

JULY 17, 2002

890 Appoint Lynne Hoffman and reappoint Kelcey Beardsley, Melvin Broadous and Anne Davidson to the Adjustment Committee for terms to expire June 30, 2006 (Report) (Y-3)	CONFIRMED
.891 Approve the application of Russellville II, LLC for ten year property tax exemption for a transit oriented development project (Resolution) (Y-3)	36086
892 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation for \$10,000 in Transportation Growth Management grant funding for the Pleasant Valley Concept Plan Implementation Project (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 24, 2002 AT 9:30 AM
Commissioner Dan Saltzman	
893 Amend a contract with Coffey Laboratories, Inc. to provide laboratory services and related administration for the Lead in Water Program (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 33890)	PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 24, 2002 AT 9:30 AM
894 Authorize a contract with Peter B. Tobey and provide for payment for sewer mapping technical support services and Net-Map license upgrades (Second Reading Agenda 845) (Y-3)	176743

At 9:40 a.m., Council recessed.

JULY 17, 2002

WEDNESDAY, 6:00 PM, JULY 17, 2002

**DUE TO THE LACK OF AN AGENDA
THERE WAS NO MEETING**

JULY 18, 2002

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **18TH DAY OF JULY, 2002** AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Commissioner Saltzman, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, and Sten, 3.

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

<p>895 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM – Accept the Martin Luther King, Jr. Viaduct Replacement Alternatives Report and its recommendations and direct its implementation (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Francesconi)</p> <p>Motion to add the clause Whereas the City's goal after clean and healthy Willamette River includes treating stormwater as close to the source as possible, and therefore, the city desires that ODOT work with the City's Office of Transportation and the Bureau of Environmental Services throughout the design of the project to use vegetative surface facilities for the treatment of stormwater run-off: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.</p> <p>(Y-3)</p>	<p>Disposition:</p> <p>36087 AS AMENDED</p>
---	--

At 4:06 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love
Clerk of the Council

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

JULY 17, 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 17, 2002 9:30 AM

* * * [roll call]

Saltzman: The mayor is on vacation. We're going to have some council communications first.
Item 886.

Moore: He had to reschedule.

Saltzman: Okay, let's move on to the next one.

Item 887.

Francesconi: We thought you'd died, we haven't seen you for so long.

Richard Koenig: Just for the record, I had to end up going to jail on that lifetime ban from the courthouse before doug gray, the court administrator discovered there was no such order, that I could be in violation of. Thank you.

Saltzman: You have three minutes.

Koenig: My name is richard koenig, buckman. I'm here to thank several Portland public servants for helping me come clear on the methodology of motor vehicle regulation. These include robert koffman, public information officers henry gripper and brian, sergeant bell of the school police and high school driver's ed program and his recent replacement. In addition to these officers who have made valuable constitutions to my understanding of the vehicle code, I also thank veronica venezuela, the police commissioner's office and becky chow of the city ombudsman's office. These individuals have helped me come to a full understanding of my status as a public member who uses the highway, including every street in the city of Portland as a matter of right. As a result of this understanding, I now declare my public member status making it a matter of public record to the Portland city council and the commissioner of police and her successors. For this record I specifically cite the legislative enactment recorded in the general laws of Oregon, 1925, chapter 380. Which according to legislative council greg chamof is the most recent definition of motor vehicle. The rulings of the supreme court of the state of Oregon in the matters of rogers construction company versus hill, found in Oregon reports volume 235 and cowlitz versus snap found in volume 73, which is a Portland case, by the way, a very interesting case. I now therefore declare that I am a public member using the streets of Portland for my vehicles and vehicular traffic as a matter of right. I have never operated a motor vehicle for compensation or profit over the highways of this state, nor at this time have I any intent to -- so to do. Therefore, I am not subject to license. That's to be used interchangeably with driver license. In the recent past, I have been mistaken for a, quote, person operating a motor vehicle without a license, closed quote, by a ppb member. The case register in that matter reflects my challenge to the jurisdiction of the court and no finding subsequently establishing jurisdiction. Absent such jurisdiction, no court can enter any judgment or order. Because the methodology of the dmv is so deeply ingrained in this culture, the commissioner of police is invited to research the records to independently confirm the public's right of use of the highway. This public member will return to city council chambers on july 24 to hear any objections which might be raised against this public member's right.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Koenig: You folks have a nice one. Thanks.

Item 888.

JULY 17, 2002

Bill White: Good morning, my name is bill white. I just want to pray, blessing god over the city council and the city of Portland. And i'll get out of the way. We thank you again for the time we have before the city council. We pray just for the blessings of god over the city of Portland, father, we ask that you continue to give them peace, wisdom and knowledge of how to run the city and make the best the -- make the city the best city in the united states and the world. We pray in your son's name. Amen.

Saltzman: Thank you. Okay. Let's move to the regular agenda.

Item 889.

Saltzman: I don't see anybody here. Anybody here to testify on 889? Okay. Please call roll.

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

Saltzman: Let's go to the next one.

Item 890.

Saltzman: Anybody wish to testify on item 890? Seeing none, please call the roll.

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

Item 891.

Saltzman: Anybody here to testify? Yes.

John Marshall, Finance Coordinator, Portland Development Commission: Good morning, gentlemen. My name is john marshall, i'm a finance coordinator at the Portland development commission. I request approval of the application for the transit oriented development property tax abatement for russellville ii. The project is going to provide 154 units of senior housing. It will also provide ground floor retail that will include a beauty parlor, a market deli, it will have a permit low -- permanent location for a day care center, that will be double the size of the prior one. The project is located a half block from the 102nd and burnside light rail station, and pdc staff has reviewed the project. It meets all the criteria required under section 3.103. We recommend approval, and I can answer any questions if you have any.

Saltzman: Does this come up to the corner of 102nd and burnside?

Marshall: It will go to 103rd and burnside. There is another block between the project and 102nd. Part of it is owned by the applicant, but it not a complete feasible project at this point for the potential third phase.

Saltzman: Okay. Sounds wonderful.

Marshall: Thank you very much.

Saltzman: Questions? Thank you. Anybody else wish to testify on 891? Seeing none, please call the roll.

Francesconi: Thanks for your work. Aye.

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

Saltzman: Okay. 892.

Item 892.

Saltzman: Anybody wish to testify on item 892? Seeing none, please call the roll.

Moore: This is a nonemergency.

Saltzman: Oh, okay. We'll move on to second reading. 893.

Item 893.

Saltzman: Anybody wish to testify on 893? Seeing none, I guess this will also move on to second reading. 894.

Item 894.

Saltzman: Anybody wish to testify on 894? Seeing none, this will move to second reading.

Moore: This is its second reading.

Saltzman: Please call roll.

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

JULY 17, 2002

Saltzman: Okay. I believe that's the -- maybe a record time for a city council meeting. We're over and we are adjourned until thursday afternoon at 2:00 p.m.

At 9:40 a.m., Council recessed.

JULY 18, 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 18, 2002 2:00 PM

*****: Roll call.

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

Saltzman: The mayor is on vacation.

Item 895.

Saltzman: Commissioner Francesconi --

Francesconi: Just briefly, thank you, commissioner Saltzman. So, we are here today to try to find the best solution, regardless of find of funding and schedules. There's going to be some testimony and issues regarding funding and schedules that are also important, but that's what this hearing is about today. With that, I would like to turn this over to our new, I guess recently newly appointed head of pdot, brant williams.

Brant Williams: Thank you, commissioner. Brandt williams, director, office of transportation. What's before the council today is a decision to make on the mlk viaduct project, determine the preferred alternative, which would be a recommendation to the Oregon department of transportation. If you will recall this past october, we held a hearing on the environmental assessment for this project, and what came out of that hearing was pretty strong testimony that, of the alternatives that were presented to you by staff, the preferred alternative was the great separated viaduct alternative. However, another alternative was recommended at that time, which we call now the at-grade alternative, and that was found to be of interest to the council, so council directed staff to go back and take a look at that alternative as compared to the grade separated viaduct alternative, which we have done over the past nine months. Following extensive technical analysis on the different alternatives, those two alternatives, we have -- the office of transportation has come up with a recommendation that, that the preferred alternative is the same alternative, which is the grade separated viaduct alternative. In making this kind of decision, there are a number of key issues that you will need to consider. Two that the commissioners mentioned have to do with timing for the construction, as well as the availability of funding. Those are two important issues. However, the real key issue that I would recommend that the council address today is really, which is the best project that, that works for the city. And that's what we based our evaluation on. We looked at a number of different criteria, but it became apparent that the benefits for the viaduct clearly outweighed the benefits for the add-grade alternative. The viaduct alternative maintains access to downtown and the at-grade alternative does not. It also maintains good freight, carrying capacity on a major regional transportation facility. It maintains better local street connections for the industrial area. It has better access to the spring water trail and to the river. It's also safer, extremely important. It will have fewer accidents on mlk. It will be safer for east-west access for bikes and pedestrians, getting across or under the mlk viaduct. And an important thing is it will not divert traffic into the neighborhoods, and the streets that would likely take the impact would be milwaukie and possibly southeast 17th, as well as maybe some of the streets in the industrial area. And finally, the viaduct alternative will have less impact of businesses in the area. So, we believe based on this, that it's clear that the best alternative, and the one that we are recommending to council is the grade separated viaduct. If we do want to consider the at-grade alternative further, we should probably take some time to discuss the timing and funding elements.

JULY 18, 2002

These issues are not a factor if you do decide today to go with the viaduct alternative. However, if you do want to look at something other than the viaduct, those two issues are signature, and we need to talk more about those. Kay with the region one office for the department of transportation, she's here today and she will follow our presentation on this and can talk more about the funding, and the timing elements of this. If the council does select the viaduct alternative, I just wanted to let the council know that odot and my office have worked out some arrangements for this particular project. The, the citizens' design review advisory committee, it was extremely important for them, as they worked on this project, that this become a, an attractive gateway into the central city. At the be of the design committee, as well as the office of transportation, odot was okay with going ahead and doing a design that met the metro's boulevard standards, versus an expressway standard, and again, we felt that that was very important to make this a good, good project that fit in well into the central east side. Doing this, included adding a number of different elements to the project, such as narrowing the structure, providing for bike and pedestrian facilities, including urban amenities, such as landscaping, a gateway treatment to the structure, itself, ornamental street lightning and ornamental raining and to enhance the architectural features of the facility. In return for doing that, odot did ask that the city take over jurisdiction of the facility and at this point, we feel that that's appropriate and that is consistent with how we deal with other state facilities that are brought up to a standard that's acceptable to us. Odot has also agreed to fund the city's participation in the project from -- through design and construction. We will be coming back to the council to formalize that arrangement through an iga, with, between odot and the office of transportation, so you can expect to see that sometime in the future. Again, that's only if we do go ahead and vote on the viaduct alternative today. Mike coleman here is here to talk about more of the specifics of the benefits of the recommended alternative. He's the project manager for the office of transportation, and I am going to turn it over to mike now to take you through this.

