



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

OFFICIAL  
 MINUTES

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

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

Commissioner Saltzman arrived at 9:34 a.m.

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

On a Y-4 roll call, the Consent Agenda was adopted

<b>TIME CERTAINS</b>	<b>Disposition:</b>
<p><b>1205 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM</b> – Reappoint Richard Alexander and Hector Lopez and appoint Mia Butzbaugh and Toni Jaffe to the Citizen Review Committee for Independent Police Review for a term to expire October 9, 2004 (Resolution introduced by Auditor Blackmer)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>36100</b></p>
<p><b>1206 TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM</b> – Amend fee schedules for certain Site Development fees on all construction permits to cover Office of Planning and Development Review plan review and inspections services (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO          SECOND READING          OCTOBER 16, 2002          AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b>	
<p><b>1207</b> Statement of cash and investments August 29 through September 25, 2002 (Report; Treasurer)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>PLACED ON FILE</b></p>
<b>Mayor Vera Katz</b>	
<p><b>1208</b> Confirm appointment of Jeffrey Stuhr to the Design Commission for a term to expire September 31, 2006 (Report)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>

**OCTOBER 9, 2002**

<p><b>1209</b> Approve appointments to the Housing Authority of Portland Board of Commissioners of Jeff Bachrach for a term to expire June 25, 2003 and Shar Giard for a term to expire December 10, 2004 (Resolution) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>36099</b></p>
<p><b>*1210</b> Pay claim of Jeffrey L. Cawley (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176952</b></p>
<p><b>*1211</b> Extend Legal Service Agreement with Preston Gates Ellis, LLP for outside counsel (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 34486) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176953</b></p>
<p><b>*1212</b> Authorize a contract with Landmark Ford and provide for payment to furnish replacement vehicles (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176954</b></p>
<p><b>*1213</b> Amend Code to rename the Office of Planning and Development Review to the Bureau of Development Services (Ordinance; amend Code Chapter 3.30 and other titles as needed) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176955</b></p>
<p><b>*1214</b> Amend Code to adopt, by reference, new State of Oregon Specialty Codes for Electrical and Mechanical Regulations (Ordinance; amend Code Chapters 26.01 and 27.01) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176956</b></p>
<p><b>*1215</b> Accept a grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in the amount of \$45,000 for development of the North Macadam Smart Growth and Brownfields handbook (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176957</b></p>
<p><b>1216</b> Grant a ten-year property tax exemption to Pearl 2002 LLC for new multiple-unit housing on the full block bounded by NW 9th and 10th Avenues and Hoyt and Irving Streets (Second Reading Agenda 1190) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176958</b></p>
<p><b>1217</b> Grant a ten-year property tax exemption to Lloyd 2002 LLC for new multiple-unit housing on the full block bounded by NE Wasco, 3rd, Multnomah, and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (Second Reading Agenda 1191) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176959</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>Commissioner Jim Francesconi</b></p> <p><b>*1218</b> Accept a grant for \$100,000 from Oregon Department of Transportation to create effective transportation safety projects/programs with particular emphasis on youth education and summer programs in an effort to decrease traffic related injuries and fatalities (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>176960</b></p>

OCTOBER 9, 2002

<b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b>	
<b>*1219</b> Accept three easements for the West Side Combined Sewer Overflow Tunnel Project, granted by Harley T. Johnson, authorizing total payment of \$52,500 (Ordinance)  (Y-4)	<b>176961</b>
<b>*1220</b> Amend contract with CH2M Hill for Combined Sewer Overflow modeling services in the amount of \$200,000 and extend the contract duration to December 31, 2003 (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 33184)  (Y-4)	<b>176962</b>
<b>1221</b> Amend Title 9 Food Regulations and Establishments, Ban of Polystyrene Foam Food Containers, to change oversight and enforcement from the Bureau of Environmental Services to the Office of Sustainable Development (Ordinance; amend Code Chapter 9.28)	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 16, 2002 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>REGULAR AGENDA</b>	
<b>Commissioner Jim Francesconi</b>	
<b>1222</b> Declare the purpose and intention of the City to construct street improvements in the NE Holman Street Local Improvement District (Resolution; C-10001)  (Y-4)	<b>36101</b>

At 10:32 a.m., Council recessed.

**OCTOBER 9, 2002**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **9TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2:00 P.M.**

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

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

<b>1223</b> TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM – Adopt the Action Charts and additional implementing measures of the North Macadam Plan (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)	<b>Disposition:</b> <b>CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 10, 2002 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b>
<b>1224</b> Adopt and implement the North Macadam Plan (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)	<b>CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 10, 2002 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b>

At 5:06 p.m., Council recessed.

**OCTOBER 10 , 2002**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **10TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2:00 P.M.**

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

Commissioner Saltzman arrived at 2:04 p.m.

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

<p><b>1225 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Continuation of North Macadam Plan from Wednesday, October 9, 2002, Agenda Item Nos. 1223 and 1224</p>	<p><b>Disposition:</b></p> <p><b>CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 30, 2002 AT 2:40 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>
---	--

At 4:39 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.

OCTOBER 9 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.

**OCTOBER 9, 2002            9:30 AM**

**Katz:** Roll call.

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

**Katz:** Present. Is Commissioner Saltzman—would somebody please remind him to come down. All right before we do consent agenda for anybody who's watching and listing Commissioner Saltzman has to leave between 4:30 and 5. Both of us are on impact and there is a very important conversation and probably a vote at impact at 5 o'clock. What I will do, we will adjourn today -- I know north macadam is on the agenda. We'll adjourn at 5:00, we will come back on thursday and continue the testimony, and if we have to go and continue the testimony until the 30th, we will do that. We've waited how many years? I think it's been identified on the map for 25, we've been working on it for seven, we can wait a couple more days before we make a decision. That's just what I wanted to say for anybody who is watching us. Okay. Consent agenda. Anybody want to take an item off the consent agenda? Anybody in the audience want to take an item off the consent agenda? If not, roll call.

**Ben Walters, Deputy City Attorney:** You'll have to wait until the commissioner Saltzman shows up.

**Katz:** Sorry.

**Walters:** He's on his way.

**Katz:** Roll call on the consent agenda.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [ gavel pounded ] all right. Time certain. 1205.

**Item 1205.**

**Katz:** I understand we have somebody who is leaving, so come on up and tell us how things are going, and bring up the new appointees, and do whatever you want to do.

\*\*\*\*\*: I'm going to speak briefly, because it's interrupted with coughing once in a while. It's my honor --

**Katz:** Identify yourself.

**Gary Blackmer, Portland City Auditor:** Gary blackmer, Portland city auditor. It's my honor to bring two nominees forward to council for appointment. We went through an extensive public notification process and selection process. We had 31 applicants who had very many qualified people, and we selected these two who I think are going to be great contributors to the committee. We have a process of renewal every year, some of the committee members come up for the positions come up and they can reapply and compete against others, we also have two that are being reappointed who have been great contributors as well. And we'll also be saying goodbye to two members who are leaving and doing other great things for our community. So i'm going to have richard do a little talking here so I can take a break.

**Katz:** And richard, if -- I can't see without my glasses, but if we have people who are leaving who might want to come and tell us what they've learned during their tenure --

\*\*\*\*\*: Excellent. In fact, we actually have some plaques --

**Katz:** They are here?

OCTOBER 9 2002

\*\*\*\*\*: One out of the two is here. Eric, if you wouldn't mind coming on up.

**Richard Rosenthal, Director, Internal Police Review:** Richard Rosenthal. Very briefly, to give you an update, it's been almost exactly a year since I first appeared here and appointed the nine members to the committee. Since that time we've made enormous progress of creating protocols and procedures, and really honing the process so that the appeals process is a fair one, objective, and will withstand public scrutiny. One of the things that council told me when I first got here was that you as a political body you really did not want to hear appeals like you were hearing them with piiac. You wanted them to be if possible resolved between the police bureau and the citizen review committee and only in the most -- only when absolutely necessary should a case come before council for appeal. Between the work of the citizen review committee and apr and the police bureau, we've heard about 45 appeals since we started, and in about ten cases the citizens have made recommendations for changes, and nine out of ten the bureau's accepted those recommendations. One is still pending, and I expect the bureau to accept that one as well. So we've been able to coordinate the work of the citizen review committee and the police bureau and the command staff such that they have reached agreements in every single appeal that has been heard, and therefore it has been unnecessary for council to conduct hearings. So I consider that to be a success.

**Katz:** A benchmark.

**Rosenthal:** A definite benchmark. So basically we went through an extensive appointment process to bring on our new members. We had two members who after they served their one year, we had staggered terms, Alice and Eric wish not to continue, it is certainly an extreme amount of time the volunteers have to spend, and we did in fact prepare a plaque thanking both of the members for the work that they have done on the committee over the past year, which I'd like to present to Eric with our thanks for particularly dedicated work done by Eric and the amount of time he's put in has been enormous. And --

**Katz:** Thank you, Richard.

**Eric Terrell:** Good morning, council and members. I'm Eric Terrell, I live in North Portland. I want to thank the council for appointing me to the new citizen review committee. It was certainly an exciting time to be involved on the ground floor, and like Richard mentioned, to develop protocols and to help the committee itself get organized. Mayor, you asked I think what did I learn. What did we learn. I learned many things, but a couple things stand out. One is that it became very, very clear to me in short order that this is a partnership effort. If we're going to have the best police bureau in this state and certainly in this country, it takes a partnership with the independent police review, the citizen review committee working with the Portland police bureau. We've done that over the past year. Not always in agreement, but certainly all of us committed to have a careful and fair and impartial review of all the appeals that have come before us. I think we've become closer as a committee, as a relationship and partnership with IPR, I think we've done well. Certainly I want to thank Richard for his leadership as a new director, and also I want to thank Captain Shank of the IAD. Anyway, I think the point I'm trying to make is that it is a collaboration with all of those players to make this process the citizen review process work most successfully. And I think the other thing that I want to say is that the members who volunteer for the CRC are dedicated, put in tremendous time and effort to do the job that we have been appointed to do, and I for one want to thank you very much for giving me that opportunity.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Terrell:** Mayor, if I may say one final thing, I'm actually going to the national association for civilian oversight of law enforcement conference at the end of this month, and one of the things I'm going to check, my understanding is there is no other city in the nation where a citizen review panel has had 100% of their recommendations accepted by the bureau or the department with which they

OCTOBER 9 2002

work. And i'm going to be verifying that with the other members of the community nationwide, but I really do think it is a remarkable factor, and we really have to thank the captain shank from internal affairs, the members of the committee, and other ipr staff who have really worked towards reaching these accommodations.

**Katz:** Captain schenck, don't leave. I didn't ask you if you wanted to come and say something, but after we meet the new members I want to bring you up while we're here and we have a relatively short agenda, to ask you a couple of questions as to why -- what have you found in your new job. Okay. Questions?

**Francesconi:** Just one. It is a very critical goal, but it's not the only measure of success here, because I doubt this group could do -- you could weaken recommendations in order to get agreement if that was the only goal. I know you're not doing that, so -- i'd like to hear kind of the other goals too. In fact, why don't you just briefly --

**Rosenthal:** Our plan is, we're going to be doing our annual report at the end of this year, and our plan was to come before council in mid-february and really go through our extensive goals. We're going to be -- we're right now conducting specialty audits of the bureau, which are extremely important, including an audit of the early warning system as well as the officer involved shooting audit that's ongoing. We're working very diligently with the bureau, and our goal is timeliness, not only making sure the investigations are timely, but the review process is timely and we're working with the bureau specifically on changing how they're handling discipline to empower precinct commanders more, and therefore reduced amount of time it takes to impose discipline on the various members. We've got -- we've basically -- i'm not specifically prepared to go over the -- all of the goals, but that gives you an idea. We're planning to -- and thank you, gary, of course one of the most important issues is the mediation program, which we started september 3rd. We're hoping to take up to 10% of all the complaints received and put them into a mediation program which will frankly make the complainants happier, more understanding of bureau policies and procedures, and help bureau members to change conduct so that it will reduce the number of complaints that we receive. So those are a number of our goals.

**Francesconi:** I'll look forward to that discussion at the right time. I just brought this up at the wrong time. One other question. How are we doing on the training that we're providing?

**Rosenthal:** Of the citizen review committee members? We've basically are providing ongoing training, and the new members will get an intensive amount of information. One of the things we did, one, I asked all members to participate in at least two ride-alongs a year, all eight out of nine members agreed to do that. We've given them specialized training in use of force, we're now -- we now have an agreement with training division where they're providing us with the videos they provide to the officers in roll call. And our members are watching those videos to see the training that the officers are receiving, because obviously if they disagree with how an officer is acting, but it's according to policy, they can't find the officer guilty of misconduct, they need to look at the training and policy issues. We have -- we've given them extensive training in how internal affairs works, we have a captain of the bureau coming in at the next meeting who is going to give them training on how the discipline process works after the investigation and the findings are concluded to give them more education in that area. And basically it's been ongoing. They've received training from civil rights organizations and input from them, and it's the idea that basically we have two -- we've been having two meetings a month. Almost -- though we've spent the last couple of months really dealing with internal processes and appeals, now we're going to be going back to each month some form of training. And they obviously receive training for each individual case. Internal affairs helps with that as far as identifying issues on particular cases and providing them with training at that time so they can make an intelligent decision.

**Francesconi:** Thank you.



OCTOBER 9 2002

**Blackmer:** One other thing. They -- the citizens are pursuing issues that they find of interest also. They had a briefing and training from the hooper center on how it operates. They've also done some policy reviews and they're looking at a number of issues in terms of ways they think officers can avoid situations escalating and looking at ways that policies and procedures and the police bureau or maybe just training could be changed to reduce the likelihood that situations escalate into the use of force. So they're looking at ways they can change policies as well, and those are areas that they're doing intensive contact of other cities, interviews, and so forth, in order to be able to develop recommendations.

**Katz:** Okay. So you'll be back in february. Let me just recommend that the council members attend several of these meetings during the year. It would help understand what the dynamics are between all the individual players in this puzzle.

**Rosenthal:** And in fact I know mayor, you've been there, every chief of staff has attended, at least one meeting at our invitation.

**Katz:** I've only unfortunately been to one. I plan to go to more, but I think every one of us should see it in action ourselves. All right. Richard. Introduce our new folks.

**Rosenthal:** We have two new members who were chosen after an extensive interview process. Our first new member is tony -- toni jaffe.

**Katz:** Tell us a little about yourself.

**Rosenthal:** On my left is toni and on my right is mia butzbaugh, who is a local attorney.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Good morning, mayor, council. I believe it's a privilege --

**Katz:** Identify yourself.

**Toni Jaffe:** Toni jaffe, southwest. I believe it's a privilege to be in front of all of you this morning, as I embark upon this endeavor and journey. My background is i'm a long-time resident of Portland, a native northwesterner, an eastsider at heart but recently moved to the inner close southwest. I'm a member at large in the committee, I have a diverse background professionally in health care, human resources, and a strong nonprofit background in working with human rights issues, civil rights issues, and haven't done anything in the last couple years because I have a 31/2-year-old. I've taken some off from volunteer work, and a very good friend of mine, elise marshall, and the mayor thought, you know, I needed something to do. So I thought this would be a great opportunity to learn a lot more about community policing, how the bureau works, and really to get closer perspective of understanding city government and how that works. So i'm pleased to be in front of you this morning, to be a representative of the mayor on this committee, and will endeavor to put forth the energy, the commitment, the thoughtfulness, to carry out my duties and responsibilities.

**Katz:** Just because you are my representative doesn't mean that you have to act in the manner that I would act on some of these issues. You are totally and completely independent.

**Jaffe:** I think that's what's good. I am a contrast. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** Whoops.

**Mia Butzbaugh:** Morning. My name is mia butzbaugh, i'm a relative newcomer to Portland. I live in southeast.

**Katz:** Where are you from?

**Butzbaugh:** I'm from michigan. I moved out here, fell in love with an Oregonian and it seems like half the people i've met are people who moved to Oregon after falling in love with Oregonians who never seem to leave. I went to law school in michigan, I also have a master's of information science, I was -- studied archives also at michigan, and currently i'm practicing employee benefits and tax law. Because i'm relatively new, I haven't been involved in Portland as I would like to be, and hope to be in the years to come. I have a 1-year-old as well, so that's taken some of my time of late. One of the things that transitioned me into taking -- into attending law school from being

OCTOBER 9 2002

library science person was doing a research project into the transparency access to information through foya as prisons are becoming privatized, and what implication that's would have in accountability for people who had formerly been government employees. I also have a background in trade union -- independent trade union reform. I worked in detroit for a couple years as a journalist and organizer for an independent trade union newspaper. So i'm really honored to be participating in this endeavor, and very much look forward to the next two years.

**Katz:** Thank you. Questions for the council? Thank you, ladies. Good luck. It's a lot of time you're putting in. We really appreciate it. All right. Anybody else want to come and talk with us?

**Rosenthal:** Mayor, i'm sorry. We have two members being reappointed, so we should bring --

**Katz:** Oh, that's right. Richard and hector, come on up.

**Rosenthal:** Rick alexander and hector lopez.

**Katz:** We're going to ask you the same questions. Richard? Go ahead.

\*\*\*\*\*: Hi.

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

**Richard Alexander:** I'm rick alexander from northeast Portland. It's been a real privilege to serve on the independent police review board, the citizens review committee, and I wanted to stay here to continue working hard towards our goal of making relations between the police and the citizens a lot better, and getting everyone to work together.

**Katz:** You've been around before. This is your second go-around. Actually your third.

**Alexander:** Yes.

**Katz:** How's it differed in terms of the process?

**Alexander:** The process has been greatly improved, I think. There's a really sharp group we've been working with in terms of the citizen review committee, and the -- having the staff and that from the independent police review has allowed us to accomplish a lot more, you know, having worked with piiiac two years prior to the appointment to the citizen review committee, we have a lot more flexibility, we have a lot more input as citizens, and we've in fact been held some public forums where we've got a lot of feedback from people throughout town had one in southwest, one in northeast Portland, and doing so it's made things open up quite a bit. And it's made a dramatic amount of improvements. There's still a long way to go, and a lot of things that need to be done, and I hope to see this evolve into the best system that it possibly can be.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Hector Lopez:** I'm hector lopez, serving one year, and will continue to be of service on the committee. I have had an incredibly exciting time working with eight colleagues that are gifted, bright, stubborn, and it has been really, really good to see how we've melded together over this last year. We have defined our relationships with one another, and how we have learned to honor and respect the opinion and the integrity of decisions that each member makes. That's been very, very important in our life as a committee. I believe that this process is very unique in my experience. The partnership of the auditor's office with this committee, ipr and crc, and very, very unique, I believe. And it's interesting because my background is pretty -- well, if I had my druthers, I come from berkeley, california, we wanted a totally citizen accountability committee, police review committee, of course that never worked. And now I understand why. It's been really good to see that accountability is there, although there is a separation from the police bureau. That that's necessary. Yet because of our connection to the auditor's office, we have incredible accountability that works both ways. So I really respect that and i've learned that this is a possible exciting new way of doing things. I think for me, after a year, we've addressed pretty much the basic steps of the ordinance. I think we're -- we're on the way to resolving a lot of those things that were mandated by you through the ordinance to us. Partnership as mr. Terrell indicated, is very critical for this endeavor. I think all nine of us have that commitment along with ipr and the police bureau. And

OCTOBER 9 2002

we've addressed those, we've nurtured those. The one area we still must work very hard on is in terms of the citizens. There's still some very strong feelings that they're not really sure this is a viable partnership, because we have not yet addressed powerfully enough the input of the community at large. Our public forums are working at it, but even then we discovered that a lot of the communities that are impacted by police activity were not present. So we have to learn ways of inviting and welcoming and bringing people to those forums so that the partnership can really become much more powerful. I thank all of you for this privilege, I thank richard, I thank the police bureau for their attention and activity with us, and I really, really thank the nine -- the eight members of the committee who have served so faithfully and so loyally. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. Thank you. Okay. Captain -- dan, i'll get to you in a second. I'll open it up. So what have you learned? Good morning. Identify yourself for the record.

**Captain Darrel Schenck, Portland Police Bureau:** I'm captain darryl shank, Portland police internal affairs division.

**Katz:** What have you learned?

**Schenck:** Well, i've learned a lot, and I think the bureau and our internal affairs unit has learned a lot as well. We certainly came into this process with the -- operating on the experiences we had working with the previous group and some of the issues and problems and the successes too in working with piac and so we were anticipating what this new group was going to bring. And we've worked very closely in trying to, as richard pointed out, to approach dealing with our complaints in a partnership mode, where ipr and the citizen review committee were a partner working with ia in effectively addressing complaints. Not just a necessary group or a necessary evil that we had to deal with, but actually in partner in helping take responsibility as well as iad and the police bureau for dealing with these complaints. So with that attitude, I think that we've learned as officers, at least i'm speaking for myself and others as well, that in our job we make assumptions. That's what we do for a living, and I think we are learning in dealing -- in working with ipr and the citizen review committee, that our assumptions are not always accurate or correct. And the citizen review committee brings together a huge variety of perspectives, and provides us with those perspectives of different groups in our community that help us learn that our assumptions are not apples accurate. And even -- always accurate. And even those kinds of details of complaints as an officer I may feel are quite minor and not really important, i've learned that these details are not that minor in the eyes of certain groups, certain individuals. And so in working with this -- with ipr and the citizen review folks, it's hoped us I think as an agency and as an investigative unit to understand these perspectives and to learn from it. We're beginning to use ipr and the citizen review committee as a tool in how we address complaints. We are beginning to rely on them for input in some respects ipr is a partner in investigating complaints, in -- as a sound board in getting feedback on ideas or perspectives that we may have about how to address a complaint or what conclusions we might draw from an investigation. So we're beginning to appreciate their input as an institution in this process.

**Katz:** Darrel, the issue of training is really one of the more critical issues, and when they identify a training issue, do you address that through the chain of command all the way to the chief and to the training commander?

**Schenck:** Not only on training issues, but policy issues as well. I bring forth that information to the chief's office, and also with the training division command staff, i've met with them on several occasions. The citizen review committee and ipr are working currently on several policy and training issues, and they have not completed a formal recommendation at this point, but they are continuing to work and develop some recommendations. I have met with them in their work groups on numerous occasions, and provided input from my perspective to help answer some of their questions. So I anticipate that at some point here in the near future there will be more formal recommendations on policy or training issues, but on a more lower level, just in having

OCTOBER 9 2002

conversations with members of the committee and in reviewing some of the outcomes of our discussions in appeals, i've taken some of those ideas back to our training division and our chief's office to discuss. The distraction principle is one of the areas that we had lots of discussion about. There was a lot of misunderstanding and lack of clarity on how the distraction principle was used as a tool in the bureau, how it was referred to, and we learned that it wasn't clear. And --

**Katz:** Profanity is the same. All right.

**Saltzman:** What is the distraction principle?

**Katz:** Why don't you tell him.

\*\*\*\*\*: The question?

**Saltzman:** What is the distraction principle?

**Schenck:** A distraction principle is a technique whereby officers, if they are involved in a confrontation with someone they intend to arrest, they may use a motion, they may use a word or some sort of an act to distract a person momentarily to take their attention off the officer so the officer can then grasp a hold of his arms and take the person into custody. There was some confusion on what a distraction principle is or technique, and how it is being used or how it is even being articulated in a police report.

**Katz:** It's what you do when your kids are crying and you're trying to get them -- their attention to something else.

**Saltzman:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Further questions? Thank you.

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

**Katz:** All right. Come on up. Do we have a sign-up sheet? Dan, why don't you come on up. Is anybody else -- does anybody else from the committee want to say anything? All right. We'll have the members speak first.

**Bob Ueland, Citizen Review Committee:** Bob, I am currently a member of the crc and a past member of piiac. The thing that I have learned, which has become -- which is very important, I think, the guiding principle in the ordinance which was drafted by our city auditor, was that our mission after auditing cases, reviewing them, is to attempt to improve the performance of the officers of the Portland police bureau. I think that's a clear guiding principle that we need to keep in mind at all times so that we don't get distracted, get into finger pointing or get into other issues. Clearly what we want to do is to help improve the performance of the Portland police bureau and its officers. So that's very clear, and I think -- I hope -- I think the council would be happy keeping that in mind too. That's what we're really about.

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

**Dan Handleman, Portland Cop Watch:** Good morning, mayor and council. I'm dan handleman with Portland cop watch. We appreciate the reappointments of some of the former members and the appointment of new members, looking forward to seeing how they perform. We have no comments on their particular appointments at this time. But we are concerned about the process by which they were appointed. A lot of it was done behind closed doors, and we have asked for redacted copies of the applications as we asked for last year. We've been told now we have to pay for these, which we didn't last year. We're hoping there's more public -- that this whole process is more public. The training of the new members, there's only been a little discussion about training that happened by civil rights groups for the previous members. We're hoping those trainings can be repeated so that everybody has the same background and is equal as they it is on the -- sit on the committee. We also as an organization have called numerous times for other applicants who didn't make the cut to be trained so that they can help with the committee work that's provided for in the ordinance that you all passed, that other people can help the committee do its work. We think that's very important, because there's a lot of work to do, and they haven't been able to come up with a single

OCTOBER 9 2002

recommendation in a year's time. So I hope as the council you take more interest in the functioning of this group which you put in place after a lot of outcry from the public, and see that more people get involved. We're also concerned about other things the community had asked for this organization to do, and I don't know when the one-year review is coming, since this is one year after it started. But the shootings and deaths in custody issue, which came to you sometime in the middle of the year, we understand that the people who are reviewing the cases are not going to review anything from the last two years, including the meija case --

**Katz:** They will later on.

**Handleman:** I understand, but the community wanted that report done particularly because of that case. Quarterly reports are not coming before council. I hope that's something you ask the auditor to do. Those reports are the only piece of productive work that's coming out of the group that the public will have a chance to have input on their process before city council. There is still a removal clause for members, if they're not living up to their expectations, I think that would be good for you to think about putting that in the ordinance. There's also some concern we have now that the director has now been inducted as an attorney with the Oregon state bar, he's put new restrictions on people who are represented by attorneys, which we don't think are necessary, since he's not representing the city as an attorney. While we did recommend that the head of the impr should be an attorney, we were hoping they would be able to represent the interest of the ipr in cases where the city and the ipr were at logger heads, but I think he's trying to take the position of defending the city's possible liability.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Handleman:** Thank you for your time.

**Katz:** Anybody else? Richard, we do get reports, but do you want to bring them to the council for discussion? We get the individual reports, but they're not up for full discussion before the council.

**Rosenthal:** Richard Rosenthal, director of ipr. We provide every council member as well as your chief of staff with a copy of the quarterly report. Our plan was to bring the annual report to council for hearings and comments, because the quarterly report really deals with primarily timeliness issues. It's almost a management document to try and assist internal affairs and -- in identifying the issues coming up on a frequent basis. Our annual report is the one that we really intend to deal with the policy issues, the looking at overall trends and patterns and what have you if the council, after receiving any of the quarterly reports or after our presentation on our annual report wishes us to come forward on a quarterly basis, we certainly don't have a problem with doing that, but thus far I haven't really seen the specific need to do that. I was thinking that -- auditor Blackmer and I felt that the one-year benchmark -- although we technically started October 1st of last year when I started, it took me three months to build up the organization and to really start. We started receiving complaints January 2nd of last year.

**Katz:** Let me ask the council to take a look at the last report and reflect upon that, and if the council thinks it would be wise to have a public discussion on that report, let me know, or let Richard know and we'll put it on the agenda.

**Rosenthal:** We would be happy to do so if the council feels it's appropriate.

**Katz:** Okay. Anybody else? If not, we will accept the resolution and vote on the reappointment of two of our members, and the appointment of two new members. Roll call.

**Francesconi:** First on this last issue, I think maybe the first year you're getting organized, it wasn't necessary. I think quarterly reports is a good idea. Where we do it publicly so we hear what's going on, it forces us to focus on it and gives the public a chance to respond. So that's my answer to the mayor's question. I guess just a couple things. One is I want to thank the new members and thank the old members for agreeing again to this appointment. I think of all the citizen committees we have in this city right now, given what's going on in the country and the city, this is among the

OCTOBER 9 2002

most important. The principle of citizen review over police power at both the national and local level is a very critical issue, and we must always be vigilant and reaffirm that fundamental principle of -- upon which we were founded. Having you participate in this is very important. I think the goal is what bob said, which is the improved performance of our police officers and monitoring that, and making recommendations. To do that we do need your insights. I was encouraged by what I heard today, that it does take a partnership with the police, our own internal folks here at the police and at the auditor's office, but also our citizens to make that happen. So if I was really encouraged by captain shank and what he said here, which I wanted to commend you, officer -- captain. In that he said -- he's learning things, you know, about how the community is responding to some things that is changing his behavior on some little things. Well, those little things can be big things, so that's good that the police -- that's part of what we're come accomplishing here. I do think the next step which hector also talked about is how do we also educate the community more about the police's job, because it's a two-way street here, and how do you reach communities that feel disenfranchised and are not coming to some of these meetings? And that's something we should talk about in our quarterly reports too. So I do think it's a two-way street as to how we do this. But i've heard many encouraging things to the point where I almost thought I heard dan handleman taking credit for this from -- because of the outcry that was generated. So we're on the right course here. I guess the last thing I want to say, maybe more of a personal note, I know hector lopez has other things to do in his life, and I want to personally thank him for deciding to reapply for one more year. I've heard from others that the leadership that you provided to this group has helped it gel, and so I want to thank you for the sacrifices you've made to do this, and you're a leader in our community and we need your help on this. Aye.

**Saltzman:** I'm perfectly willing to accept the benchmark of success as the fact we have not heard any appeals in the last year. I find that very gratifying personally. I think that -- first I want to thank auditor blackmer for really spearheading this ordinance and setting up this committee and richard for stepping in here and providing the leadership. I think from everything i'm hearing and hearing from the people here today, it's a dramatic improvement I think for all parties who are concerned about police actions and adequate citizen review of those actions when appropriate. I really -- and i'm very impressed with the training regime. That's really great. In fact I wish for my questions about what the distraction principle, I wish I had time to access some of those trainings myself. But it's great to -- great work you're doing, and keep up the good work, and welcome to new members, and thanks for our continuing members who are staying on. Aye.

**Sten:** It's a big, big task we've set out on, and I think we're heading in the right direction. I want to thank eric, who is leaving, he's done a terrific job. Also the members who are staying, who have also done a terrific job. And the new folks, you're very brave and I think you're going to do a great job. We really -- it's too early to say what exactly we need to do more of and less of, but I think we're going in the right direction, and I think that this could be the -- it's not there yet, we have to keep working, but it could be the foundation for something that's nationally significant, and I actually don't care about that. That makes our community a better place. And I think you've got two roles that are coming forward. One is to make sure there is oversight on the issues, and that there is a citizen body that can look at those things that have gone wrong, and figure out what's appropriate. I think the more subtle and it's not more or less important, but the really key piece is to build a continuous feedback mechanism so we can improve the communication so there's less of these problems in the future. I see that emphasis coming forward, and i'm very hopeful this can continue to evolve into what we all want it to be. And of course the reason it will is citizens that are doing a great job. Aye.

