be a much better place if we could form, if you could form a public utility district in which we can take part. I travel all over the world. My passport is full of stuff. Because of my work. Portland is my favorite city in the entire planet, and i've been on, lived on three continents and been all over. This is a great city. You can make it greater. I urge you to take the opportunity to form public utilities district. And I am not going to bludgeon you with more figures and why this is such a wonderful idea. You already know that. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. Thank you very much. All right. 735.

**Item 735.**

**Norman D. Wicks Sr.:** Norman wicks, sr., been a 30-year resident of Portland. I would ask the council members, did they receive a packet that was deliver to their offices yesterday in regard to this? Mr. Francesconi, did you receive these? To begin with, by his own admission, the tow hearings officer said that this tow was you on private property off of private property, so he couldn't do anything about it. However, the tow order says the tow was ordered by the Portland police and there was a ticket placed on my vehicle for the tow by Portland police, a \$40 ticket. I think that this speaks for itself. I don't think that there is any argument here that this was an illegal tow, after I was the victim of an assault on this property, which is private property. I have some photographs here that show the, the site of the assault right here, private property, it's a business mall, a business parking lot. And we were told that we couldn't move the vehicle, if we did, we would be subject to arrest for moving the vehicle by officer busse. Right there on the ticket, it says "tow." I would ask

**JULY 3, 2002**

the council members to overturn the tow since I tried to go to mr. Saltzman's office, and I was asked to leave mr. Saltzman's office. I don't know why. I didn't say or do anything that would require my removal from the office. There are 1 pages of traffic citations and parking citations that I was given by the Portland police, oh, over about a year and a half to two years' time for being homeless. And can we have a vote?

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Wicks Sr.:** Can we have a vote?

**Katz:** I run the council, mr. Wicks. This is communications. We don't have votes under communications. All right.

**Wicks Sr.:** So you won't overturn the tow, is that what you are saying?

**Katz:** This is communications only. You have three minutes to make a communication to the council. We don't respond with the communications. Okay. 736.

**Item 736.**

**Norman D. Wicks Jr.:** My name is norman wicks, jr. I was present during the assault. There seemed to be a large pile of garbage in front of this back garage here, if everybody can see. And there was a table, we have been paid to remove better and we asked a gentleman inside this garage here if we could have this table. He came out and said, I will tell you what, I don't like people going through my garbage, homeless people, and walked over to my dad, picked him up around his neck, threw him down. He hit his head. He landed on his shoulders, his head hit the ground. And then went back inside, removed his pistol. We were backing up because he had a pistol and we were saying, he's got a gun, look out. And he put a badge on, and I began calling the police. I urge you to listen to the 9-1-1. He said he was a cop, and then proceeded to start kicking my dad while he was on the ground, dropped on him, put his handcuffs in his hand, had the point and began punching my dad with a, with the handcuffs. I told 9-1-1, I can't watch. I have to help my dad. I have to break this up. So, I went over to help. He hit me in the jaw with the handcuffs, bit my dad in the back. Grabbed one of my strands of gold chain wrapped around my neck four times and began choking me with it because it was tight and it kept pulling on it, wouldn't release it. And when the police got there, I couldn't move the truck. My dad was going to the hospital in the ambulance. It was a place called "american veterans specialized services." which is not even a security outfit for the northwest corporate park district. So, officer busse said nobody can move this vehicle. I am towing it just because your name is wicks.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right. 737.

**Item 737.**

**Katz:** There is one -- he's not here. All right, there's one consent agenda item. 798 that's being asked to be amended so we will pull that. Any other item that anybody wants to pull from the consent agenda items for discussion? Anybody on the council? If not, the vote on consent agenda.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. All right, 798.

**Item 798.**

**Katz:** All right. I need a motion to accept the amendment.

**Francesconi:** So move.

**Katz:** Do I hear a second?

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Katz:** Any objections? None. Anybody want to testify on this item? If not, roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. Thank you. 738.

**Item 738.**

**Katz:** Let me say a few words before I introduce john and sheila. If you recall, we adopted the interstate corridor urban renewal plan in august of the year 2000. It's been two years since we have

**JULY 3, 2002**

done this. And the plan identified the need for the community to set some strategies to guide the funding decisions that pdc and the community were going to make. This, if I remember correctly, one of the first times where we had 52 members of the community as a planning citizen's group to work with the Portland development commission to make some budgetary decisions. If you recall, we didn't have much money because of the commitment to pay for the light rail and because of the shilo inn, we have less money. But, the work started in 2000, and what you are going to hear today are the strategies that address livability and economic development and housing and transportation, the important things to the community. So, let me invite john and sheila, who chairs the group, to come up here.

\*\*\*\*\*: That is very nice, very patriotic.

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

**John Southgate, Portland Development Commission:** This is actually coordinated. We are both wearing our colors today. I will kick off. I am john with the Portland development commission. The mayor framed the issue before you. When the urban renewal plan was adopted and yes, it's hard to believe it was two years ago, it stated, I think it presented a broad set of goals for what the community hoped to see happen, and, in north and northeast Portland, and specifically in the interstate corridor urban renewal area. Such core values as benefiting the local community and the decisions that we and other agencies make creating wealth in the community, revitalizing areas around the light rail stations, as well as elsewhere in the urban renewal area, addressing the, the challenge of displacement, recognizing that as the area gentrifies their benefits but there is also negative consequences for especially low income renters and small businesses. And then, of course, our most recently acknowledged core value, the one of sustainability. So that plan set, you know, a broad tone for what we want to do, but it did not get into a lot of specifics and as you just said, we have spent most of the last couple of years then refining how we do that by preparing these strategies, and I think that one thing I want to emphasize and hopefully sheila will agree, this has been a very community intensive process. It's not the simplest, easy way to get things done, but, you know, I think it's clearly necessary. The strategies, as the mayor said, are focused on four broad topic areas, housing, economic development, transportation, and community livability, which includes parks and open spaces, as well as historic preservation and community facilities. In addition to those four broad topical strategies that would be applicable, urban renewal area-wide, there's also a more specific one for the five of the light rail stations, parallel to working on these four strategies we got a grant from the state to do a, a stationery revitalization strategy, that is also before you today. I just want to mention a couple of broad themes. I am not going to go into each strategy in any detail. We are prepared to answer your questions. First of all, because of our commitment and your commitment to keep the community engaged in the decision-making process and influencing budgeting decisions and priorities, these strategies all have a strong monitoring component. We are committing ourselves to continue to work with the community to keep the advisory committee and the subcommittees in place over time, and to consult with them, to certainly have them participate in our annual budget process and also to report back to them on the prior years' activities so that they could tell us if, as we, pdc, undertake the implementation of these strategies and the urban renewal plan, we are doing what they hope and had expected we would when we started all of this. One other specific thing that the mayor alluded to is the challenge of resources in this urban renewal area where there are huge hopes and expectations. Even before shilo inn decision came down, we knew that we didn't begin to have enough resources to cover the needs, the hopes and expectations. I think that that's going to be an ongoing challenge in this urban renewal area, even if the shilo decision is ultimately resolved favorably and has no impact. It's still going to be a challenge. We have a commitment to light rail so that funding commitment is, does have impacts, even though it is a key investment to benefit this community. On the positive note, in fact, I wanted to mention that there are some things that we were doing to try to develop other

**JULY 3, 2002**

resources and again, I am going to try to be brief here, but a couple of examples. We have with trimet undertaken several efforts to assist small businesses along interstate avenue affected by construction, and actually just a couple of months ago, we formally inaugurated a loan program for a small business at the cascadia evolving fund is running, low interest, favorable term loans, that are pretty accessible dollars for a lot of the businesses. Some are so small and weak they can't take advantage of the loan pool but others concludes and this will help bridge the gap between now and when the light rail is done and they are ready to thrive after the light rail is completed. Another one is the north, northeast homeowner campaign, which follows up on commissioner Sten, Sten's anti-displacement pilot project. This is an effort to get 2 to 300 households current renting households in the interstate and larger north, northeast area, into homeownership over the next three years. We are also working on the new market tax credits and other initiatives at pdc, and I guess the last broad area of resource development that I want to mention is the notion of generating more tax increment financing by spurring more private development. One of the things we are doing to achieve that is a predevelopment assistance where typically for every dollar of predevelopment assistance we grant to a developer or local property owner that generates 10 to \$15 of a private investment which means local wealth, as well as generating more tif to help our other needs. The only other thing that wanted to take advantage of the opportunity, mentioned the stationery revitalization strategy. One of the things we hope to come back to you in the foreseeable future is some zoning fixes to help accommodate the sort of development that we hope to see around the stationeries, the current zoning in some locations allows what I think most would agree are inappropriate use, especially given the strategy that we just completed. Things like fast food drive-through restaurants or mini-storage at some of the stations, that sort of use which obviously underutilizes the light rail investment is allowed today if someone came to apply for a permit so, we do hope, we hope to come before you in the near future to perceive that initiative. The last thing I wanted to mention, is acknowledging the staff, and I wrote them down because I don't want to forget anyone, this project was the result of a lot of community input. Sheila and others will testify, and I think will speak to that, but I also want to mention the staff at pdc and our partner agencies have contributed so much, the lead staff of the community strategy, alisa, the lead staff on the economic development strategy. Lia and allison and margaret all worked on the housing strategy. Steve was the lead on the transportation strategy. Our friend at pdot and julie was a key player on the stationery and other strategies. So, couldn't have been done without them. I want to acknowledge that. With that, I would like to turn it over to one of our fearless leaders. We have two co-chairs, paul is out of town and couldn't be here. But sheila was gracious enough to join me at the table. Sheila.

**Sheila Holden, Co Chair, Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area Advisory Committee:**

Thank you, john. And thanks, john, for recognizing the staff. I, too, as co-chair of the, as it turned out, 55-member group, over two years, I would like to say first of all, north, northeast Portland continues to amaze me in being able to recognize the issues of our past and the concerns of the past and take those and turn them around and still have faith in the system that it can help to make a difference in that area. This plan is a very clearly an example of that, and I would like to thank all the council members who have participated and helped us to find other sources of income to help make this plan a reality. As you know when we first began down this road, we were thinking 30 million for light rail, but we were thinking 30 million over some period of time. 30 million came out up front. We already knew that there was a window of opportunity for, for the local residents that we really wanted to, to address where if we didn't get support for them right away, we would not be able to keep from increasing the amount of displacement or the loss of potential job opportunities. A lot of strategies went into place. A lot of them are, are working. Erik Sten's efforts with the housing side have made a major difference. Pdc's efforts in thinking outside of the box, and not looking at tax increment as the beginning and the ending of how you do funding and



**JULY 3, 2002**

going out and partnering with the state to bring in the activity bonds that john talked about, the new markets piece, all of those are new kinds of ways of looking at doing funding. But, we still have issues with, with not having enough funds to address the needs and, in north, northeast, and, and the interstate corridor. And so one of the things, just first off, I would like to put on your list of things to consider is how council might be able to help us in this effort to find additional funds to partner with whatever private funds we may be able to identify to address the, the jobs and employment component of, of the corridor because the folks don't have jobs, they are not going to be able to afford the housing, and the livability, which everyone wants to continue to have, to be seeing the increase, and the opportunities around transportation. So, if there is opportunity to consider in the near future, the additional funding that we had originally talked about before the shilo suit came to, to the forefront, we would hope that you would look at what those opportunities are, and be creative, if you can in doing so. Having said that, I would like to recognize some of the folks who are here in the audience who have helped to put together the interstate corridor advisory committee's plan for redevelopment of that area. We have, and I am not looking behind me, but I think I saw alan come in last.

**Katz:** Why don't you stand up when you are introduced. Alan, you are back there.

**Holden:** Alan was part of the, the economy, the economic development and jobs committee, and we have jenny, who was also part of the economic development and jobs committee. We have the chair of the, of the house and co-chair of the housing committee, pauline. We have the chair of the transportation committee, lenny, and we have the chair -- the co-chair of the livability committee, carol. Did we get everyone that was here? Oh, betsy. And betsy, who also worked with the housing committee. Parks. Thank you, betsy. And so those are our folks who are here. They are representing each of those four areas and the 55-member committee. I would like to thank, on behalf of our committee, this man who helped to keep everyone on track and doing the work, and we had very controversial issues that came up before us, and he knew when to bring the mayor in and put everyone's feelings at ease, and he knew when to, to back off and let the community speak and say what it needed to say, even when it was about pdc, and I think that because of that, pdc has a better image in the community than it had initially when we started the process. In closing, thanks again to our, to our committee and there is someone who said, they see things as they are, and they say, why some people do, and others see things as they are and say, why not.

**Francesconi:** Robert kennedy.

**Holden:** You are right. And that's the way that we feel about, about the, the ikk rack and the efforts there. We said, why not tri-met, and they were able to come up with a better way of incorporating the design, that it wouldn't impact the local businesses along the route.

**Katz:** You did a tremendous job.

**Holden:** Right so, they would make sure that people were included in the opportunity to do business with them as they did their construction and that they would build capacity with local contractors. We said why to, why not to pdc, and said, thank god it's inside the box and try to come up with other resources to help the area and they were able to do so with those things mentioned and john mentioned there earlier, and we are still saying why not to council about, about finding additional ways to provide some funding in this critical period, which we think is the next three to five years to address the issues around jobs and employment, economic development, and the projects that we have put on the table that we would like to see. So he again, thank you, and happy 4th of july.

**Katz:** Thank you, sheila, and I want to thank all the members that are here. I was fortunate to start with all of you and your little committees and working through the issues, and sheila, you are right. People were, we're here for government and here to help you and for many, many years, long past, we didn't do much, and we did more harm than good. But, people still had faith, and, and they

**JULY 3, 2002**

supported the notion of pdc coming in, working with the community and trying to make the vision a reality. So thank you for all your work. All right, let's open it up for public testimony.

**Katz:** Lenny, were you as persistent and a trouble-maker on that committee? For me?

\*\*\*\*\*: I think the answer is yes.

**Katz:** Yes, okay. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** Who wants to start?

**Betsy Radigan:** I will start because I am going to be brief this morning. Good morning, mayor, council. I am betsy. I reside at 37 northeast morgan in the piedmont neighborhood. I am a member of the community livability subcommittee. Parks and open space chair. We wanted to thank you for giving us the opportunity to address aspects of the community other than housing, jobs, and transportation. That was the charge of the community livability committee, and we have taken advantage of the opportunity that you have given us to propose some pretty solid strategies, we think, to make improvements to our parks. Give our residents better access to some pretty special open spaces. We enjoy north Portland. We would like to build community facilities. We are a community that relies very heavily on the facilities that we have, mostly operated by government, and we would like to restore our cultural and historic resources. We acknowledge that there are many deficiencies that are preventing our community to prosper, and they must be addressed, but there are assets, too. They might be tarnished. They might be dilapidated. They might be well worn, but they are assets that deserve to be preserved and enhanced. We think that they are vital to the revitalization of our community, and we, we pledge our support and our continued commitment to realizing these strategies for the next 20 years.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Francesconi:** Just one question, I should know the answer to this, and maybe, so if you don't, don't worry about it. Are any of the school lands property that is subject for development, the open space that the, the, the real estate trust think about developing. Are any of those the open space along the interstate corridor?

\*\*\*\*\*: Yes.

**Francesconi:** Which one?

**Radigan:** Canton school, beach school, I believe peninsula school, as well, and the significance of kenten, is that it's located on interstate avenue at lombard. And beach school is in very close proximity to the interstate corridor.

**Francesconi:** And what was the other one?

**Radigan:** Peninsula. I am not certain about that.

**Southgate:** Also the masonic temple, it's not on interstate, but --

**Francesconi:** At jefferson. Okay.

**Katz:** Who is next, lenny?

**Lenny Anderson:** I am a -- I am lenny anderson, I work with businesses on the swan island tma. That was, indeed, the 50-member committee, I think one thing i, I can't resist noting here is that we had members of that committee who really wanted us to fail so, we had a real steep hill to climb, and I think that we -- those of us who, who saw it to a successful conclusion have a special bond that I cherish, frankly. And I would like to also mention that outreach has been outstanding in this, and in particular on the transportation side, I would like to single out an individual, laura wintergreen, who has just done an outstanding job in getting out and talking to people and making sure that they participate so that we have good levels of participation. Our strategy is full of promise and promises and I think that the community has been, and continues to be extraordinarily patient in the face of both the shilo inn and the general fund situation, and what I have copied to you, for instance, in transportation, we have \$60,000 to work with this year, which is, which is about what one middle level planner at odot gets for a year. So, what I have copied to you as a memo, I had written for the advisory committee earlier this year, and I would like to take a few

**JULY 3, 2002**

seconds to run down some of these items, and i, and to, to follow up on sheila and say, you know, we could use your help, and for instance, the first item is the community foundation, which if you are familiar with, there is one in the northwest part of town called the i-405 fund and I would just like to point out that the city, bureau of maintenance, does lease land from odot under the east side ramps of the fremont bridge, so some of the parallel funding mechanisms are potentially literally there, that the city is making lease payments, I believe, to odot, and there's no reason those couldn't be transferred as the start of a community foundation. When interstate avenue was transferred, there was odot money that came with that. I have pursued this with steve, and apparently that money has been spent. Unlike sandy boulevard, which is in line to get close to \$8 million for reconstruction, interstate avenue will not get any, which is too bad, but the horse is out of the barn on that one. The next item, I won't belabor, except to say that the, the plans for widening the slough bridge, will, in my opinion, have additional negative impacts in north Portland, and I think that as an opportunity to look at some, some mitigation opportunities similar to what was done with the restoration where sound walls were included, and the stationery development will show you in a few minutes some, some ideas for upgrading the overpasses, and I am about out of time. But, one more thing, the underpass on russell street, for instance, which is about the 100 yards, does not have one, one streetlight, you know. When they built that, nobody said put in a streetlight. So, it's just, it's as fundamental as that. A quick thanks to bes for money for going street. That's an example of what we were able to do. And finally, if I may just say that I am really bullish on interstate avenue, and the avenue. This project, this has a destination at every station that's worthy of, of exploration today so I think it's a great project and I am proud to be part of it. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you, lenny. All right.

**Carol Chism, IFCC, 5340 N Interstate Ave, 97217:** My name is carol, and I am with the, the community livabilty committee, and i, too, support the economic development, the housing and the community livabilty strategies. Just one word, though, that parks and open spaces are vitally important to the success and networking of this whole plan. Because without a place for people to live, and the quality of life that goes with it, economic development, housing, and, and the other strategies really don't work well. We have had some kinds of hits with our parks department, and we are concerned about sustaining the livabilty in patent park and columbia park, as well. It's easy to say that there are other prying needs that need to happen with urban renewal, but we really encourage you to continue to support that, that community livabilty strategy. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Mark Kirchmeier, 7320 N Hurst Ave:** Mark. I am an intern of the interstate rickrack and also a member of the polish library association. In just 26 months when we cut the ribbons to open the interstate avenue light rail line, the train, I am afraid is going to serve a lot of vacant lots and underutilized property. I am afraid that there will be virtually no new affordable housing, and pitifully low transit ridership. And the light rail could be perceived by its critics as a failure and unfortunately, with some, some, with some reason. To reduce that risk, I would like to ask that the council consider, emphasize consider, asking the advisory committee to debate the merits of a hot potato, and that would be ask, to asking the staff to do a study of the economic pros and cons of friendly condemnation of select business property only, emphasizing business property only, and only one, emphasizing only one, and I talked with my friend pauline before I came up here, of the nine ura neighborhoods, in this case, kenten and only kenten. For example, pdc had hoped in the preshilo days and may hope again of getting as much as \$175 million in income over the next 25 years. In the study, it could evaluate in kenten how many housing units and other improvements could pdc afford if it is able to purchase business property at assessor's office real market value, as versus what pdc currently faces of not being able to, of paying any property at all because of exorbitant values that current owners are, are placing on the property. The use of this select

**JULY 3, 2002**

domain, or starting out by merely, setting it in one select neighborhood could be a way to free up the, the dire revenue shortage that the previous speakers were talking about. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. This was the time that I came to talk with the group when this issue came up so it was a hot potato at the very beginning. I assume it is still a hot potato --

**Kirchmeier:** This is a way to make it more of a manageable, small french fry.

**Katz:** Well, no, no, no. [ laughter ]

**Francesconi:** A hot french fry. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** And if the group, and I think we left it this way, and sheila and john and the group, correct me if I am wrong, if and when the group is ready to do that conversation, they will make that decision and go ahead and do it, so if the group is, is ready to proceed with that discussion, they will do it.

**Kirchmeier:** The group, as a whole, hasn't talked about it. I can talk with, with the group co-chairs about making this an agenda item.

**Katz:** That would probably be a good way to start.

**Francesconi:** And if there is some people from the group here, they might want to talk to the central east side in the back row here, about this issue, because it's later on the agenda today.

**Katz:** Okay. Alan.

**Alan Hipolito:** My name is alan, and the address is --

**Katz:** Speak up a little bit.

**Hipolito:** My address is 6736 northeast killingsworth. I won't bore you with how many different committees i've been on related to this project. [ laughter ] I am here today, really, to share with you two visions. The first one is kind of disappointing and it's already been realized. And the second one is guided but it's possible, I think, if we make commitments to work together. And my request is that you listen to both of these visions, that is that you don't indulge in what otherwise is a very normal inclination to, to close one's ears to unpleasant news nor to allow the promise of future goods to obscure water existing shortcomings. Like sheila, I really very much believe in acknowledging the lessons of past and current realities, and building for a better future. Last year, about a year ago, I sat with my children at the corner of northwest 10th and hoyt, quite accidentally waiting to show them the new streetcar. And as I sat and I watched and I thought to myself, you know, thank goodness that north, northeast is the soul of Portland. Because, there was no soul where I stood for 45 minutes on that saturday morning. There was no soul operating those businesses. There was no soul living in those apartments. There was no soul in that streetcar. We can make whatever claims we want about how we, as a city, and treat our people of colored communities, but undeniably, we failed to provide them meaningful access to this benefit, this idea of our city's smart growth future and reputation, and so I wondered, ultimately, would interstate be next? And would the soul of Portland lose its soul? And I don't think that it needs to be that way. We can commit to a different future, and it all starts for me with these compelling stationeries. Priority opportunities for reasons that we all understand, and clearing, the report before you commits future stationery developments to the following -- opportunities for community interest to access and influence project decision making, particularly those who live, work, and play close to the developments, particularly those most at risk of displacement. A plan for addressing displacements, particularly for renters who live closeby, and economic opportunity for community interest through construction and operation of any development. If a development cannot do these things, we ought not to build it. Because to do so would mean we compromised our community commitments in favor of other considerations. Conversely, developments that want to meet these commitments, demand all the support we can muster, and more so. This is going to be hard work. We all know this. A lot of us got to this work because we wanted to work on justice. We wanted to work on equality, and we are still here. We are still working on it. It's not going anywhere. And the stakes are high for the stationery residents, for the urban renewal area, and for the city and for

**JULY 3, 2002**

the smart growth movement. We know, we are making a model. We all know this, and think about it, if Portland can build a light rail and transit oriented development through its most economically and racially diverse cities, I mean, neighborhoods and generate new investment and generate tax revenue and create opportunities for the development interest, without strong political opposition and resulting turnover, then why wouldn't other cities do that, so if we can integrate community benefit and involvement, particularly for at-risk residents into that model, think what we can do for our brothers and sisters and other -- in other cities. Very desperate for transportation for jobs and for housing, but it all starts here, and it all starts with the resources in the stationeries.

**Katz:** Thank you. Aieta may, it's good to see you back.

**Jada Mae Langloss:** I had to get out of my deathbed. But, it's worth it. I wanted to ask you a favor. I would love to take tri-met everywhere I go. That's why I am a hostage of Portland, Oregon, is because it's got tri-met. I am a tri-met addict. So, since I can't take tri-met with me everywhere I go, I will just have to stay here or, or get rescued by another free beach area, maybe hawaii. In the meantime, there is, there is one chair left open right here. Nobody is there. And I have asked many times if I might be able to share the chair because I am way overqualified and underfunded for any of these offices. I was going to ask mr. Sten, because he already knows my thoughts about sharing the chair, but he's back here in his chair, so I don't have a chance to, to, to get practice of being in a chair. But I don't know why he came back so soon before I could try out his chair. I thought maybe he was still in middle school back on the east coast or, or preschool or something like that. I don't know, harvard or mitt, wherever he's learning everything, I would like to know what he learned. On his own time, not council time. So, I am stuck here because of tri-met. If I could take it with me, I would. I would be free and be able to travel around the world everywhere I go with tri-met.