Mike Coleman, Portland Department of Transportation: Mike coleman, Portland department of transportation, I have been involved in the project for about 18 months now. I want to go through a very brief power-point presentation. Primarily to set the stage for the testimony to follow. Hopefully, helping folks make the most of the time that they will have to testify. It's basically a summary of the report that you have and that we are asking you to accept. So, there are two things that I want to accomplish, to describe the alternatives and then compare and contrast the alternatives, given the work that we have accomplished over the last few months since the october hearing. Just by way of background, in the existing conditions, some of the constraints that we had to work with in coming up with any kind of solution, listed here, physical constraints are primarily the topography of the area. You are probably familiar with the area, basically is a low spot between division street and powell boulevard, and the viaduct is out there, is, almost a natural to span over that low spot, and allow for, for a relatively flat facility. Some of the other physical features that constrained the creativity, if you will, is the, the pacific railroad mainline. Powell boulevard in the south, and the ross island bridge, primarily, column locations, and the ability to get underneath that bridge. The traffic constraints, what we see out there today is, about 60,000 cars a day are using this stretch of 99-e, and the capacity for this stretch is pretty much constrained or metered by the clay street signal to the north that constraints the southbound traffic, and the holgate boulevard signal to the south that constrains the northbound traffic. So, it's really knows two locations that meter how traffic can actually pass through the project area. Land use constraints are primarily existing structures, streets, and a lot of railroad tracks that cover the area. Another feature that was important in the whole process of coming up with good solutions is knowing that the spring water trail is coming, and 4th avenue, that parallels 99-e will be part of the trail. And so what happens to 4th avenue was a real important consideration as we evaluated different ideas. Here is a picture of the grade separated by a deduct alternative. Just call out a few features that

JULY 18, 2002

distinguish it from the other alternatives. First of all, what it accomplishes is that it separates the through traffic from the local traffic by allowing it to continue to go over the district, rather than introduce it go into the district. Access for southbound into the district is basically a "t" intersection, what would be at about tagart or lickman's today. It would be a right in, right out intersection with highway 99-e that would allow drivers to get off 99-e or get on to continue south. One of the important features about this is that today there is no convenient way for southbound drivers to get off of 99-e and into the district. Now, I will talk a bit more about that later on. And the northbound direction, access into the district is provided primarily at the "t" intersection with word -- at woodword, and that would you see 6th avenue to get into the district. The typical crosssection of the grade separated viaduct would consist of two travel lanes, a bike lane, and a sidewalk for each direction. So, there will only be four travel lanes, as there are today. But, certainly the pedestrian and bicycle environment and facilities will be much improved over what you see out there today. Below the viaduct, would be two more lanes. We basically would be a local street that runs north and so you said from the division place up to the up railroad tracks. Allowing for north-south travel on the surface streets. The northbound structure is actually a separate -- a separate structure. It isn't nearly as ole as the mlk structure, and is in good shape, and basically, the project would enhance that to include bike lanes and sidewalks in a better form than they are today. It would be two lanes but essentially that structure remains as is. It only gets prettied up, if you will, as part of this project. The other thing I would mention is that the surface streets, we will see very little change. 4th avenue between caruthers and avon would be improved to city standards and would be designed to incorporate the spring water trail. Finally, just to give you an idea of how the viaduct might look compared to the viaduct out there today, right now, each bent of the structure has four columns supporting the beam. In the future, the new one would have only three. The distance between bents today averages between 35 feet and 45 feet, so it's a real forest of columns down there, as most people know. It is facing between bents in the new structure would range between 70 and 80 feet, so you can see that there would be quite a few, fewer columns because there are only three supporting each beam and the spacing would be quite, quite a bit larger than what you see today. The second alternative, the at-grade signalized intersection alternative is different from the first alternative in that instead of separating through traffic from local traffic, it actually introduces the, all of 99-e's traffic into the district, and ultimately, lands at the division place signalized intersection. Basically, it replaces the existing undercrossings out there today with at-grade intersections, primarily at tigar, avon and division place. Division place being the one that would be signalized. Typical cross-section in this case would be three lanes in each direction with a bike lane and sidewalks, and on the portion south of the signal, there would be onstreet parking, as well. A total width of about 120 feet compared to the grade separated version, where the deck would be about 93 feet wide. The surface street improvements, again, would include that stretch of 4th avenue between avon and caruthers. It would also be extended all the way up through the railroad tracks where it would intersect a new street that we have been calling for lack of a better title "the water street avenue," -- I am sorry, the water avenue extension that would run parallel to the extension tracks and connect water avenue near omsi with 8th avenue to the east. So, there is a lot of new streets that would be built and a few blocks of existing street that would be improved. The other thing that I would mention is that the northbound structure, in order to drop the traffic down to the division place intersection would have to be significantly altered. Right now, it's basically flat, and so the deck would have to be removed and changed so that it's going downhill as it approaches the division place. There's quite a bit of change that has to go on to, to the existing grand avenue structure, as well. The third alternative that could possibly play into this, is the repair alternative, where we could take the existing structure and repair it to, at the cost of \$10 million to \$15

JULY 18, 2002

million. It would address the condition of the existing columns and beams and also replace the deck. So, the repair alternative is one that needs to be kept in mind, as well. I just want to briefly go through a few of the considerations that brandt has already mentioned, and just in a bit more detail so that you can see where pdot's conclusions came from. One of the primary concerns has been traffic congestion and how well each of the alternatives would address that subject. This, again, for background, existing conditions, there is 60,000 cars a day using this piece of the 9-e, in the morning, there's about 3600 vehicles per hour going northbound into town, and about the same amount going southbound out of town in the afternoon. We know from the time when ross island bridge was repaired that, that stretch can carry 3800 cars per hour. So, the demand is a little less than the capacity. And again, as I mentioned before, the southbound traffic is metered by the clay signal and the northbound signal is traffic is monitored by the holgate signal. We looked at the separated viaduct alternative that retains the existing capacity. You continue to carry 3800 cars an hour which leaves a residual of 200 vehicles an hour. At-grade intersection, with six lanes, sees a reduction in capacity down into 3150 per hour. Which leaves 450 vehicles unserved during the peak hour.

Francesconi: Is there any dispute over the numbers?

Coleman: No, not at this point. Jim howl, who has been a helpful advocate for the at-grade signalized intersection, worked hard with us to come up with numbers that we were all comfortable with, and even analyzing the numbers together came to this conclusion. So, the new signal becomes the meter because the capacity at division place would be less than the clay signal and less than the holgate signal so we have a new weakest link in the system, if you will. And then the repair alternative would continue to be able to carry 3800 vehicles per hour, per direction. The consequences of not being able to keep up with the demand is the potential for diversion. Again, there would be no diversion or no change in the grade separated alternative or the repair alternative, with the at-grade signalized intersection, the folks who are using 99-e today will stay there and wait their turn to go through this signal, which would dramatically increase the peak period and the kind of cuing that would occur there, or they would choose other alternative routes, certainly, I think that folks coming from downtown may choose to get off the hawthorne bridge at the water avenue exit and use the district streets to get down to avon and avoid the signal. That would mean using 4th avenue. Folks maybe coming from as far as the lloyd district or north thereof may choose the 11 and 12th cuplet rather than using 99-e and leading them to the milwaukie avenue area. Folks going down to eastmoreland could opt for the southeast 26th or 28th to find their way down to the eastmoreland area. So, the potential for diversion is great in the case where capacity can't keep up with demand. Traffic safety, right now, if you looked at the accident histories along 99-e, you can see what the highest accident locations are definitely at the signalized intersections. There is real spikes in the numbers of, of accidents you see around the signals. The existing viaduct, however, has a pretty clean accident record. In fact it is excellent. And I will show you some statistics in a moment that bear that out.

The grade separated viaduct alternative should continue to keep that same good record going. In fact it might get better as the woodward and tigar intersection are improved, so that those two intersections can work a bit better. The at-grade signalized intersection is the one that we are concerned about. We would expect a number of crashes to increase to a level comparable to the other signalized intersections. Also, we might even expect them to go higher because of the downhill grades that are part of the project where folks will have to have a longer stopping distance and that sort of thing. So, the downhill grades could help compromise safety further. Here's some statistics that we put together to, to analyze what's going on, on 99-e and what we might expect at division place. I call your attention primarily to the column on the right because those are signalized intersections where 99-e is a two-way street, like it would be at division

JULY 18, 2002

place. And you can see that even at herald and ochoco, where the volumes on the two streets are light, the number of accidents is quite high compared to the number down here on the viaduct where the highest .2 of a mile segment of the project area saw at most seven accidents over the four-year time frame. So it's profound difference in the accident histories to date and we expect -- we think that this is a good illustration of what might happen if we introduced a signalized intersection at division place. Another subject, very important as we talk with different stakeholders has been a, a subject of local circulation and being able to get east and west between the neighborhoods and the river. What I have done here is tried to illustrate what's available today with the existing viaduct. There are three paths under the viaduct today at ivon, division place and caruthers and they work well if all three of the modes that I am trying to illustrate. It works great for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. The cross streets are low volume. They are simple two-lane streets and the environment is really quite quiet because it's, it's all local traffic. Here's an illustration of what the opportunities might be with the grade separated viaduct alternative. The same three crossing locations would remain available at caruthers and division place and ivon. With the viaduct there would be the potential for an additional crossing grade separated crossing in what would be about the sherman street right-of-way and if the water avenue extension were built in the future, there would be a fifth opportunity to cross east and west on low volume streets. I also tried to illustrate the new street that we would have underneath the viaduct that would provide north-south connectivity in the district. Here's a quick illustration, tried to describe what might happen with an at-grade signalized alternative. Certainly the water avenue extension opportunity remains for all three modes. Because the, the facility would be coming downhill in the vertical clearance gets less and less as you approach division place, only bicyclists and pedestrians could get under the viaduct at sherman at caruthers, there would only be opportunities for bicyclists and pedestrians. Division place would be signalized and certainly pedestrians and cyclists could cross there, just like vehicles could but the environment is very different than the other alternative, and that's why I use these dash marks to say, yes, you can do it but it will be a bit after challenge because of the amount of traffic that pedestrians and cyclists would have to contend with. At ivon and taggart, pedestrians would be able to cross. There would be nothing that would prohibit them and it would be a meeting where they could cross at one-half of 99-e at the same time. It would be tricky and it would be very different than the environment and the other alternative but it is there and available. Another subject that has been real important is the subject of getting access between 99-e and the district. What I have tried to illustrate here is what's out there today for drivers who want to get to the east side of 99-e. I won't go into a lot of detail but all the opportunities to get in are available, except for the southbound "off," and it's a circuitous path today where drivers get off at mill street and follow 3rd avenue and division street and ultimately have to cross the up railroad at 8th avenue in order to get into the district, so it's a very circuitous path today. The at-grade signalized intersection, retains a lot of those opportunities, and provides some new ones. The ivon street intersection is now available where folks could turn right in and right out in both directions. I think the biggest thing to point out in this illustration is how folks get off from the southbound direction. You can continue to do what they have always done using division street and 8th avenue, but with the, this plan, you could come down, turn right at the signal, turn right at 4th, turn right on the water avenue, turn right

onto 7th and division place and wind up in the same location. It's circuitous, again, and but it relies on surface streets in the immediate area. The other possibility is to simply use ivon and go through the signal twice in order, in order to get through the intersection, and get to the east. Here's an illustration of how the grade separated viaduct would work. It basically uses the taggart intersection to get in and out southbound and the woodword section in and out northbound. The

