



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

**OFFICIAL  
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **18<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER, 2017** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Wheeler, Presiding; Commissioners Eudaly, Fish, Fritz and Saltzman, 5.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Jason Loos, Deputy City Attorney; and Jim Wood and Adam Cuellar, Sergeants at Arms.

Item No. 1137 was pulled for discussion and on a Y-5 roll call, the balance of the Consent Agenda was adopted.

The meeting recessed at 11:44 a.m. and reconvened at 11:53 a.m.

<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>		<b>Disposition:</b>
<b>1130</b>	Request of David Kif Davis to address Council regarding suppression of the First Amendment rights of copwatchers, citizen journalists, whistleblowers and activists by the City (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>1131</b>	Request of Casey Puterbaugh to address Council regarding Forest Park (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>1132</b>	Request of Will Aitchison to address Council regarding the potential expansion of mountain biking in Forest Park (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>1133</b>	Request of Marcy Houle to address Council regarding the Six Point Wildlife Plan and recreation activity proposed for Forest Park (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>1134</b>	Request of Paul Majkut to address Council regarding off-road cycling in Forest Park (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>TIMES CERTAIN</b>		

October 18, 2017

<p><b>1135</b>      <b>TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM</b> – Accept the 2017 Annual Report on Sister City Activities (Previous Agenda 655; introduced by Mayor Wheeler) 30 minutes requested</p> <p><b>Motion to accept the report:</b> Moved by Fish and seconded by Fritz. (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b></p>	
<p><b>1136</b>      <b>TIME CERTAIN: 10:15 AM</b> – Adopt a goal of creating 2,000 additional supportive housing units by 2028 (Resolution introduced by Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners Fish and Eudaly) 45 minutes requested</p> <p><b>Motion to add “the Unity Center for Behavioral Health” to the fourth Resolved paragraph, between “mental health system” and “hospital;” add additional Resolved paragraph to state “this Resolution is binding City policy”:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Fish. (Y-5) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>37323</b> AS AMENDED</p>	
<p><b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b></p> <p><b>Mayor Ted Wheeler</b></p> <p><b>Office of Management and Finance</b></p> <p><b>*1137</b>      Create a new Nonrepresented classification of Commissioner's Senior Staff Representative, which is exempt from classified service, and establish a compensation range (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>		<p><b>188650</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Chloe Eudaly</b></p> <p><b>Bureau of Development Services</b></p> <p><b>1138</b>      Remove gender-specific language in Titles 11 Trees, 24 Building Regulations, 25 Plumbing Regulations, 26 Electrical Regulations, 27 Heating and Ventilating Regulations, and 32 Signs and Related Regulations (Second Reading Agenda 1118; amend Code Titles 11, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 32) (Y-5)</p>		<p><b>188647</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Amanda Fritz</b></p> <p><b>Portland Parks &amp; Recreation</b></p> <p><b>*1139</b>      Amend construction contract with K&amp;E Excavating, Inc. in the amount of \$196,000 to provide additional excavation and grading services for the Rieke Field Improvements Project, bringing the total contract amount to \$927,585 (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 30005884) (Y-5)</p>		<p><b>188648</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b></p> <p><b>Bureau of Transportation</b></p>		

October 18, 2017

<b>1140</b>	Authorize Intergovernmental Agreements with Portland Public Schools and David Douglas, Parkrose, Centennial and Reynolds School Districts to participate in the Portland Safe Routes to School program, 2017-2022 (Second Reading Agenda 1122) (Y-5)	<b>188649</b>
<b>REGULAR AGENDA</b> <b>Mayor Ted Wheeler</b> <b>Portland Housing Bureau</b>		
<b>*1141</b>	Approve application under the Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program for 28th St. Lofts located at 2821 NE Everett St (Ordinance) 20 minutes requested (Y-5)	<b>188651</b>
<b>1142</b>	Direct the Portland Housing Bureau to adopt an affordable housing Green Building Policy for new construction and rehabilitation (Ordinance) 30 minutes requested	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 25, 2017 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b> <b>Water Bureau</b>		
<b>1143</b>	Authorize the Water Bureau to acquire certain permanent property rights necessary for construction of the Penridge Mains Replacement Project (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 25, 2017 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b> <b>Bureau of Transportation</b>		
<b>1144</b>	Authorize the Bureau of Transportation to acquire certain permanent and temporary rights necessary for construction of the N Columbia Blvd: N Interstate Place to NE 13th Avenue project, through the exercise of the City's Eminent Domain Authority (Ordinance)	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 25, 2017 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>1145</b>	Amend Vehicles and Traffic Code to authorize Portland Streetcar Supervisors and Superintendents to tow vehicles (Second Reading Agenda 1127; amend Code Sections 16.30.100, .710 and .720) (Y-5)	<b>188652</b>

At 12:32 p.m., Council recessed.

October 18, 2017

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **18<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER, 2017** AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Wheeler, Presiding; Commissioners Eudaly, Fish, Fritz and Saltzman, 5.

Commissioner Saltzman arrived at 2:05 p.m.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Lauren King, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and Adam Cuellar and Jim Wood, Sergeants at Arms.

	<b>Disposition:</b>
<p><b>1146-1148 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b></p> <p><b>Central City 2035 Plan items continued from September 20, 2017 hearing.</b></p> <p>On October 18th Council discussed issues of interest and considered draft amendments to the main components of the plan. No votes or public testimony were taken.</p> <p>On January 18, 2018 at 2pm there will be a hearing on the final proposed amendments. At that time the record will reopen for testimony on the amendments.</p> <p>For more information see project website <a href="http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/cc2035">www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/cc2035</a></p> <p><b>1146</b> Adopt the Central City 2035 Plan; amend the Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Plan Map, Transportation System Plan, Willamette Greenway Plan, Willamette River Greenway Inventory, Scenic Resources Protection Plan, Zoning Map and Title 33; repeal and replace prior Central City plans and documents (Previous Agenda 1041; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Wheeler) 3 hours requested for items 1146-1148</p> <p><b>Motions made. No votes taken:</b></p> <p><b>B1 – Old Town/Roseland Theater height:</b> Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Saltzman.</p> <p><b>B2 – New Chinatown/Japantown height (historic):</b> Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Fish.</p> <p><b>B3 – Old Town/Chinatown height (non-historic):</b> Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Saltzman.</p>	<p><b>CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 29, 2017 AT 4:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>

October 18, 2017

<p><b>B4 – Big Pink, Wells Fargo and PacWest :</b> Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Fish.</p> <p><b>B5 – RiverPlace:</b> Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Eudaly.</p> <p><b>C1 – View from I-84 overpass:</b> Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fritz.</p> <p><b>C3 – View from Vista Bridge:</b> Moved by Eudaly and seconded by Fritz.</p> <p><b>D1 – OMSI Water Ave. relocation:</b> Moved by Fritz and seconded by Eudaly.</p> <p><b>D2, 3 – I-5/Rose Quarter:</b> Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fritz.</p> <p><b>D4, 5, 6 – Misc. PBOT amendments-Street Classifications:</b> Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Eudaly.</p> <p><b>D 7, 8, 9, 10 – Misc. PBOT amendments–Project List:</b> Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Eudaly.</p> <p><b>E1 – Volunteers of America:</b> Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fritz.</p> <p><b>E2 &amp; 3 –Retail allowance for OMSI Station, Retail allowance for SOWA:</b> Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Fritz.</p> <p><b>E4 – T1 South Pier rezone to activate the pier:</b> Moved by Eudaly and seconded by Fish. <i>(Replaces Eudaly #2 motion from 9/7/17 to include three properties.)</i></p> <p><b>E5 – Ivon Street request to allow a hotel:</b> Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Fritz.</p>	
<p><b>1147</b> Adopt the Central City 2035 Plan Action Charts, Performance Targets and Urban Design Diagrams (Previous Agenda 1042; Resolution introduced by Mayor Wheeler)</p>	<p><b>CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 29, 2017 AT 4:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>
<p><b>1148</b> Adopt the Central City 2035 Plan Green Loop Concept Report (Previous Agenda 1043; Resolution introduced by Mayor Wheeler)</p>	<p><b>CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 29, 2017 AT 4:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b></p>

At 4:42 p.m., Council adjourned.

**MARY HULL CABALLERO**  
Auditor of the City of Portland



By **Karla Moore-Love**  
Clerk of the Council

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

**This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript.**

**Key: \*\*\*\*\* means unidentified speaker.**

**OCTOBER 18, 2017 9:30 AM**

**Wheeler:** Welcome. Good morning everybody, this is the Wednesday, October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017 morning session of the Portland City Council, Karla, please call the roll.

**Eudaly:** Here **Fritz:** Here **Fish:** Here **Saltzman:** Here **Wheeler:** Here

**Wheeler:** The purpose of council meetings is to do the city's business including hearing from the community on issues of concern. In order for us to hear everyone and to give due consideration to matters before the council, we must all endeavor to preserve the order and decorum of these meetings. To make sure that the process is clear for everyone, I want to review the basic guidelines, which I hope will help everyone to feel comfortable, welcome, respected, and safe at the meeting, and also to ensure that decorum is maintained. There's two opportunities for public participation. First, we have an opportunity for people to sign up for communications, to briefly speak about any subject they wish to address. These items might be scheduled in advance with the clerk's office. Second of all, people may sign up for testimony on the first readings of reports, resolutions and ordinances. If you sign up, your testimony must address the matter being considered at the time, and Karla I want to make sure is our feed working?