**Katz:** We are happy that your health has improved and you have a chair over there any time you want. Thank you.

**Langloss:** Well, I am still going to, to preach, share the chair. [ laughter ] You have got to train your replacement, and I like the park system, so I will expect mr. Francesconi to train me to take his chair.

**Katz:** All right. All right. Thank you, karla.

**Katz:** Anybody else? Anybody else want to testify on this item?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Good morning. Today before you is the station --

**Katz:** Do you want to identify yourself for the record.

**Sylvia Evans, Power of People:** I am sorry, I am silvia evans with power of people organizing with empowered residents.

**Lucille McDonald:** My name is lucille, and I am with p and a association.

**Evans:** Today before you is the stationery revitalization strategy. We have participated in this long process of assessing community needs versus available funding, and understanding the reality that we every day, struggling to raise our families and survive, not knowing if tomorrow we will become a gentrification statistic although lo this funding will not pay for our immediate knees to, allow us to live in our communities. Bricks and missouri mortgagor can't afford us the opportunity to create stepping stones so that we may in and up and out of poverty. It would also be the means for stabilization -- for stabilizing, excuse me, our community and providing a nurturing environment to live and be happy. We ask you play close attention to this plan and only fund developers who are willing to work with the community on building opportunities, not just structures. These types of developers that we work with, we will also support. By taking a nontraditional approach to developing new opportunities, this will allow us to not just live but also to survive and be happy. Thank you.

**Katz:** All right. Thank you, everybody. This is a report and we are going to vote on accepting the implementation strategies for the interstate corridor urban renewal area. Roll call.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Francesconi:** Just briefly. There's lots of good news. The good news is how people from the community came together with government to, to make it a more inclusive process to build a more inclusive community. Because of the lack of resources and because the gentrification pressures, this had the potential to explode and because of relationships that were built by people working together, that hasn't happened yet. And that's a credit to the community leaders, sheila and paul, and others. It's a tribute to the staff led by john southgate. And alyssa gerdler and others. I was happy to learn about laura's role. And it's a tribute to the political leadership, both provided by the mayor and on the housing side by commissioner Sten. So it's incumbent upon us to do what we can to help provide the resources, or else we again raised expectations without the capacity to deliver, which in the end causes more problems than not. Now, there are some success stories that have been mentioned here already, the housing resources. One that was not mentioned on the employment side is the tri-met efforts to really diversify the workforce through the projects and bruce watts is here, fred hansen deserves a lot of credit and it shows that what you do at the top can actually have a benefit in direct economic employment to people building the projects so, that's another success story in that regard. And then we have the cascadia project, bob stole and those people bringing additional resource to say bear that should be acknowledged here on this. Then we have the efforts led by pdc and don and norris that has hope that new market tax credit. We have to land this thing, and then that would provide resources on the housing and employment side. The three areas -- I would like to do more now in two of the others, I have tried to help in one. On the park side we are going to more trying to maintain the system so there isn't a bond measure where we can acquire new things listed in your report. But, we have to, of course, pass the levy to maintain what we have got. But the second effort regarding parks and open spaces, I am very concerned as is the mayor and others, about the school lands policy and the selling of open space and green space. So what we are trying to do is put together some resources that can help with that, both foundation and, and public sectors, so we have approached some foundations. The parks foundation is very engaged in this, so if we can come up with some money, we are actively negotiating with the district and ronbergman, on behalf of the mayor and the city is in the room, taking the lead, but we need to put together a strategy because this not only affects this urban renewal district in this part of town but the entire city, so I guess I am pledging to work with you in this effort. The other is pdot. Again, I won't keep saying this forever, but I am grateful for the mayor making this appointment. Lani, I have seen your letter of january 28th. There are problems with some of those options but what we can do from a pdot standpoint to bring some resources and that depends on some other things happening. Because we are another bureau with no money. We are not -- no money, but a problem financially. So, let me see what I can do, and I have to get up to speed. But, the third effort is the most signature, and I don't have the answers. It's the economic development implementation strategy, and what resources we are going to do to implement that. There are some efforts that I am working on with others to bring some new workforce dollars to the city. If they bear fruit, it would be a way to help implement some of these, but it's premature at this time so, this is one I need to talk to alyssa, need to work with the mayor and figure out through the implementation of the economic strategy how this, which will be coming to the council later, how this area fits in that broader strategy with the idea of bringing some resources to bear. On the third one, which I think is the most critical from my perspective right now, given the dynamics, I don't have any answers. So, I guess that I just want to work with you on it. So, thanks for all your work. Aye.

**Saltzman:** I want to thank the committee and the staff of pdc, you have done a lot of work, and any time a 55-person committee can produce anything that is coherent, and intelligible, my hats off to you, and you have done it very, very well, and you have done it against some circumstances that could take the wind out of your sails, the shilo decision, the first call on the urban renewal dollars of the light rail project, the survey, you could have let yourself get very, very depressed and down and

**JULY 3, 2002**

probably that happened at times, but nevertheless, I think we are all in this for the long run and we realize that, that we will have the ability to realize the investments that need to happen, both in housing, businesses, and in transit in this area, and open spaces, as well. And I really want to, you know, do, to echo, again, the good work of tri-met, pdc, the cascadia fund and really recognizing the impact of, of the light rail project on small businesses. Many of which, you know, make it from payroll to payroll very, and sometimes not even that. These are fragile businesses. They deserve to be successful businesses, and I think the loan fund has been a big step in the right direction. I wish that there were ways that we could look at grants, but we haven't quite figured that one out yet, but let's hope the loan fund will work. Good luck, aye.

**Sten:** Well, sheila, all 55 members of the committee, I think that there is more on the subcommittees. My hat is really off to you. It's a remarkable job that you have done, and didn't go to nearly as many meetings as you did but got a taste of it, and I think that it sounds, perhaps, easier than it was today. I think this community figured out, with a lot of leaders, community mostly over a long time, that we can build different kinds of physical environments and we have been very successful at building light rail and this is going to be another light rail line. That's something that most places are still trying to figure out. I think that we are onto the next question, which for me, is much more vexing and probably more profound. Alan got at it a little today, or a lot, alan, which is, can you use that physical revitalization to benefit people who need it? And there's a long history, unfortunately, of places sprucing up and people moving out and I think the question is, you know, can we do it, and, you know, it's going to be a long struggle and money is going to be part of it, but you can have all the money in the world and not have a strategy and cohesion and you won't get there, and I think we are making progress. I also wanted to thank, along with your efforts, the bureau of housing and community development who didn't seem to show up. Maybe they are doing something else but have worked hard to come up with tricky things like residence is he requirements and it's more tricky than it sounds like. We start by saying, can we take a small chunk of the money, not most of it, but a small chunk of the affordably housing dollars and say, to access this, you have to have lived in the neighborhood because you can't really stop displacement without targeting dollars that way, and it turns out it's very hard to define. We are in a time where people move all the time, particularly renters, and people who really envision as community members may have jumped around a lot so these are things that we have to figure out but clearly one way to help people benefit from this revitalization is to own a home. If you are a working family that owns a home in the neighborhood, preferably last year but if not, next year, you are going to benefit from this, and so that's one way, and another is permanently affordable rental is you can stay in a better place at a predictable price. You don't gain the equity but you gain the chance to benefit from these things. And finally, jobs in economic development, and I think that, I think that we have a strategy on all of these things to your hard work. I think it's very, very ground-breaking and I think it's the test of the city. I will stop here but I think the test of the city is not, can we make it livable. I think that we have achieved that as a city, although we have a lot of work to do. It's, can we make it livable for everybody and make everybody benefit from these things, and obviously, that's been mayor Katz's vision, as she's led this, and your vision is you have made it happen in the community, so let's keep going, and thank you very, very much. Aye.

**Katz:** It's really all been said, but I want to remind everybody that this is the first light rail that's actually going through a neighborhood. And we need to be very cognizant of that. We talk a lot about land use and transportation and how those two are linked, and we tie housing to that formula, but this is a neighborhood that has seen very little change in some parts of the neighborhood, and in some others, a lot of change, and this is a neighborhood that had big dreams, and it started off with a commitment of the money not necessarily for their big dreams, but for light rail that was supposed to stimulate the private investment that then created a tax increment financing pool of resources. My hope is that that still will be a source of funds, but we will have to be creative and use the other

**JULY 3, 2002**

sources that everybody has been working on, so my hat is off to you. I am not going to appoint any more members, sheila. I thought that we were at 52. I forgot that there were three more that we added. But, if you ever are ready for the, the more difficult conversations, whether it's issues of condemnation or other issues, please call on me, I will be more than happy to be there. Thank you, everybody, for your hard work. And especially a thank you for tri-met. Jim doesn't know that, but there is a little group that meets on a regular basis on imax to try to work some of the sticky issues with regard to the construction of the light rail, and we had some sticky issues, and tri-met did an incredible job, and then bruce, you, as well, in terms of your commitment to hiring minority and small business, merging small businesses, so thank you all. There's a lot more to do, stay together, we'll have other hurdles that we will have to bust through, but I am convinced with the optimism of this community that we will be able to get there. Aye. All right. 739 and 740. Let's read those together.

**Items 739 and 740.**

**Katz:** All right. Before I ask denise and larry to come up -- commissioner Francesconi, we are waiting for you. This is another visioning that I had the privilege to be at. I wasn't at every meeting but I was there at the very beginning, and this was a little -- actually, it was as delicate as the one we previously talked about. This is a community that was beginning to see themselves a little bit different. It's an industrial sanctuary, but the community realized that it is in the core of the city, and as being part of that core of the city, it had to begin to think maybe in the, in the mode of the 21st century, but also, to maintain the industrial sanctuary opportunities for a lot of the members of the central east side. Not an easy thing to do. So, what you have here is a wonderful vision. What I say to you all is that it's in the details that, that, that are coming down the road that will, will test all of us, and it isn't -- there is one area that I think will, will test all of us, and will bring a much broader community to the table, as we begin to get the zoning and some of the other plans, but this is, this is the wonderful beginning. I want to congratulate all of you. There is in the document, and I need to mention this, only because I am the bureau of planning, the idea of an ix zone. We don't know what it quite is yet. But we did talk about it at the very beginning, that we may have to go somewhere else to see if we can create a, a marriage between what the vision has set out for us and what the reality is on the ground. So, there is still a lot of work to do, but you have, you have taken an incredible step, congratulations, and come forward now and present that vision to us.

**Katz:** And at some point, larry or denise, talk about the amendment, okay.

**Denyse McGriff, Portland Development Commission:** Good morning. Denyse mcgriff, Portland development commission. Thank you very much. I couldn't have characterized it better. I think that you, mayor Katz, have emphasize the challenge that lies ahead and the many, many discussions that we need to have regarding all of the aspects of the strategy. I think what I want to do is go back for a moment and let you know how much of a collaboration we had. We started this in 1999, and we had an unprecedented collaboration between neighborhoods, the business association, city staff, bureau of planning, the Portland office of transportation, and the parks' department. In addition, we had property owners, which, as you know, are sometimes hard to get out and come to meetings, and we had tenants, and everybody got around the table and I think initially, there was some suspicion about where everybody was standing and who was going to say what, but I think as the discussion continued, people realized that, that in order to move forward, we were all going to have to work together to look at the possibilities of how we could increase employment. We are so vitally located, so close to downtown that the jobs are needed desperately needed to support downtown and support the rest of the city. We really looked a lot at the transportation and the economic realities. I think I want to thank my colleague, susan at the bureau of planning for bringing up the hard questions that we all knew were there, but we didn't have the answers, so we knew that this was going to involve additional discussions and additional work and maybe some agony but that we would all get through it. I think that, that your support of us moving ahead with the next phase of



**JULY 3, 2002**

this project, which is really the hard, hard part, is going to provide a framework for increased reinvestment and revitalization in the central east side urban renewal district. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you, Denise. Go ahead.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Mayor, other members of the city council, good morning.

**Katz:** Good morning.

**Michael Bolliger, Past President, Central Eastside Industrial Council:** My name is Michael, and I am the past president of the central east side industrial council. I am currently a member of the Portland development commission's urban renewal committee for the central east side. And I participated in the stakeholder group for the development opportunity strategy. I sincerely appreciate this vision finally being brought before the city today. The study deals with some very timely issues, which I think can positively impact the central city, our business district, and the surrounding neighborhoods. First, the location is adjacent to the esplanade from the Morrison bridge north and goes south to the Cruthers street. It is intended to bring a 24-activity and employment to that area so that the park is not dark and by itself. Also, we have discussed improved east-west connections for the neighborhoods so that they have an easier way of getting to the park and enjoying it. As a result, we would have a safer and friendlier area. The development, itself, looks for a higher employment density than we typically have elsewhere in the district. It would also take advantage of solving some of the blighted, unused property that is down that area on the, on both sides of Water Avenue. The result we would look for would increase property values and the tax increment we all look for and would hopefully land 2000 to 2500 more jobs within our city. And our district. When combined with a lower burnside redevelopment vision, which has been approved as the mayor indicated, we would look for these two projects to be a catalyst for other development throughout the district. Creating an economic juggernaut for the central city, and us as well. Thank you very much for your time.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Peter Stark, Board member, Central Eastside Industrial Council:** My name is Peter Stark. I am on the board of the central east side industrial council and co-chair of the business development committee for that group. I am here to express my committee's support for the central east side development opportunity strategy, also known as the CE-DOS. I am very excited to be here. It has been a long-time coming. As Denise mentioned, it has been at least a couple of years of a planning process and has taken a bit to get here so we are excited to be here.

**Francesconi:** What took you so long. [laughter]

**Stark:** Well, just a lot of thinking and we are still thinking --

**Bolliger:** It was on the top shelf.

**Stark:** This document recommends a successful collaboration between the city of Portland, the neighborhoods, its east-side business community, and we wish to thank this council for your support through your agencies. You will note in the report that the PDC, the Portland office of transportation, mayor's office, Portland parks and recreation, bureau of planning, we are all part of this process, and these agencies had a positive influence on this document. For example, exploring a new urban industrial zone was first suggested by PDC's Denise McGriff, and Susan with the city of bureau planning. And I think that actually, it was a very brilliant idea to come up with a solution for trying to improve some density without negatively impacting the businesses in the district. What are we trying to accomplish? The primary goal is to establish a strategy for promoting economic development. In other words, find a way to increase the number of jobs in the district. We believe this effort is possible without destroying the current economic fabric that exists in the district. By looking at a small area, we had focused our efforts, which if initiated, could be the catalyst for additional economic growth. The strategy is just the first step. It is the start for what we believe will be the future of the central east side. We hope you will share our enthusiasm and support the central east side development opportunity strategy. Thank you.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Katz:** Thank you.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Any questions?

**Katz:** Well, we will get to that in a minute. All right. Anybody else want to testify from the central east side? On this?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I believe just us two.

**Katz:** Just the two of you? Come on up. Is this an amended resolution?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** There is an amended one.

**Katz:** So we need to adopt it?

**Katz:** Identify yourself for the record.

**Joanne Ferrero:** Well, I was going to speak on the 8th amendment but I served on the dos committee. My name is joanne ferraro. My address is 230 east burnside street. I would only add that when the east bank esplanade was, was a conception that we were going to go forward with, one of the, one of the things that we thought about was the safety of people on the esplanade and there was this, this large tract of land with nothing on it and that we thought we first thought that that would be a wonderful place to have a development, and we have worked on this and rewritten and rewritten and gone back time after time to come up with a document that you see today, and we, as peter stark said, are really excited and happy that this is finally coming before the council.

**Katz:** Thank you. Denise. You wanted to talk about the 8th amendment?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Sure.

**Katz:** Did you want to testify?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Yes.

**Katz:** Okay, for the 8th amendment. I called -- I read -- we read it together.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I didn't understand.

**McGriff:** Again, denise mcgriff, Portland development commission. Staff for the central east side urban renewal district. The request before you today involves an amendment to the central east side urban renewal plan. The 8th amendment is proposed to add a parcel of land to the list of real property that could be acquired by the commission. Pdc would like to acquire this parcel to facilitate development of the entire block located between mlk grand, ankeny and east burn-size. Some of the reasons that we are interested in the redevelopment project have to do primarily with the framework provided by the lower burnside redevelopment plan that was adopted by the commission, pdc commission and the council again, in 19 the 9 -- in 1999. The lower burn can say side development plan was a community-based redevelopment strategy and identified several parcels along the east burnside corridor that had the potential for development or redevelopment, and most of those parcels are vacant or underutilized. The redevelopment of this block would assist in generating new tax increment for the district, help expand an increased -- excuse me, help expand existing businesses in the district, increase the number of employees, and provide some leverage for other redevelopment in that corridor. Pdc has worked very hard with the stakeholders in this particular district to provide needed investment, including store-front improvement when we have only two properties left in the corridor that have not undergone that program. Also, with street improvements to bring needed reinvestment in the area so that people can see it as an area that has a great deal of potential. We have nothing ahead of us but looking for redevelopment in the burnside corridor. The bridge head is particularly important and the council knees that we have been working on the parcel that we own to sort of resolve the environmental issues that are inherent with that property. Today we have a proposal to develop an adjacent parcel that will improve the area and facilitate redevelopment and reinvestment.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Bob Wentworth:** I am bob, 807 southeast grand avenue. We have been asked to participate in the development between mlk and grand on east burn-size. This development is actually larger than our current needs, our current needs are for a single small, about 3000 square foot subaru

**JULY 3, 2002**

showroom, which is going to take up less than 25% of this building. So, the rest of it would be leasable, office space. We feel this development will bring increased employment, which is what I think the city council has been trying to foster on the east side. The development also fits in with the burnside redevelopment plan that's been approved by the city council. This had be the first new development that I can ever remember on east burnside street in a long, long time since maybe back in the early, whenever, long before us. We feel this would be a catalyst for future development, especially block 76 on burnside and mlk. Our family has been in business in downtown Portland since april 28th, 1903. We've been on front avenue. We have been on 20th and burnside, 50 years in the powell bookstore building and the last 25 years on grand avenue. We are a family business that has stayed in Portland and is trying to expand in Portland. We are willing to make a long-term investment, a long-term investment. There's no quick payout on this development. Long-term investment for our business, for the city, and for the community. We know it will bring increased employment in the taxes and we ask for your support in the 8th amendment to the urban renewal plan.

**Katz:** Thank you. Did you want to talk?

**Ferraro:** I am joanne ferraro. My address is 230 east burnside street. I am here today to ask that counsel to approve the 8th amendment and place 424 and 436, burnside sites into the urban renewal plan. The action would allow the redevelopment of this block, which is one of the goals of the lower burnside redevelopment plan, which was completed in 1999, and which the mayor also, you also attended a meeting for this plan. I participated in this study over a seven months' duration and was one of the property owners at the very beginning who asked help from pdc and revitalizing the lower burnside area. One of our primary goals was to look at the entire street and how existing businesses could move up to a higher standard, and that efforts to encourage development should focus on the sixth block area between 2nd and 6th and along burnside street. Now a project such as a proposed wentworth project is the type of redevelopment that was envisioned by the study group. Investment on burnside street, which has the potential, the potential to increase employment, bring additional tax dollars into the district, and replace a blighted area is an opportunity that should not be missed. And a project, such as this, could be the catalyst for future development in the area. While we have had storefront improvements, curb cuts, since the conclusion of the study, we have not had one lot redevelopment or development project. Another issue that should be addressed here, I believe, is that the area in question has been problematic over the years. I have chaired the ceic community relations, public safety committee for 1 years, which includes the, the 11-year community policing project, which you also attended. And over the years, there have been a myriad of problems in and around these sites, from loitering, littering, a high incident of street crime, and a successful drug raid under a previous owner at the site, the resident has had numerous operators as had the adjacent 424 site. And at the present time, 424 has been vacant for nine months. This has contributed to the instability of the street, so I am here today to ask the council to approve the 8th amendment and not lose an opportunity that would allow our district to be, to begin to realize this potential, as expressed in the lower east burnside redevelopment plan.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right, on --

**Saltzman:** Question.

**Katz:** On this?

**Saltzman:** Yes.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Saltzman:** I am excited to this addition about the urban renewal district but I did want to ask bon and denise, under the no surprises disclaimer -- I did want to ask bob and denise, under the no surprises disclaimer, we have a development, that with this property -- as I understand it, you acquire this property from pdc, is that the plan in.

**Wentworth:** A long time down the road, yes.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Saltzman:** Any new building built with the assistance of public dollars, and this probably falls under the category will have to meet a national green building standard, called "lead," and has been to be independently certified as to meeting that, so I want to make sure that you are aware of that so it doesn't come as a surprise down the road to anybody.

**Wentworth:** I would have to defer that to peter.

**Saltzman:** Is he working with you on this?

**McGriff:** Well, commissioner Saltzman, as you are aware, pdc requires green building standards on all projects, so this, if this project comes to fruition, it would be no exception.

**Katz:** They have adopted it.

**Saltzman:** And certified and independently certified.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Great.

**Saltzman:** Okay, wanted to make sure there are no surprises. I am glad you are doing this.

**Katz:** Before we take any amendments because there is a question for an amendment on this one --

**\*\*\*\*\*:** There is more testimony.

**Katz:** Electro. I wanted to introduce this because it's in the --

**Katz:** Yes. I wanted to introduce this, because it has a vision for the east side, we will get back to this. Let's go back now to the vision plan.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Can I say a couple of words?

**Katz:** You can say anything you want. Anybody else for the vision plan? The dos?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** You are not here for the dos?

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

**Katz:** On the 8th amendment. Go ahead.

**Rick Parker:** I am rick parker, and I have a business on, at 515 east burnside. It's on the corner of grand and burnside. My family has had this business there since the '20s. Our head office is located there. We have 23 offices in Oregon, Washington, and nevada. We maintained our headquarters here in Portland over the years, and seen a lot of changes happen up and down burnside street and I would also, mayor, like to thank you for coming over and -- in support of this plan. This plan was adopted by the council. I appreciate the council doing this. I really feel that with the adoption of this amendment, that this plan can really start to take hold and become real. It's so important to the area for this to happen, I think that once this takes place, we may soon see the redevelopment of the old bridgeport and this area finally take off and the city of Portland. So, once again, I would just ask for your support and I just would like to leave this with you and thank you again for your support.

**Katz:** Anybody else for the vision plan, for the dos? Okay. We have an amended resolution that both planning and pdc have worked on so I need a motion to amend the resolution.

**Sten:** So moved.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Katz:** All right. Any objections? Hearing none so, ordered. All right. Let's take a vote, then, on 738 and then we will come back to 739.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** We had more people for 740 to testify. Did you want to take them first?

**Katz:** I am going to get back to it.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I had 739 as a substitute resolution.

**Katz:** Yeah, we just amended it. All right. Roll call on 739.

**Francesconi:** Just briefly. It could be argued that the pearl district and the river district has been our most, one of our most important neighbors over the past decade for what it's produced for the city. It could be argued that macadam and interstate and gateway and lents could be those neighborhoods of the future, but I think that it's the central east side, right now, and it does have the potential to be that economic juggernaut. It's had a history of providing good solid jobs to working class neighborhoods surrounding it, that it has been one of the keys to our city. So, it's taken us a

**JULY 3, 2002**

while, maybe a little too long for dos to resurface but we are glad it's here. We thank all the efforts here, of the challenge of how we integrate our environment and the river with an economic future is right here in this little dos with the east bank right there, which is going to bring some vitality, but we do need a new type of zoning that allows us to capitalize on high technology spinoffs from our regional infrastructure that's in place but we are not generating enough of the spin-off jobs here in our community, and the central east side is just perfectly positioned to not only benefit the inner neighborhoods, but our whole city, so this is a very important effort, and I just wanted to thank the neighborhood and pdc and denise for forming this partnership and planning before that. One suggestion maybe down the road is if we are really, if we are ready now, I think the central east side has been criticized in the past for not having a unified vision. I think now there is a unified vision, whether that, whether that was warranted or not and now we are ready to move forward. I think that the next step would be to engage a plan -- if it's, if we can, and mayor, this obviously is totally up to you, susan hartnet or somebody of that magnitude who can help us flush out the ix zone down the road so that we can really capitalize on this, now that there's a unified vision. But thank for all your work. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Well, I really am pleased to see this finally come to fruition, too. I think when I first came into office in 1999, I know I met with many of you on the ceic to talk about dos and I guess I was new enough to think that we were talking about a computer software system or something, but I soon realized that this is the critically important plan for central east side and it's taken us a while to get here and I know it's required an extraordinary amount of patience and cooperation amongst many bureaus, transportation, pdc, and all the businesses in the central east side, but I do think that we have achieved or you have achieved really now a vision, and we know you are already a great area. This allows further greatness and further contributions to jobs and economic growth, and just being sort of a great neighborhood, too. And so I really appreciate that, and I also wanted to just commend the particular stormwater management plan that you developed in your dos. The idea of using a, a centralized facility to, to treat and manage stormwater is a great idea. I think it makes dollars and cents for each one of the property owners, but it also presents, it's a very innovative opportunity and we certainly, the environmental service bureau will be pleased to work with you to make sure that that becomes a reality. Good work. Aye.