**Katz:** I too want to express my appreciation to eric and to those of you who have decided to continue to serve and I want to welcome the new members. I think this is probably the most

OCTOBER 9 2002

difficult -- well, the planning commission might be the most difficult, but this is close second in terms of the participation and the volunteerism citizens provide this community. I remember when we hotly debated this issue, that the goal was to improve the organization. The goal was to improve the relationship between the police officers, the people, the men and women on the street and the community. And to gain the respect and the trust of both the officers and the community members in that relationship. And I was heartened by my only one visit to the group, where not only was iad the internal affairs and communication with the citizens and really listening to what you were saying, because the issue of distraction, of profanity has been on my list as well, and i'm looking for you to really discuss both sides of that issue, and provide some recommendations to us to begin to look at our training procedures. But also the fact that the union representative was at the meeting, and also was listening to what you were saying and were responding, so we don't have this hostile relationship and this incredible tension between the citizens, between the officers, between the union and the citizens, and the community at large. So I think the work that you're doing is incredibly important. I thank you for that, and i'm looking forward to the annual report. And for any new recommendations that you might want to share with us so that we would -- we could adjust the ordinance to give you some additional responsibilities if you think that's necessary. And I will leave that to gary and richard and the group to think through. Okay? Aye. [ gavel pounded ] 1206.

**Item 1206.**

**Katz:** Okay. Come on up. Margaret? Oh, okay. She's leaving you alone today.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** No, actually we have anne.

**Katz:** Oh, okay.

**Denise Klein, Bureau of Development Services:** I'm denise with bureau of development services. I'm the administrative manager.

**Anne Kohler, Bureau of Development Services:** I'm anne, the site services manager with the bureau of development services.

**Klein:** So here today we have an ordinance changing the fees for site development. Anne is our manager of this program, and what this program does is all the plan review inspections, complaint investigation and resolution for site development issues and that includes erosion control, on-site storm water management, landscaping, conditions of approval for land use, and other site improvements. Anne and her staff have been working since about march in looking at their work program, and part of what they did, and what the finance staff did was look at the fees and how the fees were charged and the revenues. What we found was that the fees for residential projects were frankly pretty complicated. And we felt pretty difficult to understand and difficult for the industry to be able to predict what their fees would be for their project. So we spent quite a lot of time looking at those, and the proposal today consolidates four existing fees into one fee for residential site improvements. And we think this will help streamline things and make things a lot simpler. We spent some time with working with industry groups, we spent some time with the home builders in development of the proposal, and they actually do support the proposal. Unfortunately kelly ross could not be here today, but he did send an e-mail in support of the proposal. We sent notification out to about a list of 120 different groups, business associations, land use chairs, and other industry groups, held an open house, and frankly didn't receive response from them. We did hear from agc, who said they would not oppose a proposal. On the commercial side for the commercial fees, we're proposing an increase of 5.1%. That's generally equivalent to the cost of living increases for the past two years.

**Kohler:** I think that pretty much covers what the fee increase proposal is. We're continuing to look at our workload, better ways we can coordinate with the industry and with other bureaus in the city. And we look forward to coming back to you and sharing with you some of those initiatives, many

OCTOBER 9 2002

of them relate to some of the work improvement plan that you all will be working on over the next few months.

**Katz:** Questions?

**Saltzman:** This looks like great work, definitely looks like it makes things simpler for the development community, and I know that will be much appreciated. I guess I wanted to ask about the increase. You said there's a 5.1% increase just for the commercial projects permits?

**Kohler:** For commercial permits and site development permits, which are permits issued when there's no structure being proposed.

**Saltzman:** So it doesn't apply -- but not to the residential projects?

**Kohler:** Not for residential projects. Most residential projects will see the consolidated fees will give them about the same fees, it's a little difficult to say that's true across the board, because we're combining some fees that have been flat and some that were based on valuation. So it's difficult to guarantee that, but most residential projects will see a slight decrease or about the same.

**Saltzman:** And the 5.1% is based upon cost of living over two years?

**Kohler:** Yes.

**Klein:** The last time these -- many of these fees were developed, were increased in calendar year 2000. So they were not increased last year at all.

**Saltzman:** So they weren't included in that round of fee increases --

**Klein:** No, they were not. We were still in the process of developing this proposal during that time, so no, these were not included in that round of increases.

**Saltzman:** Okay. Thank you.

**Katz:** Okay. Thank you. Anybody else want to testify? This moves to second. Thank you. All right. Let's go on to our regular agenda, item 1222.

**Item 1222.**

**Andrew Aebi, Office of Transportation:** Good morning, mayor, commissioners, andrew, local improvement district administrator. I was contacted in march by a resident of northeast holman about getting her center strip paving street improved. We put together an initial estimate based on the traditional process that we use with l.i.d.s, which is to use the public bidding process. After we received that initial estimate, we and transportation put our heads together to figure out if there was a less expensive way we could do this, since it was such a small project. And since we didn't have any subsidy to offer the property owners. We came up with a new approach where we can use the bureau of maintenance to actually construct these improvements where the property owners will save approximately one-third of the cost of these improvements. And these -- this reduction of property -- to the property owners is achieved through cost savings and does not require any more city resources. This project has been a real morale booster for the bureau of maintenance because they get many calls throughout the course of the year from residents interested in improving their substandard streets, and with lack of funding, there's little that we can do for them. This project would also provide opportunities for our unionized work force. We have some real craftsman and craftswomen within the bureau of maintenance. Though don't like going out and patching potholes. They like to really improve a street and make it look nice. So this is the type of project that would be a real morale booster for them. This project would mark several firsts. This is the first project that i'm aware of in at least 12 years that has no subsidy from the city of Portland. This is also the first l.i.d. That i'm aware of that would improve a substandard street. All of the l.i.d.s which i'm familiar with that we've done over the past 12 years have been to improve dirt and gravel streets, but not to take a street that was partially paved with pavement down the center and actually rebuild the street to proper standards. Another first today, this is the first l.i.d. That we would form using the new l.i.d. Procedures that will be brought to council next month. What this resolution -- what this hearing offers us is the opportunity to check in with council early, get public input early and if



OCTOBER 9 2002

there's any changes that we should make, either to the assessment methodology or to the scope of the project, we have an opportunity to respond to property owners before we come back to you with the l.i.d. Formation ordinance. We have received support from a diverse group of property owners, and at this time I am not aware of any opposition to this project, and we have contacted all of the property owners on this street and held a neighborhood meeting. This project also offers the opportunity to accomplish several other things. One of the properties in this l.i.d. We may be able to install a sewer lateral at -- as extra work to the property owner to give that property owner substantial cost savings in lieu of them doing a sewer hook-up on their own. So with this resolution of intent, if we do not receive any public input today, then we would move forward with the time and manner ordinance next month. Overall, the cost reduction to the property owner is approximately one-third. Thank you.

**Katz:** Let me see if I understand. You have maintenance people who are not doing work, and this is a substitute for the work that they're doing? Or have you actually costed out what the cost would be if you contracted it out with the private sector?

**Aebi:** What we did, we did a cost estimate as if we were to bid this project out to the private sector. And by bringing this work in-house, we don't have to do quite the amount of engineering that we normally do, and we don't have to put quite as much preparation into the plans and specifications that would go out and become a public bid document than would otherwise be the case. I think more importantly than that, this project would offer considerably more cost certainty, because when we know up front from the bureau of maintenance what the cost of their materials and labor would be, that's something that we know up front, where if we bid it, we don't know until we get bids on the contract what the costs would be. In terms of what the bureau of maintenance is doing now, we only have resources to have them do minor pothole repair and things of that nature. Most of the cost embedded in this estimate is for actual materials and completely reconstructing and rebuilding the street, which is something they do not have resources --

**Katz:** The reason I ask that question is because the water bureau worked for years and years in developing a model for comparison of the cost with the private sector and the public sector, and in some cases it showed that it was cheaper to do it in the private sector as opposed to the public sector. Have you used the model similar to the one the water bureau has been using? Because there are a lot of embedded costs that we here don't consider as costs, but we put it -- we put it on a column for the private sector.

**Aebi:** Well, I think it's important to note that there's an economy of scale, and when you get a project this small, when you're only looking at improving one block, it's difficult to achieve the economy of scale that you would achieve by going to the private sector and bidding the project. I think it's important to note that we also have expense in -- this is a street we currently maintain, and our policy has been that we do not charge overhead costs when we form residential l.i.d.s. But I think it's important to note that if we didn't improve this street, we would still have responsibility for patching the street and trying to maintain, which is a real substandard street. So long-term this will offer cost savings to the maintenance bureau in terms of maintenance. I would also add that this approach is only for small-scale projects. So any large-scale projects would continue to be bid out to the private sector. And this frankly is a model to see if we can follow it in the future.

**Katz:** Well, all right. I'm not going to torture this, but I would like to see your model where you compare your internal costs with an external cost of the private sector, okay? Whether it's large or small, the model or the work for -- ought to work for both.

**Saltzman:** Questions on the same line. We do not -- you did not solicit private bids for this. Is that correct?

**Aebi:** No, we would not bid this out to the private sector.

**Saltzman:** And the cost is going to be roughly \$53,000?

OCTOBER 9 2002

**Aebi:** The initial estimate we developed -- I should make one point which is, what we're really comparing here is an estimate versus the cost at the end of the project. Typically our estimate tends to be higher than what the cost is at the completion of the project. So what you have here a little bit is the chicken and egg approach. If do you to the property owners and say we're going to bid this project out, we have to build in more contingency. And that kind of pushes property owners over the edge as far as their ability to pay. We do have detailed cost breakdowns of the initial estimate bidding out for the private sector as well as the new estimate. So we have a detail of all those cost assumptions.

**Saltzman:** And the property owners then -- they're aware of the cost, they're aware of this process being a little deviation from the norm and they are supportive of that. Is that --

**Aebi:** Yes.

**Saltzman:** Okay.

**Aebi:** I also wanted to just read something to very briefly from karla greene. She cannot be with us today. She lives at 2115 northeast holman street. She says, i'm writing to indicate my support for the northeast holman street local improvement district. I believe the project is very important to the neighborhood. The section of the street that will be improved is plagued by pools of standing water and muck in the winter. Its high center makes it dangerous when driving, and there is not adequate room for two cars to pass, particularly in poor weather. I also very much appreciate your efforts to find a way to complete this project, keeping the budget and a -- in a range that makes it possible for the neighbors to fund the improvement. A more expensive procedure would have certainly kept it out of range for us.

**Saltzman:** So I guess the only point that concerns me is, we don't know if this truly is the least cost approach. You said it's a morale builder and all that, that's well and good, but we don't know if it's the least cost approach, and you mentioned the savings being we don't have to prepare plans and specifications. I guess -- it seems like our bureau of maintenance people need plans and specifications just as much as any private contractor.

**Aebi:** Well, just to clarify, we would still prepare plans and specifications, we just don't need to go to quite the level of the detail as if we were going to go through the public bidding process. This was -- would be a pilot approach, so this is a test case. So if we were to move forward with this project, we would certainly be looking at the cost upon completion and doing a comparison to see if it does over us a cost savings. So we wanted to start with a small project and go from there.

**Saltzman:** I'm prepared to support this as -- with the understanding this is a pilot project that you will come back to us as the mayor suggested with some sort of a cost accounting methodology that really demonstrates this approach, and i'm not sure you can demonstrate that approach without asking the private sector how much would you do this for. So I guess i'm not totally comfortable with this approach, and even though you call it small scale, I don't know what small scale, large scale, where the distinction draws, but it does sound a lot like, and it is, really, basically keeping work off out of the private sector and internalizing it. And there are all sorts of embedded costs that go with that that i'm not sure we're really capturing in this discussion here. But i'm willing to support this as a pilot, but I also want to raise a note of caution about this approach too.

**Katz:** Okay. Roll call. I'm sorry, is there anybody to testify? Roll call.

**Francesconi:** Just a couple things. First i'm going to look into this in much more detail. How come we haven't done this sooner? Given the fact there's -- it saves money in terms of maintenance, it reduces the costs by a third, there's no subsidy, and we're figuring out a way to improve substandard streets, this is a very good approach. So I appreciate the bureau doing this. And i'm going to look at how we expand this concept. Regarding the issue of private versus public, I suspect that the contract language is the same in the water bureau, which is going to be a factor that we'll have to address in conversations with our unions. But i'll look at that question as well. And I

**OCTOBER 9 2002**

personally will get involved with this and we'll see what we can do, because improving substandard streets is one of the big issues in the whole city right now. Thank you very much. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye.

**Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** Let me just reiterate and make myself clear. We are interested in bidding in, bidding out. Both ways. We are interested in looking at the lesser costs, but when you do that comparison, you do need to get a bid from the outside, and you need to take a look at what your real costs internally are. And I was just suggesting to commissioner Saltzman that you look at the water model, which though may not be perfect, at least was an attempt to do that when we were looking at this whole conversation about bidding in and bidding out. And the printing and distribution folks do the same thing. So that you really are comparing apples to apples, not apples to tangerines. Aye. Thank you, everybody. Let me repeat, we will go only until 5 o'clock this afternoon. I'm also going to ask the council to indulge me in seeing if we can hold off amendments today and get folks, though they're going to be here, to hold those amendments if they can't come back tomorrow. So that we can deal with amendments that we're going to be looking at and coming back to later this month. I want to give the opportunity for as many people to talk about the north macadam plan as presented to us, so I don't know if we'll be able to manage all of that, but i'm going to be asking the audience for that and asking for your indulgence on that as well. Thank you, we'll come back at 2 o'clock. [ gavel pounded ]

At 10:32 a.m., Council recessed.

OCTOBER 9 2002

OCTOBER 9, 2002 2:00 PM

**Items 1223 and 1224.**

**Katz:** All right? There are a lot of issues yet. Sir, yes? Again, are you going to ask me a question? Are you a lawyer? Uh-huh. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** You sure can. Actually, it would help if you had it, because we do look at it, but that's fine, and we'll hand over, if there's written testimony, and amendments we haven't seen, we'll hand those over to staff. [ inaudible ]

**Katz:** Absolutely. Absolutely. We're going to be here at least through the 30th, and I would suppose probably a little longer than that. I hope not, but I think so. All right. Let's read item 1223 and 1124. North macadam plan.

**Katz:** Let me make some opening remarks, but before I do that I want everybody to understand that the information we're receiving today are recommendations from the planning commission. And that council usually listens to those and the council then sometimes asks staff and what were your original recommendations? Then we have the ability to look at what staff recommended to the commission, what the commission recommended to us, and then what the citizens are recommending to us. This is probably the most exciting period in our history as a city. We're here this afternoon to begin the hearings on the north macadam area plan. I reviewed the history of north macadam and the name north macadam appeared 25 years ago in somebody's dream, and appeared in one of the documents that the city has. For me personally nobody else here on the council was with me on 1997 when we first started the work on north macadam. We had a vision for this wonderful new place, a vision that is exciting, a vision that's a vision and an opportunity for once in a lifetime. It's truly a once-in-a-generation opportunity to have 140 acres of brown fields, most of it empty, and begin to plan for the next river front neighborhood in the city. 140 acres that will have housing, will have hotels, will have retail, will have parks, will have a wide greenway, will have transportation options for residents who live there and work there. There'll be buses, there'll be cars, there'll be a streetcar, and potentially there'll be a tram and maybe some day there'll even be a light rail. We'll have an opportunity for greenway trails for pedestrians, for bicycles, the opportunity to restore a very precious riverbank, and to deal with some of the endangered species and habitat issues that we as a city have ignored for over 100 years. It will become an innovative urban forum. Here I want to kind of throw a little exclamation mark. It's not going to be the traditional neighborhood that we are known for. We have an opportunity to do something very different here. And it may be something that a lot of the citizens in today's Portland may not understand. And so I want everybody to please keep an open mind about what kinds of possibilities are here, what kind of landscape and urban form possibilities that we have here for us today, that will be realized probably not in your lifetime or mine, or maybe some of you younger folks that are here, but realized for this community so that we can all say "we had a dream for this area and 20 years from now it's been realized" and offer something very, very special and very precious to this community. You'll hear testimony about people who want the greenway smaller, want it bigger, want to have all kinds of amenities, want it to look different. Some want it to look all the same. We'll hear a lot of testimony. And in the end we'll decide on what amendments we want to make to the central city plan. We'll decide on the amendments for title 33 and the zoning issue. And we'll make decisions about the design guidelines for north macadam. And I hope that as a council we'll be able to decide on a new name for this area, since it's much bigger area than north macadam. That may end up to be the most controversial issue. I don't know. So we'll begin

OCTOBER 9 2002

the testimony today. I'm going to ask gil and marie, who has worked hard on this project. We'll hear a brief report on this plan, and then we'll open it up for testimony. Come on up. After planning gives their recommendations, we'll ask a representative from -- is a representative from the Portland development commission here? They have a commission meeting, so I have -- I been a little bit more flexible than I usually am on issues like this, and they will come and testify and then leave. All right, gil, why don't you go ahead.

**Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning:** Thank you, madame mayor. Gil kelley, planning director. With me are marie johnson and mark raquette from the planning bureau. We're going to sort of divide this up a little bit. Marie is going to handle the actual planning commission recommendation. I would preface that by saying, I don't think there are substantive differences between the planning commission recommendations and -- they've added and recommended to our recommendations. You will hear about one issue in the testimony where there was an addition by the planning commission having to do with affordable housing thresholds for triggering bonuses that has central citywide implications.

**Katz:** Just a minute, just a minute. Just a minute. Karla, did you raise it? Talk right into the mic.

\*\*\*\*\*: Is that better?

**Katz:** Right. Well, that's about as loud as we can get. We do have hearing apparatus. I don't want to insult anybody, but sometimes even we need them here. So karla will try to raise the volume as high as technology will permit. And then, gil, you will have to breathe into the mic.

**Kelley:** I will talk as loudly as I can.

**Katz:** Okay.

\*\*\*\*\*: Is that better?

**Katz:** Is voice is usually very low, so we'll just have to remind him. I will begin by making some sort of framing remarks and really sort of talk to you about the possibilities and opportunities for this district. Marie is then going to specifically talk about the highlights of the planning commission recommendation. I first of all want to start by giving particular thanks to abe farkas and charles jordan, dean marriott, to brant williams, before him vic rhodes, who have been great partners. I'm here giving the presentation today, but it's really been the result of a team effort. And marie johnson, the planning bureau manager, has in turn been a leader for an interdepartmental group that is also represented here today, and they also deserve a huge round of thanks for all the work that has been done here. What we are presenting is not solely from the planning bureau, but really the work of an interbureau, interagency team. And I think that needs to be recognized and lauded by council. Nevertheless, I was asked by the mayor early on to lead an effort here to re-examine plans for the district. The aspirations she had in '97 for the district were not materializing in her view, clearly in early 2001 she asked me to take a look at this. And i'm reminded --

**Katz:** Take a look at it again.

**Kelley:** Yes, take a look at it again. So I was given that task. I'm happy today to bring back what I think is a very solid proposal, a very different and to generation proposal than what the council had seen previously. And one which I feel really has legs and can transform this part of the city radically and in a few short years. I'm reminded also on a personal note that in a conversation with michael powell in about the same period of time, he said "i hear the mayor's giving you the north macadam assignment. Good luck. It's going to appear on your tombstone one way or another. Either you sold it or you went down with it, one of the two." so i'm hoping frankly it doesn't appear on my tombstone at all, but with those two messages, I chose to get personally involved in this project. And what i'd like to do to begin with is depart from normal protocol and show you a few

OCTOBER 9 2002

images myself. These are normally staff presentations, but i'd like to walk you through a few of the ideas that have guided the work of the interbureau team over the last two years. These images are also on the screen above for the audience to look at and are being transmitted to the public as well.

This is the north macadam district as it sits today, looking from the ross island bridge south. You can see it's mostly vacant, not entirely, but mostly vacant, previously industrial land. The condition of the land going northward from here to the marquam bridge is similar. I think it's -- as a touchstone it's helpful to look back at the history of the site, because if cities are anything, they are -- they are about change and about manipulation of the landscape for human needs. This is an early view, in 1867, looking east from the hills -- sort of gulch where the freeway now sits, the i-405 sits.

The north macadam district is really that area of water between that land and that narrow spit of land that sticks out into the river. Here's another view looking a bit later on, toward north macadam, still mostly floodplain and water, ross island in the background. The area near ross island was popular, even in the '20s, for recreation. The area was subsequently filled and used for industry, primarily for ship building and maintenance in the war period, second world war. We're missing an image to show you that, but ship dismantling and salvage operations continued through -- through the '60s, even as the freeway was built and as the land was filled. Again, more images of that work on the zidell site. And in present times, since that active operation, the district has largely been used for light industrial work, construction staging, at one point for manufacture and distribution of manufactured homes. And the remains, the zidell barge operation there as the lone surviving industry. There are some warehouses and small scale industrial, to the west end of the district, but this is the remaining major industrial use on the site. There have been for a number of years various attempts to plan a different future for the district, given its proximity to the downtown. In fact, in the late '60s there was a plan for the south waterfront district -- this shows the district extending north of the marquam bridge where riverplace is now and then going south into what we think of as the north macadam district. I do believe the south waterfront name is a good name for this entire low-lying plain along the river's edge, being south of downtown. The imagery at that time was for fairly low-rise commercial, corporate, kinds of uses there, with marinas and so forth. Nothing particular came of that plan, but then in 1988 when the downtown plan evolved into a central city plan, with a larger geography, there was at least a sort of rough land use designation applied here, which called for the urbanization of the industrial area. And in 1996 there were proposals here for creating a more urban district. Again, low scale, sort of village concept, but mixed use. And in 1999, after a few years of work at the development commission, a framework plan was presented to council which again called for mixed use district. Now this is one image from that plan at the time. And even though this was sort of the working idea at the time I entered 2 1/2 years ago, this plan was not precisely being followed. Still being debated as to how it would involve. In fact, one departure being talked about at the north end, which was for -- a headquarter retail, flagship retail store, with surface parking. There was a notion about a gated residential community at the south end. There was the avalon hotel controversy going on, encroaching into aspired greenway. So there was a lot of work yet to be done to sort of figure out what this kind of concept really meant. And so the land has continued to sit well. We have taken a step back and done some thinking. For my own part, I did listen to the conversation going on at that time, and then took a walk out on the ross island bridge on a drizzly sunday and a number of things occurred to me that I think have occurred to others and have guided some of our work. If you could move back, mark, to the slide here. The first thing that occurred to me is that the rancor over we could have it both a greenway and robust urban development seems to be nonsense, that we could have both, and that the greenway could serve both the natural purposes and the human

OCTOBER 9 2002

recreation and circulation purposes, that those didn't -- that didn't need to be a fight that should occur. The second thing that occurred to me is that there was no apparent economic engine for this, but proximity of the university's, Oregon health sciences and p.s.u. Were probably the strongest indicator, that we clearly needed a more urban forum expressed here, and finally it represented a great opportunity for a new kind of development, building green responsive to the environment. And I think those themes have not been just mine, but they've been held by the group. And a lot of that work has -- or those thoughts have infused our work in the interim. And using those guideposts, we have produced a different kind of plan. I would say, too, that it is kind of -- north macadam or south waterfront is really a microcosm of opportunities and challenges that Portland has a whole is facing now as we move forward. And we are doing some work this fall and next spring in the planning bureau to really do some information-gathering and identify some key - - key opportunities for Portland as we move forward and this is a tentative list that we'll be working with planning commission and council to flesh out, but there are relatively short numbers, 7 to 10 ideas, probably formative for the next generation of what Portland will be. I show you this list, just because there's another framework to get into from one that we normally are, when we do small area plans. This is one where we can step back and say "how does this match up to an eventual future for all of Portland?" and in the south waterfront area, I really wanted to highlight four of these. So coming from different directions, both from the visit on the ground in north macadam and from a sort of higher level scan, again, these are really important things. Reconnecting to the river. Becoming -- having Portland become a center for innovation. Building a true central city. And pioneering green building methods are really key foundations of the planning work that's gone on here. I want to just talk about how those four themes apply in north macadam. Obviously it sits right on the river and just south of downtown. It's the largest vacant industrial -- or land -- piece of land in the central city and it is proximate to the river. Giving an opportunity to really have not only a premier address, but an ability to really celebrate the proximity to the waterfront. Here, this slide gives you an idea, we had started that greening of the waterfront as early as the early '70s when we removed harbor drive. Since then we've continued that work on the -- on the east bank. The opportunity to continue that in north macadam, being directly adjacent, is a huge opportunity for the city. Here's the east bank esplanade. It's very heavily used, widely used. We're finding just from that recent experience that we really need more -- more width and more land to accommodate natural functions, recreation functions and circulation function. So we need to go wider. We've looked in the north macadam district, section by section, at how that might work. This is showing an average undulating line of 150-foot setback to the building line, which is the beginning of the white development parcels to the left of the screen there. And conceptualized different ways we could knock the bank down, and not create flood retention and habitat values in that first 45 feet or so. Then to create circulation for pedestrians and circulation for bicycles and other wheeled traffic as well. And really create an appropriate setback for fairly dense development just to the left of this diagram. One of the things that we've done, too, is to visit on a couple of occasion now the city of vancouver, b.c., where we looked at some different -- they're the ones who are probably most active right now in developing and redeveloping an urban waterfront. And there are many lessons to draw from there. This is one example of how they've separated the circulation. This is about a 40-foot cross-section for just the circulation piece. They're already finding that they need to widen the left-hand side of this for the vehicular traffic. So as compared to our east bank esplanade this is -- will approach about twice the distance just -- or width just for the circulation function alone. Other places -- here's a recent redevelopment of west side drive in new york along the river, the hudson. This is a point where fairly urban form pokes out, where you have green

OCTOBER 9 2002

interspersed, but then also urban plazas coming to the water's edge, opportunities we also want to find along the north macadam shoreline. The next thing I wanted to describe here was this notion about building Portland as a center for innovation. In that regard, I think that the best place to start is with a major university presence. We're fortunate to have both p.s.u. And o.h.s.u. Present at the south end of downtown, near this district. As you all know from the marquam hill plan we've just granted permission for a long-term build-out for o.h.s.u. On marquam hill. We also recognized during that process that not all of the aspired development could occur there and would need to occur at the base of the hill somewhere. This is a chart representing their rather dramatic growth in research funding from the n.i.h.. Research is really at the heart of this innovation idea, and it's growing rapidly at o.h.s.u. Similarly, their own employment, just within o.h.s.u. -- and again we look at them as a catalyst for new growth -- has grown dramatically since the mid-70s. They've been building on the hill. This is a research facility there, the volum institute on the hill. The quality of building now that has been arrived at and will continue on the hill, but the research functions can't be contained alone on the hill and need to find a place down below. So we have taken a broader look. You've seen this before, that really marquam hill shouldn't sit in isolation, even though it's at the hilltop, but needs to be thought about in the larger context of a science and technology quarter, including the p.s.u. Area, downtown area, as well as the north macadam or south waterfront district shown in orange. It's also important to think about including the two institutions across the river on the east bank, as well, and potentially other lands there in the future as we continue our conversations with the central east side. Here are -- from the aerial view, the -- the proximity is obvious, the connection is important. The land is available to really create a starting point for central -- for an extended campus for o.h.s.u. As you all know, they're extremely interested in doing that and are working with a development group now in the area, in the center of this photograph at the bottom. We all know about this issue that we've been through in the marquam hill plan. It has been -- I should say I was initially quite skeptical about the need for the tram personally, but became convinced through the process that this really was the best way and perhaps the only reliable way to connect people efficiently between uses at the bottom of the hill and north macadam and research and clinical facilities on the top of the hill. This is actually the roosevelt island tramway in new york city that crosses the river. A tram of a similar scale. And this is a site plan, initial site plan, for the center of the district being proposed by the o.h.s.u. And its private development partners that would include not only institutional facilities there, but housing and retail and hotel as well. Again, looking at a very urban expression of what that might be, you might combine a mix of uses on any given site. In any case, we'd like to see taller buildings, but narrow and oriented -- this tower would be set back in the district. Not on the greenway per se. But would set back and you can see that it's broad face -- its broad face is oriented away from the view direction, so that you look through it from corbett-terwilliger/lair hill neighborhood, looking past the tower in its sort of minimal dimension. Its broad dimension would be oriented the other way so you could look through the district here. And we don't see the district as being a sterile campus, either. It's a broad mix of uses, but there nevertheless would probably be some concentrations of uses. This is a portion -- a part of the plan's foundation as well, to really allow for a flexible office research development north of the ross island bridge with larger parcels and street blocks than usual. Residential concentration and smaller parcels at the south end and a transition area going downscale toward johns landing. Again, with office in the back, a retail core where the tram would land at gibbs street. The next thing we wanted to talk about is the physical form. Building a central city really does mean having an intense mix of uses connected by a transit and by pedestrianways adjacent to the downtown. This is an opportunity, just like the pearl district



OCTOBER 9 2002

has been to develop what we think of as the urban core of Portland. We drew some lessons from vancouver. What's interesting to note about vancouver, and we're different in some ways, but they're honestly -- there are more similarities than differences. Vancouver, if you go back, mark, for just a moment -- is almost exactly the same size in terms of population as Portland, both within the city proper and within the region. They have a slightly bigger city proper population and the regional population is slightly smaller. They've taken the geographic constraints there and made deliberate efforts to have a compact core. And so we went there to look at how they did that, given that they're roughly the same size. Don't have a strong industry dominating it. We wanted to learn what they have done. The area probably most analogous to the south waterfront in Portland is this falls creek area under construction now. A number of the buildings have been built, buy-couple of lessons here. The popular myth that this was city or state-owned land and developed in that way is not true. Actually the province did sell it to private entities, and in trade for upzoning the developers agreed to set aside about 50% of the area for open space and because they were well capitalized were able to build the infrastructure first and then the -- the towers second. They found that the amenities there were very important marketing idea for the -- for the development themselves. This is going gangbusters now. It's mostly residential. There is some -- some office here. They've also again used slender, tall towers, and a base of condominiums as their primary -- these are slightly taller than the buildings that you'd find under the zoning proposal in north macadam, but the basic idea is the same. They've used -- they have a street grid that this ties into, but they've used a smaller scale of street as you approach the shoreline and tried to get both retail and residential activity right there on the street. Again, they've been using a ambitious, but now extremely well-used pedestrian circulation system along the shoreline. And they have brought, much like our proposal at the north end of the district, analogous street to river parkway north of the ross island bridge, is this -- I believe it's beech street. On the vancouver peninsula, this is almost exactly the dimension of the river parkway proposal and the adjoining greenspace that we have in the north macadam plan. About 150-foot setback from the equivalent of their top of bank to the sidewalk there. The sidewalk and street width together are about 50 feet, so again, a small narrow street much like river parkway is proposed to be and then buildings right adjoining it. And again an idea of how the interior, where river parkway swings back into the center of the district, could be a very lively neighborhood street as well in the north macadam district. It's important to note that we've concentrated retail in a few areas. We haven't absolutely restricted it elsewhere, but we'd want to call for it to be focused on arthur, or gibbs, or close to gibbs, and at lowell street in the south. Streets like this would come off the major street, river parkway, and lead you down to the water, but would be open with cafes and shops and so forth, giving some real life and richness to the district as well. A heavyduty pedestrian orientation, narrower streets at this point, bleeding into the greenway. And an, too, for watercraft eventually. This might be supportable if there's another river front development in Portland to get some form of water taxi along the willamette river, perhaps all the way from st. Johns to lake oswego. Again, more watercraft using the central city waterfront. There should be opportunities for interior plazas and parks. We've noted some of those in the plan. Most of those are aspirational. They're not part of the zoning or street map. They will need to be negotiated through the development agreements in the district. Here's a case where, again from vancouver, where major park space was created just off the greenway. The depth here is about 600 feet from the top of the shore. The average depth of this greenway is about 225 feet or so. But here you have large who consider themselves having a river front address, even though they're setback and separated by a small street from the actual shoreline. Also opportunities to recognize some of the historic features that actually are in the district in the form of -- in the case of

OCTOBER 9 2002

north macadam, industrial history could become focal points for gathering places and so forth. And finally we wanted to talk to you about this important theme of pioneering green building methods. This has been a strong interest of the whole council, and i'm happy that our partners in b.e.s. And office of sustainable development have helped us with the planning here. We have a lot more to learn and do, but north macadam district seems like a prime opportunity to advance these goals, and there's a lot of thinking already embedded in both the street design and the greenway design about how that might happen. We hope to carry that to the next evolution in terms of the actual buildings designs as well. And I should mention that the development commission has committed itself to following the lead standard for projects that it invests in. We'd like to see that used throughout the district. This shows you the green -- the already -- that already exists in the hills and neighborhoods and needs to continue down through this district to the shoreline. That could partially be accomplished by having this set of green streets at arthur, at the ross island bridge park and at gaines. So for example those might look like this. This again is an image from vancouver. There's a similar one in the pearl district. They would also -- they could also end here at the shoreline trail, so that this really becomes an important part of the urban framework down there. And innovative storm water retention. This is actually on the top of a building in germany. This is on of a parking garage and retains storm water there in a very artistic fashion, we think. There's that opportunity as well in north macadam. As well as the things that are now more traditionally thought of as eco -- ways of building eco roofs and rooftop terraces with green elements and functions in them. This is one actually from the pearl district, from the ecotrust building. And that gives you actually a little sense of what views might be look from rooftops in north macadam as well. And finally, again, the idea of riverside habitat, enhancement, much of the shoreline in north macadam looks like it's a steep, kind of rocky bank. There's a little bit of green there. We think we can do a public/private partnership to really advance the state of habitat reclamation along the shoreline here. Getting back some of the natural occurring foliage and plant materials, as well as doing more aggressive methods of laying back the bank and doing both bank stabilization work and habitat restoration in the same -- the same breath. This would also include the possibility for inwater work as well, which one of the property owners has been pursuing there, which would complement this kind of work on the bank. So i'm going to leave you with those thoughts and ask marie now to walk you through the highlights of the planning commission's technical work and proposal.