**Moore-Love:** Yes. Your monitors aren't showing the tv view.

**Wheeler:** That's fine. I just wanted to make sure, and the captioning is working?

**Moore-Love:** Um, I don't see it right now. There it is.

**Wheeler:** Okay. It's going, good. Okay. Please state your name for the record. We don't need your full address. If you are a lobbyist, please disclose that. And if you are here representing an organization, please identify the organization. Individuals have three minutes to testify unless otherwise stated. When you have 30 seconds left, the yellow light is going to light up, and when your time is done, the red light will come on. Conduct that disrupts the meeting, for example, shouting or interrupting other's testimony, or interrupting during council deliberations, is not allowed. People who disrupt the meeting face ejection from the meeting. If there is a disruption, I will issue a warning that if any further disruption occurs, anyone disrupting the meeting will be subject to ejection for the remainder of the meeting. And anyone who fails to leave the meeting after being ejected will be subject to arrest for trespass. If you would like to show your support, do a thumbs up, if you want to express that you don't support something, thumbs down. Thank you and let's get started with council communications, if you could bring up the first Item please, Karla.

**Item 1130.**

**Wheeler:** I do not see Mr. Davis. Next item please. Why don't we bring up 1131 to 1134 together please.

**Item 1131.**

**Item 1132.**

**Item 1133.**

**Item 1134.**

**Wheeler:** Very good, please come on up. Three minutes each and if you could state your name for the record. Maybe we could also get -- pull up an additional chair. Would you

October 18, 2017

mind just grabbing one of those chairs at the end and pull that up, too? Thanks, appreciate it. We have got it. That's good. Thanks Mustafa. Good morning and welcome.

**Wheeler:** Should we just go down the line?

**Casey Puterbaugh:** My name is first on the docket. I'll go first, so good morning. How are you doing? First off, let me begin with: Who am I to be giving testimony on behalf of Forest Park? Well, I am Casey Puterbaugh, a golfer, runner, hiker, a wearer of many hats, one of which is a bike helmet. While that alone may not make me worthy of speaking for Forest Park, my tangible knowledge and experience in the field of conservation, learned during my adventures in New Zealand say otherwise. For my work there brought me face-to-face with single track trails and a conservationist perspective. Now it is not as if I landed in New Zealand without some semblance of what conservation meant, or how to go about it, however once I was boots-on-the-ground and knee deep in it I began to understand the Kiwi definition of conservation. During my few month volunteer assignment there, our group covered most all of the north island. We spent time on protected coastal lands inaccessible to the public, studying fur seal populations or repairing and building bridges and pathways and nature preserves so that the public could experience the lush plants and exotic species of birds that are native to New Zealand, which were greatly diminished by clear cutting and destructive colonials. Rather quickly, we were faced with the importance of conservation on a national level. From the outset, the work was dirty. More often than not, we returned home caked with mud, our shoes and clothes heavy and saturated with dirt and sweat. Yet we always rose early the next day to do it all again. Rain or shine, exhausted and bruised, we would squeeze into the van off on our next adventure. And as luck would have it, one of those mornings took us to a desolate summit just north of downtown Wellington. I know a desolate summit is the antithesis of Forest Park, but that's exactly the point. In 2006 during my time in New Zealand, only 22% of its native forests remained. Not only are two of the previously five species of Kiwi birds extinct because of settlers clearing forests, and their introduction of rats and domesticated animals such as cats and dogs, but the people are scrambling to preserve what they have, if not bring the native forests back, at least a little bit. When I queried our team leader Tobi, a conservationist and native of Wellington, as to what our work would be on such a visitorless hilltop, he remarked "We would be repairing and building bike trails." That honestly made not a lick of sense to me because there was really nothing to see. But in hindsight, Tobi made complete sense that morning. You see, the type of bike trails that we worked on happened to be for single track use. And what better place to construct bike trails meant for blind turns, higher speeds, and off-road with no risk of endangering pedestrians? The city of Wellington purposely built single track trails ostensibly in the middle of nowhere with the sole purpose of protecting the surrounding eco-system and the people, while giving bikers a place to ride. And biking is even far more popular in Portland. Therefore, when I saw the petition seeking support for Forest Park and the majority of its visitors, I could not refrain from voicing my opinion. If a country had to lose more than three quarters of its forests and two species of birds before it realized it had to change its ways and protect the natural beauty and eco-systems it possessed, why in the world would Portland honestly consider acquiescing to the demands of the smallest minority of cyclists and destroy the country's largest inner-city park in one of Portland's gems. To prevent that, Portland must care for and tend to the beautiful backyard.

**Wheeler:** Thank you for your testimony. Will do you want to go next?

**Will Aitchison:** Thank you. My name is Will Aitchison. I was reflecting on the way over here. I have addressed this council since Frank Ivancie sat in your seat, but all was only about police issues. Today, I would like to talk to you about the expansion of mountain biking in Forest Park. And I bring several perspectives to this. I am a user of Forest Park, I

October 18, 2017

bike there, I run there, and I walk there, I've spent hundreds, if not thousands of hours there, and I bring to you a perspective of a long-time Oregonian. My grandfather moved to Oregon, moved to Portland, and when the first land grants that now make up Forest Park occurred in the 1800s, my father was born here five years after the tremendous study by Frederick Olstead that gave us Forest Park eventually. I am heartened to see that the discussion of the expansion of mountain biking in Forest Park seems to have moved away from single track trails. Single track trails like Wildwood and Wild Cherry and Dogwood and the like. But the proposal that remains out there, the creation of bicycle only trails or creation of mixed use trails is just as troublesome. I want to show you a video, and it's a short video, it's on YouTube, and I want to set it up just a bit. This is a video that's been on YouTube for seven years. It is taken of a mountain biker in Forest Park, this mountain biker starts in a legal place for mountain biking, Saltzman, and it is headed to Fire Lane 5, a legal place for mountain biking in Forest Park. It's what happens in the middle that is troubling. I have edited this video for time. [video plays and finishes] The city made distinct promises to the community with the Forest Park Management Plan that it would not expand uses of Forest Park without making sure that the ecological, wildlife, and community pieces were in place. There is a time and a place for the expansion of mountain biking in Forest Park. The time is not now. It is not until the basic promises of preservation of the park, wildlife study, and even as simple a matter as putting up signs, much less enforcement, are met. Please put the brakes on this. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Thank you. Marcy.

**Marcy Houle:** Hi, I'm Marcy Houle, a wildlife biologist and author and been involved with the ecological study of Portland's Forest Park for 30 years. Working with other regional and nationally known scientists, I assisted in creating the specifications of the Forest Park Natural Resources Management Plan for the protection of Forest Park wildlife and natural eco-system. Ordinance 168509, which is the Forest Park Management Plan, clearly states that a six-point wildlife plan must be completed for Forest Park before any new use or change in use can be permitted. This is environmental code and land use law. The six requirements in the plan are as follows. One: To begin regular monitoring of natural resources to determine if they are being sustained, improved or degraded. Two: To coordinate wildlife monitoring with recreation monitoring. Three: To develop a monitoring protocol. Four: To establish permanent wildlife monitoring stations. Five: To monitor stations on an annual basis, and six: To conduct periodic night-time wildlife censuses. To date, none of these six points, as required by law, has been done! And these requirements were put into place by scientists and managers to establish what the carrying capacity of Forest Park is. This baseline must be determined before allowing any increase or change in the use in Forest Park to ensure that the health of the resource can be guaranteed, which is the top priority for Forest Park as stated in the ordinance. In 2012 under the fine direction of commissioner Fish, Portland Parks conducted a wildlife report and a two-day snapshot of Forest Park wildlife, of which I was also a leader. We need to be clear, though: All involved in this report have said that this two-day field study and the report is not a baseline. And there is no user group that's being singled out by this law. They are not singling out narrow path cyclists, just as we aren't singling out equestrians who are desiring more bridal paths, dog lovers who are desiring more off-leash parks, hikers who desire more connected trails, and runners who would like to have obstacle courses! There are lots of desires for Forest Park, but the fact remains the health of the park is the top priority by law. The ordinance is written so that all groups must comply and be held to the same standards to protect the unique ecological features of Forest Park for the benefit of future generations. Well, one of Oregon's greatest senators, Senator Richard Neuberger, penned a national article in 1956 about Forest Park. In the piece, he showcased its value

October 18, 2017

and its vision, and he wrote, "Portland's boundaries enclose a wilderness" that he and generations have treasured. He ended with, "I truly hope there will always be men and women in Portland who will fight to keep it that way." So, my question for you is: After 70 years of careful management to preserve this unique place and recognized treasure with natural resources that are not known by any other major city, will you be the council that stood up for them? Or will you be known as the council that disregarded the law and let the vision die? Thank you.

**Fish:** Marcy, can I make one quick comment? Because, after all you wrote the book. We haven't taken this issue up yet, and it's not clear when it's actually gonna come to council for final resolution. But my understanding is that the committee looking at this looks citywide, and identified other opportunities.

**Houle:** Yes.

**Fish:** So, one of the things that would be helpful for me, as you make the arguments which you have consistently, and in a principle way, made about Forest Park, is, if, at some point, you let us know about the other options on the table that some people view as sort of safety valves or alternatives. Which of those do you think council should embrace? And I am not asking you to say now, but perhaps at some point an email, let us know what aspects you support in other locations, because at some point, my guess is council is going to have to find the right balance.

