



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

OFFICIAL
MINUTES

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 10TH 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; Linda Meng, Chief Deputy City Attorney; and Officer Peter Hurley, Sergeant at Arms.

Items No. 863 and 873 were pulled for discussion and, on a Y-4 roll call, the balance of Consent Agenda was adopted

COMMUNICATIONS	Disposition:
822 Request of Jeff Forsyth to address Council regarding the benefits of Linux Operating System (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
823 Request of Eric Dover to address Council regarding the cost to taxpayers of dignitaries who come to Portland to campaign for themselves and others (Communication)	RESCHEDULED TO JULY 17, 2002 AT 9:30 AM
CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION	
824 Accept bid of All Concrete Specialties for Alberta Street civil and electrical improvements project from NE 16th Avenue to NE 33rd Ave (Purchasing Report – Bid No. 101516) (Y-4)	ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT
825 Accept bid of Benge Construction Co for improvements to SW Market and SW Clay Street (Purchasing Report – Bid No. 101453) (Y-4)	ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT
Mayor Vera Katz	
826 Reappoint Carl Rice, Gary Toole, Roy Moore, James Markman and Stuart Minor to the Plumbing Code Board of Appeal for terms to expire June 17, 2005 (Report) (Y-4)	CONFIRMED
827 Appoint Jonathan Gray to the Plumbing Code Board of Appeal a term to expire June 17, 2005 (Report) (Y-4)	CONFIRMED

JULY 10, 2002

<p>*828 Authorize execution of financing documents for Floyd Light Project (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176689</p>
<p>*829 Create a new Non-represented classification of Security Supervisor and establish a compensation rate for the class (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176690</p>
<p>*830 Authorize a contract and provide for payment for the remodel of Fire Station 28 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176691</p>
<p>*831 Amend contract with Interface Engineering to provide mechanical engineering services for The Portland Building HVAC Retrofit Design (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 32321) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176692</p>
<p>*832 Authorize a contract and provide for payment for architectural and engineering services for design and construction of Fire Station 27 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176693</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Jim Francesconi</p>	
<p>*833 Authorize a replacement lease agreement with RedTail Inc. for construction, operation, and maintenance of a clubhouse and related facilities at RedTail Golf Course (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176694</p>
<p>*834 Contract with Socialdata Australia to conduct the TravelSmart Portland Pilot Project to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation and document the effects of personal travel behavior (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176695</p>
<p>*835 Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Tri-Met to provide regional Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds for programs and initiatives for alternative transportation use, reduce vehicle miles traveled and improve air quality (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176696</p>
<p>*836 Agreement for cooperative assistance during emergency conditions with the Oregon Department of Transportation and others (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176697</p>
<p>*837 Authorize contracts as required with four professional, technical and expert service firms for urban design in support of transportation projects (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176698</p>

JULY 10, 2002

<p>*838 Grant revocable permit to Doernbecher/Portland Family Entertainment to close SW Morrison Street between SW 18th and SW 20th on July 13, 2002 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176699</p>
<p>*839 Authorize maintenance agreement and first amendment with the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District and Portland State University for a Bus Transit Center (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176700</p>
<p>*840 Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Oregon Department of Transportation for Transportation Growth Management Grant funding for the St. Johns/Lombard Plan (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176701</p>
<p>*841 Agreement with Oregon Department of Transportation for bridge improvements on NE 33rd Avenue over Lombard Street and Union Pacific Railroad structure (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176702</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p>	
<p>*842 Authorize contract with Youth Employment Institute to provide a summer work experience with the Water Bureau (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176703</p>
<p>*843 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland Public Schools District No. 1, for the purpose of constructing a bio-filtration vegetated swale on Beach Elementary School property, Project No. 7227 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176704</p>
<p>*844 Authorize application to the Environmental Protection Agency for a grant in the amount of \$1.25 million for innovative wet weather projects (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176705</p>
<p>845 Authorize a contract with Peter B. Tobey and provide for payment for sewer mapping technical support services and Net-Map license upgrades (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 17, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Erik Sten</p>	
<p>*846 Amend agreement with Camp Dresser & McGee Inc. to provide completion of soil remediation for an additional \$30,000 (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 32034) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176706</p>
<p>*847 Agreement with Volunteers of America for \$141, 083 for the VOA Relief Nursery and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176707</p>

JULY 10, 2002

<p>*848 Agreement with Unlimited Choices for \$154,650 for Adapt-A-Home Project and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176708</p>
<p>*849 Agreement with the Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods for \$29,651, to conduct citizen participation activities in inner-north/northeast neighborhoods and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176709</p>
<p>*850 Agreement with Community Alliance of Tenants for \$39,181 for the Renter Stabilization and Education Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176710</p>
<p>*851 Agreement with worksystems inc. for \$498,411 for the Comprehensive Youth Employment Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176711</p>
<p>*852 Agreement with worksystems inc. for \$732,290 for the workforce development services for adults and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176712</p>
<p>*853 Agreement with Legal Aid Services of Oregon for \$43,177 for fair housing enforcement and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176713</p>
<p>*854 Agreement with Reach Community Development Inc. for \$95,000 for development of affordable rental housing and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176714</p>
<p>*855 Agreement with Transition Projects Inc. for \$1,718,393 for shelter and services for homeless men and women and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176715</p>
<p>*856 Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County for the cooperation of units of local government to prepare and update the Consolidated Plan to meet affordable housing goals and to receive payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176716</p>
<p>*857 Agreement with Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives, Inc. for \$65,000 for the development of affordable rental housing and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176717</p>
<p>*858 Agreement with Albina Head Start for \$131,677 and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176718</p>
<p>*859 Amend agreement with the Housing Development Center to change the scope of work and extend the contract period (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 34032) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176719</p>

JULY 10, 2002

*860	Agreement with Outside-In for \$23,835 for the Needle Exchange program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176720
*861	Agreement with Open Meadow Learning Center for \$102,617 for the Corps Restoring the Urban Environment program and to provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176721
*862	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)	176722
*863	Agreement with Portland Relief Nursery, Inc. for \$141,083 for childhood development services and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176732
*864	Agreement with Community Energy Project for \$40,000 to conduct lead poisoning prevention workshops. (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176723
*865	Agreement with Mercy Corps International for \$53,043 for the Portland Entrepreneur Initiative and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176724
*866	Agreement with Housing Authority of Portland for \$375,361 for consolidated rental services and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176725
*867	Agreement with Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon for \$39,754 for the Share Housing Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176726
*868	Agreement with Affordable Community Environments for \$155,000 to develop Cascadia Village Housing for Persons with HIV/AIDS and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176727
*869	Agreement with Housing Development Center for \$127,562 to provide technical services to non-profit developers of affordable housing and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176728
*870	Agreement with Portland Housing Center for \$105,553 for homebuyer education and counseling services and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176729
*871	Agreement with Cascade AIDS Project for \$439,125 for the Cascade Aids Project HIV/AIDS Housing Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	176730

JULY 10, 2002

<p>*872 Agreement with Northwest Housing Alternatives for \$48,423 for development of affordable rental housing and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p>176731</p>
<p>City Auditor Gary Blackmer</p>	
<p>*873 Assess property for system development charge contracts and private plumbing loan contracts (Ordinance; Z0739, T0064, K0049, T0063, K0048, P0061) (Y-4)</p>	<p>176733</p>
<p>REGULAR AGENDA</p>	
<p>Mayor Vera Katz</p>	
<p>*874 Contract with Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. for an amount not to exceed \$100,000 to assist the City with the development of the River Plan and provide payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p>176734</p>
<p>*875 Authorize continuation of the Employee Transition Services Program, and declare fiscal emergency for FY 2002-03 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p>176735</p>
<p>*876 Authorize Intergovernmental Agreements with Portland Public Schools and the State of Oregon Department of Administrative Services for participation in the City Integrated Regional Network Enterprise (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p>176736</p>
<p>877 Adopt the 8th Amendment to the Central Eastside Urban Renewal Plan to establish authority to acquire property at 424-436 East Burnside Street (Second Reading Agenda 740) (Y-4)</p>	<p>176737 AS AMENDED</p>
<p>878 Amend City Code relating to authority to sign rental and lease agreements (Second Reading Agenda 803;) (Y-4)</p>	<p>176738</p>
<p>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p>	
<p>879 Authorize separate agreements with Herrera Environmental Consultants, Inc., Camp Dresser & 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 (Second Reading Agenda 770) (Y-4)</p>	<p>176739</p>

JULY 10, 2002

<p>880 Authorize separate agreements with URS Corporation and KJM & Associates Ltd. for an amount not to exceed \$25,000 per firm to provide engineering services for fiscal management and provide for payment (Second Reading Agenda 771)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p>176740</p>
<p>881 Authorize separate agreements with David Evans & Associates, Herrera Environmental Consultants, Adolfson Associates, Beak/Jones & Stokes, and Shapiro & Associates for an amount not to exceed \$25,000 per firm to provide engineering services for natural resources and provide for payment (Second Reading Agenda 772)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p>176741</p>

At 10:02 a.m., Council recessed.

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,
OREGON WAS HELD THIS 10TH 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; Linda Meng, Chief Deputy City Attorney; and Officer Peter Hurley, Sergeant at Arms.

<p>S-882 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM - Adopt the action charts of the Marquam Hill Plan (Previous Agenda 819; Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>Motion to amend regarding the technical amendments: Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman.</p> <p>Motion for a substitute Resolution on 882, 883 and a substitute Ordinance on 884, including Exhibits A, B, C and D: Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman.</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p>Disposition:</p> <p>SUBSTITUTE 36083 AS AMENDED</p>
<p>S- 883 Reaffirm the Terwilliger Parkway Corridor Plan, its implementing measures and include the Terwilliger Parkway Design Guidelines (Previous Agenda 820; Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p>SUBSTITUTE 36084</p>
<p>S-*884 Adopt and implement the Marquam Hill Plan (Previous Agenda 821; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p>SUBSTITUTE 176742 AS AMENDED</p>

JULY 10, 2002

885 TIME CERTAIN: 2:30 PM – Accept the Marquam Hill/North Macadam Connector report and recommendation and direct the Portland Office of Transportation to proceed with the next steps to implement the recommendation (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz and Commissioner Francesconi)

Motion to amend to add a mitigation option to work with affected property

owners to include a voluntary buy-out option for affected properties:

Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.

Motion to resolve that City Council will not use hostile public condemnation in establishing a mono cable tram linking Barbur

Boulevard

and Marquam Hill and direct the Portland Office of Transportation to work with the affected property owners, to add, after potential mitigation approaches, including consideration of recommendations from the South Portland Circulation Study: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.

Motion to resolve that the city council recognizes Portland Aerial Transportation Inc. as the project sponsor for the Suspended Cable Transportation System and directs the Portland Office of Transportation to work with the Portland Aerial Transportation Inc. through the design development phase: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.

Motion to add “Whereas alternative alignment and landing locations for the monocable tram between the Barbur Transit Corridor and Marquam Hill should be studied to determine if property impacts and Terwilliger Parkway impact can be minimized or eliminated and be it further resolved City Council supports the concept of a second tram linking Marquam Hill to the Barbur Transit Corridor and directs PDOT to provide additional information on the exact alignment and design of the monocable tram and return with this information by September 25th, 2002”: Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman.

Commissioner

Saltzman.

(Y-4)

36085

AS AMENDED

At 6:47 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love
Clerk of the Council

JULY 10, 2002

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

JULY 10, 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 10, 2002 9:30 AM

Katz: Good morning, everybody. The council will come to order. Karla, please call the roll. [roll call]

Katz: Let's do communications. 822.

Item 822.

Katz: Jeff, is he here? Is jeff here? All right. 823.

Item 823

Katz: Is mr. Dover here?

Moore: No he rescheduled to next week.

Katz: All right. Let's go to the consent agenda. We have a request to pull 873 and 863. Any other items to be pulled off the consent agenda? Roll call on the consent agenda.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] all right. 863.

Item 863.

Saltzman: I asked could have this item pulled because we have someone from the Portland relief nursery who wanted to speak to this contract. This is a contract under our early childhood development program, this is for the upcoming year, and we have tara bloom, the development director who would like to say a few words about the contract. Come on up, tara.

*******:** Well hi. Thank you for allowing me to be here on behalf of the board of directors.

Katz: Identify yourself for the record.

Tara Bloom, Development Director, Portland Relief Nursery: Thank you. I'm tara bloom. Development director of Portland relief nursery. On behalf of the board and the staff and our over 200 clients, I want to thank the city, mayor Katz for your support of the last year's \$138,000 that came to Portland relief nursery's early childhood services. With that money we were able to serve over 100 children age birth through 3, in addition to the other children who had already been enrolled in our therapeutic classrooms. We were able to provide home visits to these families in north Portland. For those who don't know, the relief nursery program is focused on abuse prevention by providing a continuum of services to the whole entire family. The children who receive services with the \$138,000 last year and who we're hoping will receive services from \$141,000 this year are in extreme need. Their parents often are addicts or suffering from mental illness, living in poverty, the majority of our families, over 99%, live on less than \$12,000 a year. There are multiple children in the home quite frequently and 80% of our families are headed by single mothers. And in addition to that, domestic violence plagues almost every single family that's in our program. All of these factors put children at risk, and as i'm sure you can understand, it's not the fault of the child that any of these circumstances are present when they're born. So we appreciate the support of the council of the city of taxpayers and of -- and count on public and private supports to keep these programs going. Last year, i'm rambling now, we were able to match public dollars one for one with private donations. That's the point I wanted to make most this morning, that we have \$750,000 budget last year, literally half of that came from state and from city, the rest of it came from private donations. This year if this support is renewed, we'll match

JULY 10, 2002

that -- we'll increase the ratio, for every public dollar we're aiming to receive two private dollars. So the public support that's present for programs like this will be leveraged and we'll have a long-term lasting effect. And because of that leverage, because of our effectiveness at being able to garner additional private support for programs like this, we're very excited about larger initiatives like the children's initiative, to be able to bring more attention to programs like this.

Katz: Thank you.

*****: Thank you very much.

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

Francesconi: Aye.

Saltzman: Very impressive work with our dollars. Thank you. Aye.

Sten: It's tough work, but i'm glad you're there. Aye.

Katz: Aye. [gavel pounded] thank you. All right. Item 873.

Item 873.

Carl Sandstrom, It's A Beautiful Pizza: Good morning. Carl sandstrom; it's a beautiful pizza, southeast belmont. Beautiful pizza has been located there across the street at 3341 for 8 1/2 years. When I first moved to that neighborhood, it was dark and quiet, the space I got into had -- sat vacant for over a year with a for rent sign in the window, and I would pull up and park my car and look around the neighborhood and think, is this where I want to be? The first week I was in business there was a murder right there in the neighborhood. But then later on the zupan's market came in, and the carnation dairy development and things improved considerably. Gentrification is the term that has been used for that. And then the building owner asked to double the rent on my building, and we went to arbitration on that case. It didn't get doubled, but eventually I won't have a lease, and I will be at the mercy of a building owner. Across the street I knew james carver, the owner of majestic cleaners. I told him if -- if his building ever became available, that would be a great move for me, to move directly across the street and not lose any business. And so when he went into retirement or semiretirement, he told me, carl, the building is available. I'll do my best to get you in there. So therefore I leveraged myself and it was quite a stretch to move across the street, managed to do it, had the windows papered up for a year and a half, deeply in debt, got the place open, and then the -- got a bill for \$36,000 for the transportation development charge. I don't have that money. I hired kittleson engineering company to look over the code and the billing, and they were able to -- I had to pay them \$4,000, but they were able to reduce it to -- by 9,000, that brings it down to 27,000 after paying them 4,000, but my move across the street, the new space is just gorgeous. Not far away at all. You could come over there for lunch from here, just minutes away. It's actually the seating capacity is smaller than the space I moved from. The actual square footage is a bit larger, but the space i'm -- I was in, 3341, I had a basement room that's later on I added to my lease, and it was rated for assembly, rated for 90 persons.

Katz: Your time is up. I'm going to give you a few more seconds.

Sandstrom: Oh, okay. I didn't know I had a time limit. The point is, this is un-american and i'm asking for a break here. I moved into -- i've got a smaller seating capacity, and i'm being charged \$27,000 that I don't have. The city's kind enough to finance it for me, but i'm -- I think it would be more appropriate and better common sense to -- and better for small business to see -- this was a -- what's the term? Unintended consequence here. I don't think in july of '97 when the city council passed this that it was their intention to catch somebody like me when they moved across the street.

Katz: Thank you.

*****: Thank you.

Katz: Anybody else want to talk on this item? All right. Roll call.

JULY 10, 2002

Francesconi: Well, just a couple things. One, i'm new on the block on transportation, but the theory, the purpose of transportation sdc, they were developed in response -- it was a community response that we actually pay for growth in order to get some transportation infrastructure to support growth and small business. And there was a committee that included small businesses in the establishment of this. Having said that, i've asked the transportation committee and don gardner, transportation bureau, to look at the sdc policy, especially as it affects small businesses in order to see how we can make sure this doesn't happen again. And so they're looking at that. To retroactively change something that the bureau had no discretion on creates a whole can of worms for everybody, because there's all these other businesses that were in the same situation as you, sir, so I don't know how you retroactively change something. But I do know how you take care of it for the future, and that's what we intend to do. Aye.

Saltzman: Your situation certainly makes me cringe, and it has ever since I first met you at the belmont business association breakfast. I think we are looking at -- I appreciate commissioner Francesconi taking a look at transportation sdc, but I think more important the mayor has really decided to tackle this whole permitting process, including I think fees we charge, and somewhere I hope we may come up with an idea as simple as a board of common sense, where issues like yours could really be looked at by some individuals and say, this doesn't make sense and we've got to do something, particularly when a small business like yourself, who i'm imagining gross income compared to a \$27,000 sdc is a pretty big bite. I don't think we can do anything in your case retroactive, but you have our commitment we're going to try to make things better for businesses going forward. Aye.

Sten: I do think sdc's make sense and I think this particular case doesn't make sense, and I don't quite have a formula for how to fix it, but I think we should change it. I think this is clearly not with the spirit of what's trying to be accomplished with sdc's. I assume there are not administrative avenues to appeal this, if there are, I think we should still take a look at it. But I don't know that there is, and you can't change rules retroactively. For what it's worth, I think you've made your point, and it's probably worth at least 27,000 at this point. I think it's something that clearly is not how this system should be working. So I appreciate it, and apologize for it. Aye.

Katz: I just want to add that we also are raising the question as to the benefits and the extent of the benefits of sdc's as we are looking at the regulatory issues in the next couple of months. So thank you for flagging that to us. You've made the point, the point is well made. Aye. [gavel pounded] all right. 874.

Item 874.

Katz: I pulled this off the consent agenda and put it on the regular agenda. I did it for the reason of further explaining what we're thinking of with regard to the river plan. If you recall, the river plan was the greenway plan, and it now incorporates not only the greenway, but also the river because you can't divide the two. And so what we hope with this contract is to pull all the visions and begin to get a little bit more in detail how those two elements work together and -- in pulling all the bureaus together as well. And i've asked sally to come and share with you a little bit more about what you want to do.

Sally Edmunds, Bureau of Planning: Thank you very much, mayor and members of the council. My name is sally edmunds, i'm with the bureau of planning. We are thrilled to bring this contract to you today, and as you know, the river plan is a very important step towards achieving the river renaissance vision you adopted last march. The plan will replace the willamette river greenway plan, which was last updated in 1987, and will address emerging issues, challenges and opportunities along the willamette river, such as the esa listing, the Portland harbor superfund, state planning goals 5 and 15, access to the river, marine industrial lands among other things. We plan to work with the public throughout this planning process, and as you know, we started with the river

JULY 10, 2002

renaissance visioning process. The next step is to develop a river concept which will build on and add detail to the river renaissance vision, and we hope to bring that concept to you before we then determine what the implementation strategies are to achieve that concept. The river concept is what this consultant contract is all about. We develop the request for proposals and the selection of the consultant team collaboratively with members of the river renaissance management team and their staff, and we're thrilled about the team that we've chosen. The parsons brinckerhoff team has a unique combination of local expertise and national experience and the team includes paul morris from parsons brinckerhoff, the lead consultant, mike abate, and evan rose from smwm in san francisco. And there are some other members of that team as well. Gil kelley and I have met with the team several times, and we really feel confident that they understand that we're looking for a river plan that integrates, that truly integrates all of the river renaissance vision. So we look forward to working with them.

Katz: Thank you. Paul, do you want to come forward? You don't need to. I know you don't need to, but come on up and talk to us a little bit. You're a familiar face here and you've done some wonderful work.

Paul Morris, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas: Thank you. Madam mayor and members of council. We're -- i'm paul morris with parsons brinckerhoff quade & douglas. We are genuinely pleased and quite excited about working with you and the citizens of Portland on this project. We understand the significance that the willamette river place, not just to folks who live near it, but everybody throughout the region. We can look back 100 years and think of it as the mighty willamette, but it's a very different place today, and we have a lot of substantial challenges that sally has articulated. So we're confident that with your direction and the input of the folks here in the community, we'll be able to bring all those pieces together, and we're committed to helping you do that.

Katz: Thank you.

Saltzman: I have a question. I apologize, I didn't get to see the attachment a, which was the actual contract. Is any of this money going for subcontracting public involvement? Public outreach? How much?

Edmunds: We've asked the team to help us design some huge public events that we hope to hold late this fall or early next spring, so this is for these big public events, and to develop the concept coming out of the events. The public involvement for the plan will be coordinated by barbara hart, who is a member of the bureau of planning.

Morris: About 35 to 40% of the fees are focused on that effort. So a substantial --

Saltzman: The events? How many events, four?

Morris: There will be a whole sequence of activities that go on throughout the course of the project, and it will be highlighted by a major series of forums that will be designed as we get closer in terms of format and content and schedule. But our initial concept is to have literally day-long events, geographically distributed throughout the river watershed that would permit people to participate on the schedule that allows them during their business day or their day activities.

Saltzman: Okay. Thanks.

Katz: Anybody else want to testify? Roll call.

Francesconi: I'm sorry. I have one question. Maybe two questions. The river concept, i'm still a little unclear on the work product, the difference between a concept and a vision, and then what happens after that when we come -- I assume the ultimate goal is to revise the greenway design guidelines. Among other things. Maybe let's start with, what is the ultimate goal here, and then how does this concept get us to the ultimate goal?

Edmunds: The ultimate goal is to expand on and revise the willamette river greenway plan, and what we anticipate the components of the river plan to be include policies, design guidelines, as

JULY 10, 2002

you've mentioned, incentives, regulations, changes to the zoning map, perhaps, recommendations for capital improvement projects, education and stewardship programs. We may have an acquisition plan, and we also hope to have funding strategies as part of this whole package.

Francesconi: So the concept is needed, and the vision is not enough, so just explain to me --

Edmonds: The concept is the first step towards the plan, from the vision to the plan. It's an intermediary step that will provide the Portland harbor superfund project with clarity as to what the future zoning and land use will be along the willamette river, so that they can design the clean-up accordingly.

Francesconi: Okay. My last question, what's general -- it's got an account number. Where's the money coming from for this? Do you know?

Edmunds: General fund.

Katz: It's part of the budget.

Francesconi: It's part of planning's budget?

Katz: Yes.

Francesconi: Thank you.

Katz: Anybody else want to tough? Roll call.

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

Katz: Thank you. Aye. [gavel pounded] all right. Item 875.

Item 875.

Katz: All right.

Yvonne Deckard, Director, Bureau of Human Resources: Good morning, mayor and commissioners. For the record, my name is yvonne deckard. Before you is an ordinance requesting the extension of the declaration of fiscal emergency related to the employee transition program. Council declared a fiscal emergency from february 14th of 2001 through june 30th of 2002. We came back to you in october of 2001 with modifications to enhance the employee transition services program, changing the target program to make it more viable for bureaus at a reduced cost. While the program was modified, the time frame for the fiscal emergency remained unchanged. Though fiscal year budget o 203 has been balanced we continue to have fiscal challenges and bureaus continue to implement reduction and reorganizations. We currently have employees whose positions have been cut as of june 30th of 2002, but bureaus have asked us to hold open on processing those through september. So for those employees we currently have in the hopper that we need to technically finish up right now because as soon as the fiscally emergency is off, we need to reestablish that in order to finish them up. The city has a number of lay-offs still remaining that we anticipate through the fiscal year '02-03 for which the program would be necessary. By this ordinance we're asking the council to extend that declaration of the fiscal emergency through june 30th of 2003.

Saltzman: What does "finish them up" mean?

Deckard: Technically their positions have been cut. The real piece of this that -- the real reason we need this is we have a safety net program, so for employees who have been laid off, if they're in a permanent position or a budgeted position and they've been there at least a year or more, then we have a safety net program where we actually try to help bridge their exit from the city, so they're eligible for anywhere from a \$1,000 to 4,000, depending on the number of years of service they have with the any order to bridge them and help them to transition outside of the organization. In order for us to be able to implement that piece, that's attached to council declaring a fiscal emergency. Because those positions have been cut already but bureaus have asked that they -- have asked to be able to keep some of those employees through the summer, we can't transition them off, transition them out of the city through that program. And so we're needing additional time in order

JULY 10, 2002

to do that, so at the time the bureaus are ready to release them, then we can actually transition them out.

Saltzman: That was my second question. What does it mean to delay somebody's position is eliminated on June 30th. The bureau is saying delay that until September?

Deckard: Right. The bureau may have identified a position as a cut for this fiscal year, but I'll give you an example, parks, for example, have identified x amount of cuts because of the summer season. They may have elected to make part of their part-time dollars in order to keep full-time positions going for -- through the summer months, because that is their peak season. And so we wouldn't actually see those individuals leave the city until probably around the 1st of September.

Saltzman: I can understand the parks model, but choose any other bureau that doesn't have a summer peak like parks.

Deckard: We have various bureaus that -- I'd have to go back and look at the list of the number of those positions we have. We don't have a lot of them, but what we do have is a number of employees, probably about ten that we're still having to process, but we won't process them completely until we get through the end of the summer months, because bureaus for whatever reason have decided that they, you know, are able to keep that position a little longer, or to keep that person a little longer in a position.

Saltzman: Won't that directly impact their approved budget? If their approved budget is based upon a certain level of employees in fiscal '02-03, they're going to have this person -- or persons for three more months, that's a budgetary impact. Are we covering that budgetary impact with this --

Deckard: No. The bureau covered that budgetary impact. They may decide to leave a vacancy somewhere else in the bureau in order to finish up that work. What they'll do is leave a vacancy somewhere else in the bureau in order to finish up that work so that they aren't expending their budget in the end.