JULY 18, 2002

locations to the west of 99-e are illustrated here and this is how people do it today and I won't go into any detail with that. Here's how they would do it with the at-grade signalized intersection. they basically use the signal to turn right going southbound. For those northbound, they could use word -- woodword or ivon and then cross at the signal. The point here is that for any, basically any destination to the west, it requires going through the signal on division place. The grade separated version again relies on the taggart intersection and the woodword intersection with 99-e and relying on division place that goes underneath 99-e, instead of going through a signal. It took four slides to illustrate this because the at-grade intersection alternative really does create a barrier, if you will, for getting east and west. And it really requires, required trying to illustrate destinations to the west and to the east because they are really very different scenarios under the at-grade intersection. Transit, right now there are no transit stops on 99-e in the area. At division place it's classified for transit in the future. And working with tri-met, they are in a spot right now where it's just simply not clear what their plans are for the immediate area given all that's going on with the south corridor study and that sort of thing. The grade separated viaduct alternative doesn't anticipate introducing new service. What it does, though, is retains the existing level of service for transit by, by operating as well as it does today. The at-grade intersection proposes transit stops at ivon and caruthers. Those haven't been confirmed or blessed, if you will by tri-met but they have been shown as possibilities in this plan. The concern that we have about transit service is that given the congestion and the delay that the new signal would introduce, the travel times and service for those who are already on the bus would suffer. In both cases, the -- there is room for a light rail undercrossing near the up railroad so, we have designed both to accommodate light rail that location. If we go to the walking, the viaduct has sidewalks and stairs but they are in poor shape. The surface streets are low volume. Most of them have sidewalks, and it's really pretty easy to contend with the intersections down on the surface streets. Grade separated viaduct would add sidewalks to 99-e. They would provide ramp connections from the deck down to the surface streets at caruthers between division place and ivon and at the intersection of taggart. As I mentioned again, 4th avenue would be improved. The at-grade signalized intersection adds sidewalks to 99-e, as well, and provides access into the district at the new intersections of division place and ivon and taggart. The problem is that the pedestrians do have to contend with large volumes of the vehicles and the intersections are very large and so the crossing distances are long and more complicated. For those who are cycling, there are no bike lanes on 99-e today, but we have noticed a division, at division place and caruthers there is a popular path for cyclists even thousand as they are trying to get to the, to and from the hawthorne bridge. The grade separated viaduct adds bike lanes. It also provides a minimal exposure, if you will, along 99-e because the only intersection for cyclist to say contend with would be woodword for those northbound and taggart for those southbound. And the environment down on the surface streets would not change. The at-grade signalized intersection add bike lanes, but also introduce three new intersections along 99-e where there weren't intersections before, which may compliment matters for cyclists. It also increases traffic volumes on division place and 4th avenue because of the sort of circulation scenarios that I have already shown you so the environment on division place and 8th avenue would change significantly. Freight movement. Right now 99-e is relatively straight and flat and the travel lane speeds are fairly consistent, certainly sometimes they are awfully fast but they are steady. The intersection corners down in the surface streets are already designed and accommodate trucks, being that it is a truck district, and so there wouldn't need to be a lot of changes to the surface street intersections to accommodate trucks. The grade separated viaduct doesn't change anything over what's going on today for freight movement. The at-grade

JULY 18, 2002

signalized intersection introduces the new downhill and uphill grades to get to the division place signal. It also requires large corners in order to accommodate trucks. Especially with higher volumes on the surface streets, some of those streets would have to be redesigned a bit to accommodate trucks. Traffic speeds on 99-e has been an issue as we talked with folks. Today it's, it's posted 45, but was reduced because of the condition of the bridge today and so you will see 35 miles per hour speed signs out there now. One of the objectives of the project is to try to create a point of transition between the wider section to the south and the one-way couplet section to the north. The grade separated viaduct, we would try to accomplish that by using a tighter reverse curve for the southbound direction. And also adding street features, physical features that might encourage slower speeds like landscaping and that sort of thing. But the biggest thing is that traffic speeds primarily will, will vary with traffic volume. The higher the volume, slower the speeds. The at-grade intersection, uses that same type of reverse curve for southbound. The street features will encourage slower speeds just like the other alternative. And unfortunately, that signal at division place will usually be green for 99-e so the hopes that it would discourage speed may not be as realistic as, you know, intuition might say, and in fact traffic speeds will probably be a function of traffic volume again in this scenario. 99-e.

*****: That's more information on the subject that brant raised. Hopefully it's enough information for those testifying on building on what I had a chance to present.

Brant: I would like to turn the mike over to kay, the region one odot manager, if that's fine.

*****: Okay.

Francesconi: Thank you both. Thanks.

Kay Vansicle, Region One Manager, Oregon Department of Transportation: Good morning. Or afternoon, excuse me. Thank you very much. For the record, I am kay vansilk, the region one manager for the Oregon department of transportation. And with me today is mark, the state bridge engineer from salem. So, and he will be here to field any of the more technical questions, which I won't be able to answer. So, briefly, today I want to go through many of the pros and con kind of issues we have struggled with through this project. I think you received a very thorough presentation from your staff, so I certainly am not going to try to add to that because they have done an excellent job in giving you the details. So, today I would really like to go through the most commonly asked questions that we have dealt with through this project, and, and give you the answers that we have struggled with through odot to give you a sense of the, all the pros and cons that we have worked through in coming to this combined recommendation from pdot staff and odot staff. And then if you have any other questions later, we will be very happy to answer them, and also today, I brought with me the consulting engineering firm that we hired to go out there and assess the current condition of the bridge. And I would also like to go through that a bit today for you. So, one of the most commonly asked questions that we have been asked is, is the bridge safe for vehicles. And based on our evaluation, and the independence consultant evaluation, we consider the mlk southbound viaduct to be safe for loads under the posted 50,000 pounds. It's about as basic as that. The southbound viaduct continues to deteriorate and at least two different signature ways. The structure continues to settle. Causing the columns to move out of alignment, and then allows the deck to twist. And later, I have some pictures for you that I will hand out to you that you can see the physical evidence of all of this. The second thing that's happening out there is that the concrete deck is continuing to erode. The deck shows rotting, supposed reinforcement and cracking. The deck joints are leaking water onto the structure below. Large surface cracks are wearing and losing aggregate, and so these cracks go completely through the deck. To explain to you best as I can how concrete functions, it gains its strength by being compressed. And then the steel rebar that's embedded in the concrete helps to pull together and compressing the concrete to add additional strength. And through the years of wear and tear,

JULY 18, 2002

that rebar has been exposed. And then it's further eroded by rain, the wear and tear of the traffic, and then the corrosive effects of things spilled onto the surface. So therefore, as it breaks apart, it's no longer compressing the concrete, which then is further weakened in its condition and breaks apart faster. Therefore, the accelerated deterioration and why we have had to go out there and load rate it. We expect to spend at least 100 to 200,000 a year to continue shoring up and repairing that structure until it's eventually replaced. If that deck surface continues to worsen to the point where it has to be replaced, or propped up or whatever, it could cost several million dollars. If we had to go out there for safety sake and prop up the structure to hold it up so it wouldn't deteriorate any further and get it up to at least a legal load rating, that would cost us approximately, as was said from before, 10 to 15 million. And that would include the shoring of the superstructure, replacement of joints, deck drains, rails, sidewalks, and would require some replacing of the deck. To emphasize this point, and mark could probably explain it to you better, when you do something like that, you are not going to have a very pretty structure. In fact, you are going to an awfully ugly structure, and I personally have never felt that that's what the neighborhood and the city was looking for. You basically would have a structure that looked like you have a lot of false work out there around it, so it would not be a very pretty sight. Until the structure is replaced, odot expects that the viaduct will continue to require ongoing temporary repairs, and then if deterioration continues, then we will further lower the, the load rating. And that really means that if we lower it any more, than where it is now, the buses, most trucks can't use it. So, they are going to have to detour. Clearly, we are going to continue monitoring this structure on a very regular and frequent basis because we will not compromise the safety of the driving public. Another question that we have been asked quite a bit is, is the bridge safe for pedestrians and bicycles. Basically, it is safe for pedestrians to cross over the bridge on the sidewalk. However, pedestrians don't really have a way of getting down off the structure except for that stairway that falls in the middle which should be closed because of the condition. Bicyclists can ride on the shared sidewalk or travel lane. However, with the condition I just described to you it will not be a very smooth ride. It's going to be a pretty bumpy ride for the bicyclists. And then walking or riding underneath the structure, the southbound viaduct, is not going to be safe because you have falling concrete that's falling off. So, it's not a safe situation there. Just a bit of history of what the structure is. As was said in the presentation earlier, the southbound structure was built in 1936 so it's basically 66 years of age. The northbound structure was built in 1965, which is the grand avenue cuplet. Overall this structure is 1600 feet in length and it's the longest concrete slab, beam, and girder-style structure in Oregon. A question that we have really struggled through this environmental process with is how long can we wait. While we decide what's the best thing to do. I think you get a sense from what I have just described to you as to the current condition of the structure, that as those problems continue and the deterioration continues, and through the funding questions that I will talk about a bit later, that has, has convinced odot and pdot that the time is, is today to replace that structure. How has odot and pdot addressed the neighborhoods and the cities needs for this structure? Again, in your presentation, you just received I think you got the details of what the structure would be. This structure is going to be funded through what is called a highway bridge replacement and rehabilitation program or hbr for short. And that is a program that was set up back in, I think, 1978, or thereabouts. And it was intended to be used solely to repair or replace bridges on the federal highway system. As we got into this project, we recognized the need to pay greater attention to the aesthetics, as far as design and then mitigation for the construction and replacement. And also because this structure is eligible for the national historic register. We have tried very diligently to incorporate the needs that have been stated by the community to come up with a structure that would meet all of their requests and set something that the