**Marcy:** I think that's a brilliant idea. And I think that really is helpful.

**Paul Majkut:** My name is Paul Majkut, I'm a 33-year resident of Portland, and an attorney. Human activity threatens to extinguish half the species still surviving into this century, according to Edward O. Wilson in Half Earth. Yet there remain many reservoirs of the earth's biodiversity that can be saved for future generations, if those alive today will have the will to act on their behalf. Forest Park animals, evolved over centuries joined each animal's specific adaptations to its habitat, according to Marcy Houle, in One City's Wilderness, with the exception, perhaps of Martins, all the species that Lewis and Clark recorded in 1806 still can be observed in Forest Park. In my August letters, I pointed out Forest Park Plan and city ordinance was created to maintain the park's wilderness quality while allowing appropriate passive recreational use. The plan struck a balance by not allowing mountain bikes on the steep, soft dirt surfaces of the park, but only on 30 miles of roads and hard packed surfaces of some fire lanes. In words still true today, in 1995, the planning commission stated: "While the park has been preserved in one sense, through public ownership and environmental zoning, recreational overuse, exotic plants and animals, inadequate park staffing and financial resources threaten to degrade the forest ecosystem and the park's special wilderness character." The Forest Park Plan provides essential strategies and actions needed to address these threats and properly manage both natural resources and recreational use. In my letters and Marcy Houle's testimony, we point out ordinance requirements staff have ignored by proposing new mountain bike trails in the park through the ORCMP. Mountain bikes tear up habitat and disturb wildlife well outside the trail, and disrupt their nesting and foraging behavior, creating a new single-track trails for bikers will fragment existing habitat, and displace wildlife in new areas, reducing the diversity and the number of wildlife species there. The process of fragmentation of natural habitat is, for all practical purposes, irreversible. The only way to accommodate mountain bikers' desires to have more challenging and engaging riding experience without degrading the natural resources of the Forest Park is to develop other recreational areas for mountain bikes as the 1995 plan envisioned, such as Gateway Green. In my October letter, I pointed out: "Mountain biking exposes hikers and riders to the dangers of serious injuries, the design, construction and maintenance exposes the city and its employees to expensive liability for personal injuries. Forest Park can be saved for

October 18, 2017

future generations. If you act on behalf of the park and not allow mountain biking down the steep, soft dirt slopes of Forest Park. I have given you my three letters. I gave it to the clerk. I sent three letters, two in August, one in October, and I've given you my testimony here today. Thank you for your consideration.

**Wheeler:** Thank you. We appreciate your testimony. Thanks for coming in. Karla, have any items been pulled from the consent agenda? I understand 1137, have any other items been pulled?

**Moore-Love:** That's the only one that I have.

**Wheeler:** Please call the roll on the consent agenda.

**Eudaly:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

**Wheeler:** Aye. [gavel pounded] the consent agenda is adopted. Please call 1137.

**Item 1137.**

**Wheeler:** Oh! Good morning.

**Anna Kanwit, Director, Bureau of Human Resources:** Good morning.

**Wheeler:** I was gonna read your letter, but since you're here, I will let you do it.

**Kanwit:** Well, actually I don't have the letter in front of me, but I will go ahead and start anyway.

**Wheeler:** Very good.

**Kanwit:** Mayor and commissioners, Anna Kanwit, director of Bureau of Human Resources. So, the ordinance before you is to create a new classification of a senior commissioner staff representative position. The last time we looked at positions within the council offices was approximately 15 years ago, and as stated in the ordinance, the complexity of the work has definitely grown, and we believe that this classification is needed to provide additional flexibility to the council offices to bring in highly experienced policy advisors that will help offices complete a lot of the really important work that you all are doing. So, that's really just the intent of this, is to create that classification, and the elected offices can use it if they wish.

**Wheeler:** So, it's my understanding, just to reiterate something you said, the offices do not have to use it, number one?

**Kanwit:** Correct.

**Wheeler:** And classifications historically do go on the consent agenda, is that correct?

**Kanwit:** Yes, they do. Yes.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Thank you. And do we have public testimony on this item?

**Moore-Love:** Joe Walsh.

**Fritz:** Thank you for the clear explanation.

**Wheeler:** Yeah, that was good. Thanks Anna. Mr. Walsh? I guess he doesn't want to do it. Please call the roll.

**Eudaly:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

**Wheeler:** Aye. The ordinance is adopted. Please call item 1135.

**Item 1135.**

**Wheeler:** Good morning. Today, we have the opportunity of hearing from Portland's Sister City Associations as part of their annual required report to the Portland City Council. I hope that through this presentation, the council and the public have an opportunity to learn more about the work of our sister cities. Now, I would like to hand it over to Chido Dhiwayo, our international relations associate in the Office of Government Relations to introduce Portland's sister city associations. Good morning.

**Chido Dhiwayo, Office of Government Relations:** Good morning. Thank you. Thank you, mayor. Commissioners. My name is Chido Dhiwayo, and I serve as the international relations associate in the Office of Government Relations. As part of my work, I support the Portland's Sister Cities, a committed group of volunteers would work together to put on an

October 18, 2017

incredible variety of activities and events that support our community's engagement with the international community. Before inviting my colleagues up to speak, I would like to provide some background on the Sister Cities program. Portland's Sister Cities are a member of Sister Cities International, a nonprofit organization that was initiated by the Eisenhower Administration in 1956 to foster mutual friendship and understanding internationally. True to the spirit of Eisenhower's vision, Portland's nine sister cities and one Friendship City Association foster mutual understanding and enhance international ties for the Portland metro area by facilitating cultural, educational, and economic exchanges between our local community and communities across the globe. Today, the leadership of Portland Sister Cities Associations is pleased to present their annual required reports on their efforts and activities undertaken on the 2016 calendar year. Thank you for taking the time to listen and accept this report. First up, I would like to introduce James Autry, president of the Portland/Ashkelon Sister City Association to present. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Thank you Cheeto. Good morning.

**James Autry:** Hi. I am James Autry, again, I am the president of the Portland/Ashkelon Sister City Association, and Ashkelon, Israel has been a sister city with Portland for the last 30 years, it is a growing city in Israel south of Tel Aviv and north of Gaza. We have the largest water desalination plant, as well as Israeli beer breweries and some of the finest creative, young entrepreneurs. Ashkelon is a 5,000-year-old city, it's been located and selected for the Rockefeller Foundation for the 100 resilient cities, we have a new mayor, Itamar Shimoni, and it's a bedroom community for intel and chip creators and other technology creators that have given us some amazing things. We've been acting and rebuilding our association here in the Portland area, as well as planning for a future. We've been working with a Multnomah university student to identify businesses in Portland as well as Israel that are making breakthroughs in medical technology, electronics, and environmentals. So, we're beginning, now to pair those relationships together. One of the other things that we've been doing is serving the other city cities as chair. I chair the monthly meeting at city hall for all the associations working together. And this year, we're able to put together a website that features all of our associations as well as host the annual reception here for the Rose Festival, coordinate that, help to serve the other presentations that are done there. We put together the Grand Floral Parade, and help in that capacity as well as work with our Royal Rosarians and then finally, we launched a Facebook page for us to promote all of our events. Up next is Phil Potestio with Bologna.

**Philip Potestio:** Hi, my name is Phillip Potestio, I represent the Portland/Bologna Sister City Association. We have enjoyed a productive and transitional year. Bologna is a city in northern-central Italy, east of Milan, and south of Venice, north of Florence of about 500,000 people, 100,000 of them attending the famed university, which by the way, is the world's oldest, established in 1088, has been a Portland Sister City since 2003. Next year will be the 15th anniversary. We continue to function as a conduit between our cities. We have hosted visitors including bicycles from around Bologna who chose the Pacific Coast particularly because of Portland for their peace ride last year, Gabriela Manuella who was from the aforementioned University of Bologna, an expert in urban sustainability and local participation, came to Portland last year and spend time with people of similar positions here. We have participated in and contributed to local events like the Italian Film Festival, the first ever large family style polenta meal, prepared by Italian organizations which we were quite integral in. Fest Italiana, where we fielded our first ever grape-stomp team. We have presented a number of events on our own, including our summer social, annual dinner, and of course, our Sagra which is a celebration of bounty and more importantly, our fundraiser for our youth exchange. Sagra, by the way, takes place tomorrow. Our annual Sagra takes place tomorrow at 6:00 p.m. at Gray Box in the Olympic meal center.

October 18, 2017

Tickets are \$50 and still available. Great food, great wine, great music from Portland's Italian flavored band Imbrascatu, and we are trying to have, through our silent auction, raise enough money to continue our scholarship program. We have a youth exchange that is our pride and joy, a reciprocal program where Italian students come here for one summer and we send Portlanders who had hosted them to Italy for the next year. We sent our fifth group of ambassadors last year, and it was an extreme success, with a home-stay experience that they will never forget. Over 150 youth have benefited through this connection and many friendships have endured. In fact, one of our former youth exchange visitors from Bologna is currently in Portland. A great thing is that through our fundraising, mostly Sagra, we've been able to provide scholarship support since 2015, and we have also begun requiring an expression of the participants' impressions, either written, presented, filmed, collages, and of course, recipes learned, and this year, we had incredible opportunity to experience the joy and the wonder of the impact on the students. We are also, next year, planning a tour of Bologna, arranged by us and customized journeys in Portland. And we are looking for as many people to participate in this as possible, it'll be October of 2018. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Thank you.