Saltzman: Thank you.

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

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 876.

Item 876.

Nancy Jesuale, Director, Communications and Networking: Good morning. I'm Nancy, director of communications and networking. The ordinance before you authorizes us to complete intergovernmental agreements with Portland public schools and the state of Oregon department of administrative services, both of these entities are looking forward to becoming ernie users and have taken a while in their own organizations to get their contracts ready. So they're finally ready.

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

Francesconi: There are many ways to support the schools, and this is one of the better ways. Aye.

Saltzman: Good work. Two more clients. Aye.

Sten: Agree. Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded]

*****: Thank you.

Katz: 877.

Item 877.

Katz: [roll call]

Francesconi: This council has been very, very reluctant to use eminent domain, and we should remain so. But in this circumstance where a block's development that the eastside wants and deserves for a very long time, we should support it if necessary. As a last resort. Aye.

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

JULY 10, 2002

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 878.

Item 878.

Katz: Roll call.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 879.

Item 879.

Katz: Roll call.

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

Item 880.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 880.

Katz: Roll call.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 881.

Item 881.

Katz: Roll call.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] and we will adjourn until 2 o'clock. I anticipate that we probably will have a late afternoon. I hope maybe i'll be wrong. We stand adjourned. [gavel pounded]

At 10:02 a.m., Council recessed.

JULY 10, 2002

JULY 10, 2002 2:00 PM

Katz: Council will come to order. Karla, please call the roll.

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

Katz: Present. If you look up at the balcony there are about 35 korean university students from korea. I want to welcome them all here. They are attending a month program at Portland state university and they wanted to observe a city council meeting. I think this is a very appropriate one.

As you all know, Olson and the city of Portland are sister cities. I want to let the korean students know -- they are from ulsan university and that I did visit your city many years ago and want to welcome all of you here. [applause] you can clap. They will be discussing american city concerns and some solutions and solutions to homelessness, to livability and to crime. I urge you, once you figure it out, to let us know, 'cause we are very interested in all of those issues and work very hard to make this city the most livable city in america, which in fact we are. All right. Now to business. **Item 882, 883, 884.**

Katz: All right. You've got -- we will be taking substitute resolutions and substitute ordinances, but I think it would be important, especially for people who are watching and who aren't here to have a very brief review of where we were last week and on all the work that we did, and then on the memorandum of understanding. And then i'll ask for a motion to substitute and then we'll go from there.

*****: Okay.

Susan Hartnett, Bureau of Planning: Good afternoon. For the record, i'm susan hartnet from the bureau of planning. I want to walk you through the package of materials delivered to the offices and for the folks in the audience who might want to pick up a copy, there's copies on both corners of the room. Let me first walk you through what's there so that you're -- you have a sense of the full document. Then there's-few minor revisions that I made to the actual content of the plan that I wanted to bring to your attention. And if any of the council members have concerns about them we can amend them before we actually put them before the council in the substitute. So what you received was a cover memo describing the package. And immediately behind that was an updated list of ideas to be included in the memorandum of understanding. And gil's going to talk about that in just a moment, so i'm going to skip over that. You do have a substitute resolution reaffirming the terwilliger parkway plan and its implementing measures. A substitute resolution adopting the action charts of the marquam hill plan, volume one, which is attached to that resolution as exhibit a. You have a substitute ordinance, which is adopting and implementing the marquam hill plan, volume one, city council revived marquam hill plan, attached as exhibit a. And the marquam hill plan volume two, city council revived marquam hill design guidelines, which is attached as exhibit b. The ordinance also clarifies and applies certain zoning code provisions that have to do with how prior conditions of approval for prior land use actions would be applied in this particular case. As you may well recall, the institutions on marquam hill are currently conditional uses and you'll be changing them to allowed uses, so we wanted to clarify to how the code applies. That's shown in exhibit c. Then the last item is through the substitute ordinance you'll be adopting, an update of the esee analysis for the designated viewpoints within the marquam hill plan district. That's a new item in your package. Following your work on this plan last week where you did indicate, including the scenic viewpoints and the new regulations concerning moving scenic viewpoints and including the design guideline that addresses them, the city attorney felt it would be a good idea to update the esee analysis. That analysis was initially done in 1990 as part of the city's scenic

JULY 10, 2002

resources plan, and did choose to provide full protection for those three scenic resources and we wanted to make sure that we documented that we're continuing to protect those resources and that the provisions of the marquam hill plan provide that protection. So we've used the analysis and would like you to adopt it as part of the adopting ordinance for this project.

Katz: Let me just go over this. On the -- the adoption of the marquam hill plan, 884, we have two exhibits, exhibit a and exhibit b, right?

Hartnett: Actually you have four exhibits. You have exhibits a, b, c and d.

Katz: On the marquam hill plan?

Hartnett: That's correct.

Katz: Do we have any new exhibits on the other two?

Hartnett: No.

Katz: Because last time we forgot to adopt the exhibit, so I wanted to make sure.

Hartnett: Yeah, okay.

Katz: Okay, all right.

Hartnett: So that's what's in the package in front of you. If I can walk you through what's in the documents so you're aware of what i've done, both of the volumes of the plan, volume one and volume two, have been updated to incorporate the events of the last couple of weeks, so the planning commission's recommended version of the document ended with their recommendation. The document in front of you now incorporates the city council's hearings, what we heard at those hearings, and the city council's decision-making on the amendments to the planning commission's recommendation. So all of that has been updated in both of these documents. I did also delete the plan review process chapter from the documents since there is no further public review of this document. It was a really unnecessary section of the document. I made some minor revisions to the other-s, really to just reflect the council's hearings and decision-making, so it's -- it's mostly things like changing present tense to past tense for the planning commission's actions. Throughout all of the documents, including the ordinances and resolutions, what had been referenced as the planning commission's recommended marquam hill plan and design commission's recommended marquam hill plan has been changed now to the city council revived marquam hill plan and city council revived marquam hill design guidelines, which are what are now attached as the exhibits to the ordinance. Now I want to take just a couple more minutes. I'd like you to pull out volume two, the city council revived marquam hill plan, and I need to walk you through a few specific changes in the -- the sort of heart of the document to make sure that a few things that I changed as I was conforming the document to reflect your decisions on amendments last week are consistent with the council's intent. Okay? So beginning on page 61 of the document, which is the goal five economic development policies and objectives, under policy d, I made a simple correction to change the word "business" to "businesses." that's a very simple change. I understand, madame mayor, but again the city asked that I walk through these changes with you. [laughter]

Katz: All right.

Hartnett: Actually the city attorney who asked me to do that is not here today, so -- the next item is on page 62. And it's the action item ed-3. Again, I simply conformed the language of that action item to agree with objective a. Simply a matter of rearranging words. I won't go into the details of that. I didn't change words, just rearranged them. On page 73, under the list of action implementers and abbreviations, you'll recall the council decided at your last session to add the hillsdale neighborhood association to several of the action items, but we failed to specifically amend the list of implementers. I went ahead and added them. Again, if any of these are problems, we can amend the document if need be.

JULY 10, 2002

Katz: Our silence, I will assume, will flag that it's amended.

Hartnett: I was going to use that as the indicator.

Katz: Okay.

Saltzman: I have another acronym we could throw in as an action item. This will kick it into a third reading, will it?

Hartnett: No. If you want to amend that, we certainly can amend that right now.

Katz: The city attorney that usually sits here isn't here, so --

Saltzman: We adopted a transportation action item related to southwest humphrey boulevard, traffic calming, and we should have included the sylvan --

Hartnett: I can do that. Do you have any concerns about that?

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

Katz: In fact, it's a scrivener's -- it's a broad scrivener's error.

Hartnett: Okay. So it's sylvan-highland neighborhood association. We'll add them to the list of implementers and use the acronym shna. Okay, i'm going to assign them. When we get to the action chart i'll point out which one it is that we're adding them to.

Saltzman: Okay.

Hartnett: Onward, on page 82, in transportation objective nine, this was one of four objectives that the council asked to clarify our references to neighborhood streets and local service streets. In that process we added the term "on neighborhood streets" to objective nine, but failed to delete "on local service streets" at the end of the sentence, so I went ahead and deleted that.

Katz: Very obvious.

Hartnett: Since it was repetitious, yes. On page 91, open space and natural resource objective two and 12, we used the acronym os instead of spelling out open space zoning, so i've corrected both of those. And again, on the next page, 92, in the action item two, the same clarification. On page 95, under building and site design, action -- i'm sorry -- objective number four, I changed a reference to a land use review to design review at the end of the sentence since it was no longer site review, it was now design review.

Katz: Design review.

Hartnett: On page 98, in action item number seven, again, I changed a reference from site review to design guidelines since that's where the functional plan -- i'm sorry -- the site development concepts are now being incorporated. That's at the top of the page. The other thing that I did -- and this is the one thing where I did take a little liberty on action item number ten, I went ahead added the bureau of environmental services and office of sustainable development as implementers. Probably should have been have there from the beginning, --

Katz: I think that's wise.

Hartnett: Okay. Then going on to page 177 this is into the zoning code amendments, page 177, this is title 33555300, the design review purpose statement. At the end we've added a sentence, it begins additional design review promotes, and that's to incorporate the concept of the site review concepts now included in design review. Those were not there previously. Then on page 89 -- i'm sorry -- 189, 33849010, which is the purpose statement for the marquam hill parking review. I removed the reference to the site development concepts because the council removed the approval camera referencing those as part of your amendments to the plan document. So those are all the changes that I made. Now let's just flip back to the transportation, and let me find the one --

Saltzman: Page 85.

Hartnett: Page 85, action item t-15. We're going to add shna for sylvan heights neighborhood association to the implementers.

JULY 10, 2002

Katz: On t --

Hartnett: On action item t-15.

Katz: Okay.

Hartnett: Okay? Those were all the changes I wanted to make you aware of.

Katz: Then I will accept a motion to adopt all of those technical amendments.

Francesconi: So moved.

Katz: Do I hear a second?

Saltzman: Second.

Katz: Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [gavel pounding] all right I need a motion for a substitute resolution on 882. We'll take one motion. I hope that's all right. We'll vote on them separately. 883 and a substituted ordinance on 884, including exhibits a, b, c and d.

*******:** Make sure you include exhibit a on the second one, I think, the action charts item.

Katz: There's an exhibit a, okay.

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

Francesconi: So moved.

Katz: Do I hear a second?

Saltzman: Second.

Katz: Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [gavel pounding] let's shift now over to the mou.

Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning: Thank you, madame mayor. I just wanted to comment that the rapidity and completeness with which susan and her staff crank out iterations of these volumes has been truly astounding and truly a service to getting the project done quickly. I wanted to shift your attention to a companion document which is the outline of the memorandum of intended -- memorandum of understanding between the city and Oregon health sciences university. The elements are much as I described to you last week. We have added a couple of concepts to it. And i'm looking through it, realize there's actually a third proposed by commissioner Saltzman that needs to find its way in there having to do with certification of lead standards, but we have broken out the storm water section and we have reinserted, based on your direction last week, a commitment to help implement and fund the suspended cable transportation system. I wanted to describe sort of where we go next, because with the adoption of the plan today, we really are beginning to move into the implementation phase and there are two critical efforts coming up. One is the negotiation with o.h.s.u. Of this mou and the other is continued work now in front of the planning commission and at the pdc on the completion of the north macadam district plan and the negotiation of a development agreement for the central district built out of that plan. Before doing that I just wanted to set the context a little bit. And I was interested this morning when I attended your session with the Portland development commission on the city-wide economic development strategy that pdc is now drafting with the assistance of the business community, it brought a lot of thoughts up to the forefront about the economy in general. I was just reminded of something that I came to after a number of years running both the planning and an economic development agency, and that is about the role of the public sector versus the private sector in economic development. And I really think the key roles for the public sector are four -- to provide a comprehensive and efficient and effective education system is probably the most important. To provide a complete transportation system. And by extension these days, I think that includes the communications network, really, which is the transportation of ideas, not just goods and people. Providing for, through policy and regulation, a supply of land and reserving that land for economic uses, and that breaks down into a number of things. And finally having a continued commitment and practice of

JULY 10, 2002

a dedication to the quality of life. And i'm including in that broadly speaking the affordability of housing, as well as quality neighborhoods, natural areas and culture amenities. Those are the fundamental strength of the economy that the public sector can contribute to. While there are important other measures that we can do, I think they're secondary and some of those are having a predictable permitting system, equitable and fair taxation and a pro active development agency for business attraction. None of those three are important unless you pay attention to the fundamentals. I say that by a way of a long introduction to the point of this effort has been really been square on the first of those top principles -- the education system. And while it's important to pay attention at all levels, this has really focused open the highest level, the one that has the potential to spin off research and other economic development jobs. So the reason i'm saying this is today I think by your action you will be delivering to the community and o.h.s.u. A very important building block for the future economy. But we now have to turn to the memorandum of understanding. And while we have developed this plan in a very difficult situation, because we're dealing with a difficult terrain, with the situation where the institution's been surrounded by a neighborhood, where transportation access to the hill's been challenged, and we've done what we could do, I believe, in the planning documents to address those concerns. We now need to effectuate this partnership with o.h.s.u. To really address many of the neighborhood improvements and concerns square on in the memorandum of understanding. And by taking this action today I hope you are also asking howe to negotiate with us in good faith on the memorandum of understanding and also to commit to sharing the burden of improvements that are going to be required in the north macadam district to make that a reality so that more and more of the development can occur, both outside the neighborhood directly and next to where we may actually blossom a whole new private sector knowledge-based industry at the base of the hill. So I think those are important things to keep in mind as we adopt this plan and go forward. The very next steps for me and the mayor has asked me to lead the negotiations at the staff level with o.h.s.u., will be to put together a schedule of those negotiations. I want to say that I will take any additional ideas you have now or soon on the outline of the mou and I will be back in contact with your offices. I'll also be consulting with bureau heads and community representatives as we go through that process. Intent would be to bring a completed mou in september or early october for your approval and expect that would also be ratified by the o.h.s.u. Board.

Katz: Working at the same time. I would also recommend that you put this on the web.

Kelley: Okay.

Katz: And get some feedback from the public before we get to a final draft.

Kelley: Will do.

Katz: Okay.

Saltzman: You don't need language now on the green building standards? I mean, we talked about this before.

Kelley: Yes. We can get that from your office if you prefer. That would be fine.

Katz: So what gil is asking from us is, is anything missing? He's asking that from the community as well.

Kelley: Correct.

Katz: And we'll wordsmith it and hopefully begin the negotiations with o.h.s.u..

Kelley: Right.

Katz: Okay.

Kelley: Thank you.

Katz: And the deadline is end of september?

JULY 10, 2002

Kelley: Well, that would be when we'd want to bring it back to you.

Katz: Okay.

Kelley: So we'd like ideas, anything that's missing, we'd like to know about it in the next week or so we can begin the negotiations.

Katz: All right. Any further questions by the council? All right. Then let's begin, then, coming to closure on 882, 883, 884. Let's take the vote, then, on 882.

Item 882.

Francesconi: I'm just going to make one statement all three of these items. There's five objectives that we're trying to accomplish here, but really only one overriding goal. That goal is how to we diversify and modernize and improve our economy while also keeping this a wonderful place to live for our families and for our neighborhoods. To do that, I mean the first objective really is to build upon the excellence that is o.h.s.u. Not that bioscience is going to be the magic answer by itself, but it's an important element in this new economy. And working with the excellence that already is o.h.s.u., with the \$220 million in research grants they brought in just last year, we have an opportunity to power ourselves into the 21st century, our economy, and we need to seize it. But the second objective is we have a neighborhood here, a proud neighborhood, that's been sliced and diced with transportation projects over the years. And we have to do all we can to mitigate the harm that could result to some of the folks, not the whole neighborhood, and we need to do some things to improve the transportation structure, specifically naito parkway down the road at the transportation is committed to funding in order to improve this neighborhood. The third objective is to build a new neighborhood. We need this expansion of o.h.s.u., into macadam, to help with housing and jobs in that area that won't develop without this expansion. That's the third objective. The fourth is to add to a regional transportation system, which this tram and actually two trams will do. And we have an opportunity with this vote to continue that progressive movement for which Portland is known, by which its transportation infrastructure contributes directly to the quality of our lives. The fifth objective -- and this is one that we're going to have to all work together on, folks, because we're part of a process here, this is not the end, but it's time to move on this decision, to allow the marquam hill expansion -- development and the tram, because we moved -- have to move on to the fifth objective, which is we need to prove that our businesses and our citizens and our government can work together to do difficult things, that allow our city to move forward. Difficult things were done by those of us that made this before we got here, to make this a special city and we need to do some difficult things together. So o.h.s.u., we're proud that you're our partner. You're a terrific institution in our city. We want you to continue to succeed and we want to do our part to help you. I think by the -- our actions of primarily our staff, but also the council, led by the mayor, we're demonstrating our partnership. In return, we appreciate all you've done in terms of the mitigations you've already agreed to, with which i'd not be voting aye if you hadn't. The trip caps, the design review, the open space in the center, the split access, the limited growth of parking, the reorganization of your campus. We knew that those are done with sacrifice on your part. You did it to help improve the neighborhood in which you live and in which you're important, and we appreciate all that. We do ask you to work, as we know you will, in good faith, with gil kelley through the mou process. Doesn't mean you have to pay for everything that the neighborhood needs, but we do need you to work through this process, to make sure that you not only keep your word, which we know you will, but to stretch as far as you can to help a neighborhood that frankly needs the help. We also are entering into difficult negotiations with you, our partner, on how we pay for the infrastructure of the tram, but also the development down in north macadam. We may be a short as \$30 million in terms of what it's going to take to do that,

JULY 10, 2002

and so we need you to be our partner, as we approach the federal government and as we work together to make sure we accomplish this. To the neighborhoods, I know that you have fought a valiant fight and been represented by good people. You can continue to fight that fight in what forums you choose, but my request to you now is, work with us as we try to mitigate and as we try to develop finally for you some infrastructure, including the second tram, as well as the naito parkway. I'm going to talk more about this second tram thing later on in the second vote. But work with us so that we try to help you as we try to mitigate some things. I guess the final thing I want to say at this point is to the staff. You've done a terrific job. First let me say to the planning commission -- I understand that some of your feelings may be hurt. It is our prerogative and obligation to make decisions that we feel is in the best interest of the city, and we've done that, but we appreciate your work and we appreciate your input. That's about all. In terms of the staff, susan hartnet and gil kelley have done a terrific job on this. And they get criticized from all sides, but I just want you to know on a personal -- on my pe half, that I have never been prouder to work with people who have done such a terrific job. And you've established a professionalism and expertise that I have not seen in many places in the private sector, where I was for 19 years. And so I want to thank you for what you've done.

*****: Thank you.

Francesconi: Aye.

Saltzman: This is my first major comprehensive plan amendment that i've been involved with on the city council. And it's certainly -- it's come pretty fast. You know, in a way -- in a way, that's not a bad thing. I mean, I think there's been adequate due process throughout this process. Sometimes when things move smoothly, you forget why you have the process. We have the prize here, a better neighborhood, a new neighborhood, and a great institution and jobs and entrepreneurial growth that will go with that, but I really do this has been a well-crafted, well thought-out, well-debated comprehensive plan that is going to serve this city well for its future. I want to thank everybody that have been involved. I know the neighbors have been involved at length. The planning commission has spent hours and hours on this, the staff months and most. You've brought to us a good product, for which we've put in a lot of hours ourselves. Nothing in comparison to what you have. It's a good plan, looks to the future, and gives us the opportunity to take this part of town, north macadam, just sitting there pretty much fallow, and to really turn that into a great new neighborhood that will have lots of jobs to go with it. It will give us a chance to turn a piece of river front property into a piece of property that works with the river and not against the river. And all the objectives we have for river renaissance there too. So it's a lot of good things too. The neighborhood, there's a lot of mitigation things here too. We need to consider the south Portland circulation study, making some of those things reality. I'll talk about later on the idea of putting forward a buyout option for homeowners, affected homeowners. I think there should be a buyout option they should exercise if they care to within a certain amount of time. I think there's things we have to address and our work still remains ahead of us, but it's good work. Aye.

Sten: If I recall, we had the doctor who's made great strides on cancer as a grand marshal in our parade this year. At that happy moment we can all see where this thing is going. It's not that easy.

I think when you look at this big hill and a very constrained amount of land, and an institution that's doing wonderful work and needs room to expand it's a very complex piece of work. And I think at the planning staff and the citizens and o.h.s.u. And everybody has done a very good job. It doesn't change the fact that there's pretty fundamental conflicts in the middle of this that you can't plan your way through and you have to make a choice on. I want to talk about three different subjects here. The first is the plan as a whole I think is very solid and I think that it gives a road

JULY 10, 2002

map. It's really just that. It's not the journey is going to have surprises and going to need a lot of work, but it gives a road map that could work. I think there's a vote of confidence in o.h.s.u. That frankly despite all the other issues, which I think were very legitimate from the neighborhood, came from the neighborhood, as well as the council, there was a strong message sent that people want o.h.s.u. To succeed, and I think that message will come back from o.h.s.u. And certainly the council expects it in making sure the mitigations get done and that the mou which will be binding to make sure things happen to build this area in a way that works for as many people as possible. I think we're going to be better on the hill when this is all done than we are now, because things aren't working correctly up there right now because of all the conflict. I think the plan as a whole is a solid step forward and a good piece of work. Embedded in this is the very controversial issue of the tram. And I guess, you know, the most direct way i've looked at this, spent a lot of time talking to a lot of people, thinking about it, doing soul-searching about it, because there's a lot of emotion and logic on both sides, and what I came to is that both sides have an absolutely fair argument. And this is a classic case of you have two competing good things. It makes perfect sense to me that if you live under a place the tram could be, or near a street where a tram is running, you don't want one. I don't think there's any reason to argue with that, other than to say it makes perfect sense. I think it's a good argument. I also think that the tram makes very good sense as a transportation option. Frankly, just to be blunt, makes a lot more sense than shuttle buss. Both of those arguments are solid. That leaves me in the position of having to choose between them. Especially in politics, but I think all of us in all of our life are always looking for a win-win solution, and on those two I think legitimate points I don't see a win-win, and I do think the tram in the long run will add dramatically to the vitality and that's why i'm supporting that. Again, if folks disagree, I do understand your point, and i'm not trying to say you should like it, i'm saying I think you've got two things in conflict. That leads me to my third point, the one i'm the most worried about and the most enthusiastic, which there has been incredible amount of work, in this case more done by citizens than staff over the years with the south Portland circulation study to try and figure out how could you envision a much better flow of transportation down there. I was at one neighborhood meeting a long time ago when this all got started and somebody said, you know, that the neighborhood's so messed up you got to go over us. I mean, that's not my final where i'm falling, but I think there's some truth to that. I think that we don't have the money in the budget, but in the past, you know, the way you get big things done, like changing the on-ramps, working on naito, there's a lot of space that could be rebuilt, incredible transportation mess that can be cleaned up, and we have to say this is going to be a top priority and we work to find the funds, federal, local, to try and use the tram, use this plan, use the incredible both human and economic promise of o.h.s.u. To also get some of the neighborhood messes cleaned up. So it's not just a -- it's not just a win-lose situation. Although I don't think you can reconcile the two sides on the tram. But I think we have an opportunity to try and make some things right and use the impetus of this new development to get things straightened out. So for all of those reasons I vote aye.

Katz: Thank you, everybody. I think it's all been said, but I have a responsibility to go over some legal issues in my closing remarks. This has been a long process for everyone. There's been a lot of work, a lot of input by all the stakeholders. And we haven't always agreed on every issue, but this is not the end. This is just the beginning. You've heard the other council members talk about mitigation and beginning to return something back to the neighborhoods who have suffered all these years with a lot of activity in their backyard. We'll be discussing that on the next item -- actually on the fourth item. I'd also like to say that the planning commission made some very difficult decisions as well, that there were some areas that they were not aware of, they didn't have

JULY 10, 2002

all the information. We were fortunate to have more information than they did. And we didn't always come to the same conclusion. So be it. That's the nature of the process. I'd like to explain some of my reasoning on these difficult decisions and why I came to the actions that I did. And I'd like to go back in history to talk about how this all started. I said one day that this isn't about only o.h.s.u. This is about the neighborhoods. This is about the veterans hospital. This is about the shriners. This is about the city of Portland. This is about the region. This is about the state of Oregon. It's about the possibilities that we've talked about over and over again in north macadam and it's the possibilities of the science and technology corridor and the future of this community. And together with o.h.s.u. And the input of the neighborhoods and all the stakeholders, the council determined that to begin thinking about all of this we would go through a marquam hill plan. And that would be the best route to go, because it would give us a lot more flexibility to talk about a lot of the issues. And the community agreed, that going through this -- this process will provide certainty to the institutions on the hill and to the surrounding residential neighborhoods over the long term, because this is not a short-term process. I look back at the resolution betsy pulled out the resolution about over a year ago which formally launched this effort. And in this resolution the bureau was directed to work on a planned district for two reasons primarily. First, our zoning code describes planned district as special tools within the zoning code to address areas possessing unique economic and environmental characteristics and requires that a planned district be established as a result of an area planning study reviewed through a legislative procedure. And second we recognized then that we were going to go well beyond the boundaries of the institutions on the hill, and that we could best address it through a much broader process, bigger policy issues. Talk about how it fits with regard to an economic development strategy that we've been working on, how the transportation system on the hill works or doesn't work, and how we can better integrate the transportation infrastructure throughout this geographic area. And how to regulate design of buildings in a place that buildings can be seen miles and miles away. The bureau, as you all know, commissioned the butell report, to evaluate some of our assumption on the bioscience and biotechnology. I know there are mixed reports about our future in that area. And we've said long ago that we are not going to be a boston, will not be a new york city, but we have places of excellence. We have schools of excellence. We have gems that we need to develop. And this is one of the possibilities for us to be re strategic about what they are and to do what we need to do to do further research and development and technology transfers. The butell report said that, yes, we had challenges, but we also have an enormous potential. Not only do we have o.h.s.u., but we have o.g.i., we have p.s.u., and we have o.s.u. And that will provide us a critical mass of research needed as a first building block to the bioscience and the biotechnology expansion that we are hoping for. Based on that report, and the testimony we received from p.s.u. And o.h.s.u., and other community stakeholders, we amended the plan to include economic development policies and objectives in the city's comprehensive plan goal five to acknowledge our vision, our aspirations, to set the stage for growth and development of the sector. As you know, we talked this morning about what happened. About a year ago we were in a booming economy, year and a half. One of the best cities to create jobs and all of a sudden everybody is -- has seen a recession that has impacted all of us. I remember this in the '80s, in the legislature. We made a decision to diversify in high technology. That diversification decision in the '80s created boom that we lived under in the '90s. We now have to think about other diversification industries that we want to focus on. This is one of them. It will take longer than creative services. We were very successful in creative services, this will take a little longer, but have a big payoff. The butell report was also useful in confirming some of the information we heard from o.h.s.u. Regarding the need for quick and

JULY 10, 2002

reliable transportation from the hill all the way down to north macadam. The timing maximum timing travel time was 10-15 minutes. And that was a very important decision on our part to include the suspended cable transportation system. The transportation peer review group worked off the same assumption, made the same recommendation. We'll be talking about that a little later.