JULY 18, 2002

community and the city could be proud of. We believe that we have reached an affordable structure that falls within the programmed amount of money, approximately 31.2 million. We have also looked at some additional amenities, besides just a structure. Just to note a few, connection to the spring water trail. Pedestrian ramps to the caruthers street. We have looked at improving the bicycle and pedestrian access to the structure. Additional lighting, both on the structure and underneath the structure. And also in the design of the structure, texture and color that makes it a much more aesthetically pleasing site. What would odot do if it was decided that we go with the grade separated alternative? We struggle with that question quite a bit. And what we would do is first of all, we would have to do a completely new environmental assessment because the federal agency, fhwa told us clearly that the current document wouldn't work by just adding onto it, so that could add at least two years to the project. There is a clear possibility that the Oregon transportation commission would reallocate the money that has been programmed there. That is now sitting waiting to be spent on this structure. We meet next week with the commission. In fact next wednesday, and this is the first item on the agenda. So, to explain it as how they, they possibly could view it, is if you don't have an environmental assessment and you don't have a final design, on its way, and you can't say when construction is going to happen, more than likely that money will be redistributed because of all the other bridge needs that we have going on right now in the state. While the viaduct replacement will continue to be a priority, of course, due to its condition, with that ongoing bridge problem that we are dealing with, and the condition and the amount of, of need that is there, there is no guarantee that the money to replace the viaduct will be available when a selected alternative happens. And that could possibly add further delay. If a alternative is chosen that doesn't meet the federal requirements, in other words as you saw in your presentation the various issues and problems with the at-grade alternative, there's a high likelihood that the federal agency, fhwa would not support using federal money for something that would worsen the existing condition out there. So, there is that added risk, also. What will odot do if the city council supports the grade separated alternative? We will do everything in our power to speed up the next phases of the project so that construction of the replacement structure will begin in 2005. We will work with the city of Portland to complete all the negotiations and agreements that brandt mentioned earlier to then transition the structure to the city's ownership once the structure is built. What insurances do you have if additional are found and more deterioration occurs? Making the price tag go up? And what will odot do as far as replacing the viaduct if those things happen? We have made a strong commitment to the community and to the city of Portland --

Francesconi: We are typing down these parts as you say them.

Vansicle: Well, you want me to speak slowly until.

Francesconi: That's right. We have special attention on this part.

Vansicle: Okay. Let me start again then so you get it. Odot has made the commitment to the community and to the city council, if you approve this great separated alternative, that we will deliver the structure, as it is proposed in the environmental document. We will stand behind that commitment. Now, then, I would like to go through --

Francesconi: Even if it cost more than \$31.2 or 8 million dollars? Yes, within reason, and you have the bridge engineer here who can talk more about that. Now to summarize and give you a sense of what the consultant, engineering study said, we have got some pictures for you that I will ask someone to give you. You each have a packet that shows you what that consulting engineer is saying. While I go through them here. What they are saying to us, as to the current status of the viaduct, it can really be categorized in three areas. That is that the settling under the column supports that's happening is causing them to no longer support the structure which allows that structure to twist. The concrete deck, as I was talking about before, is deteriorating. And then

JULY 18, 2002

lastly the bridge railing and sidewalk are deteriorating. The highlights from that consultant's field inspection findings are, are the concrete deck is seriously deteriorated with numerous cracks, and exposed reinforcement. Deterioration is especially severe at the deck expansion joints and the areas over the bents, and I think your very first picture in the packet pretty well shows the separation that's happening where you see the railing up at the top and you see the sky in between and then it goes down, as it comes down to the steel, that it's sitting on, you can see the cracks and you can see the steel starting to bend. There are locations where reinforcement is exposed and loose reinforcement bars have been cut to eliminate traffic hazards. Major amounts of deckware with rutting at the wheels, where the wheels are, have been traveling are very obvious. Concrete bridge rail and lamp posts mounted on the outside of both sides are deteriorated with spalling concrete and exposed rebar, and I think that you have a picture there that shows that very clearly. The level of deterioration could result in a hazard to the traveling public below the bridge from falling concrete pieces. The bridge rail is not likely adequate to protect traffic on the bridge so if a car got out of control or a truck got out of control the railings wouldn't stop them. Existing concrete birders are in good condition except at the expansion joint areas where some girder support deterioration has occurred. A number of girders have lost support due to the deterioration and are currently held up by temporary still shoring installed by odot, and I think that you have a picture that shows that, also. Several have settled over time creating the sagging grade problem in the deck structure, and I think you also have a picture that clearly shows that sagging. Column cracking appears to be the result of longitudinal movement of the bridge. As best as I can explain it, when I was listening to the report the columns were not designed to handle longitudinal movement. In other words they were designed simply to hold the weight vertically. So, if there is any movement, they will crack. They weren't designed to handle anything like that.

Francesconi: Your report, as the one before, was incredibly thorough and I don't want to cut you off but I am concerned about --

Vansicle: I want to wrap up and then I am finished. And then the, the existing columns have been repaired by installation of, of the steel pipe jackets that have been filled with concrete, so the conclusion of that report is that the load rating of the viaduct performed by obeck resulted in conclusions similar to those of odot, and support the need to replace the deteriorating viaduct. So, that's the conclusion.

Saltzman: Thank you very much. Any questions of her?

Francesconi: I just want to ask one, it's one question, and maybe you didn't answer it. That is that since the viaduct is dangerous or becoming dangerous in the future, the way you pointed out, it has to be fixed anyway at some point so the argument that the money will not be there, when it is, you know, your facility, you know -- the argument is made that you will find the money sometime. So I guess I would like you to, to respond.

Vansicle: If it continues to deteriorate to where it's not safe or we would go out there and prop it up, basically, to where it would hold that load. That's your 10 to 15 million figure. Once that's done, more than likely, odot would say, good job. We walk away from it. It's going to last for 15, 20 years. So, you have got something out there that's basically been propped up with something that looks like falsework. It's functionally okay. But, it doesn't look good and we have walked away from it to not come back for 15 or 20 years. I think that that's just clearly as I can say it.

Francesconi: Thank you.

Saltzman: Let's hear from the public now. I assume that we have people signed up to testify? Okay. Three at a time.

Saltzman: You each have three minutes. You know the drill. Please state your name.

JULY 18, 2002

Wayne Kingsley, President, Central Eastside Industrial Council, 110 SW Caruthers, 97214: I am wayne kingsley, president of the central east side industrial council, which represents 17,000 employees and 1300 businesses in the central east side industrial district. I am also a property and a business owner in the area of the viaduct. The central east side supports the grade separated option. If not supported today by your vote, I am afraid that we are going to lose 31.8 million of federal money. Which would be lost to Portland along with the associated jobs and activity. And as was just said most likely, the existing unsightly structure, if we don't support it, will be repaired and we will live with an uglier structure for 15 to 20 years. The grade separated viaduct was designed over three years by stakeholders. Some of whom are here today, now in opposition to their design. Including bicyclists, pedestrians, residential neighborhoods, and essentially, the central east side industrial council. An urban designer was engaged to make the viaduct compatible with the urban setting. New bridges falling down, and we still want the urban design.

I think that at some point we have got to stop designing and replace the structure. The design that, that the grade separated design provides superior north-south facilities for bicyclists, transit and other vehicular traffic. The design provides superior east-west access, for the same groups of people. Meets everybody's needs. 4th avenue is preserved for access to the spring water trail. 8th avenue, or the spring water trail is a high priority in the city, and the at-grade proposal, jeopardizes that trail access. The minimum number of businesses and employees are affected by the grade separated proposal. And the at-grade proposal affects a great number of businesses in terms of lost property and loss of the business. The minimum amount of land is used for right-of-way in the grade separated proposal. It causes the least amount of pollution from vehicles, one thing mentioned is pdot studies show something like a 15 to 30% increase in pollutants just caused by the, the light at the intersection. It also, which we are overlooking today, maintains the integrity of the regional transportation system. This is a major federal highway. Supporting a lot of different uses to degrade it by reducing the capacity does not seem to me to make sense. It maintains the transportation capacity to expand employment in the central east side. One of our objectives is to increase employment, bring more businesses and employees into the district. We just approved the dos plan, council approved the dos plan, which increases employment by 2500 people. Those people have to be able to be brought to work and they can't get to work if they don't have the transportation capacity.

Saltzman: Do you want to wrap up?

Kingsley: I will wrap. Maintains transportation capacity in downtown Portland, and we think it's an important part of the downtown Portland policy because it starts reducing access to the central city. We are going to harm that by, by the activity. The alternative does, you know, does nothing but degrade these things. Therefore, we support the grade separated alternative.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Warren Anderson, Manager, Ross Island Sand and Gravel: I am warren anderson, manager of the ross island sand and gravel company. We support the grade separated alternative. We have many vehicles down in the area, traveling there, and actually, I think the grade separated alternative would be an improvement to the existing structure. The traffic would go in a more direct route down in back of, where taggart street is, both into the area and out of the area. Where currently you come in through mill street on the detour. There are many people in the area that travel there, and they have in the past that are not familiar with the area. And when people are looking around, it's very difficult to, to look for where you are going. They go up to litman's toy store, for instance, and the trucks come around the corner. So we have given way as much as we can to the people coming down the ramp there. So, I think a more direct route is preferable for, for safety, even in driving. I think that, that, that the, the speed with which we can get into our plants will be increased. Currently we have to go around to 8th avenue across that.

JULY 18, 2002

That's added about three minutes to our time from when we used to be able to go down under the viaduct at 6th and division. We have had to, since we go down to 8th street it adds about three minutes to each trip. So, but with this, with this access into and out of our plant, we want two ways in and two ways out. That's basically what we have always wanted. I think this will really support that, and the time we have to travel will be quite a bit less. And one of the situations there with the, as far as the stop signs, when the detour had to go into place under ivon at mlk and grand underneath the structure, the stop signs were put just so that people who are not familiar with traveling in that area would not come in contact with other people crossing that path there. When you are looking around, it's difficult to watch everybody. So, I think that the more direct route is the best way to travel in and out of that area. Thank you.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Robin White, Executive Vice President, Portland BOMA: Good afternoon, I am robin white, executive vice president of Portland boma. I want to thank you, begin by thanking you to giving us this opportunity today to talk about the process but in light of the negative implications, specifically the loss of potential funding, we believe that it's time to bring this whole process to a close. If we miss this cycle on funding, we will be thrown into the 2004-2007 cycle and I heard that there were like 3800 bridges in the state of Oregon that are in need of repair. I'm concern that had if we are thrown in the pot with the rest of them we might get lost and might not get the funding. And I guess in our view, it's, why take that chance. We urge the, the council to go ahead and support the grade separated viaduct along with everyone else for a few reasons. With the 60,000 vehicles, the viaduct is already a design capacity. If we put an ongrade signalized intersection, we reduce that capacity, and it seems almost silly to consider downgrading a major arterial to something that doesn't meet the capacity need at the inception. The regional transportation plan notes that cities are losing jobs because of transportation problems. 60% of the jobs are, are in the transportation business and trade sectors and 20, 25% of the cost of a project is in the transportation and logistics. If I add choke points slowing down the process in a major transportation link, we actually create more cost for that transportation and hence, more disincentives for business to say locate and stay here. I think more importantly, mlk is an important link to i-5 for the southeast businesses. Especially milwaukie. And let me give you an idea that milwaukie right now, the industrial market in milwaukie is almost nonexistent. There is basically no leasing going on in that area. The disruption caused by the construction, obviously, of both proposals, but of the ongrade proposal and that added by the delays caused for, by the incapacity to handle the traffic could be the death of the milwaukie market and although that's milwaukie and this is Portland, this is, in fact, a regional issue and we have to look at it that way.