**Fish:** Can I just observe, sir, that I have the good fortune of living across the street from your son.

**Potestio:** Yeah, actually my cousin, Rick.

**Fish:** Cousin. Who by the way, cooks a mean bowl of pasta.

**Potestio:** I know he does. We compete in that regard. [Laughter]

**Fish:** Just wanted to put that out there. [Laughter]

**Wheeler:** Good morning.

**Ivette Flores Schmidt:** Good morning. Commissioners. Mayors. My name is Ivette Flores Schmidt and I am the new president of the Portland/Guadalajara Sister City Association, and thank you for letting me be here today.

**Wheeler:** Thank you for being here.

**Schmidt:** Thank you. Today I am going to talk of our three more recent projects. Bomberos Latinos – PGACA this program and helped to create the Firefighter Academy, making Guadalajara the premiere place for firefighters all throughout Latin America to go train. We are traveling next week to Guadalajara to be present in the opening ceremony. We also did a cerveza collaboration with Cerveza Loba, with Portland [indiscernible] here in Portland, and Cerveza Guadalajara, a special batch of beer named Sueno Rosa was created, and it was submitted to the beer festival in Mexico and it was awarded the best beer. Also, we were very close with Father De Alejandria, an organization that helps low-income families with autistic children and adults. We support this school with monetary donations and supplies. This organization is very dear to me also. Before I say thank you for letting me be here, I want to say that I want to express our appreciation for Hector Miramontez for all his work to our organization. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Thank you. We appreciate your being here. Good morning.

**Michael Bostwick:** Good morning mayor and council members, my name is Michael Bostwick, I'm president of the Portland/Kaohsiung Sister City Association. Kaohsiung is the large port city on the island of Taiwan. We had a very good year this year. We have averaged 65 teams for our dragon boat races for the last several years. We get some new ones, we get some old ones. But, you know, it's down from what it was about eight years ago, when the economy went down, so did all our teams and stuff. But we've been doing good, we've been keeping the prices even for the teams because we initiated a sponsorship program and a patron program which has brought in enough money to allow us to keep the price of the registration for the teams even for the last few years. This year,

October 18, 2017

we added a new thing to our eye-dotting ceremonies where we awaken the boats on the river by painting their eyes. The mayor was there this year. But we added - the Grand Ronde Tribe came to welcome our boats to their river, which was nice, and they did chanting and drums. We were going to have a canoe, but the park bureau closed the ramp because of the high water, so we couldn't get a canoe this year. Hopefully next year we will. We have also assisted in several companies here in the Portland area to going to Kaohsiung to make contacts with them by contacting the Kaohsiung city government, and they have contacted, you know, companies in their area that might assist some of our companies here. We had a good delegation this year from Kaohsiung. We had over 100 people here between the city council and the city government and the Shuda High School and their teachers, so that was good. It was a little more than we were expecting, but we hope to have that many next year for our 30th year celebration of sister city. With that, the Shuda High School received first place for their band in the Rose Festival Parade this year. Between the dragon boat races, the practice time, which is two months, the teams have two months to practice, and the delegation being here, the economy was assisted by probably over \$400,000. We are looking to take a delegation this next year as I said for our 30th year celebration of sister cities between us and Kaohsiung. The Lantern Festival is on March 2nd this year. It changes every year. So, we hope to be going there about March 1st. We haven't got a final thing from the mayor yet, but we hope to soon, I hope. So, we can invite the mayor or one of the council members to go with us this year, and we are looking to present again to the high school some scholarships. We started that several years ago where we have presented students at Shuda High School with scholarships to assist them in coming over here. We have given some, the Rose Festival foundation has given some, and the Royal Rosarians has given some. We also give a scholarship to the Chinese student in the area. Each year. And so that is helping, you know, go with what we have. So, I would like to thank you for listening to me and hope one of you can come with us this next year.

**Wheeler:** And thank you Michael. And I do apologize. I have not had the opportunity to travel to any of our sister Cities yet. And I know virtually every one of those cities has made an effort to bring a delegation here. And I do understand the reciprocal importance of also traveling overseas to visit our sister cities, so it is high on my list of items to do in the next year, is to actually visit some of our sister cities and engage with them the way that they have been more than willing to engage with us, and I particularly appreciated the eye dot ceremony, it was a lot of fun, and really interesting, and my daughter loved it, and I would encourage all people in the city of Portland to participate in that next year, it's a lot of fun. Thank you. Karen, it's good to see you, how are you today?

**Karen:** Good! Although...

**Wheeler:** Oh, I'm sorry, I've got the order wrong. I apologize.

**Thomas Benke:** My name is Thomas Benke, I am with the Portland/Khabarovsk Russia sister City Association. If you can say Bach, you can say the Khabarovsk. [All laughing] And I do bring you personal greetings, mayor Wheeler from Mayor Sokolov in Khabarovsk. He's very interested in seeing you, and I am glad to hear that you might be able to make some trips to some of our sister cities. This is our 29th year of partnership with the city of Khabarovsk. Of course, it grew out of the thawing of the Cold War. It is a very important relationship to our partners in Khabarovsk. I want to remind the council that there are different systems in the United States than in Russia and Khabarovsk is actually, for all intents and purposes, a unit of the federal government. They have an imperative for foreign relations in the traditional sense. An imperative that perhaps is not in our city's charter. So, the Sister City Associations, in particularly ours, act as sort of an adapter between those two systems, and we take that role very seriously, but we can't do anything

October 18, 2017

without the support of the council. I don't know if commissioner Saltzman remembers me, but many years ago, there was an environmental disaster in Khabarovsk. Our city's was the only international response to a chemical spill in China that imperiled the water supply of Khabarovsk, and they remember that. It's very important to them to maintain our relationships, so we do a number of exchanges. We try to get our community involved. We do victory day celebrations, we drink vodka, we have a Bridge to Russia event. We sponsored the newest breakout rock band in Russia, 3 for Silver, they went over there with the United States government assistance because they were being sponsored by a Sister City Association, and now, we have got that cultural tie as well as 29 years of history. So, there is a lot more that I could say about what we do over there, but it's in the traditional sense of cultural, educational, academic, a lot of what I have done over there is good governance and well received, and I just can't thank you enough.

**Fish:** Can I ask you a question?

**Benke:** Sure.

**Fish:** I never clearly understood why this particular city in Russia was so prominent in the jazz world. And that's one of the strong ties that we have with Portland is around music. Is there a historical reason why jazz flourishes in Khabarovsk?

**Benke:** Darryl Grant knows a lot more about that than I do. The great jazz artist at Portland State University who went over there a few years ago. They are a very, very open society relative to other communities in Russia, and we are extremely fortunate to have them as our partner.

**Fish:** Thank you.

**Karin Hansen:** Good morning!

**Wheeler:** Good morning.

**Hansen:** Good morning mayor and commissioners, it's a pleasure to be here today. Thank you very much for inviting us. I am Karin Hansen a member of the Portland/Mutare Sister City Association. We are Portland's only sister city located on the continent of Africa. We are the only sister city's that sole purpose is to offer aid and support to families and children in the far-off, beautiful land called Zimbabwe. Over the years, among other projects, we have built and sponsored a health clinic that serves women giving birth and assistance to those living with H.I.V. AIDS, supported an orphanage school, a hospice house, and a camp for deaf children. We also support an organization called FASO, which stands for Family Aids Support Organization, it is primarily women with children who are living with HIV AIDS. These women embroider fabric panels, we buy them, and resell them to raise money for FASO and other projects in Mutare. Most recently, we raffled off a beautiful quilt highlighting some of FASO's panels, that is pictured on one of the slides, actually the one that's up right now. We have partnered with Bylinda King Marimba Concerts, ZimFest, an annual culture fair for celebrating the beauty of Zimbabwe and its people, and the Portland African film festival by selling our Faso panels, and we educate attendees of the work we do, and will continue to do this. Next fall, we plan to resume our annual bowl-a-thon that has brought together many people of all ages in costumes and fun with bowling, laughing, and bidding on auction items and FASO panels. One of our former members, Paul Sivley, who is usually the one the last few years who sat before you, he has moved out of the state, but he visited Zimbabwe before his departure this year and he reported positively on the state of our work and suggested new ideas for the future. We are heading into a year of board development and restructuring with a new single focus of FASO and the families it supports, with the idea of possibly starting a scholarship available to children of FASO families. And we will continue to do our good work. If you are interested in any of our panels and seeing them more closely and a little more of our

October 18, 2017

selection, somebody from our group will be coming by your office to show you and your staff at a later date. Thank you very much! [Laughter]