These facts led to my conclusion that in fact a suspended cable system was needed and should be supported by policy in the language of this plan. And that's what we did. Now let's talk about the good things. Because we heard a lot of negative comments from the community. Let's talk about the things we can celebrate together. Three acres of formal open space that will be requiring on the institutional campuses. We're rezoning 45 acres of environmentally significant land to open space.

And hopefully work together with the health sciences center and the city for conveying that property to us, or figuring out some other way that we can keep it permanently in open space. This was identified in all the discussion that we had with the community as one of their top priorities. And I think it's fair to say that that priority was met. We talked a lot about something that's very dear my heart, and that's design review. Now the design review will apply to all of the institutional growth on the hill, regardless of whether or not they're within the area covered by the terwilliger design overlay. So the expansion of design review has occurred. The environment has also been enhanced. We had long conversations about impervious surfaces, and not only through the rezoning of open space, but through green roofs, storm water management, and policy language supporting decreases in impervious areas. And if you are going to go for a gold -- is it gold? -- lead standard then we will have met that policy direction. I think overall this is an excellent plan. It's not everything to everyone. But it is comprehensive. It is well balanced. There'll be impacts, there'll be benefits. The council's job now is to fully understand both the impacts and the benefits, making policy decisions for the long-term future. We did that. Now it's up to all of us to make it work and to begin implementing it. Now my thanks. I heard a lot of discussion about the staff and about the work that the staff did and present to the planning commission. I want to say that susan hartnet, we give her the most difficult assignments. I can't promise you, susan, that you won't get another difficult assignment. Gil and I have not discussed that, but at least you won't get one for a month.

*****: Thank you. [laughter]

Katz: I'd like to thank --

Kelley: How about two weeks?

Katz: Two weeks. I'd like thank the planning commission. They did spend a lot of time on this plan on intricate details, and maybe perhaps too many intricate details, but they were committed to this project and I want to thank them. I want to thank troy and matt and gil and for everybody that was involved. And I certainly want to thank my betsy, and i'm going to lose my betsy, but she'll be here sitting on the other side of the table with these wonderful folks. You've all done a great job. This is just the beginning. And we have a long, long adventure together in the next couple of years. Aye. [gavel pounding] okay. Item 883.

Item 883.

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

Item 884.

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

Item 885.

Katz: What will do is have matt brown and pdot's consultant from Gmuender and then we'll have the Portland aerial transportation, the no tram incorporated, that will be larry beck and sean

JULY 10, 2002

brennan. The congregation, synagogue located on barber, and then friends of terwilliger. Jim, would you like to make a few comments?

Francesconi: Yeah. On this second tram, which i've already mentioned, we need to clearly proceed with the first tram and alignment. On this second tram issue, which I know has come up suddenly, I really think the issue of the alignment, whether it can be mitigated, how it can be mitigated, all those kinds of questions need further study, so I have an amendment here that says that. I just wanted the audience to know that. So afterwards, i'm going to introduce an amendment that does say that I think we need a second tram, but the alignment, if it can be mitigated, if it can be handled, so it only approves the concept as opposed to. Then there's other steps in the process. We need more work done on this, because I know it's come up suddenly, so i've asked transportation to do much more work on the second tram. I wanted people to know that ahead of time before you testified. Thank you, mayor.

Brant Williams, City Engineer: Okay. My name is brant williams. I'm the city engineer with the office of transportation. I just wanted to make a few comments before I turn it over to matt, our project manager.

Francesconi: Brant is the head of pdot now.

Williams: Starting monday. He's still here. The office of transportation has closely followed the marquam hill plan over the last 18 months. Our involvement increased when it became evident that the transportation connection between marquam hill and north macadam would likely either be built by or permitted by the city engineer's office. In order to provide a forum to gather information and have this discussion we presented to you back in -- at your may 23rd council meeting a process for evaluating transportation alternatives for this connection. You approved this process and also directed the office of transportation to initiate the project assessment phase and report back to you at -- on june 26th, which is what we did. Without a doubt, the time frame for doing this first phase was very aggressive. However, I believe we produced a solid report and recommendations based on our analysis of the six alternatives across the 30 different camera. The office of transportation's recommendation is to approve the alternative. That includes the gibbs street tram and the mono cable tram to barbur. Approving this recommendation today is an important step in providing the certainty to o.h.s.u. To advance its development plans in accordance with the marquam hill plan. It also allows staff to move forward where we'll have an opportunity to work closely with the community looking at specific design options for the approved system. This process will include a design competition and a very importantly will look at thorough consideration of the mitigation strategies. Finally, I want to mention that given the tight time frame for doing this work, that matt brown and his project team has done an exceptional job in pulling this together, and with that i'm going to turn it over to matt so he can go through the report and its recommendations with you.

Matt Brown, Project Manager, Office of Transportation: Thank you. Matt brown, project manager with the Portland office of transportation. I'm going to run through a fairly -- I hope to be a fairly brief power point presentation here. I'm also here with joe, a consultant on the tram and gondola alternatives that we looked at here. He's a designer for those kinds of systems. We'll be jumping back and forth with pieces of this. We have a lot of people, so if we want to get into more detail, we can maybe revisit that later, but i'll true give you an overview at this point. As was mentioned, the process for looking at this, these alternatives, was approved on may 23rd, and we were directed to return with a report by june 26th. We did that, bringing out a report on june 20th of this year. One of the things that has occurred over the last couple months is that Portland aerial transportation, inc., a nonprofit board, has been formed in response to the need for a project

JULY 10, 2002

sponsor and they're here today, as well to testify. They funded the study and funded the work, both of pdot as well as our consultant to produce the report.

Katz: Let me just add there, that I have -- too have an amendment that one of them -- one of two amendments, one that reflects that this is the organization that we'll be working with pdot.

Brown: Okay.

Katz: As a sponsor.

Brown: Thank you. And they will continue to act as a project sponsor, is our assumption as well.

Katz: Okay.

Brown: Just real briefly, I want to refer to our project team, because this really has been a group effort. I want to give a sense for the people involved in this. Within pdot, rob, city traffic engineer, steve, transportation planning, and a couple other folks, doug and john were incredibly helpful. And in the bureau of planning did a great job. Also have had a couple of consultant firms assist with some pieces of this. Again, i've already introduced joe. We've also asked eric and denise to assess economic implications of the work. We've also been working with partner agencies. Most specifically Portland development commission, tri-met and metro have all helped in one way or another to get us to where we are today. It's so it's been a real team effort. We've had a lot of support and help from others. Real briefly, just to put this process into context. As you know, we've just completed the marquam hill planning process and have the scts, the suspended cable transportation process. And the process we're talking about today regarding the tram is about a evaluation design issues related to those systems. As compared to the policy and regulatory side that we just went through the marquam hill plan. And these two pieces are really sort of -- will work together, I think, to support the recommendation that we're making today. Not going to get into the process too much, but as you know that we listed these steps when we came to you in may, and this is the process that you approved. Essentially we're making a recommendation through the city engineer. We asked for planning commission advice on this process as well, and incorporated the community planning commission advice as we went along. The phase that we're just wrapping up is really the second phase of this, which is the project assessment process, looking at establishing evaluation camera, looking at alternatives, and coming back with a recommendation to you for a public hearing and council decision. And today really our action is either to approve or reject the recommendation. I want to highlight a couple of assumptions that we made walking into this, because I think they're very important for the kinds of alternatives that we looked at, as well as some of the information. First, I think we stated that an o.h.s.u. Presence in north macadam is both desired and appropriate, and that is very important. Establishes the need for the connection. Second, that we've accepted the stated travel time needs of 10-15 minutes between these two areas. I want to point out that this travel time is total. It's not just the time you spend in the vehicle. It's the total amount of time that it takes you to get from one location to another location. So from your -- you're leaving to your destination. Another assumption is these systems would operate 18 hours a day and seven days a week. This is a dense and very -- yeah, that's our assumption. The fourth assumption that we drive our costs using information from tri-met and some of the assumptions about the regional transportation network as well were factored in. So how we modified the transportation network helped to form some of the costs that we came out of the back end of this with. Just to place this in context in the south Portland area, the science and technology corridor has been something discussed as part of the marquam hill planning effort. The north macadam area is reliant not just, we think on this connection between marquam hill and the north macadam district, but also on connections into downtown via streetcar, into the university district of p.s.u.,

JULY 10, 2002

and that can really become part of an overall strategy for the development of south Portland. I'm going to hand it over very briefly here to joe. He's going to walk us through some basic assumptions or some basic information about the differences in the aerial alternatives that we looked at, because I think it's very important to understand sort of the differences between the various aerial technologies.

Katz: Identify yourself for the record.

Joe Gmuender, Gmuender Engineering: I'm joe gmuender. I'm we studied three basic different types of aerial systems. In order to understand the conclusions as to which system was chosen it is important to understand the basic differences between them. The first system we looked at, one studied the most, is the aerial cable tram. This system uses the word bi-cable which means two cables. There are two -- there's one cable that's stationary that forms like a railroad track for the -- for the carrier, and another cable that pulls it. What this allows this system to do is span very great distances. And in the case of the -- the tram that we studied, it allows with one tower to span all the way from the north macadam area all the way up to the top of the hill. Cabin sizes on these types of vehicles range from 20 to 200 passengers. And the systems that have been studied for marquam hill have been around the 60-80 passenger cabin. One of the advantages of this system is that the terminal itself is fairly compact. In this picture you see essentially the mechanical system of the lift. They built no other structure around it. So both terminals are relatively compact. Because of the large cabin, the ride is also relatively more stable than you would have in the other alternatives that we're going to look at. While all these can be somewhat affected by wind, this cabin will provide the most comfortable ride of the systems we looked at. This is a quick shot of the top terminal. Once again, a fairly compact system. And we don't need just that mechanical stuff. It can be covered up with a -- or enclosed inside a building. This is a lift at stone mountain, georgia, outside of atlanta. The next system we looked at was an aerial mono cable tramway. This system is simpler and makes more sense on short runs. It uses one single rope that both suspends the carriers, as well as propels them, but because it is only one cable the size of the carrier is limited. So in order to achieve higher capacities you can group carriers together. In the case of the barbur marquam hill alignment this system seemed to make the most sense because of the short run and the capacities needed. It's also -- has the smallest footprint at either end. This is a shot of a typical top terminal. You can see it's a relatively compact structure. This is a shot of a bottom terminal, of an aerial mono cable tram. Another advantage with this system is that we're able to rise very quickly out of the lower station. And that can be an advantage in certain locations and the location on barbur is one of those.

Saltzman: How many people?

Gmuender: Normally you're limited to 12-16 passengers per cabin, but by adding additional cabins you can increase the capacity. Both the -- this aerial mono cable tram and the other one are known as reversibles. Which means essentially you have two cars that work at opposite ends, pass each other in the middle and pass to the opposite station. So it's a to-fro system. Therefore the longer the system is, capacities dropper. Shorter they are, the capacities go higher. So these are very effective on short runs, to obtain higher capacities. The next system is the aerial mono cable gondola. It's continually circulating and you have a series of cabins spread out along the system. This is a picture of a 12-passenger cabin. One difference in this technology is -- you can see in the area right here, where the carrier attaches to the cable, to the haul rope, is a detachable grip, a more complex piece of equipment and requires that when it comes into the stations that it disconnects from the cable, from the haul rope, and slows down. Because of that, you end up with this long machinery required at either end to slow the -- to detach the carrier and slow it down for

JULY 10, 2002

loading/unloading, and then speed it back up. In typical applications, these type of lifts can achieve very high capacities, higher capacities than appear to be required on any of the alignments we studied. At those high capacities, however, the cars never fully stop. The cars just go to a slow period. We studied a system that would allow the carriers to stop momentarily, but this system, it does have a disadvantage in comparison to the other systems in that the carrier is moving or only stopped for a short time while you load and unload. Here's a shot showing different -- showing a building over top of the mechanical equipment. And typically the -- the gondola-type lifts need some sort of support, usually at two ends to hold up the equipment. This is another shot of kind of a typical enclosure that manufacturers provide, economical solutions -- [no audio] [no audio]

Gmuender: Let me walk you through very briefly the six options that we looked at. Then I'll describe the recommendation. We can go from there. We looked at, in the first option, essentially a shuttle bus option. We looked at -- well, this is essentially the recommended route between marquam hill and north macadam. We also looked at three other routes in addition to this to get down there, all sorts of variations on the alignment to see if there were any advantages or disadvantages in terms of travel time to get to and from that area. The one -- again, the one in the magenta, sort of gets down -- that was more of our recommended one, also the same one that was looked at in the o.h.s.u. Analysis, the bucky analysis, was also the same one that the no tram folks looked at when they did their travel time runs. The second, just has a little bit of a hiccup, goes down kelly and gets down on hood a little different way. The third one in purple would bring buses down barbur to hamilton, back up corbett, before it comes back into the neighborhood. The fourth option looked at bringing buses out campus drive on terwilliger, down condor to hamilton. So -- I'm sorry, I think it's hamilton court to hamilton. So a number of different things we looked at. I think one advantage of the shuttle bus system, is if you did have something on the ross island bridge you could select another route to get to and from. Some of the problems, though, for instance choosing terwilliger as the route, has its own disadvantages as well. In general, for those four routes that we analyzed from marquam hill to north macadam, the average travel time in offpeak hours, so hours outside the p.m. Peak of say 4:30 to 5:30, sometime in there, about 9:55 in the vehicle. If you look at a total trip time, which includes walking to and from the stops, waiting for a vehicle to arrive, which we averaged that about 2« minutes, assuming you had a shuttle bus leaving every five minutes, that you can get to a total trip time about 19:05. During the peak hours that changes a little bit, because the vehicle time, in-vehicle time increases, so you can go to about 14 minutes in the vehicle and about 23:30 minutes for the total trip. Those are also going to be subject to congestion over time. We believe that p.m. Peak number will increase over time, probably by about four minutes on average over the next 20 years. When we looked at the initial capital costs of the shuttle bus system, be a one-time cost of purchasing six buses, plus some fairly minor improvements around some of the stops. A little over a million dollars. Annual operating costs of around \$2 million. That's based again on the 18-hour per day, seven day a week operation, maintaining five-minute headways for the shuttle bus system to make it comparable to the other systems that we are looking at. And when you look at those costs averaged over a 30-year cycle, it comes to just over \$2 million a year. It's the least expensive of the options that we looked at. Option two, the gibbs street tram, this was the option that was originally proposed by o.h.s.u. Essentially is a bi-cable tram, linking marquam hill down to north macadam. It would land on gibbs street bone bonn and moody. For things staying south of the ross island bridge, that's been the landing we've assumed for all the aerial systems. It also has -- oops. Sorry. Also would have one tower as joe mentioned. Just to the east of macadam avenue in gibbs. Towers, plus or minus 185 feet. So it's on the east side of macadam. In this process we've actually looked at the upper

JULY 10, 2002

terminus and feel that the tram can incidentally integrate into the landing itself without an additional tower on the uphill side. So one tower on that system. In general, this is sort of a cross-section taken at a low point near water street. It's about 67 feet from the ground. Now that low point is determined by a fully loaded tram, coming to an emergency stop at that exact point. More generally, if the tram just traveling overhead, over that point, it would be about 12-13 feet higher than that. So getting closer to 80 feet is where you'd see the tram probably 99.9% of the time. 67 feet is a full emergency stop at that point along the alignment. And that tram would be visible from some parts of the blocks, but not all of the adjacent blocks. The average travel time on the tram would be about 2.8 minutes within the vehicle and about 12.6 minutes for a total trip time, including walking to and from and waiting for the vehicle. And the initial capital costs, a little over \$10 million. Annual operating costs, nearly \$2.4 million. Over a lifecycle, assuming again a 30-year cycle, about \$2.6 million. The option three, which is the recommended option, we'll get to in a little bit, is the same tram that we just described along gibbs street, but in addition to that we're suggesting that a mono cable tram down to barbur be included with that. The primary reason is that we have an incredible amount of traps sit service along barbur. In the future we see that continuing to increase and continuing to be an important transit corridor serving southwest Portland. And the ability to create a fast and efficient link to marquam hill from that area we think is well worth looking at and well worth serving. When you look at the mono cable tram as it passes over terwilliger, the tower itself is about 155 feet above terwilliger. One of the reasons that the tower's required in that location is we've tried to do two things, we've tried to basically avoid doing any kind of clear-cut situation where we're trying to -- where we would impact the trees and that. So the tradeoff was sort of tower versus trees within the parkway. So that's what's driven this design a little bit. The second thing that the mono cable tram begins to do is it begins to we think alleviate some of the pressure on terwilliger itself, in terms of bus traffic. We know that a lot of the number 8s actually come down today through the campus drive on to terwilliger. We think that providing this transportation link is going to lessen the demand for even something as simple as the number 8. You wouldn't have these 2-3 buses following each other up the hill during peak hours. You could alleviate some of that using this mono cable tram. So the alignment of landing locations were essentially chosen to try to alleviate as many of those impacts on terwilliger as possible. Again, the gibbs street tram portion of this is the same as we just talked about, but on the mono cable tram itself it's about a minute and a half trip up the hill. About an 8-minute total trip trying to get to and from the two landing areas. Looking at then the total project cost for both, we're looking at initial capital costs of \$15.8 million, annual operating costs of \$2.8 million, and an annual lifecycle cost, about 2.4 million. The reason this number is lower than that of that gibbs street tram, just by itself, in terms of the lifecycle costs, is that we've been able to look at the regional transportation system and think more -- I guess more globally about how we can make that more efficient. So instead of routing in a very time-consuming and cost-ineffective manner, routing express buses to the top of marquam hill, we can basically bring them to this point, save a lot of time, save a lot of money, to create a more efficient transfer. In addition, you also have more demand coming from the other bus lines in here and we'd be able to achieve some savings in that way. Go ahead.

Katz: Go ahead.

Saltzman: Do we have an input from tri-met on verifying that?

Brown: Yes.

Saltzman: In terms of travel demand and passenger behavior. I mean, I know on paper it looks good to take a bus down barbur and switch to a mono cable at the top of the hill, but in practice will

JULY 10, 2002

transit riders do that? I mean, tri-met has a lot of knowledge to that respect. Do we know anything about that from them?

Brown: Yes. And they're here today as well and we can probably get them up here to discuss that a little bit more.

Saltzman: Okay.

Brown: Option four looked at the same gibbs street alignment, but using a gondola instead. So it lands at the same point, both above and below. The difference here is with a gondola you can easily integrate a midpoint stop as joe was going through the differences with the gondola and tram. To pick up those transit trips at barbur and to begin to serve this, integrate this more into the regional transportation system we looked at an additional stop there. There would also be about seven towers associated with this. They're shown in the purple boxes there along the alignment. So the number of towers obviously goes up as compared to the tram. You have more towers in the neighborhood. This is an example -- in order to say keep gibbs street open along the alignment, this is an example of a tower near water street. Have to come up with some sort of design that would essentially create a way for traffic to move underneath the tower. It would be sort over the street. That tower is about 140 feet tall at that location. On the midpoint stop at barbur, joe mentioned that you need about a 200-foot run to sort of accommodate the mechanical equipment. Having the stop there would essentially require us to build a structure over barbur, an overpassing of barbur to accommodate both the area for the station, for loading an unloading, but also to support the mechanical equipment itself. So when you look at it in a cross-section, you'd actually have this sort of layer, this structure sitting over the top of barbur boulevard. On this gondola, the average travel time is about seven minutes. The reason for the increase in the vehicle time, travel along here, is that you have that midpoint stop that forces you to slow down and speed back up as you enter and leave the midpoint station. So, you know, the tram is obviously just going to point a to point b. Doesn't have a slowdown point in between. It's about a 14-minute total trip. One advantage of the gondolas is there's less time to wait for a vehicle. So your waiting time for a vehicle to come along is less than that of a tram. The initial capital costs for this are higher. On the order of \$17.75 million. Annual operating costs of \$3.75 million. Over the life cycle, you can bring that number down a little bit, but still relative high compared to the others. We looked at two other options that attempted to take advantage of the ross island bridge ramps to see if there was a way to minimize some of the neighborhood impacts for the aerial systems. One was looking at a tram alignment which does not allow you flexibility in the -- in the alignment. You have to go from point a to point b. So in this case the tram would land on the north side of the ross island bridge. It would require some property acquisition, especially to the west of naito parkway, as well as a little pit just to the north of the ross island bridge ramps. Again, we could probably accomplish this with one tower to the east side of the i-5 corridor. Average travel time in this would be around three minutes in the vehicle. A little under 15 minutes for the total trip. A lot of the capital costs associated with this are sort of the upfront property acquisitions. That's why this is much higher than the gibbs street tram option. It's about \$21.6 million. Annual operating costs are essentially the same as the gibbs street tram. And the lifecycle costs then are a bit higher, \$2.6 million over a 30-year cycle. And option six, which is looking at using the gondola and using the flexibility that a gondola system could provide, again, takes us more to the ross island bridge ramp area, having a turn station at barbur, and a turn station near i-5. Essentially run along the grover street right-of-way on the south side of the ross island bridge ramps there. And one of the things we wanted to look at there with that is not only can we minimize the impacts, but can we look at how this integrates into potentially the south Portland circulation study improvements and does this

JULY 10, 2002

coordinate well with those. So that's one of the reasons for the alignment that was chosen as we did. There's also the blue dot in the middle, which represents the potential to integrate a stop, you know, in the heart of the neighborhood there as part of the south Portland circulation study. So it's also possible to even add at a future date a stop into the gondola alignments. Flexible in that regard. Again, there's probably -- I think there's one more tower on this. I believe there's eight towers along this align. We also looked at two options. Because you need to integrate a turn station you get over towards i-5, you also have flexibility on whether you take this north or south of the ross island bridge. So you can really, you know, take it from that turn station, you can take it to any point north macadam. Similar to the gibbs street gondola this would have a midpoint stop at barbur, also be a turn point at that location. You can see in the dashed-out line area some property acquisition would be necessary near that location. It would be a structure over barbur is how you would house that. Just the idea that potentially in this mid-neighborhood stop that the gondola could be integrated in some way to development within that area that we freed up by the south Portland circulation studies. There's a possibility that this is flexible later on to coordinate with those kinds of things in the neighborhood. One of the down -- or I guess one of the downsides to this alternative is that the number of turn stations and -- on the alignment that we've chosen, that the travel time begins to go up significantly, around nine minutes in the vehicle and about 18 minutes on the total trip. That could be alleviated if you just chose one central midpoint turning station and one angle point in the alignment, but these times assume that there's two. The initial capital costs would be nearly \$30 million for this -- this improvement. Annual operating costs would be higher than the other gondola because of the additional turn stations at around \$3.7 million. Over the lifecycle, it would again approach the \$3.7 million. This was actually the most expensive of the alternatives that we looked at in terms of lifecycle costs. When we went through, then, and took each one of those alternatives and analyzed them across a number of issues, just to give you a sense for the range of things we looked at, we looked at neighborhood impacts, including visual, sound, property values. We looked at transportation access and efficiency, how well does the system integrate with our transportation system, clean air transportation system. How feasible is the system really in terms of being able to build it as it relates to property acquisition or the availability of property. The implementation costs, what it takes to construct. The maintenance and operations, there's significant differences in how some of these systems would be maintained and operated. And public safety issues related to all of the systems. At the end, what we -- what we recommend is that the gibbs street tram, the mono cable tram to barbur, be forwarded as our preferred approach for connecting these two areas. And this is really based -- it's based on a number of areas. I'm just going to highlight a few of those right now. First of all, on travel time. Clearly the gibbs street tram meets the travel time needs the best of the alternatives that we studied. Between marquam hill and north macadam. Transit access. The gibbs street tram in and of itself links to other improvements that we have planned, like streetcar, surface transit, that we would anticipate bringing into north macadam. But the addition of the barbur street tram really -- the barbur transit corridor and bringing the mono cable tram down to barbur really helps to tie this into another piece and probably a larger piece of the regional transportation system and a piece that we can -- that we would see continuing to grow over time. And that is the barbur boulevard transit corridor. In terms of neighborhood livability, we think that this system has less impacts than many of the others that we looked at. And should be -- should be recommended on that basis. The maintenance considerations, especially when you compare this to the gondola system, clearly the tram systems are going to be less problematic in terms of maintenance, more cost efficient in terms of maintenance. Long-term costs analysis, again, by capturing some of the costs over the long

JULY 10, 2002

term, of integrating the system with a regional transportation network, and by choosing an appropriate technology that is more efficient, more reliable to maintain the system wins out. And on the development impact side, clearly this -- this system has the most potential for us to achieve the kinds of things we'd like to see achieved on marquam hill and north macadam and we have denise whitney is here if you have questions in terms of the economic impacts of this.

Katz: Okay. Let's open up the lights. Are you done? Do you want them to come up and --

Brown: I just had a couple next steps I wanted to highlight, sort of where we're headed on this.

Katz: Okay, go ahead.

Brown: The next steps we feel -- you know, this has been a quick process. But it's not -- this is the beginning of a conversation. I mean, I think we're going to continue to be working with the neighbor as we go there you this, working with our partners on this. We would see that the next piece of this really is moving into the design, developmental phase, continuing to work on this project and to define the design a little bit more. That includes things as a design competition for this. This needs to be -- you know, have the best design minds attack this. Working at some potential mitigation for the project and figuring out how this project will be funded, built and paid for.

Katz: Okay. That's it? Yeah, let me just add that I think there are a couple of amendments. I think you've seen them all.

*****: Uh-huh.

Katz: The one that commissioner Francesconi just raised, commissioner Saltzman has one. And you've seen mine -- the two of mine?

Brown: Yes.

Katz: Okay. And so you've looked at it technically?

Brown: Yes.