**Sten:** Well, michael and joanne, rick, see you back there. This is, you have been working so hard on this, and it's actually, it's a tricky mix to keep the industrial base that I think is very vital to the city but also makes some room for, for, it's a different type of job out there, and I think that you have pulled it off, and it's mostly been set, so I will just say, good work, and also pdc, terrific work, and now we have really got the easy part, which is to implement it, and we will see if we can do that. Aye. And you can do that, I should say.

**Katz:** Thank you. I do now expect a collaborative effort among pdot and planning and the steering dos steering committee and pdc to begin thinking through how do we implement this, that's my expectations and I know that my partners will be at the table. Aye. All right. 740. Anybody else want to testify on 740? Do we have a request on that. Do you want to come up, denise? It says he won't be here? Do you have that in front of you? Do you want to comment on that.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Yes, I just got it and gave it a quick onceover. I think that we would be okay with this proposal. We would want to recommend the statement as follows, that this amendment shall automatically rescind and become null and void on december 31st, 2002, and so forth. That would be our only change.

**Katz:** So, you would start the sentence in the middle of the second line. Do you have that? Okay. Why don't you --

**Saltzman:** Are you okay with december 31st?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Yes.

**Francesconi:** Okay. That's a good question.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Francesconi:** Are you sure that's enough time? I would be open to giving you more time.

**McGriff:** Well, I am confident that, that we can resolve this. I don't think that we are really that far apart. We have been working with this property owner for about 20 months, and I think that we have a better understanding. We've been communicating. We've been trying to work this out. We feel that at this point in time, we would like to have both options available, but we are still willing to continue to work with them and negotiate.

**Francesconi:** I am not accusing this lawyer, who is very ethical, and I am not accusing this property owner, but sometimes it takes two to tango here, and you can delay something out, and all of a sudden, have the leverage disappear, and that's why I am concerned that you may not be giving yourself enough time here.

**Sten:** It will also force pdc's hand in the condemnation -- all they are asking is -- they are sort of putting themselves in a box, too. I think it's a really good concern, commissioner.

**Larry Broadham, Portland Development Commission:** I am larry with the Portland development commission. We just had a look at that letter requesting the amendment, if we are asked concludes we work within this time line, I think that it is possible to do that. If this amendment is passed, and the statutory waiting period has expired without a challenge, we do have the ability at any time to go to the commission. They could authorize a resolution of condemnation and we could go immediately to court. We have the ability to move fairly quickly, in that regard. So, we have some comfort with this time line. It is really your decision whether or not you want to provide the accommodation as requested, but if it was your had to do that, we think that we can work with, within that.

**Katz:** Thank you. So what's the will of the council? On the amendment?

**Francesconi:** Well, if pdc can live with that and they have understood the concern and since it has taken us a while to get here, this will force us to make sure that we move on this, so I think that we should leave it. We should adopt the amendment.

**Boardman:** I would just point out that the, once the amendment is, is adopted, even with this amendment, we do have all the, the incentives that we would otherwise have to encourage all the parties to move to a rapid conclusion here. We don't -- you know, we can work within the time line. I don't think it reduces our ability to move this process along.

**Katz:** Okay. So go ahead.

**Ben Walters, Sr. Deputy Attorney:** This is a nonemergency ordinance. So, there would be a second reading. After the amendment.

**Katz:** Okay. We know. All right. I will assume that the discussion is a motion to adopt the amendment and there is a second?

**Sten:** Second.

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

**Katz:** Any objections, hearing none, so ordered. This whole thing goes to second reading. Thank you very much. All right. We are onto the regular agenda. 799.

**Item 799.**

**Katz:** Who is here to talk on it?

**Nancy McPherson, Director of Services, Portland Police:** Director of services, Portland police.

**Katz:** While they are making themselves comfortable, this is a grant that comes in on a regular basis for us, and this is a grant that we share with our partners at the county. And this is a grant that is used to support a lot of community projects where we don't have necessarily enough resources within our budget, so go ahead and tell us what it is.

**McPherson:** I would like to introduce susan crabtree, our grants coordinator. This may be the last year for law enforcement block grant we are hearing indications from the bush administration that they are going to be looking for other ways to do this kind of funding in the future, but for this year,

**JULY 3, 2002**

we are looking at \$1.4 million to be split between fairly evenly between the county, the city, and some local partners. The local partners are both embrace the program, which is service to high-risk offenders who are reentering the community, and youth gang outreach. 425,000. The county requested \$583,000. They are looking to fund domestic violence and victim advocates programs. Their drug court, and then the, the d.a. Is, is funding some neighborhood d.a.'s in east and southeast precinct and the drug unit, and the other, oh, the other item is for the sheriff for correction over time and some equipment for river patrol. So, that's the county's allocation. The police bureau is going to be getting \$704,000. We are looking to maintain some existing positions that provides support in services and then we are also looking to fund records over time. We are a little bit behind in processing records and then we are looking this year to fund for equipment, tazers so we can get them out on the street. So, that's kind of the, the overall look at the law enforcement block grant for this, this next year.

**Katz:** Just want to remind everybody that, that the primary purpose for this grant is one-time money for one-time projects so when the county and the city start funding ongoing programs, that means that it's for one year.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Right. That is a concern.

**Katz:** It is. And it should be. Okay. Did you want to add anything? All right.

**Saltzman:** Where's the map? There's an \$85,000 map required?

**McPherson:** Right. We are looking internally for the match.

**Saltzman:** That's our share of the map?

**McPherson:** That's our share of the match. The county also has to come up with a match, as well, but we are looking for our share of the maps right now.

**Katz:** Okay. Anybody else want to testify? Roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. All right. 800.

**Item 800.**

**Katz:** Okay. Anybody here to testify on this? All right. Roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. All right. 801.

**Item 801.**

**Katz:** Anybody want to testify? Come on up. Go ahead.

**Jada Mae Langloss:** I believe in -- jetta, I am a resident at the mcdonalds center, for the moment, until I recover or not. I want to talk to you about the situation. It was outlawed in 1937. It's because cotton industries, timber industries, and pharmaceutical industries could not stand to have a natural plant, take the place of their replacements. I think that, that, and so did anne landers. She wrote a whole column about it. She thinks that we should eliminate the, the punishment of people who use this plant. I will always believe in peace on drugs and war on polluters. Polluters that, that kill fish, mammals, and pesticides kill all life eventually. We must give nature equal rights. Thank you.

**Katz:** Anybody else? Roll call.

**Katz:** I need commissioner Francesconi.

**Saltzman:** We have three of us.

**Katz:** Roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 802.

**Item 802.**

**Katz:** Anybody want to testify on that? Roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 803.

JULY 3, 2002

**Item 803.**

**Ron Bergman, Director, General Services:** Director of general services and I have diane with us, who is our property manager and deals with leases and rents in case there are questions. The proposed ordinance changes the process for signing off on, on these leases and rental agreements and we are hopeful that we will be eliminating a lot of time in doing it normally about a week, maybe up to two weeks' worth of time in terms of getting those agreements back.

**Katz:** Did you want to say anything? Are there any questions?

**Bergman:** I will be happy to answer any questions.

**Katz:** Any questions? Anybody else want to testify? It pass to say second. 804.

**Item 804.**

**Susan Feldman, Office of Planning and Development Review:** Opdr is requesting that council adopt a new land division and demolition delayed fees. This responds to new regulations that were adopted and go into effect this month. And we need to have fees for these new types of land use reviews. I also want to remind you that these are separate from the 5.1% increase of all the other fees. This is actually new fees that need to be put on the fee chart that we know currently we do not have fees assigned to these reviews. And also margaret mahoney wanted me to remind you that we will be back probably in the late august with some proposed site development fees, and that will be done after we spend time talking to contractors and other interest groups.

**Katz:** Questions by the council?

**Saltzman:** So, these are new fees? And are a result of --

**Feldman:** They are new reviews. The land division code went into effect july 1st. This was part of the package we brought you last month that you deferred, so we have been sort of established a crosswalk for the last three days, but we would like these to go into effect on friday so that we have the new fees associated with the new land division code reviews.

**Francesconi:** And I am just asking obviously, you worked it through with the stake holder so that they know about this? There's a process that they went through, I assume, of notice so they know these fees are coming with the new regulations?

**Feldman:** Well we provided notice to, to, to a lot of people, and, and the early june, late may, but these are new reviews that --

**Francesconi:** I know. You just notified them that this is coming?

**Feldman:** Right. These, these are, they are actually lower than what they were notified of.

**Francesconi:** Did you get any reactions from folks?

**Feldman:** No, I don't think that we have had any reactions to the fees, it's more regulation.

**Francesconi:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Anybody else want to testify on these? Roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. All right. 805.

**Item 805.**

**Sue Klobertanz, Director, Bureau of Purchases:** Item 805 amends chapters 5.33 and 5.68 of the city code and those deal with the purchasing policies and authority respectively and the professional technical and expert service contracts. The revision to say chapter 5.33 are primarily house keeping, designed to clarify existing language and efficiencies to the process. 5.68 dealing with pte contracting, this is the major new item, a revision to our current language that aligns the city code with revisions made to, to the ors during the 2001 legislative session. These visions mandate a qualification based selection of architects, engineers and land sur various under certain funding conditions and the new section set forth definitions and process. So, that's, that's the major change as a result of this ordinance passing today.

**Saltzman:** Conforming with the state law?

**Klobertanz:** Right.



**JULY 3, 2002**

**Saltzman:** Changes to 5.66.

**Klobertanz:** 68.

**Katz:** Further questions? Anybody else want to testify? If not, roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. All right. 806.

**Item 806.**

**Katz:** If you recall correctly I pulled this back, and you may have people who can explain it --

**Nancy McPherson, Director of Services, Portland Police:** Director of services, Portland police and I have with me lieutenant ron schwartz and mike palmer from management services. The purpose of this contract is to define our facility needs and to develop a conceptual program and a site master plan for training facility. Dan smith and associates are currently under contract to the city to develop our facilities master plan. And this firm has had extensive experience in designing and planning police facilities throughout the united states. Currently, we have a short-term strategy to address our training facility, which you approved recently, which is an agreement with the Oregon military department for a site at camp withicom. We are looking for a long-term strategy, and we needed to develop a footprint for a training facility. Dan smith and associates have begun the work on that. And we specifically had an opportunity to work with scappoose representatives from scappoose approached the city after deliberations with the department of public safety standards and training failed for them. They have a site available for, that meets the land requirements for regional public safety center. They had held public hearings regarding community support for this because public safety training facilities are actually very controversial because they include firearms ranges and high-speed driving tracks both which make a lot of noise. And so we had an opportunity to develop a footprint and this contract is, is to provide for that.

**Saltzman:** To provide for what in.

**McPherson:** The footprint. The facilities plan is already being taken care of through the city's master plan development. The footprint for the training site is developed under this separate contract.

**Saltzman:** Are we at the question point?

**Katz:** Yeah. Did you want to testify before we get to questions?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Well, I want to add --

**Katz:** Identify yourself for the record.

**Lt. Ron Schwartz, Portland Police Bureau :** I am ron schwartz, lieutenant with the training division, Portland police bureau. Currently the training division utilizes 14 sites throughout the metropolitan area, many of the sites are outside the city of Portland. One of the sites we train at is in shelton, Washington. We rent high speed training track up there with the academy students up there as part of the training. The sites being so distant require a lot of resources and a lot of time transferring students back and forth between these different sites. The strategy with the Oregon military department and the camp withicom will bring a lot of the sites together but the two things it doesn't bring together are firearms training site and/or driving and those are two major pieces in our training curriculum. Hopefully, a longer-term strategy we can bring all these together into one location, which will be the first time in the 21 years that i've been a police officer with the city of Portland that we have had one, one training facility for everyone it train at.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Saltzman:** My question is, I know that there is, there's sort after two visions on what the facility will be, one is simply what you described, a training facility. But then there's also the larger vision, the chief has articulated of playing some role under homeland security as a regional training facility for, for the homeland security. And are we looking at the larger version or, or just the training version? It seems to me, maybe I am wrong, but it seems to me the footprint might vary, depending on which options.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**McPherson:** The footprint could vary. What we are looking at with this is the training facility for public safety, and not the national center, initially, when we started conversations, we did have the opportunity to look at the national center and look at homeland security funding, as a potential funding stream for this. But, we've broken that off, and we have bifurcate that had process. We are really going into, into completely separate directions now.

**Francesconi:** How are we going to fund this?

**McPherson:** The facility?

**Francesconi:** Yeah.

**McPherson:** We're not sure at this point. One of the models we are looking at is in san bernardino, california, where they have developed a complete cost recovery training facility. When they are not using it for public safety, they are charging other agencies to provide funding for their facility and they have been able to do it completely at cost recovery so that's the motto we are looking at. Dan smith and associates, the contractor that the city is working with, actually built that facility, as well, so at this point, we're not sure what the funding is going to be in the future right now, we are trying to get the plan together and then look for, for funding sources.

**Francesconi:** So is that both construction and operating?

**McPherson:** It would be both, yes.

**Francesconi:** We are covered potentially by other sources?

**McPherson:** Right.

**Francesconi:** Okay.

**Katz:** Further questions? Anybody want to testify? Roll call.

**Francesconi:** Well, this sounds like a good thing. I am going to vote aye. At some point, when the timing is right, both for the police and the mayor determines it, kind of a plan where we look at your whole facilities, maybe appropriate so we have some sense of the future. The police facilities plan for the future. At some point we need to see how this fits in the overall picture but this is a good thing in getting this work done will help that. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** Yeah, this is -- I would say one of the top priorities, the other is the property, but we will see the math, the full plan, facilities plan soon, aye. All right. 807.

**Item 807.**

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 808.

**Item 808.**

**Francesconi:** I liked it better when it was extra-terrestrial services. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 809.

**Item 809.**

**Katz:** This is a second reading. Roll call.

**Francesconi:** Well, I understand, mayor, but is there going to be any flexibility in this?

**Katz:** Right now we don't know, commissioner, so we just --.

**Francesconi:** So we don't know is the answer?

**Katz:** Right.

**Francesconi:** Well, we don't know is better than no, and so to be a team player here, and the mayor has always been, done the right thing in terms of trying to take care of the bureaus, that have had difficulty, I will vote aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 810.

**Item 810.**

**Katz:** Roll call.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Francesconi:** It's a good thing, aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Item 811.**

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 811.

**Katz:** Roll call.

**Francesconi:** This is a very good thing for the district. It's one of the tangible things that can be measured that people see. Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 812. Roll call.

**Item 812.**

**Francesconi:** You did a terrific job, staffing this thing. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 813.

**Item 813.**

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 814.

**Item 814.**

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 815.

**Item 815.**

**Katz:** Okay.

**Saltzman:** I will briefly introduce this. This introduces another property acquisition by bes and the flood management -- and the flood plain of johnson creek so this is part of a willing seller program, and again, it adds to a substantial number of properties we are adding as basically open space to our city. I will turn it over to dean.

**Dean Marriott, Director, Bureau of Environmental Services:** Thank you. Good morning, mayor Katz, members of the council, I am dean mariat, environmental services director for Portland. With me is Daniela brod who will give you a very brief update on where this program has come from. As the commissioner mentioned, acquisition of property in the johnson creek flood plain area is part of our willing seller program, which is, of course, part of our johnson creek restoration effort, and I thought that since you had two specific items on your agenda today, two specific properties to authorize the acquisition, it might be a good time to fill you in on what we have been up to since 1997 when we started this. So, I will ask denala to run through that for you.

**Daniela Brod, Bureau of Environmental Services:** Johnson creek watershed manager. Thank you for the opportunity to give you a brief update about where we have come since 1997. Since '97, you have seen over 40 or nearly 40 ordinances passed here for land acquisition in the johnson creek watershed. The goals of the program are to mitigate long-term flood damages and improve fish and wildlife habitat and water quality. When we conglomerate enough property in the watershed we will be able to turn these areas into passive recreational parks that will be able to hold flood waters in the winter and offer people passive recreational opportunities in the summer. On your screen and in hard copy you should have a graph showing where the money has come from since 1997. All the colors in the graph, basically, reflect that we have got a lot of partners making this program possible, and including federal partners with hazard mitigation money after the floods of 1996, parks is partnering with bes, with local fdc natural area funds, and local share of the metro sale that went through in the late '90s. So, that shows that we have got a lot of partners in this program. The other two points that I would like to make about this graph are that, that we have got an average cost per property in this particular program of just over 150,000, so you can see there that on a per year basis how many properties were able to buy, have been able to buy and are able to buy currently and into the near future. The peak, again, represents the, in the late '90s represents post-1996 floods and an infusion of federal money, as well as a peak that occurred because of the metro bond sale and that money that we got from those funds, and the dip in the next couple years reflects the

**JULY 3, 2002**

diversion of capital improvement project moneys and bes into large pipe projects to mitigate or, or get rid of cso overflows into the willamette, and the promotions in 206 and 207 are 2006 and 2007 are estimates of what we think we can do with capital funds right now. This is just a little illustration of how far we have come in one of our four target areas in johnson creek. This is the lents target area south of foster at about 108th and here's the public ownership in 1997, and again, in 2002. The subject property that you will bereaving today is the nguyen property highlighted in yellow. We estimate in this particular area we have about 20 acres to go and an estimated cost of it .5 and \$3 million in order to fill the gaps you see in this picture. So that's where we are today.

**Saltzman:** What was the monetary figure?

**Brod:** 2.35 to 3 million for the estimated cost for the properties.

**Marriott:** I want to bring you up to date on where we have come since 1997. If you look at the '97 and 2002 maps, you can see that we have been very busy. The crosshatched area in red is the, is the, the floodway area that that area floods virtually every time johnson creek floods those properties have been damaged repeatedly, have led to a lot of public expenditure to say try to assist those folks. I think this program has been a, has been a success to date. We look forward to when we can complete the acquisition. We have had some preliminary discussions with the parks bureau about the future of this area. We are obviously working with, through the lents urban renewal process, the lents 20-40 process to make sure that the vision for the future of this area is compat, but we made a lot of progress and wanted to bring you up to date on it.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Marriott:** And we would be happy to answer any questions.

**Katz:** Anybody else? Did you have anybody else you wanted to add? Anybody else want to testify? All right. Roll call. Okay. Roll call.

**Francesconi:** You have done terrific work here. We may not quite achieve earl blumenauer's forest park east but you are doing great work that provides open space and green spaces, as well as the flood benefits for the areas, we appreciate the cooperation of the private homeowners but you are doing a terrific job and the partnership between parks and you has been terrific, with you and the lead on this, so thanks for your work, aye.

**Saltzman:** It's very impressive effort and it's a tremendous way for us in the city to, to achieve several multiple objectives, and that is to, to, where the property owners deem it appropriate to remove themselves from the, the impacts of perennial flooding. In return, we gain open space and we gain flood storage space, and those are all important objectives to us as a city, more open space, less property damage from floods, so this is a tremendous program and you made a lot of progress in the last few years. That map is a very, very startling and pleasingly startling progress, and we hope we will get those, the rest of the properties soon, aye.

**Sten:** Well, terrific work. I am really proud of what bes has done and working with the community, as well. It's, it's a situation where the way we were doing land use around johnson creek didn't serve people or fish or wildlife, and I think that rethinking it is good for everybody because less flood damage and restoring the environments, that's terrific. Aye.

**Katz:** Good work, aye. 816.

**Item 816.**

**Saltzman:** Madam mayor and members of the council, this is an opportunity, again, I think it's with several multiple objectives here. In april of 2001, the city council passed an ordinance that allows the environmental service bureau to execute individual agreements for innovative stormwater management projects as part of our willamette stormwater control program to keep, to reduce combined sewage overflows into the willamette. These projects are vital in demonstrating how commercial developments can control stormwater run-off on the site. So, keep it on the site rather than going to the river. They also help us achieve the goals of the clean river plan by, as I said, reducing cso's and they also help with the city's response to the endangered species act. One

**JULY 3, 2002**

of the multiple benefits of the program is today, is this ordinance allows us to enter into two agreements with Portland public schools for demonstration projects at the middle school and glencoe elementary school. So, again, this will be saving not only the water quality but also the school district money that they would otherwise be paying for stormwater management, as well. So, staff is here to answer any specific questions that the council may have regarding the projects.

**Katz:** Did you want to say anything in?

**Dean Marriott:** Good morning, mayor Katz, members of the council. Dean marriott, environmental services. The commissioner highlighted, I think, the, the attractive nature of this project, to put it in context, we are going to be working on 11 of these kinds of demonstrations of projects this year. The two that we have in front of you today are, are to authorize particular agreements with the Portland public schools. I think that we feel particularly good about given the nature of the problems that the school district faces to be able to partner with them, and to assist in removing stormwater from the system and providing passive treatment of stormwater, so, so the glencoe school project is a \$65,000 project, and the divinnchi school is a \$30,000 project, both, I think, will serve us well in the future to demonstrate not only to the school district but any sort of commercial or institutional landowner that, that you can make a difference, doesn't have to break the bank, and the results, I think, will be very positive. Thank you.

**Katz:** Anybody want to testify? Roll call.

**Francesconi:** This is terrific work, commissioner Saltzman, and the bureau. If you get a chance and if you have any resources, extending us a couple of east Portland school districts would be important given some, some dynamics that are out there and not only in terms of, of stormwater, but also school funding, so that would be good. Aye.

**Saltzman:** I appreciate your point. Our efforts have been focused where combined sewage overflows areas are but we want to were the institutions because they have an interest in influencing the stormwater management fee by controlling the stormwater on-site and we help them in a lot of those regards. Aye.

**Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 817.

**Item 817.**

**Katz:** Roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. 818.

**Item 818.**

**Sten:** Mayor just a couple of representatives are here from cable access, come on up. I think people are aware that it was a very tough budget year and the cable access folks took more than their 7% share to try and help us get through and we wanted to give kind of brief updates on how we are going to get through that budget cut and the future for cable access, which remains good, despite all the, the budget struggle that we have asked you to go through and appreciate all your hard work.

**Julie Omelchuck, Assistant Director of Mt. Hood Cable Regulatory Commission:** Thank you, commissioner Sten, mayor, members of the council. I'm julie and I am the assistant director for the mt. Hood cable regulatory commission. What you have in front of you today is a contract with Portland cable access that the regulatory commission has been working on for about the last eight months, and they are bringing it forward to you recommending approval by the council. The contract represents discussions among the commission, pca, commissioner Sten's office, your finance office, and the city attorney's office. We also convened a community round table last fall, and the work of that round table is also incorporated into the contract. With me here today is mr. Haver, the Portland cable access board chair, and karl, who is the, the interim executive director and I think that they have some comments, as well, and I am here to answer any questions you have.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Katz:** We will let you comment.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** All right.