**Wheeler:** Excellent, thank you Karin. It's good to see you.

**Hansen:** Good to see you.

**Jeff Mandel:** Good morning.

**Wheeler:** Good morning sir.

**Mandel:** Honorable mayor wheeler and commissioners, my name is Jeff Mandel, and I'm here representing Michael Bacon, the president of the Portland/Sapporo Sister City Association, who is unable to be here due to work commitments but he sends his regards and the following brief annual report. As I am sure most of you know, the sister city relationship between Sapporo, Japan and Portland is one of the longest standing sister city relationships in the United States, beginning in 1959 and continuing with regular plentiful and meaningful exchanges that have built an incredibly strong bond of friendship between our two cities. Both Portland and Sapporo share common reputations as being highly livable and vibrant cities that attract many visitors and new citizens every year. Not sure what the rankings are this year, but both cities fall into the most livable cities in their respective countries, and I am sure, in the world. Clean air, clean water, abundant local produce and beer, a strong culinary culture, great access to the outdoors, beautiful gardens and parks, and mass transit are among the many shared aspects of our two cities resulting in this recognition. Please allow me to highly our association's activities this past year. Both Sapporo and Portland recognize that investment in our youth is critical to the longevity of our relationship and, of course, the prosperity and the vibrance of our cities. Over the past six years, we have established annual youth exchanges that leverage a partnership with the Japanese Immersion Program in Portland Public Schools, where we send a delegation of advanced-level speakers and writers of the Japanese language from Grant High School to Sapporo. There, they participate in an intensive summer institute. The themes of the Sapporo Summer Institute are humility, endurance, and respect. This past summer, we sent fifteen students to Sapporo. In turn, each spring in March, Sapporo sends a delegation of two representatives from each of their eight city high schools to spend a week living and going to school in Portland. Meeting our mayor and commissioners is always the highlight of their visit. One of the highlights. This past March, the Sapporo High School Delegation was charged with transporting a special gift from the city of Sapporo to commemorate the grand opening of the new cultural center at the Portland Japanese Garden. The new mayor of Sapporo, mayor Akimoto, paid the city of Portland a visit in September 2016, and hopes that sometime soon he will have the opportunity to meet our new mayor. Every year, we have athletes from Sapporo who participate in the Portland Marathon. This year was no exception. This past year, we held our second annual fundraiser that features Izakaya foods prepared using local Oregon ingredients such as Oregon albacore tuna and chinook salmon coupled with tasting of sakes from northern Japan and specifically Hokkaido and environs. The new councilor general of Japan, a native of Hokkaido, also attended the summer event. This event raised almost \$1500 in scholarships to support our youth exchange programs. We will be hosting this gastronomical event again next summer, and let us know if you would like to join us. I have gone the last couple years, and it's just fantastic. Well worth it. This year, we continued our collaboration with the Northwest Film Center in helping to sponsor the Japanese Film Festival reception. We invited an origami master to teach this ancient craft to 60 people while eating Japanese snacks donated by Uwajimaya. For the 20th year, we sent a snow sculpture team to Sapporo to compete in the annual Sapporo Snow Festival. However, this year we shifted to a collaboration with the Pacific Northwest College of Art. We selected a snow sculpture team through a design competition last fall. The winners of

October 18, 2017

which traveled to Sapporo in February under the guidance of PNCA sculpture artist Nan Curtis. Their sculpture, which you see in the slide, featured a number of Portland icons. On a special note, we are fast approaching our 60th anniversary in 2019 and have begun planning and preparations for celebrating on both sides of the Pacific Ocean. We hope that you will support These efforts and join us in commemorating the longstanding, important friendship between Sapporo and Portland. Thanks for allowing me to highlight some of the endeavors of our association as we join you in enhancing Portland's livability and vibrance. I would like to recognize the incredible efforts of my fellow board members and our partners in Sapporo. The relationship thrives because of the talents, hard work, and dedication of these individuals. Thank you for your continued interest in our organization.

**Wheeler:** Thank you sir. We appreciate you being here today. Good morning.

**Lynn McIntyre:** Mr. Mayor, commissioners, members of the gallery, good morning. My name is Lynn McIntyre, I'm president of the Portland-Suzhou Sister City Association, and from China, we say zao shang hao. Painting your home, dreaming your future was the theme of the 2017 Jiangsu International Youth Art Contest where Hope Chinese Charter School and Portland-Suzhou Sister City Association received awards. Hope students are shown working on their masterpieces. Students participating in the Hosford Middle School Exchange in February are among the 100 students from Suzhou exchanging at Hosford, Cascade Heights Public Charter School, the French American School, Woodstock Elementary School, the International School, and Cleveland High School. Jackson Middle School, now in its 19th year of exchanges with Suzhou #10 Middle School had an exchange too. The value of these relationships continues to grow as Students participate in cultural experiences and home stays. The next photo shows the Jiangsu Provincial Commercial Delegation at City Hall, which included a delegate from Suzhou Dongda, Intelligent Electric Automobile Sci-Tech Innovation Park. In June, a cooperative MOU was signed between PSSCA and the Culture Bureau visiting delegation. On World Friendship Day, board members participated in the Friendship Force International event promoting Suzhou to attendees. The highlight of our annual Evening Under the Stars fundraising gala at beautiful Lan Su Chinese Garden was the inspiring speech made by mayor Ted Wheeler as he welcomed our visiting delegation led by the Suzhou Foreign Affairs Office director Shu Wadong, leaders from Nike, and the president of a Suzhou robotics firm considering citing a business location in Portland. There were awards for business, Nike Leads Platinum Logistics Center, education, Confucius Institute at PSU and cultural leadership, Hope Chinese Charter School, a scholarship was presented to a student from China attending PSU. The most significant achievement of the year was PSSCA's five-day working delegation visit to SuZhou, laying the groundwork for our 30th anniversary in 2018. We are preparing for an official mayor's delegation to SuZhou, where numerous signings, events, and partnerships in business, education, and culture will take place. Photos will give you a glimpse of some of the delegation's activities. We toured a robotics factory, sister schools, and the Benson Bubbler site where students were enjoying fresh Chinese drinking water. We met with the director general of the Culture Bureau to further plan for a relationship between the Suzhou Museum and Portland Art Museum, anniversary art exhibits in both cities. A Suzhou performance next year in Lan Su Chinese garden, a relationship between Washington Park International Rose Test Garden and Ujong [sp?] Rose Town, including a 30th anniversary rose bed dedication ceremony in Portland, and 2018 tree plantings in both cities to commemorate the activity and the anniversary supporting our motto, "To build green cities," and thank you to the Portland Parks and Recreation Bureau for all of the help on that. We unveiled the opportunity for Suzhou youth to participate in Larry Steel International Basketball Camps and Nike Summer Camps in Portland. The city of Suzhou honored me with the Friend of Suzhou

October 18, 2017

Award. We look forward to a great 30th anniversary year. Thank you for your support.

Good morning.

**Wheeler:** Thank you. Appreciate that.

**Katherine Morrow:** Good morning mayor Wheeler and commissioners. I am Katherine Morrow, and I am the president of the Portland Ulsan Sister City Association. This year marks the 30th anniversary of international relations between Portland, Oregon and Ulsan, South Korea. For our Portland-Ulsan Sister City Association, it has been a very active year. We've had two Portland delegations travel to Ulsan this past year. Highlights include dedicating a Portland garden within Ulsan's rose garden, facilitating relationship building between the parks and recreation programs in our two cities, and participating in the Rose Festival and parade of each city. We have also been networking with other members of Ulsan's international sister city's communities. In June, we welcomed a delegation from Ulsan, an 18-member government delegation led by mayor Kim, and they were also accompanied by a 65-member community choir group. During the time they were here in Rose Festival, we dedicated a rose bed in Portland's Rose Test Garden and also planted a tree in Hoyt Arboretum in commemoration of the 30th anniversaries of our cities. Also at that time, mayor Kim extended an invitation to mayor Wheeler and to the city officials to please visit Ulsan this past September. In Rose Festival, in Portland, the choir of Ulsan performed a free public concert. And they also participated in our Rose Parade, buying a float, which won an award. In September, just last month, Portland sent another delegation to Ulsan, and while they were in Ulsan, they joined with the representatives from Ulsan's other international sister cities. This occasion was to mark and commemorate Ulsan's 20-year anniversary as a metropolitan status city. And at this event, the mayor of Ulsan presented to the City of Portland Director of Government Affairs a plaque thanking Portland for 30 years of friendship and exchange. In one of my last slides, although it's not showing right now, the statistics demonstrate that Ulsan is an exciting, youthful and wealthy city full of opportunities for international partnerships. This coming year, we will be focusing on hosting a government official for a one-year professional development training program as well as a rose gardener who will be interning with Portland's rose garden. We will also be building connections between the art museums of our two cities and continuing to facilitate a bridge between the parks programs. We will be taking part in one another's rose festivals again next year, and hopefully sending another Portland delegation to Ulsan in May, during which we hope that we have more participation from the city of Portland. We will also be exploring trade, business, and economic development opportunities between our two cities. Thank you very much.