Katz: Okay. Why don't we hand them out among ourselves so at least the council knows what we're talking about. Just for the audience, there's one on the property acquisition, the second tram and i've got the recognition of patty, and also added that some of the mitigation order ought to include mitigation of the south Portland circulation study, so that that's in the resolution. Okay. And so we'll talk about that after we hear the testimony and then we'll try to fit it in if the council approves all of them or if they have any more to fit it in and adopt them. Okay? All right. We've given ten minutes to the Portland aerial transportation, inc., no tram, inc., a congregation, and friends of terwilliger. Friends of terwilliger here? Because they weren't confirmed. I know that there's some neighborhoods that want to know why they didn't get ten minutes. We don't do that as a matter of fact. We gave the neighborhoods 15 minutes last time, and that was a decision of the council, wants to give the neighborhoods five minutes, that would be fine too. We'll talk about it when we get there. Portland aerial transportation.

Pat LaCrosse, President, Board of Directors, Portland Aerial Transportation: Madame mayor, members of council. My name is pat la crosse. I'm president of the board of Portland aerial transportation incorporated, known as the paddy board. We are recently formed by a number of community leaders with a goal to assume the role of sponsoring the tram through design and construction. You have a list of our board members and our statement of purpose. And we have additional lists if you'd like to look at them again. We also have a number of our board members present today, and i'd like to make you aware of that. As we saw the tram idea emerge last year, we saw the opportunity to achieve a true community asset. Our board is a group of people focused on organizing for a major design competition and assisting the city by financing the work the office of transportation just completed. With the council than's approval of the tram, we will expand our

JULY 10, 2002

board to fully reflect broader interests of the community in the next phase of the work. We are ready to start a design competition for the tram and discuss how the tram will be owned and operated. Gordon Davis, Paddy's secretary, will describe our approach and the status of the planning and funding of that process. Portland is a great city and we have a great history of great vision and leadership. Great cities are great because they have the leadership to achieve their visions, even in the face of criticism, and even sometimes because of it. In the face of often strident debate, we believed in our vision and trusted our political leadership to balance the interests of the entire community. By itself, the tram may not be one of our visions, however it is a critical factor in achieving the vision of a strong employment base within the central city, coupled with a transportation system that allows us transportation choices. As the Paddy board discussed the tram, we also discussed what is happening in this part of our community. It is certainly no surprise to the people that live and work in this area that has a community we have created a situation where people in the homestead, Over Terwilliger, Lair Hill, Fulton Parks, Johns Landing and North Macadam areas cannot move freely east to west. The access of citizens of southwest Portland to the river is greatly restricted. Reconnecting these neighborhoods to the river and defining regional transportation from neighborhood traffic needs to be a high priority. The South Portland circulation plan has several projects that begin to do this. The plan for pedestrian crossing of I-5 is one. An increase in transit service to North Macadam is another. The tram will be yet one more way to create new east-west connections. It will take all of these projects and more to reconnect these neighborhoods. Your decision to accept the city engineer's recommendation and move forward with the tram is a critical step. The board is ready to organize and manage a major design competition for the tram and to fully engage the community through that process. As your resolution directs, along with the PDOT staff, we will come back to the council in September with a complete outline of that process. We're well into the planning of that effort now and Gordon will give you more information in just a second. And finally, myself and the board members want to thank you for your leadership and vision. As the Mayor has said on several occasions, there is nothing more important for the future economic vitality of Portland than the Oregon Health Sciences University. You have made the important decision on the Marquam Hill plan and we urge you now to make the important decision approving the tram. Paddy is ready to give leadership to implementing your decision. Thank you.

Katz: Pat, we don't have your list of board members. Do you have extra lists?

LaCrosse: I'll get that for you in a second.

Katz: Okay.

LaCrosse: I could rattle them off for you if you'd like.

Katz: Go ahead. It would be easier.

LaCrosse: It includes myself as chair, and Bob Gerding, Homer Williams, Jay Zidell, present today, Nancy Stuber, Dike Dane, and who else?

*******:** And Greg Baldwin, and Steve Stadem from O.H.S.U., and Mike Lindbergh.

Katz: Thank you. Go ahead.

Gordon Davis, Secretary, Portland Aerial Transportation: My name is Gordon Davis. Today I've got a slightly different hat than I usually have, and that is I'm testifying today in my role as secretary to Patti. Specifically I'll tell about our plans to proceed with the design competition for the tram. Clearly with your approval today we're setting out on a course to design a transportation project that's unique, innovative and something as the Mayor has said will very likely end up on a postcard of Portland in the future. It's a project that's worthy of as much attention to its design as

JULY 10, 2002

we've given to making this decision that we have before us today. Something happened to the mic?

Katz: We lost you. Is it back on?

Davis: Pati sees this challenge and opportunity and agrees with those in the community that say that the design of the tram and the process by which we design it is worthy of a carefully-managed process. We've given considerable thought in the last several months to how to do that. Under the leadership of paddy board member greg baldwin, from the architectural firm, and with advice of brad from allied works, and with the paddy board and other individuals weighing in on how the process might be managed, we've come up with at least a preliminary outline on what we think the design competition will be. The competition process begins with the hiring of a competition manager. This must be an individual with the experience and contacts to entice international and national designers who are being sought worldwide to compete in competitions for many different projects. To a certain degree, even as exciting as this project is, we have to sell this project to those people who are really looking -- or being sought after to do these things of very innovative and very high-profile projects around the world. We've solicited the interest from two individuals to fill that role. One is from Portland and is one of our community's senior architects who's practice includes the managing of these types of design competitions, and he's done over 45 national and international competitions over the last number of years. The second is an individual who has just left his position as the editor for a major international architectural magazine, and is now consulting on design competitions throughout the world. With the council's approval today, the paddy board is meeting tomorrow and is prepared to make a decision on the selection of a competition manager and to engage this person quickly to begin to formally organize the competition process. Our preliminary outline for how this competition would work will first involve identifying and soliciting from a list of 12-15 design teams those who may be interested or potentially interested in this project. Those will be screened to 4-5 design teams who will actually be asked to compete in the process. They will be given -- those 4-5 teams will be given a stipend level of funding to enter the competition. They'll be asked to develop and present their ideas to a select jury on the understanding of the design problem, how they would go about doing the design, understand their concepts for the design itself. And the jury will be formed, including individuals from within and outside the community. The jury will then recommend to the paddy board the selection of the team to ultimately design the system. At this point we've developed the following criteria for selection of the design team. One is the quality of their experience in this type of very unique sort of design. Secondly is the quality of their actual ideas about this design. And third, the quality of their design approach, including their understanding of the design problem, their understanding of the context in Portland within which this problem and facility will exist, and their excitement to engaging the community as they develop the design, and finally their ability to be effective in selling the ideas they come forward with. With the design competition manager decision tomorrow, we expect to have that individual begin immediately to more fully develop the scope of the competition and be prepared to come back to council on september 25th. These type of design competitions are not cheap, however. To get the best to even consider competing, not only must the project be enticing, but we must provide them some financial support as well. There are other opportunities in the design competition to bring these national and international people into the community and engage them in educational and other kinds of programs while this is going on, all of which does cost some money. The paddy board is committed to provide a significant amount of the funding for this competition, but will be seeking mapping contributions from the city and community because we believe ultimately the design competition needs to have broad

JULY 10, 2002

community support. This is one of those rare opportunities that communities have to create a high-impact design for a very unique facility. The space needle, the st. Louis arch, the statue of liberty and eiffel tower are certainly all landmarks familiar to people worldwide. More recent examples include the tower in spain, the milwaukee art museum, the museum in spain, the stuttgart tower in germany, and numerous others all of which are significant in their impact and image to the communities they represent. This is our opportunity and paddy is ready to begin.

Katz: Questions?

Francesconi: Just one question and then one comment -- well, two comments. First, there's got to be some significant landmark in italy you could add to your list.

Davis: Believe me, we'll find it.

Francesconi: And also, barbara walker, is he she on your board? I see she's there.

Davis: We've talked with barbara on a number of occasions much she's not officially on our board, but given her thoughts on many occasions.

Francesconi: My question is -- I don't know what hat you're wearing now, maybe your other hat. So has o.h.s.u. Put some money into this thing and if so how much?

Davis: O.h.s.u. Is a board member of the paddy board. And what the paddy board has done has committed to providing funding for at least half of the design competition. Now we've developed an outlined budget at this point, but we'll really wait for the competition manager to help us flush that out. We think the total competition is probably somewhere in the \$300,000 range.

Francesconi: Okay. My request, and maybe it's there, because I haven't seen it, but I would request -- for two reasons -- that ms. Zantner be talked to. There's a couple reasons. One is with terwilliger parkway, and what potential effect on it, but the second thing is she's managed design competitions in parks and we've brought in super people. She also knows how to do that. So that's my request.

Davis: Actually barbara and I were talking about that exactly this morning.

Saltzman: So when you say the tram, what do you mean?

Davis: Will well, we're waiting for the -- well, you're talking about what the scope of the design is?

Saltzman: Mainly i'm thinking of the barbur boulevard, the mono cable. When you speak of the tram, are you speaking of now a system that includes --

Davis: That's the council's decision at this point. We're not -- we're neutral on at least the question of the detail. If the council decides today --

Saltzman: But that will be included in the design competition?

Davis: Yeah. The critical thing to us is that if there is to be a two-tram system, as the engineer is recommending, then we need very quickly, if not today, within two months, to know that in fact a second system is going to be in place, because it directly affects the upper terminus. The lower terminus and the alignment of that can still be studied and played with a bit, but that upper terminus, if it has two systems landing, we need to know that fairly soon, so we can develop that as part of the scope of the design competition. Now if the rest of the -- if the second tram remains in the recommendation and moves forward, and does so in a way that's timely, then we can include that total system, including the lower terminus as part of the scope as well.

Saltzman: And what's the significance of september 25th?

Davis: That's actually in the resolution, when we are directed with pdot to come back to you to talk about the design competition. That's with we would really kick it off pretty officially at that point and begin to bring the 4-5 teams into the process and get it moving forward. So that's what we're expecting to be able to do at that point.

JULY 10, 2002

Saltzman: Just offhand, who knows this, what's the date for the mou to come back to you?

Katz: End of september, early october, I think. About the same, roughly the same time.

Saltzman: Final question. Maybe this should be directed to pat. Former pdc executive director. I'm concerned about condemnation and the potential use of it and building any -- in building any aspect of the tram, but particularly the barbur boulevard terminus. Right now I would probably oppose any use of condemnation. I just wanted to know, is that -- where are you on that?

*****: Well --

Saltzman: Where is pati on that I should say?

LaCrosse: Commissioner, pati is a nonprofit. As a nonprofit it would not have any authority --

Saltzman: I know it would not, but it would come to us and have our ear.

LaCrosse: I mean, we have not thought that far ahead. I think that really is a decision for the council to make. Clearly the tram that's recommended is in the gibbs right-of-way, and that's the main route. The other route, I know there's an amendment that's been discussed that would cause additional study to take place over the course of the next two years -- two months, leading up to the september date. And during that time period all of these issues could be looked at.

Saltzman: So you're not willing to say you would not support use of condemnation? I mean, that has been a council trend. In the interstate renewal area, we've taken that policy at the outset.

LaCrosse: Commissioner, i'm not in a position to indicate one way or another what is really a council decision.

Francesconi: I'm in a position to say that.

Saltzman: Are you?

Francesconi: And, you know, that's why we want to study the alternatives. That's why we've already met with the synagogue to try to work this out. I can't imagine that we would condemn this.

Sten: We're not condemning the synagogue.

Saltzman: I'd probably to like to add some language to the amendment.

Katz: All right, folks, we haven't even decided whether there will be a second tram. Before you even get into the issues of condemnation, we ought to at least make that decision first.

Saltzman: I do think it's appropriate, though, to establish that ground rule. I'll offer some language.

Katz: All right. I can't recall the last time we actually condemned something, so --.

Saltzman: Let's keep it that way.

Katz: All right.

*****: Thank you.

Katz: All right. No tram. Larry and sean?

Larry Beck: I'm pleased to note before we start, hopefully this doesn't count against my ten minutes, that my sister has just arrived from Washington, d.c. She spent a lot of time doing -- covering government meetings, working for nbc and other news outlets, and so --

Katz: Will well, welcome.

Beck: She's a professor of journalism. And she always brings the heat. That's why it's 100 degrees here.

Katz: Where is she? Timing is everything, larry.

Beck: Going upstairs.

Katz: We welcome her. If she wants to testify, she can sign up.

Beck: She's here as a visitor. So thank you very much. Thank you very much, larry beck. I live on southwest corbett and gibbs. Here as part of the tram presentation today. There's a number of

JULY 10, 2002

comments that we've submitted to matt brown and pdot about this project. We'll all know that matt is very capable, very nice man, who's been given an impossible task to do in a unreasonable period of time. And that's the report that we have today. I'm going to hit 4-5 topics and very generally talk about this process. First of all, the general need for this tram at all, let alone now, has still not been established throughout all this process. We have to question why there's such a rush to judgment about this tram. We're not talking about a system that has to be built now to serve an existing pressing need. There's no current need, as there's no o.h.s.u. Presence on north macadam. We're talking about a 30-year plan after all. There's nothing, you know, absolutely nothing that's been presented to date in any study, any testimony before planning commissioner here to refute the obvious that o.h.s.u. Can connect at a minimum for now, or the next 5-10-15 years with buses and without a tram. Make them prove their present need with real world data. Not with projections. Pdot confirmed the study we did about the shuttle bus connection that do meet o.h.s.u.'s stated objectives, so we have to disagree with that conclusion if matt indicates they do not. It certainly meets it during the morning and evening commutes, and easily throughout the day when most of the commutes would be done by these research doctors. You also need to look at impacts that our neighborhood will feel, both the real and perceived impacts of this tram versus bus option. Again, the buses will meet those objectives, so they're not only acceptable alternative, but really the preferred alternative, because you don't have those adverse neighborhood consequences with the bus. The impacts of this on our existing neighborhoods and the community we feel there, that's my second point. I think in the pdot report they've really done everything they can to minimize our -- the impacts of a tram on a neighborhood, and maximize the impacts of a shuttle. That just isn't the case. You look at planning commission, you look at the testimony here, how many people have come in from the neighborhoods complaining about a tram, how many have come in complaining about buses? You know, it's just -- that's obvious. That's real -- the real sense of what's going on in the neighborhood, not some imagined sense from the pdot report. We've worked hard in our neighborhood, our oldest Portland suburb, to build a neighborhood, and it's much more than bricks and mortar and shingles and wood frame houses. Our children are born there. We've put down roots there. Financial exception that we may be entitled to isn't enough if we lose that neighborhood, whether we stay or whether we go. We already live with a large amount of surface traffic and we can live with a reasonable amount of traffic, because we already do, and we do need help with transportation fixes, south Portland traffic study. We worry about parking with a second tram, that we may end up being o.h.s.u.'s satellite parking lot, even though we have an area permit parking program, because you have to park there for two hours, ride the tram, visit your doctor, go to classes, you can visit and you park in our neighborhood, and then we can't. The speed of this process. There's been a lot of talk about how quickly it's gone, and pdot's acknowledged that. We have to ask why. You've seen "the Oregonian" editorial from over the weekend, "willamette week's" article last week. Why are we going so quickly? What is the rush? We have to agree. Again, we repeat the obvious, what we've said previously, there's no pressing immediate need for this connection and we can wait. There are costs beyond just infrastructure and operations costs, which have not been considered as part of this process and really need to, and is there a realistic solution to deal with those costs and a source of funds to pay for them? Other people will talk about that today. I don't think pdot addressed those other costs and they need to be factored in. There are right-of-way acquisition costs. And that could be a 10, 15, \$20 million item that's not included. It exists with the tram. Doesn't exist with buses. Other costs, south Portland circulation study that you approved august a year ago, at least accepted, 28-30 million dollars. The utility undergrounding, 1.5 to \$2 million. What's going to happen when we've got things dropping from

JULY 10, 2002

cars, grease and oil dropping from cars? We've got some type of fund to compensate property owners for that type of damage. Pedestrian access over i-5 is something that's been talked about and needs to be dealt with. Briefly i'll touch on biotech. This might not be the end-all, and be-all, and the city should participate and o.h.s.u. Should participate in that, but should we put all our eggs in one basket? It's going to foreclose other options. I think that's very important that we don't put it all there. Real generally, I want to talk about the whole process and I think the recognition that this council needs to make, that we're having logic and reason take a holiday if we approve these plans. You've already approved marquam hill, but if you approve the tram plan. I think we're only doing it because o.h.s.u. Insists on it. I don't think that's good leadership from this council. I think we need more from you on that. I don't think we feel this process has been a fair and full process. It's been a process in name only because the code says we have to have one. That's really all it's been. I really think that that's a unforgivable for the council. There's been positive comments about planning commission today, but really the work was ignored. Their work was ignored dealing with the marquam hill plan, and I would wonder why those nine volunteers spent all those hours when their work is so routinely ignored, particularly as they're working on the second half of this plan, north macadam. And finally in conclusion, I think we'll say that we're always -- we have been, we'll continue to be, opponents of the tram system because it's not necessary. And we really hope that one of you, or two of you, and we'd love to have all of you, recognize that. To lead for the city, to make a difference for our neighborhood, for o.h.s.u. And the city. And be able to say when we're done with this that Portland is the city that works rather than the city that works you over, which is what we feel it's been. Thank you.

Katz: [applause]

Katz: No, no.

Sean Brennan: Sean brennan, 20 southwest gibbs. We used to joke among ourselves that this exercise was in futility. We didn't really believe that no one in city government would pay the slightest attention to our concerns, even when presented with laughable transparent self-justifications masquerading as studies, all of which have characterized the process in these hearings, we still clung to the hope that someone would give us an honest hearing. We know better now. We didn't start believing with critics of the city administration that it was impossible to be heard unless you were politically connect, moneyed or powered or all three. I'd wager we all voted for you, even in the last election, but if this is how you treat your supporters, it's a wonder your critics aren't down here. I don't think any of you have any real appreciation for the found anger that you've fostered among hundreds of constituents. You haven't bothered to find out, but you don't need to be a psychic that the anger is increasing and spread. Yesterday the "Portland tribune" carried a piece that lambasted this council for its deaf hear about the colombia hill development. It's become a pattern for you. Marquam hill and o.h.s.u. Are only symptoms of how broken government in this city is. The sweetheart deals with the well connected didn't start with north macadam. Now we have this utterly cynical office of transportation report to contend with. Its flaws are glaring and evident. Here are the two more egregious of them. The calls for your disfavored alternatives, shuttle buses are inflated. As we pointed out to pdot repeatedly, a contractor eager for the o.h.s.u. Shuttle bus already exists, but o.h.s.u. Simply dismissed its offer. Pdot didn't who it, and raz transportation was kind enough to provide an estimate for us with a fleet of six buses, enough to meet o.h.s.u.'s capacity needs that works out to an annual cost of \$1,149,750. That's assuming 365 days, seven days, for 18 hours. There's no cost for fleet maintenance, no cost for buses reserve, any of that, no capital costs. The costs for alternative fuel buses would be higher, but not nearly the annual cost of \$2 million that pdot projects. The cost for

JULY 10, 2002

the tram is whole unworkable, since o.h.s.u. Will have to find a way to get people to the tram terminals. We have an existing model for tram costs in the roosevelt island tram in new york city. The route there is approximately the same length and capacity is nearly the same and many of the other particulars are similar. But that tram's operating costs run at \$3 million per year for a single tramway, much like the one proposed to run over gibbs street. This tram actually charges \$1.50 per way fare. These are expenses for a tram constructed for \$5 million in 1976, simply adjusting for inflation puts that cost today at \$20 million. Expected costs of constructing this tram is a low 12-\$16 million, another crock of wishful thinking. With regard to the roosevelt island tram, we also have a quote who says that people running the tram tying traffic on the east side for a day and managed to repeat their catastrophe for a second time before they got it right. No roosevelt island administration has been able to keep the tram running.

Katz: Your time is up.

Brennan: I'll finish this thought, this quote. I don't know why anybody should be surprised at this. The responsible agencies were established. The tram has always lurched from one neighborhood agency to the next and no wonder. No one knows how to run a tram as a way of mass transit. That's new york's experience with the tram for over 25 years' worth. How do we expect that we're going to be doing it better without any experience here? What kind of kool-aid are we drinking here in.

Katz: Thank you.

Saltzman: What was the operating cost number from raz?

Brennan: \$1.1 million approximately, per year. And that's no capital costs.

Katz: Thanks.

Beck: I meant to say at the outset that our group would oppose condemnation as well, so we're with you, commissioners.

Francesconi: We agree on something. That's good.

Katz: Okay. The next is congregation, richard, sybil and ralph.

Richard Matza: Thank you for allowing us to testify. My name is richard matza. I represent the congregation. On my left is ralph funes and to my right sybil barrier, also members of the task force.

Katz: Let's start all over on the time. Let me remind you all have ten minutes. There's a little timer on there. I've never seen you here before. That's why I wanted to remind you.

Matza: That's okay. We'll abide by the time. Thank you. Honorable mayor and city council, what i'd like to today is tell you a little bit who we are, what our special needs are, what our current situation is, and what our position is regarding the acquisition proposal and the conditions of an acquisition. We're testifying today as appointed representatives of our synagogue. We are here to inform you of our thoughts and our considerations regarding the proposed mono cable tram which is proposed to be constructed on our synagogue site. Our testimony today is conditioned on the vote of our members and we reserve the right for further testimony and to change our position, if necessary, as our members may direct us. Our current situation is this -- we were surprised to learn through "the Oregonian" newspaper that our synagogue was being considered for a transit station by pdot. This was no prior notice given to us by city staff, not even the courtesy of a telephone call. Of course, this came as a shock to our membership. We had to contact pdot and can for a meeting to be performed about the situation. Therefore our first request of you is you keep us involved in your process as it relates to our property and communicate with us fully, honestly and consistently. Now let me tell you who we are. We are jews. We are of spanish descent and trace our roots back to the time of the spanish inquisition and expulsion from spain of our ancestors to all

JULY 10, 2002

regions of the mediterranean. Our synagogue is a unique institution, serve mediterranean jews with descent from turkey, the island of rhodes, persia, morocco and israel. We have separate and unique religious rights, separate food from the european jews. We do not speak yiddish. Our prayers and pronunciation vary from those of the european jews. We cannot be integrated into that continue to retain our culture. We are the only sephardic congregation between seattle and san francisco. Portland is only one of a dozen cities in the united states that has a sephardic community. As stated in the attached letter from the Oregon board of rabbis, we are, quote, the jewel of the Portland jewish community. The sephardic jews have special requirements, as our religious laws are different from the european jews. Construction of buildings are usually in a moorish style with domed roofs, special acoustics are needed, two separate kitchens with separate appliances for dairy and meat and special seating sections for men, women and families. Any relocation program must consider the special needs of our congregation. We have had some historical experience with the urban renewal. Our first sephardic synagogue was displaced and destroyed by the city of Portland urban renewal project in south Portland during the 1950s and 1960s. Without a house of worship for four years as a result. We lost half of our membership. We suffered severe financial hardship. It was a disaster. It cannot be allowed to happen again. We cannot be allowed without a place to pray for even one week. We had to initiate legal action in federal court in order to restore our community and rebuild our synagogue, and we won. We are prepared to do the same thing again if necessary, but that's not our real desire. Our real desire is to work with the city than a plan that guarantees that each party comes up as a winner. The jewish community reaction has been that the total jewish community is concerned for us and is mobilized in our support. Although we have not contacted the media or joined the neighborhood coalitions against the tram, we have received offers of assistance and support. We have enclosed a news article with our testimony with a photo from the "Portland jewish review" newspaper which reinforces the concern of the community. The article states, and I quote, "what's the city got against us?" unquote. Furthermore, the Oregon board of rabbis and the jewish federation of Portland has stepped forward with moral support reinforcing that we are a jewel in the fabric of jewish life in Oregon. It adds to the rich diversity in Portland. It's a home no middle east jews, as well as several generations of Portland jews who have built the congregation. Now let me get to our positions a congregation. We are very happy with our present location. We have no need to relocate. In fact, we're in the middle of a capital campaign to renovate our building and hire a rabbi. Within the last two years, we've installed a new roof, new doors, applied new paint to the interior and exterior. We've upgraded our kitchen than and appliances. We've installed a new gas furnace and air-conditioning system. We have a new water supply line, a new drainage system, among many other improvements to mention. So you see our building is really in good shape. So we intend to -- have intended to the stay in the neighborhood for many decades to come. And all of this was done at the cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars. And now we're in the middle of a process of hiring a rabbi. He's scheduled to interview with us in the next two weeks. As you can imagine, the mono cable tram proposal throws our hiring efforts into confusion. How can we attract a rabbi if we don't know if we're going to have a house of worship or not? Our position regarding the acquisition proposal is this -- we are realists. We know that there's a tremendous desire on the part of the city council to implement the o.h.s.u. Plan, and we are wise enough to know that it is in the best interest of all parties to work together to find a mutually agreeable solution. We will require our involvement in the process and your consistent and honest communication with us. In order to relocate, we've identified four simple needs that can be fully satisfied. They're not unrealistic and they're not overly demanding. Number one is build us a new synagogue without financial burden to our

JULY 10, 2002

congregation. The \$1.4 million stated in the pdot connector study is insufficient. Number two, relocation on a site on the west side of Portland that works for us in hillsdale or the raleigh hills neighborhoods. Number three, a seamless transition and a move from the existing synagogue to the new one without a period of time where we are without a house of worship. And number four, develop financial options or private development partnerships that will secure our fiscal health into the future. We believe our needs are simple and realistic. We've been in discussions with a private sector developer who has a plan that meets the needs of o.h.s.u., the city of Portland, and our congregation. A private development for transit from barbur boulevard to o.h.s.u. is a real possibility. It may be a better solution than the pdot concept. The city staff will soon be fully informed regarding this solution and we encourage you to consider it seriously as it may add real value to the public and avoid expenditures by the city of our precious tax dollars. As quoted in "the Oregonian" newspaper editorial page on Sunday, July 2nd, 2002, quote, the city council shouldn't be so agog over the tram that it allows a transportation tail to wag the dog. It makes sense to take a few extra months to settle on a tram option that best fits the public as a whole. We encourage the city council to broaden your concept of transportation solutions for barbur boulevard to include a more comprehensive private sector concept that will allow us to move with complete satisfaction of the four conditions stated above. In closing -- I'll make that ten minutes over. In closing, we're here as appointed representatives of our membership. A final position on the question of relocating the synagogue lies in the vote of our membership. It is they who will determine our stand on the question. We've not voted on the position to date. We are waiting for more information and communication with all interested parties, including the city, o.h.s.u., and a private sector developer. In the final analysis in large part it all depends on you, city government, as to how we can or cannot work together. As partners in a grand vision, we can all get what we need if we work together in a spirit of goodwill. We are reasonable people and if our relocation needs are satisfied then we can help you satisfy your vision. We wish to thank you for providing us with a letter of understanding, which affirms your commitment to work with us and satisfy our relocation needs. We're off to a good start. And thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Let me, on behalf of the city, because some of us were just as surprised with the second tram proposal that came out of the report as you. So on behalf of the city, our apologies, that you weren't notified on that.