**Cole Haver, President, Board of Directors of Portland Cable Access:** Madam mayor, and members of the city council, I am cole haver and president of the board of directors of Portland cable access. Portland cable access is pleased to continue our long-term partnership with the city of Portland. With the city's support, pca has been able to provide unique services to our community, during the last contract period, pca has trained more than 1,600 people in some aspect of video and media production, we have assisted the community in producing 25,000 hours of local, original programming, and according to national reports, that's more original programming than any broadcast or cable network has done. We have leveraged more than 56,000 hours of volunteer services, and pca's worked with many community-based organizations and achieved national recognition for some of its locally produced programs. Pca recognizes the fiscal realities, reflecting the 21% cut in the city funding for this year. But, we hope in the future the city will be able to restore some, if not all of the reductions. We are looking forward to continuing to explore other ways to involve more stakeholders and organizations and using Portland special community communications system. In this coming here, pca will be concentrating on neighborhood issues and organizations and continue to grow our visibility. Last november, with the leadership of commissioner Sten's office, pca co-hosted a community media round table and as a result of that meeting, pca will be exploring ways to develop new media and technology, internet for community use in partnership with other community media organizations, nonprofits and educational institutions. On behalf of the board of directors, we appreciate the council's continued support and we look forward to working with you and even more community stakeholders in the coming years. Thank you.

**Katz:** Do you want to add anything?

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

**Katz:** Okay. Questions? Anybody want to testify? Roll call.

**Francesconi:** That was a nice report. And especially the emphasis on community stakeholders led by commissioner Sten and you do the work, so we appreciate it. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye.

**Sten:** Again I appreciate your hard work in helping us through the budget crunch and good job. Aye.

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. Before you adjourn, remember we have to elect the next president of the council and it's commissioner, dan Saltzman.

**Sten:** Outstanding.

**Katz:** It's an election. Any opposition? Hearing none, so ordered.

**Katz:** We will be voting this afternoon and it may be a while, and may take a while, but he knows. All right. We're adjourn until 2:00.

At 11:43 a.m., Council recessed.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**JULY 3, 2002          2:00 PM**

**Katz:** Good afternoon, everybody. The council will come to order. Karla, please call the role.

**Francesconi:** Here. **Sten:** Here. **Saltzman:** Here.

**Items 819, 820, 821.**

**Katz:** Present. I'm sorry, I misspoke this morning. We aren't going to be voting. We voted -- we voted -- when was it? What's today? Wednesday. We voted Thursday, and this will go on to second. Okay. Why don't you read the items.

**Katz:** All right, gil and susan. Commissioner Sten, let me just know where we were. We went through 92 amendments, and you were very fortunate that -- but we actually agreed on all of them. Some of them we asked -- conceptionally we agreed -- asked staff to come back with language, and then I was -- it was flagged to me that there was some documents that came up during the planning commission that technically we probably need to hear, and then act on today as well. And I will -- we'll go through those a little later. I don't know when you want to go them through.

**Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning:** Hopefully at the beginning.

**Katz:** That's what I thought. I was originally later on, but I think it's probably better to have everything on the -- going on on the beginning. So go through the -- well, go through some of the key amendments, but you wanted to say something to the council.

**Sten:** Mayor, aside from thanking you for doing that, I should mention I have reviewed all of the records and the record, which took less time than creating it, but i've got myself up to speed.

**Katz:** Identify yourself.

**Kelley:** Gil kelley, planning director. Good afternoon, mayor and council. Two things that I wanted to do just to introduce this item generally and also honor a specific request for the planning commission chair. Just very generally, as you have seen, susan has put together a document that includes all of the amendment requests that you acted on last week in -- or tentatively asked us to come back with language on. Yes, so that document is dated july 1. And like any imperfect, but close to perfect human being susan actually discovered that there was a handful of amendment requests that were technically still before you because they had been in front of the planning commission and attached to testimony that you received directed to you. She will walk through those in a moment.

**Katz:** We have about 5-6 of them.

**Kelley:** In addition to that there are errata sheets that susan will go through quickly. That was the latest handout you got. They're fairly minor, but she'll walk through them.

**Katz:** And walk through the ones that we asked you to come back, with either new numbers or a new way of addressing the issues we identified.

**Kelley:** Okay. Also I wanted to mention that, again, we'd gotten -- started the discussion last week of the memorandum of understanding, which we provided you in outline form. And we'll keep ourselves open today and next week to any further suggestions you want to have to add items to our list to and return to you in the early fall with. We also got language, additional language, from bureau of environmental services on some items that susan will describe as she walks through the amendment.

**Katz:** Right. Could you make sure that we all get another copy of the m.o.u.?

**Kelley:** Sure, we'll do that.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Kelley:** Finally, I wanted my conversation with the chair of the planning commission, rick michaelson. He is concerned with how this process is moving forward and trying to keep up with all the amendment requests and what the council has done or hasn't done. He wanted me to on his

**JULY 3, 2002**

behalf and the commission's behalf to articulate a little bit more than I was able to the last meeting, the rationale on two particular items of concern to them. One had to do with the economic development policy, remember, that we added a goal to the comp plan in the economic development section with regard to a bioscience. And I articulated that the commission was not convinced on the basis of the information given them about the justification for that policy in its own terms, but he also wanted me to add that their second concern about adding that policy was that -- was a reluctance on their part to make a city-wide economic statement coming out of a community plan essentially or an area plan, and they felt it would be more appropriate to consider that policy in the context of a city-wide discussion and a discussion alongside other economic objectives. So I --

**Francesconi:** I think you said that.

**Kelley:** I believe I alluded to that. I wanted to make sure I said it clearly for the record.

**Katz:** You did say that.

**Francesconi:** In fact, I remember it.

**Katz:** Let me just say that I think you reflected, both of you, the planning commission's conversations on these issues when I and other members of the council asked you that, because I think -- I know for myself I was very sensitive about the commission's recommendations and wanted to keep them as much in whole and intact, but also agreed that we happen to disagree on some issues, plain and simple.

**Kelley:** Wanted to make that clear again, thank you. The other point he asked me to raise was with regard to the -- this was a question you raised last time about the parking ratios, and you'll recall that the amendment request was to essentially lower the ratio from 1-750 spaces -- or excuse me -- one space per 750 square feet, which was the planning commission's recommendation to an amendment on the part of o.h.s.u. To one space to every 600 feet, which is a liberation of the parking ratio. As I explained at that time the rationale of the planning commission was that the higher number, being more restrictive was more compatible with their thoughts about limiting traffic on the hill and was more in sync with the parking cap and other limitations they had for traffic on local streets. You asked us also to give com comparables about other standards in the city.

**Katz:** Right.

**Kelley:** Susan will get into that in a moment, but I just wanted to make sure I had reflected that concern on right part of the commission. We also went back and listened to the tape of the planning commission meeting, and this was a fairly -- although the parking discussion in general was lengthy, this particular portion on the topic of ratios was quite brief by comparison and fairly general. And although there wasn't a specific numeric rationale attached to a numeric standard in the planning commission's discussion, there was a reference here last week that there was not an exact science to this.

**Katz:** Weren't you going to come back and take a look --

**Kelley:** We will. We'll give you the comparables. I think they're in the document. I think it is fair to say again that the planning commission felt that if you had to guess, guessing on the more restrictive was more compatible with their intent than guessing at the lower level. So make that clear. Susan?

**Katz:** You've done your work.

**Susan Hartnett, Bureau of Planning, Project Manager, Marquam Hill Plan:** Good afternoon. For the record, my name is susan hartnett. I work for the planning bureau. I wasn't exactly prepared to go through and highlight those amendments where you asked us to come back, but I just did that. So I think I can do that now.



**JULY 3, 2002**

**Kelley:** Susan, I'm sorry, just to belabor the point, but I am recalling that one of the rationales in the parking ratio was that the effective ratio, not the regulated ratio, but sort of the current square foot to parking inventory on the hill, at least in terms of o.h.s.u., perhaps not va, is about one per 750. And some commissioners felt its working fine now, so why we don't encode that into a regulation. Susan had pointed out to them that the traffic report did show a deficit in parking and pointed more toward the 1 per 600 ratio. So that was sort of the extent of the discussion at the planning commission.

**Hartnett:** Okay, great. So what I'd like to do is first of all you do have some errata sheets, and I want to -- as we get to each of those pages -- describe what they are and ask you to stick them into your amendments document that you will have them in the right page for the audience members -- yes, those are the errata sheets. For the members of the audience, if you picked up a copy of the amendments document as you came in today, it had the errata sheet stuck in the front of it. If you picked up a document previously and would like just the errata sheets, there are stacks up in the corner of the room as well.

**Katz:** Betsy color-coded for me all the ones. So if you miss any --

**Hartnett:** You might be in better shape than me.

**Katz:** I'll remind you.

**Hartnett:** So the first page that I'd like to point out would be the first errata page, which is page 2-a. And this is simply adding one I think relatively minor amendment request, which is to correct typographic and spelling errors throughout the documents. And this is a fairly typical amendment that we include as a request --

**Katz:** Any objections? Hearing none. [ gavel pounding ]

**Hartnett:** The next one I would go to is page 3. This was the council's request to put back in the comprehensive plan goal five economic development goals that the planning commission had chosen not to put in. You asked us to produce one policy with a series of objectives that were focused on the science and technology corridor and the growth of bioscience industries. This is what we've produced as a result of that request. It is one policy and six objectives.

**Francesconi:** I think we asked you to include Portland state, which you've done.

**Hartnett:** That's in the action charts, yeah, which is actually the next page, the amendments requesting the action charts, are actually shown in attachment b, which is page 40 of the report. We used the same action charts that we had used in the proposed plan, because they were pretty consistent with the -- the revived objective -- policy and objectives, and then revived the action chart to include p.s.u. So you'll note p.s.u. Is added on the first three action items and it's underlined to show that it's an addition to the text. Okay? Next one would be page five. This is the request to reinstate the vision objectives and action items related to the suspended cable transportation system. The request was a single request. I've broken this into a number of different amendments to make it a little bit more workable. So you'll note that this is c 1.1. Initially in the -- in the stuff that you looked at on the 27th, it was just c-1, but I've broken it into I think three different amendments. So the first one is the vision. The second one is the objectives and the third one is the action charts which are on page 42 and 43. The next one I would point out to you is on page seven of your documents. It's items c-2, which has to do with the plan district and plan area boundaries. As a result of putting the suspended cable transportation system back into the document, I pointed out to the council that we needed to amend the plan boundaries. You asked me to do that, but you asked me to make it somewhat smaller than it was previously. Those maps are shown on page 47 and 48 in attachment d. And you can see we've got a small area of the terwilliger parkway included now in both the plan district and in in the plan area map. It's probably half the size of what had been in the original staff proposal to the planning commission. Page next

**JULY 3, 2002**

thing I would go to is the next errata sheet, which is page 7-a. This is a conforming amendment to the zoning code language. When we added a portion of terwilliger parkway, which is zoned o.s. to the planned district, we needed to go back -- I missed this the first time around -- to make sure we weren't creating regulations in that portion of the o.s. Zone that we did not intend to create. The first one has to do with signing within the planned district. If we do not correct the language as is shown on page 7-a, we will liberalize the regulations for signs in the terwilliger parkway. Is it in there? I figured that was an amendment you would at least want to consider and vote on, one way or the other. The next one -- yes?

**Katz:** Do you want us to do that now or wait until --

**Hartnett:** My understanding of what the process is going to be is that you're going to -- we're going to walk through these amendments so you understand what's there. When we get to the missed items, the ones that you did not consider on the 27th, you will decide whether you want to include them or not.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Hartnett:** Then you will take the public testimony, then we will return for a vote on the amendments.

**Katz:** On the errata sheet, there's no objections to the last one. I sort of -- everybody's got their issues.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I would call that leadership.

**Katz:** Okay, go ahead.

**Hartnett:** The next one would be page 7-b, another errata sheet. This is, again, an issue of by adding the o.s. Zoning to the planned district, we would have created an unintended regulation if we did not correct the building coverage standard in the way that's shown on 7-b. So you can see the double underlined text that says "in the e.x. Zone." we're making clear it's applies to the e.x zone, but not the o.s. Zone.

**Katz:** Any objections? [ gavel pounding ] hopefully by next you'll check --

**Hartnett:** I'll make sure everything is organized and be able to review that again with you on the 10th. The next thing would be on -- i'm not sure why I needed to show you that. The next thing would be on page 12 in the document. Items d-17. This was a request to add vmc and shriners -- the vet advances medical center and shriners as implementers. I have had the opportunity to communicate with both institutions, and they've agreed to be added to these. I would like you to add the words "as shown" at the end of that statement. Va agreed to be an implementer on one of the three items discussed in -- in transportation -- in items t-27. So I think if we say "as shown" we're only adding them to one of the three?

**Katz:** Any objections? [ gavel pounding ]

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Next one is page 13, items d-18. You need to delete that. That is no longer on the table.

V.a. Has chosen not to be added as an implementer to that items. In keeping with our policy in not having implementers, unless they're willing, d-18 shouldn't be considered by the council.

**Katz:** Okay. Any objections? [ gavel pounding ] so ordered.

**Hartnett:** Next one is page 14, items d-21. This is a request by o.h.s.u. To be removed as an implementer from items t-30. In my discussions with the veterans administration, they identified an additional items that they felt they really did not want to be included on. It's items t-45 which, -- let me just read to it you quickly.

**Katz:** What's t-30 again?

**Hartnett:** T-30 is the "seek to provide continuous pedestrian access --".

**Katz:** Right.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Hartnett:** Okay. T-45 is the one that -- that v.a. Has asked to be removed from. It's "investigate a flex car program." v.a. Indicates that may be contradictory to some of their rules and regulations and has asked to be removed from that. So I recommended amending number d-21 to say "remove o.h.s.u. As an implementer to t-30 and remove v.h.m.c. From t-45." that way you capture both of the ones --

**Katz:** Okay. Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [ gavel pounding ] all right.

\*\*\*\*\*: The next one would be page t -- i'm sorry, ts, qs -- page 15.

**Katz:** Uh-huh.

**Hartnett:** This was a request from o.h.s.u. To adjust the action chart time frames. Council asked us to work with o.h.s.u. And see if we could reach some consensus about which ones to change and which ones not to change. I believe that what's in front of you is what they've agreed to, that means that we did amend items t-7. We did not amend items t-24, so please cross that off the list. We did not amend items t-25, so that should be crossed off the list. T-27 and t-31, we did amend. Items t-32, we did not amend. T-35, we did amend. T-45 we did not amend. And t-47 we did amend. So the amendments should now read "adjust action chart time frame for t-7, t-27, t-31, t-35 and t-47."

**Katz:** And for those who don't have everything in front of them, do you want to share with us what that means?

**Hartnett:** All of those are in attachment c. You want me to read all of them?

**Katz:** There are people that might be watching this that aren't here.

**Hartnett:** Oh, that's true. I always forget about that audience out there. I'm sorry about that. T-7 says "install directional signs so that employees, students and patient visitors access routes are clearly identified." we changed that from the next five years to ongoing. That is something that we need to continue to work on over time. T-24 is on page 44. "seek to develop or improve pedestrian connections to and through terwilliger parkway and marquam hill in general through refinement and implementation of the pedestrian connections. Vision plan, the request had been made that into the 6-10 years. We left it in the next five-year time frame. T-26, also on that -- i'm sore -- t-25 on that same page. It's been amended now to say "use Portland state university's cap stone program to enhance the pedestrian connections to and through marquam hill and terwilliger parkway with interests on the area's vegetation, geology and history." we left it in the next five years' time frame. T-27, on the same page. Implement high priority pedestrian connections as follows. The first one is a stairway. We left that in the next five years. We did not move it out. The next one is pathway on the south side of the canyon from campus drive to veterans hospital. We did move that from next five years to 6-10. And the third items in that list is a pathway on the north side of the canyon connecting from campus drive to sam jackson. We left that in the next five years, did not move it out to the 6-10 as requested.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Saltzman:** And why did we move the south -- south side pedestrian walkway to 6-10 years?

**Hartnett:** My reasoning in discussing it with o.h.s.u. Is that the south side of the campus is not seen as where the most upcoming development is going to occur. It's going to occur on the north side. And so if we're going to be enhancing pedestrian connections, particularly as you would come up through the canyon off of terwilliger, it makes sense to connect them to the north side. And there's adequate access from that area to the village area on the north side as well. Okay. The next one then would be t-31, I believe. Yeah, t-31, which is on the next page. Develop trip-end facility, showers, and lockers for bicyclists. We moved that to ongoing. Every time they build a building they should be looking at bicycle facilities. T-32, seek to actually or symbolically connect terwilliger parkway and the south end of the park blocks. We left that at the next five

**JULY 3, 2002**

years. Did not move it out. T-35, also on that same page, encourage marquam hill institutions -- again, this one's been amended slightly based on some other amendment requests -- encourage marquam hill institutions to achieve the ambitious 32% transit mode split for employees and students as stated in the marquam hill transportation partnership by 2030. We moved that from next five years to ongoing. Again, that's an ongoing transportation demand management effort that they should be looking at regularly, not trying to accomplish in the next five years. T-35 -- i'm sorry, that was t-35. T-45 on the next page -- investigate and implement if practical a flex car program for use by employees, students and area residents. We left that in the next five years. I felt that the investigation can occur in that period of time and implementation as well. And then t-47, the last one, encourage the use of hybrid fuel or alternative fuel vehicles by marquam hill institutions and residents. Again, that's another one that's been amended based on a different amendment. We moved that from next five years to ongoing on the basis that we really don't know that there's going to be practical alternative fuels in the next five years. If they come along in ten years, they should be continually looking to see what's available for alternative fuel vehicles. Does that cover that?

**Francesconi:** Can I ask you a question about one, but maybe it's the wrong time to ask you this. You didn't cover t-15. Are you going to get to that later?

**Katz:** That's d-28.

**Hartnett:** T-15?

**Francesconi:** Yeah.

**Katz:** That's d-28.

**Hartnett:** Yeah. I wasn't actually going to discuss that one. Did you have a question about it?

**Francesconi:** Well, no. This is just to study the realignment of sixth avenue and homestead avenue. The neighborhood was interested in this.

**Hartnett:** That's correct. T-15 had previously talked about just making changes at the intersection. Homestead asked and pdot suggested that we fold in the notion of -- that either one of those two approaches could accomplish what homestead is looking for, which is a reduction of traffic impacts on homestead drive.

**Kelley:** I think this allows study of the alternative that homestead had requested.

**Francesconi:** I just wanted to point it out, make sure that people noticed it because they requested it.

**Hartnett:** The next page I would want you to turn to would be page 16. This was -- transportation objectives 8, 9, 17 and 18. There was request to add marquam hill drive to all of those. We had some discussion about making sure that we were clear about what streets we were trying to address. You'll note that we've added and neighborhood streets to number 8. And to number 9.

**Katz:** And to --. In number 18 we've changed surrounding to neighborhood. In number 17 we very explicitly said local service streets, which is the designation of the streets that we're protecting through that single occupancy mode split and -- it's the traffic volumes on local service streets that is specifically designated in the -- in the plan.

**Katz:** All right. I just want to make sure that as we go along the council has no objections to any of these changes. If you do, say something. Then we'll move on, assuming that it's okay.

**Hartnett:** Okay.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Hartnett:** The next one I would point out is another errata sheet. It's labeled new page 18. And this was correcting a -- an error in the zoning code amendment that I put in front of you. Initially the language said -- oh, actually I need to tell you a little bit about this. This was a request from o.h.s.u. To revise the parking maximums to limit by parking access location instead of parking

**JULY 3, 2002**

stall location. I had conveyed to you that the office of planning and development review had some problems with how that might be implemented. We actually, immediately after council's discussion on the 27th about, about five of us put our heads together and came up with what we think is a workable option. I believe o.h.s.u. Finds this acceptable as well. And that is to simply merge the total for subdistrict a and b and not distinguish where, within the planned district, that total number of parking spaces can occur since we're also then requiring through the new design review process that they look at the site review elements, which includes specific reference to how parking is accessed. We feel fairly comfortable that we won't have, you know, an overloading of parking spaces or access to parking spaces will not break down that reorganization of how people get there. So we'll be reinforcing the employee-students coming to sam jackson and patients coming to campus drive.

**Saltzman:** Just combining a and b takes care of that?

**Hartnett:** Yeah. That was the initial amendment I put in front of you, but then I forgot to take out in each subdistrict in that first line under number one, so that's why you have this errata sheet to correct the zoning language now as opposed to in code maintenance 2003. Okay? Can I move on, madame mayor, or do you want to check first?

**Katz:** Everybody all right. Go ahead.

**Hartnett:** The next one would be on page 19. This was the revise the parking ratio to one space per 600. Gil talked a bit about the conversation we had with you and the conversation that took place at the planning commission. What i've provided you is some information on other comparisons of parking ratios. I've given you the base zone. I've given you some of the downtown comparisons. The current ratio at o.h.s.u. Is around one space per 750. That's a -- you know, that's a pretty loose number as we would call it in planning. It's a back of the envelope calculation. But I would also want to point out that -- that the transportation analysis done by carl budke indicates that there is a deficiency of 270 parking spaces. As gil said in proposing 1 per 600 initially we felt that provided some opportunity for them to catch up in this initial go-round, but they're still limited to 900 spaces. I don't think they'll be building, you know, one space per 300 square feet because they'll burn through that 900 too fast. The last thing I would note on this is that staff does support this requested amendment. That was the conclusion that gil and I came to after assessing this.

**Katz:** So you would continue to support that?

**Hartnett:** We would suggest that we change the 750 to 600.

**Katz:** All right. How does the council feel on this one? Nod, yes, no?

**Hartnett:** Consider the amendment?

**Katz:** Yeah. Well, i'm not a happy camper, but -- consider the amendment.

**Hartnett:** Okay. The next one I would point out is on page 21. This is another o.h.s.u. Requested some revisions in the single occupancy vehicle rate table that's applied through the type a parking review asking that we push out the time frame and change the -- the numbers so that it didn't drop so quickly. Again, gil and I had conversations. We included pdot in those conversations. Came to the conclusion that it's probably a good idea to not require a drop in the single occupancy vehicle rates until we know that some of the tools that are going to be essential to allow o.h.s.u. To actually decrease their single occupancy vehicle rate are in place. And that specifically includes a suspended cable transportation system and the length of the streetcar in north macadam. We've looked at a december 2007 as being the first time that they would have to drop their rate. We also felt that at that point we'd want them to be pretty aggressive, that they'd have these new tools in place and it would be time to start working on people's behavior aggressively. So we're looking for a 3% drop in that first rate. And then we give them another five years at which point we're

**JULY 3, 2002**

looking for another 3% and then we drop to 2% for the next three five-year increments, so we're requiring them to be at 39% after Jan 1st, 2028. Which again is earlier than we're expecting downtown. It's later than what we'd originally had the plan, but again between the conversations we've had with pdot and amongst ourselves and with o.h.s.u. This seemed like a reasonable approach.

**Francesconi:** Thank you for doing this. I think I suggested or at least encouraged it. So thank you.

**Saltzman:** Yeah.

**Kelley:** The council last week gave us the direction that commissioner Francesconi is urging, but we look at allowing a little bit more time to comply. That was the direction you gave us.

so we came back with the specific numbers, which are different than what o.h.s.u. requested. They're more aggressive than that.

**Katz:** Okay. Council? Okay.

**Hartnett:** Okay. The next one that I would call your attention to is page 25. Items g-1. This is the merged site review, approval camera criteria with an additional guideline. It is only one. That is actually in attachment f, on page 51. And we have essentially captured the goals of each of those concepts into the background text of a new design guideline and the design guideline simply says that they will need to demonstrate how they are -- that they further the implementation of the functional areas, pedestrian and vehicular circulation site development concepts. So for every -- every building proposal that needs to go through design review, which will be most, we are -- they will have to show how they're meeting the goals of these site development concepts. The one thing I also wanted to mention on that is I did have a chance to speak briefly with Chris Copka and McCulloch, the chair and vice-chair of the design commission they haven't had a chance to review this, but they -- they understand that things are moving forward. They've asked me to brief this on this new design guideline. I'm on their schedule for that assuming you pass it. They were a little bit concerned that if there were a major glitch that somehow staff is overlooking, would there be some way to correct that, and Gil and I have assured them if that is the case we will figure out to get an amendment to that in front of the council. They'll be briefed probably not next month, and if there's a major problem we'll have to bring something back, but we're not anticipating that.