**Wheeler:** Thank you. Appreciate it. Good morning.

**Rindert Schutten:** Good morning mayor wheeler and commissioners, my name is Rindert Schutten. I was actually born in the Netherlands, and by way of California, and ended up in Portland! And right now, I am heading up the Portland Utrecht network, taking care, basically, of the sister city relationship. Or actually, formerly, the friendship city relationship, but that's a long story. We don't go into that right now. So, we did actually welcome, you may remember, you met Marta Filarhoven back in June, and she reported back she that had a very fun and positive visit here in Portland, and thank you to the city and to actually the people of Portland, because we made many visits during that time as well. Next slide please? So, we are the baby of sister cities, everybody else here is 30 years old or something like that. Well, we are not. We are very young, so I want to spend a little time on why we are sister cities. The main reason, really, is that we believe that sharing experiences across different cultures is important! Because we can learn. There are different problems in different cities, they are being attacked and tackled in different ways, and we can very much learn from them. For example, in Utrecht, they have a

October 18, 2017

tremendous amount of bicycles. They have really figured out how to have bikes and traffic, cars work together. It's a very dense city. But all the cities in the Netherlands are dense in comparison. With the growing density in Portland, it's another thing, I think, we can learn a lot from what's happening, and what has been happening over there. So, exchanging, cultural exchanging, business exchanging, people-to-people exchanges are very important. So, it all started with beer. No surprise there. Holland known for beer, and Portland is known for beer. And I must thank Greg Riceman here, who used to be the president of the Portland Utrecht network, and Adla Rams, who is one of the founders of the beer industry, the craft beer brewery industry here in Portland. They organized during the brewer's fest, we had Dutch brewers coming over here, and right now, at this year, actually, they had brewing, a Dutch company brewed beer in Portland and a couple of weeks later, they did a tap takeover at a brew house, a brew pub here in Portland, northeast Portland, highlighting the beer that they actually brewed. It's an example of the type of collaborations that we do. The next thing is what we focused on, is the maker-to-maker contacts, connections. We have the central east side area with lots of makers. In Utrecht, they have lots of makers. We share the experiences and we focus on getting products made in the city of Utrecht, sold here, and it's happening today in the Made Here store, down at the Pearl, and vice versa. We are working on this as well. They are opening a store, and a physical store in Utrecht, called, guess: Portlandia.NL. [Laughter] To sell Utrecht Portland-made products in Utrecht. Next slide please. So, I have not talked yet a lot about the city of Utrecht. But, you all had a chance to really see what Utrecht is like, because we had a great photo exhibition back in June, the whole month of June, showing the specific scenes in Utrecht as well as in Portland and show them the connection, and show how the different cities deal with the various things. Of course, the show is over, but the web lives forever, so the pictures are still available online, and I am very happy to let everybody know, the pictures are for sale as well! And it would be a good thing, because it would help us fund our projects, and we have some very exciting projects going on going forward. They are not carved in stone yet, but they have to do with very famous art, and no surprise there, soccer. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Very good, Thank you all. We appreciate it. Colleagues, I will entertain a motion to accept the report.

**Fish:** So moved.

**Fritz:** Second.

**Wheeler:** We have a motion from commissioner Fish, the second from commissioner Fritz. Please call the roll.

**Moore-Love:** I am sorry do we have request for testimony on the report?

**Wheeler:** We have one individual. We typically don't take testimony on reports. One individual come on up. Why don't we say two minutes. We typically don't take testimony on the reports. This is just accepting the report.

**Moore-Love:** I have three people. Two more people who signed up.

**Wheeler:** In that case I am sorry, no. This is not for public discussion. This is us accepting the report, and if there is a bunch of people who want to testify, I am going to have to hold the standards in place. So, I am sorry.

**Lightning:** You just said that I could testify and have two minutes and now you are denying me the right. So, I think that that's completely unreasonable from your position.

**Wheeler:** Why don't you do this, who are the other two who would like to testify on the report?

**Moore-Love:** Cedrick Wilkins, Nancy Newell, and Mimi German.

**Wheeler:** Okay. To the point of the report.

October 18, 2017

**Lightning:** First of all, I would like to just say commissioner Eudaly, please leave the room. Thank you for following my instructions. Now I will get to the report. My name is Lightning, and I represent Lightning Super Watchdog X. First of all, I would like to commend the Sister City group here that has presented their testimony. In my opinion, I would like to see the city donate to this group as much as they donate and give grants to Travel Portland. If not even more. I think what we have here from the relationships that can be developed and the time that they have put in is one of the most important things that the city can do as far as funding. I would like to see the mayor go to every one of these locations, I would like to see the funding provided for your travel, and anyone else that wants to go, I would like to see that funding provided. I think it's very important, I think it's very necessary. And it's continuing the ongoing relationships. This is a very important issue. I like what I see. And again, just from my standpoint, I want to see funding provided to this group. I want to see funding of no less than a million dollars if not up to 5 million to this group. I want to see travel expenditures put into place. This is a very important issue here. I have not heard the word North Korea. I would love to see somebody make that attempt. I would love to see somebody from this group to try to make that attempt. I would love to see somebody welcome them as our friends and talk to them in a reasonable manner and develop relationships so we're not sitting in our chairs right now worried about what North Korea will do. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Thank you. Good morning.

**Nancy Newell:** Good morning. My name is Nancy Newell, I live in northeast Portland. A lot of you know me as an activist and I get things done. I am you appalled at the program of sister city because, don't be hypocrites. We share with japan radiation from our nuclear bombs, we're the only country in the world that have dropped them, and we share nuclear waste from the electric plants, who promotes continually these plants to operate with waste that we have no place to put. It will be now trucked on our highways through every city in the united states. We have record breast cancer as a sister city in this city of Portland. We have Warren Buffett owning coal mines, owning them all, owning the railroads, owning the tracks, owning our utility and we had blackouts, three times this year with no excuses. With no explanations. With no amount of time that it will be blacked out. Possibly frozen pipes in the winter, and not a word is spoken. The level of hypocrisy with Warren Buffett is unbelievable. He is climbing up Mount Hood and areas that are banned from being purchased by any private interests and he's being allowed to do that. Why has his license not pulled, he owns a coal company, California has gone from San Diego all the way up to our border to alternatives. It is cheap. It is doable. We can do this, we are not doing it at the rate that we should. You should call in the Bonneville Power administrator who is not enforcing his role to keep the rates low and to do the efficiencies and the wonderful technologies, and this is all on behalf of the sister cities that should not be radiated and deadened by global warming. This is what a sister city is truly about and don't interrupt me, Mr. Wheeler, because you gave Chase Bank, the Paulsons who are crooks that we bailed out, you gave them several privileges withholding the debt on the drinking water and people can't get drinking water and children's brains can't develop. So please don't interrupt my time.

**Wheeler:** Time is up, thank you, good morning.

**Mimi German:** My name's Mimi German, and I do want to say before I start that this is about the seventh time that Chloe Eudaly has not been in here during my testimony, and I don't know even if that's legal. I request that in the future, Chloe stays in her seat when I am up here testifying. So, I want to make it known to the people who want Portland to be their sister city that one of the things that we do in Portland is we have a mayor who also is the police chief who hires police chiefs who put activists who want to protest for the rights

October 18, 2017

of all of our community to remain in Portland against ICE, they put hoods on them, the police put hoods on the activists and they look like this and they cover their faces in them. The photos are all online, and then they put headphones on them so that they cannot hear, and they threaten them with machinery which is why they tell them they put these hoods and ear plugs and ear phones on them. This is torture, this is from, you know, scenes of Abu Ghraib. And I want the people and all these other places around the world who think that Portland is so awesome to know that we have not only one Nazi cop but more than that, and we have police with a new chief who are using Abu Ghraib's CIA homeland security torture techniques against activists who want to protect all of our residents from the ICE trucks. So, I just want to also be clear that northern Japan is highly radioactive. This is not just me saying this. Feel free to speak to Arnie Gunderson. Or Paul at Beyond Nuclear. Have at it. All that food that's coming over from Japan is radioactive, it's not a lie. It's not hyperbole. So, to get in bed with the foods of Japan is dangerous to everybody's health.

**Wheeler:** Thank you. Call the roll.

**Fritz:** Thank you very much to those who testified and it does bring home that we need friendships all over the world. And I'm a little miffed that we don't have a sister city in England, I might have to work on that, but I was actually glad to see the red cross of Saint George is part of Barcelona, so I'll count it as that. Thank you. Thanks for everybody, it's all volunteers raising money for these good works. Thank you. Aye.

**Eudaly:** Thank you for your reports. Aye.

**Wheeler:** Please stop interrupting the deliberations. Mr. Walsh you know the rules.

**Fish:** Thank you to all of our volunteer sister city organizations for the outstanding report. I agree with Lightning. I think that this is something that each member of council on some cycle should have an opportunity to do. And I am creating quite a bucket list of things I intend to do next spring. Or next summer. And one of them is, I would like to go to the Netherlands because after all, I am Dutch. And I have actually, in 59 years, never set foot in the place where most of my family came from. So, mayor I am going to volunteer at some point to go represent the city, but I have never been to that part of the world, and I would love to do it. The other thing I want to share with my colleagues is, the new president of Portland State came to visit me yesterday. I know he's, I think I was the fourth or fifth member of the council he visited. And he's a very interesting and compelling person, and he shared with us his vision for PSU. And one of the things that I loved is that he wants it to become a global university. And he said that one of his three priorities is to require that students do a semester abroad. And mayor, I was thinking about the challenges of that. It means that, A: You have to have a lot of private money to underwrite those kinds of things, B: You have to have a lot of connections but I was reflecting today after this excellent presentation that we already have the sister city relationships. And so, what if we took our networks through sister city relationships, marry them with the vision of the new president, and said, you know, "Let's create priority opportunities for students at PSU to go to the sister cities?" It seems to me that's a no-brainer, so it just occurred to me as I was listening to this. So, I want to thank our friends for their excellent presentation and their work. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Thank you to our sister cities. Great report, and we cherish our relationships with you. Aye.

**Wheeler:** I am sorry that a number of the representatives that took the time away from their jobs to be here today to share with us what they are doing as volunteers for the sister cities that they were here to represent could not stay to actually hear us deliberate this. I will make it very clear right now in the future we will not take testimony on reports. That is the council tradition, and I think that we now know why. They are doing a great job. They

October 18, 2017

are volunteers. I find it interesting that virtually every one of these sister city associations has sent a delegation to Portland to further cultural ties, to develop relationships with kids in our schools, to help expand cultural understanding, they have met with our business leaders to talk about what economic opportunities we can share, and American cities, historically, don't reciprocate because there is a view that sending elected officials overseas to foreign countries is somehow a boondoggle, or it's not a good use of an elected official's time. And I like what you said, commissioner Fish, whether you meant it or not, I think we should collectively talk about how we can visit and reciprocate some of these delegation trips to our sister cities. It's very important to them that we be present in the relationship as one would expect in any relationship, and I will certainly make that a higher priority in my second year than I was able to do in my first year. There is a lot of good things here that are going on. And I have really enjoyed the interactions that I have had with the delegations have come to our community to share with us, and at the end of the day, in this day and age, it can only be a positive thing for us to continue to work across cultural divides to find the commonalities, and I vote aye and the report is accepted. Next item please.