**Francesconi:** Before you do that, if I can make one comment. It was great how you listed the goals of the city and you personally. Maybe, too, and we don't need to respond right now if you don't want to, but two additional ones that north macadam could really help realize that I think are important to our city is, one, is to continue the multi-modal transportation options.

**Kelley:** Yeah.

**Francesconi:** I mean, that's one of our goals and that's typified here.

**Kelley:** Absolutely.

**Francesconi:** The second one, which we're not doing so well on, is just housing in the central city, just more housing, period, in the central city.

**Kelley:** Yeah.

**Francesconi:** And I think this can do that as well.

**Kelley:** You're absolutely right. Those two were sort of embedded in the short version of building a true central city, but those are two of the options. So I would agree with that.

OCTOBER 9 2002

**Katz:** Let's put up the lights and let's start with the presentation of the plan. And then we'll have p.d.c. And marie, did you think of anybody else that needed to come before we open it up to public testimony?

\*\*\*\*\*: I'm sorry?

**Katz:** After p.d.c., was there anybody else you wanted to come up?

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

**Katz:** Okay, go ahead.

**Marie Johnson, Planning Bureau:** My name is marie johnson. I work for the Portland planning bureau. First a procedural issue. I just want to call your attention to the legal record, which is in the room. So I am going to just briefly highlight some of the key elements of the plan that gil hasn't covered, just things like what documents we're looking at, what the process was to develop them, and some of the key elements of the code, but i'll do that very quickly. I think we'll dispense with the power point and just in the -- we don't need to use power point. We can skip it because that will save us a little bit of time. First of all, I want to let you know that this work is the result of an effort from a lot of people, as gil has mentioned. In addition to the planning commission recommendation for the north macadam plan and the planning commission recommendation for the north macadam, zoning code elements, the design commission worked on the design guideline document and really looked at how they could integrate urban and natural elements to reinforce the elements of those other two documents. The policy 21, which is the guiding policy in the central city for north macadam, calls for creating a vibrant urban neighborhood connected with and enriched by a clean and healthy river. That is our ultimate goal in this process. I want to let you know that as part of the interbureau team working on this we achieved consensus on many of the issues you'll be hearing about. As you can imagine, there are many challenges in dealing with a district that has numerous infrastructure constraints and a lot of opportunity. Everyone is very -- the stakes are high for all of us, and so I think it really speaks well of the different bureaus that were involved that we were able to come to agreement on so many different issues. The development of the recommendations in front of you is part of a public process that began formally last winter. It had been working informally for a while before then, but in november and december of last year this team we call the core group went forward to a number of stakeholder groups and had briefings, which actually were really more dialogues and conversations with folks that represented property owner and business interests, design interests in terms of the local chapters of the american institute of architects, and american society of landscape architects, met with neighborhood association groups on transportation and greenway issues, and we met with different community groups such as coalition for a livable future, league of women voters. Last february we held two open houses where we received comments on the preliminary concepts that had been developed. In april, based on the comments we'd received and more work with the interbureau teams we developed a set of proposals, a proposed plan, proposed zoning code and proposed design guidelines that were then forwarded for public review and comment before the planning commission and the design commission. We had hearings in late spring, in the summer, before both of these commissions they reviewed the comments that were given and made revisions and the recommendations that they developed are those that you will be hearing testimony on today. Gill's highlighted for you five different elements of the plan in terms of implementation in terms of district development. Those elements all weave together to reinforce each other. So we talk about them as separate elements, they're not completely discrete. They really are integrated. We're really looking at using each system as efficiently as possible. We're doing that through a set of tools, including the zoning code and design guidelines, but also the development agreement process, the

OCTOBER 9 2002

process of developing funding strategies that can prioritize and phase the infrastructure improvements that are needed as well. The goal for the district in terms of jobs and housing is 3,000 housing units at least. 3,000 housing units. And 10,000 jobs. Excuse me, I had to catch up with myself for a second. I want to just reinforce that the park and greenway system that is called for in the plan, it's meant to serve employees, residents and visitors to the district, and reinforce the relationship to the river. And also, because this is -- we're looking at this as an urban neighborhood, it's important that we have opportunities for people to have rest and relaxation and a respite from the urban environment. Our aspiration is for 150-foot greenway to be provided through a public/private partnership. In addition, we have zoning code elements that set a minimum requirement for 100-foot greenway setback that can be averaged to as narrow as 75 feet. We've discussed many of the elements that we want to include in that. In terms of transportation, we are looking at an aggressive mode split. 30% mode split for the district. As you know, the district has significant constraints in terms of access into and out of the district. There are only a few access points and achieving a high mode split is going to be very important for the health of the district to function efficiently, for allowing transit in and out of the district and sufficient. The streetcar will be an important element of the transportation system, extending from the central city, all the way from northwest Portland into north macadam, and with the potential connection on to lake oswego. The greenway trail, which is in the past thought of as a recreational facility we see as an important connection of a existing trail system that can provide commuter functions as well. I'm sorry. I'm trying to skip ahead. I think that's the majority of what I wanted to cover with you today. As the mayor mentioned, there's a hearing today, another continuation of the hearing tomorrow, and then council will be considering a hearing -- they'll be holding a hearing on amendment requests on october 30th. Once the council's completed their deliberations in november, the plan would go into effect in january. And as that -- as council completes its deliberations, we're already looking forward to additional work that will be done to implement the vision of the plan. This includes a greenway design coordination process, where it's a cooperative effort various city bureaus and involve property owners as well, looking how we can envision a cohesive and exciting greenway system that provides both areas for people to enjoy themselves along the river and places to enhance habitat. In addition, work will be done on updating the street plan for north macadam to make it consistent with the proposal that you're -- you will be hearing and deciding on over the next few weeks.

**Kelley:** One final thought about implementation. I think it has to begin with a vision that is bold. And to do that you're asking people to believe and to stretch. This vision is -- is both more green, more urban, and more active than past proposals. And I think that's necessary to actually make this district work and to be able to finance all of it, is not only a challenge, but requires this level of boldness. This can't be done with small thinking. The infrastructure costs alone just to serve any development down there, realistically, are large. We're act actively working with p.d.c. And with the other infrastructure bureaus now, and with o.m.f. To devise a plan for that. That work will need to continue over the next months and years. What is important for you to do now is to set a clear framework and expectations for the parties involved and the plan, the street plan, and the beginning of the greenway after-planning concept, which the mayor has initiated, are really keys in that effort. And we need certainty going into that. So we're asking council, when you complete your deliberations next month, to really give us very clear guidance with regard to the elements that are in front of you now so that we can all move forward and not spend the next two years reinventing what the plan is. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right, karla. P.d.c.?

OCTOBER 9 2002

**Francesconi:** Can I ask one process question. It's the last thing you said. We all want a visionary plan, but also want it to happen. Therefore when will the financing discussion happen about how we're going to finance this?

**Kelley:** I think you'll hear a little bit from baruti today. I know they're doing additional studies, market studies and so forth. Realistically that work is going to continue on over the next several months. This plan allows, I think, a very robust capacity, and so the ability to fill the bucket with private dollars is allowed by the plan. What's really the -- the crunch is how we phase and finance that first bit of public infrastructure, which is fairly substantial, because to serve the middle of the district you've got to extend the streetcar, the streets, potentially the tram, to that area. So a lot of the big ticket items come early. We're not suggesting that the greenway improvements come early president those would probably want to continue to hunt for outside funds for and so forth, but there are some critical transportation infrastructure costs, and frankly I think we all recognize we're going to need help from federal partners as well as the private development side of the equation to make that work, but we've got to set ourselves a clear challenge to do that. Thanks.

**Katz:** All righty.

**Baruti Artharee, Deputy Director, Portland Development Commission:** Good afternoon, mayor, members of the city council. For the record, my name is baruti, the deputy director at the Portland development commission. I'm here today in the absence of our executive director, who is out of the city, and I do appreciate this opportunity to comment on p.d.c.'s position related to the north macadam plan, the proposed plan at this time. And thank you for taking me first, because we have a commission meeting that's going to start in just a few minutes. So we really do appreciate that. Number one, the p.d.c. Commission is going to hold a work session on october 30th, the morning of october 30th. And it will be at that work session that they will formulate the final comments and prospectives on the proposed north macadam plan. We will be prepared to present to you at your work session on the afternoon of october 30th more specific comments about the overall feasibility of the plan, from a public and private development perspective. This plan has been evolving and we at p.d.c. Are very anxious to be involved in the implementation of this new, exciting central city neighborhood. We certainly recognize, as you mentioned, commissioner, that a key component will be the long-term funding strategy. We also believe that a high priority in launching this particular district will be the central district project by o.h.s.u. And river campus investors. We think that both -- that that project is fundamental to the future of north macadam. So we are very anxious to move forward, to work with you from an implementation standpoint, and we're looking forward to building a very exciting, vibrant mixed-use neighborhood anchored by o.h.s.u. And complemented with an abundance of greenspace. And that's my testimony. And with me today is one of our senior project managers, larry brown.

**Larry Brown, Project Manager, Portland Development Commission:** Thank you. I am larry brown. I'm project manager with the development commission. I have one proposed amendment for your consideration in this process, and it's for the riverplace project area, not part of the north macadam planning district, but it is part of the north macadam urban renewal area. It represents the gateway to this important new development. District. One of the first -- one of the principals of that was established -- principles of that was established in the work of the planning bureau over the last many months in terms of urban design was the trading of height for a more livable and pedestrian-oriented ground-level throughout the district. And what you found in your review certainly is that there's a stairstepping of heights throughout the north macadam area from a maximum of 250 to 125 to 75 adjacent to the greenway. In the riverplace project area, which was where the heights and the zoning was established many years ago, and in many cases does not line

**OCTOBER 9 2002**

up with the property lines as we know them today, the heights are considerably lower. And as the gateway to north macadam we are proposing that we establish higher heights in some areas and lower heights in other areas within the riverplace project area, basically carrying out and continuing the theme, the urban development theme for north macadam proposed regulations. We have three parcels that the commission currently is holding for future development that would be subject to this height change. The one at the bottom of the screen is the so-called substation parcel, immediately adjacent to the pp&l substation and to the marquam bridge. Current heights are 150 in that location. We're proposing to bring that 50 feet higher to 200. Immediately north of that is another development parcel, also 150 currently. We would propose to bring to 200. And the parcel to the north is referred to frequently as the steam plant parcel. This is the former location of the pp&l steam plant that was cleared from that site and the commission's worked for many years with d.e.q. To prepare that site for future development. And your next screen here, we have an inset of the steam plant parcel itself, which is worth examining further, because the blinds here for - - lines here for the height change are more complex. Currently we have -- we're working with a mixed-use proposal for this property that would include 170 residential units and a tower and a lower hotel adjacent to the greenway. Currently you can see the heights through this area, established some time ago bisect both properties. Immediately to the east and 75 feet from the top of the riverbank is a line of 35 feet, which's will remain unchanged. The next screen, you take a look at the condominium site, which is the western half of the steam plant parcel. That site is currently 125 and 150 feet. Under the current zoning height limitations, we're proposing that that part of the parcel, where the residential tower would go, would be increased to 200. And the next screen, looking at the hotel site, which currently has heights of 125 and 150 feet, we are proposing that those heights be lowered to 75 feet, with no change in the location of the 35-foot height limit adjacent to the greenway. The reason for proposing this type of height adjustment at this time is driven by a number of design considerations that have evolved in working with the private sector and looking at how we can handle parking on the site, which has severe limitations because of the former uses there. And our ability to work more flexibly with providing a more attractive open space and pedestrian area as part of this overall site development. As you can see here in this illustration, having a single tower allows us to develop and extend the open space that was recently created with the construction of the south waterfront park, and brings that pedestrian-oriented area further into the site providing a significantly greater public benefit than earlier designs that showed most of that site covered with buildings of a shorter height. Like the north macadam urban design guidelines, this is a proposal and a design direction which allows the existing f.a.r. And density to be put in a higher tower, freeing up the ground levels for more open space and pedestrian-oriented use, instead spreading that same density out over a larger footprint. Working our design advisers and design team this looks like a very attractive direction to take. This part of the north macadam area and is consistent with the design direction that we're moving in to the area immediately south of the marquam bridge. And the next screen, there's an illustration of the type of building that's possible with greater heights and being able to put the same amount of density and residential units in this case in a taller tower instead of spreading it out in shorter -- shorter, more massive buildings. This more design flexibility, but also provides, in this particular instance, the ability to move all the parking underground, not formerly possible. The last screen is the result of our request to -- our architecture team to show us from a perspective in the south auditorium district, what these heights would look like in the context of the rest of the riverplace development and the waterfront and the views to the east. As you can see, as you get further back from the sites, buildings do diminish in size and their impacts are much reduced. One of the things we're not able to show in this kind of

OCTOBER 9 2002

an illustration is the thinner buildings that are possible. These are basically squares that represent a mass and not an actual design, but they do, from our perspective, show in context what these buildings would look like from a distance, closer to the downtown core.

**Saltzman:** You're showing four buildings?

**Brown:** I'm sorry?

**Saltzman:** I thought you were talking about two.

**Brown:** We're showing four buildings here. There are three sites. One of the sites is actually two acres and would probably have two buildings on it instead of a single building. The site adjacent to the pp&l substation, actually a fairly large site, that's going to be a residential development with a grocery store in the ground floor. In the course of our investigation of the zoning and the heights in this area, one other thing that we uncovered, which we think may be important to some people looking at the impact of these buildings from this location, this distance, and that is if you can locate -- there's a faint yellow line that goes roughly across the tops of those buildings. That represents a line -- a height of 125 feet at naito parkway. The current height limit at naito parkway is 150 feet without any proposed changes. That means that there could be buildings built on naito parkway between the riverplace project area and the rest of the downtown at a 150 feet. But 125 feet, most of this area would be obscured under the current zoning provisions of the area. So we attempted here, as best we could, to depict the context for this height from this area. We know this is important to many people that will be choosing to testify later in this process. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. This is an example where an amendment has been placed, and we would hope - - hope to hold the testimony on these amendments for a future time. Okay, thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*: Thank you, mayor.

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

**Katz:** All right. Let's open it up to public testimony.

**Katz:** I want to remind those of you, we will be adjourning close to 5:00. It is now 3:00. If you are at the bottom of the list, I certainly invite you to stay and listen to the testimony. This is an important project for the city, but you may not be able to get to testify until tomorrow. Rick, why don't you go ahead.

**Rick Saito, North Macadam Development Council:** Thank you, madame mayor. My name is rick saito and I represent the north macadam development council. Can you all hear me? The proposed plan creates a vision of the district and a role for the district, but in the context of the entire city. We assume that it is responsive and supportive of the needs of o.h.s.u. As well. We are very supportive of o.h.s.u. In north macadam, as you well know. Our comments should not be construed to inhibit that project. Rather our comments are meant to create a balanced vision that can be attained for the entire district, not just the center portion. For the balance of the district, the plan does little to show how the vision can be realized and does not establish the region's role in this realization due to an absence of a financial analysis -- and you've already talked about this -- there's little information as to costs or a plan as to how these costs are going to be met. Utilizing the economics in the proposed needs of the central district plan for the entire strategy of developing a plan for the entire -- or for a strategy for the entire district is a flawed approach and there's a certain amount of evidence, evidence that that's how the plan has been derived, and that we have specific issues with this. I'm going to give them to you in bullet form, but in a written piece that i'm going to submit there's a little bit more expansion for the sake of time. Number one, assuming all the areas of the district can develop to the densities of o.h.s.u. Is incorrect. Assuming that all areas will be able to develop the same type of market as the central district is also incorrect. The transitional role that's designated for the southern portion of the district, from a land use standpoint,

OCTOBER 9 2002

cannot be accomplished by duplicating the assumption of density and level of development as in the central district. The greenway requirements are not consistent with the scale of all properties, and their realistic development. Should the region require a greater overall greenway -- and it certainly may do that, as we've studied it for a long time -- a strategy and a commitment for the region to supply the funds necessary to implement this should also be put in place and part of this plan. The concept of bonusing, increased height and therefore density, to reflect the loss of land and the creation of the greenway, also does not work in son of the areas of the district overall. The reduction of bonus options to the few that are mentioned in the -- in the proposal is a disincentive to creating the overall vision of the district. We need something closer to what the central city now has. The absence of a financial analysis raises issues of cost and affordability. Costs of infrastructure, such as the streetcar, the tram, and the greenway, must be regarded as part of the plan now, not later on. How much will they cost to build? Who will pay for it? Who will provide for the operation and the maintenance of these items? How much will that cost? How will private property owners know the limitation of their commitment financially? And what is the public's commitment to these issues?

**Katz:** Thank you. Your time is up. Why don't you submit those. Those are very good questions. We're not ignoring them.

**Saito:** Good. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Phil Grillo, North Macadam Development Council:** Thank you. Mayor and council members, i'm phil grillo in here. I'm here on behalf --

**Katz:** Speak closer.

**Grillo:** Okay. Get a little closer. I'm speaking on behalf of the north macadam development council as well, and i'm here to offer you my revision to the zoning code for north macadam. This revision really uses a framework that's already in place for the central city master plan's provision already in your zoning code at 33510255. My remarks are in a letter that are being distributed to you now, as well as attached to that is a -- are some revisions to the central city master plan provision. Actually they're not revisions to the central city master plan section. They're a new section that's modeled after that provision. As I was saying, in order to create a framework for flexibility in north macadam, we've borrowed text from the central city master plan section in your code to create a master plan code section that applies specifically to north macadam. This new code section could be referred to as the north macadam master plan section. And as I said, our text is attached. There are only really two substantive changes to the central city plan that would be encompassed in the north macadam regulations. First our proposed north macadam master plan regulations build on the concept of using development agreements as a flexibility tool. You've already heard testimony with regard to that. And as I think you know this concept is specifically called out in the recommended north macadam plan in at least two places. And i'm not going to read those provisions that are in my letter, but they're there referenced for you. In order to effectively utilize development agreements under the statue -- and i'm referring to ors 94.518, the city's regulations have to allow for increased flexibility. Development agreements in and of themselves don't allow for that flexibility. You have to get that flexibility in the code. Part of my job here was to look at the existing code and to see what kind of flexibility existed. We looked at a number of different areas, including the central city master plan situation, planned developments, conditional use master plans, adjustments, those kinds of things, and felt that the central city master plan section was the best text to borrow from. So as you'll see in the text that we've provided, we've referred in subsection 6 -- that's on page 3 of the attached material -- references to the



OCTOBER 9 2002

development agreement provision, and then we've allowed in section b on page 1 of our attachment, to allow for increased kinds of flexibility, so that you can use development agreements in context with the north macadam master plan section to in essence put development agreements that really work within the context of each proposal.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Okay? Thank you.

**Katz:** I just want everybody to note that I am keeping, as well as staff, is keeping all of these recommendations and we'll come back to them at the appropriate time. Thank you.

**Beverly Bookin, Prometheus Real Estate Group:** Good afternoon. Can everyone hear me? I'm Beverly Bookin, here this afternoon on behalf of a real estate group, which since 1996 has owned the a nine-acre parcel on the river on north macadam, south of what is now the north macadam investors o.h.s.u. Development site and north of the old spaghetti factory. This real estate group is a privately-held real estate and management company out of California that currently manages or has developed or manages over 10,000 units of rental housing and over a million square feet of office and commercial development. We're here today to be on record in support of the o.h.s.u. Development project. We think it will kick-start development in north macadam that will be beneficial to the community and all of the stakeholders involved, however as Rick indicated many of the development standards and design guidelines have been tailored in these regulations before you have been tailored specifically to the central property owners proposal and we don't believe that this development is likely to be replicated on other sites in terms of development product, market realities and/or site configuration. For example, the project is going to be doing high-end condominiums, which supports concrete development and allows highrise buildings with residential densities, as much as 100-plus units per net acre. We're on the -- we're on the rental side, which is an important part of the continuum of housing types. Because of the realities of the market we could only do wood frame construction, limited by the uniform building code to five stories, including all above-grade parking. This means we're going to achieve densities that are more in the realm of 60 to 70 units. Actually on the lower end, because we have to put all of our parking above grade because of the high water table near the river. That's just one example of the differences. This is the reason why we're so supportive of his proposal on behalf of the north macadam development council, to provide us a quasi judicial vehicle for flexibility that combines a variant of the central city master plan and the development agreements allowed for by statute statute. We also have two issues of concern that I want to highlight. One is 100-foot greenway is not a district amenity. It is a regional amenity that will serve the community's values for recreation, transportation and environmental protection. The planning code is silent on this matter, so it suggests that the full cost of its implementation will fall on the riverside property owners. We don't believe that that is appropriate. We hope that you will acknowledge it as a regional facility and that you will direct the city bureau to develop a formula in which the property owners pay for their fair share, but -- but also in proportion to their benefits, but that also other property owners in the district and the community as a large help to pay for it as well. And the second issue, if I could just quickly, is the housing overlay, which really penalizes those properties because they cannot build anything that's nonresidential unless they shift densities, they shift the 43 acres per -- 43 units per acre to other property -- other acreage on their site and it really penalizes us and we're only one of two properties in that overlay and we believe it's ineffective and unfair to single out a single property and ask that it be removed.

**Katz:** Thank you. Did you have a question?

**Saltzman:** A question for Phil. On your proposal about the master plans --

OCTOBER 9 2002

**Grillo:** Yes.

**Saltzman:** -- you're envisioning not a master plan for the entire area, but for each property parcel, they would have the ability to do a master plan approach, like that real estate --

**Grillo:** Yes, that's correct, either that or in groups as well.

**Francesconi:** Do you have any other alternatives, language, any other suggestions to provide other than that one, to give more flexibility to the south property owners?

**Grillo:** I only had three days. These were my best cut in three days. If I had a couple more days, I could come up with a couple.

**Katz:** You'll have a couple more days.

**Bookin:** We looked at several other alternatives, including the conditional use master plan, p.u.d. Provisions, a number of mechanisms in the code, and this really is the best fit and it's already in the code for the central city, and so it really makes from our standpoint the most sense.

**Katz:** Thank you. We'll have that discussion later on. Thanks. All right.

**Katz:** Okay. Mike?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Have to get my water ready.

**Katz:** Oh, your yellow water?

**Mike Houck, Audubon Society of Portland:** Mayor Katz, commissioners, my name is mike houck, representing the Audubon society of Portland, coalition for a livable future. Before I start my testimony i'd like to go back and actually congratulate gil and the rest of the city staff for having come together in we think really putting forth a much-improved proposal we're commenting on today. Also his comment that we need to be bold. I'm thinking back to whenever the 25-foot setback was established on the willamette river greenway, and the legacy that's left us and i'm urging you, and everybody in this room, to be thinking out 50, 100, 150 years, and make sure we don't make a wrong decision today because we were too timid, that in fact we were bold and we looked at what this city should look like in 100, 150 years. I have a lot of specific comments i'm not going to handle in my limited time now. I hope you'll look them over, but broad, global communities. North macadam is an opportunity to blend a natural environment. In previous hearings there are those that have argued that north macadam should be distinctly urban. And there really isn't any place for nature in the central city. And we reject that either/or proposition. And the exciting thing about the plan before us, in the presentation that gil and other staff has made, is I think we're at the cusp of actually creating a whole new way of creating a city that does integrate the natural environment, and allows us to integrate the green building approaches to produce a city that brings nature into the city and the heart of the city while maintaining those important urban design considerations for creating a truly livable and vibrant city. We can do that. We've not done that heretofore. I think I -- I really do think that Portland can set the standard, certainly in the united states, and I would hope internationally, if we move in the right direction and we in fact are bold. I want to spend whatever time I have left on the greenway width. There will be those that say it's just establishing a set width does not make any sense, create a monotonous environmental on the greenway. I reject that outright. The fact of the matter is we need -- the 150-foot aspiration that came out of this process was not picked out of the air by somebody. The 150 feet, 100-foot minimum that we would recommend you establish really reflects a multi-use concept for the greenway that we're talking about ecological values, we're talking about recreational values, we're talking about transportation facilities, you cannot pack all of those uses into a small area. It as simple as that. So that figure was not simply plucked out of the air. It's actually very functional in nature. I would like to point out that I have visited vancouver, b.c. I'm glad gil showed those shots, because I have the same ones myself. And downtown vancouver, b.c. Is not languishing

OCTOBER 9 2002

economically. There are places in downtown vancouver where there's a hole in the ground they haven't even built the foundation and there's a sign out front that says "sold out." all of the units are sold. The reason for that, to a large extent, I think, is they do have 240 -- I paced it -- 240, 250, 600-foot setbacks from that seawall. Was that an indication my time is up already?

**Katz:** Yes, unless the council wants to give you --

**Houck:** I'm certainly glad I focused on the most important issue in my mind --

**Katz:** They said yes.

**Houck:** -- if the greenway is not sufficiently wide this whole program I think falls to pieces as part of a package. Thank you very much.

**Katz:** Thanks. We have your amendments and those will be in the record, and they'll be responded to. Jeannie?

**Jeanne Galick, Corbett Terwilliger Lair Hill Neighborhood Association:** Okay. I'm jeannie gaelic. It's no surprise what i'm going to talk about either. Throughout this long, long process, one thing has remained constant -- the public's desire for a larger greenway. A greenway that will adequately support wildlife habitat, enhanced river health and accommodate present as well as future populations. We feel that the proposed 100-foot setback, while a big improvement, is the minimal needed to accomplish these objectives, but we question whether the proposal is truly a 100-foot greenway if buildings, markets and walls may be allowed in 25% of the setback and the additional exceptions can be granted under a discretionary review. We urge council to support the following -- a minimum 100-foot greenway with no exceptions. No commercial activity or barriers within the greenway setback. The greenway should be green and it should be open. Commercial uses can easily be built adjacent to that setback. Increase the mandatory greenway bonus to 15,000 square feet. It's at 7500 right now. 15,000 square feet represents a small percentage of potential increases available through bonuses. A good example is the avalon hotel. I hate to bring it up, but it doubled in size within an additional 50,000 square feet through bonuses. That just shows you what a building can do. Amend the greenway bonus option to one square foot of open space for one square foot of additional floor area. I hope that you continue to restrict bonuses to those amendments -- or those amenities that are proving so difficult to get -- the greenway, parks and open space, and affordable housing. And let's move beyond the aspiration phase very quickly. Please master plan and build a greenway as quickly as possible. And use every tool to fund and strategize to increase the greenway width to 150 feet. We support a minimum three-acre park, neighborhood park in the south end, as well as pocket parts in urban plazas. This area is still very short on open spaces and we support the preferred river parkway alignment. We also ask that you look at dramatically decreasing the building heights on properties adjacent to the greenway and park to provide for maximum solar access. Finally, we remind you that we are giving substantial public investments if this area in terms of money, increased capacities, and just my neighborhood dealing with the effects of this, this huge development, we're not against it, we're looking forward to it. I hope you know that, but we're also really wanting these public amenities. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you, jeannie.

**Corrine Paulson, League of Women Voters:** I'm corrine paulson of the league of women voters.

The key to success in this district is the city's ability to effectively leverage the substantial amount of urban renewal and other dollars that it has to invest. The league would like to see those dollars accomplished, directly or indirectly, things it might not otherwise have in the normal course of development. With that mind, the league supports backing our commitment to the recovery of endangered species, restoration of a healthy river, backing that commitment with action. We recommend that you establish a minimum 100-foot greenway setback with no exception or

OCTOBER 9 2002

commercial activity and ensure a property restored bank. Lower building heights along the greenway to a maximum height of 35 feet. Increase affordable housing targets to reflect the city policy calling for housing, affordable, across the full spectrum of household incomes. Increase park acreage beyond the minimal amount called for in the plan. We attached written comments that expand on some of those points. We urge you to ask whether the development policy set forth in the plan is the best investment approach for our urban renewal money. The plan calls for these funds to be spent primarily on infrastructure costs, which are normally borne by developers as it was in the river district. Consider whether the case has been made for such public subsidy. Similar conservative assumptions are made in the river district, but as we know private development has proved extraordinarily lucrative even after bearing infrastructure costs such as roads and utilities. With its spectacular river front location, north macadam is an even more desirable location than the river district. In the words of homer williams "this is the most seductive piece of property in the region." four stories up and you're looking straight into mt. Hood an st. Helens. In our view a better urban renewal investment approach in such a desirable district would be to publicly fund amenities that private development typically would not undertake, but also make the district even more attractive to the private developers. These would include a master plan for the greenway and purchase of additional width, more parks, riverbank restoration, and affordable housing. This approach eliminates the uncertainty of whether developers will provide these essential amenities and gives the city more control over these spaces. Alternatively, we should require these features from the developers in return for relieving them of customary infrastructure costs and for the other massive public investment that will be made, otherwise you run the risk of having to do it all with public money. By the way, we trust tax breaks for market raise housing will be eliminated so that the tip money can be generated from these projects. In conclusion, we urge you to consider how we can most effectively leverage our public urban renewal dollars to reflect this investment approach. Let's realize a better return on our investment than we did in the river district. Thank you.

**Francesconi:** Korean, one question. You know, a return on public investment and making sure we get public amenities, like the width of the greenway, affordable housing, parks, I understand all that and the league's interest in that, but the league's interest in height, leaving it at 35 feet. Explain that a little bit.