**Katz:** Any problems with that? All right, go ahead. The next one would be page 30. This was a request to delete the words "avoided and limited" from the land use poll 1-c. And the council's direction was to take a look at what was done in the recent work we did on the airport master planning process. And so what I looked at was a document called natural resource --

**Katz:** Whoa. Did you skip 29 on the impervious surface issue?

**Hartnett:** Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, I had that flagged.

**Katz:** And did you look at page 26?

**Hartnett:** See, Betsy's color coding is better than mine.

**Katz:** She didn't color code that one, but she did flag it.

**Hartnett:** Oh, yeah, 26, thank you. This was the thresholds for design review. O.h.s.u. had made a request to increase the floor area from 15,000 to 55. And to increase the facade area from 1500 to I think it was 5,000. Again, the council's direction to us was to look at this, to have some conversations with o.h.s.u. About why -- what was driving their numbers and figure out what we thought might be appropriate. So what we've presented to you is a floor area of threshold of 25,000 square feet and a facade area of 3,000 square feet. That was based on discussions we had with o.h.s.u. About what would institute the kind of addition, particularly building addition -- a new building is almost assuredly going to be more than 25,000 square feet. It would be they were adding on to an existing building where we were kind of trying to figure out where to set the

**JULY 3, 2002**

number. For what -- the conversation we had revolved around the floor plates, typical floor plates, for research buildings and medical patient care facilities and the size of those floor plates are typically 25,000-30,000 square feet. In a given scenario where they were very pressed to bring -- add space to bring in a new, you know, researcher or something like that, or they had a new patient program they needed to quickly provide space for, they typically would not be doing less than one floor. So you'd be looking at a 25,000-30,000-square-foot addition as an absolute minimum. So we kind of figured -- you know, we want to make sure we capture just about everything, but we do want to allow, particularly for that kind of circumstance, where they're needing to, you know, put something together quickly to capture an opportunity to leave open some room. So that's how we came up with that number.

**Saltzman:** How does council feel about that?

**Kelley:** You don't have to agree with it.

**Katz:** I don't agree with it, but they came close. I would prefer the original numbers, but you know how I feel about that issue. All right.

**Francesconi:** I'm fine.

**Katz:** Leave it the way it is, all right. [ gavel pounding ]

**Hartnett:** Then you said page 28. Is that right? What was the number ?

**Katz:** No. It's 29.

**Hartnett:** Page 29, yes, thank you. This has to do with the effective and impervious area which had been discussed last week as a -- an addition to the zoning code. The council did decide that they would like us to approach it from a policy standpoint and to add policy language as opposed to regulatory language. So what i've got here is two new objectives that we be added under policy for the open space natural resources policy and policy 5, the building and site design. It's essentially the same statement in both places. Support development practices that achievement no net increase in effective and impervious area in the marquam hill planned district.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Francesconi:** Now o.h.s.u. objects to this. They've sent a memo on this.

**Hartnett:** I have seen that. Yeah, i'm assuming they'll --

**Katz:** They'll testify and if the council then wants to open up that issue again, we can open it up. Okay.

**Hartnett:** Okay, so page 30, this was the issue about avoided and limited. Again, the council asked us to look at what the language was in the natural resources criteria for the Portland international airport zoning code amendments, which were recently heard by the council and passed. The phrase in that document is "avoided minimized or mitigated." it's talking about a mitigation -- natural resource mitigation plan requirements, when that expression is used. And then goes on to describe that if -- that significant detrimental impacts must be avoided, is the first clause. And then where that is not practicable, it goes on to say that the impacts must be minimized and the impacts mitigated. So I wasn't sure exactly which way to go with this language, so i've given you four options. The first one is to strike the word "limited" and essentially use the same language as is in the airport stuff, and say "avoided minimized or mitigated." that's option one. Option two would be to put the "or" in a slightly different place and have it said "avoided or minimized and mitigated." the third option would be to strike "avoided and limited" and simply say "are minimized and mitigated." the fourth option is to take out "avoided and limited" as the request was made and simply say "mitigated."

**Katz:** And the airport language is option one?

**Hartnett:** Yes. The airport language would be -- either one or two. I think option two is actually closer, because the airport says that significant detrimental impacts must be avoided and where that

**JULY 3, 2002**

is not practicable, the impact must be minimized and mitigated. That would probably be closest to the airport.

**Katz:** Which one? Two?

**Francesconi:** I don't know which one. I don't even remember this discussion, to be honest. I'm sure it happened, but this is the only one I don't remember.

**Katz:** Remember, it was the and/or, we had a conversation. We told them to go back.

**Hartnett:** And figure out something else.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Francesconi:** So now I guess I need to know a little bit more about the consequences of the different options in practical terms here. Well, the policies come into play under certain land reviews. So there's references to comprehensive plan language in -- I have to think for a second which land use reviews include that. I was turning to Douglas. He's not remembering it off the top of his head either I can give you that answer if I check the zoning code, Commissioner Francesconi. I know for example a comprehensive plan map amendment says that you must reference all comprehensive plan policies. You're incorporating this into the comprehensive plan, so this would be something that has to be looked at. Okay? There are very few land use reviews -- quasi judicial land use reviews that require that we look at the comprehensive plan policies. In all legislative planning projects we would have to look at this language. So, for example, if we were going to come back and do some sort of revisions to the Marquam Hill plan, we would have to look at this language and ask, are we actually avoiding an impact. And if we're not, are we mitigating and limiting -- minimizing and mitigating or, you know -- depending on which language you put in there, we'd have to evaluate it against that. So its biggest impact is in future land use decisions, both quasi judicial and legislative. Fairly narrow range of quasi judicial cases, though. I don't know if Kathryn wants to add anything to that answer.

**Katz:** Option two?

**Francesconi:** As I'm looking at this, with no testimony, and just that explanation, option two, I'd like to hear some testimony.

**Katz:** Let's keep it as option two and then if we hear testimony and the council wants to come back, we'll do that.

**Hartnett:** Okay. Okay, the next one would be page 31. And again, going back to your errata sheets, you have a new page 31. And really the difference between existing and new page is simply that the text under items two and three is underlined on the new page to show that it is being added to the -- to the document.

**Katz:** J-2?

**Hartnett:** Yes. This is items j-2. Let me give you a little explanation on this. This was an objective that the planning commission asked us to write, which was to clarify the desire to encourage development to occur off of Marquam Hill when that was possible and practical. There was a request to rewrite this, as well as its associated land use action. And the council asked us to look at it. I think the original request was actually to delete it and council asks us to rewrite it. So in trying to rewrite it as a single statement, it really got to be way too long of a run-on sentence. So I decided that, you know, for clarity, let's break it into two statements.

**Francesconi:** I like this.

**Saltzman:** I guess --

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Saltzman:** Yeah. I don't know how important this is, but we talked about the importance of saying somehow we encourage their growth in the city. And you're really only singling out the science and technology corridor, I guess. I guess there are other places in the city they could high school grow.



**JULY 3, 2002**

**Hartnett:** That's correct. I did single out science and technology quarter kind of based on the conversation we had about the goal five stuff, but we could broaden that to say elsewhere in Portland.

**Saltzman:** Or elsewhere in the city, I guess.

**Katz:** I think we did. Let's put that in. Because I think the conversation was, "and the city." I remember that. Okay. All right, no objections to that.

**Hartnett:** So we'll add that language.

**Katz:** Right.

**Hartnett:** Okay. I think we're coming in close now. All right, so on page 34 are the missed items. I'm going to skip over those very briefly to go through the last of your items in your errata sheet. That is you've got new page 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 46. And essentially those are just redoing the transportation charts to be consistent with all of the last-minute changes on whose an implementer, who's not.

**Katz:** They're in the action chart.

**Hartnett:** Yeah. It's the same chart, just ever so slight differences. One thing I want to point out, because it is actually a change -- i'm sorry, let me find this for you. It's number t-43. If i'm remembering correctly T-43 in the original version there was no time indicated. We had crossed off next five years, but we hadn't put in 6-10 years. This is on the pace car pilot car program.

**Katz:** Yes.

**Hartnett:** I just want to point out that that's the correction to that.

**Katz:** All right. So we're now back to the --

**Hartnett:** Actually, madame mayor, i'm sorry, that should not be changing. That should remain under next five years. That is incorrect. There should be an x in the next five-year column. There's no change. It shouldn't be struck out. There shouldn't be an underlined x in the 6-10. Cross off both those things, put an x in that column and that's the correct way of doing that. Sorry about that. It all gets confusing, I know. So if we can go back to page 34. As I think gil said at the beginning, in the process of identifying the requested amendments that the council considered on June 27th, there were five items that had been part of -- four of the five had been part of the requestor's planning commission testimony and were overlooked by me. They had attached their planning commission testimony to their city council testimony, and I missed them. The first one was just an oversight on my part and I apologize to Sean Brennan for doing that. It was a little difficult to capture them all. So what i'd like to do, then, would be walk you through them, as we did with the others. If council wants to add the amendment to the amendments that you're considering, I have provided sufficient language that you could actually consider the amendment today and you can take testimony on it. So the first one was to delete 33855060-c, and that is a section that provides a new approval criteria for a zoning map amendment that addresses any future requests to move a Marquam Hill viewpoint. And the planning commission very specifically added this as a way of assuring ongoing protection and maybe even increasing the protections for the Marquam Hill viewpoints. And the language reads, in the Marquam Hill planned district, relocating a scenic viewpoint will be approved if the review body finds that the applicant has shown that the relocation result in a net benefit to the public, taking into consideration such factors as public access, the quality of the view, the breath of the view, and the public amenities that are or will be available. And there is another amendment to this as part of the housekeeping items that the staff presented to clarify that all three criteria, a, b and c, apply the way we'd written it. It says it only applies to c.

**Katz:** So you're recommending no action on this one?

**Hartnett:** Yes, I would recommend you not move this --

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Katz:** Not to delete it?

**Hartnett:** Yeah, don't move this amendment forward.

**Katz:** Okay. Council?

**Francesconi:** That's fine.

**Katz:** Hello? Okay.

**Hartnett:** Not moving that one forward. The next one is m-2, again a request to the planning commission, to apply the residential institutional i.r. Zone instead of the central employment e.x. Zone. Again, this was something the planning commission did discuss. They had quite a lengthy discussion on what base zone to use. They did ultimately decide that the e.x. Zone with the planned district provided them the -- the opportunity to create specialized regulations that -- that they felt would be acceptable as the alternative to the i.r. And they did not forward to you a recommendation to implement i.r., but they did say e.x. With the planned district.

**Katz:** So leave it as the planning commission recommended?

**Hartnett:** Yes, that would be our advice.

**Katz:** Okay. [ gavel pounding ]

**Hartnett:** M-3, this was, again, on the height limitations. There were two specific requests that I did catch. This was one generalized request that I did not catch. It actually goes into quite a bit of detail about raising this and lowering that. And there was actually a map in the testimony that was original submitted. It wasn't submitted to the council, but I took the liberty of providing you the map so that you could see --

**Katz:** Didn't we act on something like --

**Hartnett:** There were two, as I said, that were very specific about two areas. This was the more generalized. It's the map in attachment a if you want to look at it. Again, you did decide on the two specific requests not to move them forward. This -- this repeats those requests as well as adds several others. This map that I added and the request in general was specifically discussed and considered by the design commission. And again, not part of the design commission's advice to you on the height limitations on what they felt were appropriate height limitations.

**Katz:** Okay. What's the council -- leave it? Leave it? Okay. [ gavel pounding ]

**Hartnett:** And that was leave it out?

**Katz:** Right. Don't -- don't forward it.

**Hartnett:** Okay. Items 4 is a new action items. Again, this was a request to the planning commission that the planning commission considered, so they were asking at that time for a new action items to institute a more aggressive transportation demand management program, including, and then there's a list of about six different things. The planning commission in their discussion about it agreed that there were specific action items that spoke to each of these individually with more specificity, and they didn't feel the need to add an additional action items that summed them up.

**Katz:** Okay. Don't include it? Okay. [ gavel pounding ]

**Hartnett:** Okay. Then m-5, this was a request to suspend the marquam hill plan for a minimum of 180 days with some specific notions, ideas, about the type of public involvement process, community involvement process that needs to take place.

**Katz:** This is where we were threatened?

**Hartnett:** This was in written testimony that didn't include that same language.

**Katz:** Oh, okay, all right. Okay. Don't include it?

**v:** Don't include it.

**Katz:** Don't include it. [ gavel pounding ]

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Hartnett:** Okay. So I think that's the amendment package. Do you have any questions on any of them at this point?

**Katz:** She's signaling me, and I have no clue.

**Moore:** Page 8.

**Katz:** Okay. Oh, yes, basic utility.

**Hartnett:** Yes, basic utilities. This was, again, part of the -- of the overall request about the suspended cable system. So this was the request to reinstate the land use regulations regarding the suspended cable system. The top portion of it are those -- those pieces that were in the marquam hill planned district. The first one making basic utilities in the o.s. Zone -- i'm sore are -- making suspended cable systems within the basic utilities category an allowed use. Other basic utilities would still be handled through an additional use review. The second one has to do with applying the offsite impact standards for any suspended cable transportation system, so we have specific standards regarding noise, vibration and glare. And normally they would be applied like in an industrial area that abuts a residential area, to make sure that those industrial impacts don't go beyond the site boundaries. Our idea here was even though it's within that same zone, let's apply it within that same zone to make sure that if any system is developed, there's no glare, vibration, or noise that affects the terwilliger parkway.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Hartnett:** And then the last -- the second portion --

**Saltzman:** Shouldn't that also include the residential zones that the system's going over?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** That portion of the system would be in the public right-of-way. And title 33 would not apply.

**Saltzman:** Okay.

**Hartnett:** So just a bus going down the street doesn't necessarily have to meet noise criteria.

**Saltzman:** Okay.

**Hartnett:** And i'm sure tri-met hears about that all the time. And then the second half of the page is noting suspending cable transportation systems as an example within the basic utilities category. I believe you've had a memo from the office of planning and development review on their analysis of this. If you need that.

**Katz:** Yes. That was last week. All right. Leave it -- leave it the way it's been amended. You did leave out one, page 10. Humphrey boulevard. Your favorite --

**Hartnett:** Actually I flagged that very specifically, because pdot asked me to make a comment on this. They provided you with a memo, I believe on monday, that talked about some of their concerns. One of the things that was not included in that memo, because they didn't know it at that time, was that apparently they -- they are actually working on a traffic calming project on humphrey, and they've included hewitt as part of that discussion. The project, as far as I understand it, is actually underway and steve gerber can come up and --

**Katz:** Okay, steve, come and talk to us, because this was important to one of our council members.

**Saltzman:** Are we also going to have testimony on this as well? We can take testimony on this?

**Katz:** Sure.

**Steve Gerber, Office of Transportation:** Steve gerber, office of transportation. I misspoke. Just to make that absolutely clear.

**Katz:** No.

**Gerber:** In a very hurried conversation with rob birchfield before he took a very much-needed and well deserved vacation, we discussed humphrey boulevard and what was happening there. I obviously misheard what he told me and I informed you through a memo that humphrey boulevard was being considered as an emergency response street. That is not true. In fact, whether or not it

**JULY 3, 2002**

should be an emergency response street was a consideration in the traffic calming project and process that is ongoing on humphrey boulevard at this time.

**Saltzman:** And while you're here, why don't you tell, what is happening in terms of -- you said there was a traffic calming proposal underway.

\*\*\*\*\*: Yes.

**Will Stevens, Project Manager, Office of Transportation:** I'm the project manager for that project.

**Katz:** Steve, give up your seat for will. Since you misspoke.

\*\*\*\*\*: It's hot.

\*\*\*\*\*: It is. I'll just elevate.

**Katz:** Identify yourself for the record.

**Stevens:** Will Stevens, office of transportation, project manager for the humphrey-hewitt traffic calming project. We currently have a project underway that is essentially addressed to -- to address speeding traffic on humphrey boulevard. We undertook hewitt as part of the project scope out of concerns for potential diversion. One of the policy mandates with pdot is that we don't undertake a traffic calming project that may potentially divert traffic from a higher classified street to a lower classified street. So we currently have a project that's underway and it happens to be in the petition process at this particular time. Petition is being circulated through the neighborhood for signatures of support for this particular project. It's estimated that we'll have about a \$40,000 project, 12 speed bumps on humphrey and eight on hewitt. And this is a project that is currently being undertaken through the residential speed bump purchase program. Obviously pdot does not have the funding to provide these types of services currently. And it's one that's been on our radar screen for no less than three years. And the urgency of this particular project has -- has somewhat elevated because of the marquam hill plan and the potential impacts that this plan may have on traffic for -- for humphrey. To the point that the neighborhood as opposed to waiting for either the state or the city to provide funding for this particular project, they decided to step up to the plate and fund it themselves. So I think that certainly adds to the -- the sense of urgency for this particular project.

**Saltzman:** So leaving this new action items in there is not inconsistent, then, with what's going on?

**Stevens:** That's correct.

**Saltzman:** So we can leave it in there?

**Stevens:** That's correct. That's absolutely correct.

**Katz:** Okay. So leave it in?

**Saltzman:** Yeah, leave it in.

**Katz:** Leave it in.

**Hartnett:** The only thing I would point out, it is somewhat inconsistent with what we've done in the past with area plans.

**Katz:** He wants it.

**Hartnett:** I just wanted to point that out madame mayor.

**Katz:** He wants it in. It's a good thing. Oh, I shouldn't say that.

**Hartnett:** I just needed to put on the record what you've done in the past. I'm sorry.

**Katz:** Okay, all right.

\*\*\*\*\*: And then gil had one --

**Kelley:** If I could, madame mayor --

**Katz:** Yes, i'm with you.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Kelley:** -- I wanted to return to two items because I think you may get testimony on that today, and just for the benefit of testifiers or listening audience, I wanted to return to pages 19-21. These are parking ratios and the single occupant vehicle rate decreases over time. On the first one, on the parking ratios, you asked susan a few moments ago what the staff recommendation is, and she repeated what our recommendation was to the planning commission. And that is in line with the requested amendment. But you asked us to come back with some sort of comparable standards from other locations and I just wanted to elucidate those. The standard in the e.x. Base zone is one parking space for every 500 square feet for medical centers. The 1 per 600 recommendation you heard from susan would be a stricter ratio than that. The planning commission felt strongly about this one and pegged the ratio at 1 per 750 square feet. By comparison, most of the downtown is at 1 space per 667 square feet. That's sort of between the staff recommendation and the planning commission. Some of downtown and the river district, which are both intensely developed, are at the 1 per 500 square feet. And then you also asked about some other areas of the central city, such as lloyd center and goose hollow, lower albina, central east side, and there are no maximum ratios there. Again, the current effective ratio right now on the ground, on the hill for the o.h.s.u. Property, discounting the v.a. Is about one space for 750 square feet. They feel -- and the -- the transportation report that we received showed a deficiency of about 270 parking spaces on the hill. So I just wanted to give that range of numbers so that the discussion could be enlightened by those. Clearly staff has only one opinion and it's really a policy choice for you, as it was for the planning commission. With regard to the s.o.v. Rates or single occupant vehicle rates on page 21, the direction you gave us last time was to allow more time to comply with the strictest number, which is the 39%, essentially the 39% drive alone rate. The current rate is about -- between 50-51%. The downtown is expected to reach under the regional framework plan, the 39% in the year 2040. So this is an ambitious standard to go lower than that. You asked for more time than was in either the original staff or planning commission recommendation. And you asked for a sort of fewer stepdowns. The planning commission recommendation had a monitoring and stepdown about every 18 months or so. And these are now in five-year increments. The request from o.h.s.u. Was for the five-year increments, but as shown at the bottom of page 21, would step it down from 51% from now through 2007 to 48%, and then 45%, 43-41, and then 39 in each of the next five-year increments. We've recommended to you a more aggressive stepdown of 51% to begin with, and then stepping down -- excuse me, i'm reversing -- the numbers I just gave you are our recommendation by comparison, the o.h.s.u. Numbers would be 49 versus 48, 47 versus 45, 44 versus 43, and 42 versus 41. So ours is a more aggressive stepdown in numbers.

**Katz:** Can you just tell me why are you telling us this again?

**Kelley:** I expect you may get some testimony on this and we didn't exactly lay these numbers out for everyone.

**Saltzman:** Since you're revisiting this, under the proposal they were supposed to be, as of this august, at 51%, single occupancy vehicle rate.

**Hartnett:** That's correct.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Yeah.

**Saltzman:** And under the proposed change, we're saying now they don't have to be there until 2007? They kind of stay where they are?

**Hartnett:** The way they've written it is a little bit differently than we would write it. The way they wrote it is after august 1st, 2002, essentially until 2007, it would be 51%, because the way they've written it is after december 31st, 2007, they have to be at 49%. The way we write it in the zoning code, is we clarify the beginning date and ending date. So the beginning date is the effective date

**JULY 3, 2002**

of these regulations, and they can stay at 51% until december 31st, 2007, which is essentially the same thing as what they said. Then for the next drop, it's jan 1st, 2008 until december 31st, 2012, which is again the same time period, but we've dropped it to 48%, whereas they proposed 49.

**Saltzman:** Okay, I got it.

**Hartnett:** Okay. We're fussy with the code.

**Katz:** Okay, thank you. Let's open it up for public testimony, karla. Let me give some ground rules. We are not going to permit passing on your time to somebody else. Somebody did that last time. We don't do that. I didn't really object, but let me flag that. And let's just address the amendments that we went over, the primary amendments, but there were others that we went over last week. Okay.

**Moore:** If you come up three at a time.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Don Baack, 6495 SW Burlingame Pl, 97239:** Mayor Katz, council i'm here representing the hillsdale neighborhood. Hopefully we'll be able to talk about what our concerns are. Hillsdale has two miles of terwilliger parkway in its boundary and has a number of traffic problems that have been generated by traffic going to o.h.s.u. That have been accruing over the years, particularly resulting from the traffic signal management at capitol highway and terwilliger. What happens there, the traffic backs up almost to dan Saltzman's house, and then people decide to go other places, mainly vermont, capitol -- chestnut, seventh, and burlingame avenue. And so we would propose that you add in t-13, add the southwest streets of seventh, chestnut, vermont and capitol hill -- that is from vermont -- chestnut to capitol hill road and burlingame avenue to be considered for traffic calming. This is very important, because we are getting -- these streets particularly, burlingame avenue, and southwest vermont, are within the pedestrian district of the hillsdale town center, and this kind of additional traffic, it goes by two schools, rieke and wilson. These are important things for hillsdale. And this is very definitely, as the testimony given in the working groups indicates, the traffic management -- traffic light management is using the light at capitol highway and terwilliger as a gate-keeper to keep traffic from going further on terwilliger. So therefore it's a direct connection.

**Katz:** All right. Susan, write that down and we'll probably want to hear from traffic -- i'm sorry -- from transportation on this traffic issue. Go ahead.

**Baack:** Second, I see there's a -- an amendment in here dealing with the park and rides. We would like to see the park-and-rides reinstated rather than the free bus pass.

because the free bus pass is having tremendous impact on hillsdale. We've got documentation where metro did a stud of 13th and barbur where some 57% of the people were parking in the business and local streets, getting on the bus, and going to o.h.s.u. That's happening not only in that area, but also entirely along terwilliger, and we've got more and more streets, either no parking or two-hour parking, which inhibits the use of the streets for the neighbor. We really would like to see the park-and-ride put back in place. Some of the reasons for taking it out were air pollution. Those environments have changed as in the document that's given to you indicates. We no longer have those kind of conditions. And it's important that we get these people taking the bus further away. Putting a satellite parking lot possibly on barbur with a connection that matt brown came up, I know this isn't the focus, but just an aside, might alleviate this and also take the pressure off the parking on will hit. That's something you might want to think about. We urge the implementation of the pedestrian vision plan that was put into the package, and that that be included in the current transportation system plan rather than ongoing. Because five years waiting, everyone's current of what's going on there now. It's before the planning commission, let's get it done so it comes to you as a completed package now rather than waiting five years. There will be a change of staff, the

**JULY 3, 2002**

people and citizens will be less involved. I'd like to add also in terms of these amendments you've got before you on transportation, and suggest that we add hillsdale as implementers. Those are changing the names of the terwilliger parkway and so on, things related directly to terwilliger, since two miles of that is in the hillsdale neighborhood, we had like to participate in that discussion and not just be observing it. In that same regard, regard to implementers, I suggest we add as well as trails as an implementer on t-26 and include in that, create and maintain a user route map for pedestrian connections. And that's "and routes." because the objective of people on the hill is basically saying, here, you go to this place for this kind of doctor. We're trying to show people how to get through that maze if they want to walk someplace else. We would like to be involved in that discussion. Also in t-27, i'd like to suggest that the ad -- we add a project, southwest fourth and woods to terwilliger. This is through the terwilliger parkway. All of the use on this particular route is commuters actually going to o.h.s.u. These are students and people living in the housing in that area just below there in the apartments -- it's a terrible route and yet it's where they walk to work.