**Item 1136.**

**Wheeler:** So, colleagues, homelessness, as you all well know, is a humanitarian crisis which threatens the dignity and the safety of very vulnerable people in our community. 72% of the people sleeping outside reported that they have experienced a mental illness, chronic physical condition, and-or a substance use disorder. Supportive housing marries affordable housing with support services primarily serving people who are chronically homeless and with disabilities who cannot succeed in traditional affordable housing without support services. Supportive housing is one of the most effective tools for ending homelessness among people who are generally among the most vulnerable and most visible people experiencing homelessness in our community. In an analysis prepared for A Home for Everyone, the corporation for supportive housing calculated the need for over 2,000 new supportive housing units in Multnomah County. We are going to prepare a plan outlining the strategies and resource requirements for creating 2,000 units of supportive housing over a ten-year period. I wanted to thank, in particular, commissioner Fish and chair Kafoury who is here with us today for their leadership in bringing this resolution forward, I would like to turn this over to commissioner Fish.

**Fish:** Thank you very much, mayor, and my comments will overlap a bit with yours, but before I make My comments may I invite the distinguished county chair Deborah Kafoury to come forward? Ian Slingerland, director of homeless initiatives for Home Forward, Mark Jolin the director of the Joint Office of Homeless Services and home for everyone, and Justin Martinez, who, I understand is here to share a personal story. Thank you, sir. Mayor and colleagues, I am very proud to co-sponsor this resolution today. It builds on a history of strong partnerships with the county, Home Forward, and community nonprofits. Today, we have yet another opportunity to come together, to set a bold vision, and to get the job done. We have shown that when we link arms, we can make progress. Consider 11x13 where we preserved over 700 at-risk homes. Operation 305 where we worked to end veteran's homelessness. And the Joint Office of Homeless Services, and the list goes on and on. Mayor, I am proud to be a part of this council, which has already, this year, taken important steps to address our housing crisis. Working with the county to open new shelter beds. Extending the housing state of emergency. Enacting historic renter protections and then extending them. Making new and significant investments in the Joint Office. I believe today's action is yet another step forward. We are having a big community conversation about homelessness, and the increase in very vulnerable people on our streets. The most recent point in time count showed that while more people are moving from the streets to

October 18, 2017

shelter, chronic homelessness is up. And about two-thirds of the people surveyed that are living on the streets reported a mental illness or an addiction or a physical barrier or some combination. Chronically homeless men and women are the hardest to house, face the greatest barriers, and are at the highest risk of dying on our streets. And frankly, they are caught in a costly, inefficient, and failed system. So, what do we do, and what have we learned? We've learned that for many people, a roof over their head is not enough. They also need intensive services that address their other life challenges. Like mental illness and addiction. And that's where supportive housing comes in, deeply affordable and safe homes, paired with inventive services. Today, mayor, we acknowledge the successes we've achieved together this past year helping hundreds, if not thousands of people move from the streets to homes. And we are poised to make a new and bold commitment to our most vulnerable residents. The Corporation for Supportive Housing has identified a need of about 2,800 new units of supportive housing. A special shout-out to our guest Heather Lyons. The resolution before us calls for 2000 new units of supportive housing over the next decade. It's not enough. And no, it won't solve the housing crisis. But it will make a big difference in the lives of the people we serve. To craft and then to advance this vision, we have assembled the A Team: Multnomah County, the City of Portland, the City/County Joint Office of Homeless Services, Home Forward, the State of Oregon, the Corporation for Supportive Housing, and all of our nonprofit community partners. This resolution directs our partners to come together and to develop a road map for accomplishing our goal. That includes identifying existing and new resources to fund the services. Mayor and colleagues, I want to thank chair Kafoury and commissioner Meieren for their leadership at the county. I also want to acknowledge Christian Gaston and Adam Renon for their tireless work. I want to thank the mayor and the commissioner Eudaly for their partnership and support and in particular, Michelle Plambeck, Michael Cox, Kyle Chizzick, and Jamie Duhamel, Du Ham-mel, Doo- Hey!!!-mel – and when they do it phonetically for me I always screw it up, Jamie, I'm sorry. Your Jamie, not mine. And Marshall Runkell and others. And there's many other people to thank, who we will get to later. So, we have a terrific – oh, I see, ok, yeah. So, we have a terrific panel here today, and I want to begin by asking commissioner Eudaly if she has some remarks.

**Eudaly:** Thank you commissioner! I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this item alongside commissioner Fish and mayor Wheeler as my colleague so eloquently explained, we are setting an ambitious goal to meet a need that we have fallen short, fallen far too short on for far too long. The only thing that I have to add to this is that we know that this resolution is only a next step, and not a solution to the entire problem or need for supportive housing. In ten years, we may be trying to catch up to a need that is sure to grow as our city grows. That is why we've included directions in this resolution to prepare a plan that can be scaled to further expand supportive housing to meet the total unmet meade - unmet need. I don't know if we have any unmet mead, I maybe have an unmet mead right now. Ok. I feel strongly that if we can do it we should do it, and this plan will help us to understand the full scope and the resources available so thank you to everyone here today. I look forward to your testimony.

**Fish:** Chair Kafoury.

**Kafoury:** Thank you and good morning everyone. Thank you very much for having me here today. Since I became chair of Multnomah County, we've been working together, the city and the county, to build a more rationale and robust response to homelessness. Step one was pulling everyone together through A Home for Everyone, setting big goals and aligning our resources around a simple strategy, prevention, housing, and shelter. Step two was making that partnership real with the Joint Office. Bringing all of our resources under one roof, giving us the ability to respond to the forces that drive homelessness in

October 18, 2017

real time. We're here to talk today about what I see is the third step: A big commitment to supportive housing, which takes what we have learned in this year's point in time count and what we are learning in our efforts to reform our public safety system and what we've been learning during the healthcare reform and putting it all into practice. In February, when we went out and counted the people who were living on the streets, we found that our strategies were working. For the first time, there were more people in shelter than on the streets. But the folks who are on the streets are facing difficult challenges. Some are struggling with mental health issues and addictions. Some have serious medical conditions. And some people have been on and off the streets for years. We know that a jail bed or the waiting room of an emergency room are not the places to overcome these challenges. People need a home. But the reality is that affordable housing doesn't always come with these services. Supportive housing is affordable housing that has the intensive services that people need to stay healthy and stable and successfully housed. And throughout our healthcare system, our mental health care system, and throughout our public safety system, we are paying for apartments just like these, but we need more. So, we're saying today: Let's challenge ourselves. Let's pull together all of our resources around a hard problem and align our efforts to help the most vulnerable people in our community. Tomorrow, the Multnomah county board will bring this same resolution forward, and I know that commissioner Fish is planning on being there.

**Fish:** And expect to be hazed.

**Kafoury:** [Laughter] So, I am excited to be here with today with you all, each one of you have played a key role in building a better safety net, and I look forward to continuing our partnership in the coming years. And today is just further proof of that committed partnership. Once again, we are saying that we can take on big problems, and together, we can save lives. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Thank you.

**Ian Slingerland:** Mayor and commissioners, Ian Slingerland, director of homeless initiatives with Home Forward, thanks for the opportunity to be here in support of this important effort. We know supportive housing is a proven strategy, and we know it works in our community. As a community, we have significant expertise and capacity in delivering supportive housing. As we speak, there are thousands of units of supportive housing across our community. In some cases, this supportive housing looks like Home Forward's own Bud Clark Commons, a permanent supportive housing community that was designed and is staffed with the appropriate property management and resident services to serve the most vulnerable people in the community coming out of homelessness with utilizing principals of harm reduction and housing first. We are fortunate today that we are joined by a colleague of mine who, in a bit, will share, far more eloquently than I can, what that means in real terms. In other cases, supportive housing looks more like a tenant-based housing voucher that's paired with supportive services, placement and retention support, attachment to clinical services that are mobile so that participants can make use of existing affordable and market rate units in the community. In other cases, support for housing means recovery housing for people who are selecting a recovery-oriented environment in the community of peers. This model of supportive housing matches peer case management with the supportive employment services and connection to outpatient addiction and primary healthcare. We know there is a range of needs in our community as it relates to supportive housing, and we need a range of responses to meet those needs. None of these models are without challenges, but we know we can meet those challenges. Our response as a community is not lacking in passion or expertise or a willingness to dig in and face the challenges we have and continue to improve. What we are lacking in is the necessary scale. We have a lot of experience to build on, and partners across the systems

October 18, 2017

that touch people in homelessness agree that now is the time to lean into this effort. We need to expand, and we need to keep learning, and we need to focus on insuring that as we build on our current efforts, we continue to make sure that what we are doing makes real our commitment to address the persistent racial disparities that exist in homelessness in our community. It will take us all working together, home forward, government at all levels, justice system is, mental health resources, recovery programs, housing providers, social service agencies, and healthcare organizations. It's the humane and compassionate approach, and it's also the most cost effective. Supportive housing is less expensive than shelter beds, jail beds, stays at the state hospital, time in the emergency departments... We know we all gain when we work together to align the resources to fill this gap. At Home Forward, we are eager to continue to partner with you to drive this effort forward.