Matza: Thank you.

Katz: As for me, I'm not bought off on the idea of the second tram. If it's going to solve some regional transportation problems, then it ought to be paid for by our regional transportation partners, not by Portland development commission or by pdot. That's my personal view. We've not talked about it as the council. My also personal view, that if we're going to spend some additional money, it isn't necessarily building a new synagogue, though I hope you can get what you need and what you would want, it would be to solve some of the neighborhood's problems like a pedestrian crossing over the freeway so they can get to the river. And that would be my priority for spending any additional money as opposed to the second tram. So that's at least for today what I'll be like your congregation, I can change my mind when I listen to additional information.

Francesconi: I guess I appreciate what you said. I wanted to do the same thing on behalf of pdot. I wanted to apologize. I'll take responsibility for that and I'm sorry that that happened. I also appreciate that you referenced the letter. In fact, you enclosed a copy of it. We met, I wasn't there, but in my office with the head of pdot on July 2nd, and we confirmed that we want to work with you, we're going to work with you, and we want to make this a win-win situation for you. Further, and I think you were here, the alignment question, we're not going to settle on at all. And we're

JULY 10, 2002

going to restudy the whole thing. You need to be involved in that, along with others. So again, i'm sorry that -- owe how this worked out, but now we get to build a relationship together.

Matza: Thank you. I would like to say, first of all, apology accepted and thank you for offering it.

We appreciate that. Regarding alignment, one of the things we do not want to do is be sandwiched between two trams. So that is an issue that is important to us, to have the -- the main tram system to our south and a mono cable tram system to our north is really not the best situation for us. We do have outside religious ceremonies at certain times of the year and having two cable systems over the top of us is really very invasive. And we want to cooperate. We're here out, looking out after our own interests, not anybody else's, so we want to cooperate, we want to be able to have a dialogue and see if we can reach some settlement, whether we stay or whether we move, it is conducive to everybody. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Saltzman: I think you also heard the earlier discussion, certainly won't be mistakes of the past in terms of public condemnation, which really did destroy a lot of old south Portland. A lot of our roots, including my roots come from. So you have my personal commitment that -- we will soon hopefully put that into the resolution, that we will not use public condemnation.

Matza: Thank you. It's reassuring to hear that. Thank you very much.

Katz: Sir, identify yourself for the record.

Ralph Funes: I'm ralph funes, one of the committee people that came here today. I've had a lot of input in what transpired just now. But I just wanted you to know that it was a horrendous situation for us in the late '50s and early '60s when we were shoved out of south Portland and -- and lost many members of our congregation because of it. And if you want i'll tell you the whole story at a later time.

Katz: Thank you. That isn't going to happen in our urban renewal projects today don't do that. Those were the miseries and the mistakes of the past. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you very much. All right. Friends of terwilliger here? Come on up. You have ten minutes. I don't think i'll need to take the whole ten minutes.

Katz: That's what they all say, but trust me.

Doug Weir: My name is doug weir, i'm vice president of friends of terwilliger. I've been working on this project for 2 ½ years. And this process, several years before that, in the homestead neighborhood association plan. It's been a very difficult process for us. The plan has been all along has been about o.h.s.u. And what their needs are. And really the needs and the concerns about terwilliger and the neighborhood have really been after thoughts. The plan was largely formed before the city process even started. About one and a half years ago. Before that there was a whole year of planning and process that went on that o.h.s.u. Did. And that like I say the plan was already pretty much well formed by that time. At this point with the plan, we're losing about a mile of the parkway functional -- functionality as a scenic parkway. And I believe we're going to continue to lose views with the -- with the north macadam with the building heights we have down there. We may be losing views of mt. Hood and probably the river too. From terwilliger. Considering the tram, my biggest -- i've been thinking through this, you know, over a long period of time, and I guess one of my biggest concerns about it is that the tram basically is -- serves o.h.s.u. That's its purpose. It doesn't really serve the surrounding neighborhoods. As of now it doesn't really take traffic off of terwilliger. We talked about that, floated that as an idea, I did over a year ago, and were told it wasn't a possibility of having parking down on north macadam and then having people ride up the hill, which might have taken some traffic off terwilliger, but that was -- that was shot down then. I don't know -- i've heard some mumblings about it recently, but my

JULY 10, 2002

understanding the parking -- the parking restrictions are just as tight down in north macadam as they are up on the hill. The tram's going to destroy major and panoramic views as outlined in the terwilliger parkway corridor plan design guidelines. As designed, it's going to affect the designation at the campus drive intersection. We also have the basic utility designation, which as far as I can see subverts the terwilliger parkway plan and design guidelines, and -- and destroys the ability to -- for that -- for the design review. I think there are other viable solutions. They've been talking about the people mover. I saw a presentation on that recently. I think it has some merit. We've talked about doing some kind of tunneling under -- along campus drive alignment, under terwilliger. I think that we should really look at some of those other alternatives. And I think one thing that's extremely important, and I think everybody would agree on this, including o.h.s.u., is that we have to get funding for the south Portland circulation problem, because that is causing most of the traffic problems in the area. And if we can solve some of those problems, I think it's going to make all these other transportation solutions easier to solve. In conclusion, i'd like to say to please take a step back and try to find a solution that works for everybody, that works for all the stakeholders, not just o.h.s.u., but also work for the neighborhoods and the community. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. I was wrong. You did it. Okay, karla, let's open it up.

*******:** You ready?

Katz: Go ahead.

Terry Parkor, 1527 NE 65th Ave., 97213: Thank you for allowing me to testify. My name is terry parker, live in northeast Portland and i'm a taxpayer. When it comes to narrowing streets, giving bicycles a free ride, and using buses to block traffic, more con degrees for motor vehicle accidents, the city council has always touted making the city more livable. Most of the time the noisy support for these congested creative ideas comes from a small group of interest activists. When the whole neighborhood says no tram, the city needs to stop and listen. The mctram fails the livability test. I call is the mctram, because somebody's carrying a big stick. This is not the -- issue to correct Portland's anti-business climate with. Saying yes to the mctram shows the public, city government only uses the term neighborhood support only when it is request convenient to do so. So instead of throwing the term neighborhood support totally in the hopper, throw the transportation system plan in the hopper. Start to plan over with the support of the stakeholders who pay for the transportation system. Those who pay gas taxes and support businesses and jobs with the council wanting to spend money to put parking and freeways underground it's time to think placing transit underground too. The article in this morning's "the Oregonian" has a lot of merit. Not only would an underground people mover offer more connections than the mctram, but it would not destroy a whole neighborhood. The trolley option would create a direct connection to downtown with no transfer and no new vehicles to purchase. Going under the neighborhood has far less impacts than going over it. Currently the city is spending large portions of transportation budget dollars on discretionary projects, making Portland streets artificially congested. The first use of transportation dollars must be to maintain what we already have and not take away options that currently exist when making transportation decisions. The city council must show respect for the neighborhoods and find a compromise. A solid transportation connection that does not impact neighborhoods, but no tram. If you choose a tram, you're choosing a postcard over a neighborhood. Thank you.

Katz: Why don't you take the mic so we can hear you.

Glenn Bridger, SW Neighborhoods Inc.: Good morning, council. I'm glen bridger. I'm here on behalf of the southwest neighborhoods incorporated, your coalition of 16 neighborhoods in

JULY 10, 2002

southwest Portland. I live at 940 southwest vicinity sent place. Let me focus on three items. First, if there is to be a tram, what camera should be in your agreement, specifying the threshold for any construction activity? This is a business camera that you should insist in that agreement. The camera very simple -- first you should ask, before any investment takes place in the tram, that there should be a threshold of real ground investment on the north macadam district, that there are real buildings there, and that a certain amount of building has taken place at that site. Second, you should be looking at the interaction between that area and the -- and the hill as witnessed by a successful operating shuttle. That will give you an indication of how much interaction is needed. This is a very simple test that you should insist on. That agreement before you will commit to a tram or other linkage between those two. Now I might suggest that if this is too critical to o.h.s.u. And that their business plan cannot sustain this, then their business plan is pretty weak and we should not be entering into an agreement with them. I'd also like to ask that if you enter into an agreement with paddy, the group that was going to be fostering the tram, please ask that there be some community leaders involved on that board so that there can be community input into the actions that they take. The second item I want to hit is, if there is to be a tram, what about the people that live within that community? This is very important. You don't just build a tram and operate it successfully and safely within a 50-foot right-of-way. It doesn't happen. If this were a high powerline running through there, which is the typical cable and towers that we see in our area, it would be on a much wider than 50-foot right-of-way. If we were flying people 100 feet over people's houses as we do at the port of Portland on approaches, we would be taking those houses out. It's not realistic to believe there won't be no property acquisition in that area. Third area I'd like to hit is the cost. Mitigation -- if you'll look on page 85 of the report, it talks about some nice potential mitigation efforts. I like these if there's going to be a tram, they are good mitigation efforts. They include south Portland circulation study. That project can run from 25 to \$40 million if you do it. They talk about undergrounding utilities. They talk about a lot of good things. Mitigation in a report like this is pure fluff and even worse promises that may not be fulfilled. Mitigation must be included in the actual cost of the project and must be undertaken at the time the project is to be constructed if it is to be real mitigation. And I ask that as you move forward with this project, include the real costs of mitigation and the commitment to construction within that project. That way it becomes real and the community doesn't feel like they've been lied to.

Katz: Thank you.

Rachel Gold 3325 SW Kelly Ave., 97239: Hi. I'm Rachel Gold. I live on Kelly Avenue between Gibbs and Kelly Avenue.

Katz: Talk loud are.

Gold: I'm very nervous to be here. I don't want to be here. I'm sorry about the clapping before, but this is a very personal and emotional thing for me. And the testimony I'm going to give is personal. I think that's appropriate, because that's how it's going to affect me. It does sound like your minds are made up already, but I hope you'll listen and re-consider, or at least I want you to know the effect you're having on people on a personal level. A year and a half ago my boyfriend and I bought a house in Lair Hill. I've never owned a house before. It's really exciting. I mean, it's thrilling to me and him. It's a small house, but it was built in 1880. It's a Victorian and we're just ecstatic with it. It's really a neat experience. We hand-painted it last summer. We had to finish this summer because it started raining in October. But it's really neat thing for us. We have rose bushes. I've never had a garden before. And I love my neighbors and we know them all. This is really special. I mean, this is an important thing for me. I never want to leave it. I love it. The house is my future. It's my investment. I've never owed that much money before. You know, it's a

JULY 10, 2002

big deal. Tram will go right past my corner. It's going to be ugly and noisy. The wind through the cables is going to make noise. And 18 hours a day, seven days a week? It makes me sick. Imagine that over your house, seriously. Imagine it. It's awful. There goes my smart investment. I called mom, i'm investing, I bought a house, you know. O.h.s.u. Does really good work, and they should get what they need, no question about it, no question, but not this way. This is a flashy way of dealing with it, it's about their prestige, not the smartest solution. It's about a postcard. It's not about -- it's not the only solution. It's just the one that will make them look the fanciest. I don't care how fancy they look. It's ostentatious when there are other options. Don't let them ruin my neighborhood to make themselves look good. Please, don't let them use their size and power to go to the bathroom on my neighborhood. Please, please. They don't care about us. But I hope you do. Have you decided on this already? I mean, is this a done deal? It sounds that way to me, but I hope you'll use your power and your position to protect my neighborhood. That's your job, is to protect homeowners and neighborhoods. This is your chance to do the right thing. Please protect my neighborhood. Please protect my neighborhood from the tram. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Go ahead.

Katz: Go ahead.

Anton Vetterlein: Thank you. One more time here. Anton vetterline, 430 southwest hamilton street, homestead neighborhood. A couple critical impacts I think that an aerial cable system, or any kind of transit system up down the hill has. One has is on views, views from homes in the neighborhoods, and perhaps more importantly views from and along terwilliger boulevard. And the other major impact is traffic. The ability to reduce traffic on neighborhood streets and on terwilliger boulevard. And I think the tram proposal really doesn't do enough to reduce traffic on terwilliger boulevard, particularly I think the marquam hill plan does provide some protections for the neighborhood, and so i'm happy about that, but I think terwilliger has been kind of left out in this pros, and I think you're all sort of lauding the marquam hill plan and all the wonderful things it does, and no one has mentioned what it's really done for terwilliger, and I kind of feel that terwilliger has been left behind in this process. We're going to see a 58% increase in traffic north of campus drive on terwilliger boulevard. That's with a tram. Beyond that, the problem with the tram is it doesn't really meet some of the 6 goals that the neighborhood has in terms of reducing traffic and providing sort of a better link to the mass transit system and the regional mass transit system. I think linking to the streetcar gets us a little ways there, but I think something like the downtown bus mall or a light rail line is really what we need to really link it to the regional system. And this doesn't do that. The second tram starts to get at these issues, but it sort of doubled the impact on terwilliger boulevard. And it to me we should have one system that works as efficiently as possible and produces the least amount of impact. In that regard, I think it's really necessary to study the alternatives a little more closely than we have so far. I think the underground people mover system works really well as far as the neighborhoods' criteria. We won't see it, its impact on terwilliger is virtually nil, provides multiple stops to tie into both the regional transit system and to go down to north macadam. Also the shuttle bus study I don't think was really a fair or accurate study. The travel time was the deal-breaker on the shuttle bus system. And the travel time was based on current conditions. And with the marquam hill plan there's going to be improvements to sixth avenue that's going to speed traffic down through that area. That was not factored into the travel times -- travel time estimates. And so I think we need to evaluate the shuttle bus in terms of the environment it's going to be in a few years. Then to look at the south Portland circulation study and how that might improve travel times as well down there. Thank you.

Katz: Thanks, antone.

JULY 10, 2002

Dan Yates, 4000 SW Viewpoint Ter, 97201: Good afternoon. My name is dan yates. I am a resident in homestead. At least as of today I might be run out in a few minutes, because i'm actually a resident that supports the tram. It will be -- it has the potential of providing a tremendous resource to the city, especially if it's very well and smartly designed. I have been -- i've traveled through europe extensively and switzerland has trams in their neighborhoods in several cities, and people have co-existed and used them, and I think that if -- if we do a good job of designing them, that we can also learn to not only appreciate them for -- as a people mover, but also visually I think they're very interesting and I think that they could be a tremendous benefit to the community. I'm very leery of the shuttle bus. Any time I go -- go to my house I have to time it, especially in the afternoon, because the traffic in the area is brutal. And if a doctor needs to go between the locations and it's a 25-minute run, having a mother that has been in o.h.s.u. With a severe brain injury and o.h.s.u. Saved her life because a doctor was able to get there quickly, and I also have two employees who use o.h.s.u. For inoperable brain tumors, and I know time is essential when they're having seizures and they need quick response, and to have lives hang in the balance on a 25 or 30-minute commute when testimony has already said that the commute -- traffic is going to increase by 58% over the next couple years, and i'm sure it's just going to keep getting denser and denser and slower and slower, I think reliable, quick, simple transportation system like the tram will be beneficial and reliable and provide benefits more than just moving people around, but it also reinforcing and enhancing o.h.s.u.'s prime area mission, which is helping people. So I hope that you all have -- will support this project and insist on a quality design that reinforces the neighborhood and takes care of some of the issues, but I think the tram is a great idea.

Katz: Thank you.

Kathleen Root, 3308 SW Corbett Ave. 97236: I live at corbett and gibbs. I'm at the center. I'm convinced after just being involved in this process for a couple of years as a citizen and taxpayer, that we need an east-west transportation link, not just for o.h.s.u. Underground people mover. Option, refreshingly, honestly, he replied to me, our group assumed the cost would be too high. No study for this option due to assumptions. No creative solutions or open minds to work together. Why? The neighborhoods say no to the tram. O.h.s.u. And its partners say we've got the facts. The council has settled for a fast track plan that ignores your responsibility to consider all options. Your responsibility to pursue options that would serve the citizens of this city and protect the diversity of our city. You asked us to celebrate the designated open spaces in the plan. I personally will mourn the loss of open skies. I believe many will, not just the people who live in the area. An overhead system is invasive and privacy. Why spend money that does not address barbur, naito, corbett and ross island traffic? Why is this process so narrow-minded? I do not see how the council, regarding this transportation issue, can regard themselves informed or making responsible decisions for the citizens of Portland. I urge the council to look beyond fictional facts and assumptions, to creative solutions, that responsibly meet the needs of our very valued community partner o.h.s.u. Also, our very valuable cities diversity's, who you've heard from today. Our history and our quality of life. As good neighbors to each other is why i'm here testifying. I ask you not only to be responsible council members, but also to be good neighbors. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Irwin Mandel: You are being asked to decide a major question with long-term consequences for the entire city, region and state. I agree, mayor Katz. What mode of transportation between o.h.s.u. And their proposed macadam campus will best serve the needs of o.h.s.u., the surrounding neighborhoods, and the rest of the city? A tram, shuttle buses, or some form of underground system? Commissioner Sten, you should have three choices before you today, not two. Now in

JULY 10, 2002

another lifetime I was a research scientist and coincidentally at a medical institution. I believe that at this time there is insufficient, meaningful data upon which your choice can be based. No comparative engineering study that includes an underground system has been done. There are loads of opinions, estimates, guesses, in this pdot document, but no solid, substantive information. Let me deal with some other comments from today's "oregonian," our favorite reading, of course. I'm amazed to read in the newspaper off the cuff opinions that an underground system is too expensive when it's not backed up by any comparative cost information. An underground system does not have to be faster than a tram. You can go at the same speed. This is one of the criticisms offered. Question -- will people go underground in an unattended car? Will people travel in a suspended unattended cable car? The same issues are for both underground and above ground. If an underground system can be criticized for potential vibrations, then do not trams produce noise as they move language a cable system? Criticisms have to be focused equally. After all, cities are not silent, bucolic, rural communities. We all put up with city noises. Now i'm not inherently opposed to a tram. I too have traveled extensively in europe and switzerland. I love gondolas, cable cars, and all forms of transportation, such as that. They're marvelous sights. Great views of places. However, in my opinion today this council does not have sufficient substantive data to make an informed choice among all possible alternative transportation modes -- trams, buses and underground surface. One more sentence. You must assume from a long-term perspective initial costs alone cannot be the sole determinate for this important decision.

Katz: Thank you.

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

Katz: Thank you. Lilly?

Derby ODonnell: Good afternoon. My name is derby o'donnell. I've lived at 230 southwest woods since 1984. My house is 100 years old this year. And it's about one football field north of the gibbs tram alignment. Throughout the past year the more I learned about the tram, the gondola, the shuttle bus methods of connecting the giant on the hill with its offspring on macadam, the more I realized how damaging each of these prospects are to the historic character of lair hill neighborhood. The worst of these would be an overhead tram or gondola. My neighborhood was declared an historic district by none other than Portland city officials decades ago. We residents have been restricted to city guidelines as such, a text almost an inch thick whenever we want to build, remodel, renovate or add on. We're restricted on setbacks, garages, fence types, roof pitches, parking, building height and so on. And we have lived by the rules. Wealthy medical corporations and developers want to bypass the rules. There's no question that a tram would be a jarring contradiction to the historic victorian nature of lair hill neighborhood outside of the rules you made. And they get a free pass. And I ask this question -- why are there two sets of rules? One for those of us that don't have much money, and a second easier set of rules for big money? About a month ago I learned of the underground people mover proposal. This is the one plan that will serve o.h.s.u. Better than the official concepts, while not only preserving the character of our neighborhood, a people mover will actually serve the neighborhood with transit means to the waterfront to barbur bus lines and to o.h.s.u. And without the drawbacks of the tram. You simply must give the underground people mover a fair consideration. You must give the residents of this neighborhood fair consideration as well. And outside of the details of why an underground system is better than an overhead system, i'd just like to go to something very simple and say, a tram is wrong. I mean, wrong not just technically, but it's wrong as in the difference between right and wrong. It would harm the innocent. For the benefit of the privileged. And any alignment, mr. Francesconi, is going to hurt someone. I urge you to please give fair consideration about you

JULY 10, 2002

commit our tax dollars to a system, give fair consideration to what I believe is one system that will serve everyone. Thank you.

Jeff Carlson, 6701 SE Foster Rd.: Madame mayor, members of the council. Good afternoon. My name is Jeff Carlson, and I represent over 1200 members of the bridge structural, ornamental and reinforcing ironworkers, local 29. I'm here today in support of the proposed tram project, linking o.h.s.u. With the new bio-research and development facility planned for the north macadam area. This is the essential element of a master plan that could make Oregon the place where new discoveries are found leading to the cure of crippling and fatal diseases. The economic upside of this endeavor is enormous. On the front end there will be hundreds of new much-needed construction jobs which will create a facility that will employ thousands in the medical field. The ripple effect of these new dollars will be widespread, including revenue to the general fund. Local 29 is willing to meet with any group to openly discuss issues surrounding the tram project. Furthermore, as this project moves ahead, I can assure you the skilled craftsmen and women of local 29, together with the other construction trades, possess the talents necessary to produce a facility that all Oregonians will be proud of and will leave the rest of the country envious. Thank you for your time.

Katz: Thank you.

John Carroll, 13355 NW Flanders, 97209: Good afternoon. My name is John Carroll. Just a first quick thought. I can't tell you how proud I am to be part of a community that's having a debate that feels like this, looking at alternatives and opportunities for the community down the road. Especially when we have an economy that has -- that's struggling a bit. We have some tight budgets. As council members you know it's true, but it's refreshing and encouraging debate. I want to thank you for at least creating the environment so we can have this. This is not an insignificant decision. This is a huge decision. And it's not just one for north macadam and it's not just one for o.h.s.u. It's one that the city, the greater interest of the city, comes into play, and certainly the greater interest of the region. We are competing and will always compete with other communities and other states and other regions for jobs. We have some opportunities. This may be one of them. We do have an opportunity, as we've demonstrated in years past, to be a -- a good example, a world class example, of how to think and move forward in a methodical way. We will be creating value. We will be creating jobs. We talk about job retention, but in this instance we're going to be creating jobs. Most important from my perspective, I think, is that we further demonstrate that we're growing as a smart community. A few thousand jobs here, a few thousand residences there, building on public investment like our streetcar. We see it happening in other parts of our community. I think this is another community to do that. I'd like to think that the political and the economic lessons that we're going to learn here will guide us further and quicker down the road. Just one quick little anecdotal piece. I got a call from a council member from Seattle that wants to come down to Portland and ask questions and talk about how we do what we do, about how we develop infrastructure, our streetcar system, they want to see how we're doing high density residential at our core, and I find that curious, a community that's as large and has the economic base that they have, is coming to Portland and asking those types of questions. Further interesting to me is the fact that we have alternatives and we're putting ourselves in a position of acquiring more alternatives. Seattle doesn't have those alternatives from a transportation standpoint and it's clear they don't have the appetite. I commend the council and I also commend the neighborhoods for standing up so strong and participating in the conversation. It's not an easy decision. And it's one that's going to have to be made, and we're going to have to look down the

JULY 10, 2002

road 25-30 years. And by doing that, I think we will say we made the right decision in support of the tram. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Craig Rowland: Good afternoon. My name is Craig Rowland. I live at the corner of Southwest Gibbs and Water, that's the 67-foot point of the loaded tram. I'd like to start out by saying that I'm opposed to any aerial system being built over the Ctlh neighborhood. Even in the face of thousands of packages of pro tram reports that read like conclusions in search of answers, I feel a shuttle option is still best for the neighborhood, O.H.S.U. and the city as a whole. However the reality we are facing today is that an aerial system of some sort will unfortunately be given a green light. Given that, let's focus on the actual cost to the tram. The PDOT report estimates tram infrastructure operational costs that are likely low. The report has ignored costs to mitigation for the Ctlh neighborhood. It has been very difficult to listen to 2-3 years of concessions being given to Homestead, the stakeholders in North Macadam and O.H.S.U. itself. Someone mentions mitigation and we hear about sidewalks in Homestead. Well, we who live in Gibbs directly under the linement don't give a rip about sidewalks in Homestead. Some Sunday, July 7th, there was an editorial in "The Oregonian" that suggested mitigation measures. These measures have costs and need to be considered when weighing the cost of the tram of the buyouts were mentioned. This should include full price buyouts for homeowners along the proposed route. 100% offers for those along the route who would choose to be bought out and 50% payment for reduction in value for the quiet use and enjoyment of their property for those who choose to stay and live for that. The estimated cost of that would be 12-15 million along Gibbs. Property rights need to be valued and included in the system cost analysis. Utility undergrounding. This is not mitigation, as it would have to be done anyway as a 67-foot tram would run into wires already there. That's really mitigation for O.H.S.U. and for the neighborhood. Specifically the South Portland transportation study. This requires coordination with ODOT, the county, at a hefty price tag estimated at \$28 million or more. If the city can't bring these agencies together the tram vote should be a know. The study only gets us to where we should have been before the tram was even proposed. It's been on the table for almost 25 years now. We also need to help in North Macadam with those concurrent transportation fixes as Marty has repeatedly urged you to support and fund to fix already failed intersections. The need is made even greater by the proposal about O.H.S.U. and North Macadam and other development there. These cost figures, but the need is real now and will become even pronounced when North Macadam begins to develop. The pedestrian connection to Willamette needs to be figured as well. The cost is approximately \$3 million. Insurance and bonds to take into account any accidents that should happen. One more sentence. There are probably even more costs that others or you yourselves can think of that should be included in this list. Recognize these costs require that they be paid. If you do not have the wherewithal or political will to say what they are, then your only fiscally responsible action today is to say no to the tram.

Katz: Thank you.