**Katz:** Today was supposed to be testimony on the amendments we adopted, not new ones. We'll respond to only of them, but that was last week. Okay?

\*\*\*\*\*: All right, mayor.

**Katz:** Thank you.

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

**Katz:** All right. Go ahead. Go ahead.

**Tom Miller:** Yes. Good morning. My name is tom miller. I live at 1225 southwest green. Same issues over the last couple years. I'll be very brief. I will try not to, as I misspoke the other night, milk a dead horse. One thing i'd like to do -- I was trying to say -- yes, you get it. Very concerned with this eastbound -- or excuse me -- the only westbound traffic out of marquam hill road. And Saltzman, thank you for looking at the possible ramifications of traffic mitigation on humphrey. That's just one piece of the puzzle. The way objectives eight and nine are written you, they say use sam jackson for northbound access to the school. Well, sac jackson, where it goes through the school, goes east and west. I would like you to put in there that use sam jackson to go north and east out of the school. The way it's written now, it almost promotes, because the direct link to marquam hill road, it promotes traffic going through fairmont, marquam hill road, humphrey, patton, et cetera. I'd like you to see if you can get your minds around that as i'm trying to. Another action items, number 10, although I put it in my amendments, proposed amendments last week, I didn't spell it out, but the vehicles owned by o.h.s.u., owned and operated on their time travel through the neighborhood. I would like you to implement it with the plan, that they have to use the parallel route that goes right next to their border, their school. I do have some words in here about the parking spaces, 'cause I do remember the planning commission speaking long and hard about the parking ratios of 750 versus 600 and the 750 would allow them 1300 spots with the proposed million -- million square feet, that leaves 1300 spots. I believe this is adequate. I believe the commission did too. The last point I put on here was that the mode split fallacy. That's that if you look at the -- the numbers, from 1986 and so far as traffic counts are concerned, the mode split has gone from 70% to 51 now. Well, the amount of traffic on the hill has gone from roughly 30,000 to 40,000. And I would like you to realize that it gets to be a shell game when all the numbers are played with and thrown around. And I understand that increasing the amount of parking spaces does increase the amount of traffic. I would like to close by saying that on behalf of the neighborhood association, we like o.h.s.u. As a neighbor. They do a lot of good work. A lot of people have testified to that. A lot of people who live in the neighbor go to school or retire from the neighbor. The concept of neighborhood livability gets an awful lot of lip-service. I would like

**JULY 3, 2002**

to think on behalf of the community, all my last efforts for the last year and a half are for the community. We would like this to work. All of my concerns are on behalf of trying to make this a good place to work and live. Unfortunately, they've fallen on deaf ears and I'd like you to not allow these efforts to be in vain and please let's make this work. Thank you for your time.

**Katz:** Okay.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Go ahead.

**William Danneman:** William danneman, 623 southwest carruther street. The first topic is topic d, page 11, d-13. And it has to deal with the satellite parking lots. And I would like to see that some kind of wording if put in there that these parking lots were not just at the bottom of the hill, which happens to be where I live and work and own properties, because all that would do is degradate our section of an adjacent neighborhood and we'd still have all the same pollution and congestion and traffic problems. I'd like to see at least maybe a couple miles out so we could really get a feel for how these shuttle buses could work with the satellite parking areas. The next one, topic, was topic c-3 on page eight. Has to do with the infamous utility of the suspended aerial tram, but my only concern is under the accessory uses and the parking. And in this specific situation, both at marquam and marquam hill, they have limits, and when you get to north macadam they've been talking about these limits all these times. The only area is with the new acceptance of the tram that goes gown to barbur boulevard. If you put in a parking lot in that area, it would further decimate the neighborhood. And I think it would be totally inappropriate to do. And I think it would be something to quell the concerns, because if you -- if you give them the right to have parking, then that could be argued any time, no matter if you have limits in other places, you've already granted it here. So I think maybe some wording that would not give it by right to the suspended aerial tram might be more appropriate. And the last one that really concerns myself and my family most is topic b-1, point one, page three, and that's your economic language. We've been in Portland over 100 years. And we've been in that neighborhood over 100 years. And now all of a sudden you're coming in and their language is telling me who I can do business with. I just happen to be in the corridor. I didn't choose to be in the corridor. This is arbitrary lines that you've drawn. Now you're saying you're going to take my tax dollars and support and collaborate and encourage bioscience, bioengineering, and these very specific industries, and if I wanted to do business with somebody else, I would be ad an economic disadvantage, because I wouldn't have the use that you're giving to these other industries. I think you have -- well, you've gone a little bit too far, and I certainly hope that you would refine your language to be a little bit broader like it was in the comprehensive language, a little bit more diverse use of the funds for our industries in that area.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Anton Vetterlein, 430 SW Hamilton St., 97201, Homestead Neighborhood Land Use Chair:**

Good afternoon. I'm anton vetterlein, homestead neighborhood land use chair. I'm like to let you know that we had a general neighborhood meeting last night and we voted I think almost you unanimously to support the traffic calming and access limitation measures that are specified in this plan, specifically t-13, t-14 and t-15. The caveat -- or what's in there says with neighborhood participation, so I think that means we're not going to have anything we don't want shoved down our throat. And certainly these measures are for us, our advantage in the first place. So we do support that in conjunction with the limits to neighborhood traffic that have been specified for the local service streets in the area. Those become the trigger that would cause these action items to be implemented if -- you know the thresholds for traffic on those streets is reached. So I strongly support that -- you know, that we maintain these action items for traffic calming. And also the amendment request to modify action items t-15 to study the realignment and access limitation of homestead drive, sixth drive, we strongly support having that in there as a -- as a study items and



**JULY 3, 2002**

possible impact mitigation measure. Moving on, there's a lot here. Three minutes isn't enough. Let's see, the parking ratio issue, this is pretty important to us. I think that the 1 to 750 square foot ratio is consistent with the goals and objectives of this plan. They say they want 900 new spaces on the hill. They want up to one million new square feet to build. And at 1-750 parking spaces, they can achieve those goals. And the only reason they need to loosen up that standard would be if they want to exceed 900 parking spaces. And I think it has served up to this point to encourage a successful transportation demand management program. If a tram's put in, it would encourage people to use the tram. And what I think is really important to note is that there's no actual limitations to square footage or, you know, additional new development on the hill. They say they want to build one million new square feet, but there's nothing in this plan that says there's a limit to that. And really the only thing that's limiting development on the hill and subsequently traffic in this really constrained area is the parking. And there's no absolute limit on the 900 parking spaces, the type b parking review requirements allow a way for them to exceed 900 parking spaces. So I think this ratio of one per 750 square feet is vitally important.

**Sten:** Can we extend his time?

**Katz:** Thank you. Take the most critical ones.

**Vetterlein:** Yeah. I think what's related to that is very important as well, is the s.o.v., single occupancy vehicle rate decreases and the table there. I think comparing Marquam Hill to downtown Portland, or other medical centers around the area, is kind of an apples to oranges comparison, because Marquam Hill has very limited vehicular access, and for instance downtown has a very extensive grid of freeways, highways, local streets, as well as all the mass transit. And furthermore, O.H.S.U. is seeking I think a fairly rapid buildout of its square footage on the hill, and adding parking up there as well, and these are going to lead to increases in traffic up there. And so we need to see the -- the impact mitigations or the measures that are sort of promised us to us to reduce traffic on the hill, we need to see those things implemented concurrently, not a lot of new parking spaces and no -- no -- like, for instance, campus drive, the realignment there is supposed to reduce traffic on Terwilliger Boulevard or spread it out over the day, that's gotten the five-year time line. So I think the s.o.v. Rates encourage the -- the t.t.m. Program and are really a crucial component in limiting traffic on the hill. Then the other critical thing I think is the site review, merging that with the design review. I understand O.P.D.R.'s concern about that, and my concern with merging it into design review is that design review's a discretionary procedure and deals more with aesthetic type issues, not exclusively, and I think what the site review procedure was -- was created for was -- was a check on O.H.S.U. And how they're progressing toward the goals that they've stated they -- that they've put out there as a way of mitigating impacts to the neighborhood. Again, reorganizing campus activities to get -- to spread out traffic on Terwilliger and kind of reduce it on neighborhood streets. So we need to have a way of checking and making sure that those things are actually happening the way they said they have, because there's not a lot in the plan otherwise that really assures that. So if there's another way to achieve that, without merging it into design review, I would -- you know, something that is a little bit more rigorous, I would strongly support that. At the very least, I think as suggested in the memorandum of understanding, the outline of possible topics there, the last item is periodic assessment, which basically talks about -- a periodic assessment of the implementation of the Marquam Hill plan. I think that's essentially a site review process.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Vetterlein:** And that first report by 2005 with subsequent reports every five years, I think that would be an absolute minimum.

**Katz:** That's it.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Vetterlein:** There's a lot more here I could talk about, but --

**Katz:** Those are the highlights.

**Veterlein:** Yeah.

**Sten:** Question?

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Sten:** Anton, just wanted to make sure i'm clear. Is the neighborhood satisfied with the language on the traffic mitigation sections at this point?

**Vetterlein:** Ideally we would have liked to see no increase in traffic on the hill, no new parking. It's not the position we took a year ago, but given where we're at now I would say that -- that that's a reasonable place to go. We certainly don't want anything less than that.

**Sten:** Okay, thanks.

**Katz:** There was a little dispute, and that's why antone came back with an actual vote. All right, go ahead.

**Janet Kelly:** All right. I'm janet kelly. I live at 641 --

**Katz:** Grab the mic closer to you. Or both of them. All right.

**J. Kelly:** I'm janet kelly. I live at 6411 southwest virginia. My concerns focus on topic c beginning on page five of the council requested amendments for july 2002. Topic c, specific reference to any suspended cable systems appears to be premature, since the results of the connector study requested by council will not be presented until one week from today. Therefore, under c 1.1, we would like to strike the words "suspended cable transportation system" from the amendment language. There are three occurrences on page five. We would also like to strike the final sentence on page five, which claims people from the local area, quote, treasure this connection, quote. Nothing could be further from the truth. People from the local area despise and abhor the idea. If this dreadful system is ever actually built, it will be imposed on an angry and resistant population. On c 1.2, we would like to remove the words, quote, suspended cable, quote, from amendment language. It occurs once in number one, twice in number two. And we would like number three stricken as premature, since any suspended cable system is still highly controversial. The corbett-terwilliger and lair hill neighborhoods are prepared to support a transportation system linking marquam hill with north macadam. We have, however, formally requested that pdot initiate a fair, comprehensive and unbiased evaluation of a lateral and vertical system of elevators or people movers, and that the results of this evaluation be presented for a public hearing and comment before any connector between marquam hill and north macadam is approved. The system has much to favor it, yet for reasons that are unclear to me it has been met with derision when our representatives have suggested it. It appears to be cost effective, time efficient, neighborhood friendly and safe. It will not destroy our historic neighborhood or trespass upon the terwilliger parkway, or hang as a hideous blob in the future of this beautiful city. It is worthy of serious consideration. On c 1.3, it is inappropriate to amend the zoning code, t-26, before selecting a suspended cable system. T-27, or developing terminals, t-28, the move is upsetting to the people who live in the city and who are deeply opposed to having a tram hanging like an ugly spider from its web over their streets and homes.

**Saltzman:** Thank you. Larry?

**Larry Beck, 3307 SW Corbett, 97201:** Thank you. Larry beck, I live in the ctlh neighborhood. I'm just speaking for myself, not for a committee. I testified last week. As I was thinking about preparing testimony for today, I realized I didn't need to prepare any testimony, I just needed to change the leave the plan to where it was to -- we talked about several points all contained in here. Planning commission had said you need to keep the reference to the aerial tram out of the plan. There's a very good reason for keeping it out of the plan. We have a planned district, planned

**JULY 3, 2002**

districts can only contain regulations and only contain development within that planned district. Trams by definition travel outside the district. You're injecting a legal issue for appeal. Rather than speeding this up for o.h.s.u. You're going to slow it down. That's a good reason to keep those out. Concerning basic utilities, this is the amendment c-3. It's a similar issue. There's a legal issue there about the -- the definition of a basic utility. And that again is going to be a problem. That's a legal issue. That's a luba issue, it will slow it down, not speed it up. It's just not a proper designation. Planning commission was right on on that. If you'll recall, it was a 9-0 vote. So this amendment flies in the face of all the work that the planning commission did. I would recommend that you reconsider planning commission's position on that and toss out this particular amendment. And I think, you know, commissioner Saltzman, you'd asked a moment ago to susan about the rules and open space and residential area. And I think you need to realize that there's also a legal dispute between bureau of planning view and other legal positions about whether that right-of-way is available for a tram. That's not going to be decided here. That's a legal issue. Luba will deal with it or the circuit court will, but it's important for the council to know, and it's important for this plan, because that's going to slow it down as well. If we're trying to give them speedy resolution it's not going to happen if we include these, and that's important and that amendment should be stricken as well. I talked about the o.s. zoned land east of campus drive. That's now included in some of the maps that I think are attachment d. So we changed the boundaries again. This is land that's not going to be o.h.s.u. developable land. I'm not sure why it's included in the plan anyway -- well, I know why it's included in the planned district, because it makes it easier to build a tram if just -- trams are basic utilities, basic utilities can be built, tram basic utilities as a matter of right, if you include that land it makes it easier. That again is error, it shouldn't happen. I would think our parks commissioner and others would be more concerned about protecting those park lands. I would certainly hope that would happen. There's specific action items. There's a new one called t.x.x., t-37, t-38, that should be deleted. That relates to, you know, this vision action items, objectives about keeping trams out of the plan. I'm glad to see that t-39 was included. The use of satellite parking lots and shuttle buss, I think that's good to keep traffic off the hill. I would certainly encourage that. I think that's all I have. Thank you for your time.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right.

**Saltzman:** Kelly, go ahead.

**Kelly Burin:** I live at 4335 southwest humphrey boulevard. And first of all i'd like to say that i've been a life-long member of -- owe or resident of the city of Portland. I'm also a business owner. I can't speak for all my neighborhoods, but I know I adamantly support the o.h.s.u. Expansion. I think it's wonderful for the city. And so why i'm testifying here now, as I first of all would like to thank you, the council and mayor, for recognizing that there are impacts to the neighborhoods, and particularly the neighborhood where I live in southwest humphrey boulevard. It in fact becomes a escape route or commuter route for many of the people that work or have to go to o.h.s.u. For three years now myself, along with several residences on our street, have been working with pdot to implement a traffic calming project on southwest humphrey. In fact, southwest humphrey appears to be a bypass to highway 26 as people cut through our neighborhood to -- to find their way to o.h.s.u. Odot has not helped the situation by constructing the new sylvan overpass design that funnels o.h.s.u.-driven -- directed traffic up scholls, where normally they would have just turned on highway 26. Now they have three stoplights that they have to go through to get to highway 26. Whereas before they could simply go up the ramp. Now they come up scholls, get to a stoplight at humphrey that wasn't there before, get to a stoplight at sylvan overpass that wasn't there before, and now they go down the ramp, which has a ramp meter, which wasn't there before, and owe now they have three stoplights. The alternative is take a right turn on humphrey, go

**JULY 3, 2002**

through the neighborhood, and the next thing you know they go down on fairmont and they're down at o.h.s.u. Pdot has taken tests during their -- helping us through this problem with the traffic-calming project. They've putten a road -- meters on the road. And they have a documented 95.1% of all traffic is violating the speed limit. I mean, it's absolutely outrageous. The neighborhood is so upset with this whole thing, that we've said, well, we're willing to pay \$40,000 of our own money to -- to install this traffic calming project to do something about it. And it's really not fair. There's a lot of people that are on fixed income. It seems like it's very, very unfair, because it's not our -- it's not our doing. And as a runner, and as a biker, which humphrey and fairmont, the loop up there is used extensively, there's signs all over the road to say "bikes on roadway," I can tell you that as i'm riding my bike down the road, I see o.h.s.u. Parking stickers on the back of the cars going through our neighborhood. Clearly the fastest way from beaverton, if you're going in that direction, and you want to get to o.h.s.u., is through our neighborhood and open our street. There's another side issue much my son happens to living at the landing condominium down in johns landing. So we go to visit him. So our fastest way to get to his house, since we are on humphrey, is simply to go to broadway drive, go down broadway drive, exit off and take the ross island bridge exit, and the next thing you know you're on -- in the johns landing area.

**Katz:** Your time is up.

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

**Katz:** Did you make your point?

**Bruin:** Well, i'm asking that -- first of all, thank you for recognizing that we do have a problem on southwest humphrey and i'm asking that you include the southwest humphrey traffic calming project as part of the mitigation for the o.h.s.u. plan. Thank you very much.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**John Morris:** Thank you very much for the opportunity to talk about a subject about which i'm very passionate. My name is john morris. I live at 5033 southwest humphrey boulevard. I've lived there since 1969. At that time I was able to sit in my backyard and carry on a conversation with my friends and my family, and now it's virtually impossible to do such. Every time there's been a growth take place on marquam hill, we've felt the increase in the traffic on humphrey. When the shriners hospital was built up there, bingo, we felt traffic increase. When the vets hospital tripled in size, we felt traffic increase. The housing growth that's -- there's a limited amount of space to build in the southwest hills, but so the growth taking place out west. Direct access is to go take humphrey boulevard, for people that are using the hospital as patients or for people that work there. Humphrey has become -- kelly mentioned this. Humphrey has become a highway 26 bypass. A few weeks ago I followed a loaded five-ton dump truck all the way down humphrey -- the reason he'd done this, is he'd gotten off highway 26 because it was slow, slowing up. Loaded five you ton dump truck down humphrey boulevard, down broadway drive and got back on the freeway at the bomb of broadway drive, just because he didn't want to be inconvenienced on the highway. I'm in the retail business, and I -- I tell my employees, there's one word we will not use, and that's can't. So i'm hoping that since it's already been documented -- documented that the traffic calming project on humphrey is one of the most critical projects that needs to be -- take place for traffic calming, I hope you don't use the word "can't." thanks for the opportunity to speak with you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Andrew Holtz:** I'm andrew holtz. I live at 4723 southwest humphrey court.

**Katz:** You all got together for coffee one morning, right?

**Holtz:** That's right. And again, I came into this a bit late as far as working with -- on the traffic calming project for southwest humphrey boulevard, but it's something that i've felt ever since we moved into the neighborhood about five years ago. And because we have kids I brought them

**JULY 3, 2002**

down here, my wife kelly and our son aaron and our daughter judy, who have to use humphrey boulevard to get anywhere to the outside world. And the -- they need a way to do that safely. Particularly aaron pretty soon will be going to lincoln high school. And the high schools as you know do not provide transportation. Tri-met also does not provide transportation on humphrey boulevard. Therefore, all the students in that neighborhood have to walk or ride their bikes or god forbid drive their own cars along humphrey boulevard to get to school, because the nearest bus stops are at sylvan or at patton road, which each one of them is 3/4 of a mile from our house and more than half a mile of that is on humphrey boulevard their safety needs to be protected so that they have adequate, safe pedestrian and bike use of humphrey boulevard. So again, I want to thank you for including traffic calming on southwest humphrey boulevard in this plan, because we need it and we're going to need it more as that area develops.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Francesconi:** I want to make sure I understood transportation right, but I think not only are we including it in the plan, but we're prioritizing it and putting it ahead of others, partly because of your cooperation and insistence. There's a lot of neighborhoods that want this, which means that you do have an issue that we need to deal with.

\*\*\*\*\*: Yes, thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Francesconi:** Are the three of you testifying as a team here in.

\*\*\*\*\*: You bet. They decided to come over to our side, no longer be on the dark side.

**Francesconi:** I was trying to lighten it up here a little bit here.

\*\*\*\*\*: Thanks.

**Katz:** You're moving from the dark side?

\*\*\*\*\*: They are.

**Katz:** Okay.

\*\*\*\*\*: I wish we could afford them.

**Francesconi:** So much for my attempt. I'm sorry.

**Katz:** Didn't seem to work.

**Christe White, 101 SW Main St. #1100, 97213:** Christe white representing o.h.s.u. We think the amendment package that you have before you is a good blend. A mix of a bunch of different voices. There's planning commission amendments in there, neighborhood amendments, o.h.s.u. amendments. Bureau of planning amendments and pdot amendments. One example, because it's been mentioned today is the type a parking review. I think it's a perfect example of this and then i'll get on to one amendment that we have a problem with. And that is the type a parking review includes local trip caps on -- trip caps on local streets. Once you pass those trip caps, if you do, you have to then lapse into a type b parking review. I've heard some concern that we may not be able to meet those trip caps and the local neighborhood is concerned about that. I think there's a very good check in the system that you lapse into a type b parking review, it's a very rigorous review, and requires that you reassess the entire transportation capacity serving the hill. I'm certain at that point if there's conditions that need to be mitigated on local streets, that those would be carried forward during that process as a condition of approval are as a point of discussion. But let me say that there's one or two amendments that are particularly important to us, and the first of these is related to impervious surface. We've reviewed commissioner Saltzman's amendment and the bureau of planning response to that amendment and we support unequivocally that priority, to reduce or limit the impervious surface on the hill in conjunction with development. But we think there's probably a better way to do it. Right now the standard is no net gain in impervious surface. That is a perfect standard, requiring a perfect measurement. And i'm not sure anybody can make

**JULY 3, 2002**

that measurement. And as Mr. Beck said, that leaves us open to appeals that would probably jeopardize a lot of our mutual interests in proceeding with this project. So we've suggested some alternative language that I think meets the same objective and its mitigation language. A mitigation clause that is included already within objective 10 of building and site design, and I believe it's objective seven of open spaces and natural resources. And both of those objectives already speak to progressive storm water management techniques, controlling runoff, on site detention, roof gardens, and we would suggest to be sure that this important issue is forwarded through those objectives to add a clause that seeks to state that those objectives are intended to mitigate increases in impervious surface in conjunction with development applications. I think that gets us all to the same point. I think it's an appropriate level of regulatory burden, and I think that it helps us accomplish the shared objective. So I would suggest that you replace that language with the language that was forwarded to you by the bureau of planning. I'd also suggest that the local traffic calming has been an issue here. We originally asked for local traffic calming to be removed or at least placed later in time in the action items. The issue there for us is that we think local traffic calming, should we exceed our local trip caps, will be reviewed in a type b parking review should that be necessary if we exceed those caps.

**Katz:** Thanks. We'll go back to those after we hear testimony.

**Gordon Davis, OHSU:** Gordon Davis, representing O.H.S.U. Let me just speak to the parking ratio issue, which has come up a number of times. I think it's important to set it in the context of the plan as a whole. The plan as a whole really devises a number of specific strategies to manage and regulate traffic and access and parking on the hill. One of those that Kristi's already mentioned is the notion of specific trip caps on specific local streets. Secondly we have the reduction targets that are now built into the plan, in the table, for reductions in single occupancy vehicle. And third, as Kristi mentioned, we have -- or third, we have the maximum under the plan of 900 additional parking spaces on the hill. And finally, to the extent that we are unable to achieve any of those, either the trip caps or the S.O.V. reduction or desire to go beyond the 900 spaces, we automatically flip into the type b parking review. That's a very extensive review. That's really reopening the whole question of traffic capacity and access capacity and relooking at it, and to the extent that we choose in that review to modify the Marquam Hill plan, it really is in effect an amendment to the plan and an amendment to the comprehensive plan. So it's a significant review and a significant change required at that point. The ratio is really just a matter of timing. It's really a matter of pace. And what it really says is as O.H.S.U. builds the buildings and contemplates doing, as it builds 100 square feet or 100,000 square feet, how many spaces can it build with that building? There's been no additions in parking to the building since 1966. At the time Doernbecher was completed there was a net increase of 200 parking spaces at that time. Since that time there's been over 3,000 new employees on the hill. And the reason that O.H.S.U. has been able to do that is because of its aggressive program on transportation demand management, its aggressive program on shifting shifts and other factors. The plan has now put those programs in place and what we really need with this ratio is the ability to pace the development and additional parking at a rate that's equivalent to what's really needed for these new buildings.