**Paulson:** Well, we follow -- we support planning that has been done. And everything that's ever talked about, the greenway, from way back in 1970, is stepped down to the river. As I think I mentioned once before, they move the p.g.e. Building back one whole block in order to have the lower building next to the mccall park. So that's -- that's our position, that we support those planning goals, and that's why we continue to support the lower height stepping down.

**Katz:** Let me reiterate, that this is going to be very different, or should be very different, from what we know today. This is a neighborhood too tomorrow.

**Paulson:** I know.

**Katz:** Okay, thank you.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** We're ready.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**William Danneman:** We're here to set forth a plan for the revitalization of an area of Portland that has languished for decades. You are the keepers of the future for an area that impacts an entire city, not just this local area. Your task is to balance all of the Portland residents' interests and rights, not just a few vested interests. The planning bureau has worked long and hard for years on this project, but always neglected to give the public a true perspective on the heights they're talking

OCTOBER 9 2002

about. It is one thing to say the words "200 feet, 250 feet, tall," but when you see it in such an area, as you will shortly, you truly open one's eyes to the enormous impact it will have on not only the immediate area, but to Portland to the west, south, north and east. According to the city's own code section 33510205, height and the purpose, the natural building heights are intended to accomplish several purposes. These include protecting views, creating a step down of building heights to the willamette river, limiting shadows on public open spaces, ensuring building height compatibility, and stepdowns to historical districts, and limiting shadows from new development on residential neighborhoods. With the plan presented, we violate all of these purposes. Please do not rush into approving a plan that benefits only a very few and penalize thousands of residents and our environment. The willamette river runs through the heart of our city. It has defined us for generations. It is our soul and peace of mind. I can only hope that you will preserve this area as our city and state has planned for it through thoughtful planning that will benefit everyone involved.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Katz:** I tell you what, let's take somebody else -- are you almost ready?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Just about.

**Katz:** Okay.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Okay. Is it on? Now is it on?

**Katz:** No. You have to talk into it -- yeah, it's on now.

**Jerry Ward, Corbett Terwilliger Lair Hill Neighborhood Association:** I'm Jerry Ward on the north macadam urban renewal advisory committee member. I'm going to talk about north macadam height issues and the ctlh's position. I handed you a pretty large packet with photos, which is a duplication of what's up here. I'll be brief and summarize what I have here. I would like to reiterate ctlh's position on height adopted by 17 neighborhood city associations. Our position is height shall be limited, but the 250-foot height area shall be reduced to 250 feet. The stepdown shall comply with map 2 of 2 at ratios of 6 to 1, 4 to 1 and 2 to 1. The neighborhood has taken these positions based on three primary factors. Density and traffic, reducing proposed height standards reduces density, which reduces traffic. Two, greenway, proposed 250-foot heights up to the proposed 100-foot greenway will affect riverbank environmental factors. Three, views. I won't elaborate on that. I'd like to go to the boards now, one, two, three and four. The first issue is the central city plan district, the city of Portland zoning code, says, for height, the purpose is the maximum building heights are intended to accomplish several purposes such as city plan -- central city plan. These include protecting views, creating a stepdown of building heights to the willamette river, limiting shadows on public open spaces, ensuring building height compatibility, and stepdowns of historical districts and limiting shadows on new development on residential neighborhoods in and at the edges of central city plan. From there we -- the ctlh got this in late april, this drawing. It was our first really public grasp of what is being proposed here. And in looking at this we noticed that some of the cross-sections that the planning bureau developed weren't real. If the greenway's 100 feet, then this building is only 100 feet high. So in the red we indicated really what the heights are. Same thing in the cartoon drawings here. There's a lot of misconception. We took that misconception and developed true cross sections through our neighborhood, from council crest all the way to the willamette river, east side, brooklyn neighborhood. We took this off the city's maps, and we can see that even at terwilliger parkway at campus road, even o.h.s.u., that the views of the mountains, the river, ross island, east side, is all affected, even at that height. You get down in our neighborhood, down here, and it's really affected. The next drawing, just a blowup of this area here. And you can see that the heights are --

OCTOBER 9 2002

here's our neighborhood, really affecting the neighborhood. You cannot see it through this. This is a true representation of what could happen in a cross-section to our neighborhood. I'll go quickly through the other two.

**Katz:** Quickly.

**Ward:** The height ratio thing. As you increase the height of the building with the same square footage of building, that the slender ratio of that building isn't really reduced that much. I won't elaborate on that much. Someone else. This is just a cross-section.

**Katz:** Okay, thank you. My time's up?

**Katz:** Yes.

**Francesconi:** What would be the next most important thing?

**Katz:** He finished his presentation.

**Ward:** You're asking a question, right?

**Francesconi:** Next most important thing, one is why is it that regionally, urban advisory committee meeting, homer williams stated that Portland does not guarantee people views. Why is it that the planning bureau staff states the same? We're taxed for it. Views do have value. And the -- the central city plan district has five things for the purpose statements for height.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Sten:** I have a question. I don't know if you could speak for all the neighborhoods you're referencing here, but what's the rationale behind the 150-foot recommendation? Why did you pick that number? I mean, I see why you don't like 250.

**Ward:** One is both on to the south and to the north. To the south is Johns Landing, exactly where I own several pieces of property, and would be affected buying that. In the south area, 75-foot heights, right, immediately like Spaghetti Factory south. To the north is the 150-foot present zoning that we were talking about earlier. So by zoning regulations, we're supposed to sort of collaborate the two heights. And the other thing that comes in to it is a traffic issue. We have -- we have -- we see a synergy here, that if you reduce the height, you reduce the density, and the density means traffic. And with respect to the greenway is that we -- like Jeannie is saying, is we need to ensure that we have something that's compatible with the greenway, and League of Women Voters concur with that, there isn't a stepdown to the greenway. That's why we're advocating this lower height.

**Katz:** Thank you. I guarantee you we will get into -- [ applause ]

**Katz:** No, no, no. Thank you. I guarantee you that we will get into this discussion in greater detail. That's why I'd like to go on and get as many people here who have been here to testify.

**Jim Gardner:** Jim Gardner, 2930 Southwest Second Avenue, 97201. Mayor Katz and commissioners, I'm no stranger to urban planning issues. I served in several city advisory committees and ten years on the metro council. While there are others actively involved in developing the 2040 vision and early pieces of the 2040 growth management plan, not to mention serving as a sounding board and occasional editor for my wife as she completed a masters in urban planning at P.S.U. I've been observing the north Macadam planning process for the last 15 years, as a resident of Lair Hill and member of the Ctlh board. I was struck from the beginning by a strange difference in this planning process. As always the area's property owners came in asking for the moon. The city's planners told them we'll give you the moon and the stars if you go along with our scheme to make this a bigger and better downtown. This is reflected in the plan's overall vision and goals as they're implemented by zoning and by F.A.R. ratios, but nowhere is it more evident than in the building heights that are proposed to be allowed. Put in basic terms here, we have an area very close to the Willamette River that allows buildings up to 250 feet tall. This is nearly twice the height -- 150 -- which is allowed in the south waterfront area to the north, and in many parts of

OCTOBER 9 2002

downtown. Now the rationale for that 150-foot height limit in downtown was protection of views. Those in the west hills and from the rest of downtown. Apparently the existing residential neighborhoods and the more southerly hill dwellers in this area don't deserve that same type of protection. Your planners have attempted to justify these exposure and height limits by saying there's a tradeoff, allowing a wider greenway and the fact that the area has to set aside some areas for parks. This justification, though, really is pretty feeble, partly because most of the park area is unbuildable land under the ross island bridge, and the city proposes to spend many millions of dollars in public infrastructure improvements, which is going to make that property much more valuable. Don't be deceived by the whole proposition that this plan will produce slim needle-like towers instead of a high-rise canyon. All this really achieves is leave slivers of views between the buildings. If you're fortunate enough, maybe mt. Hood or part of the ross island will happen to fall in one of those slivers. But by and large it won't. Actually mentioning the slivers brings to mind what I think is one of the most egregious aspects of this thing, and that has been the distorted graphics and illustrations that have accompanied the package. You heard earlier about how scale was distorted. It made 100 feet of greenway look like 200 feet, and made 200 feet of building look like 100 feet. It's the type of perspective that architects use when they're trying to sell a project. Where every tree is full grown and every building blends in with its neighbors.

**Katz:** Your time is up.

**Gardner:** I know the plan for you is for adoption and here after several years of, quote, process. You're understandably reluctant to make changes yourself at this point, but what you can do is refer specific details, such as building height limits, back to planning staff, with some guidance about what you think is a more appropriate scale.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Gardner:** This area is -- is the future neighborhood of Portland. The concept of benefiting the city as a whole, though, should apply to existing residents as well as those who will live here in the future.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Gardner:** Thank you for your time.

**Ken Love, Board Member, Corbet Terwilliger Liar Hill :** Madame mayor, city council. My name is ken love, member of --

**Katz:** Ken, closer to the hike.

**Love:** I'm a member of the cthl board. I'm fortunate to be able to say that I live on the greenway just south of willamette park. I'm here to ask that you consider nothing less than what was presented on the 150-foot on the greenway. Where I live now we have beaver. I can sit on my deck and watch. I have sea otter that will come on the dock. We have the -- the bald eagle, the osprey. We got ross island becoming a park in the next ten years. And after seeing these pictures of the planning board up in vancouver, fantastic. I was really kind of disappointed until I saw this, and I thought what a neat, livable community Portland can become. So mine's very simple. Hope nothing less than the 150 feet greenway. Thank you.

**Katz:** Why don't you go ahead. Are you all three planning to testify? Is that the -- okay.

**Steven Shaw, Zidell Companies :** While paul is dealing with the technology today, my name is steven shaw, southwest moody avenue, here representing the zidell companies. The zidell companies are the single largest property owner in north macadam. We've been in that area for -- since the turn of the last century, since -- in -- around the 1915s, the family located there. We have, when these images come up, you will see that our site is on the river. We have always been a river-oriented water-based company, from the time that we either scraped ships, recycled steel or built

OCTOBER 9 2002

barges, we have always looked at the site from the river landward. We've always led the river in our property. Zidell companies, the family owners in 2000, started a plan to come up with a vision for the property. This has not been widely circulated. We've opened it up and circulated it to some members, so that you can understand that we have been involved in the vision. We've looked at our architectural greatness, but not only in the buildings, but also looked at the open spaces, look at the interstitial spaces between those buildings to find a way of looking at how the site works. We've looked at our vision is to be urban, is to have a wow, is to not be suburbs, not to be a kruse way, it's to be looking out towards the future. The property owners plan to be there for the long term. Where the plan is we have certain major concerns with the plan. Part of it starts with the alignment of river parkway. And then deals with from river parkway and the greenway. One of our guiding views has always been can north macadam, or the zidell properties, coherently celebrate history, reflect current culture, look to the future, educate, respect its river ecology, serve a broad and diverse constituency? Our answer is an unequivocal yes. In particular we have different visions and ideas, but these five concerns that we have all are interrelated. River parkway, the alignment needs to shift to the west, underneath the ross island bridge to allow an open space of park. I think you'll see that some of this in your -- in your proposals before you. The greenway, we find north of the ross island bridge, without a certain pinch point of 50 feet to allow economically developable parcels, critical to the city of Portland, needs to be there, where we see there's a wide and diverse open space that can be created. One of the other items -- this will be in there -- is that some other minor points in the plan dealing with the issue of ownership and site, we feel that the code needs to be modified to trigger greenway improvements to be still based on the definition of site. Also the issue of bonuses, we think the -- requiring the greenway bonus as an initial threshold misses the point on dealing with a broader perspective of what all the other bonuses are. We think all bonuses currently in the code and those proposed should be included in the plan. The other item that we have, that we'd offer as an amendment, deals with the north macadam greenway trail fund. This is a relatively new item. I needs to be either reconsidered, revised, eliminated. It needs to -- go ahead.

**Shaw:** What i'd like to do is talk about the urban design concept and if you turn in your little booklet to the urban design concept page, first i'd like to just talk about the scale a bit. The scale is similar to the reach between the hawthorne bridge and the marquam bridge for the zidell properties, which reach between the marquam bridge and the ross island bridge. And I think what we're seeing is that in that reach there are a diversity of uses in there. Wide-open spaces, more naturalistic kinds of areas, and so forth. The views, I think it's going to come up on your screen in a moment. The views are dynamic. As others have said, mt. Hood, mount st. Helens, downtown, ross island and even the -- the west hills in -- including o.h.s.u. River parkway can be viewed right now, we think, in two ways. One is the proposal before you by the planning bureau, which is a concept that says that river parkway and the neighborhood is an edge between the neighborhood itself and the river. The proposal that we have before you is really based on the framework plan and what has come forward to -- through the process, and it says the river parkway should be a dynamic place and be integrated in with the neighborhood, a sequence of events. The marquam bridge has a gateway, the reach about a quarter mile reach along the river that provides peaks of mt. Hood -- peeks of mt. Hood, of the ross island bridge and the river itself, and then the street diving in past a jewel box or a signature kind of building and reaching into more of the heart of the neighborhood, and then emerging on to a park underneath the ross island bridge, and then on into the southern properties, and a different kind of context, a different kind of nature in the research area that's been talked to you earlier -- or presented to you earlier. River parkway is an integrated



OCTOBER 9 2002

street. It fits in the neighborhood. It's part of the neighborhood. It is not an edge. It's an incident great component. It relates horizontally and vertically. It has diversity. It's double-loaded. It has a dynamic waterfront and it is flexible for parks and so forth. There are about five to six acres of parkland exclusive of the -- of the greenway. And I think the thing that's important also is that the concept provides for a very dynamic kind of greenway experience with a number of different kinds of uses. Thank you.

**Paul Fishman:** Paul fishman. I wanted to very quickly talk about some of the ecological contexts.

Some things we need to keep in mind is number one that the plan uses the term "natural." let's make sure that people understand that the willamette river today is not very natural. We've really influenced it a lot. And we need to keep in mind. Riparian areas are limited along the river, limited to the riverbanks, but many opportunities there for habitat improvement and enhancement. The river sets the context for the district. And it's important to understand that context in the physical sense, boogie at some of these physical characteristics that the river provides. And looking at where those improvement opportunities really occur. In this -- in this slide you'll notice that the -- the darker the blue color means the deeper the water. And along the zidell property in north macadam, the green indicates that it's very shallow water. That's an opportunity area for habitat improvements. The important thing here is that it's -- it's a diverse shoreline, and the treatments or the opportunities along that shoreline throughout the district and on the zidell portion of the district are different as you look at different areas. The focus of the zidell proposal that we've been working on for about three or four years now is really to look at the shallow water -- the shallow inwater areas and the riverbank areas. Zidell has with a consultant team has produced a project concept for habitat improvement. In plan view, what you see is the addition of river rock and gravel materials to produce gravel bars and offshore islands, if you will, and please note that the scale here that from the top of bank, which is this line, some of these areas go out into the river where you're improving habitat over 200 feet from the top of bank. A typical cross-section would look like this, where you take some of the existing pilings, you add gravel and rock, you create a very diverse set of habitats here, including an improved riverbank, and these are the general concepts, where you're really focusing on the river floodplain ecosystem element of the district that the river dictates. There are different types of treatments available, and there are some issues with the greenway code. There's no credit given in the code for this kind of inwater work. Although it should be there. There's really not a scientific basis for this 45-foot ecological zone. I'm not saying it should be smaller or larger. I'm saying let's make sure people don't think there's some ecological reason that 45-foot number was picked. The habitat diversity is the key. What we're keying on is an area that starting from the top of bank and for whatever distance you want to have habitat above the riparian area on the -- above the 100-year floodplain area, that have you have habitat types that simulate what the river used to be if you want to talk about restoration.

**Katz:** Thank you. You had about 23 seconds on -- left.

\*\*\*\*\*: I would like to give --

\*\*\*\*\*: Does the gentleman yield?

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Shaw:** The last picture that we showed here is in conclusion letting the in form the urban fabric. This shows you a concept how we see river parkway moving through the ross island bridge, connecting ross island bridge park, which we -- it's not a leftover pace, a valuable space, but connecting it back to the river. As river parkway moves north, it creates some developable parcels, but between these two -- these two parcels here, the river pinches down -- or the greenway pinches down, but up against the emerging islands creating this depth of actual habitat. This is actually not

OCTOBER 9 2002

a final version, of course, but it is a concept. It's a concept that we can move forward with and create something where we can work with you on a contingent relationship.

**Katz:** And you probably will have that opportunity, but you have to begin to work with us on that and think through and maybe do some changes in your design to get that. We'll have time to talk about it on -- either tomorrow or next -- at the end of the month.

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

\*\*\*\*\*: Thank you very much.

**Katz:** Okay. Tim? There he comes.

**Katz:** Okay, art, go ahead.

**Art Lewellan:** My name is art lewellyn. I live in the brooklyn neighborhood just immediately east and across the river from macadam district. I appreciate the participatory process. I have seven points that I want to list. I may get them all. So here it goes. I've participated in this process of determining the development plan for several years. It's still my hope that the district will mature into a vibrant place in Portland. That said, I must point out my disagreement with certain aspects of the current design. The current proposed building to me, the heights are too tall. They -- not only do they block views, they represent a desire to develop an area to a degree of density which will present transportation difficulties because of the limited access. The proposed buildings adjacent to the greenway have setbacks above the lower floors. And I don't believe the setback amounts to much. These buildings are simply towers on the edge, despite the setback. They still block that view from new buildings and established homes further west. I do -- I support the gondola proposal, with stations on barbur boulevard. I support the streetcar extension, but believe that it will not provide transit access to accommodate the proposed density. I'm going to skip the next two points. The potential replacement for marquam bridge is likely to take the land immediately south and adjacent of the bridge of the this is a primary consideration for how that area develops and should not be neglected. Marquam bridge. And my final point, my most important, I have confidence in the 2040 regional plan. A lot of confidence. I think it's some sort of groundbreaking concept. I think it's crucial. It's a very important plan. To date there's ben no development of these sites. It's important that the 2440 plan take precedence over where to develop. Portland is not just central city. If downtown development continues to dominate, the travel demand will increase beyond the capacity of existing new transportation systems. When I look at everything in that sense of finding new ways to control our density and development of travel -- development affects how much travel we have. With that said, I have a lot of confidence in the planning staff to be able to do a good job with this project. Thank you.

**Katz:** Will somebody go next?

\*\*\*\*\*: Thank you. Before I begin my testimony, --

**Katz:** Get closer to your mic, please.

\*\*\*\*\*: -- corbett-terwilliger/lair hill neighborhood association is not willing to give up the shoal that would be taken away from us.

**Katz:** I --

\*\*\*\*\*: I know. It was said and i'm just stating a position. Before I begin my testimony --

**Katz:**, no, no. You're going to begin your testimony with the time. You can start right now.

\*\*\*\*\*: I begin my testimony --

**Katz:** You want to identify yourself?

\*\*\*\*\*: You know, I should know this by now.

**Katz:** Yes.

OCTOBER 9 2002

**Jim Davis, Land Use Chair, Corbett-Terwilliger Lair Hill Neighborhood Association:** My name is jim davis. I'm land use chair of corbett-terwilliger/lair hill neighborhood association.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Davis:** Before I get into the bulk of my testimony, let me state for the record that I protest this process. It gives folks who have lost a day's pay three minutes to make their case against a development that's steeped in greed, a development whose primary benefits will go to less than 100 people, a development that will not generate significant property taxes for at least ten years and a development that ignores the character of Portland and panders to the investment desires of large r.e.i.t.s and insurance companies of the east coast and a development that will raise property taxes. Now no one in this room today has any doubt as to how this council will vote. Given that fact, and the fact that the design commission on an adjacent property, objected to the height of 250 feet, and given that the neighbors are objected to this proposal, I have just a simple question, an I wish commissioner Francesconi was here, but i'm asking each of you directly, do you have any formal training in urban planning or urban design or architecture or any idea of the impact of density on the livability in the west? It's a question that's not a rhetorical question. I'd like it answered.

**Katz:** We're not going to have a conversation. Why don't you go ahead.

**Davis:** Then I hope the record shows that the mayor does not answer. And i'd ask the same questions to the other commissioners. Commissioner Sten, commissioner Saltzman. It's a valid question.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Francesconi:** I wasn't here. [ laughter ]

**Francesconi:** But unfortunately I came back a little too soon.

**Katz:** Is that the end of your testimony?

**Davis:** If the record shows that there's no answer to the question, yes, it is.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Kathy Bambeck:** I'm kathy bambeck, 5131 southwest 38th place here in Portland. I'm an executive board, southwest neighborhoods. I was for six years on the bicycle advisory committee here in Portland. And but today i'm speaking for myself as an avid recreational bicyclist. I've been looking forward for years for this link from the spaghetti factory to downtown Portland on the willamette greenway. I've been looking for this nice, pleasant ride along the willamette river, and I hope that it will happen. Now that i'm retired, i'm committed to seeing the city is indeed the best place to live and to retire in and the north macadam district must become the best place for our bicyclists. The willamette greenway link must become the best bicycle link for the citizens in the city. There should be adequate space for both pedestrians and bicyclists to be safe together and to use the area without having to look out for each other. It should be wide enough to be partitioned as in stanley park in vancouver, b.c., where there is a line down the middle of the path dividing the area for pedestrians and bicyclists. I don't want to see any collisions like we have over on the east esplanade. The developers with us not encroach in this valuable space. When I bicycle I don't want to have to, "hey, folks, get out of the way." I want to see a nice wide space along that area where there will be safe pedestrians and safe bicycling. So please, city council, give us a nice, wide willamette greenway with the wide space for us to walk and bicycle. Okay?

**Katz:** Thank you.

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

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

OCTOBER 9 2002

**Dustin Posner:** Thank you, mayor Katz. My name is Dustin Posner. I live at 2831 Northwest Cornell in Northwest Portland. I'm here today as a citizen of the city, as an architect, who practices in the city, who cares deeply about it, and also a member of the A.I.A. Urban Design Committee, although I'm not here speaking here on their behalf. Our chair I think will present at some point. First off, I want to say that I'm very supportive, in general, of the planning strategy and of the document as it has developed. I think it's going to have tremendous potential and that the district has potential for a lot of exciting growth down the road. I do support the 250-foot height limit. I'm not feeling like that that will be a detriment to the city. I think the city needs variety. And I think that this is a select area where this type of element can occur. My main testimony is that I feel that we need to have a lot more flexibility in the width of the greenway. I think that there are great examples throughout the world of where we allow urban development up against a water edge, and where we have the potential to have healthy rivers and allow that. So I would like a lot more flexibility, not just a blanket 100-foot or 150-foot, but where, you know, maybe it averages at some point, but where you can allow urban development really to much closer at select locations and that the pedestrian -- basically the greenway elements can move inward from that in select locations. I think of Georgetown in Washington, D.C., with its urban development along the canal, and that to me is a very vibrant space. I also think under this proposal we wouldn't be able to have a riverplace, which when I go down on there on weekends, I see a huge amount of people right there, and that's much closer to the river than this development would allow. A couple other points -- if we'll have a park at the Ross Island area, I really encourage you to be on the south side of the bridge, not under the bridge, so that solar access makes a lot more sense. Becomes a positive space to use, especially in the off-season. I think that -- those are basically my major points.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Francesconi:** I think you can do better than that, since we're talking about the --

**Kevin Montgomery-Smith:** Hello, mayor, commissioners. My name is Kevin Montgomery Smith.

My comments today -- and thank you for letting me make comments -- is on one particular small point, there was a proposal by the planning commission, to reduce, restrict, and constrain the f.a.r. Bonus for middle-income housing central citywide. Go through the north Macadam process, but then affect the entire central city f.a.r. Bonus for middle-income housing put forth through a four-year planning effort in the West End plan. I would hope that you would reaffirm that process today or in the near future. The way that Director Kelley referred to it was, a change central citywide to affect affordable housing. Unfortunately that's not particularly true. It's a change that would affect middle-income housing development. This is a revenue neutral or passive incentive for building between 80% m.f.i. And while it hasn't been used currently, there are four developers looking at it actively and it would or could affect a more diverse residential population. If you turn your attention to the charts, the first chart shows all rental housing and in the central city by median family income. 80% of the housing stock in downtown according to the most recent publication on residential inventory for the central city, shows that 80% is at f.m.i. And below, and the most underserved population is between 121 and 150 f.m.i. The current bonus is between 80 and 150%.

The current restriction it would take it down to between 80 and 120%. While there is 11% over 150 in ownership, there still is only 4% in ownership and rental that's serving 120 to 1 f.m.i. While affordable housing could be affected in the Macadam plan through the development agreements and while the city has been doing a very good job of making incentives available for affordable housing development, there really isn't a lot out there for the middle-income market. And while market rate over 150 can kind of take care of itself, the 80 to 150% market really isn't being tapped into it. Something that was alluded to earlier by the League of Women Voters about the distribution

**OCTOBER 9 2002**

of income, these are 1990 numbers and this was from the language bureau. As you can see, 53% is over 80% median family income of the entire city of Portland. 80% of our housing stock in the central city is geared toward 80% f.m.i. And less. So to go back to the original premise, which is that this is an affordable housing addition to this plan would be incorrect, and middle income was defined in 1999 in the comprehensive plan and the housing policy as 80% to 150% f.m.i. So in closing, we're in support of a middle-income f.a.r. bonus. Please don't change it.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Sten:** This question isn't exactly relevant. Do you have a sense of what percentage in the families in the 120 to 150% actually rent in the city?

**Montgomery-Smith:** There's not much to rent in downtown to begin with.

**Sten:** Citywide.

**Montgomery-Smith:** Oh. No, I don't.

**Sten:** 55% of the city owns, so 45% is the total rental pool. I'm just curious, if the availability matches up against the demand.

**Montgomery-Smith:** You know what? The f.a.r. Bonus could also be used for ownership. I mean, when you're getting into that --

**Sten:** I'm not arguing against the f.a.r. I'm just curious.

**Montgomery-Smith:** Just to make a point, between 120 and 150 it means a great difference between what a developer could charge for a condominium to make the project feasible. It's my assumption that taking the middle-income f.a.r. Bonus wouldn't force people to make more housing between 80 and 120, it would be pushing housing prices past 150.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Rhoda Weiss:** Council members, my name is rhoda weiss. I live at 2211 southwest first avenue. Perhaps i'm representing, although not officially, the many, many thousands of people who move to Portland in the last 25 years. And we chose Portland rather than seattle or l.a. Or san francisco because of the charm and the beauty and the pace of the city. We've come to love it more each year. When the question of this development came up, there was no discussion in the newspaper. It occurred to me to look up the city law, which has been repeated here already. I've heard it twice. Nevertheless, I think it's a very important thing here. It's called the central city plan district, chapter and so and so height. The purpose, the maximum building heights are intended to accomplish several purposes of the central city plan. These include protecting views, creating a stepdown of building heights to the willamette river, limiting shadows on public open spaces, ensuring building height and stepdowns to historical districts and limiting shadows to a new development on residential neighborhoods in and at the edges of the central city. And the state law, goal number 15, and the state law, willamette river greenway, to protect, conserve, enhance and maintain the natural scenic, historical, agricultural, economic and recreational of lands along the willamette river. Paragraph b-1 under that says "the intensification --" and that has to do with the change of use or development "-- will provide the maximum possible landscape area, open spaces for vegetation between the activity and the river." i'm thinking that tom mccall would be turning in his grave if he heard this request of the 200 to 250-foot height. In 1974 he formed a group called the 1000 friends of Oregon. I don't know where they are. Maybe they're not aware of the plan to increase the height of these buildings. I can't imagine any reason why this council would seriously consider this proposal to build more than 150 feet or why anyone would suggest such a thing. Corporate greed comes to mind. We know what that to our economy and it would bring the same harm to the quality and the character of our city. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. Karla?

OCTOBER 9 2002

**Rob DeGraff, Portland Business Alliance:** Mayor Katz, members of council. I'm rob degraft, representing the Portland business alliance. I'll try to be brief. Let me start by saying by without hesitation we unequivocally support the idea of getting o.h.s.u. Down to north macadam. It's our city's best opportunity to establish that viable bioscience, biotech industry and create those high-quality, high-paying jobs in the central city. So to the extent that this plan supports that, that effort by o.h.s.u. And the north macadam investors we want to express our wholehearted support. Nonetheless, we have some concerns about the north macadam proposal before you. The plan be win characterized as being driven by incentives rather than regulation, particularly as it relates to commercial development we see the plan differently. From our perspective the plan relies heavily on regulations and forced bonuses. Standard and successful bonuses like percent for art and daycare have been eliminated while the bonus has been transformed into 100% regulation. Bonuses exist for the greenway open space, but property owners are forced to use this bonus first and build an extensive public access system. Given tax increment financing, crucial to the development of this district, we believe the bureau has failed to establish a framework attractive to the marketplace. We would recommend returning the art stake here and incent the greenway bonus rather than regulate it. You've just heard from Kevin about how we feel about the middle-income housing f.a.r. Bonus so I won't repeat that. With regard to the greenway, the 150-foot top of bank minimum, or average that's being proposed here, is dramatically different from the 25-foot easement donated by the Naito family at McCormick Pier 25 years ago, yet there's no debate really that this is a regional resource, and yet the north macadam plan places responsibility for the greenway on the property owners, requiring them to vote to contribute the land and to build a greenway according to city standards. This paradigm seems unfair to us, and we would encourage a more flexible approach that provides for perhaps a narrow baseline for the owners to -- with incentives for the owners to create more greenway. Regarding the alternative alignment for the parkway, as it was originally proposed in the framework plan, we think this creates an opportunity for a great street through the center of the district, some development parcels along the edge between the parkway and the river, and it breaks down the -- lessens the amount of space where river parkway becomes a barrier between the district and the river much as Naito is -- to waterfront park. Thank you.

**Sten:** I can't resist. I mean, the proposal is to allow a lot higher buildings, which are worth money, and potentially to invest a lot of taxpayer money. Should the city not require anything for those things?

**DeGraff:** I'm not saying they shouldn't require anything. I just think there's a better balance.

**Sten:** I didn't hear any testimony from what you think is a reasonable requirement for those kind of things.

**DeGraff:** Those are the type of things you can work out individually, property owners, through development agreements, as opposed to establishing a basic rule and taking more from there.

**Katz:** Okay. Go ahead.

**Grant B. Hughes, MD:** Mayor Katz and members of the council, I live at 2211 Southwest First, in the 17th floor. My name is Dr. Grant B. Hughes. I'm a retired psychiatrist. I address the council with a concern that is perhaps different than you've heard from anyone else. Although there have been opinions expressed today that I've heard that suggest to me that they're talking about something that I'm concerned about. As a psychiatrist, I'm interested in the emotional and the mental health effect of the plan. And I know for a fact that crowding is not good. I think when something is almost perfect, why should we try to improve it? Except maybe to paint up the buildings and spruce them up a little bit. But I am very much opposed to crowding. One of the

OCTOBER 9 2002

examples that I could give is what do you think happens in the classroom when 40 students are there trying to learn? I'm prepared to tell you that if we crowd too many highrise buildings and put too much population congestion in given areas, and take away the river and the beauty of this city, we're in trouble. One of the things I know in living here since 1963 that I am very fortunate to live in one of the most beautiful cities in the united states, if not the world. And I hate to see us damage that image. We have people from near and far who come and talk about our open spaces. Our parks. Our playgrounds. Our open swimming pools. And where can you go other than mccall park and feel good? I'm prepared to tell you that as you see so will you think. If you don't like what you see, you may be become depressed. You may become all kinds of stressful problems to deal with. The transportation, the crowding and what not. So I don't like the thought of living elbow to elbow. I'm here to speak for the unknown generations that I will not see. I'm only a kid of 85. I don't have many more years to live. But i'm very much concerned about the generations that come. And I would like to thank the council for giving me this opportunity to express my concern. And i'm willing to participate in further deliberation if i'm so called upon. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you, doctor.