John Zegar, 2246 NE 31st, 97212: My name is John Zegar. I currently own property at 2004, 2006 and -- a residential triplex I bought. I currently don't live there. I have an appreciation for older houses. Two of the triplexes are occupied by tenants who work at O.H.S.U. I've asked them about their interest in the tram and they have no -- no interest either way, one or the other. They're tenants. It's possible that when it's time to downsize I could live in one of those units, because that was one of the plans when we bought the thing a couple years ago. Assume that O.H.S.U. needs additional space, that is not available on the hill, I believe a tram is appropriate way to get from -- to get from one expansion -- to the hill from the expansion area, and I currently support the tram. I

JULY 10, 2002

think it would not be -- I think it would be a positive thing for the neighborhood overall over many years and not -- and not adversely decrease property values.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: Ray, why don't you start.

Ray Polani: Thank you. Mayor Katz, commissioners, my name is ray polani. I live at 6110 southwest ankeny street in Portland. Having testified before, I just wish to make one very important point. It deals with the operation over time of the proposed transportation system, connecting the two o.h.s.u. Facilities and in between point. Since this is a transportation system, an alternative transportation system, we're confident that tri-met will be asked to operate it, which means that the taxpayers, the transit riders of the region, will ultimately pay for most, if not all of the operational and maintenance cost of the proposed system once built. The yearly estimate of the aerial tram is somewhere around \$.8 million. While the elevator and people mover is somewhere around \$600,000. A substantial difference, which must be considered after thorough, impartial verification. If the public, the taxpayers, are to pay part or all of these continuing costs, this better by a substantial benefit to all the riders, the users, because tri-met's mission is to provide alternative transportation to everybody, mostly at taxpayers' cost. As we well know, tri-met needs all the money it can get to fulfill its mission to provide more and more service. Only a system that interfaces fully with the existing and future transit can qualify. Only the proposed elevator and underground people mover does truly connect. Therefore, the choice is clear. No taxpayers and riders contribution without clear taxpayers and riders benefit. No institutional benefit welfare, yes, general welfare. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you, ray.

Katz: Go ahead, sir.

Alan Grinnell, 3410 SW Corbett, 97239 I'm allen grennell. I live on corbett. I have some slides I wanted to show you. You have copies for the council as well? Can we wait until you have that. This is a copy of an analysis I did of the pdot study.

Katz: Yes, we received it, so walk through it quickly.

Grinnell: All right. I wanted to take a giant step back and ask the question, does o.h.s.u. Need a tram? If you read this office of transportation study closely, you will see that it shows clearly that o.h.s.u. Does not need the capacity provided by any of the alternatives to aa shuttle system. Furthermore, each the alternatives is far more expensive in its initial costs. We can take a look at that first slide, which is on page 2 of 10 in your packet. These are the ridership estimates. These are the same numbers that o.h.s.u. Has been quoting for over a year. Look closely. Only 51% of the projected ridership 30 years out is going to be on actual o.h.s.u. Business. The other two groups are people on business unrelated to o.h.s.u. Therefore o.h.s.u.'s arguments for quick 10 to 15-minute trips do not apply to this combined 49% of the total. That is these people have no need for a rapid trip that o.h.s.u. Says its people do. Thus any argument for any transportation alternative should be based on the 2,800 maximum that o.h.s.u. Needs. The study states that the shuttle alternative will be sufficient to meet this need. If we can look at the next slide, that's page five in your packet, the study recommends this alternative, the gibbs street and barbur boulevard trams, and it shows that that alternative provides capacity that far outstrips o.h.s.u.'s needs. This green section, that's the 2800 people that they actually need. The rest of it, 59%, is excess capacity. 30 years from now, there's still 59% excess. The other alternatives in the study are even worse in terms of their excess capacity. The next slide. Here's how much that excess capacity's going to cost. This is on page five and ten in your packet. This is over 22 times the initial capital costs of the shuttle. Again, the other alternatives are worse. Some as up as 42 times the cost of a shuttle

JULY 10, 2002

system. Here's another way to look at it on the last slide. This is page nine in your packet. The blue bars, the front, represent the relative excess capacity of the various alternatives. The red bars, in back, show the relative costs of building each system. Although the studies recommended alternative is not the worst, recommend that its excess capacity is nearly 60% at a cost of 22 times that of a shuttle system. The citizens of Portland will end up paying for this system, one way or another. How can you justify voting for any other alternative, other than a shuttle? Tell them to take the bus.

Saltzman: Go ahead and start. State your name.

Tony Mendoza, Tri-Met: Hello. I'm tony mendoza. I'm here representing tri-met today. We have a letter from fred hanson to the mayor and the council on this issue. I'm going to be reading it. So --

Francesconi: Does it say you're going to pay for the tram?

Mendoza: Let's get to that. Tri-met supports the findings of the Portland office of transportation, that the gibbs street tram with mono cable tram to barbur be pursued to connect north macadam and marquam hill. Tri-met has continually worked to provide innovative transportation solutions for marquam hill residents, employees and students. In 1995, tri-met entered into a formal partnership plan with the hill employers, neighborhood and city to improve transportation. The results have been significant. Increasing transit use on the hill by 79% between 1995 and 1999. Although tri-met will continue to help meet the needs of campus expansion, the demand for trips between a new campus and -- in north macadam would be difficult to meet with standard tri-met bus service. The project the ridership for shuttle buses would not be tri-met's service standards for productivity. Tri-met has reviewed the technical analysis for projected ridership and operational costs and agrees with city staff that a tram with a barbur connection alternative would best meet the goals for providing reliable and fast service between these two important areas of the region, as well as provide an excellent connection to the regional transit system. The connection at barbur boulevard is worthy of further study because it would significantly offset the demand for bus service to the hill. Tri-met would expect to save approximately \$700 to \$800,000 annually in bus operating costs over an alternative without a barbur connection. While it remains to be determined who the owner/operator of the tram would be, it would be in the public's best interest to provide a transportation solution that provides the best value in the most efficient manner. I'd be happy to talk to you now about some of the assumptions we've made in assisting the city with the report that we prepared.

Saltzman: Go ahead.

Mendoza: You had some questions earlier, I know.

Saltzman: I did ask -- yeah, the question about, is this consistent with what we expect transit retired behavior to really deliver on. In other words, will riders get off at barbur boulevard, take a tram.

Mendoza: We think so, because it would be a much faster connection for them. If you think of somebody coming into town today on-line 12, they come all the way into town, get on-line 8, and go back on the hill. They could expect quite a bit of time savings by being able to transfer right at the station on barbur and then shoot up the hill. That amount of transfer activity alone is expected to save about a thousand work trips only off of the line 8. That all translates --

Saltzman: There are about a thousand work trips that actually do that?

Mendoza: On the line 8 today?

Saltzman: Actually take 12 down to line 8?

JULY 10, 2002

Mendoza: That's what we're projecting, yes. There's about 3800 work trips only one way in -- on the line 8 in -- every day, so it's significant.

Katz: Are you from tri-met? I'm sorry, I had to step out.

Mendoza: Why, I am.

Saltzman: Are you -- are you prepared to pay for that particular tram that will assist your regional transportation system?

Mendoza: You're asking me.

Katz: I mean, I don't know who to ask. Go ahead.

Mendoza: We're prepared to tell you that it would provide tri-met a savings, because it would relieve some of the demand we have to take --

Katz: You would provide -- ray made an interesting policy -- raised an interesting policy question, and I think is a legitimate one. So you would take the service -- the tri-met bus service from that area, if we had that connection, and then move it to other -- other parts of the community? How will the rest of the city, in a regional system benefit for it?

Mendoza: I think it makes sense to look at it as an entire regional system. When you provide the -- the transfer at barbur connection, you do provide some relief from the buses -- from the passengers that are currently taking buses to north macadam -- or to marquam hill. That does provide us the ability to decrease the service and save money. Where that service would be could be throughout the entire region, which all benefits the regional transit system.

Katz: That's what I wanted. Okay. John?

Francesconi: Thank you for coming. Thanks for coming.

John Perry: Good afternoon. My name is john perry. I live at 3430 southwest first avenue in lair hill neighborhood. The tram issue has been the topic in my neighborhood for the last 3-4 years. It is unfortunate in that long period that no progress has been made toward finding a design that is a win-win for all the parties involved. O.h.s.u. Hasn't budged an inch from their plan to run a tram down southwest gibbs in the no tram group is still dead set against any aerial ropeway system anywhere in our neighborhood. Unfortunately the pdot report does nothing to bridge the gap, and advance this dialogue. The recommended alternative serves only o.h.s.u. And not the larger public. I believe now, as much as ever, that we can satisfy o.h.s.u.'s needs and at the same time make this a win for the city and the neighborhood. What are the elements for a plan that will work for everyone? The plan must meet o.h.s.u.'s needs for a fast and reliable link. I served on the marquam hill citizen technical advisory committee. This experience convinced me that some sort of aerial ropeway system is the only way to meet that need. The link should start on marquam hill and end in north macadam, roughly at the spots shown in the report. The plan should provide a stop at a transit hub that allows passengers to transfer to and from buses. It is important that the link between the transit hub go both ways. That is to and from marquam hill as well as to and from north macadam. The link to north macadam is critical. It is a -- it has a huge potential as a means of transportation for the future thousands of workers and residents of north macadam. Four, the alignment of the system, should avoid the historic residential heart of the corbett and lair hill neighborhoods. Five, the plan should conform to adopted neighborhood plans and bring the corbett and lair hill neighborhoods closer to realizing the vision of the south Portland circulation study. Six, this needs be a flexible system that can be expanded to meet future demand. No one can predict the future needs for these links. Let's not block ourselves in into a technology that can't be upgraded. Unfortunately the pdot recommendation -- recommended alternative fails four of these six criteria. I distributed as part of my testimony a graphic that shows one way these plan elements can be achieved. I don't offer this as the solution, but it shows one way these criteria can be met. I

JULY 10, 2002

hope it expands the discussion to ways we can use this link to serve broad public purposes and not only the immediate needs of o.h.s.u. My plan has the following elements -- one uses the gondola technology. Two, it has -- one intermediate stop and turning point somewhere within the land recovered from implementing the south Portland circulation study. And three, buses currently running down southwest barbur boulevard would be rerouted to southwest naito parkway for approximately one mile before continuing their current routes.

Katz: John, your time is up. Why don't you just summarize.

Perry: Okay. I suggest that council pass a resolution with the following elements -- the city agrees to make this -- this link with some type of aerial ropeway system. This intention leaves open the discussion about the technology, whether it's a tram or gondola. Two, set the terminal on the hill, roughly the way the report states. And three, establish a hub linking buses in this new ropeway system that serves north macadam as well as marquam hill.

Katz: Thank you.

Perry: Thank you.

Francesconi: John, why did you feel that a shuttle bus system would not work?

Perry: For the same reasons the report says. I mean, reliability, speed. You know, and frankly, who needs more rubber-tired buses on the road? I think we've got to find other solutions for moving people around. I've never regarded, you know, the tram as being a destruction of the neighborhood. I've just seen the plans that are proposed as being a lost opportunity, losing an opportunity to do some better things.

Francesconi: Thank you.

Katz: Thanks, john. And thank you for all your work on this.

*******:** Uh-huh.

David Redlich, President, Homestead Neighborhood Association: Good afternoon. I'm name is david retlich, president of the homestead neighborhood association. Am I allowed three minutes or five minutes as a representative of an organization?

Katz: If you're going to insult us, three. If you're going to be productive, five.

Francesconi: Why don't we give him four. That way he has flexibility.

Redlich: I'll go with the five and reserve my private comments what might be interpreted as an insult then. First of all, let me state that the homestead neighborhood association opposes the tram because it does not meet any of the transportation criteria that's important to our neighborhood. Further, we fully support the analysis and positions put forth by the corbett-terwilliger-lair hill and the no tram association. This is 16 neighborhoods of southwest Portland speaking through the southwest neighborhood coalition, which has sent you multiple letters regarding our concerns on the tram, on parks, and on public process. Now we would like to support -- our position is that we should support -- the city should support the shuttle alternative. The reason for this is that with the implementation of satellite parking lots to bring both employees, visitors and guests on and off the hill, that it will relieve some of the congestion that is going to be placed on our neighborhood streets and on the terwilliger parkway. So a shuttle system has two benefits. It moves people back and forth between the hill and north macadam. And I want to note that I have repeatedly driven that route in less than seven minutes during rush hour traffic. I think the same times would apply to the shuttle. And I think also that the -- what we need to consider is not a point to point time comparison, but a door-to-door comparison. The shuttle would give the flexibility to move people around both campuses, that the tram would not allow them to do. So again, our favored option is the shuttle, because it will not impact the terwilliger parkway the way the tram will. It will not be a visible impact and because it can serve the broader community. Having said that, I think that the

JULY 10, 2002

shuttle should be solely funded by o.h.s.u., because the narrow basis of benefit is simply for o.h.s.u. And not the community at large. To shift this on to the taxpayers of Portland, either through trimet's business taxes or other fashion, simply is unconscionable, because the benefit is so narrowly focused on o.h.s.u.'s needs and the greater community is in essence ignored. We also are very favorable to the people mover concept. We think this is both practical and cost effective and that it deserves full and complete critical study. You have a fiduciary responsibility to engage in due diligence and study all of the options. Though this one has come on the table at the last minute, we strongly urge you to take the time to examine this and do some -- some extensive studies to see whether or not it will actually do the job at -- as it's been present to do so. Unfortunately, I think that the biggest problem with the people mover, as well as the shuttle, is the fact that when we talk in terms of the tram, we make a mistake and we talk in terms of transportation. It's really, whether it's admitted or not, is all about symbology. Both o.h.s.u. And the developers on north macadam, realize this would be a very visible symbol in the form of cheap advertising, the largest billboard in the city of Portland, saying here we are, and please come and do business with us. However, that criteria does not meet the broader needs of the entire community as i've said earlier. Now if the shuttle is implemented, which we hope you not do, it is the position of the homestead neighborhood --

Francesconi: You mean the tram?

Redlich: I'm sorry, the tram. I misspoke. A little mic fright. It is the position of the homestead neighborhood that if the tram is implemented over community objections, that there should be an outright negative impact payment to the neighborhood that will have to live below it. In addition to that, tax abatements would be appropriate for the ongoing of the tram above their heads. Last, but not least, we feel that the south portion -- south Portland circulation plan, which has been adopted by council, should be implemented up front. In other words, before any construction of the tram or in north macadam, you ought to do something for neighborhoods that already exist rather than devoting all of our resources to neighborhoods that are currently occupied, primarily by rats and raccoons. It's become apparent that it's all too easy to come up with money for new projects where no Portlanders live, whether it's in the river district or now on north macadam. I think we need to focus on where Portlanders live today and focus our resources there. And last, I would like to say that many in my neighborhood have expressed one recurring theme, whether they support or oppose the marquam hill plan. And that is, number one, for both the mitigation and the cost of the tram, if that's the way we go, should be o.h.s.u.'s responsibility and not the taxpayers.

Katz: Thank you.

Redlich: And last, that we have yet to figure out what the rush is. We should allocate the time to give careful consideration to all of the proposals put forth and that is something we've not done to date.

Katz: Thanks.

Redlich: You will excuse me, madame mayor, I have also summed up three minutes as a private citizen which I do not give up because I represent a core organization. I'm entitled to -- as a citizen to also speak my three minutes.

Katz: Well, could you let some other people go before you? I'll give you three minutes, but let other people go before you.

Redlich: That's fine. I'll go last. I don't mind at all.

Katz: Go ahead.

Katz: Go ahead.

JULY 10, 2002

Janice Marquis, Russell Company: Good afternoon. I'm Janice Marquis with Russell Company. I'm here this afternoon on behalf of John Russell. I'd like to read a letter he's written to the council.

Katz: Okay.

Marquis: To the members of Portland City Council. I would like to testify as an individual in favor of the construction of the proposed tram system between O.H.S.U. and North Macadam. I have been an advocate of the tram for over a decade because of my experience with them in Europe. It is in the spectacular alpine system, trams are common sights. Nearly every town and village in the mountains has at least one because trams are the only way to provide travel with a minimum of environmental disruption. In sharp contrast to road systems, which require massive excavation on hillsides, the towers for trams touch the ground only infrequently and the tram cars are a silent presence in their communities. The city engineer's report and recommendation makes it clear the trams are the best environmental solution and the best solution for moving people between Marquam Hill and O.H.S.U.'s new growth in North Macadam. If there's any argument remaining, it is over the benefits to the neighborhoods or the potential damage to the neighborhood property values. Unfortunately, some folks have adopted the belief that the tram will reduce property values. I don't share that belief. In fact, I believe the opposite. I believe that proximity to the tram will enhance property values and I base that belief on seeing that effect by -- by a number of trams in Europe. That is why I had offered to put \$10,000 of my own money into a fund that would send key city and neighborhood leaders to see urban trams in Europe that are comparable to ours in Portland. There's nothing like kicking the tires to overcome fear and doubt. This is, once again, an example of Portland reaching for creative solutions to challenging transportation problems. I urge you to accept the city engineer's recommendation and to allow the city and Portland Aerial Transportation, Inc., as the project sponsor to move forward with this most important project. Sincerely, John W. Russell. Thank you.

Francesconi: Tell John two things. One is we'll take his money anyway for the design competition. Two, tell him to send you more often. [laughter]

Jamed Davis, Land Use Chair, Corbett Terwilliger Lair Hill Neighborhood Association: My name is James Davis. I'm a land use chair. I admitted that I voted for Vera Katz as often as opportunity has permitted. For nearly 30 years, she's proved to be adroit, gracious, and very bright.

Katz: Oh, I'm waiting. [laughter]

Davis: You're going to get it. I think this commission can understand my puzzlement as to why she's the political advocate for a project that is as bone-headed as the old Mt. Hood freeway. I thought about this a lot since this project began. The tram has so much political downside. It will cost the city so much in money and in goodwill. My conclusion is simply that our mayor is in love with the tram. The tram is a project the like of which has never been seen in the city. It stretches near -- it stretches nearly 4,000 feet, crushing through two neighborhoods as it plunges into North Macadam. Passengers will ride -- will have a ride like they'll never forget. In 20-30 miles an hour winds of which there are 117 such days last year, riders will not only be going up and down, but also from side to side at speeds that drop them over ten feet per second by the time they reach Barbur Boulevard. On days when the wind gusts are up to 40 miles an hour, the tram will be closed because of reliability. Last year there were 18 such days. So much for the reliability argument. This project has produced nearly 40 pounds of documents on my desk at least. Yet there's not one word about the public's acceptance of this tram as transportation. The tram may be a romantic notion to some, but it is a lie. It will not fly doctors to workbench to patients to classrooms, for the

JULY 10, 2002

simple reason that the building it serves in north macadam will be used primarily for administrative purposes only. Now, let me repeat that. The building will be used for primarily administrative purposes only. In fact, most of o.h.s.u.'s research is done 30 miles away and in the opposite direction, that is hillsboro. It is a fact that the total ridership of o.h.s.u.'s shuttle buss now is about 60 passengers a day, and that's from 8-10 different locations. The total projected ridership of the tram, which is primarily an intercampus device, is about 6100. If you can believe that figure, how about the easter bunny and the tooth fairy? As bad as the long tram as opposed as proposed by o.h.s.u., the short tram as proposed by the bureau of planning is even worse. It will --

Katz: Pdot.

Davis: Thank you. It will destroy the oldest institution in the lair hill neighborhood, the temple. This is unacceptable and will not stand. The sephardic temple is our neighbor and the neighborhood association will do whatever it can in its power to support it. It has the fundamental right to exist and practice its rights free from questionable transportation needs of this city and o.h.s.u. It has been said that the short tram has been added to the tram proposal only so it can be rejected by this commission in an attempt to make it appear that this commission is meeting the neighborhood halfway. We reject this maladroit plan for what it is. Trade goods of no value to assure the destruction of the lair hill neighborhood. Fundamental to the nature of a basic utility such as gas, electric or water, is that its providers may collect from the ratepayers the cost of the product, as well as the cost of providing that product, that is construction, repair and maintenance. The trams are basic utilities. I fully expect to see the cost of the tram added to our water bills, and that way the tram not only will affect two small west side neighborhoods, but every resident in this city. In closing, let me allow -- allow me to paraphrase the late orson wells. We will build no tram before its time, and that time will only be found in never-never land.

Katz: Thank you, thank you. Jim, I hate to blow your testimony, but i'm going to vote -- I didn't advocate for anything, any of these choices. I was not an advocate, so just wanted to say that.

Jim Howell: Hi. My name is jim howell. I'm here in favor of a tram, a tram, not an aerial tram. The definition of a tram is a people mover, and it can be up in the air, on the ground, or underground. And so I would like to talk specifically about costs, because that's what commissioner Francesconi is concerned about, the cost of putting it underground. It's too overwhelming. I wanted to dispute that because of what has transpired since this project started. And that is pdot has come up with an operating cost that is scary. \$2.8 million a year to operate a tram. That's 7,671 a day, just to operate and maintain it. This is over double the cost of operating a light rail vehicle, over seven times the cost of operating a bus. This is a very expensive operation and yet i've heard no mention of who is going to pay this \$.8 million, which will inflate over time. It's a horrendous amount of money. It could be as up as \$114 million over the 30-year period. The lifecycle cost is something that has to be looked at very closely, because an underground system is far less expensive to operate in spite of what I read in the paper today, some comment that it would be about comparable. This is -- this is absolutely untrue. An underground system is an automated system. There are no operators, except possibly one person that would monitor the tv screens and some of the technical as it operates. So you don't need a small army of operators like you do with an aerial tram. Its labor is what runs up the cost of operation. And you do not have that when you're in an enclosed environment, where people aren't swinging out over the -- the area. As far as the environment for the user, it's more like an elevator. In fact, it basically is a horizontal elevator. You don't have any feeling of where you are, just like you don't know whether you're on the tenth floor of a building or in a subbasement of a building in an elevator. You wouldn't know in this particular case. So it's a kind of thing that the costs overall will be less than the aerial tram when

JULY 10, 2002

you figure operating costs over time and it's something that should seriously be looked at, not just thrown out as saying it's about the same in operating costs. And do you have any questions?

Katz: Thank you.

*****: Yes?

Katz: Thank you. Go ahead.

*****: I think you're next.

Wayne Stewart: Oh, next? Okay. I'm wayne stewart. I live at 5155 southwest cheltenham street, 97201. I agree that the council has taken the position here that better east-west connections are definitely needed to link the hill and north macadam. I think it's very important to both developing areas that -- that that linkage be very well designed, et cetera. Unfortunately, the current proposal is a win-lose proposal as has been mentioned by several people here today. The winners, of course, o.h.s.u. And the developers who want to build something down at north macadam. The losers, of course, corbett-terwilliger, homestead, and terwilliger boulevard. I think we all need to work together to find a better situation that ends up as a win-win for everybody. And a true public transit connection is needed, not a connection that simply serves o.h.s.u. -- excuse me -- o.h.s.u., and with a slight nod to others. I think what's really needed is something that starting at the top would service o.h.s.u. The transit interchange on barbur I think is absolutely key to both o.h.s.u.'s growth, marquam hill growth, and also north macadam's growth. Stops of some sort at corbett and kelly, or potentially at hood, I think would be very useful for the neighborhood. Certainly there needs to be the connection to the future streetcar down at north macadam and potentially the system should also extend all the way to the waterfront to provide for recreational users as well. I think that the true key here is to develop -- maximize the utility of whatever this transit connection is. And such a system can reduce auto trips on terwilliger, which is a benefit to those who appreciate terwilliger, including myself. Has the potential for reducing auto intrusion into the homestead neighborhood. Would encourage more workers, both up on the hill and down at north macadam to use transit. And potentially also has a very large -- and this is a serious potential here -- of being able to create additional jobs in north macadam area. Right now that area is going to be eventually strangled by the lack of street capacity because you're limited to the north and the south, a system that provides better access from the west, i.e. From a transit interchange point on barbur would do far more to allow additional jobs to be developed down along north macadam. In my opinion, the transit interchange at barbur is really the critical link in the system to make this work. It has many benefits of course. Many existing bus lines pass that area. There's adequate traffic-carrying capacity on barbur itself. It's near the midpoint of this east-west connection system. And it's also at a significant grade break point between the steeper area up the hill and the flatter area towards the river. My feeling is that the previous instructions to the pdot staff were far too restrictive. They were basically to find the best aerial cable system. I think the question that should have been given from the council to the staff is evaluate all reasonable east-west public transit options and find the one that is the best for the city in the long run, including both north macadam and o.h.s.u.

Katz: Thank you.

Stewart: Those are basic comments. If you have any questions, i'd be happy to answer anything.

Katz: Thanks.

Janet Kelly, Chair, Corbett Terwilliger Lair Hill Neighborhood Association: Do I get them both? All right. First let me show the picture. We have been talking about this. When they first talked about it, I was picturing a track that you stood on like at the airport. No. It's a car. Okay? And I am janet kelly. I'm chair of the corbett-terwilliger lair hill association, and I seem to be here

JULY 10, 2002

every wednesday. Okay. The mini max, or people mover, is designed to provide rapid transit in communities where space, resources and projected use does not require light rail. Hence, our name, mini max. This is a flexible network that can include a horizontal elevator, running just a few hundred feet. The cars are like elevator cars. Those traveling from north macadam to lair hill would move sideways. You get in, you press the button for your stop, just like you would in an elevator. You move to the base of lair hill, where you get out of one elevator, into another, and move upward to the ninth floor of the hospital or wherever the terminal is placed. Other stops could be included along the way of transit -- if transit connections are desired. The two tunnels required for the system are approximately 12 feet. Not 24 feet as in the zoo tunnel. And are only 300 feet long as opposed to 15,580 feet for the zoo tunnel. The pile of dirt out of these tunnels would be 1/15th the size of the pile of dirt that came out of the zoo tunnel. It will be much cheaper.

A more accurate reading of the construction could be gained from the sewer interceptor project, which is currently being built in the same part of the city as the proposed transit. Those sewer pipes appear to require the same bore size as the mini max would require. Also an idea of the soil formation could be gained by reviewing the work there. The people in corbett-terwilliger-lair hill and in the homestead neighborhoods are asking for a fair evaluation of the system, and we haven't been given that. Rather we've been derisively dismissed with guesses and unsupported statements.

Incredibly sloppy research. I think, it may, it might. It's not acceptable. Please, show us the numbers, get us the facts. I have here a list of 68 sites where this system is in use. How many has pdot contacted? What were their construction costs? How many attendants, mechanics and electricians were required to operate them? What problems, if any, have they encountered? I challenge pdot to do at least a random sample of 10% of the projects on this list. Get accurate information instead of guesses and provide sound supportive data before they decide it won't work.