Safety, as was noted before by staff, is a very important concern and to me, as a pedestrian, even a signalized intersection with 60,000 vehicles a day is not an exciting prospect in trying to cross that, and although I am not a trucker, I can't imagine but the grades that you are going to have to be coming down ending up at a signal is going to be an accident waiting to happen. We also understand the neighborhood's need to open up the neighborhood but the proposal does, in fact, have bicycle and pedestrian improvements. So, with all of those things, we would urge you to reconfirm the position you had already taken and approve -- support the, the segregated proposal.

Thank you.

Saltzman: Thank you very much. In the next panel we have somebody from the park's bureau that would like to testify if we could put her in with the next two public witnesses. Is there any other city bureaus want to testify? Okay. Thank you.

Mary Anne Cassin, Portland Parks and Recreation: Good afternoon, members of the council. My name is mary anne cassin, the development section manager for Portland parks, and we are here today first of all to thank pdot staff. We want to congratulate them on a process that was

JULY 18, 2002

very collaborative, very cooperative and very inclusive. I was also pleased to hear the importance that not just pdot but that the public at large has placed on spring water. We are having a groundbreaking tomorrow in October. The OMSI to Spring Water connection is going to be made. It's a really wonderful improvement and a really wonderful important regional trail system. And so, it's good to see the importance that 4th Avenue has there. Our main point and the reason that we wanted to come today was to lend our support to the separated grade crossing. It is clear to us that that will have the most benefit for all of the pedestrians and bicycles trying to get to Spring Water to be able to do that without crossing in a signalized intersection. It would be very important to the neighborhood and the city. There are three minor points that we wanted to bring to your attention. First of all, the improvements along Southeast 4th are critical because of the connection to Spring Water. At this point, Ivon Street will be the end of the Spring Water corridor so it's important that the improvement to say 8th Avenue stay in the first phase of construction. And any, any scenario that eliminates or delays those improvements will negatively impact the trail. Secondly, we want to see the potential future Southeast Ivon underpass become part of phase one construction. Without this, we lose another link to the neighborhoods to the east. Potentially, this would have negative impact on residents north end of the Brooklyn neighborhood south of Powell for whom this is the nearest access point. And last we oppose an alignment that's called a "future potential jug-handle align." that would negatively affect the Spring Water because that is -- it would introduce truck traffic at a really dangerous angle, and so until, until and unless Spring Water is completed along the river front in the future, that future jug-handle looks like a safety problem to us. In conclusion, we really support the separated grade crossing. Thank you.

Denyse McGriff, Portland Development Commission: For the record I am deanids mcgriff with the Portland development commission, and I am the project person for the central east side urban renewal. Thank for you allowing our testimony I wanted to point out to the council a bit about the process. I think that Mike has alluded to that, as has Brandt but I was a member of the design review advisory committee that worked for over two years to come up with a proposal for the viaduct and try to make it more acceptable and more supportive of the city's goals and policies. And I want to say that it was not easy by any means. We disagreed a lot, but that's how the process works, and at the end, I think that we all came out with something that we thought that we could live with, but I do want to point out that, that it was a really great collaboration not only with pdot, but with the odot staff and I know more about bridges and structural repairs than I ever wanted to know in my entire life and I think that that's probably a good thing. Now, I am a little more informed. I wanted to go on record as supporting the staff report as presented by the Portland department of transportation. And the fact that the grade separated option provides the best access to and through the central east side urban renewal district and the rest of the city. The grade separated option reduces the impacts to the existing street system and through traffic would continue through and out of the district and local traffic would be able to function efficiently. What I am most impressed with is the traffic that would be able to be improved by the car and truck access and also improved access for bicyclists and pedestrians. One of the things that came to mind in reviewing the report by the city is that most recently, Portland development commission did some zone changes for the east bank esplanade and its associated facilities. The parking lot. And one of the things that we had to review and also put into our report was whether or not what we were asking for met the city's requirements for traffic and capacity. One of the things that I did note in the study is that unfortunately, the at-grade alternative reduces the capacity and fails to meet peak demand during the peak hour resulting in increased congestion. I think it is unlikely that that scenario would have allowed to us move forward with the proposals that we have for east bank park and the associated facilities because we would not have been able

JULY 18, 2002

to show that we were able to stay within the traffic capacity that currently exists. I think in conclusion, it's important to note that the proposal as presented does support the central east side goals and objectives and also city goals and objectives. And thank for you the opportunity.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Fred Granata, AORTA, 700 SW Taylor St., Suite 201, 97205: I am fred, and I am here as a member of aorta, the association of Oregon rail and transit advocates. We support the at-grade alternative and we look upon this for a couple of reasons. The, above grade alternative would create 2000 feet of elevation where buses could not really give people access to the area. Right now, as I am informed, there are about 400 bus trips through that corridor, but for that 2000, just the 2000 feet discourages people from using buses to get to that location, and we, we don't know what plans tri-met has for this situation. However, we want to see, as much encouragement for public transit as possible. We also submit that at least in our observation, an elevated roadway tends to blight what's below it. It becomes a place for a homeless encampment, tends to collect debris and the like. It is destructive of surrounding property values, and really destructive tax base, whereas less of that exists in an at-grade situation, so that is why we support the at-grade structure.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Marie Phillippi, Board Member, Brooklyn Neighborhood, 4014 SE 9th, 97202: My name is marie, I am a board member of the brooklyn neighborhood, and was on the design review committee for the mlk viaduct. Just an aside, the at-grade option was brought up during the duration of a meeting of those meetings but it was immediately dismissed, as not feasible and cut off any discussion of that when it was brought up. On october 3rd of last year, I testified in favor of the boulevard design for the mlk viaduct. At that time, I testified against the at-grade option because it was late, and the other members of the, and probably like other members of the committee, I was tired and wanted to just go ahead after two years, but after that meeting, we contacted jim and made several -- and he made several protections to our board and the neighborhood. I submitted an addendum to the testimony within a week after that meeting. Advocating that jim's plan had many good points and certainly needed to be looked at carefully. This addendum was not included in the notes from the last meeting. Since the october meeting, I felt that pdot's presentations didn't give the at-grade option a chance. I feel that pdot and odot has spent more time fighting it than seeing if it would work. It is true that some of jim's ideas were incorporated in the raised viaduct option, but that is as far as it went. In my opinion, this document is so biased that it is worthless as far as an evaluation. At the last meeting I went to, I went into hoping for an honest evaluation. I left feeling it was nothing but a well prepared snow job, and I have to say that. I would like to mention some of the pluses for the at-grade option that affects our community. As you know, brooklyn is just south of the viaduct. It lends itself to easier and more visible access to the area and therefore, in the long run, would be more likely to develop into a viable business district, a raised viaduct would continue to isolated the area. For years to come. The at-grade option would be more bus, people, and bicycle friendly than a towering bridge with on and off-ramps like a freeway. May I remind everybody the viaduct is not a freeway. Even though speeds are usually between 60, 65 miles per hour. The raised viaduct will only encourage the same speeding, which will continue through our neighborhood. We in brooklyn feel that whatever happens to this viaduct will directly affect us because our homes are immediately south of that. One big obstacle in most people's minds is the proposed traffic signal at division place. Traffic is currently controlled by the signal at clay at the north end. Contrary to this document, the additional signal would have little impact for traffic flowing at the legal speed. If coordinated with the clay signal. If peel are going the speed limit, they won't be slowed down. For this reason, we see the at-grade option a positive impact. The last thing that I would

JULY 18, 2002

like to say, the e-mail we received from pdot regarding funding for this project stated that unless we move forward with the raised option now, construction and funds would be suspended for at least a year. This feels and smells like a scare tactic but nevertheless, I ask that we need to look beyond these first, even five years. We in brooklyn strongly support going for the environmental study for the at-grade option. We are living with the structure. We will be living with the structure for 50 years plus. Let us not create something that we have to look back and say, why did we do this? Or how do we get rid of it, like we now do at the marquam bridge and other structures. Thank you for listening.

Judy Litt, 3115 SE 18th Ave., 97202: I am judy, resident of brooklyn. I was here, also, in the fall, and I did not exactly speak directly to the issue because I was talking about calming traffic on mcloughlin, which is still my primary consideration. I see merits in both plans, and particularly the traffic signal to integrate traffic on the viaduct area to grand and mlk. Because my experience is that, that those corridors move wonderfully if you are traveling at, at the speed limit. You can go through all of those lights. You don't have to stop once. And if, if a traffic signal somewhere else down the line would calm traffic and have it join in something that works very well, I say, here's to it. Another thing about the, the -- jim's proposal that is very attractive to me, is that proposed water avenue extension south of the railroad because a lot of the congestion in our neighborhood is because of, of trains, and division and 11th or the other way around is, is a nightmare because of the trains, and if people had choices, there wouldn't be such a bottleneck. So, so anyway, I do think that you are, you are our representatives in the city of Portland. And we know that we want to have a good regional transportation plan, but if people are moving out of the city of Portland, because the conditions, the living conditions are intolerable, that's also very detrimental. What I was starting to say is most, inelegant, but I wish that you would consider the needs of, of the people who are already there, rather than the needs of the people who might move out to clackamas county.

Saltzman: Thank you very much.

Saltzman: Go ahead and start, sir.