**Greg Pedon, West End Steering Committee:** Mayor Katz, members of council. My name is greg pedon and I reside on southwest 11th avenue in Portland. I'm here today to represent craig goodman in his role as the co-chair of the west end steering committee. You received yesterday a letter signed by mr. Goodman. I will just briefly summarize his concerns, particularly about the f.a.r. For middle-income housing as it relates to the north macadam plan and as it affects the entire city -- central city plan, as has already been stated the proposal in the plan here would be to lower it from 150% from median family income to 120. My point here is the process that was gone through to reach the 150% was over a four-year process through the west end plan. This seems to be a proposal by the planning commission, eight months after that decision was made, to change that back to 120, we're concerned about that done without any proven track record or testimony today as to why we need to do that. If that isn't a legitimate issue that the city council wants to explore and reopen, we would ask you to separate that out and ask for a more thorough investigation of why that needs to be that way. Thank you.

**Katz:** I was -- what I wanted to ask, gil, if the planning commission member or members would be willing to come in and let us know what their thinking was on this particular --

**Pedon:** Right. We haven't had that chance.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Pedon:** Thank you.

**Katz:** All right. It is 4:18, so we will adjourn at close to 5:00.

**Donna Drummond:** Hello, commissioners. My name is donna drummond. I live at 2221 southwest first avenue. First good news is I don't have a handout. My second point is I have no idea why there's 150-foot zoning in the riverplace area. That may be a discussion for another day. But I would suggest to you that there is very likely a -- using this riverside zoning increase as a rationale that it is part of the gateway to the so-called south macadam avenue. I think it's discrete. I think it should be dealt with discretely. I further think that the excuses -- and I think they are excuses by the developer to crouch this height increase from one 50 to 200, remembering that initially they wanted 250, but were happy with 200, I think that that is lights and mirrors. They are getting a 33% increase in height. They are giving to the city and all their magnificence about a 17% increase in zoning -- i'm sorry -- in open space in this area. I don't think that that is a particularly a good quid pro quo, and I think you should look at that. I realize this may not be the

OCTOBER 9 2002

time for a discussion of this amendment. I would be glad to come back and say this again. Thank you very much.

**Katz:** Okay. Thank you.

**Val Descamps:** I'm val descamps. I live on first avenue. I'm here to -- i'll be very brief and simple. My testimony is based on this premise that if construction in the city adds to the quality of life it is good for the city, and if construction in the city detracts from the quality of life it is bad for the city. This building, this building height increase, I say is bad for the quality of the life of the city and is bad, and I can tell you how I know this. My experience supports this premise in this way -- a few years ago I had the opportunity to retire, and I chose to stay in Portland. I could have gone anywhere in this country. So by the fact that the city had excellent quality of life, you've added two heads to the taxpayer roll, and so the city is better off for having this quality of life, and I admit it's in a minor way, but nevertheless it could be expanded. That's the end of my testimony.

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

**Janet Kelly:** I am Janet Kelly, I live on southwest Virginia Street here in Portland. The proposed North Macadam District plan has much to recommend it its design guidelines show sensitivity to the many conflicting goals put forward for this very special piece of river frontage. I do have some concerns. One of them, I was asked to draw attention to one that Jerry did not have the time to show. This is the way our waterfront would look. Okay? I'm asking that's the vision we all have of the waterfront. The recommended plan, page d-8, paragraph 5, refers to an allotment of 25 feet of greenway space to be fenced off and used privately. Cafe tables are suggested as appropriately placed in the greenway. This clutter has no place in a greenway setback. Terraces and tables and fences are fine, but not in the greenway setback. 1/4 of the greenway is being given away. We ask that the entire greenway be structure-free. Additionally, I heard a man earlier today testify that he wanted variability in the width of the greenway. I think that's wonderful. But 100 feet of greenway space is a miserly minimum setback. We would be more than happy to see variability, but go from 150 to 250, not 100 down to 25. Further, I fear that we may be creating a densely populated park impoverished region. The existing state park standard is 2.8 parks per 1,000 of population. This means that a little over 18 acres should be set aside for park use in North Macadam. South Waterfront Park and existing parks ten minutes away in another district is not an appropriate substitute for North Macadam District parkland. This area as planned is too dense, too constricted and too heavily populated to be deprived of the park space available. Somehow more land needs to be freed up for park space. The three-acre neighborhood park included in the framework plan is not located. It is given the status only of a good idea. This proposed park would be located in the southern end of the district where housing used to be sited and offers the only place where children could play, friends could gather to toss a frisbee or kick a soccer ball. I ask that the proposed plan be amended to give a precise location and time line of the development of this southern three-acre park. And it is with real dismay that I read page e-16, that all future park sites in the North Macadam District can be paved and used as temporary surface parking lots. Once those lands are paved, and people become accustomed to parking there, they will never become parks.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Bill Rollins:** I am the mystery person. I'm Bill Rollins. I've lived in Portland for 40 years. I came as a young man, working for Bill Roberts, who I think is credited with the vision of tearing down the general building and moving some freeways and a man of great taste. I have spent my life looking and working on change, and I cover change. Change drives lots of businesses, including



OCTOBER 9 2002

the fashion business and the pot and pan business and many of those. But good taste is important. I traveled the world. Recently spent ten days in Chicago. It looked like Hawaii until 2:00 and then the zebra stripes came from all the buildings. I think we need to worry about the height. I don't believe anybody has gone out to look at the area to see how tall these buildings are. 200 feet is very tall 250 feet is almost outrageous. It does become economic to build the right size buildings. They're going to be there for a long time and I know that the -- the planners are developing the river had no idea we planned to line it with skyscrapers and block it out like Miami or the Loop or than other places in the world. I love the city. I know you're doing a good job, but money cannot be the driving force for developing our beautiful river. It is our heart and soul. And I believe that sincerely. Thank you.

**Lee Buhler:** Mayor Katz, commissioners, my name is Lee Buhler, and I live on Southwest Hamilton Street, the southern end and to the west of the North Macadam development. And I was really excited when I got this map of the planning department brought to our neighborhood association, because it talked about the 100 to 150-foot greenway. The pictures looked great and I think the pictures earlier from Vancouver looked great, and I think that if we did something like that it would be the most exciting feature in that part of town. Maybe in the future when people mention Southwest Portland, the first thing that comes to mind could be the greenway. I'm a little bit worried on the recent planning code document, and I'm hoping this vision isn't slipping away, because as it's been explained to me as I read it, there could be walls, fences and commercial activity in the first 25 feet of the 100-foot area specified as greenway. I really don't -- hope that doesn't happen. It doesn't add to me. How can fencing and walls and commercial activity be considered greenway? Me it's kind of making the greenway 75 feet, but I hope you hold the line and I hope you keep it at 100 feet of greenway, minimum setback. I think people in the future will be grateful to you, just like we're grateful to the efforts that were done for the Oregon beaches. And I know we're asking people to give up use of a fraction of their property, but I think they're being fairly compensated, not only because of the public money that will be going into the development down there, but I also think that if a vibrant greenway will add value to their property. I think they'll get back as much as they give away. I think people mentioned that earlier. People want to live and work and come down to that -- to the greenway. Finally, please keep in mind that residents of my neighborhood will be paying for this development as well. I don't mean just tax dollars, but there's going to be higher traffic and more pollution and also a lot of us are going to lose some of our views. And I think a greenway with at least go a little ways in compensating us for some of the -- some of those things we'll lose, some of the costs to us. So I really urge you to -- to maintain a 100-foot green greenway. I think in the future that this -- and if you can get further, by using bonuses or grants or money to get it wider, that would be great. So I hope in the future it be an area we can all enjoy. Thank you very much.

**Rudy Henley:** Mayor Katz, commissioners, my name is Rudy Henley, and I live 0018 Southwest Hamilton. Our Ctlh neighborhood has submitted testimony on transportation issues you should have before you today. I'm very concerned about the traffic problems that will occur with the North Macadam development if we do not start working on solutions first off. We simply can't expect tens of thousands of people to go in and out of that area every day without a major problem. The area has very poor access now and we need traffic solutions before, not after the development. Extending the streetcar is one solution, but it's only one solution. We need other solutions to avoid major congestion. Our neighborhood association has many great suggestions, which include adding bus routes, extending the streetcar even further, fixing intersections, and a water taxi or water bus on the Willamette River. My point is we need to start now on planning, funding. It will

OCTOBER 9 2002

not work to spend millions of dollars of public money on the infrastructure of north macadam. And expect the traffic problem to take care of itself. The development of north macadam is long-term, therefore we need long-term traffic solutions. I hope the north macadam area will be a great success. I really do. But I wanted -- I want it to be a success for all, and it will start if we avert major traffic tie-ups. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Marty Slapikas:** We're having difficulties on the microphone. My name is marty slapekis. I would like to momentarily direct your attention to this famous coney island picture here. I believe the picture is of at least 10,000 people, if not more. I believe we can agree it's an example of high density, maybe even population density. New york city, I remember headlines in the paper saying "1 million, 2 million people spent the night on the beach because of high temperatures during the day." these folks arrived using buses, subways, cars, taxis, bicycles or walked. Some may have even parachuted in or arrived by plane. I'll quickly go through them. I think it's very important. Evaluate the transportation impacts on adjacent neighborhoods when considering development in north macadam district, and include neighborhood traffic mitigation measures, north macadam district development plans. Number two -- require the bureau of planning to put a regional -- this is regional development. We're not even talking --

**Katz:** Marty, if you want to go through, go ahead. Your time is short. Go ahead.

**Slapikas:** Public hearings on -- [ inaudible ] there's also a paragraph on funding, which might be of interest. Finally on this recommended north macadam design, we support the -- [ inaudible ] in conclusion, I do believe -- [ inaudible ] all the studies i've read. [ inaudible ]

**Katz:** Thank you. We got the message. Thank you. Okay. Who wants to start?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I'll start.

**Kristin Udvari, Ball Janik LLP:** Good afternoon. I'm with ball janik, legal counsel to o.h.s.u., the major landowners in the central district of north macadam. Our proposed code amendments are outlined on our exhibit today and detailed in the written narrative we've submitted. Our amendments request increased f.a.r., increased height and tower width options, revisions to access and parking standards, a revised delineation of the required residential development area, and revisions to the greenway trail fund to exempt property owners already contributing improvements and/or land. I will summarize the proposed f.a.r. Amendments and the next five speakers will address other amendments in detail. The amendments not addressed orally are detailed in our written narrative. The proposed north macadam code places a 9 to 1 cap on floor area ratio per site.

We do not object to that, however as illustrated by the code f.a.r. Map displayed, the base f.a.r.s are 5 to 1 along the greenway compared to f.a.r.s up to 12 to 1 in similarly situated portions of the central city. In addition, unlike other central city districts, the code limits f.a.r. Bonuses at a maximum of 2-1. In order to reach the recommended 9-1 cap, a property owner must purchase the additional f.a.r. From another property owner in the district. As a result, one owner must rely on another owner's willingness to reduce f.a.r. Nowhere else in the central city do we require transfers from another property to meet the permitted f.a.r. As an alternative, we're requesting that you amend the code to permit a property owner to reach 9 to 1 through their independent resources. This will allow a property owner to reach 9 to 1 by fully utilizing base and bonus f.a.r. In addition, the increased f.a.r. Will mitigate the inequity of allowing a 6 to 1 base f.a.r. North along the greenway north of gibbs. The greenway area south of gibbs will be served directly by the transit hub on gibbs and as illustrated by the grating that began in september, the central district south of gibbs will be the first development in north macadam, because it is the catalyst and testing ground, the central district should be given all of the necessary tools be successful and to jump-start the

OCTOBER 9 2002

north macadam district. The proposed 6 to 1 f.a.r. Increase looping the greenway south of gibbs will ensure a vibrant start to the new district. Finally, we propose additional f.a.r. Bonus options which we list in our narrative. Adding bonuses to encourage and reward art, environmental building and egressive storm water control will create a unique community with superior design. In the end, because f.a.r. Is not adjustable or modifiable, these north macadam code amendments the dictate the future success of north macadam. I think that we can all agree that the 9 to 1 cap as recommended by the planning commission is appropriate. We are simply asking for better opportunities to reach that cap.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Julie Kuhn:** Good afternoon, mayor, members of council. My name is Julie Kuhn

**Katz:** Get closer to the mic.

**Kuhn:** We've been working with r.c.i. And h.m.i. On the parking and transportation needs. I'd like to talk with you briefly about the process we've been using to evaluate the improvements of the development plan. This -- as part of our analysis we've reviewed a number of studies. Studies were conducted at the planning level detailed findings about the specific needs of the district. As an example, we now know where each of the individual land uses and parking garages are planned for within the district. We also know more details about the planned street system. Both of these allow us to project demand on specific facilities within the district. Secondly, the city's previous studies have assumed a single occupancy rate of 70%. We now know that the predominant office user is o.h.s.u. On their marquam hill campus they've achieved a 30 to 1 s.o.v. With the office estimated to comprise approximately 50% of the project's power trips, this could mean significant decreases in the number of vehicular trips generated by the district. In addition since the city's planning studies have been conducted the tram has been proposed to serve the marquam hill campus and proposed district. These contribute to a transportation rich environment that provides a variety of transportation choices for visitors, employees, and residences residents of the district. These facilities are illustrated in this graphic over here and help to reduce reliance on the automobile. In addition, with the parking cap on the district, the increased f.a.r. Will not result in increased s.o.v. Trip-making to the district. Instead the f.a.r. Will contribute to the abilities to provide improved transportation options, while allowing automobile travel to and within the district. The increased density creates a critical mass, which can increase streetcar ridership, guarantee a level of ridership for tri-met, and will provide a critical mass for opportunities and take advantage of programs like carpool match northwest and create additional opportunities for people to live and work within the district, utilizing the pedestrian infrastructure plan in this part of the development. Finally, with our more detailed information, we've been working collaboratively with p.d.o.t. To identify location-specific transportation improvements needed to accommodate development. These improvements will be phased over time to allow the transportation system to mature. Through this process, we can ensure that the increased f.a.r. Will not negatively impact the surrounding system.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Roz Estime, Estime Group:** Good afternoon, madame mayor and city council members. My name is roz. I'm with a firm with clients throughout the west coast and i'm here to provide testimony as to why it is important to allow a limited number of buildings in the north macadam district to exceed the 250-foot-high cap currently proposed by the north macadam code. I have also submitted a letter to you and mr. Gil kelley on the subject. Based on my experience, the 250-foot cap would compromise the economic viability of biotechnology buildings in the north macadam district. The cap is inappropriate in two ways. First, the infrastructure cost, including the

OCTOBER 9 2002

mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems, typically exceed \$100 per square foot in these buildings. It is crucial that the building owners have the opportunity to aggregate these costs over larger areas to take advantage of the economies of scale in these systems. Second, such buildings have significantly environmental control, vibration sensitivity demands. Engineering solutions to address these challenges create the need for 16-foot-floor heights. [ inaudible ] provide the required flexibility and height of buildings in north macadam to allow the city to be competitive over the long term.

**Katz:** Thank you.

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

**Katz:** Okay. This will be our last three.

**Katz:** Who wants to go first? Go ahead.

\*\*\*\*\*: I will, this way. Ready?

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**John Ringert, Kittleson and Associates:** I'm john rinkard, a principal engineer with kittleson and associates. As judy mentioned in her testimony previously, we've been working with r.c.i. And m.m.i. On the transportation and parking issues for the north macadam development. What i'd like to address are three issues related to the accessibility of the local street system and parking within the district. The first issue is the need to allow parking access along bond street and river parkway.

The current draft of the proposed zoning code restricts access to parking along both bond street and river parkway. The restriction was developed when the streetcar line that was proposed along bond street and river parkway, but there are a number of reasons this doesn't make as much sense on the current plan. The first sense the plan's evolved a bit and now the new alignment for the streetcar is along moody. Secondly under the this restriction, all the parking would be concentrated on the east to west streets, so all the access to all the garages, which are the primary pedestrian accessways to the willamette river. In fact, gaines and gibbs are designated as pedestrianways in the north macadam plan. Final, or thirdly, the width of the district's only four blocks. So you can imagine what's going to happen when you combine entire blocks of access just on these -- you know, this narrow segment to all the parks accessing together. This density of parking will both increase the pedestrian conflicts with vehicles entering and exiting in parking facilities, also create an aesthetically unpleasing environment. Forcing all the parking access to east/west blocks could also result in traffic issues. If you have three or four garage access points all combined within a one-block section, you can imagine the cars maneuvering in and out because you are combining them on these single street faces. By allowing the parking access on bond and river parkway, the parking accesses can be distributed. This will increase the aesthetic appeal of the east/west accessways and also result in improved traffic circulation, because we can distribute those conflicts instead of putting them in one location, which should improve the pedestrian environment. The second issue i'd like to address has to do with loading. This is something that comes up sporadically on projects with larger buildings, and the fact that the city code requires two loading docks, or large loading spaces that effectively become loading docks for little over 50,000 square feet. While loading docks are very important to have for large buildings with a lot of loading needs, they do create some conflicts with -- for pedestrians and bicycles. This occurs when you see -- when you require trucks abe backing in and crossing pedestrian paths and bicycles. In addition, they also require very large curb cuts, which take away from parking. So you end up not being able to have the on-street parking. The final issue i'd like to address is related to the requirement of residential parking being accessory. Per our memo we submitted into the record, this will -- this will result in excess parking being built in the north macadam district. The accessory requirement

OCTOBER 9 2002

was based on the parking regulations for downtown. Downtown's very different in that it has a huge supply of existing residential parking that if allowed to be shared would flood the new -- the new parking -- new parking end of the system. So you can imagine if you opened up in downtown, all the residential parking, but this is a new district. This is brand new. We don't have this huge amount of residential parking if you opened it up to the public.

**Katz:** All right, thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*: That's my last.

**Stuart Emmons, Emmons Architects:** Good afternoon. My name is Stewart Emmons. I'm the principal in the Portland architecture firm and planning firm, Emmons Architects. There's been talk about Vancouver today and I'm going to talk about that in a second. We also have looked at many, many other cities around the country and in Europe and the Far East to find good examples. Today I'd like to share some of our recent experiences and visits by representatives of my firm, R.C.I., and O.H.S.U. To Vancouver, B.C. As Council is aware, the recent redevelopment of both the North Falls Creek and Colbert Harbor areas in central Vancouver are compelling examples of transformation of former important industrial areas to vibrant new central city neighborhoods. Our recent visits and discussions in Vancouver have been very important and influential to the code amendments being proposed by R.C.I. and O.H.S.U. and North Macadam. I'd like to comment on three issues. Building height, tower width, and F.A.R. The height amendment discussed previously is important to incent and accommodate a biotechnology corridor in the city of Portland. In addition Vancouver's recent residential development in selected areas has exceeded 250 feet in height, bringing on better daylight and views to the urban areas. The lesson on height learned from Vancouver is that -- building height, once established, will not change. If we are to consider reviving height under special circumstances, now's the time to do it. On tower width, the North Macadam code currently limits tower width to 125 feet for all buildings within the district. This standard concerns us, because it will lead to the creation of a mono type that does not represent design, diversity and excellence that is consistent with the Council's vision for the district. For example, as currently proposed with blocks allowing a tower of 125 feet in width, each block can locate that tower in a different location, looking east to west you may have a four-block area with a tower on different place on each block, thereby completely blocking the east/west view. We don't believe anyone would want that outcome. I understand this tower width requirement as proposed would be subject to modification only through a design process, however in my view permitting a tower width greater than 125 feet only by modification places an applicant in the position of justifying a deviation rather than pursuing innovation. Instead, I would ask you to consider removing the tower width restriction and craft design guidelines that help shape and scope that tower to maintain the same objective of variable transparency in the district, but allow design innovation and excellence. Finally, F.A.R., I'd like to comment on the 9 to 1 F.A.R. In Vancouver, I know I'm out of time, but increasing the base F.A.R. and providing a wider palette of F.A.R. bonuses will enable the property owners to begin to build this district without having to stretch. I think we're stretching too much with the current base F.A.R. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Homer Williams, Managing Partner, North Macadam Investors:** Homer Williams, managing partner, North Macadam Investors. I'd just like to clarify one thing. It was about what I was quoted as saying about views. You know, cities need to protect view corridors and things for the general public. I think individual buildings. It's probably not the city's job to protect those, but that's just my own feeling. North Macadam is an important part of our future in the making. It should be a great place for people, for business, for education, and invention. North Macadam is not just about

OCTOBER 9 2002

f.a.r., height, tower width, parking. These are essential elements in the mix only because they create the opportunities that we seek in north macadam. With these essential elements, north macadam can provide a beautiful and unique neighborhood that invites people to the river, allows the community to celebrate its proximity to the river, will be a place for people through its park systems, as well as its greenway. If you've ever stood under the ross island bridge you would know the supporting structure of the bridge creates a unique urban frame for an open park and opens many opportunities for creating a great space. If you are a resident of north macadam or a neighbor of north macadam, this redevelopment will bring a wide array of public benefits. There will be active ground floor retail that is other largely absent in this area of the south waterfront. There will be at some date a pedestrian crossing in the ctlh neighborhood and in north macadam, reconnecting the river to ctlh. There will be a silent tram line connecting the waterfront of Portland to its west hills. And not only connecting institutional uses with the science and technology corridor, but connecting large areas of park land and waterfront to the hill. There will be jobs, there'll be housing for both market rate and affordable, as well as daycare facilities. This will be an environmentally responsible development. There will be innovative storm water treatment and we desire rich design with the development guidelines we have proposed, all of these things can be realized. This is a plan that builds on a great and which you say something for everyone. We're really excited to be involved and looking forward to working with everybody.

**Francesconi:** Can I ask two questions? I'll be quick. First, before I ask these questions, I just happened, homer, to be in Washington, d.c. -- not happened, and I was lobbying a minority member of the transportation committee for the congress on the reauthorization. I actually showed him that picture that you have on the cover here as to the -- you know, the transit options, trying to help set the way for -- with others for federal funding. So that's the comment.

\*\*\*\*\*: Perfect.

**Francesconi:** The two questions are -- one of the mistakes I think we made at the beginning of the river district is we didn't provide enough for land for parks. You actually helped us modify that when you didn't have to afterwards to provide more land for parks. In looking at your handout here, which I haven't -- i've been, but not focused on this recently, it looks like there's a lot more park space available here, at least in english bay. My concern is the size of the neighborhood park. Is there anyway to make it bigger?

**Williams:** Well, I think that we do have certain things we're constrained by. One of the things, when you're in vancouver, and you're looking at that, you could go back block after block after block. I mean, in reality here, once you start at moody, you're three blocks and you're at the river. Because of the long, narrow design of the land in north macadam, there are some restrictions, but I think that what the possibilities that we need to be looking at, at ross island bridge, are pretty practice ordinary. And, you know, jay and steve have indicated they want to see something really exciting happen there. As far as creating other spaces, I think it is important that we do it. And so, you know, I don't -- you know, i've watched what's happened with the park that just opened, you know, in -- in the pearl district, and it's fabulous. I mean, nobody expected, you know, 100 kids swimming or, you know, into the soup every day. You know, there's been some -- as one might expect, controversy with it, but it is exciting. And those are the things that do make neighborhoods. So, you know, we're not adverse at working on this at all, but I think we do have to realize that for the amount of investment that's going to go in there, and this is -- it's going to be significant on everybody's part -- that, you know, we're down to less than -- I think it's 60% of the property that we have is now an open space or roads. 60%. So there's a limit at what economically we can do, I think.

OCTOBER 9 2002

**Francesconi:** We appreciate it. I think it was actually the zidells that came up with that urban park under the ross island bridge, but there's a difference between that kind of park and a neighborhood park. We appreciate your willingness to talk about this.

**Williams:** I really think that that should be looked at maybe in a context more of a neighborhood park.

**Francesconi:** Okay. My last question, homer, is -- and you mentioned it on the resources, investing in this. It's very important that we all -- we make this happen for o.h.s.u. And to help get this, but it's also important that o.h.s.u. Helps contribute to this so that we have enough amenities to benefit the property owners to the north and south as well. So i'm just -- is there anything you can say about that issue, the issue of investment that o.h.s.u. Is willing to make in this?

**Williams:** My take open it might be a little bit different. And that is I look at what's going on up on the hill right now, and there's 300 million to \$400 million investment going on. We need to see them building, research buildings, you know, dental schools. I mean, you know, we can -- there's enough tiff on the private side, we can create enough housing and taxable properties down there to deal with the infrastructure. We need them putting their money in the buildings, because that's what they can leverage. They can't leverage tiff, like we can on the private side, but every time they build a building, and you've got more research guys, just like in the baseball team. I mean, these guys bring a lot of people with them. They get big salaries and bring in their own money. To me I would -- I think they need to make those kind of investments down there to make this thing work, but I would rather see their money in a building, because we get more leverage out of it than -- because they don't contribute to the tiff.

**Francesconi:** Under that argument, which may be the right approach, then that would help generate tiff that could be used in other parts of the district?

**Williams:** Well, if they're growing -- it's kind of interesting. If you looked at what happened to harvard today, just in "the new york times," you know, there was a big navarus in europe, they just leased 750,000 feet. This is not uncommon now. These people are starting to migrate to these places. They've never been on the map, ever, because there's no place for them to migrate too. We're going to be on the map. I mean, we've got a very special place down here.

**Katz:** Thank you. Commissioner Sten has a -- i'm going to ask those of you who wanted to testify to be patient with us tomorrow. We will take you first. So karla, anybody that's here that signed up that didn't get to testify first. Commissioner Sten?

**Sten:** This is a question I could get feedback from later, because I know the mayor's got to go, but also to some of the folks in the audience. I'm really interested in getting some more feedback over the next week or two on height. I guess the way I want to frame the question is that, you know, without saying, you know, what the right answer is, there's a compelling case from people who would like the building smaller and their reasoning makes sense, and a gentleman who came who made a if case that for economic reasons we should have 350 feet in some place. I guess when you start to look at that question -- and I think we need to come to an objective answer on what's the right aesthetics versus economics, and there's a lot of valid positions, you quickly see there's no real good compromise that does anybody any good. You sort of solve each problem poorly. I think that -- you know, so you split the difference and nobody wins, because the view's block and you have an uneconomic building. So what I keep coming back to, probably what we don't want from an aesthetic standpoint is a long row of 250-foot buildings, but it's probably clear that economically there needs to be some ability to build bigger buildings for the right kind of tenants. The question is, kind of planning as well, he is there a way to look at this as a district as whole and limit of amount of buildings you can have total, so you know you won't have a blank wall, but have

## OCTOBER 9 2002

room for people to go taller. It seems like the cookie cutter approach on height that you can't win on.

**Williams:** I really think we can work it out with planning, frankly. The thing about it is, you have to remember, when we started down on the river district, the market tells you to a large degree what you're going to build. We're not going to go down and billed a 350-foot condominium tower.

We're just not going to do it. First of all, we would need a different code here. Have to be looking at a much smaller floor plate. You know, those are just the reality of what we'd have to -- as we all know, parking drives these things. So it is -- in planning -- and planning understands this.

I think it's the idea of -- of having some flexibility down there, but i'll tell you we can't create a vibrant neighborhood with people living there if it was massive 350-foot buildings. Just won't work. So we all know that, I think. And it's a question of maybe not getting too prescriptive, but still protecting the neighborhood.

**Katz:** Let me add to that, I want to make sure that that photograph underneath doesn't happen. So we'll need to have a conversation about the footprints so we don't have this massive block along the waterfront, I think is --. We all agree to that.

**Williams:** Yeah, we all agree to that.

**Katz:** I just want to make sure we have the language that would accomplish that. From your testimony there are some pieces that need to be changed to provide some variety. Thank you, everybody. We'll be back at 2:00 to be continued. [ gavel pounding ]

At 5:06 p.m., Council recessed.



OCTOBER 10, 2002

OCTOBER 10, 2002

2:00 PM

**Item 1225 (continuation of 1223 and 1224)**

**Katz:** Do you want to put those boards down? Why are those boards up? I'm not going to allow the same people to speak. You didn't speak as a private citizen? Yes, you can, then. Fine. Good afternoon. The council will come to order. Karla, please call the roll. [ roll call ]

**Katz:** I just want to remind everybody that the city attorney mentioned that she needs either the originals or hard copy of anything that you show us. That includes these boards. In case we have a legal issue, we need to have all the material before us. I also asked karla to call on the people who were here yesterday, and who didn't get a chance to testify, call on them first. When we finish the hearing today, we will bring back planning, gil is here and marie is here, we'll bring back and go over all of the issues. I've got a running tab of them as well, but you -- yours are probably more complete, and then if the council wants to talk about any of those issues or wants more information on any of them, that will be a good time for us to signal to planning to come back with information whether they want simulations on height, or whatever issues there are. Okay? Let's read 1223 and 1224.

**Katz:** Let's continue the hearing.

**Moore:** Come up three at a time.

**Katz:** You all have three minutes, and you know the clock's on the screen, and it rings when your time is up.

**Scott Montgomery, Portland Parks Board:** Thank you. I'm scott montgomery. I'm a member of the Portland parks board and their vice chair, and we're very pleased to be here to provide some testimony to you. We have provided separately a statement that encompasses a little more than i'll address this afternoon. The two items that are of concern that we'll look at, or we'll speak about are the importance of parks for livability and key implementation points. We want north macadam to be a great place for people to live. And work. And not just an average place. So the commitment is sufficient land for public purposes and its configuration and design details will make all the difference in the area. This is why it's so important to have adequate local parks, green streets and plazas. Without them we will not have a great place. And it's absolutely essential that we have a spectrum of parks and parks-related land. The greenway trail will serve a critical but very different function than will the neighborhood parks and plazas. Having that type of -- one type of public resource is no real substitute for the others. This is a fundamental concept of the park's 2020 vision. We believe it's imperative all the elements of the greenway and parks concept depicted in the plan be retained and implemented, including the 100-foot setback. To achieve the goals in the parks 2020 vision and create a great new neighborhood in north macadam, more public spaces should be provided. We believe the recommended plan is light on local parks, plazas and green streets, and we recommend the following. One, that a local green space in some form be added to the south end of the district. Secondly, more green streets should be created to bring the atmosphere of the river into the district. The gibbs area where the tram stop is anticipated, should be developed as a signature plaza, giving this neighborhood a real center and a tangible sense of place, and finally, a north-south street should be made into a tree-lined pedestrian-oriented street that would connect the local parks and plazas. We believe all of these enhancements would support the overall effort of place making in north macadam. The key implementation points that we see are one, that the design coordination plan is really a key implementation tool, and should be adequately funded early in the process to enable development on north macadam to proceed expediently. Second, the greenway trail should support place-making in the district if it's

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

established through a successful private partnership, and is an implementation priority that jump-starts development. In fact, we would suggest that early development of a greenway master plan be completed for review by all of the possible parties. Finally, a successful implementation will depend upon acquisition of much-needed land, and it should be done earlier rather than later to save money. Thank you.

**Madeleine Girardin-Schuback, Portland French School:** Madeleine, 6318 southwest corbett in Portland, 97201. Madam mayor and honorable commissioners of the Portland city council, greetings. I am here on behalf of the Portland french school, located in Johns Landing at 6318 southwest corbett street. We provide a language immersion, elementary education program for children beginning at age 2 1/2, ending at age 11. Our current enrollment is 156 students. We are an elementary school community of 119 families, many of whom have two or three children at the school. The faculty and staff of 30 people in their -- and their families. Most importantly, we are an educational institution that is located at -- adjacent to the north macadam area to the central city.