This is a system that could save the homes of the residents of the lair hill section of Portland. They're investments of money and time. Their dreams should not be dismissed as irrelevant. Any decision on the kind of transit from north macadam district to marquam hill should be delayed until we have good data, accurate statistics, and responsible conclusions. This is all corbett-terwilliger-lair hill and homestead are asking.

Katz: Thank you. Okay.

Lee Buhler: My name is lee buhler. I live at 018 southwest hamilton street. I don't live under the tram, directly under the tram. And I don't think it would have a direct impact on me, however I know a lot of people going through a tough time right now because of the tram. A couple weeks ago at our neighborhood association, mr. Jim howell came to speak about the people mover. At first I was skeptical and the more I learned about it the more impressed I was. I think it's a brilliant, brilliant idea. I know you've already decided on the tram, but in case that deal falls through, just keep in the back of your mind, there's some real advantage to the people mover. It's faster. It's safer. It can work in inclimate weather. And it won't get people so upset. An also -- and this is the tough one -- I believe it's less expensive in the long run. According to mr. Howell's numbers, which I think I can support, he estimates an operating expense of 600,000 a year versus \$2.8 million for the tram. 2.8 million times 30 years is 84 million. That doesn't count inflation. 600,000 times 30 years is a \$66 million difference. That would easily cover the extra capital costs of the people mover and extra costs to finance that. Now I know, then, the questions are, what about his assumptions? What about this \$600,000? I've been checking into this. I've been calling him. I think he's been getting tired of hearing from me, but I really want to get this figured out. An I called the company that make people movers. They're in texas. I asked them what their cost of operations are for a similar system. And they sent me an e-mail today. I could leave it with you,

JULY 10, 2002

but they have a similar system as what mr. Howell's proposing in the minneapolis airport, and their yearly maintain operation is one million. That's higher than howell's, but it's within range and much less than the 2.8 million. Also on the internet, I found an article from the national academy of science on the current state of automated people movers. And this is this about two years old. I just want to read one quick sentence in will. They're complaining that -- it was a high cost of operations of people movers. It says for a small system running 24 hours a day, provision of using one maintenance person in a central control operator for three shifts, plus supervisor staff, can amount to \$500,000 a year. \$500,000 a year versus \$2.8 million a year. These are called automated people movers. The reason they're called automated people movers --

Katz: Finish. Your sentence.

Buhler: Well, they're automated because they don't take much labor. There is some operation, but not much. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you very much.

Rose Marie Barbeau-Quinn: My name is rose marie barbeau-quinn. My late husband mike quinn and I moved to gibbs street. I live right in the middle of this. We moved there in 1980. For the neighborhood, victorian house, closeness to downtown with the feel of being in the country. Over the years the neighborhood has changed somewhat. The neighborhood is now historic, the host is wonderful as ever, but the noise and cars have increased tremendously. Gibbs is very narrow and gets a lot of traffic. During the restoration of the ross island bridge it became intense for the better part of two years. Front avenue is very busy and noisy, plus it has semis and buses which don't belong there. Then there's life flight and its low-flying helicopters. Don't get me wrong, life flight is a necessity. But again, we're the ones who bear the brunt of its noise, which causes our houses to vibrate. These are old houses. 110 years old. Sometimes they fly so low, they literally sound as though they're going to ram right into our houses, but again, because we love this old historic neighborhood, we put up with these discomforts good-naturedly. But now these modern, ugly, useless moby dicks flying right in our faces every five minutes. Be serious. Have I mentioned this is a historic neighborhood? Last year a neighbor wanted to add a window to his victorian how is, exactly like the others, no discrepancies. All of the neighbors were sent letters asking if we objected to this. The was hard to get because this window might contravene the pristine nature of this historic neighborhood. But a large bus flying over the same houses does not contravene the historic nature of this neighborhood? Please. There's a serious and blatant discrepancy in the set of standards, don't you think? Again, the little guy has to grovel, while the administrator gets his way, no matter what it causes to the neighborhood. The flying object is not a necessity. That's not been proven. It's a new toy syndrome. This is not the alps, for heaven's sake. It's a hill. There are other hospitals in the world on a hill. They don't use trams to get there. This is an insidious toy, one which will surely not bode well for Portland and will even more surely destroy us. Please respect one of Portland's few historic neighborhoods. Think of the harm this would cause to its beauty, quaintness and value, both aesthetic and monetary. We don't deserve this. Please show us you care about the little guy. Don't leave this piece of nonsense as your legacy to the city. Respect our wishes and just say no to this insanity. And as an afterthought, how can anyone be so disingenuous as to compare this flying object to the elegance of the eiffel tower or the beauty and form of the leaning tower of pisa? Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: Go ahead, steve.

Steve Stadum, General Counsel, OHSU: All right. Good afternoon. My name is steve stadum, general council for o.h.s.u., been part of the o.h.s.u. Planning team for over three years. The

JULY 10, 2002

decision you've made to adopt the marquam hill plan is a big step in allowing us to move into a new era of discovery and cures. The decision you're still facing, whether to accept the city engineer's recommendation on the tram is equally important. With the tram and the other necessary infrastructure, our campus in north macadam can happen. The city's vision of the science and technology corridor between Portland state university, o.h.s.u., omsi and the east side and the redeveloped north macadam can be realized. But the steps you are taking today are not only good for o.h.s.u., the city and the community, they can also be good for the neighborhoods, including homestead and ctlh, part of the surrounding areas affected by these decisions. I believe years from now these steps will be viewed as the first steps toward achieving a long overdue goal of reconnecting these neighborhoods to the willamette river. O.h.s.u. Is part of the homestead neighborhood and we support this goal. The city engineer's analysis is not only an excellent piece of work, but also a most thoughtful and creative recommendation. We are encouraged that the engineer concluded that the trams in the gibbs alignment is the superior solution to connect marquam hill with north macadam and the solution with the least overall impacts. This recommendation is consistent with many years of study of alignment and technology conducted by other experts. I would like to take a minute to respond to a couple questions that have arisen during the testimony you've already heard. First, commissioner Francesconi asked a question and I want to respond to that. As part of the paddy organization, o.h.s.u. Has pledged \$75,000 toward the design competition. I think gordon was uncomfortable speaking for o.h.s.u., and I can understand that. It also wouldn't be appropriate to speak for other paddy members as to their exact commitments, but we know that when combined with our pledge, paddy members have pledged at least half of the estimated cost for this design competition. Second I wanted to respond to the comments of the synagogue. I caught them as they were leaving and shared these comments with them. As you know, o.h.s.u.'s support had been for a proposed single alignment along the gibbs street right-of-way. We were just as surprised as the synagogue to learn about the second tram. While we believe that the recommended second tram does have some transportation benefits, we also believe that the concerns synagogue are well founded and their concerns should be addressed if the second tram proceeds. Finally o.h.s.u. Has not been in any discussions with anyone about displacing the synagogue for any reasons. We have no desire to do so. That was a complete surprise to us. Before I conclude, I want to thank the city for working with us over the last several years. Let me particularly recognize susan hartnet, I don't know if she's still here, and her staff for absolutely tireless work on this plan. Their work is the best demonstration of the commitment of city staff to crafting a future for the city that balances many competing interests. I also want to thank gil kelley for his leadership in building and articulating a vision for north macadam and the hill. And I want to thank matt brown and the staff at the office of transportation for their excellent work in analyzing and communicating the many issues surrounding the tram. Finally I want to again thank the mayor and city council for your understanding of these important issues and your leadership in resolving them. I'm out of time, but I want to say one more general statement. And that is that we hear your call for a partnership with the city and our community to ensure that the benefits of your decisions today are realized and that the issues and concerns that have been identified in this process are addressed. We will, of course, be at the table and will work diligently and in good faith to make this a great partnership.

Brenden Hyde, 3115 SW First, 97201: My name is brendan hyde. I'm a lair hill resident. I'm going to digress from my prepared comments based on something I heard today a little bit. I listen to those who claim that a tram system is going to increase or benefit my property value, i'm a little puzzled by their reverse logic. In these people's minds for my family and I to benefit we need to

JULY 10, 2002

stick around for 5-10 years, slog through the construction, deal with all that, and at the end of that time, sell our home for this huge profit we're going to make. Wow, to benefit we have to actually leave the neighborhood we're living in. I mean, it doesn't make sense to me. That's not my definition of a benefit. I'm living -- my family and I are living where we live for a reason. With that in mind, I guess I have a real estate opportunity for some of those who support the tram. Some neighbors will leave their hill for various reasons. Had he they need to move on, need a bigger home, smaller home, what not. And some will probably leave because if the tram is approved they don't want to live under it. Here's a challenge, aside from the other challenge I was going to make today, but for those who support the tram i'd like to see them put their money where their mouth is and move into these homes and live under the tram that they support. And if they perceive it as a benefit and they think they don't mind living under it, then clear out some other real estate space in other parts of the city and move under it and live under it. Don't buy it as an investment property and put tenants in there, live under it. Put your money where your mouth is. You know, if it's such a benefit and so glamorous and sexy and the best place to live in Portland because it's on postcards, live under it. I sincerely doubt, you know, in all due respect to the people involved in Portland aerial transportation, inc., et cetera, that they would take me up on my invitation. Maybe i'm cynical, but whatever. Lastly, you know, what troubles me most about this whole process, and I know we've heard about the process all day, but it seems like the lack of leadership in this city, leadership by one or more of you to rise up above the political brinkmanship to insist that items that we see as mitigation in the plan that will simply consider later aren't on the table right now, 100%, part of this plan. There is important to our neighborhood and the city as the cost of the cable, as the cost of the tower, as the cost of the little car that people are going to fly over my home in. You know, this arrogance to me about this just portrays a sense of fear, fear to lead honestly and represent all of us. Fear to be creative. Fear to stand up and say an aerial tram may look good on paper, but what I actually -- would I actually want to live under it? Can't we go under the neighborhood? We've heard about that today. Fear to create a win-win situation, and say if we do this right, believe it or not, shuttle buses can actually work, especially given the current demand. And the current ridership need to a vacant lot today. Fear to commit to neighborhood improvements up front now, not as mitigation later to be considered. I don't want to open up the paper and read, o.h.s.u. Tram starts up, but, gosh, no more money left for any of these mitigating factors. Sorry, south Portland, bye-bye, synagogue.

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

*****: Thanks.

Eileen Lorber, 6740 SW 11th Dr., 97219: Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is eileen losher. I have md and dmd degrees from o.h.s.u. And currently working on a research project for the state department of health, and there's collaboration with o.h.s.u. On that project. I say that because i'm a strong advocate of o.h.s.u., and yet I totally oppose the tram as it is proposed at this time. I'm speaking today, not as a resident of the neighborhood most directly affected, and i'm not even speaking as a resident of hillsdale where I live in terms of the traffic impact which I know we'll have there, but I want to speak as a resident of Portland and just a voter who voted for three of you in the past.

Katz: The three of us that are here right now, right?

Lorber: We'll just not go into it, okay? But majority support. You know, there is a huge missing voice here that I -- this is the third time i've spoken. And I don't hear people from outside of the neighborhoods directly affected, but i've talked to many people in Portland, and they think it's goofball and crazy and they don't want to see it. They don't want -- this is the most visited

JULY 10, 2002

terwilliger parkway is the most visited tourist parkway in the city. It's a beautiful place. And I think that you might be missing the voice that is Portland in general, and that is who you should be representing, as well as o.h.s.u. On the other hand, I truly believe in medical research. I think that's obvious from my background. So I would like to go ahead and see north macadam developed, even though it takes away the river view, which I love too. I'd like to propose that there's a very reasonable alternative that might work for everyone, which is to compromise. Start out with a shuttle bus system as o.h.s.u. Builds its second campus. Watch the ridership. Make it as fast, efficient and low impact as possible as that occurs. And as that occurs take the time needed to really look at good alternatives. I've heard people movers, i've heard, you know, low gondola -- I haven't heard that much today, but something that has less impact visually and maybe isn't as polarizing to the neighborhoods. If you started with a shuttle bus system, which could be flexible, operate, could move up in need, and then could back off, and then build a true east-west system that makes sense, that is really researched and could be the best alternative for all of us instead of going with this slam, bam project, has to be now, has to be today, otherwise the whole thing falls apart. I don't think it will fall apart. I think you do that. And you could also estimate the need on the basis of who's riding the shuttle bus. I want to address that one point on need. I read in "the Oregonian" that there are -- and i've heard a lot about physician researchers needing to get back and forth very quickly. "the Oregonian" said there were 230 of them. I'm sure that's low. There are also more than physicians that need to go back and forth, but I wonder if this is really going to end up not to be an intercampus connection, but to be a commuter site, a park-and-ride site for people who can't get parking at o.h.s.u. Please consider that that's how it's mainly going to be used.

Katz: Thank you.

Lorber: That's a big possibility, because there's no parking at o.h.s.u. When I worked there, it was a three-year waiting list for parking.

Katz: Thank you. Time's up.

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

Malea, 2939 SW 4th Ave, 97201: Hi. I'd like to -- i'm melea. I'd like to cap a little bit on what eileen stated. That is what I ask each of you that are for the tram to take for a moment, if you haven't already, to put yourself in our shoes. And imagine how it will affect the ctlh neighborhood. Look at the effects it will have on the historic neighborhood and the terwilliger parkway with the natural scenic beauty, terwilliger parkway is a highlight of tourists and outdoor enthusiasts, and I highlighted a little bit on that a few weeks ago. I'm not sure that, you know, some of you realize that it really truly is one of the peak areas. The other item is what does a tram really benefit? Is it really going to benefit those of us in ctlh? I don't believe so. O.h.s.u. Says it will eliminate traffic problems, but all the tram will do is reroute traffic and we'll end up back where he started at a lot of expense. Look at some of the options. We've heard a few today. One of them is to, again, as eileen stated and i'll recap, is to look at an alternate shuttle bus, in place -- add another shuttle bus to the system. Or the underground tunnel. I realize "the Oregonian," matt brown in charge of development with the tram, stated that he didn't believe that folks would ride underground, an underground transportation, however people get into elevators all the time. There's good examples. Some would be the holiday tunnel, or a great example would be the tunnel from london to paris where you're underground approximately 20-25 minutes, under water in fact, which would be much more difficult to get off if there was an emergency rather than if we were looking at an underground tunnel we could actually look at getting off on to a walkway if there were an emergency. A lot of folks are upset today, and i'm sure you've learned to tune many of them out, buffer many of us that live in the neighborhood are open to their anger and frustrations and many

JULY 10, 2002

of them shedding tears, because this is their neighborhood, their community, part of what they've built their livelihood on. So in closing I ask again that you please think about the long-term effect that the tram will have on our livable city. While we have taken pride in our natural beauty, our historic neighborhoods, please give credit to those of us who are just the small folks, who have made this city a lot of what it is today and not just o.h.s.u. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Ernie Munch: Ernie munch, 1515 southwest myrtle street. I've come to support the aerial tramway, or aerial ropeway as a solution. I think it's really necessary to have the investment in the hospital area and also north macadam. And it's a clear gain for the city in terms of jobs and creation of a neighborhood down by the river. And I think that it's going to create wealth for the city. My concern is that somehow the neighborhood gets cut in on the deal. They are going to be impacted by it. I think having some financial guarantees about loss of their homesites and the value is important and a good step in the right direction, but I don't think it's enough. I think they also have aspirations, they wanted to be rejoined. It's a historic neighborhood. It's the focus of your mural above you. Somehow this project is an opportunity to link those together and an opportunity to forward your commitment to building and reinforcing inner city neighborhoods. This area is important for two reasons. One, it is a great neighborhood. And the other is that it is a part of a regional transportation system, which is my third concern about it. I think this is an opportunity to link into that regional transportation system and provide access to the hill and also down to the river, where you have a developing neighborhood. No one's really figured out how to get enough access into the north macadam area to support the growth that's predicted there. We certainly don't have the commitment in terms of dollars to provide those resources. And we can't let this opportunity pass without speaking to that issue. So i'm hoping that you will limit the debate to an aerial hopeway, but leave open the technology, because there may be a better technology in terms of a gondola that would provide an answer to these other criteria. You'll adopt a broader criteria for the investigation, that will benefit the neighborhood and tie into the regional transportation, as well as support the two end points. And hopefully involve the neighborhood now in a more focused debate as to how this can be designed to help that neighborhood. Thank you.

Katz: Thanks, sir.

*******:** Mike, why don't you go ahead.

Mike Dee: Sure. Mike dee, liberation collective, 133 northwest sixth avenue. Howdy, y'all. I'd like you to vote no on the tram. Oregon health sciences university has a plenty of the taxpayers' money already. 40 years, no cures, okay, well, maybe there's that one with brian and the glivac drug. Actually did that in a petri dish, so maybe they should stop animal cruelty out there in hillsboro and here at p.s.u. They have all kinds of money to buy billboards, newspaper and tv ads, and the grand floral parade. Been trying to have a public forum with them. They're not always good faith negotiators. If you remember the o.h.s.u. Nurses strike here recently where they hired the scab nurses and still didn't come out with a very good settlement. You know, they're not the best people to be working with here. I've been harassed by their security, followed around. You know, I protest them. I'm concerned about what they're doing out there. And this would just make it much bigger. I know that many of you are for the biotechnology industry and that's a really risky business. It takes a lot of money. And, well, o.h.s.u. Already has a lot of money. In fact, they got the \$200 million from the tobacco settlement. And then they got our recent bond measures that passed before them. We heard about the guy from local 29, talking about jobs. And how they might get some construction work. It's possible. They might. But there's not a lot of experts on building trams here in Portland as far as I know. So that might not be as helpful as we were

JULY 10, 2002

thinking. There was a -- i'm concerned about the fleecing of america. There was a -- the national institute of health gives them all kinds of money, and they don't necessarily use it appropriately. The monkey research -- i'm sorry -- the squirrel mating habits, you know, that doesn't seem like a priority to me. The size of monkey's testicles, you know, i'm sorry, I don't know. I could go on, but i'll get back to this. If we're worried about jobs, you know, what about the school district and the 30 people that they just laid off, the custodians because they're privatizing it? These are all concerns. It's great that o.h.s.u.'s going to throw some money to the -- what? 75,000, they said, to the design competition. I'm glad they're going to throw something involved in there, but i'm also happy to say that i'm glad that my history with the city council here is that you have a really good record as far as historic code resources and with the amendments and the current pending stuff, and so i'm sure that you're going to try to do the right thing. I can't tell how much time. Oh, I see. Not much. So I guess what i'd ask you to do is vote no on the tram. I'd like to have a public forum with the o.h.s.u. People about their animal research, scientific debate, and then let's just get the budget of what they're working with here. They have a lot of our money. Where's it going? Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

*******:** Age before beauty.

Katz: Pull the mic down.

*******:** Age before beauty.

Katz: We don't want to miss this.

*******:** I just made this up.

Katz: Oh, okay.

Lili Mandel: Lili mandell, 1511 southwest Portland. Oh, it's late. First, I want to make something very, very clear. I love o.h.s.u. My wonderful doctor is on pill hill and I love him. But I know while i'm right here i'm dead in the water. And even o.h.s.u. Will not be able to save me. I know that. And yet I feel that I must speak out because I think arrogance has run amok again. Take this synagogue being condemned and nobody even knows about it. The root -- route that you travel on your way to a decision on the mode of transportation is very important, since that's the Portland process that people are calling john carroll about. That means all alternatives must be considered. Haste makes waste. And all this precious word, how much does it cost? Cost, cost, cost. And it may cost us too much in the future. Give love a chance. Give all alternative a chance before you vote on the mode of transportation. That's all. I just made this up.

Katz: Lilly, let me just say that o.h.s.u. Had nothing to do with the second tram to barbur boulevard.

Mandell: No, I know that. I still love them.

Katz: I thought you were making the tie that in addition to everything else, they did this.

Mandell: No, no. You didn't run amok. It wasn't your arrogance, it was somebody else's arrogance this time.

Katz: Okay. Sorry. Why don't you grab the mic.

Kelley Pects, 3322 SW Water, 97239: Good afternoon. Or should I say good evening? Madame mayor and fellow commissioners, thanks for having given us the chance to talk this evening. I'm losing my voice a little bit so you got to bear with me. My name is kelly petchis. I'm a resident of the corbett-terwilliger-lair hill neighborhood. I'm a project manager for oracle in their research and development organization. My husband and I live there. My husband is an employee of intel. And we've worked both quite a bit in high tech. And I think we both understand how important it is to implement solutions that can be upgraded. Effectively and easily. And when working with my customers I talk a lot about total cost of ownership. And I think that's a really important

JULY 10, 2002

concept that I hope all of us take to heart. And that is not just looking at what it costs to implement the solution, but what is the long term cost? What is this going to cost us 20-30 years from now when all of you are hopefully retired or moving on to other things. So let me just go through a list of other points i'd like to make here. The first question I have is, has a true need for the tram truly been established? If you were to get in your cars at rush hour and drive the route from north macadam up to o.h.s.u., you would find that if you did this several times, and averaged that out, like my neighbor did, it comes to about 8« minutes. And I realize that the tram -- I think purports a six-minute travel time. So for a 2«-minute benefit, are you really going to put out the neighborhood the way we all know the neighborhood will be put out? So i'd just like for you to think about that. Tune in your heart of hearts that this need has truly completely and conclusively been established? The second point i'd like to make is that about safety. Do you know that a tram will be a safe transportation method, given the high winds that we have, given life flight's low path? And I think their path is pretty much over where the tram would ride. And third, I hate to say it, but in this day after september 11th, I think we need to think about vandalism and terrorism. Heaven forbid if something were to happen to that tram as it's in the air, passing over a highly populated area, and barbur boulevard with all kinds of cars and people, what could the outcome be? The third point i'd like to make, i'd like to reiterate what eileen was saying earlier, and that is that of public opinion. I think you've only really heard from a small group of folks. You've heard from people that are paid to be here and are doing their jobs, and you've heard from people that care enough about this subject to take a half a day off work to be here, but you haven't heard from people outside the neighborhood or really outside o.h.s.u. To the degree that you probably need to. Lastly, when you were you're thinking about how you will vote, and I really hope you haven't all made up your minds already -- just two more sentences -- please consider the impact on this tram and how it will affect Portland's oldest residential neighborhood. Commissioner Francesconi, when speaking with the gentleman from the synagogue, you said that you would drive towards a win-win situation. And my question is, what are you and the other council members going to do to be sure that you provide a win-win situation for the homeowners who reside under the tram wherever that tram may be?

Katz: Thank you.

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

Marjorie Enneking, 0121 SW Whitaker, 97201: i'm in that neighborhood and care much about that. I guess I have three concerns that i'd like to reiterate. I think they've been brought up before. One is respect for the neighborhood. I can't even change the color of my house without approval, and yet you're considering putting a tram on the street next to mine. I think respect for the neighborhood is very important. Not only for our neighborhood, but how other neighborhoods view the actions of the council. When you run roughshod over a neighborhood because some big business wants it done. So I think there's a principal here and not this particular decision. It occurred to me thinking of the cost effectiveness of the tram, for \$2.8 million a year, if it's true, as several people have said, it takes about eight minutes on the shuttle to go back and forth, and six minutes on the tram, and you think about those people aren't all doing research on the ninth floor of the hospital, so they still have to walk another five minutes. He would be spending more time rather than less. And for 2.8 million, you could give every one of them a personal chauffeur and still pay less than 8 million and they could get personal transportation from one site to the other. So again, the need and the cost effectiveness, I don't believe anything in any of the documents has shown who is really going to use the tram and how cost effective is their use. I urge you to take the time to look at those. And I guess my third issue is the whole fairness of the process. I reluctantly

JULY 10, 2002

had put my name in for one of those review committees because I knew I wouldn't have time. I'm a faculty member at Portland state, I felt I was pretty open minded about this. I have a lot of colleagues in the math department who regularly both are my colleagues, faculty members and students regularly go up to the mill. -- hill the their students come down, they interchange statistics classes and others. The tram won't have any impact on that. I've worked at people regularly with ohsu. And I support them. I'm an avid bus rider. So I have no objection to public transportation to ohsu. And I felt I could have been a member that could really look at the issues. I was notified by susan that I wasn't selected because there was another community representative that had been selected, and in fact someone from psu. I called her and said i'd like to talk about some of the issues from the tram. She called back, left a phone message and said, I want you to know, I am in full support of whatever ohsu wants. I don't consider that kind of a process a selection of the people to be a fair and open process.

Katz: Thank you.

*******:** I urge you to take time to make a good decision.

Katz: Thank you.