Anne Gardner, NW Industrial Neighborhood Assoc.: My name is anne gardner. I am here today representing the northwest industrial neighborhood association. I am employed by the schnitzer group and we own and manage warehouse and distribution facilities in the Portland-metropolitan area. You have heard a lot about the, the advantages of the grade separated project. I would like to step back a bit and talk about the project within the region. That if, as a community, we are to prosper, we need to be able to participate in the global marketplace, and to do that, we need to be able to move ideas, people, and product. And mlk is part of the transportation system. The transportation system is essential to our, our community's prosperity. As that system, as mlk functions, so does the region, and if we create a weak link here, it affects our entire system. And it is for that reason that the northwest industrial neighborhood association urges you to support the grade separated proposal and to do that today. On a personal note, as I was discussing with my daughter before I came here today what I was doing, and I said I was going to be talking about improvements to mlk, and she said, it needs bike paths and I said, it has bike paths, and she said, tell them that I told you to tell them it needs bike paths, and I would like to be able to go home and tell her that I told you that it needs bike paths. But, I would also like to be on the record on behalf of nina in support of the proposal that does include bike paths. It's important that as we make transportation system improvements as we are doing here we make full use of the right-of-ways and that we include, where possible, bike and pedestrian amenities and it's great in this particular project we have been able to do that. We have done the planning. We have done the discussions. It is time to capture the money that is available to us. I agree so totally with the messages that robin delivered about the, the needs on a statewide basis for bridge improvements

JULY 18, 2002

and we need to capture the resources now and make sure that we maintain a strong transportation system. Thank you very much.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Francesconi: Could you tell your daughter that we would like her to review your testimony all the time before you come to city council? [laughter]

Gardner: I will deliver the message. Thank you.

Gino L. Iwginouis, 2637 SE 6th, 97202: My name is gene, and I am a property owner and business owner that is right alongside the viaduct now and I wanted to go on record to say that I oppose the at-grade option.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Rob DeGraff, Portland Business Alliance: Good afternoon. I am rob, representing the new Portland business alliance. I believe actually wayne kingsley has provided you with a letter that our predecessor organization, the association for Portland progress wrote several months ago prior to the staff report that you have gotten, which totally agrees with the staff report and so I am here testifying for the pba, supporting the staff recommendation for the separated alignment. We were involved -- the association for Portland progress was involved in the creating of the cctmp in the early 1990s and the issue of moving people into and around and through the central city was obviously the reason for that important public policy. We recognized at that point in time that as we grew jobs in the central city, the fully 50% of those employees would get to work in the central city using their single occupancy automobile. The others would use other modes, that is walk, bike, bus, train. What that says to me is that we need to preserve the capacity of our roads in order to, to accommodate those new jobs, those new commuters, and that's not just for the automobile but it's also for the buses and we have heard from the staff report that the at-grade alignment compromises that, and we think that that's a very serious flaw in the at-grade proposal and thus, we are here to tell you that we believe you need to support the continued viaduct option. Thank you.

Jerome Madden, 2933 SE 26th Ave., 97202: I am jerome madden, I am the chair of the transportation committee for the neighborhood. I have been involved in the project since 1999. I wanted to state that we advocate the development of the at-grade establishment through the full assessment and we feel that the at-grade alternative could perform much better than the highway, when measured against the objectives, that the neighborhood has and also the guiding principles established by the drac and stakeholders that were there. I just have four brief points which I think will get the point across. First and foremost is access to the river. We have got the east bank esplanade. The raised highway, which is really what it is, is going to be 93 feet wide, about 18 feet above the heads, and it is going to be a, a truly formidable, physical barrier. We think that, that the underneath of the viaduct won't be usable but dead space and one of our guiding principles has been safe pedestrian and bike access and seems to us the at-grade alternative could do a better job of that. Secondly, we have the chance to reclaim a Portland street here. It could, with parking, with parking and street trees, and buildings, this, this at-grade could provide a better urban environment in our opinion. It provides thirdly, provides better connections. There wouldn't be, between east and west and north and south, wouldn't have to go up and down stairs. And the fourth argument I guess that we have been hearing is this, this argument about the capacity which I think, as I understood was the main reason for looking at the raised viaduct versus the at-grade and in our mind, peak hour, there is a 12% difference. It seems like you could tweak the design to make up the 12% and now we are at parity. And I guess if they, if they both work functionally, then you need to take a bigger view about what does it do for other people. And I guess that's where lastly, I was hoping that city council would take the longview on this, do you think this will be 100-year structure, what's going to happen around that area. We don't see other cities building elevated

JULY 18, 2002

highways, and that's why we would hope you would take a long, hard look at this, at going forward with the raised highway. Thank you.

Marilee Tillstrom, 3233 SE 24th Ave.: Hi, I am marilyn, and my comment is that I would like to see -- to back up. I have never seen a viaduct that didn't become a parking lot or a storage for semi trucks or basically a wasteland underneath it. And that disturbs me because that is what is between my livability and my access to the river. And so I am asking you to look at our vision for our neighborhood, which is friendlier access to the river, a more neighborhood look to it, whether there are people down there, all hours. We just, we just want our neighborhood to appear open to the river and not a parking lot for people that are not our neighbors.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Mark Kogut, 1547 SE Elliott Ave.: I am mark. And I am with the abernathy development neighborhood organization, and I would like to reiterate that our major concern is, and we really appreciate the work that has been done by perform do the, odot to develop this process along -- been done by pdot and the input that we have had, however, we feel that the at-grade proposal has not been given full review. Although there is tremendous amount of information that was provided today, I believe that if we could bring this whole process together on an easement, that we would really find out apples and apples on what are the best proposals. I believe that the urban design issues of an at-grade proposal are pretty compelling. In a sense, that it would open up that, that, our access towards the river front, and feel that that may be a better proposal. Thank you.

Saltzman: Thank you very much.

*****: Why don't you go ahead and start.

*****: Thanks.

Bill Wiley: 330 southeast division place. Business operator in the area, obviously. I won't take long. I don't think that I can add much to what has been said in support of the grade separated alternative and think of no negative aspect as you view and work in the district. I see it as very positive.

Saltzman: And that was for the grade --

*****: Separated alternative.

*****: Thank you.

*****: I am bob --

Saltzman: Would you move the microphone.

Bob Russell, American Trucking Association: I am president of the Oregon trucking association, bob russell, and I am here to testify in favor of the grade separated design. A couple of quick points. I am sure that you are aware that mlk is actually us highway 99, part of the national highway system and as such, carries a street corridor designation. The freight corridor in that particular case is not a name only. South of the viaduct, the union pacific has the brooklyn yard, which is a major intermodal facility, containers and trailers on flat car come in and out of that facility. Are moved by truck into the city, so the mlk viaduct is the major intermodal link between the railroad and the rest of the city. Further south of that is a major commercial warehousing district. Wilhelm warehousing has several in that area. Those are serviced by truck.

And mlk and the viaduct is the link from that warehousing area into the city. You heard earlier that the viaduct has already been restricted as far as trucks are concerned. A little less than a year ago, it was restricted to 80,000 pounds and it was dropped to 64,000 pounds. And most recently it's been dropped to 50,000 pounds, but there's also a prohibition against any combination vehicles. Combination vehicles, your typical tractor trailer. So, as of today, most trucks are prohibited from using that structure. And it's continuing to deteriorate. One of our major concerns about the at-grade crossing design option is safety. Our understanding is that going southbound would require a 6% grade going down to the intersection. That is a signature

JULY 18, 2002

downgrade and we are concerned that there would be a signature number of rear-end accidents at the stop light at division place. And finally, we have talked about the option of temporary repairs, and I want to emphasize the word temporary. 10 to 15 years is not the expected life of a bridge. It's more like 75 to 100 years, so if we got into a position where we had to make the temporary repairs, then what we are doing is spending 10 to 15 million in addition to the 31.2 million that it's going to take to replace the viaduct. That's my testimony. Thank you.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Chris Hammond, Transportation Chair, CEIC, 619 SE Division Pl, 97202: I am chris hammond, I am the current transportation chair for the ceic and also co-chair land use. I am here today to support the grade separated viaduct alternative, and I have participated in the public planning process for the grade separated alternative from the very beginning. Starting back in 1999, and also served on the design -- back in 1999 and on the design reserve committee. The business located adjacent to the viaduct, grade separated turn it has worked effectively and efficiently to move vehicular, truck, bike, and pedestrian traffic through our portion of the city with a great and successful safety record. The current great separated alternative has already moved through the environmental impact process and has the required funding needed for the project to move forward today. To delay or endanger this project from moving forward seems to indicate a lack of commitment to invest in the city's infrastructure for which funding is already available. As a property owner, and a business, I am certainly can't support the, the at-grade crossing for the following reasons -- on a personal level, I wouldn't be too happy about having 60,000 cars passing through an intersection that's less than 500 feet away from my business. And the signalized intersection at division place would create a level of service of "f," meaning it fails already before it's in place. It would impact the city adopted portal policies into the central city. And the city of Portland endorses the project that cost, how can the city of Portland endorse a project that already costs more than the grade separated process? And at what price? I mean, lost jobs, more lost property, all more asphalt down on the ground, take property off of the city of Portland tax rolls, and replace it with this asphalt. I can't support something like that. And in summary, I strongly urge you to support the grade separated alternative so this project can move forward. Thank you.

Saltzman: Thank you very much.

Chris Eykamp, 2101 SE Tibbits: My name is chris, I am on the land board and on the land use, and transportation committee. For better or for -- the land use and transportation committee. This is the gateway to the omsi, coming string water corridor and the future park, that is hopefully going to be developed down there, and I think as the spring water corridor opens there's going to be a lot more pedestrian and cycle traffic under viaduct or across the road or whatever is constructed there. And so I think that one of the things we need to consider is what is the environment going to be down there as people are, I am afraid that if the viaduct is built, that the underside will be used for parking and storage, you have heard other people express similar concerns and if you do go ahead and approve the viaduct today I would ask that you also ask pdot and odot for commitment that it will not be used for storage and will not be put to some nonconstructive use because I think that that really will be, have an impact on people using it. But I think more importantly, I would like to you look at kind of the longer range picture. Everybody is talking about moving traffic today. I mean, and that is important, and I understand the needs to, the needs of moving traffic today, but what about tomorrow? What is the development in that area going to be tomorrow? If we build a viaduct, we will have it for 50 to 100 years, and in 50 to 100 years will we want that down there? There may be some other better use for that land than what's currently down there today. And I just feel that a little more time is required in order to consider some of those issues, and I would ask that -- I am not advocating one

JULY 18, 2002

proposal over the other but I would ask that the at-grade proposal be developed further so some of the questions can be answered. Thank you.