We are very family -- familiar with many of the planning issues for north macadam, because we have lived there in the same area for the past four years. Even though we are a private nonprofit school, we support the Portland school district, school system by paying a market rate rent for school facilities that was previously unoccupied for 18 years. We also use the neighborhood for school activities after school hours. The new play equipment, the softball field, the soccer field, the basketball courts are busy every night and every weekend. I am here today to encourage the city council to provide important incentives, such as f.a.r. Bonuses for prekindergarten, elementary and secondary educational facilities to the property owners and developers in north macadam. The current plan provides for 10,000 new jobs and 3,000 new units on the last large tract of urban land in Portland. Let's not forget the importance of including a provision for children education in this emerging area. The presence of a pre-kindergarten through 12 educational facility that is located in north macadam will support many important elements in the north macadam plan. It would support a mix that includes family with children, it would support the employees of a large institution, research institution, it would support the area, retail establishment. It does not require a lot of parking, it would support alternate modes of transportation. It would support the requirement for active users at ground level and above ground level, because the space remit for school and the size of a typical classroom are versatile. Enough to be programmed on a smaller development parcel or on the outside edge of a park parking --

**Katz:** Your time is up. Do you want to get to the close? I think we get the idea.

**Girardin-Schuback:** As an educational institution that is well aware of the realities of the current economic climate, we urge the council and city agency who are planning north macadam to provide realistic market-based incentive in the form of f.a.r. Bonuses from pre-k to 12.

**Katz:** Thank you very much.

**Christopher Kopca, Downtown Development Group, Design Commissioner:** Good afternoon. You have two design commissioners here today.

**Katz:** Aren't we lucky?

**Kopca:** I think so.

**Katz:** Before you even start, the question that I asked was, how do we make sure we don't get that?

**Kopca:** We're going to talk about that.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Good.

**Katz:** We may even give you a little more time. Go ahead.

OCTOBER 10, 2002

**Kopca:** Christopher kopca, with downtown development group. On behalf of the entire design commission, i'd like to thank the city council for directing such a comprehensive work effort to be undertaken on this segment of the central city that is largely undeveloped or grossly under utilized and possesses the possibilities of this district. We also too took this matter seriously for the first time that we know of the design commission stepped out of its normal review and evaluate role and elected to exercise our collective ideas and judgments garnered from our own commission experience as to how this district should fit into or expand the overall character of the central city. From design to development, to preservation, to restoration. In some regards we became another interdisciplinary team given our own make-up of landscape architects and interested citizens. After numerous all-day work sessions and significant hours of hands-on drawing and writing and editing, we produced, literally, we produced a document which I believe you have which is a vision statement about this area. It was our sense of vision for the area. Again, these words and pictures and visions were ours. This document was then submitted to the planning director and the planning commission for its consideration. Rather than just wait and jury the work of various private committees and city staff, we elected to put our ideas out early and for others' consideration. Candidly it was a process that was exhilarating, but it was exhausting. We held these sessions in addition to our normal workloads. I think in the -- the last two years have been a phenomenally successful year are for the city in development. We were pleased to see several of our key ideas and concerns reflected in the staff proposal before you. Not the least of which are towers and green fingers and the like. We're also obviously a little disappointed several other points were not picked up on. As i'm sure others who participated in the process had the same experience. We're well aware of the responsibilities and the judging and the balancing that staff had to do in putting together a single proposal. Mike will talk a little more about some of these balances when he speaks. In the end we would like you to know the design commission followed through on its assigned responsibilities throughout the process, holding several rounds of public meetings and making upwards of 50 changes in the final documents that were reviewed and approved. Specific on the design guidelines. So we feel quite good about the work that we did, and comprehensive and responsive. In closing i'd like to talk about one element of the plan and mike will talk about several others. If there's one point of concern we'd like you to bring to your attention, it would be to encourage you to commit and commence with what's called the design coordination plan. We called it the greenway master plan. Call it what you will, in conjunction with your actions on these documents.

**Katz:** Keep talking.

**Kopca:** Even after all of our language and graphic changes, we remain concerned the role of the greenway as a recreational resource integrated within a riparian sort of environment has been relegated to more or less an exception standard. Our sincere hope would be the appropriate places for such urban riparian settings, the opposing bank of the river and even the shoreline within the center of the river as you take over control of ross island, can be identified and conceived up front. The commission believes this greenway should be of regional scale and importance and not just an add joining owner responsibility. Key decisions about the greenway and its continuity should not be left to sole individual property owner submissions, rather it should be done with a broader context in mind.

**Katz:** Let me ask you the question, because in the report it says that this design coordination plan is voluntary. I'm reading that correctly? That concerned me.

**Kopca:** We're asking -- I believe the parks bureau and scott montgomery were asking for the same thing, a design coordination plan to be done in advance of the individual proposals coming through.

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

You've heard some concerns from people that talked about how parts of the greenway could be cordoned off with walls or fences. There was concern about -- we had concern about recreational urban opportunities that could occur on the river, but weren't necessarily authorized as part of the plan. You had to come through on a case-by-case basis. It seems the better opportunity for us is to identify those on the front end and have a master plan, maybe it's not all that a master plan normally is, but a broader vision specifically about those areas that you really would want to preserve as riparian, those that could be urban and actually try to implement those elements that way.

**Katz:** I understand.

**Kopca:** As opposed to waiting for the luck of the draw with the individual property owner.

**Katz:** You'll respond to my issue on that at the appropriate time.

**Francesconi:** That's what we intend to have happen. So we'll have.

**Kopca:** We don't know it will, we think it's a fundamental element of part of this plan.

**Katz:** Let me just say that with the help of the council members, the notion here is that the planning bureau will take the lead in the conceptual -- people will be working together, but planning will take the lead in the designing or thinking through the concept. Parks will take the lead in the actual design, and pdc will take the lead with implementation. But all of those three bureaus in addition to others will be participating in -- at every point. But there will be different people taking the lead.

**Kopca:** Great.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Mike McCulloch, Chair, Design Commission:** I'm mike mcculloch, the chair of the design commission. I'm with water leaf architect which your. I'm an architect. First I'd like to say that the design commission was very excited about the potential to create what is essentially a new district. The concern that we had going in was that goals and guidelines that are already established for the downtown area would be pulled across this area and we'd get more of the same. I think this is a real opportunity to transcend that, and I think you have the goals and guidelines in place and some of the bigger picture issues that have been established in order to transcend that. I wanted to give you some comfort, hopefully, that you have a safety net in the goals and guidelines that have been established thus far. The design commission is very excited and interested in engaging the first of these projects that come through and we'll be reviewing it very, very closely and very intently. We're very excited about the fact that there's so much coordination from originally mike houck saying the design challenge is how to integrate nature with this situation, and all the way to the director kelley saying here's the picture, now we can get on with the coordination. You have a set of bonuses that we supported. We discussed the issue of the greenway bonus being the first bonus to be taken, and the intent was to make sure this greenway design coordination plan would in fact come into effect. You have a very strong first possible project coming down the road with the williams proposal with ohsu, and again, we're very anxious to see that happen. There are four things I want to mention that we were concerned that were to be kept in mind as this gets developed. They start from the biggest picture to the smallest. The biggest picture was to make sure the other sides of the river and ross island and the greenway were included in the design and the design concept. This is the first time we have an opportunity to develop the district in concert with an enormous natural resource like that, and they have to be put in balance. Secondly, the major unified greenway project really takes effect with -- without that overall coordination, this project won't work as well as it could. Third, that there is some kind of major character to the main roadway that goes through there. Here's an opportunity to build a different kind of street and

OCTOBER 10, 2002

define it differently than streets have been defined in the city. And I think lastly, that there is flexibility by the intuitive and review processes that a commission like the design commission can bring to this, because as Mr. Williams stated, these projects should not be visualized and frozen in time where you have a concept in 2002 and you carry that all the way out through 2020 exactly as you originally conceived it. You have to allow for flexibility and evolution. In summary, I'd say the design commission has been very pleased with the process so far. It's been difficult, it's a struggle, but we're very optimistic, and I think that you all should be optimistic that the rules and the safety net is in place to create something great here. Thank you.

**Katz:** Questions of the design commission members?

**Saltzman:** Sure. I was curious what you meant by river parkway being a unique and exceptional street. Give me an idea what you mean.

**McColloch:** What I mean is that I think that will set much of the character for the district. I think it's -- there's very elaborate response to that question, but it ties into the green fingers coming off of the greenway. It ties into creating unique intersections, it ties into screening of parking, which we took quite a bit of time looking at. The setbacks, the differing setbacks from the north-south roads and the east-west roads. I think as much design time ought to be put into the design of that particular roadway as is put into the greenway, because that will establish the character of it.

**Saltzman:** You mentioned we should look at it in a holistic manner, look at the east bank, Ross Island, did you have any further definition about looking -- looking at the -- what -- about what looking at the east bank means? When you're down there the east bank seems far away, and there's nothing but McLoughlin Boulevard and not much going on. Are you talking about bank treatment, restoration-type stuff?

**Kopca:** I was talking more about bank. One of the observations we had is that for those people who are -- had a very strong environmental focus, it was all about this bank. We were trying to explore the possibilities that there is bank on both sides of the river and there's shoreline in the middle of the river, and maybe that left more opportunities to think about a mix. A lot of the changes we made to the guidelines in our final edits were meant to take that approach, which is, it's a very important segment of riverfront, it's a long length, but it's not the only length, and you've got some opportunities within there to meet multiple objectives.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Francesconi:** Talk to us more about the height issue. You were here yesterday, you heard people's concerns. Project us into the future. Talk to us from design as to, is this a good thing for the city as we move forward? Or is this something the citizens in southwest are going to regret?

**Kopca:** We had lunch before this, and our bet was nobody would ask that question. So we were wrong.

**Katz:** You bet nobody was going to ask that?

**Kopca:** I bet. Let me say I bet you wouldn't ask that question. We struggled with height --

**Francesconi:** Do I get to win the bet now?

**Kopca:** You do. I owe you a lunch. We struggled with height a lot. We were concerned about the very issues that were put out yesterday. We were -- one of the points of reference that we had were allowing the west hills to be expressed behind the north macadam district, which is a little different than downtown. The west hills get lost behind downtown. Could you do that by doing towers and trying to have glimpses, or could you have done it by establishing some height limits overall. We chose a mix of both. For some of us, 250 was too tall, I was in that camp. For others of us, 250 was -- they probably could have seen a little more margin to that number. In the end, what we I think as a group found consensus around was that they won't all top out. Some will

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

naturally top out at 200, but comfortably 250 will be the tops. Some people felt with good design could it have been taller, particularly if they were point towers. I think the dilemma for you will be that some of the uses they're talking about getting very tall aren't point tower kind of uses. Institutional uses. Tend not to have small floor plates. They have larger floor plates. It's the residential that have smaller floor plates. So you not only have to think about the -- you have to think about the use of the building and -- along with the character. You have two different kinds of buildings. One has a larger floor plate and one has a smaller one. And how those two integrate are something we tried to come to grips with. I think you'd find from us the division that went on within the group and we tried to find a comfortable resolve.

**Katz:** So let me follow up on that. There was a case made for 350-foot buildings because of the potential need of biosciences, and you're saying that the institutions could use 350, but it wouldn't look the way that we would envision one of those towers.

**Kopca:** For what we saw and talked about. And I don't know that anybody presented those visions. Those buildings tend to be -- I don't call them bulky, because they can still be slender, but not as slender as point towers. When people started to talking about a 300-foot building in terms of being a positive addition, they talked about them as being a more slender building. But i'm not sure with the institutional uses that you'll get the more slender building. You may get the wider building, so we tried to find that comfortable resolve where we knew we weren't putting this side as housing, this side as institution this, side as commercial. Obviously we aren't doing that kind of zoning. You had to come up with a set of guideline that's would work for all uses and places. You just have to find a comfort level to work within those varying conditions.

**Katz:** Did you want to respond to that?

**McColloch:** I think that we've talked a lot about trying to elicit signature buildings in the city, and I think this could potentially be a signature district. Further, I think a few of these buildings could be signature buildings that we should challenge ohsu and the developers to do better design, to not necessarily take the footprint that they have to have in other places, or the height or the bulk, and give them some flexibility. I think a few taller buildings, if they're very carefully juxtaposed with one another, could help provide that signature, and also meet the needs of the tenants within them. So I look forward to that as the signature challenge. As a designer, I think everything can be solved by design. But I think it can.

**Katz:** I don't think that's going to be a problem. They will be identified as signature sites if they aren't today, on our list, they will be tomorrow. Because I still don't know where the council will fall on this. I don't want to presume anything, but if the council adopts the north macadam plan, they will be on the signature list, and then we can talk about it from there.

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

**Katz:** Okay.

**Lynn Connor:** Good afternoon, i'm lynn conner, I live at 2211 southwest first avenue in the american plaza condominiums. I'm on the board, however today i'm here providing my own personal comments on the north macadam plan, the good, the bad, and the ugly. The good is -- there's a 100-way greenway, ecoroofs, affordable housing, a science and technology corridor, the step-down of building heights to the river, many other good items in this vision. The bad -- under the plan it is possible with the use of transferred f.a.r. And bonuses 250-foot buildings could be constructed just 150 feet from the top of the riverbank. And this gives you a step-down of 250 feet to 75 feet in the building, from that wall to this wall. So the step-down doesn't -- I question -- my question becomes, hue does this meet the intent of 33510 205 for step-down? Further, the plan provides a number of examples for several examples of research buildings in other cities in the

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

recommended plan drawings. They look good. However, they are nowhere near the 250-foot maximum north macadam building height. The university of massachusetts medical center pictured on page c-5 of the plan is 171 feet, two inches tall, including the machine room on top. It's also 300,000 square feet. The northwestern university's medical research center pictured on plan page c-6, currently is in construction in downtown chicago and some of the highest priced land in the country, it's only 12 stories tall. Further, if you look at the biotech center near mit and cambridge, the tallest building there is 15 stories tall. Along the charles river. The ugly. I guess the future to me could be the ugly. A traffic nightmare. You're taking a narrow stretch of land bounded by the willamette river east to the i-5 corridor. Why propose the highest -- the city's highest density be located in one of the narrowest strips of land? This seems to be a guaranteed bottleneck to me. In addition, have you this potential for a 250-foot-high canyon wall near the river. Portland has already claimed part of its waterfront. Will our children and grandchildren be doing the same? The plan is good. It has a vision. But a vision also needs to deal with the physical realities of the site. The current plan seems to me at this stage to be a vision in search of a site. The two to four-block north macadam site needs to have vision meet reality. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Go ahead and start.

**Travis Williams, Willamette Riverkeepers:** My name is travis williams, I represent local nonprofit group called willamette riverkeepers. Our charge is to work for improved water quality and habitat along the willamette river, we're located on southeast spokane street. I just want to make a couple of larger schemed points here with this whole process. If you go on the river today where the property, one of the properties is currently being altered, you'll see a hardened bank that in many ways biologically is nothing more than a moonscape. Not a lot going on there. If you travel from there 14 miles down to the confluence with the columbia river, you're hard-pressed to find what we might call natural areas. I appreciate the fact that paul fishman yesterday put a couple slides up that indicated natural areas are few and far between. I think that point is very important, and I know you guys are aware of it, but I want to underscore the fact that gets to the opportunity with north macadam. If we want to put this in a historic context, what will people think 50, 100 years from now when this great new district is vibrant if we end up with an area that has really little in the way of biological benefit for the river, has very little in the way of a true greenway? I think that we really need to, with this plan, need to make a provision for riparian riverbank restoration throughout the 1.2-mile extent of the area. We can look at other opportunities that were just mentioned across the river, on the east side. I think some of these are a little more problematic. I think we have a golden opportunity to get in -- get our handing dirty and really provide for some meaningful restoration that folks will truly recognize as restoration. That doesn't mean we can't have public access and -- into this design in some way, shape, or form, but I think it's a real opportunity that we can't miss. The other thing is, I feel strongly that the greenway along this breads of the river has to be a greenway. I don't think it's something that can be negotiated away, can be something that we deal with as a formality, and I know that's not what you intend. I think that 100 feet should be a minimum, and within that 100 feet of greenway, there shouldn't be any development. Let's let the river have that combination of greenway and restored riverbank to truly help restore some biological function. I think it's also important to underscore that in the last year, year and a half, two years, we've found that this section of the willamette river actually has more in the way of -- even areas like this isolated do have meaningful -- meaning for restoration. I know my time is up and I want to thank you for the opportunity to share those thoughts. We look forward to continuing with this process.

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

**Katz:** Thank you. Go ahead. You go.

**Jim Labbe:** Okay. My name is jim, I live at 4805 north warwick. I'm here representing myself. I'm a recent graduate student from Portland state university. A native Portlander with 15 years of experience working in environmental consulting and planning throughout Oregon. I'm here primarily because i'm very concerned about the possible departure from the existing 100 to 150-foot greenway on north macadam. I think a point has been made that if you look at the existing densities in the central business district in relation to the width of the waterfront park and the proposed densities in north macadam, we should really be talking about a wider greenway. I think that comparison is particularly relevant, considering the types of businesses and development work we hope to attract in north macadam. I'm sure you're aware of joseph courtwright's research in the region, and the importance he's put on the quality of life and access to nature to retaining and attracting workers in a knowledge-based economy. I can't imagine another development site in the region where his recommendations to decision makers should be more heeded than north macadam. I think north macadam is really key to integrating the natural environment and providing access to nature, and fostering a more compact form -- urban form in the city of Portland and the region, and the greenway is critical to that. So I really hope you will hold firm on that front. I'd like to make one other comment in reference to paul fishman's comments yesterday regarding the greenway. Paul's a friend of mine, and he's a former mentor, but I strongly disagree with his assertion that there's no documented evidence that the 45-foot zone inclusive of subarea 2 is not going to provide ecological value to the greenway. I could think of several articles in the literature that would indicate that -- that would support an ecological design that would improve the subarea 2 for its wildlife values, given it's proximity to the river size of the willamette. I think would it also, given the proposed dentist of adjacent properties, it's going to be critical to enhancing and buffering the microclimate habitat that are being considered hopefully. I would be happy to submit literature to the city staff if they're interested. So thank you very much for listening to me today. I appreciate it. One more thing. Ron asked me -- ran from audubon asked me to tell you that up to a thousand postcards have been submitted in support of the greenway, and he wasn't here to tell you. Thanks.

**Katz:** Thank him very much. Tell him we usually respond to every single piece of mail we get. We're not sure we'll get to that in our benchmark of 48 hours. Thank you.

**Steve Karolyi, AIA Urban Design Committee:** Good afternoon. My name is steve, i'm here representing the aia urban design committee. The committee strongly supports the creation of a high density mixed use urban neighborhood on the bank of the willamette river on this underutilized land. We believe the plan compliments downtown central business district by providing housing closer to employment, reduces reliance on the automobile, helps preserve our region's valuable farm and forest land. However, we are concerned about several elements of the plan. While the committee strongly supports public access along the entire length of the riverfront, and we also support the placement of parks and open space along the waterfront, we believe that this plan does not adequately address a major problem inherent -- inherent in trying to develop a vibrant urban neighborhood on the waterfront. Let me try to explain that. In her work, the death and life of great american cities, jane jacobs makes the following observation -- massive single uses in cities have a quality in common with each other. They form borders and borders in cities usually make destructive neighbors. We need not to look for to find an example of this. If you examine the businesses and buildings between hawthorne and burnside bridges, I think that area will reveal or that examination will reveal an area in a state of urban decay. Some might argue this is due to traffic values on front, but if this were the case, west burnside would be suffering a similar



OCTOBER 10, 2002

fate. This is not the case on burnside. Especially near the brewery blocks where a massive single use is being replaced by mixed use. The force that's help destroy the vitality on southwest front are the single use waterfront park and the river itself. The north macadam plan with its generous greenway risks creating a similarly destructive border between the river and the district, therefore the committee strongly feels that within the north macadam district and within a city there should be areas where the urban fabric boldly meets the waterfront without intervening landscape zones, transition areas, or riparian habitat. This treatment need not occur everywhere, but in the interests of urban vitality and public safety, it should occur, especially near areas that emphasize retail and hope to attract people. This contrast between urban and natural landscape also creates a memorable experience. The majority of the committee expressed concerns about transportation, and I won't get into that since I think that's been covered. We are concerned about the character of the architecture, while the vancouver bc-style point tower concept is attractive, there is some question about whether this type of building is viable or even possible in Portland. The building codes adopted in the cities of Portland and vancouver are not the same, nor are the economic or social climates. Remember that vancouver has enjoyed a significant influx of capital migration within the period concurrent with this type of development, since much of this plan revolves around the point tower concept, we urge the city to retain a consultant team if it has not already done so, to study the feasibility of this building type with consideration given not only to zoning, but to our building code and the economic climate in this city. Without changes to our building code, the committee is afraid the point towers envisioned by this plan may mayor of into slab towers. If this occurs, and given the east-west building orientation advocated by the plan, the east-west streets are likely to suffer from a lack of solar access, this would have significant impact on the retail emphasis proposed for bancroft to gibson. Another concept that we think should deserve study is the parking idea. We acknowledge subterranean parking this close to the river is unlikely and we support wrapping parking structures with active uses. However, are the proposed blocks large enough to accommodate this worthy concept without being too large to jeopardize pedestrian comfort. We think this should be verified independently before adopting these plans. In summary there are many good ideas contained in these documents. There are also elements we think require reexamination. Let us be certain if the good ideas are realized or can be realized we encourage the council not to rush into adopting this plan without full consideration and a thorough analysis of its implication.

**Francesconi:** Did your committee adopt this report?

**Karolyi:** Adopt it?

**Francesconi:** Are you speaking on behalf of the committee?

**Karolyi:** I'm speaking on behalf of the committee. The plan, the -- was presented to us a year ago. I asked the committee to forward their comments to me and also refer to them -- refer them to the revised --

**Francesconi:** If i'm understanding your testimony right in this written argument, you could be making the argument that if jane kay cobs were here, she would be opposed to waterfront park, because it creates a dead zone to the right of front avenue. And it could also be interpreted from your testimony that she would not be in favor of a greenway along the river. Do you mean to say that?

**Karolyi:** I think she would find problems with waterfront park vis-a-vis the vitality of the buildings and businesses on southwest front.

**Francesconi:** Well, we agree obviously that there needs to be housing, more active uses along front to activate the park. But that's not what this says.

OCTOBER 10, 2002

**Karolyi:** What this says is that we believe that because of concerns about not only vitality, but of safety, that there should be a more urban response or development along the waterfront.

**Saltzman:** I wanted to follow up on that point. That's a very -- you're making a very bold statement given sort of the mantra we're all hearing about 100 feet, 150 feet. So i'm glad to hear -- I wanted to make sure this was the aia speaking, or at least the aia urban design committee. I was curious whether you had any particular suggestions where you want to have -- where the urban fabric should boldly meet the waterfront, or is that a level of detail you just didn't really --

**Karolyi:** That probably is a level we haven't gotten into. But I think the design of that waterfront needs to take into account the existing -- whether there are tractions or context, but I can say that the majority of the aia urban design committee feels there should be an opportunity where there is building or some other use than recreation in the -- next to the river.

**Saltzman:** I guess the other point you bring up in your statement, which i've heard elsewhere too, and I think we need to get some feedback from our people, is about can these point towers really be built, given our building code and fire codes? I've heard they can't. So I guess I want to have some -- I hate to think we'd have to try to change those codes, given the enormous headaches associated with that, but if we're thinking -- if we're envisioning something that can't be built under our codes, we should know that. I appreciate you flagging that point and hopefully we'll get some response on that from our staff.

**Katz:** What you really are describing, a diversity along the greenway as opposed to just a band of --

**Karolyi:** Diversity.

**Katz:** Whether it's what travis was talking about in terms of the bank itself, or some commercial uses, or some recreational uses. Is that what you were referencing?

**Karolyi:** Diversity in use, yes. Including commercial.

**Francesconi:** That's not what this letter says. As a future, just for an aside, parks and I would like to come to your committee.

**Katz:** I wasn't finished.

**Francesconi:** I'm sorry, mayor.

**Katz:** In your sense that the waterfront park, because of its width, has kept the edge on front avenue dead --

**Karolyi:** It's a combination of the park, the river, and the nature of front avenue.

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

**Katz:** I don't know if you were here, I think you were out of the room when we asked that we're going to need to have those hard copies or copies of those copies for our legal records. Jerry, we're going to need these or hard copies for our legal records.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I gave you copies yesterday of everything --

**Katz:** Just make sure the city attorney, who is right next to you, has it. Okay. Go ahead.

**David Redlich, Homestead Neighborhood Association:** Good afternoon. My name is david, i'm president of the homestead neighborhood association. I live on southwest condor avenue. I'm here today to speak on behalf of positions put forth by the ctilh neighborhood association. We're fully in support of the positions they put forward. We have some specific concerns of our own that relate in particular to the view sheds from the terwilliger parkway and the building heights that are being proposed that will block those viewsheds. Though extensive damage is going to be inflicted upon the parkway because of the traffic growth that this council has allowed under the marquam hill plan, we'd like to save some elements of the unique qualities of the parkway for future generations. We would also like to. On the subject of building heights we suggest, much lower building

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

heights that are being proposed, we strongly oppose the concept of these tall needle buildings, and we would like to see even with much lower building heights, view corridors to be established that align along with the viewpoints along the terwilliger parkway. We also fully support a 300-foot greenway as proposed originally by gil kelley. Yesterday he spoke that this city needs to exhibit some boldness on behalf of preserving a legacy for future generations, and I think this is an ideal opportunity to do so. Let's not think small for 100 feet or 75 feet. Let's go and create something that future generations will look back upon this time and say these people had some real vision. We're also deeply concerned about the cost. According to my calculations, just simply adding up the costs that have been published in "the Oregonian," public investment of one variety or another now exceeds or \$250 million. For that amount of money we're not really buying much. Frankly, I can't understand why this property, which is waterfront property in the heart of the city, should need this massive infusion of public money to make it work. In the real estate business, they say it's location, location, location. This is prime location, and I think that we should let market forces develop this property as most -- to its most suitable end. Within the parameters of creating a portion of our city that serves the overall public good. Lastly, I would like to speak to the issue of what planning in our community has become. It's become more and more to be similar to the type of economic top-down planning that the -- we used to see in the old soviet union, where economic plans were imposed upon communities regardless of whether or not they actually benefited those communities. Yesterday the mayor spoke that we should create neighborhoods of the -- we are creating neighborhoods of tomorrow. Unfortunately, to create these neighborhoods we are sacrificing the neighborhoods of today, the parks of today, where Portlanders already live to create nebulous economic development in areas where currently only racoons and rats live.

**Katz:** Thank you.

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

**Katz:** Let me just correct you, it's not 250 million, and I work very closely with gil kelley, he never mentioned 300 feet.

**Redlich:** He did at the planning commission hearing many, many months ago.

**Katz:** Okay. Thank you.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** It's my turn now?

**Katz:** Yes.

**Pat Lawrence:** I am pat lawrence. I am a citizen in southwest Portland, and I also work downtown. I located my office here because I felt that I believed in this city, and i'd like to see you reexamine the part of this plan that pertains to north of macadam bridge. The first thing that bothers me about this, and i'm speaking on three separate issues, the first one is the way this amendment came about when the public heard about this at least in our neighborhood, it was in august. This is the amendment, and i'm questions whether or not that is legal to put this amendment in when you've been looking at this plan for over two or three or four years. The second thing i'd like to bring up is, what is the real height of these buildings? We have seen different heights here, and one of them is a bird's eye view, and maybe the real view is the perspective that you see over there. And if you're talking about making the greenway 40 feet and not a large amount like 100 feet, you're going to see those little stick people, and when I go down to walk by the water, that's what i'm going to look like. That little stick dot there next to that huge building. And the third issue pertains to, if you make this building lower, and it's not 200 feet, it's 150 feet, you're only -- you're gaining -- you're losing 81/2 feet around the building. But you're losing, if you make it 200 feet, you're losing 33% sunlight. So you are going to create shadows, and you're going to create a picture if you change all that zoning north of macadam bridge, a

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

picture of buildings like I handed to you. And I don't think you in Portland or us in Portland want to see this kind of construction along the waterfront.

**Francesconi:** Where's your office? Where are you located?

**Lawrence:** Across from o'brien park. I met you. I know you're preserving parks.

**Katz:** I won't say anything. All right. Thank you. Go ahead.

**Rick Saito:** My name is rick saito, I am representing teeny investors who are owners of property in the south end of the district. This is a rare occasion for me where i'm speaking specifically about our property and not about the district. However, my comments have direct relation to the general concerns of the district that were raised yesterday. In the handout we provided, our property is about 3.7 acres on the river just south of the old spaghetti factory restaurant. Our neighbor to the north has a three-story structure, 25 feet from top of bank. Our neighbor one property to the south has a five-story structure, 25 feet from top of bank. I'm not advocating for a much narrower greenway standard by any stretch of the imagination. However, the proposed code does not give the latitude for us to adequately address these conditions in terms of the greenway. We need to be able to seek a lesser minimum setback while at the same time providing the average that is desired to demonstrate that there's a better overall greenway benefit for everybody. When you account for the greenway, right of ways, and building setback that's are proposed in the code, we are left with an irregular shaped area on which we can build. That's approximately 40% of the original area. That's shown in attachment b.

**Katz:** Which is the property you're talking about?

**Saito:** The investment company. You'll see the detail of the property itself.

**Katz:** I'm sorry. All right.

**Saito:** This loss is very onerous, but it's also compounded by several factors. One of which is the fact that there's a restriction on surface parking and we're not arguing for that restriction, but the way it's presented, it restricts surface parking on 60% of the land that's left for us to build on. The creation of an irregular shape that does not lend itself to building orientation is also a result of these things. Our land is approximately 1 1/2 times wider in the north-south direction than it is deep in the east-west direction, which is not conducive to the building orientation in the east-west direction, so that we would need to be able to seek some kind of latitude in that area. Also, the access designation at the end of bancroft street, it looks only marginally feasible in the -- in concept, and that's the plan documents, but if you look at the cross-hatched access that's shown, that's the reality that goes around a regularly formed property lines. That access doesn't necessarily serve the purpose of a green extension. Public access or view corridor. And it exacerbates the problems that we have. These are specific examples, and there are many issues that are common to all the smaller property owners. We need your help in helping staff to try to work out solutions as to how we can develop our property and help contribute to seeing the vision.