**David Redlich, President, Homestead Neighborhood Association:** Good afternoon. My name is David Redlich of the Homestead Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood association reaffirms its support for the changes made by the planning commission to the Marquam Hill plan. Further we seek additional changes that will enhance the Terwilliger Parkway as a scenic parkway, preserves neighborhood views, protects the Terwilliger Parkway and neighborhood streets from excessive institutional traffic, improves pedestrian connectivity, and I remind you here that again Homestead is overwhelmingly a residential and/or park neighborhood with generally -- changes that

**JULY 3, 2002**

would generally promote the neighborhood's livability. A couple of examples were on page 19, items e-4, our concerns are the examples of the floor area, ratio comparisons in e.x. Zones and other parts of the city do not recognize the fact that o.h.s.u. Is served by five main routes, four of which utilize the terwilliger parkway, all of which are narrow, winding, two-lane streets, mostly in residential areas, none of which have contiguous sidewalks. Now again the comparisons in other e.x. Zones, all are connected to extensive transportation grids. So we're really comparing apples and oranges here. On page 21, items e-6, again, the single -- s.o.v. rates are misleading, because of the massive increase in traffic that are going to be allowed by the increases in parking on the hill, while the percentages may go down, the actual numbers of vehicles on the road is going to increase. And items t-15, we would like that to be expanded to include the homestead proposal to disconnect southwest gains and sixth avenue route from direct access from o.h.s.u.'s property. This is a simple realignment and would be very cost effective. Further, since kristi brought it up, on the issue of traffic management, there's a great fear within the neighborhood that the solutions, speed bumps and disconnecting streets, will in fact be a cure that's worse than the problem. Lastly, we would like to voice our support for the comments regarding a tram made by ctlh president janet kelly and larry beck. The homestead neighborhood organizations, and many other associations, including the 16 neighborhood associations of southwest Portland, ask that you consider the impacts to our neighborhood and the terwilliger parkway from the manner in which o.h.s.u. wishes to conduct its expansion. We have offered many practical cost effective alternatives to many of o.h.s.u.'s proposals that allow them to pursue their objectives and protect our parks and neighborhoods. The legacy of the marquam hill plan, unfortunately, is going to be the trashing of one of Portland's premier parks, the terwilliger parkway. And further diminishment of the livability of a neighborhood that the last 25 years has been forced to bear many burdens, including traffic, congestion, noise, helicopter noise I might also point out, air pollution, as o.h.s.u. pursues its goals. The perfunctory manner in which these our recommendations have been considered and summarily dismissed is sending a clear message to Portland neighborhoods and park supporters -- you don't count is that message. That is a very unfortunate situation for our community.

**Katz:** Thank you. Okay.

**Katz:** How many more, karla?

**Moore:** One more.

**Katz:** All right. Let's go.

**Corrine Weber:** Good afternoon. My name is corrine weber. My address is 6245 southwest 39th avenue, Portland, zip, 97221. I was here last wednesday to testify, but had to leave before my name is was called, so i'm here today to pick up that testimony that I couldn't give at that time.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Weber:** I first of all want to say that I support unequivocally all of the comments and positions, recommendations and so forth that have been made by the swini board, representing the 16 neighborhoods of southwest, the homestead neighborhood association, ctlh neighborhood association, friends of terwilliger. These people have lived there, they're fully knowledgeable, know about that area than any of us sitting in this room today, I think, I believe. So I heartily endorse their recommendations and proposals and hope you seriously consider them. I want to refer to the -- to the comments made last week by jim davis, the ctlh land use chair, and his remarks to this council. Last Wednesday, I believe he referred to the process in arriving at the marquam hill plan as a travesty. And unfortunately I have come to believe that it probably was so, because throughout this entire process we had reports that the swni board and at the swni land use meetings that was what was transpiring week by week and month and month. It appears that this was a perfunctory exercise of citizen involvement and that was followed through the marquam hill plan

**JULY 3, 2002**

process. It indicates that the probability that the outcome of the issue was predetermined long before the discussions even began. The suggestions, the concerns, the recommendations and proposals presented by the homestead neighborhood association and ctlh, friends of terwilliger, by and large, fell on the deaf ears of o.h.s.u. And the bureau of planning. On July 13th, 2000, this citizen -- this city council passed ordinance number 174667. Remember? We sat in this hot room at that time and passed it. It includes policies regarding citizen involvement how we rejoiced at that time, believing we had achieved an understanding at long last on collaboration with city bureaus. Unfortunately the process involved during the formation of the marquam hill plan failed to create those partnerships that we had envisioned, and in fact it only gave lip-service to the guidelines herein. And sometimes blatantly disregarded them. And so the orderance is just a piece of meaningless piece of paper. At this point in time it appears now that the trust, confidence and high hopes we had in July 2000 have been seriously undermined. It is a sad day for all the citizens of Portland. I urge you to stop this negative trend. First of all, to review with care all of the positions and recommendations made by the coalition and the neighborhoods involved and whoever has a strong stake in this development. And secondly, to make this citizen involvement policy the cornerstone of your administration in years to come. Make sure that the bureaus that you've been assigned are fully knowledgeable of its contents and realize and understand the implementations therein and make sure that you as the administrator in charge, that your bureaus do indeed understand and follow these policies. I thank you very much for your attention.

**Katz:** They think. Thank you.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** She said in up more --

**Katz:** Identify yourself for the record, please.

**James Davis, Land Use Chair, Corbett-Terwilliger-Lair Hill Neighborhood Association:** I'm sore. My name is James Davis, land use chair of Corbett-Terwilliger Land Use Association and the stranger to my left said much of what I'm going to say so I'll try to be very, very brief. I'd like to remind the commissioner that there is a myth that's grown up about this whole process, and the biggest myth is that the o.h.s.u. Building on North Macadam is going to be a research or teaching facility, which in fact 95% of it is going to be administration. The myth we got in "The Oregonian" a week ago Sunday, followed up on Wednesday, is just that, we will not have doctors flying from patient to bench to classroom. And that has not happened in the last several years. Another thing I'd like to point out to you before I get to the remarks that I've submitted to you, is that CTLH does support the no tram ad hoc committee, but its concerns are much greater than the alignment of the tram on Gibb Street. For those who think that our neighborhood is crying wolf, that we will be destroyed, that tells me you have not been connecting the dots. The biggest dot, the boulder, is the Barbur Boulevard light rail, which is an integral to the transportation as per operations of o.h.s.u., but will in fact take out 40-50 of our homes, all the way from Naito to Woods, and pretty much end what we know as Lair Hill today. And lastly, I think that within the transportation plan, o.h.s.u.'s transportation plan, they see what was Lair Hill as essentially a series of satellite parking lots. And I don't think that that's really what any of us wants. The Marquam Hill plan will last 40 years. And if o.h.s.u. Has its way the most intrusive part of that plan will be free of any land use restrictions. The proposed Marquam Hill plan as submitted by o.h.s.u. Is by and large based on the Jesus principle, that is I'm good so everything I do is good. No one is disputing that o.h.s.u. Does good work or employs a large number of people that it benefits our community and our state, but it does not follow that because they are experts in medicine, they are experts in all things. As one doctor has been quoted as saying, "we may be wrong, but we're never in doubt." The documents of amendments before you today contains two words and one amendment that asks you to buy into their Jesus principle argument, the two words are by right o.h.s.u. Is asking you to allow them to



**JULY 3, 2002**

build the tram by right, that means you will give up protections in the city's land use code, not for 40 years, but forever. Before you accept these two little words, remember what the doctor said, we may be wrong, but we're never in doubt. O.h.s.u. is seeking an amendment that would make the tram a basic utility. That is like a gas piper or a sewer, and that means it can go anywhere it wants with the tram, regardless of its impacts on our neighborhoods, the environment, property rights, and proper heir rights. Again, remember the doctor's words, "we may be right, but we're never in doubt." the o.h.s.u. Tram is an unknown quantity. There is no place in the world where the majority of a tram run is above a residential neighborhood. In all the documents and in all the testimony there's not one word attesting to o.h.s.u.'s ability to run and maintain the tram. Those two words, "by right" and the basic utility amendment put them functionally beyond the reach of our -- this commission, the city and the courts.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Davis:** If you're in a car wreck, o.h.s.u. Can help you mend, but who will be able to go to if o.h.s.u. Wrecks our neighborhood? The opposition to this folly is practicing the same kind of preventative medicine to preserve our neighborhood's health as o.h.s.u. Preaches to maintain the health --

**Katz:** Mr. Davis, I think we get your message. We have it in front of us. Your time has been up a long time ago.

**Davis:** Well thank you for allowing me to continue.

**Martin Slapikas, Transportation Chair, Corbett Terwilliger Lair Hill Neighborhood**

**Association:** Well greetings once again, my name is Marty Slapikas, I'm the CTLH transportation chair and while I do not have any prepared comments, I've got to admit that I wholeheartedly concur with president Janet Kelly's comments regarding the neighborhood attitude about the tram. One of the things I'm concerned about is micro traffic solutions to a macro land use development including Marquam hill and north macadam district. my one comment on pg 41 T-1, chart 3 transportation. It's referenced there where they advance necessary improvements to the regional transportation system such as those addressed in south portland circulation study and the long range transportation options for south portland. we had many many user studies on the south portland circulation study. It was vetted with the public and ultimately approved. While I served on the south portland transportation alliance this long range transportation options with south portland, while briefed to all you folks and several other officials in the city has not had its public exposure. So my question to you basically is what options are you considering from the south portland long range transportation options. Because when that study was presented to everyone who was interested in it, it was a discussion draft for the portland community and we have not had that opportunity to expose some of those concepts. So I would ask when you consider that you consider the options in that study and also get it out publicly. I think there are some pretty doggone good things in that study, but I also think it should be exposed to the public.

**Katz:** It will be eventually. We can talk about it some other time.

**Slapikas:** It's being mentioned in the north macadam and the marquam hill plan, that's the reason I'm bringing it up. Page 8, suspended cable transportation system. Can't say enough. Do not include it in the marquam hill plan. The portland department of transportation connector study reports the capacity would be 12,960 passengers per day in 3 categories. Inter-campus trips, commuter trips and visitor sightseeing trips of unknown number. The question I have for you folks is how are they going to get there? Obviously north macadam district is on area that's already constrained and we're already talking about problems on Marquam Hill. When one considers the traffic issues already associated with north macadam district I think it deserves some additional study and some of the additional options that were mentioned earlier. I found it interesting that a

**JULY 3, 2002**

business rep from Eugene who upon being questioned by this panel about relocating to Portland refused, yet they recommended the tram. I found it very interesting that happened. It brings to me a question. How many of you would live underneath the tram? Would you move underneath the tram? I've raised this issue before and I've heard nobody say that they would. And if that's the case, would anybody from OHSU, would dr.kohler move underneath the tram? I know I wouldn't and I don't want to put a personal thing on it, but I'd like to see some officials say I think it's a wonderful idea to live underneath the tram. so what I'm asking is including in that page 8, I'd like to hear the council come out with benefits to the residents of living underneath a suspended cable transportation system.

**Sean Brennan, 20 SW Gibbs St. 97201:** Good afternoon, Sean Brennan. I'm going to try to do this at a bit of a gallop. There are some issues we want to cover. This regards the basic utility designation that was stricken from the plan by the planning commission as a proposed amendment. This change has major policy implications for the entire city is not something to casually slip in to the definition of the land use code, especially into a plan that concerns one applicant in a defined plan district with no notice to the city at large. No Tram to OHSU calls you to deny this code change and require the bureau of planning and the office of planning and development review to make the findings required for such a change and to create an appropriate use category for the suspended cable transportation system or classified into appropriate existing use categories. As an additional matter section 33.920.030 outline procedure for siting the ---use category responsible city agencies must assign use to a category whose description most closely describes the nature of its primary use. Subsection 8.2 lists criteria agencies must consider when they make that assignment. They must first generate a description of the use and then consider how it fits into a category paying attention to among other things what hours this will operate, it's building site arrangement, how man vehicle trips it will generate and whether it will exits independently of other activities on the site. The plan before you makes no such findings. There is no description, no consideration of criteria required in the governing section. As a matter of law you cannot approve a code change without these findings and without public notice for required for input into them as OHSU is asking you to do here. NO Tram raised this concern a year ago asking specifically to be included in the process to determine the use category and this did not happen. As a second matter calling the cable system a public utility is clearly erroneous. The function and physical characteristics of the cable way are simply too diverse to fit into a single use category as you will see shortly. A portion of the code provides the situation like this in two ways. First, you can create a new use category under section 33.07.070 when the existing ones are comprehensive enough or when the code is silent. That section also prohibits the use until the planning director asks for an amendment to title 33. We thing this is the proper course to follow. Otherwise section 33.9.030b states that where the development has uses that have fallen into more than one category each primary use must be assigned new property subject to the regulations for that category. This is the minimal step the bureau must take to account for the unique and unprecedented nature of the tram proposal. Now for the tram itself, let's look at what it is and is not and why it is not a basic utility. Tram or cableways is a transportation system but clearly a unique one. It has 2 or more terminals and 2 or more large supporting towers depending on the system proposed. This specific cable way will function between 2 medical centers without which it would not exist. Cableways are aerial systems unlike any other transit system in the city and they have cables on which two or more large passenger cars actually travel, not merely draw electrical power. And I see my time is coming to a close so I will close by saying Sec. 920.400(A) defines a "basic utility" as an "infrastructure service." The examples offered in the definition primarily concern water, sewage, stormwater and electrical systems. Other examples mention mass transit and light rail, but in fact govern only the

**JULY 3, 2002**

support services for those systems, not the entire systems. Conceivable part of the suspended cableway could be considered a basic utility under this definition, but definitely not all of it. The other uses are too different. And I go into other things in the written comments you have about what it could possibly be classified.

**Katz:** Thank you very much for your testimony. Alright let's have staff come up again. I think it's fair to say all of the issues we've heard they've been magnified in different ways and let me ask the Council would you like to go through them again, or do you want the staff and Gil to address just some of a few key issues that the community has identified. I take it by your silence that you'll want to identify them. Let's get to Commissioner Saltzman who wants to get to the stormwater issue.

**Saltzman:** Yes, the impervious surface one. I guess I would advocate that we go with the language that has been drafted by Planning and Bureau of Environmental Services. As you recall last week this was a similar statement in the zoning code or proposed to be in the zoning code. And after discussion we took it out and decided to make it a policy objective. And that's what the language is before you now and I think it's an appropriate policy objective. I've looked at the language OHSU has provided and I think we're substantially on the same page. And I guess given they are substantially the same intent I'd go with the sentence that is 18 words rather than the sentence that is 40 words. I think it's clear in intent. The other thing I think OHSU is not quite understanding is that this is a no net gain on effective and impervious surface. That means that effective surface contributing to our combined sewer overflows going straight into the river. And that's what the restraint is on and I think that allows them a lot of flexibility and they are already talking about flexible innovative things they are going to do so I don't think it's an absolute no net gain strategy on impervious surface which they think would be too restrictive. They talk about no other precedent throughout the city, I guess this is the first new plan district we are approving, at least since I've been on City Council. And I think in a day and age where we are concerned about the river, the river renaissance through everything we're doing. ESA watershed health, that it's appropriate that this standard be in the first new planned district we are adopting in this new era. And that a public institution should be expected to be held to a high standard such as this. They are proposing 110,000 sq ft of open space as part of the plan. I want to see this open space serve two purposes. Serve an open space purpose but also as an innovative stormwater management purpose. And again that is how we reconnect the built environment to the natural environment. So I think it's measurable, it's enforceable. It's not onerous. And as I said earlier it's a shorter 18 word sentence as opposed to a 39 word sentence. I think the statement OHSU has suggested are more appropriately contained in the memorandum of understanding. So I would urge that we stay with the language as proposed. Or adopt it.

**Katz:** OK. How does council feel about it?

**Francesconi:** Well I guess I think there is a difference here, after I listen to the explanation by Susan Hartnett. And contrary to Commissioner Saltzman, I think the mou is the place to deal with this. If they would get credit for the stormwater benefit of the open space donation, for the future, maybe. But they don't under this proposal. So it seems to me that the better way to do this is to address this citywide given the discussions we've had about regulation. And as I said last time when this came up I thought the appropriate place is in the stormwater management plan because then it's addressed citywide. It doesn't come up here in just one plan. So the way to address it individually is through the mou. So this is where I was before. This is where I still am.

**Sten:** I lean toward Commissioner Saltzman's language.

**Katz:** Before I make a decision on it, do you have a comment on it?

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Kelley:** I think that in our conversations with them they have some notions about what kind of flexibility's included in implied by the word effective. And I think they can better describe that than we can. Dean had to leave, but was intending on coming back.

**Hartnett:** Dean is here.

**Katz:** Come on up.

**Marriott:** Good afternoon, Dean Marriott, environmental services. I think as I've read their commitments to do lots of innovative things, my understanding is they would essentially get credit for virtually all of those activities, retrofitting parking lots, eco roofs, roof gardens. By doing that, they would be putting in the bank, so to speak, credit toward the effective impervious surface calculation. As I said the other day, I think it should not be any prohibition or bar on any kind of development activity they want to do on -- in this district.

**Katz:** Okay. I will support commissioner Saltzman's amendment. All right. Next? Commissioner Sten, you -- you missed some of the discussion, but I think you may want to --

**Sten:** Yeah.

**Katz:** Do you want to raise some of the issues?

**Sten:** No, fine.

**Katz:** No, okay. Any other issues? Do you want to identify some things that you might think we might want to discuss that we hadn't heard before? Did you want to do that? You wanted to go through some of the community issues? Okay, then let's go through them again. So it's the --

**Kelley:** Let me pull out a few and see which ones you want to talk about.

**Hartnett:** Did you have something in particular in mind?

**Sten:** I thought you were going to do that.

**Hartnett:** No, that is what we're going to do.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Kelley:** The ones I was tracking that are new or maybe have not been fully discussed before have to do with the language concerning satellite parking, the orientation of Sam Jackson Parkway, and how the traffic exits, whether it's headed north or east. The notion about whether or not parking for tram or other suspended cable system riders would be included in the basic utility definition and therefore allowed as a right-of-way, that was a particular question that came up that we can now offer our opinion on today. Probably it would be good to have a definitive opinion for that from Margaret Mahoney before your final action next week. There were concerns again raised by the site review and design review and whether or not design review as a process, given its orientation, could accommodate some of the notions that we have previously incorporated in the site review when we suggested that to the planning commission. I'm just giving you the topics here.

**Katz:** Right. And then the council members can flag some of the topics. I think that's a good idea.

**Kelley:** There was language that was offensive to some city residents about the -- about treasuring the connection between those things. I think in reading the word "connection" literally as the area device. I think there were reaffirmations of things you've already done with regard to Humphrey and so forth. The impervious surface you've talked about. The parking ratios, you heard testimony on both sides of that argument. Let me see. Again, concerns raised about the South Portland transportation study, which you reflected, and how people would get to the -- the tram in North Macadam, if it were constructed. Those were the major -- major points there. And also, again, the s.o.v. Ratios were mentioned.

**Katz:** That was the s.o.v. Ratios and parking ratios.

**Kelley:** Parking ratios.

**Katz:** Okay. Which ones you want to raise again? Either one. Feel free to go ahead and --

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Sten:** Can you walk me through one more time on where we landed, what's the proposal for the site review, design review issue? I got a little lost.

**Katz:** And why. Why did we combine the two?

**Hartnett:** Let me just quickly find it so that I can reference it. It's page 25 in the amendments documents. And the proposal came initially from the office of planning and development review with concurrence from the -- from o.h.s.u. And bureau of planning actually concurs on this as well. The -- there's a number of items that got discussed. One was site review for marquam hill would be a brand-new review -- land use review. It doesn't exist anywhere else in the city. So we were creating a whole new review process, which meant o.p.d.r. Needed to deal with that aspect of it. Secondly it was proposed as a type one, which is the lowest level of ministerial review. And yet it asked o.p.d.r. To look at a fairly complex set of goal statements associated with three site development concepts. And so there was kind of a little bit of a mismatch between the review type and the nature of the review. Thirdly, there -- there had actually been some discussion at the design commission, when they were reviewing the design guidelines with them, about their interest in having more discussion about the spaces between buildings and how things relate to each other on the hill, more so than they might typically have in a design review process. So all of those things sort of coming together, it made sense to us, and to o.p.d.r., to merge those two processes. So it means that essentially the same question will be asked. What progress are you making through this particular proposal towards implementing these concepts? And the concepts have to do with organizing activities, organizing access, organizing pedestrian movements, those kinds of things. So that over time you do things like decrease the amount of employee traffic that's able to access terwilliger boulevard, those were some of the notions contained within there. We work closely, jeff joslin is here today, we worked closely with the design review staff to create a guideline that we think embodies the intent and gives them the ability to implement what the initial desire was, only it's collapsing it down into a single review process that most of these buildings were going to be subject to anyway. So there was sort of this proliferation of reviews that was really the underlying pies.

**Katz:** And the design review commission thinks they can handle all of that? Yes, they do.

**Sten:** That makes sense.

**Kelley:** In addition to that, there is a policy and something in the m.o.u. Outline that we've said we should be mutually reviewing our progress against the goals every five years. So that's an additional --

**Katz:** Okay. Let's -- i'm going to raise some issues, because I think they're important. They're important to the community. I don't know if anybody wants to talk about the -- the basic utility language in there. Did -- city attorney or was it margaret mahoney that wrote' letter on that. You had a memorandum from margaret mahoney which katherine beaumont has seen and has had opportunity to reflect on, so she could provide information on that. Douglas hardy from o.p.d.r. Is also here.

**Katz:** Who would like to do a little bit of that right now?

**Douglas Hardy, Office of Planning and Development Review:** Douglas hardy, o.p.d.r. Margaret mahoney did provide a memo to the council early last week that basically provided a more detailed analysis of o.p.d.r.'s determination that the suspended cable transportation system does -- does fit into the basic utility category. And that basically provided more detail in the memo that was also submitted to planning commission during the process. I think as was indicated by previous speaker today, the code does specifically identify the process that o.p.d.r. Would go through in terms of determining what use category a particular development would fit into. And the memo from margaret does go through that process. There's roughly, I think, about a dozen

**JULY 3, 2002**

criteria that you would look at, hours of operation, sort of the setup of the use, in terms of how it uses buildings, how it uses the site, that type of thing. And I think what's important to note, number one, is that when identifying -- or determining the best use category, the code is clear that you're really intended to put it into the use category that most closely describes the proposed use. And to provide a little history -- or I guess a background in how the use categories were set up, the zoning code prior to 1991 for every zoning district in the city identified literally specific uses pie name, that were allowed in the particular zone, and we had consistent problems with new uses coming along all the time, they weren't specifically identified on that list, and, you know, the question became, is it allowed or is it not? So the use category, the broad use categories that you see in the code today, were specifically intended to address that problem that we had in the past. The use categories obviously are not intended to distinctly and specifically identify every possible use that could come -- that could be proposed. But again, going through that list of a dozen sort of criteria that we look at, we are basically -- we need to identify the category that most closely identifies the use. The basic utility category -- the name, as with many of these categories in the goad don't always at first glance don't seem to reflect the particular use you're looking at. I think several people throughout the process have identified basic utilities as including only gas or sewer or pipelines. In fact, when you look at the stated characteristics in the zoning code of what a basic utility is, it certainly goes beyond a gas -- or pipeline. It does identify it as any infrastructure service that needs to be located in the area where the service is provided. Then the code does go on further to provide examples of basic utilities. And examples of basic utilities include mass transit stops and turnarounds, light rail stations and transit centers. So the basic utility category clearly does include -- in the sort of area of infrastructure, transportation infrastructure.

**Katz:** Hold on. Do you want to hear more? Are you pretty satisfied? You satisfied?

**Hardy:** Just one quick note, if I could.

**Katz:** Yeah.

**Hardy:** For central city streetcar, the comparable example -- or setup that was presented to us when trying to identify what was the best category for the central city streetcar, and o.p.d.r. Also did conclude that that fit into the basic utility category. So there's some consistency in terms of what o.p.d.r. has proposed.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Kelley:** One of the questions raised today, though, had to do with the parking associated with that and whether that's included as a right use as a part of the basic utility.