Bob Belshur(sp?): Hello, good afternoon. I am bob, an east-side resident at 1533 northeast stanton and I am here for riverfront for people three. We are a group of advocates for progressive planning. And i'm for the ongrade option, which I will refer to here as the short viaduct option versus the long viaduct option. Our position is that it's a more comprehensive solution because particularly, it pays close attention to transit planning. Do you know that in the area between southeast 17th and southeast mill street, a very long area, there are no bus stops. When we talk about the need to keep up the present traffic load and future load, I would love to see a model, if we could add simply more bus and transit to that whole area. It seems to me, this is something that's not being mentioned by industrial and business advocates, and I think that they have made a strong argument for you to act immediately on, on the long viaduct proposal. But I would hope, if you do so, there's a real attention given to better transit and there's a shift of how the workforce and local residents can access the workplaces and move throughout the city. One of the big advantages of the signalized intersection is it provides immediate four-way accessibility by the workforce and residents and I think that that's been overlooked. We would like to ask you today, respectfully, if you would consider weighing bodes options by the potentials, particularly versus transit and shifting the current kind of traffic usage. Consider that there's been a really, a compromised process. We have never seen environmental assessment done by odot. And unlike many of the public agency representatives today, that have spoken of the high collaboration with odot and pdot, we sense that that's really been lacking in our experience with them. We would love to look at their analysis. But we usually you to weigh both options and to consider delay on the basis that they should complete the process as originally spelled out. Thank you.

Saltzman: One question, mr. Isaac?

Eykamp: Eykamp. What kind of uses would you envision.

Saltzman: For under the viaduct in.

Eykamp: Yeah, rather than parking. I was curious --? I have some ideas, and, you know, there are some -- one idea that I had was, perhaps, some rock-climbing gym, put a building down there, a shop, and build some structures that go up. It would be sheltered out of the rain and used year-around. That's one idea. Maybe some kinds of sports facilities, like basketball or some, something that, again, you don't need -- it's something that might be loud, like basketball is loud, you know, and that's a good place for things like that, so that kind of facility.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Larry Corwin: My name is larry corwin, a business owner at 342 southeast caruthers. I am here to support the grade separated option for the martin luther king, jr. Viaduct. My main argument is that most of the traffic on that road or on that street is transitory in nature. We do need to allow access to the area and as a business owner there, I would like to see that, that improved if at all possible. I believe that this option is the best option. And in regards to the signal, it would be placed at division street, or division place. If you ever tried to use clay and grand, at rush hour, at any particular time, you can see how that, that type of signal would affect the, the situation. I think that the bus and transit can be and should be improved with the above option, and I look forward to your decision.

*****: Thank you.

Rod Merrick, 3627 SE Cooper, 97202: I am rod merrick, and I am a member of the, the design review advisory for the project and i've been involved in the project since 1999, and also representing the pedestrian advisory committee of which I have been the chair. Just a comment on the process. Through the public involvement process, the viaduct has moved from a, a vehicle-centric ordinary highway project to a high-quality bridge design in which both odot and the city

JULY 18, 2002

can be very proud. And it can get better. The options, I believe, have been sufficiently explored in the last six months to suggest that further study of the at-grade option is not warranted. I am supporting the, the viaduct option because it is better urban design. There are better east-west connections on the surface street allowing flexibility for development in the district and for a la modes of transportation. There is much less asphalt. There are two fewer lanes. Two travel lanes and a bike lane, versus three travel lanes and a bike lane and parking. Onstreet parking which is proposed in the at-grade. Less right-of-way is being taken. Less damage to existing businesses. And to tax base. Less noise and pollution from vehicles starting and stopping, less vehicle congestion on surface streets, as well as on viaduct, and better use of the space below the viaduct for freight movement and the access to existing businesses. In terms of pedestrians, they are safe for pedestrian sidewalks and on the at-grade, the sidewalks, because of the constrained right-of-way the sidewalks are further intruded by the street trees, which are very desirable, but there isn't enough width to accommodate them properly. There are some conditions, and I guess other, other issue for pedestrian safety in crossing under. The conditions for support that I would have would be continue to develop the traffic calming measures. Design the road for safe, comfortable travel at 48 to 45 miles per hour, not 55 or higher. Continue to use the design review advisory committee to inform and guide the project, continue to use the urban design consultant as a key member of the design team, and continue to look at improvements for access to transit, which I think is important. Continues to be important. And continue to look for ways to reduce noise, speed, and river access for the brooklyn neighborhood. And build on the vision of a boulevard parkway beginning at the bridge and extending south to clackamas county and beyond. In some, the project is -- in sum, it is good urban design, good transportation policy, and good public process. Thank you.

Saltzman: Thank you very much.

Susan Pearce, Chair, Hosford Abnerthy Neighborhood Association, 3142 SE 25th, 97202:

Susan pearce. Chair of abernathy neighborhoods. My other board members, or the other members, they are not my members, have spoken. I don't have much to add to what they have to say. I would mention that there was a general sense in our discussion last night of having, being forced to make a decision, pushed into making a decision without all the information before us that, that the, it was actually this body that asked, as I understand it, a few months ago since the at-grade proposal back to the neighborhoods for us to look at and that has not been to the, the environmental impact study yet and we don't have that information. It's possible that once the information is in the viaduct option would be a preferred option but we don't have all the information. In any event, whichever structure is, is chosen, hand would hope that the plan would include and allow for safe east and west transportation, especially for bicycles and pedestrians and safe north and south transportation. That, that it would allow for, for future mass transit options, and allow for, for an aesthetically pleasing route to the river, actually, that may be one of the things that there might be some application even under the viaduct that would be a pleasing route to the river but that's very important to us. I would like to see -- I personally would like to see traffic-calming through hand and buckman and brooklyn, at the same time, would continue to flow, whichever option is chosen. I want to thank odot and perform do the and thank you three for listening to us today, it has been a long day.

*****: Thank you.

Francesconi: So are you going to invite us to the tomato festival?

Pearce: You are already invited. You are on the schedule as a taster. We are counting on you.

Dee Walsh, Vice President Central Eastside Industrial Council, 1135 SE Salmon, 97214:

Good afternoon. I am dee walsh and I am here in my capacity as vice president of the central east side industrial council and co-chair of the land use committee and I am here to choice my support

JULY 18, 2002

for the separated grade option. I voice that support both as someone who supports the business schools of the central east side, the regional transportation needs, and also as a pedestrian and bicyclist who frequents the area and often goes from my office at southeast 11th and salmon to the esplanade and I can say that I would much rather go underneath grant and mlk than have to cross them as I do in my current situation because of the difficulty with the amount of traffic there. I know that there's been some discussion that having an at-grade option would improve pedestrian access and I think that, that that's a subjective opinion, in my opinion, being able to go under the busy streets makes it easier and the access better, and I agree with susan, that anything that can be done to enhance that area under there would also be a plus for the project. Thanks.

Joseph D. Jannuzzi, 3025 SE Knapp, 97202: I am a resident of eastmoreland. And probably one of the people that would be impacted by traffic calming or slowing. I can't add a whole lot to what's already been said, except that it really wouldn't bother me to slow things down a bit on that road. And the slowdown within a few blocks anyway. It doesn't seem to make a whole lot of difference. If it improves access by public transportation, which is something that we need to look at, because there's not going to be room for all the cars as the population continues to increase. And as the population continues to age, you probably want to get me off the road and into a bus anyway. Thank you.

*****: Go ahead and start.

Susie Lahserk, Port of Portland: Okay. Good afternoon. My name is susie, and I am transportation planning manager for the port of Portland. I am here today because of our interest in efficient freight movement in this region. Recent commodity forecasts by metro and the port show a doubling of freight volume in this region over the next 25 years, for a long time, the port has said to its regional partners that they should be concerned about bottlenecks affecting access to our facilities because it affects the regions businesses market access. By the same token we must care about the bottlenecks affecting freight in the rest of the city. And the region because freight moves by overall multimodal system. To serve both the businesses from moving to market as well as consumers. Freight movement is not an end to itself, it is a good move because consumers demand products and businesses want to sell to markets. The efficiency of that activity can be translated into improved business productivity. Recent research in the area of freight and business productivity demonstrates the linkage of efficient freight movement to a business and a region's economic health. If industry can count on their goods getting to destinations when planned they don't have to devote their resources to fixing a transportation delivery problem. They can use those funds for business development, research, et cetera. What we know about the economic base of this city is that we are a distribution center serving a larger population base than the jurisdictional boundaries. The economic benefit of that means we draw dollars from areas beyond the boundaries and jobs for the city. If we are to remain competitive in this arena, then why is investment to support efficient freight movement is a critical factor. The mlk viaduct product, project is just such an investment. It serves the industrial sanctuary and it's part of the national highway system. The grade separated alternative will support improved freight mobility. The at-grade option will not. The at-grade option will have an impact of truck operation, overall traffic flow, trucks using as you have heard earlier an at-grade intersection coming off of 6% grade are going to have difficulty with their operations. They are going to have difficulties stopping and starting. And the impact of that is both an impact to freight movement but also an impact to air quality. For these reasons, we support the staff's recommendation and I urge your support for the recommended grade separated alternative for mlk and an expedited construction of this project. Thank you. -- an expedited construction of the project.

JULY 18, 2002

Peter Fry, 2153 SW Main #104, 97201: Peter fry. I support the option. I think it is actually going to be a very attractive and beautiful structure. It's not going to be like what you see there today with modern techniques. There will be fewer pillars, the bridge will be shaped and it will be a very nice portal into the central east side. The important thing here is to understand the geography of this location. This is actually a slough. It's not a flat area. There's banks on each side of it. On the south is powell boulevard, which is a bank, and on the north is the, the main line of the union pacific railroad, and a bank that goes up and so this viaduct bridges as a river, it bridge as slough. Bringing the viaduct down to grade and remember, that grade option is not truly an at-grade option. It's simply at-grade at an intersection, and then it climbs back up. The mcloughlin currently because of the railroad and the slough, there's only two roads that cross this area. One is mcloughlin, and that carries 54,000 cars a day. The other one is 11th and 12th, which carries 20,000. And 11, 12 goes down through milwaukie through housing and storefront and it goes up through neighborhoods, 11, 12 has houses and store fronts all along it. If you were to downgrade mcloughlin and force it to behave like burnside does on the west side, burnside carries 33,000 cars. You would be forcing a diversion of 28,000 trips. If those trips were diverted to 11 and 12, which is the only other way to get through here, unless you go up 39th, that would double the traffic on 11 and 12 and create more traffic on 11 and 12 than on barbur, 82nd avenue and 39th. So the reality here is a geographic issue, and the viaduct solves that. There's two last points. I wanted to speak briefly on the transit side, and it's nice that people come in every once in a while and kind of grade us on how badly we are doing on transit, but I do want to report to you that we are working with tri-met right now on, on trying to extend a line pass omsi, instead of ends at omsi, and option would be to come up mcloughlin, down off the viaduct into the new intersection, that's much more friendly for buses. Come around and go to omsi and then go back up to downtown via the hawthorne bridge. So, we are working to improve transit in the area. It's not a simple problem. Last point I wanted to make was from an urban design point of view, kind of my perception of all of this. And I perceive some day mcloughlin south of ross island bridge being a true boulevard with grade sidewalks separated from the roads, street trees, trees in the middle, access across mcloughlin and every section, and then north of the viaduct is the urban grid system, and 200 square foot block grids and this viaduct bridges between the boulevard and the grid system, and I think that it's a very nice transition. Thank you.