**Katz:** Okay. Finish up.

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

**Katz:** Your time was up. I meant, finish your thought.

**Saito:** All right. We also need your help in addressing the issues of financial feasibility and we encourage to you do that as part of the plan consideration as opposed to in sequence after that consideration.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**John Carroll:** Good afternoon. Just a few thoughts regarding -- my name is john carroll, i'm here today to testify in favor of the north macadam plan. As it exists. The plan is a good one in its -- and it's provocative, as evidenced by the amount of testimony you have and that you will have

OCTOBER 10, 2002

about heights and setbacks. It suggests that people are going to look very closely at everything that's built down there. I think Chris had previously addressed one very important factor that -- from time to time in my experience gets lost. That is the marketplace and the momentum of the marketplace. I don't think you're going to find building permits for 28 buildings, 250 feet tall come in in the next six or eight months if the plan moves through. I see it being built out pursuant to the demands of the marketplace, certainly OHSU will have an impact on that. But I want to be very clear that it's not a wave that's going to overwhelm people. It is not something that's going to kill that district. In fact, what it is you're looking for that people aren't so smart that aren't smart enough to figure out they're at huge risk in going down there and building buildings, because it is not a slam-dunk. It is going to require a lot of capital, a lot of attention. There was an amendment introduced yesterday on the property north of the Marquam bridge. To a great degree that was introduced by efforts that I participated in because of the north macadam plan that suggested maybe there's another approach to building short, squatty buildings that consume huge square footages. By way of specific example, the building plan of -- that goes to the 200 feet, on an 18,000-foot floor plate, the open space, the park space, the -- that connects directly to the city's investment of riverplace, that would be a reduction from a 40,000-foot floor plate in two buildings that averaged 125 feet tall. Shadow lines on a building against the property line, in that park space, we'd share that previously the shadow line up against the property line is greater than a 200-foot building set back 125 to 150 feet from the property line. So I encourage you to start looking at height differently in taller towers, thinner towers, you find there will be a lot more open space. You find there will be a lot more open air, and I think it's going to be more user friendly. I encourage your support in the plan. Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*: My name is Bob --

**Katz:** Grab the mike.

**Bob Lawrence:** My name is Bob Lawrence, and I live on Southwest First Avenue. I just wanted to address two separate issues, and one was the previous speaker just mentioned the amendment to zoning changes north of the Marquam bridge. I just wanted to say that that came in at the very last moment. I hope that that's not really considered, and it would make a mockery of public review. It came in as an addendum to the plan, as in a letter that came out in -- basically it was first discussed in August. The developer and the Portland Development Commission had a long-time to try to bring in an area outside the original planning area. So I hope if there's anything -- it's to concentrate on the original planning area, not have such a bad precedent to have letter comments at the very end of the process, bring in areas that were not initially considered. My second comment is with regard to the height and the current standard, and I hope that's not changed, and that's 33.510.205, which speaks of the central business plan district. And talks about the maximum building heights are intended to accomplish several purposes for the central city plan. These include protecting the views, a very important issue, and creating a step-down for building heights to the Willamette River. Limiting shadows on public open space, and ensuring building height compatibility. And step-down to the historic district. The plan amendment I had seen had the sentence crossed out that says, create a step-down of building heights to the Willamette River. I think that's a very important central issue to the planning. And I hope that that concept is still retained.

**Francesconi:** Because your testimony, sir, I was hesitating as to whether to ask John Carroll this question, but now I am going to ask it. I personally think we need to get taller in some place, but I'm concerned about the process question here. I'm hearing a lot in the recent days from people at Riverplace and others that they feel cut out of the process. Can you say anything about that? Why was this process chosen as opposed to some other process?

OCTOBER 10, 2002

**Carroll:** I don't think I can technically address the process, but let me very briefly a little bit of history. Which I think will give you an explanation. We looked at the plan that was part and parcel with the pdc's request for a proposal for the parcel on riverplace -- riverplace. It was interesting because my view of it was that it created more of a barrier between the riverplace and the waterfront, and in fact created less open space for the general public. And so I have to share with you my -- I'm predisposed to look to a smaller footprint, to a smaller profile. To the extent the north macadam plan is provocative and as I said, starts talking about getting height and creating more open space and setbacks, I have to appreciate that the footprint as we have it -- as it has -- as it has evolved is about 160 -- about 165 feet back off the riverbank, and it's further from the riverbank than the previous two buildings. So it -- for me it is clear that if you're talking about in the north macadam area, talking about encouraging heights, more open space, more view corridor opportunities, this clearly fits in that conversation. And so again, not wanting to address the technicality of the process, I personally have a concern that you go ahead and you will build to the code, and you'll have a bad building, and you'll have -- not have a particularly good environment. I think there's an opportunity to do a better job, and that's what is it we've advanced here in our effort. So I don't disagree with the gentleman over the technicalities. I'm suggesting that there are a lot of people that were hit in the crosswalk when the signs said walk, and they were right. But I think you have to be mindful and look down the road a little ways and protect yourself from developing bad product and I think this is an opportunity in the north macadam plan, and then as well north of marquam bridge to do a better job.

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

**Lawrence:** I just think it sets a bad precedent, if there's anything that should be sack row exact, it's when you have a planning area you stay within the planning area and it's a bad press kent to let letters come in at the end of the process as to further it to go into an area that has not been involved with the public. It's one of the state goals to have public involvement. You can't have public involvement if meaningful public involvement if within a month or two you have allowed someone to change the area. And it would be a terrible precedent to set.

**Katz:** I think there -- we're actually trying to make it better rather than worse. Because I saw the original, and none of you -- none of the residents around the area wanted the original either. Everybody was opposed to the original notion of the building, and when I saw it, I said, this is not going to be good. So they were involved in problem-solving.

**Lawrence:** They have claimed that this area is next to the -- is a part of the planning, but the marquam bridge, that whole area, very much separates those areas. And I don't think anyone -- no one knew about the height changes until really august. And that --

**Katz:** That's on my list to get back for further discussion with the planning bureau. And with pdc. Mr. Ward?

**Ward:** I'm speaking as a private citizen. I'm Jerry Ward, I own four pieces of property in the Johns Landing and Corbett neighborhoods directly affected by this issue. I'd like to direct you to the top board there, and I didn't get a chance to review that yesterday, but as a private citizen I want to point out the Terwilliger Boulevard photo in the bottom left corner. That's at Campus Drive, that's actually lower than Campus Drive, about 200 -- 250 feet. Elevation. So that depiction is correct. It would block Mt. Hood views, river views, Ross Island views, et cetera. The other photo that is not in your pack is the photo right in the little glossy photo. That's good -- close to what we were talking about in the -- in this issue. The plaza we measured is about 100 feet wide. So there's a little human being in that footee, you can see what that feeling might be like. A closer look would be appropriate. The second issue, there's been several developers and architects that are

OCTOBER 10, 2002

advocating low-rise buildings. If they are -- they're proposing there will be low-rise buildings. There was six acres a lady was talking about yesterday. John carroll just mentioned that, and homer williams yesterday said he's not planning on doing anything -- the 250-foot buildings. If that's true, why are we planning for those? Why don't we reduce the height and maybe 25 years from now we can maybe -- we might increase the height of that. But I probably would be opposed of it in 25 years. Mayor, you said I don't want to see the wall of buildings in that photo. And I want to say to you that there are no really -- I don't say no, there aren't enough provisions to ensure that won't happen. It's not like vancouver bc. People don't tell you in vancouver bc there's trading rights. Not every blocking go those high. They're trading rights. This is not what is in north macadam. I can go on and on. I made my point, I think.

**Katz:** You're right. That's an issue that is on the list for discussion.

**Ward:** The next issue, the point tower slender thing. We've -- several people have talked about it. I want you to know that the fox tower is only 125 feet wide east to west. The fox tower would fit in the envelope of north macadam. Almost every building in downtown Portland fits in the envelope of north macadam's guidelines as they presently are drawn. That's scary. That goes back to the issue right before, there aren't -- there aren't insurances that it would get what you see in that top photo. That's what we need to work on. And it's a strong point. Last one. The citizens -- commissioner Francesconi said this -- citizens of southwest are going to regret this height. Or he asked a question, in the southwest, he asked the question for the people in the southwest. This is more than a southwest issue, because this, like I think someone said affects river district, rose garden, central east side, terminal 1. There's so much waterfront property in the urban area here, that will be using north macadam as its measurement of what we can do on the river. I want you to go back to vancouver bc. There's a signature building in downtown vancouver, one of them is erickson's city hall building. Signature buildings do not mean height necessarily.

**Katz:** I didn't say they did.

**Ward:** I'm just helping you out.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Sten:** Do you have any response to the idea I was trying to get some more feedback on yesterday, not knowing how to do it, I think if you -- you are calling for 150 feet, if you go for all the f.a.r. Et cetera, you can get to 250, a lot of times politicians are looking for ways to split the difference. That doesn't make any sense, because it's still too tall for you and not tall enough for the economy. If there was some way to allow some taller buildings but look to giving the market reality, make sure there's not as many of them, is there any kind of approach to that that -- because I think you could potentially come up with the landscape that it's certainly going to block some views, but wouldn't have all the problems you fear without having no tall buildings. Have you guys looked at any of those scenarios, and is there an interest in exploring that kind of thinking?

**Ward:** Exploring how you can go beyond what we are requesting 150 feet? We haven't --

**Sten:** The idea of having 150 feet isn't super exciting either.

**Ward:** Again, I would apply the same thing. As an architect, if -- our neighborhoods are 35-foot-height limits. Do you see just absolutely 35-foot-high buildings? No. If your height limit is 150, just like six acres on the south by the spaghetti factory --

**Sten:** I understand that. I'm asking if you're interested in more -- in anything more varied -- you're saying no. It's a long no.

**Ward:** It's a long no. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** Thank you, gentlemen.

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

**Martin Slapikas:** My name is marty, I reside at 5211 southwest viewpoint terrace. I'm here to testify on behalf of myself and my family. Basically in relationship to what happened yesterday at the hearing. My wife was unable to be here, and so she watched this on television. As we went to dinner at the old spaghetti factory, we had a discussion as to what kind of vision we would like to see down there. During the morning in preparation for this hearing, I had to go downtown, and I was next to the fox tower, jerry ward certainly made everybody in our neighborhood, myself, aware of how high that building is. I tried to place myself to 100 to 200 feet away, basically standing across the street at the art media building. I looked up and up, and frankly, I don't think that kind of a building in even 200 feet on a greenway is suitable for greenway architecture. At the old spaghetti factory, we took a look at the architecture, and frankly, we prefer the architecture and the size of the spaghetti factory. Better than we do that large building down there. Some other issues, obviously the reports i've submitted and have studied have indicated pollution and traffic are increased with smaller and smaller greenways. That's brought forth in a report, the wider the greenway the less the traffic. One of the questions i've got, what's the responsibility of the city should an earthquake hit and the city is endorsing development in an earthquake area? I spent many years in alaska, and we got hit with earthquakes on a pretty regular basis to the point where in some areas in earthquake park, a historic monument now, people wanted to move back into it. And there was no notification to, let's say, any -- if you folks moved up there, you would not know you were moving into an earthquake area unless you really researched the air. I'm wondering if there's a responsibility of the city to make sure that people know when they move into such an area, that they are building and they're moving into an earthquake area or an area of some similar danger. The last thing we talked about last night was, if this is such somebody said provocative development, would it be worthwhile, wise, to have this up for public vote? A lot of the issues in this development are in fact going to be I think setting precedent for the rest of the city. I don't know. That's all I have to say. Thanks.

**Katz:** Thanks. Go ahead.

**Larry Beck:** Last and probably least, larry beck, I live on southwest corbett and gibbs. I don't have any written testimony today, so there's less for you to read, i'm sure you're happy about that. I want to thank our neighborhood folks, the ctlh folks who have come in and advocated the neighborhood position yesterday. I couldn't be here for all the testimony. I know the greenway has been very important to the neighborhood. I love this string of green we have along the river. It works real well for our city. I'd like to see that extended. I know the property owners aren't keen about that, and I think if we're going to have 100-foot greenway there needs to be something in place so they're not stuck with all the development and all the maintenance for it, but our city is going to benefit from that over the next 50, 100 years. So a very positive thing. Building height and where those buildings will be placed, I think the mass of the buildings I hear being proposed is scary for me. I'm not sure why we need to have another downtown in the north macadam area, when we have this downtown area here. I think the scale is out of whack. Commissioner Sten brought the point up yesterday, this is the good type of dialogue we need. What are we going to do when we've got the balance of we don't want too tall buildings can but we need to make it economically viable for the property owners. Maybe they can be located so the impact on views can be minimized. I hope there's more work done there. And I guess that relates to views and the view corridor as I hope we continue to protect the east-west street view corridors. I know some of the streets in the northern part of the district are lined perpendicular to the river, so some views may be lost for people who live in the homes above me in the really nice neighborhoods in the west hills, but hopefully we can still protect those as well. Marty's talked about transportation quite a



OCTOBER 10, 2002

bit. I think that's going to be the thing that will impact us the most with the massive development that we're looking at down there when our roads can't handle it. We've got to make sure there's going to be the transportation fixes that Marty talked about, because otherwise we're going to have huge credit lock, and that's going to hamper development. A few cautions. One thing I worry about, this area didn't take off in the 1990s. Our biggest boom since World War II, and now we're in the slump of the oughts, where is the money going to come from to pay for this? Is this really going to take off? I don't want to see us put all of our eggs in that basket at the conclusion of other things the city may be doing. And that goes into whose going -- who's going to pay for it? The infrastructure costs are incredible, and I hope the landowners and developers who stand to bottle shoulder a huge portions of that and not the citizens who probably don't have the bucks to pay for it anyway. Something I've been noticing, it sort of relates to this and the Marquam Hill plan, and North Macadam plan, the dialogue with a person we're going to elect to sit over here is the business climate in this city. A lot of people seem to think we have an antibusiness city, and I think there's anything but that. It seems like business and development interests have taken -- they have a greater strength in this city than people with --

**Katz:** Could you say that -- repeat that again?

**Beck:** It's -- is it going to be on the tape later? I think they have pretty good power and control. I think the Marquam Hill plan and certain elements of this plan certainly bear that out. I think that leads to balance. We've got to have the balance between the business and the citizens, and protecting our neighborhoods, so I guess I'll close with two final points. Ctlh neighborhood, North Macadam is included in that. Remember, that's our -- a very strong inner city neighborhood and it's our oldest suburb from the 1860s. So let's not damage that neighborhood or ruin an old neighborhood as we build this new neighborhood. You probably want me to talk about the tram.

**Katz:** Your time -- [ laughter ] no, no, no. Between Marty and taking a vote on a planning issue, and --

**Beck:** If you wanted me to repeat things you might want me to repeat something --

**Katz:** No. Thanks.

**Beck:** It's not necessary for connection and it's viability is up in the air, so look for other connections as well.

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

**Saltzman:** Question for both of you. On this whole access issue, what about the notion of access from I-5 to North Macadam? Is that something that's ever been looked at that you're aware of?

**Slapikas:** I-5 -- from I-5 to North Macadam?

**Saltzman:** Yeah. I'm not sure where, but the whole idea --

**Slapikas:** That's an issue -- we've got one off-ramp that goes on to Macadam, and in the middle of that area, no matter what kind of proposals are being made in studies I've read, they're saying that's going to be -- if you come out of heading west out of North Macadam into Macadam Boulevard, that area is going to be level of service F no matter what is done. That's one of the reasons I'm so adamant if you will, about getting some publicity or some discussion on the South Portland transportation alliance. That was one of the issues that we tried to address, but we don't have all that knowledge and experience. We know that there's an issue here. One of the proposals was to make Macadam two-way heading south in addition to having north. But that would seem to cut off an off-ramp on I-5. So one of the proposals that I thought about with just -- was to get access to I-5 further -- farther south, even before we get into Ctlh. That issue just points out the fact that if that isn't solved, something like that isn't solved, I think it's going to be a major traffic increase along

OCTOBER 10, 2002

macadam. Both from the north and the south. So I -- that's a round about way of saying I don't know.

**Saltzman:** Any thoughts, Larry?

**Beck:** I think Marty would understand the I-5 connections better than I would. I was thinking he might have mentioned South Portland circulation study. It's connections with the Ross Island bridge, certainly the Ross Island bridge, a key component of this area, if there could be an easier way to get people in and out and not have them drive through the existing Ctlh neighborhood, that's going to help us free up some land for some of the housing, or some additional housing that people could live in there. That's going to be a good thing for us, I think.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right. Come on up. You've heard a lot of testimony. I've got three pages of notes. Probably match yours. There's some very obvious themes that I'm sure I don't need to repeat and take everybody's time. So let's go through maybe we ought to start with the very obvious themes that we heard, and concerns, and then go through each one of them one at a time. And then this is the time for the council to identify things that you would like for the planning bureau to think about, or amendments that you would want to consider, or any of the amendments that were brought to us by either the bureaus or individual citizens, or organizations. Okay, Gil, and Marie.

**Kelley:** Let me say there are seven or eight I think big ones that we heard about often from more than one speaker. Those have to do with height, F.A.R., the bonus structure, greenway, provisions including landscape standards and width, river parkway, particularly the alignment and the treatment of it as a special street, parking, and loading on the east-west streets was an issue mentioned yesterday. The area for required housing was talked about by two speakers yesterday. The notions of point towers and what that means exactly and what building code changes would be implicated and what that also might mean in terms of potentially higher heights in some areas. The north of Marquam bridge issues, which I think there's been some clarification about we certainly have been working with PDC in the interim since the planning commission to change that proposal, at least make it consistent with the north macadam proposal. It still may pose issues for you. I think there have been changes since the previous hearing there. A funding priorities, which was also a communication sent to you from the planning commission was talked about by some of the speakers. The bonus trigger with regard to affordable housing levels was talked about yesterday.

**Katz:** Bonus triggers, period.

**Kelley:** Bonus triggers in general. Particularly with the 120% versus 150% of median family income as the -- which should be the upper threshold. Those were the major ones. There are lots of other issues. We heard about increased flexibility for small parcels, frankly I think there's a lot of things that have already been done that are in the code that not all the speakers may be aware of. We'll have conversations again with Rick as we've had before and there may be other things that need to be done. For the smallest parcels at the south end.

**Katz:** Let me run some more that we probably -- you mentioned the riverplace, the financial analysis of how do we get from here to there, and the time span. Mr. Houck's amendment on the hundred minimum greenway with no exceptions, and we probably need to talk a little bit about that. You mentioned the height issues. The Zidel property and the river parkway, the parkway moving of the parkway --

**Kelley:** Particularly the question about the alignment of the parkway between Hooker Street and Gibbs Street.

**Katz:** You mentioned the median family income, the bonuses, somebody talked about the precise location of the three-acre park or some guarantee of some precise locations. You talked about in

OCTOBER 10, 2002

the design talks about commercial activity within the 25 feet, and that may be the diversity discussion, I don't know. I'd like to hear that. Of course the traffic, the limit -- how do we limit the number of buildings, and I think that gets to commissioner Sten's how do you limit the buildings to 200 feet without having something none of us want to see.

**Kelley:** I would also add to that the threshold question of whether we need to limit -- clearly we have things in the downtown that have not been used --

**Katz:** As well as building codes issues, which include earthquakes and then the ability of actually doing the towers, the spiral towers. I think we covered everything. So -- go ahead. Just put them on the table and then we can go back.

**Saltzman:** The issue raised yesterday by phil about master plan.

**Kelley:** I think that was particularly aimed at this flexibility for parcels at the south end.

**Saltzman:** And just one other thing that I certainly would like to have addressed more is how is this going to implement innovative and artistically conceived approaches to storm water management? I think we have a history of putting a lot of good verbiage in plans, but when the plans hit reality, these things usually fall by the wayside. So i'd like any discussion, or more discussion on that.

**Katz:** Okay. Anything else that we -- I think we covered everything.

**Francesconi:** One small one that I didn't understand. In the zidel ownership and site, they had some requests about an amendment on ownership and site. Frankly I didn't know what they were talking about. That's a small thing.

**Kelley:** That goes to implementation question of when the greenway implementation requirement is triggered. On a large property with a large frontage.

**Francesconi:** The bigger issue, maybe you touched it, the whole issue of green streets. Was that on your list? I didn't hear that. And that's it.

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

**Kelley:** I think one thing we'd like to do is, because of some of this came in as written testimony, we'd like on the 30th to be able to present you with a listing of all the amendment requests. We've summarized them here, and so I think that because we don't have the sort of extra meeting that we had with marquam hill, for example, where we could come back in a week and have a written cataloging of all the amendment requests, we're summarizing them verbally today. That would be the first thing we'd do in preparation for the 30th, so you'd have that in advance of the -- as well as the public would have that in advance of the 30th. We would proceed to draft language to the extent that code language is being asked for, so that you have in front of you that for a number of these items that we just mentioned. So that the hearing could be informed by a more detail on some of those topics. We'd kind of like to know from you, which of these -- the height issue had many dimensions to it, sort of, how you'd like us to proceed in at least crafting some proposal there.

Because i've heard an interesting both potentially higher buildings in some locations, even than we've proposed if circumstances justify that. But a desire to not see a wall of buildings. By the way, I think many of the pictorial images you've seen are misrepresentation of what we've proposed, so i'd want -- the first instance we'd like to do is come back and clarify exactly what we mean. There are concerns that these highlight, and we'd like to take a second look at our proposal to make sure there aren't some things we can do, but I wouldn't take on surface value that all of those representations are correct.

**Katz:** Fair enough.

**Francesconi:** I don't think we ban to -- want to go higher than 250.

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

**Katz:** Fair enough on that. I think if they don't washing or not, but back to the issue jim just raised, there was a request to allow one, two, three buildings to go higher, 3050 for the institutional purposes, and then we heard things that those don't normally lend to the spirals, as you call them. I'd like to hear a little bit more discussion about that.

**Kelley:** We can do a little bit of that right now.

**Katz:** I think you need to talk about some of the big issues right now.

**Kelley:** All right.

**Katz:** That doesn't mean we're finalizing anything, but I think the council wants --

**Kelley:** With regard to height, when we -- we set a limit of 250 we thought as chris described, sorted after comfort level. On the other hand, we're not assuming that all of those are typically vancouver-style point towers. Those -- the classical point towers really are a very small footprint, where some of these might be in the 15 to 18, even 20,000-foot range for the residential buildings. In the vancouver model, those are really seven or 8,000 square feet, so much narrower. There it does depend on having a different -- increased flexibility with regard to fire exiting requirements, which have an equivalent life safety standard, but are done in not the same formula that we're doing them now. In many cities in the u.s. They're actually going to that standard. So it's an equal fire protection standard, but allows you to wrap the two fire stairwells in a scissor manner or sort after double helix manner which allows you to put them in the center and compress the floor plate and open up more of the exterior walls for living space and views and so forth. So it's a great building form, and in that case I think what you heard from one of the presenters is that you might want to go higher to be able to have a very narrow footprint and then capture some additional view and living space at the same time create more interesting skyline and more open space on the ground. So that might be one reason that you'd want to exceed the 250 some in some places.

**Saltzman:** We can't do that under our --

**Kelley:** We're actually looking into that right now. So there -- you may want to do a conditional approval on that. We think it's probably possible without going through too much. So we can come back and give you a status report on that. The other justification that I heard advanced was for the biomedical facilities that require extraordinary floor-to-floor heights. Six or eight feet more than you'd find typically in office buildings. They chew up that height pretty quickly in terms of the number of floors because of the mechanical needs and so forth. Those would not be point towers, they could still be fairly slender but they'd be broad in the other -- along the lines of what is individual in our proposal. So that's a policy choice for you.

**Francesconi:** Is ohsu advocating for that? I don't see that in their list of amendments.

**Katz:** That was --

**Kelley:** I heard one consultant to them advocate that. We can clarify that with ohsu.

**Katz:** Answer the question that commissioner Sten raises. Which is, I think everybody here would feel very comfortable even with some taller buildings if we were assured that the land escape would be something that -- the landscape would be something that the city and residents here would feel comfortable, even though we are planning for 20 years from now, a lot of things will change.

**Kelley:** Our conscious choice, this was through a discussion with the planning commission and design commission, was not to scope the skyline in advance, but rather to allow things to organically happen over time. Assuming what happens in this district would be like every other part of town, which is, you never use the full f.a.r. In height envelope on every block. But that you would also subject that to the design review process on a block by block basis. And the design guidelines also call for the combination of the design guidelines and the way the f.a.r. And height

OCTOBER 10, 2002

rules work together, you could never fill up the envelope on every block. You just -- you can't do it. You could not use the full height and the full block perimeter until the bulky fashion that was described in some of these photographs, because you can't get there with the available f.a.r. What you're seeing in those pictures is more than 9-1 f.a.r., which is the absolute cap in north macadam. So it doesn't look like that. What we'd like to do is bring back some notions about how it might work.

**Sten:** Let me try a different take on it. It may be this just doesn't work. I think that basically anywhere from 150 on up most of the views are blocked. So if your concern is views, I understand all the arguments, but it's sort of everybody's trying to do a real politic argument of, how can I get it as high or as low as I want, but if you what you care about is views is meaningless, because at a certain point you don't get the view. If the view is blocked -- I don't know where that number is. It probably different than what you can see from terwilliger, but I guess once the view is blocked, i'm not sure it matters if it's blocked a little bit more, but if you could frayed some taller buildings for being sure there was significant places in the district where the view wasn't going to be blocked, as opposed to you could see through that. Maybe -- part of why I can't know for sure is that there's four different versions of what --

**Kelley:** We'll bring you a better diagram. You have a very good point. That actually was embedded in our philosophy. We didn't take it to the extent you might be imagining where we built kind of a trough or two in the district a block wide. What we have done, and by the way, the existing height limits are 250 feet in the district. So we haven't gone up. We've just allowed different ways to access that height. The existing height is 250 feet, and when you put that next to macadam avenue, you're already blocking the views from cthl. What we've tried to do is improve on that by saying, our rules are going to say for taller buildings you can't occupy the full block face oriented north-south, so you can't block the whole view. You need to limit yourself to about 60% of that. And then with certain key east-west streets, where we feel there is a public view, even if it's not a scenic view established in the comp plan, we've said, you've got to step the higher parts of the building back from the street so even if one person wanted to do a tower here and there on the key streets, they both have to step back, so do you have wide option going east to west. That doesn't occur on every street, because then you couldn't have that variation -- but it does happen on the primary streets. So that was the way we tried to get at that. We can look again to see if there's further tweaking we could do, but --

**Sten:** See if there's some further tweaking.

**Kelley:** Okay.

**Katz:** Keep going.

**Kelley:** We also heard issues about height versus -- adjacent to the greenway. We have stepback, but it's a more -- it's probably a steeper ray than you see in the downtown zoning. So we can reexamine that issue, but I think part of the trade-off was to get an average width of the greenway approaching 150 feet by -- partially by incenting taller buildings, set that far back. So we've allowed them to go up to 250 feet. That's different be the drawings you saw, but it's still a tall building next to the greenway. We could examine notching back a little more, but that -- we need to be careful we haven't taken too much away from the development capacity, particularly in the central district. Those are the primary issues we heard on height. The other thing related to height was accessing the height available and the f.a.r. Available through the bonus system. And I think there are two conceptual ways to go. One is to increase not the cap, not the amount available but the amount available in certain bytes. If you provide more park space, you get closer to that cap. So you could increase the height of the step as you approximate that. Or you would open up the

OCTOBER 10, 2002

menu of bonuses, and that's going against what our philosophy, which is to say let's figure out what's really missing and focus on some of those things. So we've tried to limit that to the green spaces, the ecoroof and the housing -- affordable housing to focus on what we desperately need most in the district. So our inclination would be, if you want to allow better access to those bonuses, particularly as an alternative to transferring f.a.r. Between sites, I didn't hear anyone ask for more f.a.r., though I could be wrong about that. It was really theable says to the f.a.r. That's available. I would suggest that you look at the first of those two methods, which is by using shorter menu of bonuses, allowing you to get there more quickly as opposed to widening the menu of bonuses.

**Katz:** I'm okay with that too.

**Saltzman:** I guess I would like to raise the prospect of adding child care facilities in back end to the eligible bonuses. I can't see why an area where we expect to have 3,000 people living and 10,000 people working isn't all critical need down there.

**Kelley:** We also think there's a strong market incentive to provide it anyway, but it may -- you may want to reinforce that with a bonus. What's the value of that bonus versus other things.

**Katz:** Keep going.

**Kelley:** With regard to -- did I skip anything on bonuses or f.a.r.?

**Katz:** Marie, don't let him intimidate you. If there's anything you want -- i'm not afraid, knowing you, i'm not afraid, but just in case. Parsons brinckerhoff quade & douglas what about the percent for art bonus?

**Johnson:** What we really wanted to look at, there's real challenges, and we know that. We saw this district as being interesting in the amount it could be green, we also know we have limited funds right now to purchase parks and provide open spaces, so we looked at focusing bonuses on how we could get the additional open spaces. Affordable housing is going to be a big challenge in this district, and it's something pdc is going to be negotiating for, but it's a difficult issue to grapple with when you have such significant up front costs. So -- and then the ecoroofs, we have that in our menu of bonuses, but we felt like it's such an important element in north macadam, that we want to have this limited palate of bonuses so we don't dilute what we're going to get.

**Katz:** It's called priorities.

**Johnson:** We set our priorities and looked at the things that most reinforced the vision for the district. That's not to say these other provisions aren't important. They are very important. And we expect as ohsu does its development there will be certain art provisions that will be required to provide by law, and we expect that the child care will be provided because we'll have a connection to this big employment market and we'll have a strong housing base in the district, so market forces are likely to provide that. So these are things we think are important --

**Katz:** Ohsu, because it is the state program, has to -- that has to be provided --

**Johnson:** Correct.

**Kelley:** Along the lines of your earlier comment, we'd love to see artistic treatment of the landscape as well. As well as the ecological function. We think we'll be able to get there, I think what our notion was is though the -- because we don't have a huge amount of up front cash here to acquire green space, we really want to incent that first. That will be gone, and you can't add that later. And we want to make sure the district isn't there for just the wealthiest people, but for the broad range of income that's we find in Portland and so the affordable housing part and the child care is consistent with working families. Those are things we want to get from the beginning. So we were frankly deliberately narrowing the range in that regard. Not that the other things aren't all valuable.

OCTOBER 10, 2002

**Sten:** It's all valuable, but I think that's the right approach.

**Katz:** Keep going.

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

**Francesconi:** Art and parks do go together for all ranges of incomes. So i'm not saying -- you're not saying contrary to that.

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

**Francesconi:** So i'm not saying you have to put it back in as a bonus, but I want to make sure there's a way it can happen.

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

**Johnson:** My understanding that it is, that in the design coordination plan process for the greenway, one of the pieces that they'll be looking at is how do we provide a greenway that has artistic elements.

**Francesconi:** That crossed my mind. I wanted to make sure there's resources for it.

**Kelley:** Okay. With regard to the greenway, you heard testimony much like the heights, you heard testimony for increased flexibility to go narrower in places than the proposal would allow. And you also heard testimony to say that it ought to be 100-foot minimum everywhere and allow no commercial or other intrusion into that greenway. We wrestled with this for a long time, and I would remind you that the aspiration for the district is actually to incent more than the minimum, which in our view is -- the code is the minimum, and that's where we have a hundred foot average, which means could you pinch down at 75 feet. We feel the 75 is the minimum to accommodate the multiple function that's we need. You saw my images from vancouver, about the pure circulation of people. We have ecological functions and we have landscape functions as well as the overall sort of scale of development and shadowing effect. So we think the 75-foot is truly the minimum after wrestling with that for quite a while. There was a proposal --

**Katz:** Before you get to that, you think using that as the bonus that we -- we're almost guaranteed to have at least a hundred if not more.

**Kelley:** We will have the -- we will have a hundred on average. And I think even rick at the south end can approach that average. There's a different case for very small parcels. We'll take another look at his, though I think there are things that can be done. For the broad stretch of properties, we see no reason why that -- the proposal couldn't work. And in fact, we would really motivate through the greenway master plan and through the incentives and bonuses that are already embodied in the plan to approach 150 feet on average. That would be accomplished by having some deep pockets as you saw from the zidel presentation near the bridge, but overall we'd want to get to 150 feet. 100 feet was -- with 75 was the minimum pinch point is the code proposal as the minimum. That would be the default standard if a property came in on their own and didn't participate in the greenway master plan.