Tom Miller: Good afternoon, my name is tom miller, I live at 3422 southwest 11th, and I would like to share the concept of evaluating all the options very thoroughly. I believe this tunnel, people-mover thing is getting shorted. One of our council meetings a couple weeks ago it almost got laughed off the table. They said would it go halfway through the hill and be almost expensive as the tri-met-max. It's only 3300 feet long rather than 15,000, and it's about half the diameter, which ends up being one-fifth the expense. It's not as much as maybe as it was shown, and I think erik, as you said, there's no win-win if you're talking about the tram or the houses underneath. Your pretense to the marquam hill plan. I do believe this could be a win-win in a lot of respects. You could get the very direct access to north macadam and the ohsu properties, but more than that, you'd have stops at barbur, and you can go from barbur rather than the two trams, rather than going up the hill and back down north macadam, you could go to the people-mover and go directly east. I think this warrants more consideration. It also does not affect the neighborhoods as everybody -- a lot of neighborhood activists are speaking against. I think that warrants maybe even more expense, but with thorough investigation it may not be more expensive at all. There's some other issues on this as well. One thing, seeing gordon davis now is secretary to the organization, one of his criteria was that one of the design standards is its high impact, casey eye institute was built bright light and lit with aviation landing lights. It's just an eyesore. This is hopefully a community of environmentally friendly, low-impact designs and developments. What's wrong with trying to build it -- if you were to build a tram, as like the ymca, the building in duniway, it's very low-impact, environmentally friendly. The thought the design criteria for the tram is high-impact, we just get rid of that impact all together and build what I perceive to be a better solution for all involved, and pursue this people-mover idea. It may be more cost effective, it may warrant being - - if we had the money, paying twice as much for it, not to have the impacts this tram is deemed to have. It may be -- i've been very involved with the process, all you -- all of you have known, and I understand the problem, it's crucial to ohsu. What has not been on the table is they need a calling card, a focal point such as the tram. If that is indeed one of the criterias for this tram, I think it should be addressed as such. If they just need an adequate way to get from one campus to another, I believe this people-mover scenario will work. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

David Redlich: Thank you. My name is david redlich, I live at 3944 southwest condor avenue. Is this the three meant where I get to be nasty? No? Okay. First, let me open with this comment for

JULY 10, 2002

our commissioner responsible for parks. There is a win-win solution in the north macadam plan. The area designated as a public park underneath the ross island bridge, while is so ill-suited as a park for people, may be a perfect park for the regional dog off-leash area, after all, it is already a brown field, so there are a host of environmental concerns that can be avoided in one fell swoop. Now, some of my previous comments were interpreted as being threatening and insulting. I'm sorry if you've taken it that way, but i'm not going to apologize. Frankly this entire process has been an insult to me as a citizen and taxpayer. Consistently throughout this proper at the -- process, documents have been delivered to the community in unreasonably short periods of time. Ten days before the planning commission took this up, the marquam hill plan was delivered to the neighborhoods, 230-some-odd pages with another 100 pages much addendum and we were given ten days to respond to that. On numerous occasions i've been called upon by the bureau of planning to submit neighborhood positions on various amendments and items on a couple of hours' notice. I was called on one item five hours before the closing deadline. How is a neighborhood association and as a community, can we respond to these kinds of situations? Take a look at this document. We're mowing down trees right and left here, folks. That one right there, two weeks beforehand. How is a citizen that has a job and a life supposed to wade through that document, prepare their testimony, and then take a half day off work to come down here and talk to you all? Now, as i've said earlier, i've been deeply offended by this entire process. You sent a clear signal to everybody in southwest Portland that's paying attention. The neighborhoods and park users simply don't count in this process. The message you're sending now through the marquam hill plan and now the tram decision, which I think you're going to adopt, that this council is willing to put a price on neighborhood livability, and our -- on our parks' heritage. Anybody that comes along and can promise enough job creation will get just about whatever they want. All along throughout this process ohsu's position has been it's either our way or the highway. I frankly call upon you to exhibit a little backbone and suggest they may want to examine the highway option. Try the drive out to 26 to hillsboro. I think they may find in fact that a shuttle system in fact is a very reasonable alternative at eight minutes versus trying to get out to a facility in hillsboro in god knows what period of time. This plan, both the marquam hill plan and the tram contain nothing in the way of serving the broad public and community interests of the city of Portland. And I urge you not only to reject the tram, but reevaluate your position on many elements, particularly the transportation elements, of the marquam hill plan.

Katz: Thank you.

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

Katz: Thanks. Anybody else? Okay. Matt, why don't you come on up. There were a couple of issues that were raised. Do you want to respond to them? As I said, we have a couple of changes in the resolution. I'm going to hold off on that until all the issues are out on the table and then we can decide.

Matt Brown, Portland Office of Transportation: Matt brown, Portland office of transportation. Why don't we jump --

Katz: Speak up.

Brown: Why don't we jump to the one we heard the most about, the underground people-mover system. I'm going to defer on some of this to joe. A lot of the people-mover systems that are being considered are also made by many of the same manufacturers that do an aerial tram. Actually I think mr. Hall's characterization of this as an underground tram, that's probably correct. You can go a lot of different ways. A lot of the technology is very similar. A lot of this work is based on as good as the assumptions that go into it. I'll say the cost information, for instance, for the aerial

JULY 10, 2002

tram proposal is that we put together made certain assumptions about those trams. For instance, the cabins are attended. You would have one attendant in each cabin. Aerial tram systems, it's also possible you can build a fully automated aerial tram. That's not the assumption we made, and in part that's why some of the costs for the aerial tram are what they are. You could play a similar kind of scenario out with a people-mover system. Do you have attendants in those vehicles or not? I think again, that will change your cost, your cost analysis of what those systems are. From a mechanical standpoint, I think we've been pretty conservative, frankly, with some of the numbers. I've certainly deferred to Joe on his judgment on this, but to give you an idea, during the off -- the nonoperational hours for the tram, we've assumed there will be two mechanics, and one electrician.

Basically every hour shift. Whether or not we actually need that number of bodies working on this is a little up in the air, we chose to be very conservative. I think we have to ask the question, these mechanical systems are essentially equivalent. Should we make the same assumption for an underground people-mover as well? It's something we want to address if that was council's discretion. But we also I think know enough at this point to know that \$600,000 is low if we hold the assumption consistent across the alternatives.

Saltzman: What about capital costs?

Brown: I think we're in pretty close agreement with some of the folks from the neighborhood, that \$50 million, 80 million, somewhere in there is an appropriate range for this. An underground cable system, Joe may have more to offer on this, but he feels it's somewhere between, say, a tram and a gondola in terms of a mechanical system, what that costs to install. Somewhere between 10 to \$15 million would be about what you're looking at in that case. Then you have the elevator stations, which are some additional costs. We took a pretty cursory look at it. I'm not going to say that it is a full-blown engineer's estimate. But using the 3300 linear feet level -- 3300 linear foot measure, taking cost information from Tri-Met and their Washington Park stations about what does a high-speed elevator cost, and taking that information into account, and then also taking just some basic tunneling costs into account, from Tri-Met, not saying that it's a 33-foot-wide tunnel, but it's not -- it's probably not just a 12-foot-wide tunnel either. It's probably somewhere in between.

Katz: Did you want to -- I wanted to ask you if you wanted to add anything.

Brant Williams, City Engineer: No, I really don't. I was just making sure the capital costs got put out there too, because I think we are in agreement that the capital costs are significant for the tunneling. It was the operating costs where we had the disagreement with the people who are proposing this.

Brown: And I think, again, on the capital side, I know OHSU developed some of their own information about that. We didn't refer to that. They've also developed their own information about what it would cost to implement an idea like that. They'd probably have it, but I think they've looked at it independently as well as far as up-front capital costs.

Katz: Do you want to respond to this? [phone ringing] [laughter]

Katz: Just pull the plug. Identify yourself for the record.

Joe Gmunder, Gmunder Engineering: Joe, an engineer. You have to look at going underground and going above ground, they're two totally different things. Also from the -- an aerial lift is very efficient at going up avert call rise. That's where if we're staying above the ground, the system makes a lot of sense. If we're talking about putting a tunnel underneath the ground at a horizontal level, now you open up the possibility of whatever type of movement you would do under the horizontal ground. There's no advantage of the incline. So there are cable propelled systems that can work underground, you could have the streetcar underground. But the big capital cost is going to be building the tunnel, building the stations and all that. The -- if you choose a cable-propelled

JULY 10, 2002

system underground, it's somewhat comparable to the above-ground system, the capital cost of that underground system is 1 1/2 to two times the system above ground and the operating costs will be the same. The big variation, like everybody said, the big cost in operating this is labor. And the assumptions you make in the labor costs and the labor hours in -- can drive these costs from \$400,000 to \$2.5 million. But in the end, you have to make the systems work, it's going to take a certain amount of maintenance personnel and operational personnel to run them. You can automate the people-mover below ground you can automate to a higher extent the tram above ground. I feel the costs for operation will be equivalent.

Katz: Further questions by the council?

Francesconi: For you, matt, in a minute i'm going to offer a second -- an amendment on this second tram. Can you go into a little more detail about how -- the significance of the second tram, and also how it might be funded?

Brown: Sure. I am also I think i'm going to call rob birchfield up here as well. He coordinated with tri-met and metro some of our -- how this integrated with the system. I think in general that obviously from a regional perspective, we see the opportunity of connecting to barbur boulevard as a major opportunity, and as you heard from tri-met, today, they feel they're able to quantify what the -- the kinds of efficiencies they're able to maintain. They can put dollar figures into it in the sense of, you know, making their system more efficient and providing better transit access to and from marquam hill. I might also point out that we haven't talked a lot about the role that the second tram may play in providing access to north macadam. But you're only a 7-minute trip, including your wait time up and back. And that will probably rival, probably beat out, again, going downtown, transferring to a streetcar, coming back down into the district. It puts it if not faster, fairly equivalent to that. So it could also play a role there. Maybe i'll turn it over to rob to see if he wants to talk more about some of the assumptions we made with the importance of that connection at barbur.

Rob Birchfield, City Traffic Engineer: Rob birchfield, office of transportation. The value of a connection at barbur was really played out, I mean, validated for us when we had metro do modeling for us of the tram connections either from north macadam to marquam hill, or a transit connection that included a stop at barbur. Essentially what they modeled for us at that time was a tram scenario or a gondola scenario. And what we found was there was considerable trip demand, or travel demand for the trips from barbur to marquam hill. And the reason for that is, you can connect well with the regional transportation system along barbur, especially with the type of transit service that the 2020 networked -- priority network that's planned for in our regional transportation system plan provides. So what you have, for instance, on barbur in the year 2020, you have, like, rapid bus service that provides along the barbur route that provides five-minute headways, other bus routes are there, you have net headway that's are down around 2 1/2 minutes. People coming from the south or north have a lot of opportunity to make transit connections, and get to a station at barbur where they could travel to the hill. What that allows tri-met to do is -- as tony alluded to, they can avoid bus trips and bus service that would have to go up the hill otherwise. They can pig -- essentially this barbur tram can piggyback on the regional transit service that's already there and you don't have to essentially add more service to get people up and down the hill in buses. That's why that short connection there becomes quite cost effective and makes a lot of sense in terms of the regional transportation system. The other thing that's in the regional transportation system in 2020 is very good streetcar service from downtown to north macadam. So what happens is you don't necessarily see as many trips going between barbur and north macadam because many of those trips can be served by streetcar, which from downtown to

JULY 10, 2002

north macadam. So you don't find people necessarily making a trip south on barbur to get on a gondola or other system to get to north macadam, they would instead get on streetcar from downtown and go to north macadam. So in terms of looking at the numbers and doing the analysis from a modeling perspective, the barbur tram kind of -- or that connection, jumped out at us as a real opportunity in terms of integrating with the regional transportation system. But recognize, all this is done in a modeling environment, where there's a lot of assumptions about what's going to be out there in 2020 and how robust are all these transit systems going to be? Is that streetcar network going to be there? Is it going to be running 71/2-minute headways, et cetera, et cetera. Whether all these benefits are realized depends a lot on what future we do have to work with.

*****: Regarding the funding question --

Katz: Identify yourself.

Williams: Brent Williams, city engineer, office of transportation. We have just begun some discussions about funding for the tram, and since we haven't adopted the two-tram concept yet, that hasn't been a point of discussion. However, since this would be more of a regional system that connects to our regional network, it would be something that we would be looking at working with our regional partners on, looking at federal funding. We're going to have to get as creative as possible to come up with some type of funding scheme for this entire system, but we haven't developed a program at this point yet. So that is something that we will be working on in the next phase when we get into the design-development phase, not only the design aspect, but a funding scenario for the project itself.

Saltzman: Are you including budget for mitigation options?

Williams: We'll -- certainly. We'll be looking at what those mitigation options are. That's going to be a key component of that phase, and it's going to be real important to the community, of course, and of course to the city. And so --

Saltzman: You're attaching costs right now in your budget?

Williams: We have not yet. We will be doing that as we develop the mitigation options that will bring back to you -- we'll bring back to you for approval, along with the design of the system, and we'll be looking at whatever funding options are available out there to make sure this is a completely funded program for us.

Katz: Brant, with all due respect, I know what the demands for the transportation dollars are. In fact, JPAC is beginning that conversation as to what's going to be important in terms of criteria for funding. I also know what the I-5 trade corridor demands are going to be in terms of federal priority, and now we're working with two states and have a delegation from two states looking at this. So I don't know where all of that fits in, and as I said before, yes, it is -- I understand the importance of it. It is part of a regional system. And if we had the resources and maybe I'm wrong, we can do that as well as other things. But I'd love to use the money for the mitigation. So if somebody else can pay for it that will not deter us from spending transportation dollars on priorities that have been set for a while prior to this, that might work. But right now, I can't -- I can't assure you there's going to be those dollars.

Williams: We all know the shortage that we're dealing with, and the demands that are out there for especially federal funds in the next go-around for the allocation of the federal funding. These are two completely different systems, and they are dependent, so we can explore funding packages for each one, and bring those back to you with options for funding as well as the funding options for the mitigation. It may end up being a trade-off, and we may need to let go of that second tram. But we want to come back and give you the best options available so you can make a good decision along those lines.

JULY 10, 2002

Katz: Okay.

Brown: And i'd just like to add one point, I think what yes really need to know, even if we decide not to fund the second tram, or not to pursue that, we need to make a decision about whether or not that is sort of our, say, long-term goal so we can really adequately design the upper terminus.

Katz: And that's fair. Okay. Any more questions by the council? All right. We have --

Saltzman: Were there any other issues you wanted to address?

Katz: Did you want to respond to some of the other issues that were raised?

Saltzman: I'm not sure, i'm just saying if there were other issues you wanted -- .

Brown: I don't think so at this point. Unless there's something you'd really like us to address, I think we're --

Williams: I would like to reiterate that this is just the first step. We need to go through this design-development phase and we'll be coming back to council again for review of the design itself, and key is the mitigation. So we have not developed a mitigation strategy at this point but we don't know what the system is. Once we learn what the system is, then we can start looking at the mitigation. That is going to be very important.

Katz: The mitigation I think extends also out to the neighborhood, whether it's the south Portland circulation, whether it's the bridge, the pedestrian bridge over the freeway to the river for the neighbors, whether it's the slowing down of traffic on naito parkway, a lot of that has been studied, and requires considerable amount of resources. And I guess for the council at some point they're going to have to make a decision where all of the priorities, there are other transportation priorities and begin to identify them and where those resources can come from.

Brown: I would like to say one last thing. I want to take responsibility for our lack of communication with the congregation. This is always happening very quickly and I wasn't able to sit down with them and go through this as I should have. So I want to make that clear.

Katz: You're very sweet. Thank you. You were asked to do something, and this is one of your charges that you probably were a little nervous about. So I appreciate that.

Saltzman: Since we're on mitigation options, this would be a good time to present my amendments since they deal with those.

Katz: We'll take all the amendments. Let's start, commissioner Sten, do you have -- let's start with yours.

Saltzman: I have two amendments. The first amendment is a resolve that would add as a mitigation option that we work with affected property owners to include a voluntary buy-out option for affected properties. We do have other mitigation options that address decrease in property values, but I think there are many neighbors who are affected who will be affected by the tram who have expressed an interest in moving if in fact the tram is going to go over their location. I think there should be a duration under which there would be an option for them to be bought out at a fair market value or above. I think that has to be one of the mitigation options.

Francesconi: I'll second that, if it needs a second.

Katz: I'm going to need to tell linda, do you know where it goes?

Linda Meng, Chief Deputy City Attorney: I don't have it.

Katz: All right. We need to make sure she's got it. Be resolved that the city council directs the Portland office of transportation to work and then it's amended with the affected property owners, and then, the names of the property -- the neighborhood associations, homestead neighborhood, corbett-terwilliger, lair hill neighborhood, and Portland aerial transportation, and continue with that.

JULY 10, 2002

Saltzman: And the second amendment is another resolve that city council will not use hostile public condemnation in establishing a mono cable tram linking barbur boulevard and marquam hill.

Katz: Okay. Let me add a friendly amendment to your amendment on, in the be it resolved that the city council directs the Portland office of transportation to work with the affected property owners, to add, after, potential mitigation approaches, including consideration of recommendations from the south Portland circulation study.

Francesconi: I'll second both of those if they need them.

Katz: Okay. With the combination of this one and what I just read, you've got three amendments. I also -- let me -- we'll vote in a second. Being put on the table, be it further resolved the city council recognizes Portland aerial transportation inc. As the project sponsor for this suspended cable transportation system and directs the Portland office of transportation to work with the Portland aerial transportation inc. Through the design development phase for this system.

Francesconi: Then I have one amendment, but two parts to one amendment, because part is a whereas and the other is a resolve. You have a copy, linda?

Saltzman: I've got extras.

Francesconi: Let me read it for the audience. Whereas alternative alignment and landing locations for the mono cable tram between the barbur transit corridor and marquam hill should be studied to determine if property impacts and terwilliger parkway impact can be minimized or eliminated. And be it further resolved city council supports the concept of a second tram linking marquam hill to the barbur transit corridor and directs pdot to provide additional information on the exact alignment and design of the mono cable tram and return with this information by september 25th, 2002. So it's softer than the language have you in front of you on the second.

Katz: Let me see that. All right. Is the council in support of all of the amendments that we just mentioned? Do I hear yes?

Williams: I want to comment on the one amendment regarding condemnation.

Katz: Okay.

Williams: Condemnation is actually a tool that we use quite often. It goes against what you were saying, mayor. I think what we're talking about here is displacement. With like the imax project and interstate urban renewal district, we decided not to do displacement there, but we still use condemnation to do small pieces of public improvements, like at corners of intersections to provide for access and things like that. And so I just want --

Katz: I think the adjective was hostile. Because there are friendly condemnations that provide tax benefits, or provide some benefits. I think -- yes, linda? Correct all of us.

Meng: Well, in my -- my concern too is that if you need three feet of right of way across somebody's property, sometimes it's hostile in the sense that you have to negotiate and you might have to file a lawsuit. It's not friendly in the sense that they've agreed to it, but it's not dislocating somebody, or you might need an easement under somebody's property for, you know, a water line or sewer line, or some other piece of a project. And so --

Saltzman: We're talking about an aerial system that would be going over open space.

Meng: I'm just saying that it's possible if you needed to make some -- to put poles in somewhere you might need a couple feet of -- feet of right of way. I understand your concern about dislocating the congregation, and that's certainly your choice to make. But I think if you say you're not going to use condemnation at all, you could end up with some property owner where we need three feet of right of way who would -- basically has a veto over the whole project because we can't get that --

JULY 10, 2002

Saltzman: We'll not use it for dislocating commercial, nonprofit or residents, will that do it?

Meng: Is that would be fine. Even dislocating, you know, an entity or a property owner.

Katz: How about a property owner? Would that cover --

Meng: That would be fine, yes.

Katz: So that's a friendly amendment.

Saltzman: Hostile public condemnation dislocating a property owner.

Katz: Okay. So do I hear a second for all of those amendments?

Francesconi: Second.

Katz: I will, as you heard me, i'm still nervous about the second tram. I think the word has been soften, it's the concept, I may not end up supporting it, but I have no problem with you looking at it. All right. All in favor of the package of amendments? [chorus of aye] unanimous. Any opposition? Hearing none. [gavel pounded] anything else? Council, anything else? All right. Then let's take a roll call vote.

Francesconi: I'm going to support this. Just briefly, we're choosing to do this, think we need to do it right, which means not only helping ohsu connect to macadam, but helping the neighborhoods and that portion of the city connect to the river. Establishing a system that connects to a regional transportation system, and then also works to mitigate harm, especially for people underneath the tram. I've never said that there wouldn't be harm, and I do believe that in fact there will. I actually met with the neighbors in their homes underneath the tram, and we've talked about this very issue. So I do think that when you first on the issue of the tram, when you look at the issue of travel time, neighborhood impacts, transportation access and efficiency, feasibility, implementation and operating costs as well as the issue of the development, I do believe that the by cameral tram linking marquam hill to north macadam along the gibb street alignment is the right thing to do. I also believe we need to look very seriously at a mono cable tram linking barbur to the marquam hill for the reasons that were just expressed. Regarding the issue of mitigation, the three that i'm the most interested in are how we implement the south Portland circulation study, how we improve pedestrian access for south Portland neighborhoods to north macadam and the willamette river, and the property value guarantee for properties along the tram alignment. I actually went back and read the south Portland circulation study, a copy of which I have in my hand. In 1943, it was harbor drive that cut through this neighborhood. We mitigated it with waterfront park, but this in the -- and the ramps and the cut-throughs still affect this neighbor. As I mentioned before, we're going to align all the major transportation projects that we have and we're going to have a work session with the city council, hopefully in september, because we need to get our priorities straight before we talk with jpac, before -- so this needs to be something we talk about at that time, along with our other transportation priorities. The key will be naito parkway and how we deal with that, because that has really -- we've already decided we're going to reduce it to one lane, we're going to eliminate parking and we're going to make this the kind of street that's typical -- that is fitting of our terrific inner city neighborhoods. So we need to do that. If we're going to do it right, in addition to these important connections, in addition to making this part of a regional connection, we have to design it right. And this is an opportunity to do something on a scale that is befitting of Portland. So i'm pleased to see the design competition aspect. I also think we do need to broaden that board to include more community participation, and I was pleased to see that they agreed to do this. Finally, I want to thank my new bureau, especially matt brown, for the professional -- we're the ones, the council wasn't matt, it wasn't pdot, it was the council that set this time frame and required this work done in that period of time. And you handled it in a very professional way, and I thank you. Aye.

JULY 10, 2002

Saltzman: Well, i've kept an open mind on the tram literally up until today, and I now am going to vote in favor of it. I believe i'm convinced it is the option for the future, and I realize it will have impacts on the neighborhoods. And unfortunately the lair hill neighborhood is one of our oldest neighborhoods, it's one of our richest in history, and it has been savaged by progress. And part of it's because it's along the river front, part of it's because it's a linear neighborhood, and it's a key connection from the south area to downtown. So we have i-5, we have naito parkway, we've obliterated the northern part of lair hill neighborhood for urban renewal in the 1950s and 60s when we did it the wrong way. And I believe this is an opportunity for us to come -- be serious with mitigation measures that will allay the impacts, but I also believe in the long run there are many benefits to this tram system not only for ohsu and north macadam and the city as a whole, but I do believe the residents most directly affected will also come to benefit from this as well. So it's been a tough decision. I want to thank everybody for their work and participation. This is not the end, it is the beginning of some tough decisions to come. I do consider myself along with the mayor not fully whetted to the idea of the monocable from barbur boulevard. But I still will need some more potentially especially if it comes -- if we don't have good mitigation option was respect to the main tram and it comes to trading off mitigation options or a second tram, I want to see the mitigation options funded. So let's continue. Aye.

Sten: I have not found this to be an easy decision, but I think it's the right one. I do concur with the study that's come forward today, which is the report we're accepting. Whether this is a good thing or really terrific thing I think does depend on how it's implemented. And I think the design competition is part of it, so is the way that both the neighborhood and the council decide to respond to this next step and try and work together. It not everybody's going to be willing to work together, but we're going to have to try and figure out this mitigation strategy in a way that makes sense. Commissioner Francesconi really points out we're going to have to make this a choice among some pretty tough and short funds, but i'm very committed to say that this only works in my mind and becomes a vision that I think a lot of people think is wonderful and i'm one of them, it can be wonderful f. We do big pieces of the parts that have been promised for decades in this part of town and haven't been done. It doesn't mean if you live under a tram that's a good thing, but it does mean the satisfactory going to work better if we do it right. I want to make one personal request of the nonprofit working on the tram and of pdot. You review very carefully john perry's letter of today and spend a little time talking with the design committee f there's any room to allow some of the thinking people to look at different alignments as we go forward. The reason I didn't try to amend it to sigh that, I think we have such a combative situation, trying to talk about is there another alignment at a council level is foolishness that will never happen. But I found you've got the two sides lined up and said, here's a way to do it, it's public right of way, john's approach goes over more private land, but i've found john's testimony to be relatively compelling in the argument that if we're going to have an airway system which is what the council is voting for today, there may be alignment that's are better for the neighborhood. That's been a discussion we haven't been able to have, and i'm not criticizing the neighborhood because you have every right and responsibility to fight what you think is the right approach, and you fought the tram. As long as the issue remains no tram or tram, I don't think we can have that discussion. But I think at least in the context of a design competition it makes sense to review some of the testimony that came in today that says maybe there's a way to do this in a way that isn't -- that is slower, perhaps, but better nor the neighborhood and gives more options. I may be the only person but I found it quite compelling and would request the group you look at those issues. I'm not putting it into the resolution and saying, that's an order from the council, because I think what we need right now is a

JULY 10, 2002

clear signal to ohsu to give street alignment is acceptable. I'd just like to keep some room if we can create that kind of discussion to look at those issues through the design process and see if any of the things john and ernie are arguing are as compelling as I think they might be with a little more room to breathe. So I would just like people to look at that. With that, it's a tough decision but I think it's the right one and I vote aye.

Katz: I think this can be a win-win decision, but it's going to take the neighborhood to sit down and work through some options in terms of the mitigation. This neighborhood has been hit hard. This probably will impact some of the residents, and I think it's time now for them to sit down with us and to begin thinking through what kind of mitigation -- where, what's the time line and be active participants in solving that problem. There are really four reasons to do all of this. One is to connect ohsu to north macadam. And connect the neighborhoods to the river. And provide speedy access. The other is to get any additional traffic, as much of it as possible, off terwilliger boulevard and out of the neighborhoods, to add additional buses to the hill for me doesn't make much sense. Three, we have an opportunity to look at regional transportation system here. And I want to talk about that in a little while. In greater detail. Streetcar, an aerial system, bus service, light rail, and there may be others that none of us have figured out yet. Four, the need to think seriously about the development of a neighborhood. Not only the development for additional research, but also a development for people to live. One of the reasons why we do spend some time in abandoned pieces of geography is because to meet our 2040 goals, we have an option, either we go into farmland or we develop where nobody lives rather than in your neighborhood, which you don't want either. And so these are opportunities whether it's the river district or north macadam, to develop new neighborhoods, meet our obligations under the 2040 goals, and stand firm and not to expand the urban growth boundary for housing when we don't have to. Let me go back on the regional transportation system. The south Portland area and the study area that we were all referencing is an incredible pinch point in what we call the freeway loop. As i've mentioned to some of you, i've been asked through the i-5 trade corridor task force to pull the governor and metro and the city in a conversation about looking at the loop. The south waterfront area is part of the loop. I-405 is part of the loop. Rose quarter is part of the loop. I-5 freeway, the east bank is part of the loop. And so we can't study one without looking at all the others. We have to begin to think about what is it going to look like in the next 30, 40, 50 years, and then we can prioritize, this is where we go 1st, this is where we go next, and be logical about it. And I want to flag that, because that's going to happen very soon, we're just kind of thinking how to do it and when to do it. The mitigation, you know that I support the design competition. I'm very excited about that. I think you've placed enough resources to make it very, very, very successful, and this may be, never thought this would be the first sight and the first opportunity for a serious design competition that hopefully there will be a lot more. Certainly I want pdot to look at the pedestrian crossing. That's a very important mitigation for the community. There's no question about it. And then the south waterfront study as part of an overall study of the loop. Thank you, everybody, for your hard work, matt, thank you. Brant, welcome. You've just been initiated. Aye. [gavel pounded] thank you, everybody. We stand adjourned.

At 6:47 p.m., Council adjourned.