*****: Thank you. That's all.

Saltzman: That's it, okay. Anybody else wish to testify? Okay. Brandt do you want to come back up here, and mike, too? Members of the council, questions?

Francesconi: Just a question about use under viaduct. Is there anything that pdot or the city can do to make sure it doesn't become an eyesore for the neighborhood?

Williams: That has been a major concern of all those involved if working on the project. Right now, with the plans, what the plans call for the local street that goes in under that, that mike referred in his protection. And that local street would provide better connection for all of the streets, the local streets in the industrial area there, trying to connect all the businesses and it would also provide for onstreet parking, and that onstreet parking may be beneficial. We have had some discussions with parks about that onstreet parking being helpful for the trail head to the, to the spring water trail, which they would find attractive, but the, the -- was we would be looking at, as far as the design, is something that's, you know, much higher quality, of course, than just down there right now, and something that would be, of course, attractive and not be a place where people would hang out. Mike mentioned that the columns would be much, much less. There would be much less number of columns down there. So, it would be much more open and the visibility from one side to the other would be much greater, so I don't anticipate that there would be a problem. If we want to continue to explore other options, as far as what to do adjacent to

JULY 18, 2002

that local street or at the ends of it, we can certainly do that. But, we do plan on make it go a much more attractive and active location than what it is today.

Saltzman: I think, I am not sure mr. Francesconi's question but, I think my question is the land underneath the viaduct. I know about the streets improving and the east-west access and --

Williams: This is a street. It's a north-south street. That goes underneath the viaduct. Yes.

Saltzman: Does that -- will that use all of the available surf areas underneath?

Williams: I don't think it will use a quite all of it but there is a need for the adjacent businesses to have some loading areas given their existing uses and like I said, there would be some opportunities for onstreet parking for other uses in the area.

Saltzman: Is that land currently owned by odot and then owned by the city under this transfer.

Coleman: I think that there is a mix, actually. Some of it is city, most of it is odot. But, I believe that the arrangement once the project is complete, everything would be under the city's.

Saltzman: Okay. So, the city makes decisions about if somebody needs to lease the property for any kind of a use, or --

Coleman: Yes, even today, I believe, some of the areas leased through like a parking, ongoing parking permit arrangement.

Saltzman: One final question that I had, there is many references to the at-grade option being studied further. I sense that, that the study is designed, there is no further study after a decision today unless we choose to make it further? There is no, the environmental assessment, this is it.

Williams: That would be correct. If you decided today to go forward with the viaduct design, I think that there might be a few details that odot would have to wrap up, but for the most part, the environmental assessment would be complete and the report would be published. And the final report. If you decide otherwise, then one option would be to go back and more or less start again with an environmental assessment process to include the at-grade alternative. Now, regarding additional information, we feel like we have done a fairly extensive review of all the traffic information as we presented. Some of the other things that are in environmental assessment that we would have to take a look at include like historical impacts, noise, cultural, natural resources, hazardous materials, biological assessments and things like that. I think that the biggest issue here has to do with traffic and transportation and I feel like we have really pushed that -- flushed that out and given that as much attention as it really needs. The other issues, I don't think that there would be much tradeoff between them. Noise, there are noise problems, with each alternative that, that would play out. Hazardous materials would be the same for both. Air quality would probably be worse for the at-grade than it would be for the one we recommended. The viaduct. And the other thing that goes along with the environmental assessment is process. And time. And that's what we would be seeing also if we continued forward.

Saltzman: Any further questions? Okay. Thanks. I guess we are at the point of considering the resolution. I have an amendment I wish to offer to the resolution. And what it deals with is simply adds a "where as," that, that the diagram shows stormwater management using the natural areas for stormwater management, potential stormwater management, as the quality of the willamette river is important to all of us. My where as encourages odot, pdot, and the bureau of environmental services to really do their best to make sure that those stormwater management areas are, in fact, used as stormwater management areas so this water run-off from roads is filtered and not dumped directly into the river. So, I will distribute that and --

Francesconi: Has pdot seen this?

Coleman: I think mike has.

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

Francesconi: Is everything okay?

JULY 18, 2002

Saltzman: I can read it if you want.

Francesconi: I haven't seen it. Yes, I think that we should read it.

Saltzman: It says, whereas the city's goal after clean and healthy willamette river includes treating stormwater as close to the source as possible, and therefore, the city desires that odot work with the city's office of transportation and the bureau of environmental services throughout the design of the project to use vegetative surface facilities for the treatment of stormwater run-off.

Coleman: It has a confirmation that folks from odot have reviewed it.

Saltzman: I would move the adoption. I think that I am allowed to do that as president.

Francesconi: Sure. Go ahead. That's fine with me.

Saltzman: Second?

Francesconi: Second.

Saltzman: Any objection? Okay. Any further discussion? Okay. Call the roll.

Francesconi: Well, it is time for a decision, and we need to make a decision today and we need to move on. I guess I think that we have studied all the alternatives enough and in fact, I want to thank pdot and i, I wasn't the commissioner at the time but I think that I wanted to have an analysis done of the pluses and minuses of the alternatives. I think the report you have given to us on july of 2002 actually does this. The problem is we have some different visions and different objectives that people want to accomplish, and taking more time won't help us. The hand neighborhood and the brooklyn neighborhood at least some very good citizens there have a right to, and as pushed by jim howell appropriately, to see if we could reclaim a Portland street here. In a way that benefits the neighborhoods. And there is a very powerful and good argument that here's an opportunity to do this. But, we do have obligations to represent the whole city, including the brooklyn and hand residents and neighborhoods and we have to do what we think is in the best interest of our city and community. In looking at this, the viaduct above grade is the best alternative. And we need to proceed with this. It's not a question of funding. Although we need to have the resources to build it. We need to do what works best for the users and all the users. So, here we have an opportunity you know to help pedestrians with wider sidewalks. To help the cyclists who have pretty much supported this alternative. We have a chance to connect to the spring water corridor, which is going to be a tremendous facility that we are celebrating again, the opening tomorrow. And we can, in some people's opinion, better connect the neighborhood to the river through this, although there is some split on that. From a transportation standpoint, there's going to be a backup in the neighborhood that they are not going to like, if this doesn't happen. The transportation numbers, which I have looked at hard, and I have met with jim howell myself and ron buell, there's been no contest on the numbers in terms of what the transportation impacts will be. People have not said that pdot is wrong on this. So, that's why I don't think even delaying that makes no sense. So, it is important that we do the best urban design we can, and transporting freight at the expense of the neighborhoods is not what we are trying to do here as a community. On the other hand, it is important for our businesses in the central east side and throughout the city that we give adequate consideration to the transportation of freight. And we don't want to backup the traffic into the neighborhoods, so here we have had a process that's gone on for a long time. We have considered alternatives and this is in the best interests of our businesses, of our neighborhoods, and of our city. Aye.

Saltzman: Well, back in october, I guess the council was somewhat on a renegade street. We entertained a new vision at the 11th hour, which generally is not the way things happen around here. Not quite the favor of the Portland process but we were enamored to ask and certainly well aware of the risk to funding and eligibility for funding of that at-grade proposal but nevertheless we did ask that this proposal get a serious look. I think you have done that, and I think that there has been ample room. It was october, it's now almost ten months later. So, I think that there has

JULY 18, 2002

been an ample process to look at it and I think that the information you have provided with us does not seem to be disputed. What is disputed is the vision, and the role of the viaduct in terms of whether it enhances attributes of the neighborhoods and what serves best the central east side's need to, and the city's need to move. To move people, freight and commerce. I think that we have to be a little consistent. We just a few weeks ago adopted the central east side district opportunity study, was certainly, it paints a whole new role not east side, not a new but embellishes the role, employing more people, and employing more people is the ability for freight and people to move in and out of that area. I think it's incumbent upon us to be consistent with that action of just, just up to two weeks ago and to support the above grade proposal here, and I clearly like parts of the at-grade proposal. I will be the first to say there are appealing attributes, especially when you think about looking at the big picture, what we want the city to look like 40 or 50 years from now, but I think that we also have to recognize right now that we are this sort of the economic version of the perfect storm, and it's important that we not let 32 million wash away. And this is something that we have to take an opportunity of and it's not something that I am prepared to gamble that it might be available after further study and consensus around an at-grade option so I think that this is the way to go and I also believe that the above grade has a lot of attributes to it. So I am pleased to support this decision. Aye.

Sten: Well, I was definitely one of the people who was very interested in jim howell's vision and he's a great visionary, and I think that it's kind of, my instinct and I think that it's right, is that generally speaking having viaducts through the middle of the city is not a terrific strategy for urban design, and but the question was really, can you make it work by going back and I think that for many neighborhoods, having a viaduct is not a great, great way to go, but actually the neighborhood, I think happened to be out in a few neighborhoods right before the last hearing, had really worked to say at that we could go with the idea that the new viaduct approach with some caveats and I hope that we have got all those in the record and I think those will all stay there and I think that there will, there has been a couple other good ideas, and so I hope that pdot will also stay in touch with us because I think you will and see if when we go this way, I don't want to see them lose anything in this, but as I looked at this, I think that there is probably, you have your urban design issue and then speed of transportation. You have got, where is the backup going to go, bicycling, a whole bunch of issues, and I think on the whole, that, you know, when you have got all the experts who took a clean look at this, you weren't really himming and hawing a lot with the presentation. It kept coming and coming, one more reason that we think this is best from both odot and pdot with not too tricky undertones for this politician to figure out about what happens if we don't move forward. I don't think it was a threat but the time has come to make a decision and I think that the choice has been laid out clearly. I am glad that we went back and took a look at it and I think that it's just a very vexing question, once you build these massive structures that I don't think are the best strategy in neighborhoods, you know, when do you say, we are going to completely change the approach. I am convinced now isn't the time to completely change that approach, and that this is the best strategy that doesn't meet all the goals equally but meets them, the most amount of the goals the best, which is, I think the choice that we have in front of us so I will vote aye.

Saltzman: Okay. That's it.

Francesconi: Mr. President if I could do one thing, I forgot to thank the staff, and you did it really, a really thorough job but I also want to thank you on your citizen involvement process and how you listened to folks and do the best you could under the circumstances. Done a terrific job so thank you.

Saltzman: Okay. Good work, everybody. We stand adjourned.

JULY 18, 2002

At 4:06 p.m., Council adjourned.