**Katz:** That would be the regulation.

**Kelley:** We're hoping nobody gets to use that because we'll be out in front of it with this plan, which we want to involve the property owners in that process obviously. But I think -- the one issue is whether you want to compress that minimum width at all.

**Francesconi:** No. No.

**Kelley:** That's an important question for you all. The second question is whether you want to not allow walls, terraces, what were the other features? Any kind of commercial intrusion within the hundred feet.

**Saltzman:** 150 feet, right?

OCTOBER 10, 2002

**Johnson:** Maybe I can clarify this. The way we think about the code provisions, we have sort of bands, and that's really a way of conceptualizing it. So I don't want you to read this as absolute, but the first band, the band in water and up to about 45 feet from top of bank, is the habitat area. When we talk about allowing flexibility in the setback area, we would allow that if we were -- if the person seeking the change was providing some habitat improvements on the bank or in water, or changing the bank in some way, in a way that improves the situation. So there would be some flexibility with that part of -- or the flexibility in the setback in acknowledgment of the improvements they've made above and beyond what the code calls for. Then we have the trail easement that allows for the circulation that Gil has talked about, and then there's an area between the trail and the building, and this is an area that has landscape provisions to ensure we have some -- we limit the impervious surface so we have opportunities for the water to infiltrate, we have planting that's provide habitat for birds, but there's also an -- a provision that allows for places where people want to be out in that area. So there could be some patios next to someone's row house, there could be children's play areas with some amount of paving, and there could be paving for, say, cafes. So there's a place where people can be out and active in the greenway. So we have about a 25-foot area where we're saying these uses make sense, and so this area provides ecological functions and also provides a place for human activity.

**Saltzman:** And that's 100 foot?

**Johnson:** Yes. So the 100-foot setback is the setback from the building wall, there from -- from top of the willamette river bank to the building wall.

**Kelley:** It does vary, because we're talking now about the standards where development about the greenway directly, not where in the case of the north end of the district where there's a small street between the property and the greenway. In those cases we've already given the bonus f.a.r. In heights as of right to those properties, because we've set the road back so we're approximating 150 on average already. So we've given as a right -- this is really south of the Ross Island bridge in our proposal where you'd have this sort of dialogue back and forth. So I think the width is one. We soon get into the river parkway alignment which shifts that flexibility further north.

**Saltzman:** Rather than giving you an answer right now about how I feel about those types of intrusions, intrusion is pejorative, but those types of uses, I guess that gets back to my question about this idea of master plans. Maybe this is the type of flexibility we want to see. And in return for other things.

**Kelley:** The only -- I think we do have master plan proposal in the code that allows for some flexibility, but our interests going into this greenway master plan or design coordination plan is to have some of these parameters fixed so we're not renegotiating the greenway through that process. I think we need to have some parameters going in so the basic notice about what our aspirations should object average and what the minimums are would be helpful to us.

**Katz:** I'm sorry, let me see if I understand. Are you saying through the design of the greenway that we're going to proceed with you can respond to the issue you just described for diversity?

**Kelley:** I think we could respond to the diversity. What I wouldn't want to go into that process being open ended what the minimum and aspired width are on average.

**Sten:** It seems to me it's between 75 and 100 where you can't do the cafes and other things, and I guess did I understand you to say to get that last 25 feet to do something other than what people would think of the greenway, you have to do some extra stuff on habitat? Or do you automatically get that 25 feet?

**Johnson:** The idea is that there's two layers we're looking at along the greenway. One layer is ecological functions and the other layer is human activity. So when you're at the river, you have



OCTOBER 10, 2002

the highest level of ecological function you're trying to satisfy. As you get inland, that need for ecological function diminishes, and as you're close to the river, you have a low level of human activity. And it gets greater as you get farther inland. The provisions that allow flexibility that I was talking about are basically saying that if someone were to go the extra step in terms of providing in-water or bank improvements, which can be kind of a big process, because you have to go through not only our local permitting but federal permitting as well, we should acknowledge there is an increased benefit to ecological function, so they're not expected to provide as much ecological area when they get above top of bank. The activity area closest to the building does have some ecological function. It's just a lot smaller in proportion to the amount of human activity.

Part of what we're trying to get at is having a place for people to be out and about on the greenway that can be provided through the code, and also the idea that you don't necessarily want a building to immediately abut a trail, because you could have problems with safety if you have entrances right on to a trail that's -- that has bicyclists particularly or people on roller blades. So we need an area to transition from the built environment to the trail and to the more intense ecological function, and it also happens to be a good place for us to -- for the people using the buildings so the employee and residents of the district to hang out and enjoy the wonderful place they're at. Does that answer your question?

**Sten:** Kind of. It wasn't a well-framed question. Is it really by right a 25-foot front yard for the building? It's not really a greenway for the citizenry.

**Johnson:** The use would be more related to the building. Depending how that developer chose to use that space, it could be more or less public. It certainly would -- there would be the perception this is part of the expansiveness of the greenway.

**Kelley:** You have to look at the code minimums as one thing, which are really building setbacks. It's assumed that remains in private property with the exception of a public access at the top of it. So we're really talking about a building setback. What our aspiration is and what the planning commission recommended you make a priority was what we referred to, more proactively assume people will take advantage of the incentives we've given, and approach the average width of 150 feet, and that gives us a real design exercise to go through, where I think we can get at the diversity of use that's people want and the generous greenway. So I would say your actions are to establish the code minimum as the default, which we propose would be the 75-foot pinch point, and set the aspiration for the greenway of it being 150 feet on average or even more if we can get there through some other creative means for that exercise.

**Katz:** You have some schematics in the plan book. You might want to bring some additional photographs or schematics to set a comfort level. I'm not uncomfortable with that at all. I think we need to have a little bit of diversity, but I want to make sure we protect as much of the greenway for the natural uses and -- that we've all feel very strongly about, but I also think at the other edge, the edge of the building that's probably something that we ought to have. But I think people need to feel comfortable about that, and before we make a decision as a council, prepare some additional photographs or schematics.

**Kelley:** There are two narrower questions which you've talked about. We don't need to answer today, but one is we do allow credit, reduction of 25 feet on the inland side for a substantial amount of inwater habitat work. So you couldn't come closer than the 75, but your average could be conceivably 75 as well as your minimum if you've done a significant amount of inwater habitat work under the code proposal. The second question has to do with the 25 feet nearest the building and whether you'd want to allow any nonpure greenway uses in that space. So we'll be aware of those two questions when we come back to you.

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

**Saltzman:** Give me an example of a nonpure greenway use?

**Kelley:** Porch stoops for buildings, terraces for cafes, outdoor play areas with -- for child care that are -- that have a wall around them.

**Katz:** Table and chairs. Keep going.

**Kelley:** River parkway.

**Francesconi:** I think it would be helpful if parks -- if zari or Janet was here. Maybe they could brief the council. The goal here is to really get into the design process. To have a wide greenway that would accommodate a variety of uses, but also have voluntary participation of the owners of the property, because we think we can end up with a better product. And I think you should hear the thinking that zari or Janet has, but I think unfortunately both of them have left.

**Katz:** Fair enough. Let's do that. And I didn't understand the voluntary issue, what that -- what the impact of that is if it -- if a property owner doesn't participate.

**Johnson:** I have a process point. This has been an interbureau effort, and at the next session the core group, many of the members have been listening in as the testimony has been presented, and they'll be here at the next session.

**Katz:** You mean public corporate -- did you say corporate?

**Johnson:** Core group.

**Katz:** Public core group --

**Johnson:** The inner bureau team --

**Katz:** That's fair. They work together and we've only really heard from the two of you, which is the one bureau.

**Francesconi:** This might be an appropriate note. I thanked the mayor privately, but I want to thank her publicly for putting parks in the lead on the actual design of the greenway. We're going to do it in a cooperative fashion, but parks appreciates it.

**Kelley:** We think it's appropriate. With regard to river parkway, the primary testimony was about whether the alignment ought to be changed from the planning commission proposal, particularly near the Ross Island bridge between Gibbs Street on the south and approximately Hooker Street on the north. The property owner argued for a different design to have parcels on both sides of river parkway so that some parcel or parcels were on the outboard side, the greenway side directly. Planning commission did consider that alternative, including his drawing and decided that with the exception of one participant, that having a narrow parkway coming out against the greenway made a good urban form and a public parties pa -- but if the planning commission wasn't absolutely sure about that one the section nearest the Ross Island bridge, so they asked us to look at it for a while. We did, they ended up sticking with the original staff recommendation. But you heard testimony about that yesterday.

**Katz:** Do you think in this particular case there may be a compromise? Do you think it's at all doable?

**Kelley:** I think it's possible to look at some refinements there. I think what -- we want to narrow it between that territory between Hooker and Gibbs. There are benefits both ways, clearly. The most compelling argument advanced by the property owner yesterday was that you could allow for a more -- a deeper contiguous green space contiguous to the greenway near the Ross Island bridge. We would not want to see all that green be underneath the bridge. It would need to be broader. That might be a compelling reason to swing the roadway in sooner. As well it would provide some signature development parcels outside, on the riverside of river parkway. But then again you need to be careful of the greenway width, so it plays back to that discussion we had a moment ago.

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

**Sten:** Let me ask a question. This is a big part of the district, and the owner has put a lot of time and effort in trying to get it right, and has been pretty clear they intend to do something really good. I also think unless i'm completely mistaken, it's unlikely to be developed for a very long time. I don't know with very long, but a while. It's not going to be the first parcel that's done. So i'm really hesitant to sort of have what I fear could be a theoretical pretty tough vote on how -- this parcel is crying out for development agreement. Before the council spends hours and hours and hours debating exactly how to move the road, we know where the road is coming in and going out, and I think almost everybody is on agreement on just about everything. Is there a way to basic parameters of the district in place, and set a pretty firm template, and move this into a negotiated process where the council's expectation is that if the proposal is going to be to not meet the basic guidelines, it sure better be great on some other things. It just seems to me it's -- I don't want to leave it so vague that it's a bad negotiation, but it seems a little hypothetical at this point. I have a hard time because I can see some of the benefits on both arguments coming to a firm conclusion, and I just am not sure it's not going to change. Is there a way to give room to figure on you the best solution?

**Kelley:** Our concern would be that we're able to enter the greenway planning process very soon, and with a certain level of certainty. That's the key here. If we leave it wide open it's going to unravel that whole process. So we could do something like that as long as we can define the parameters. I think over the months and last year the interests have become clear on both the public side and the private side. I wouldn't leave out the possibility we might find a little change in the road alignment that would at least serve as a good provisional alignment that --

**Sten:** The alternate for me would be, as I see it, there is a possibility depending on what's agreed to to make either verse better than the other. If it doesn't make sense from your point of view, i'm open to -- I don't know where the whole council is, to leave some room to negotiate, then i'm going to need to know what you consider a good enough give on the park for something else to make the other alignment worthwhile. Did I say that right? Because I want to know what I would get back then if I was going to go to the -- go the property owner's way on the road. I want to be able to give the property owner a clear choice that says, you know, here's what would seem like a fair deal to go your way.

**Francesconi:** I talked to both parks and pdot about this question, and I think the property owner wants flexibility on the park, the greenway, i'm sorry, and the road. And from our prior discussion, I don't think we should give flexibility on the greenway. But on the question of the road, I think there should be some flexibility, and matt's here, and you can correct me, I think pdot thinks so too. So the point -- thinks so too. The point you were making about, I don't think is necessarily true, because we have some certainty enough for the greenway. So I think you could move the road a little bit. But where I was going with commissioner Sten was, it sure would be nice to see the development, to know if it's worth it. I don't know how you do that.

**Kelley:** I think my preference, I will take your advice on the greenway we now have some parameters, and I think that's been --

**Katz:** I think you've heard that.

**Kelley:** It's pretty clear. What we'd like to do then is to explore this notion of perhaps an alternative look that you could consider and then what the points behind that are, and what you'd need to consider if you were to change it in the future.

**Katz:** Okay.

**Kelley:** I think we can come back to you with something.

OCTOBER 10, 2002

**Sten:** We get into these things in different venues a lot. Property owners hear, and it's nice if there's a proposal if the two sides -- that the two sides agree on before the council gets to pick it.

**Kelley:** Got it. We have had some discussions with the property owner, and --

**Saltzman:** Can you have it in 15 minutes? [ laughter ]

**Katz:** I think if there's give on everybody's side with the knowledge that the council feels strongly about, the greenway, I think we can get there.

**Kelley:** I hope that comment is directed behind me as well.

**Katz:** No, no, it was -- it was directed --

**Kelley:** We've offered up some ideas, so we're waiting for a response.

**Katz:** Keep going.

**Kelley:** Okay. There was also an aspiration that you heard from the design commission about really making that a wonderful street. We think the zoning code provisions do address that as a special place. We will be working with pdot going forward, and part of the proposal is to ask for the street plan, the details back, the components back in january. So we'll be reviewing those street --

**Katz:** I want a little hand on that one.

**Kelley:** The street elements proposal, we want to make sure they're working in sync with that. So we'll come back in january with pdot. And then similarly on the parking and loading on the east-west streets, rather than giving you the solution today, we did make some changes, there are probably a few others -- .

**Katz:** On what?

**Kelley:** This is the parking and loading access on the east-west streets and whether that interferes with the pedestrian movement in the sense of the connection with the greenway, we'll take another look at the issues raised there and discuss those with pdot and opdr. I think we'll just look at the nature of the request and see what can be done there. Required housing overlay, there was a change in the staff proposal from earlier drafts which did lower the housing number, the total required housing. It's still a subarea of the entire district that -- for which provision of a minimum amount of housing would be required, and you were heard from a couple of the property owners that they would like that removed.

**Johnson:** And in the current--

**Katz:** Talk a little bit about the discussion at the planning commission and there are options that we can -- how we can respond to that. But I need to understand a bit better, and I don't -- didn't see any from the -- anybody from the planning commission here to help us. Maybe they can come in next time.

**Johnson:** Under the existing zoning code, there is an area from about ross island bridge and then it goes south almost so old spaghetti factory, and i'm going to forget the western boundary, I believe it's bond street and to the river, where there is a required number of residential -- certain number of residential units that are required for a site. And in staff developing our proposal, we increased the number of required units over what's required in the current code, but shrunk the area where those provisions applied. And then testimony came forward in planning commission process, people felt that that was going to basically -- was going to create sort of a subzone within there that didn't allow enough flexibility and really required a higher amount of housing then. -- than some of the testifiers felt was appropriate. In response to the request for flexibility, the provision was change sod the residential units, though the requirements attached to the site, the units could be provided elsewhere within the district, so we looked at how can we make sure we have a certain amount of housing to provide for our transportation system, because if we have more housing our

OCTOBER 10, 2002

transportation system will function better, but allow flexibility in terms of how it gets located. That area is considered to be prime area for residential development, it has views of ross island and views of the river, and it's right next to the streetcar, it's going to -- it can be a very wonderful residential subarea of that district. So I think that's some of the background on how that provision came to be, how it's modified over time, and why it's in there.

**Kelley:** One particular hardship that was posed by Prometheus development was that they -- having only a medium sized parcel as opposed to a very large tract of land, given their market prototype, which is fairly low-rise apartment development type, because of their perception of the rental market --

**Katz:** Which we rejected.

**Kelley:** That's pretty much what they're thinking at the moment, anyway, about doing. Just meeting the required housing would mean they would have to use all of their parcels for housing and wouldn't give them the flexibility to do one in office or retail.

**Francesconi:** There's two housing issues. One of the one we're talking about, the other was the issue of the middle income --

**Kelley:** I want to get to that second.

**Francesconi:** This one ties into the issue of the smaller property owners to the south. And what kind of flexibility you're going to give. I don't know how you -- how you're going to -- i'm not clear what usual going to do on that issue. Are you? I do think they need more flexibility, but --

**Katz:** Why?

**Francesconi:** Without reopening the whole thing.

**Katz:** Why?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I think the --

**Francesconi:** Because they have smaller parcels. I think you said that too.

**Kelley:** The primary issue that was being discussed had to do with the green way and with building orientation and surface parking restrictions. Not so much the housing requirement. This is a distinct issue, though it does affect one of the south end properties. This is a matter of whether the line should be drawn differently or the housing numbers should be higher or lower. Or whether there should be some provision.

**Katz:** What was prometheus issue? They didn't want to build more than five stories because they wanted to keep the wood structure, and -- period.

**Johnson:** I haven't had a chance to review the written testimony, but my understanding from yesterday's testimony was they're arguing there isn't the market currently in Portland to build concrete apartment buildings.

**Katz:** Hello? Okay.

**Kelley:** This is sort of a policy choice. It has to do with having some portion of the district housing -- minimum housing requirement or not.

**Francesconi:** Let's leave it the way it is. That's what I vote for.

**Kelley:** Okay. The other issue had to do with accessing bonuses for affordable housing provision and the planning commission had recommended that the qualifying income level be lowered for accessing the bonus from 150% of median family income to 120%.

**Katz:** If we adopted that, that would change the policy we established.

**Kelley:** Correct. There's one provision, it's not in the north macadam district, it's in the central city code, and so their motion effectively changed the number for the entire central city, and you heard testimony from the Portland business alliance yesterday about the fact that that was a hard fund negotiation in the west end plan and it ought to stay that way, at least for the west end.

OCTOBER 10, 2002

**Katz:** You could either accept it, reject it or keep it in the west earned and change it in the north macadam.

**Kelley:** Those are your choices.

**Sten:** I'm having an open mind if somebody feels strongly enough to contact me, but I don't find the logic of moving it down to 120 compelling at all. It's one of the only things we have to give some bonus to try -- i'm not a supporter of subsidizing middle income housing shall but I support having it. I think taking away some of the few incentives we have to get more of it, which we agree is good for us, seems silly. It's not a tax abatement they're getting, so I think it's a good policy as it is.

**Katz:** Keep it at --

**Katz:** 150. I'm in agreement, and I think we've got a council agreement, but i'm curious to hear the planning commission's --

**Sten:** Right.

**Kelley:** We'll bring forward further articulation of their rationale.

**Sten:** Their logic has escaped me. I'm sure there is some.

**Kelley:** I think they were trying to target this to serve the population most in need. They felt the middle segment might be already served by some of the development there.

**Johnson:** North macadam getting the housing below 120% is likely to be particularly difficult, because of the cost of development. So I think it again was one of those issues of prioritizing on the segment of the population they thought was most difficult to serve. I don't know, but my sense is there may have been different rationale for having that bonus applied 150% of median family income, so what we have is one bonus provision that applies, but maybe intended to accomplish slightly different goals in two subdistricts. And that's where we're having the conflict. So we can talk to planning commission and --

**Katz:** Have them come here and explain it to us.

**Kelley:** Okay. With regard to the north of marquam bridge proposal, again, I think the -- at the planning commission hearing there were two elements involved here, one was the requested increase in height for the -- what you heard discussed was the condominium to you there's are set bark from the bank at the time of the planning commission hearing, there was also a request to change the height closer to the bank for a hotel proposal that was about 75 feet in height and closer to the greenway. Since the planning commission hearing, the hotel has been moved back so it's no longer closer than 75 feet to the bank, and they have achieved an average setback of well over 100 feet there. So I think one of the issues that was in front of the planning commission has been resolved as far as I understand, the latest proposal, so it would make the proposal consistent, but is it a different geography. It comes up north of the bridge and the request there as I understand this is for 200, not 250 feet. But --

**Katz:** I think it was 200.

**Johnson:** And the proposal is to keep the floor area ratio at the level it's at right now, so if they were to realize the 200 feet in height, they would need to create a more slender building than they would under the existing height regulations.

**Katz:** Could you do some digital computer work on that to show the shadows and the view issue that was raised?

**Kelley:** I'm not sure how sophisticated our shadowing is going to get, but we could give you the basic building outlines. If you accept the proposal, we would go back and clarify the map so the zoning maps clearly reflect that within 75 feet of top of bank the 35-foot greenway height limit is firmly established. That the higher heights begin farther back than that.

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

**Katz:** I think the residents farther west, because of the change, and the change was made to protect the greenway and to see if we can build a better building, need some explanation on that.

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

**Francesconi:** On this one, i'm reading the letter from the planning commission, and one of the grounds was the 100-foot average that you just talked about. But the other was that the proposal cannot comply with the existing central city plan. And they recommended a different process for changing the plan. So it was a process objection.

**Kelley:** Specifically what they were talking about was the step-down issue. As I understand the revised proposal, it does now step from the greenway height of 35 feet, which essentially just allows for conforming structures within the greenway, like bathrooms and kiosks, to a 75-foot height limit for the first row of buildings, and then their proposal to go up to 200 feet back. So the proposal as it's reenvisioned as I understand it would stair-step.

**Francesconi:** You're making me feel better, but i'm still not prepared to decide today. I'm not.

**Kelley:** Clearly the proponents need to explain that.

**Katz:** We really didn't hear them, and I guess I also would like to see some idea of what the design is going to look like. Keep going.

**Kelley:** Okay. We talked about the point towers a moment ago and the affordable housing. The master plan issue was really brought up in terms of flexibility, particularly for the smaller parcels at the south end. We actually do have a provision there, we will look at that again and see if there's anything else that can and should be done, keeping in mind what your direction is on the greenway.

**Saltzman:** How does our provision different than what they were suggesting?

**Johnson:** The central city master plan provision that they spoke to does apply to north macadam. And I think maybe there was a misunderstanding that it doesn't. But we can research that a little bit and get back to you. We haven't had a lot of time to research that issue.

**Saltzman:** Okay.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Okay. Are there others on your list?

**Katz:** The design commission had -- defined the parkway differently. Is that an issue for us? Are we -- is that a problem?

**Kelley:** I mentioned that one, i'm not sure specifically what mike was referring to. I am certainly in agreement with his notion about that it ought to be a very special street.

**Katz:** Could you come back with transportation folks and let's talk a little bit about that.

**Kelley:** There was then discussion about implementation, and I wanted to remind you that the planning commission recommended a schedule, a set of implementation priorities that was part of your transmittal. That is in concert with the discussions that i've been having with pdc as part of their negotiating team on the first development agreements. Again, pdc is looking now at some of the financial aspect of how you would phase the infrastructure investments and how those costs would be shared. I think that's a critical piece of work going forward. I frankly don't think that's going to all be decided and figured out before you need to adopt this plan, so I wanted to caution you on that.

**Katz:** Pdc and planning in our regular meetings are going to start that, and then at some point pull in when we have figured out what pieces we have available to us, then have a conversation with transportation.

**Kelley:** What I would -- i'm taking this issue very seriously, and have from the beginning. I know pdc has. There's a big nut to crack here in terms of that initial investment. And we can't do it alone, and some of that has to be shouldered by the property owners and by other sources. But I do

OCTOBER 10, 2002

think that sort of in response to some of the speakers, lowering the anticipation of development in the district doesn't get you there either, because in fact you're working against yourself.

**Katz:** It works in opposition.

**Kelley:** Because you need to get that basic infrastructure, regardless -- unless do you to a low scale of development. You need to get that critical infrastructure in there. And the more robust the development you're allowing and the sooner you can bring it online, the more able you are to pay for it.

**Saltzman:** Maybe somebody needs to pull it out for me, i'm not clear, what is that basic portfolio of critical infrastructure? Does that include the tram? I get asked that question a lot, and I don't have a good answer.

**Kelley:** I think that remains probably the principle question mark in terms of how that cost gets shared.

**Saltzman:** I want to see what else is included.

**Katz:** When we get the elements pulled together, you know, i.i.d., all the elements that we have, tiff money, and then what it is that's going to be -- need to be funded, we'll bring it to you. We haven't really sat down and filled the numbers with any certainty.

**Sten:** Without getting into a huge exercise, I think it would be great at the next piece if somebody could have something for the public digestion, an outline of how we're going to build that financial plan, because it's an issue that just keeps coming up and up, and it's absolutely appropriate, which all these things are great, but how are we going to pay for them. Even the way we're going to go about making those determinations, because it's really the next phase for activist and property owners and everybody else.

**Francesconi:** I still think, you may disagree, there's a relationship between a plan and making sure we can afford to do the plan. And in that regard i've only -- i've not been briefed, but I have been briefed by pdot and parks. And i'm feeling better, because I think there may -- there may be resources from other places besides tiff to make this thing happen. But I think the idea of a work session, or some report at some point pretty soon here is a good idea.

**Katz:** Let me -- there's no kidding, they're blanks. There's a gap. But some of the pieces have been filled in, and there is a gap, and that's a conversation that we need. We need to have. I really also don't know what the needs are in terms of the time line. That's --

**Kelley:** That's the critical issue as far as I see it. So much has to be front loaded, that's the difficult part of the equation. In general, I think we're -- at least from my experience in doing this work, you expect to leverage seven to ten times at a minimum on the private side the investment that you're putting in infrastructure and I think that's -- if you ask homer's group, I bet they're right in that range, if terms of if we're putting in 60 noun get the central district up and running, their investment over their first two phase has got to be approaching seven or 800 million. So I think you're easily getting to a good leveraging. It's really the critical question is how do you come up with that first nut, that first seed money to get it off the ground. Because over time I think the amenities in the district can be afforded. Particularly if we can get some federal help.

**Katz:** Okay. I think you covered -- marie, did he cover everything?

**Johnson:** I believe so.

**Francesconi:** I have a new issue. We don't have to raise it for now, but at some point, i'm going to be careful how I say this, we're ending up with a good product, and this is nobody's fault, but I think having a look back on this process and how we got here, and how we're going to do things differently in the future, i'm saying that, i've spent enough time with some citizen that's just feel burned out by this whole thing. So I think looking back on what lessons do we learn, how on do



OCTOBER 10, 2002

we work together at the bureaus, what's the role of the bureaus, how do we involve citizens and businesses, we should do that.

**Kelley:** I can't say I was here for the first five years of the process, but I was here for the last two. And I do -- I want to compliment all the other bureaus, because they really, really struggled heart with us. We really came forward to the planning commission with 95% agreement on issues. There were very few left dividing the bureaus. It was very different than the situation when marie started out. She just deserves an immense amount of credit.

**Katz:** Not yet. Not yet. [ laughter ] but the issue, if you recall, the council was not satisfied with 50-foot greenway. I mean, the council just said go back and rework it. We are not going to adopt that. And that was the time that gil came on the scene, and that was another piece I gave him. I said, go back, take a look at it and see if there's anything else we need to do to make this happen. Go ahead.

**Saltzman:** The other thing before we leave, how are we going to make sure we implement creative approaches to managing storm water? I'm not convinced.

**Kelley:** That was another key implementation point. I took that less as a vision challenge as more of an implementation challenge. How does it work out.

**Saltzman:** Oh, yeah. There's plenty of vision.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Got it.

**Katz:** I would like to have some of ability -- some ability in the years to come for the council to check in with this. So that it isn't languishing with maybe one development and nothing else is happening. We do -- we talk about that with the albina plan, we probably need to go back and review the streets and the zoning on the streets. This is something else that I don't want to just leave on the shelf and hope something happens. So if we've made some mistakes, we ought to automatically review it as opposed to having somebody else bring it to us like what happened on the west end.

**Kelley:** Sort of automatic review at some point.

**Katz:** Yeah. All right.

**Kelley:** I guess in response to commissioner Francesconi's point a moment ago, the other thing I would say is that we have perhaps differently than before, tried to understand the plan level first as the guide to the implementation efforts, which include not just zoning and design guidelines, but include the street plan that include the implementation priorities for pdc that include the greenway, parks issue, the legislative agenda and so forth. I think before this point the implementation was driving the plan and the vision, and we needed to step back and get the plan set, and I any it's going to make everybody's work a lot easier going forward. Even though it's challenging.

**Francesconi:** I agree with that. And I also think that we've got to be clear on who's planning and implementing, and who speaks for whom, so there's internal issues too, because citizens get either confused or they use us. Not --

**Kelley:** Right. I think we have more to do as an organizational culture to learn, but I think we've advanced it a lot through this project in terms of the teamwork and the -- clarifying the roles.

**Katz:** One more issue. In the signature site and the design initiative that's going to be launched soon, there's an opportunity for some flexibility in the design, and in the code. I didn't catch that in -- and maybe I didn't read it very well, and i'll go back. I have a couple weeks. I didn't catch that opportunity, and I certainly don't want the first development to come back and tell us, well, sorry, but your silly code didn't allow us to do this, and if you were able to do this you could have achieved this much greater design. In terms of the aesthetics. Is that --

OCTOBER 10, 2002

**Kelley:** I think we have allowed more flexibility than in the past to do that, but that's something we'll --

**Katz:** Could you come back --

**Kelley:** We'll look at that. In general I would say the design commission has been enormously helpful, and they have gone beyond their traditional role and been proactive, really rose to the challenge. And I think they probably are willing to take on a role that has a little more robust discretion for them than typically you would find.

**Katz:** But they need that --

**Kelley:** Flexibility in the code.

**Katz:** That was just my point. If it's not enough, we ought to at least for signature sites, because that will be the first one, it will be a signature site, it will have to be, it better be one so we can give them that flexibility.

**Saltzman:** Since you're the first -- you're our guinea pig nor impact analysis project, that we now require of new rules, I think it does merit maybe at the next meeting a presentation on the impact analysis.

**Kelley:** We'll do that. We tried to be -- tried to set a good first item plat, but i'm sure it can be improved.

**Katz:** You have until the 30th, and then we'll probably have to continue and hear if you come in with amendments, hear from the public on the amendments. We're not going to open it up to anything else other than the amendments that you bring back to us. And then the following week we'll vote on it.

\*\*\*\*\*: You have allowed additional written testimony through monday.

**Katz:** I'm nervous on the time line, because at some point in november everybody's gone.

**Moore:** Last two weeks of november.

**Katz:** So we'll have plenty of time to adopt.

**Johnson:** You have an october 30 hearing, if you close the hearing you then have the 6th and if you want to said yourself a safety valve of the 7th to do your deliberations, we have to have the second reading by november 13th.

**Katz:** Right.

**Johnson:** I just wanted to provide a couple clarifications. I think we may have time on the 31st for some council session time. Staff will be publishing an amendments document, and i'm going to forget the date, the friday before the 30th. So that will be available to the public. Included in that will be some additional technical amendments that we didn't discuss today. There are some amendment that's were requested by a couple of bureaus to deal with implementation issues, and we've been looking at those, so those will be included in the amendments document as well as amendments in response to council direction today.

**Katz:** Is that what you wanted? Okay. All right. Anybody else? All right.

**Beaumont:** Mayor Katz, I want to make it clear that you're formally continuing this hearing to october 30th?

**Katz:** I was going to get to that. For those of you who have these boards or any boards, make sure that our city attorney has a copy, whether it's a smaller version or the originals. We will continue this on october 30th, and october 30th is a wednesday or thursday? Wednesday. We don't need thursday as well, just -- we'll need just wednesday. What do you think? Possibility on thursday?

\*\*\*\*\*: We may need the 31st for deliberations, but we can work with the clerk and your office --

**Katz:** Certainly on the 30th, and possibly on the 31st. All right, everybody. Thank you. [ gavel pounded ] -- yes, sir? [ inaudible ]

**OCTOBER 10, 2002**

**Katz:** We will, and if I recall -- you came in late, and you didn't hear the fact that we will have that discussion on the 30th. How did all this happen, what the amendments are, et cetera. [ inaudible ]

**Katz:** I love ya. [ laughter ] thank you, everybody. We stand adjourned. [ gavel pounded ]

At 4:39 p.m., Council adjourned.