**Hardy:** We may want to look into it further. I think briefly the code does also describe how and when you define a particular use as being accessory to a primary use or whether it's its own primary use. My understanding of the question was would parking related to the tram be accessory to the tram, or accessory to the basic utility use?

**Kelley:** I think the concern that whether it would be allowed as a right -- commuter traffic.

**Hardy:** Will well, and I -- for basic utility, if you look at the parking requirements, generally in the zoning code there is no maximum cap on the amount of parking related to a basic utility use. However, obviously in this case the planned district has put another layer on that further restricts the overall amount of parking on the -- within the planned district. And my understanding is that would apply basically to any use that is within the planned district. So effectively the overall parking is capped at 900, whether it's used if a basic utility or any other use on the campus.

**Katz:** Do you concur, susan?

**Hartnett:** Yeah. I mean, I think it's a question that o.p.d.r. Would have to look at with more specificity than asking douglas to answer on the fly, but it's the same process of asking who is the parking going to be used by and for what purposes. If it's the operator coming to work his eight-

**JULY 3, 2002**

hour shift, it's very reasonable to provide him or her with a parking space. If you're talking about people who are going to come and park-and-ride the tram to go someplace else or ride the streetcar to go someplace else, we would typically not consider that accessory to the use. Otherwise you'd have people saying that the parking lot next to them where they're providing commercial parking for people to ride the bus from hawthorne to downtown is accessory to their grocery store or boutique, and we clearly don't buy that argument. So I think it's a little unfair to ask douglas to answer that completely, but there's assurances about parking limitations at both ends of the system that would address any proliferation, significant proliferation of parking associated with these.

**Katz:** Okay. Are there any other issues that you want to flag for further discussion?

**Saltzman:** That issue raised by tom miller about sam jackson road being north and east, employee-student access to marquam hill.

**Hartnett:** Yeah. I'd be happy to add that. I mean, we were trying to generalize it into one direction, that the access is generally coming from the north, but if we wanted to add east, i'm happy to add that. It's -- it's objective eight on page 68 of the recommended draft. It says "limit the negative impacts of high traffic volumes and peak hour congestion by terwilliger parkway by encouraging employees and students to access marquam hill to and from the north via sam jackson park road and patients, visitors to access from the north via terwilliger boulevard and campus drive." again, we were trying to generalize it into a single direction.

**Katz:** So let's add it.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Add the east?

**Katz:** Is that all right with everybody? Yeah.

**Saltzman:** I think it is appropriate that the hillsdale neighborhood association be added to the implementers of some of the --

**Hartnett:** I had noted that as well.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Hartnett:** Let me find a couple of amendments to -- when we get to one of those -- let me just find one to add those to, when we get to some of those that say so and so and so and so, let's just add hillsdale. I can don, who also spoke about southwest trails, I believe he's president of southwest trails, so I believe he can speak for that organization also. He suggested adding them to t-26.

**Katz:** He speaks for everybody, doesn't he? Are you authorized? He's authorized.

**Sten:** We've authorized him.

**Katz:** Okay, all right, all right.

**Hartnett:** Okay. So let's turn to page 12, item d-17. This says "to include v.a. and shriners on a number of items. Let's amend that amendment to include hillsdale neighborhood association.

**Saltzman:** Where? We're on page 12 of the amendments document.

**Katz:** D-17?

**Hartnett:** D-17. It's saying add implementers, so i'm going to tack them on to here so when you vote this one you'll be voting the same thing. Include hillsdale on t-41, t-42, and t-43. Is that correct, don?

**Baack:** Yes. And 44.

**Hartnett:** And 44? Got 'em. Then include southwest trails on t-26 -- 26 and 27. Then don also suggested on -- is it 27, don, about the routes? It says -- it's t-26. Create and maintain a user map of transit and pedestrian connections. He suggested adding the word "and routes" to that.

**Baack:** The idea of this is so when people pick up a map --

**Katz:** Okay.

**Hartnett:** I thought it was a good point, so --

**Katz:** Yeah.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Hartnett:** We'll add routes to t-26. Okay. Did you want to entertain any of the others he suggested on adding --

**Katz:** I'm leaving that to the council to flag those. Any others that the council, that were identified after we adopted those amendments the other week, and some of the amendments this week? All right.

**Sten:** I wanted to kind of ask a question of the council. I don't quite have an amendment, and probably have this if I was here last week, so I apologize. It seems to me that kind of getting to marty's point, from corbett, terwilliger, as you look ahead, it seems to me that the real success or failure of a lot of these issues and i'm setting aside the tram for a second is the south Portland circulation study and where and how the planning bureau, o.h.s.u. And the council are going to put some weight behind trying to figure out some real changes to the transportation structure down there. Is that -- it's sort of the sense -- I want to make sure the sense of kind of urgency and commitment from the council is this in the amendments. I think it is, but I think the way I want to say this on the record to -- because I think, you know, whatever we disagree on, and there's going to bitter disagreements as this goes forward, trying to get this transportation flow right, which is a monstrous decades-long job that's going to cost a lot of money, got to be pushed right away or else we don't get there. I wanted to get that sense on the record.

**Katz:** I'm glad -- i'll let gil respond, but let me just say i'm glad you did, because this is more than - - as I said -- the tram. It's a transportation system and it involves connections from the neighborhood to the river, from the neighborhood to other places in the city. And I think that issue will come up next week when we talk about the transportation study, as well as the m.o.u.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Right.

**Katz:** And why don't you jump in on that right now.

**Kelley:** I think it will come up also in the context of the north macadam plan coming in front of you to do anything of import with science and technology corridor, we're going to keep running into these issues. I would concur wholeheartedly. It is a big price tag and is going to need to involve others, but we do have an item in the m.o.u. outline that compels the city and o.h.s.u. To work with others to try to advance that agenda. It's not something frankly we would look for, o.h.s.u., to pay the freight for, but to be a participant in. We would.

**Francesconi:** Commissioner Sten, to we are your question, as the newest kid on the block in terms of transportation, a lot of these issues are transportation, the will is there, not only on my part to answer your question, but also on behalf of the bureau's part, but as the neighborhood points out, the money's not there. So redoing naito parkway is a high priority. Are the resources there? No, but it needs to be done. That would help in this regard. Connecting the streetcar going eventually all the way to lake oswego would also help. Is the money there at the moment? No. So it's hard to answer your question, because we don't want to mislead folks that the resources are there. So I guess I want to be clear, the resources are not. Is it a high priority? Yes, it's a high priority.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Kelley:** Well, there are also opportunities to articulate the agenda for the federal folks too, more clearly than we have before, and that of course means looking across city-wide and even regional priorities for transportation improvements an just going through that process now, it will be in front of us again in five years, and --

**Francesconi:** Well, sooner. The mayor and I have had this conversation, I don't think i've had it with the council, but what we need to do is set the city's transportation priorities between now and october, because of the reauthorization -- then in the context of a regional discussion, and that conversation we're going to have with the council in a work session, before october.



**JULY 3, 2002**

**Katz:** Yeah. And it also ties to a couple of other things. It's by state transportation priorities and a huge agenda for both Vancouver and Portland, that has been identified as a priority for federal funds, for regional funds, for state funds, that also needs to tie in with the whole conversation about the loop, which is a charge I have been given by I-5 trade corridor. And I think that that will be one of the places to discuss what you had just -- just raised. Because it's part -- it's part of -- of like we -- congestion areas around the loop, and that hasn't been studied for eons. Okay.

**Francesconi:** What happens next here?

**Hartnett:** I just wanted to take one quick step back. On the discussion about adding the word "east" to objective seven, I'd like to get that added to one of the specific amendments you're about to vote.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Hartnett:** On page 17, item d-35, this is an amendment request to object ten in the transportation rein, so I would simply add to this, that in addition to amending 10 in the ways proposed, that you would be voting on adding east to the objective seven as we just discussed.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Hartnett:** This will be a two-part amendment.

**Katz:** Right anything else? This moves to second for -- why were you shaking your head?

\*\*\*\*\*: We're voting the amendments today.

\*\*\*\*\*: We just voted amendments, yes.

**Hartnett:** No. You need to go through and vote these individual items. We do need to do that. Then it is an emergency ordinance, so it will come back to you next week. I need the opportunity, and a one-time reading next week.

**Katz:** Good, okay. Let's go through the amendments, then.

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

**Saltzman:** Before you do that, can somebody tie in what we do today with what we do next Thursday?

**Hartnett:** Yes. What you're going to do today is you'll go through and each one of these amendments you can have a vote or package them together and have a vote on groups of them. Once I have knowledge of which ones you're incorporating and which ones you're not, I need to take the time to go back and amend this document. It will now be called city council revived Marquam Hill plan. It will reflect all of your amendments in both the policy and introductory sections, so we will describe the council's hearing process and decision-making process in this document, in addition to the planning commission, like it does right now, so we're adding another layer. I need to conform the adopting ordinance, then, to the decisions that you're making right now. So, for example, the ordinance in front of you right now doesn't speak to the science and technology corridor because the initial proposal did not have in it. If you choose to make that amendment, I need to add some findings to the ordinance. So once you make all of these, I make all those changes, it comes back to you next Wednesday, as I said, it is an emergency, it will be a single reading on that revised package. It will include the adopting ordinance for the Marquam Hill plan and the Marquam Hill design guidelines, and there are two accompanying resolutions. One that adopts the action charts and the second that reaffirms the city's commitment to the Terwilliger Parkway plan.

**Hartnett:** Those are the things we'll be act on next week?

**Hartnett:** That's correct.

**Katz:** Okay, go ahead. Identify the amendments.

**Hartnett:** So let's start with topic a. And there are four items in topic a. A-1, a-2, a-3 a-4. A-1 corrects the error we made in conveying the planning commission's desire on the new -- for

**JULY 3, 2002**

viewpoints. It is a correction that we believe needs to be made. A-2 -- this one, if you'd like, this is one I think you may be able to vote as a package, all four items at one time. So i'm going to describe it that way and then if you're all comfortable, maybe vote it that way. Okay. A-2 corrects a missing word, adding the word "area" to 33555270 b-3. A-3 replaces the introduction section in the design commission's recommended marquam hill design guidelines with text that is more consistent with existing adopted design guidelines. Again, this was an oversight upon our part. We were trying to make it a little bit shorter document and came to the conclusion that we really needed to be more consistent with other things that we've done. Then a-4 is the request to allow us to correct typographic and spelling errors in the document.

**Saltzman:** I'll move we adopt all of those.

**Sten:** Second.

**Saltzman:** It's been seconded we adopt all the amendments.

**Katz:** Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [ gavel pounding ] go ahead.

**Hartnett:** Okay. Topic b, there are two parts to topic b. One is new language as an amendment to comprehensive plan, goal five economic development, to establish a science and technology quarter and establish the six objectives that go along. With Item b-1.2 references the action item table on page 40 of the document, attachment b, that would be the implementing action items for this new policy and objectives.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Kelley:** There was one neighborhood testifier on this that I mentioned to -- neglect to mention in my list that you heard earlier today.

**Sten:** I move that we adopt as read.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Katz:** Objections, hearing none, so ordered. [ gavel pounding ]

**Francesconi:** Mayor, if it's all right --

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Francesconi:** Because the amendments are so important, I guess I just wanted to take a brief opportunity to make a statement. Is that all right? Because this vote is more important than next week's votes.

**Katz:** Can we get through the amendments?

**Francesconi:** It explains why i'm voting the way i'm investigate, but I can do it at the end.

**Katz:** Let's do it at the end. C?

**Hartnett:** This is a series of items that are interrelated. They are all related to the implementation of the suspended cable transportation system. The first one, item c, 1.1, is adding language to the vision for the marquam hill plan that acknowledges the development of that system. Item c, 1.2, returns the transportation objectives -- or returns language to the transportation objectives that specifically acknowledges that system. In objectives 1, 2 and 3. And actually, hold on, just a second -- no, those are the correct numbers. I wasn't sure if that had been misnumbered. Item c, 1.3, is the action items associated with that. And the new action items are actions on pages 42 and 43. New pages 42 and 43. T-xx because it doesn't have a number right now. T-37 and t-38 that speak to implementing the process that pdot is undertaking in dealing with good design issues. Item c-2, revises the boundaries of the marquam hill plan to include portions of terwilliger parkway and as I mentioned earlier those maps are in attachment d on page 47 and 48. T item, 2.1, has to do with the sign regulations that would then apply to that new portion of the planned district, the o.s. Portion of it to make sure we're not liberalizing the sign regulations. And on page 7-b, item c, 2.2, is also dealing with the zoning code regulations that would apply to that new o.s. Portion,

**JULY 3, 2002**

clarifying how the building coverage applies.

**Katz:** Keep going.

**Hartnett:** Oh, i'm sorry. I thought I hit them all c-3, these are the zoning code regulations, specifically related to allowing a suspended cable transportation system within the basic utility category to be allowed in the o.s. In the marquam hill plan, requiring that it meet the offsite impacts for noise, glare and vibration. And then the lower portion of the page clarifying that suspended cable transportation systems are an example under the basic utility definition.

**Katz:** Okay. Do I have a motion for c?

**Saltzman:** So moved.

**Katz:** Do I hear a second?

**Sten:** Second.

**Katz:** Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [ gavel pounding ] d?

**Hartnett:** Now we get into a whole series of transportation policy objectives and action items, and i'm not sure if we can bunch them altogether or not. Maybe if there's ones that the commission -- council members --

**Katz:** Let's try to bunch them, because when we talk through them, there was a majority of us that supported all of these.

**Hartnett:** Why don't we do it this way -- if I talk through them, that if there's any one that any council member wants to pull out of the package, let's do that, and try to come back to it, but try and assemble a large package.

**Katz:** Right.

**Hartnett:** D-1 seeks to modify, by removing the dates on action items t-13, 14, 15. That's on new pages 42 and 43. And that -- that has been done. That is what shows there. D-2 is the request to add an action item addressing traffic calming on humphrey -- southwest humphrey boulevard. And that's shown on new page 42 and it's again titled t.x.x. Because I don't have a number for it, but it does speak to traffic calming on humphrey boulevard. D-13 is to amend t-39 to specifically reference shuttle bus use for satellite parking. That's on new page 46. And then amending the time frame for that also, again, on new page 46. Sorry, I had to get some water. Item d-15 is amending both the objective -- transportation objective 15 and transportation action item t-35 to clarify how the 2003 strategic goal of the marquam hill transportation partnership relates to the requirement to meet those under the marquam hill plan. So there's language that amends objective 15 right here on page 12 and then there's revised language for the action item in attachment c on new page 45. Topic d -- i'm sorry -- d-17 is include v.a. And shriners as implementers, and to that we've added hillsdale and southwest trails on a couple of items and adding the word "routes" to t-26, action item t-26. D-18 has been deleted, so that will not be in the package. D-19 is a clarification that pdot is the lead implementer on transportation action item t-19. Item d-20 is to amend transportation action item 28, relating sidewalk improvements to design review -- to implementation of sidewalk improvements through the design review process. That's shown in attachment c on page 44. Item d-21 on page 14 is to remove o.h.s.u. As an implementer on t-30, and we added removing v.m.a.c. As an implementer on d-22 is to amend 46 to change the language to reflect, investigate and implement. That's shown on new page 46. D-23 is to add homestead neighborhood as an implementer

to t-47 and to revise the language encouraging the use of alternative fuels by all residents of marquam hill. We revised the language as requested. That's on page 46. And homestead neighborhood chose not to be added to the item so they're not shown there. On action d-24, which is on page 15, there's again a series of time frames. I went through which ones we changed and which ones we didn't. Those are shown on new pages 41-46. Item d-28 is to add an action item -

**JULY 3, 2002**

- or add to action item d-15 about the realignment or disconnecting of homestead at gains and reconnecting it, so we've added that as an alternative to simply making traffic movement restrictions. That's on new page 45. Action items d-29, 30, 31 and 32 make revisions to objectives -- transportation objectives 8, 9, 17 and 18 to clarify which streets we're trying to address through each one of those objectives. Item d-35, i'm now on page 17 in your amendments package.

**Katz:** I'm with you.

**Hartnett:** Okay. To amend objective 10 to add some language specifically addressing south of veterans hospital. And i'd like to -- I think I got to this, to suggest that we add east to objective seven to that.

**Katz:** Right.

**Hartnett:** All right, I did mention that. D-39 is making a reference to marquam hill road as part of the existing condition summary, which the language is shown below there. That's the end of that package.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Saltzman:** Move adoption.

**Katz:** Move adoption to all items under category d. Do I hear a second?

**Sten:** Second.

**Katz:** Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [ gavel pounding ] e.

**Hartnett:** E has a number of regulations related to parking. And I think some of these you're going to want to discuss. How about go through the process? As I go through them, if you want to pull them out, let me know. Maybe you don't want to discuss them.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Hartnett:** E-3 is dealing with how parking access is regulated -- or how parking is regulated, either by access by location. This was an agreement that we reached with o.p.d.r. That satisfies o.h.s.u. E-4 is the request to revise the parking ratio. The way the amendment is shown, the parking ratio would be one space per 600 square feet of building area. E-5, this is to delete language from the type a --

**Katz:** We'll vote on that one separately.

**Hartnett:** So the package so far only includes e-3.

**Katz:** Right.

**Hartnett:** E-5 is to remove the site development concepts as an additional criteria for the type a parking review, which again is a type -- a type one procedure, a simple ministerial. A lot of findings that need to be made, and it's also win rolled into design review, so it will be caught there. Continue? E-6 -- i'm sorry, i'm trying to keep track of what's in here. E-6 is the s.o.v. Table. We've provided an alternative to what was specifically requested that is different than the planning commission's recommendation. It begins with a 51% being allowed through december 31st 2007, and then drops as shown on the table on page 21. Okay, that stays in the package, I take it. E-10, this is combining approval criteria, c and d, for the type b parking review, to make them consistent with other land use review language. This was something that o.p.d.r. Asked for. That's the end of e. The e package would include three, five, six an ten, and you'll talk about e-4 separately.

**Katz:** Let's motion for e, with the exception of e-4.

**Sten:** So moved.

**Katz:** Do I hear a second?

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Katz:** Any objection? Hearing none, so ordered. [ gavel pounding ] okay, e-4.

\*\*\*\*\*: E-4 is the question about parking ratio.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Katz:** Right. Somebody make a motion.

**Saltzman:** Move adoption.

**Katz:** Okay. Move adoption of e-4. Do I hear a second?

**Francesconi:** Second.

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

**Katz:** No. [ gavel pounding ] thank you. Thank you for letting me vote on that. Makes me feel good.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Got to have a couple of roll calls, madame mayor.

**Katz:** Yeah, well. Keep going.

**Hartnett:** We're on to f. We're on page 23 of the amendments package. F-1 is amending the purpose statement of the marquam hill planned district to add neighborhood livability, I believe. yes, add neighborhood livability in the third line. You can see it double underlined. F-2 is revising the height sub districts as presented to you by the design commission. Again, those maps are on page 49. That map is on page 49. The next request, which is f 2.2, is a conforming -- a conforming amendment to make sure that the map that goes along with the planned district is consistent with the one you're revising in f 2.1. And the maps are -- i'm sorry, let me just get this in the record. The maps are 555-1, the subdistricts map, and 555-2, the heights sub. F-5 is reinstating regulations concerning contemporary construction activities within the planned district area -- i'm sorry -- within the o.s. Zone within the planned district area. F-6 is to revise the limitations on retail and industrial uses back to what they were in the proposed marquam hill plan, so what they read now is no more than 25,000 square feet of retail sales and service uses, and no more than 30,000 square feet of industrial uses within the manufacturing and production, industrial service or wholesale sales categories. And that's a total for all -- those three uses within the planned district.

**Katz:** Do I hear a motion for category f?

**Saltzman:** So moved.

**Francesconi:** Second.

**Katz:** Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [ gavel pounding ] let's get to g.

**Hartnett:** G is I believe a single item. This is merging site review with design review. The new design review guideline is attachment f in the document.

**Francesconi:** I'll so move.

**Katz:** Okay. Second. Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [ gavel pounding ] h.

**Hartnett:** H, I believe, is also a single item. This is design review. This has to do with the thresholds for when design review triggers. The request was to change it from 15 to 55. What's in front of you says 25,000 square feet. And the request was for 5,000 square feet of facade. We proposed 3,000 seat.

**Saltzman:** So move.

**Francesconi:** Second.

**Katz:** Any objections? Hearing none, so moved. [ gavel pounding ] i.

**Hartnett:** You actually didn't vote this, but the consensus I heard on the council was to keep the language as -- that's in front of you. So let's see if we roll the whole thing to package. I-1 deletes the requirement for environmental review, which I pointed out was a problem with state law. I-2 and 3 are to delete action items and -- i'm sorry objectives and action items that were the supporting policy and action item for the environmental review that we just talked about in i-1. So the deletion is shown on page 28 for the objectives. And the action item deletion is shown in the action charts which are on page 58 and 59 in the amendments package. And then i-4 was the objective and action item concerning no net gain. The language percentage in front of you would add a poll policy -- or an objective statement to both policy 4 and policy 5.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Saltzman:** Move adoption.

**Katz:** Move adoption category i. Do I hear a second?

**Sten:** Second.

**Katz:** Any objections? Hearing none, all right. [ gavel pounding ] j.

**Hartnett:** Which I think might be the last one. No, that's wrong. Sorry. Oh, this is one you have to make a choice. This is owe delete, avoid and limited --

**Francesconi:** I'm sorry. I missed it. So you put -- the impervious surface we just did?

**Hartnett:** Yes. That was i-4.

**Francesconi:** I'm sorry. Could you pull that one out.

**Katz:** Do you want to change your vote?

**Francesconi:** On just that one.

**Katz:** Let it be known that commissioner Francesconi voted no on that one.

**Francesconi:** Thank you, mayor.

**Katz:** All right. J.

**Hartnett:** Okay, so the first one, j-1 is which one of the four options on avoided and limited. I do note that previously you said option 2. Is that the option you want to vote right now?

**Sten:** I'd move j with option 2.

**Katz:** Right.

**Hartnett:** Option 2. Okay, j-2, then, is to rewrite objectives concerning development on the hill and off the hill. We gave you two statements, and in the second one I have a request from commissioner Saltzman to add in the science and technology corridor and elsewhere in the city to the language.

**Saltzman:** Or elsewhere.

**Hartnett:** I'm sorry, that's what I have, or elsewhere in the city to that language. Okay.

**Katz:** That's it.

**Hartnett:** That's it on j.

**Katz:** Okay. Motion on j.

**Francesconi:** So moved.

**Katz:** Second? Do I hear a second?

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Katz:** Any objections, hearing none, so ordered. [ gavel pounding ] k.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** K. One item.

**Hartnett:** K is a one item. This is just simply deleting some language from an action item. O.h.s.u. Requested that we not specify the kind of uses that might happen there.

**Francesconi:** So moved.

**Sten:** Second

**Katz:** No objections. [ gavel pounding ] all right, l.

**Hartnett:** There's a couple items in l. The first one is a new objective -- no objective and action item to encourage o.h.s.u. To transfer ownership of the 45 acres or to seek a conservation easement. The language for the objective is shown here on page 32. The action item would be new action item o.s.n.r.x.x. Shown in the action chart on page 58. Second item in that topic is l-7, which is to add the office of -- the office of sustainable development to action item s.o.n.r.-7, again shown on page 58. I would also note that we will need to amend the action of implementers in the document to indicate what o.s.d. Stands for, which is office of sustainable development.

**Francesconi:** So moved.

**Katz:** Already. Second in.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**JULY 3, 2002**

**Katz:** Objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [ gavel pounding ] m.

**Hartnett:** You already went through m. M was the missed items. You chose none of them to move forward. I believe that you're done.

**Katz:** All right. Any other items that the council would like to bring forward? All right. Then we are done for today. This all moves over to next week for action.

**Hartnett:** Yeah. You're time certain on July 10th for this item.

**Katz:** And on July 10th, Matt will bring his report and then --

**Hartnett:** At 2:30.

**Katz:** -- at 2:30, and we'll -- I'd like to work some language into whatever resolution, transportation, or Matt brings forward, to include a much larger view of the transportation issues. We talked about that. So play with the language on that.

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

**Katz:** Okay? Fine, everybody. We stand adjourned. [ gavel pounding ]

At 4:49 p.m., Council adjourned.