**Wheeler:** Thank you.

**Justin:** Is it me?

**Wheeler:** Sure!

**Justin:** Ok. Hi guys. My name's Justin. I just want to thank you for having me, and I want to start off with a quote. "Please don't judge people for the choices that they make when you don't know the options that they had to choose from." Okay. So, I have experienced homeless at a really young age. My family, my dad and my two brothers, we lived in the back of our station wagon in the ninth grade behind my high school. And to cope with that, my mom started giving me codeine threes, which is an opiate, because she saw it was really rough on me, and so any time that I had a problem or it got tough I would ask her for them and she would give them to me, and when she wouldn't, I would steal them out of her purse. This led to me, later on in my life, to several years of incarcerations due to my addiction. And 17 years homelessness. It's been a rough road. Been in and out of the treatment centers. I could never really get off the streets. I cost the city a lot of money to support my habit, and sometimes it went up to \$200 a day, and that's a lot of shoplifting and stealing. That was probably about six years ago. I was introduced to CCC, Central City Concern. And I got diagnosed with PTSD, depression, and bipolar schizoid disorder. I realized, once I was given the meds for my mental health, that I was self medicating all those years. I was still on the streets when they put me on a wait list. And while on the wait list, I got in trouble for my last time, and was locked up for nine months. Upon release that time, I went right back to the streets. But I got accepted after two months into the Bud Clark Commons. From there, I used every resource that was available. And I kept taking my meds, doing the next right thing, I got my GED, I got my driver's license after a 26 year of a suspension, graduated a pre-apprenticeship program, which afforded me several really good certifications that make me a valuable asset to the trades, and now, I am an employee of Home Forward and I'm doing well. I just want to add that without the foundation of having housing, I would be out there wreaking havoc, costing taxpayers lots of money. Just trying to survive and self-medicate. Now I am a taxpayer and I would like nothing more than my tax dollars to go toward more housing opportunities like I have gotten. And I just want to close by saying one more quote. This one is by Marion Wright Edelman. And she says, "Homeless shelters, human hunger, and suffering have become normalized in the richest nation on earth. It's time to reset our moral compass and redefine how we measure success." Thank you for hearing me.

**Wheeler:** I would like to suspend the rules. Thank you. [Applause] thank you for sharing that and congratulations.

**Justin:** Thank you sir. Appreciate that.

**Wheeler:** Good for you and thank you for coming in and sharing that story with us.

**Fish:** Thank you for Reminding us why we do what we do. Thank you very much.

**Wheeler:** Mr. Jolin I think you are up.

October 18, 2017

**Eudaly:** Good luck following that.

**Wheeler:** You should have gone first.

**Marc Jolin:** Yeah, probably. So, I am excited to be here and there's been so much important work happening around housing and homelessness but today is really a unique day. We've done a lot of important work over the last 2.5 years since launching A Home for Everyone to create more opportunities if people experiencing homelessness, but I don't think there is an effort that's going to prove to be more important to the success of our work than what we are proposing to launch today. We are preventing, placing, retaining and sheltering more people every year than at any time. Over 29,000 of our neighbors received assistance just through the programs funded with local city and county homeless program funding last year. We are piloting new interventions, and we're expanding the ones that work but we are continuing to lose ground with one of the most vulnerable populations on the streets. Those who are chronically homeless, people who have been homeless a long time, and are struggling with one or more serious disabilities. And the increase in chronic homelessness accounted for the vast majorities of the overall increase in the homelessness in the last point in time count. No other population group grew faster. Today, we're talking about an intervention, often the only intervention that works to end someone's chronic homelessness: Supportive housing. Supportive housing was an innovation in 2004 when we launched the first ten-year plan to end homelessness. Today, there are literally volumes of research documenting not just the supportive housing works for those who benefit from it, but that it is the most cost-effective intervention we can make. We've studied it locally, through an evaluation of the Bud Clark Commons, and more recently, a study by Enterprise of different types of supportive housing in the community. Across the board, what we learned from the research is what we would expect. Even the most chronically homeless individuals start to thrive when they get into supportive housing. They are able to retain that housing long-term, and they use far fewer high-cost crisis resources. Supportive housing is a strategy that literally saves lives. When I moved back to Portland in 2000, I reconnected with a friend who I had gotten to know at the St. Francis dining hall in the early '90s. He had spent most of the intervening period living on the streets. He was camping in the central east side when I met up with him again. He had aged a lot and was clearly not healthy. All of us who cared about him tried to help. He bounced around from garages to basements to a broken-down truck, but none of it worked, and his health continued to deteriorate. And then, one day almost 15 years ago now, he finally got what he really needed: A supportive housing voucher. A shelter plus care voucher. A permanent, deep rental subsidy, and a commitment of ongoing support services, provided through Central City Concern and Join. The transition back inside was not easy. After so many years, he will tell you the story of how long it took him to move his shopping cart, his safety net, out of his apartment, and his health challenges didn't disappear, but it did allow him to stop drinking and to stop smoking. He's now been off the streets and in his apartment in the central east side for more than a decade. And I talked to him this morning, and he said he's been sober for 13 years. While I was at Join, we tracked the success of every person we helped move into permanent housing. We were proud of the fact overall, nearly 80% of the people who moved into housing were still in their units after 12 months. But our highest retention rates were with people who were in our permanent supportive housing programs. Even though those were some of the most vulnerable and we served, and we a housing-first strategy of moving people directly out of their camps and into permanent housing, retention rates for those households were always over 90% and in some years, over 95%. The resolution that you have before you today represents both the recognition of the power of supportive housing to save and transform the lives of people living on our streets with serious disabilities and a commitment to make

October 18, 2017

this vital intervention available to thousands of additional people in our community. By adopting this resolution, you will direct our office to work with the Portland Housing Bureau, Home Forward, and the Multnomah County Health Department, to launch a 9-month planning process to bring forward a plan to increase, by at least 2,000, the number of available units of supportive housing in our community. The target will be 2,000, but recognizing that over time, the need may well be greater, the plan will also lay out what it will take to further increase the number of units. In putting this plan together, we will be looking at the work that the Corporation for Supportive Housing has already done to identify the need and projected cost for developing and operating 2,000 additional units of supportive housing. We will be pulling together the relevant local stakeholders, to look at our current housing and service investments, to determine how many of the needed units we can create through better alignment of those resources. Through that process, we'll be able to determine how much additional resource it will take to meet our goal. And we will evaluate potential sources of additional funding. Importantly, our local effort will be running parallel to and capitalize on the supportive housing planning work at the regional and state levels. We are hoping that with the support of Metro, we will be able to launch a regional PSH planning process in the coming months that not only brings together our neighboring counties, but also our regional healthcare providers to determine both, what the regional need for supportive housing is, and how to meet that need. At the state level, there is also critical work happening, to expand access to supportive housing for medically vulnerable individuals. Our local process will connect with those state efforts to look for opportunities to align our resources and to increase our supportive housing inventory. Within the planning process called for in this resolution, we will be able to start to answer some of the more specific questions many people have: How much different types of supportive housing will we create? Will it be scattered site or facility based? Which subpopulations will it serve, how will it be accessed, and by what criteria? These are all important questions. But none are as important as the vision and commitment contained in this resolution. To focus our collective efforts on dramatically expanding access to supportive housing in our community. So, I want to thank, first, the supportive housing workgroup of A Home For Everyone that has been working on this for the past year, worked with CSH to put together the plan that is the foundation of the goal we've set here today. I want to thank commissioner Fish, commissioner Eudaly, the mayor and council for your leadership. I'm very much looking forward to doing this work.

**Wheeler:** Thanks to all of you very much. Thanks to all of you. Commissioner Fritz.

**Fritz:** As you were talking, I was thinking of a committee that I was on in the 1990s, and I was serving as a registered nurse working at OHSU in inpatient psychiatry. And your mother, the great Gretchen Kafoury, commissioner, was on that committee, and I vividly remember when I said, "It costs \$1,000 a day to have somebody on inpatient psychiatry at OHSU," and her mouth literally dropped and she said, "Do you know what I could do with a thousand dollars a day?" So, in some ways, it's tragic that it's nearly twenty years, and here we are finally getting to it. On the other hand, here we are, we're finally getting to it. So, I just wanted to thank all of you for being here today. I also have a couple of friendly amendments if I might propose them.

**Wheeler:** Okay.

**Fritz:** In the middle, there's fourth from the top and fourth from the bottom, it says, "Be it further resolved that the convener shall engage and seek resource alignment opportunities with all potential funders and service provision sources," and there's a list of a lot of what those are. I would propose, after "the public mental health system" and before "hospitals," we would add "The Unity Center".

**Fish:** I accept that as a friendly amendment.

October 18, 2017

**Fritz:** Thank you. And then, the second is to have a further – uh, “Be it further resolved,” to say that this is binding city policy.

**Fish:** I accept that as a friendly amendment.

**Fritz:** Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Those are substantive. So, just for the record, if you don't mind if I go ahead and call the roll, just so that we have that on. Commissioner Eudaly.

**Eudaly:** I just wanted to thank all of you for being here and especially thank Justin for sharing your story. I know how nerve-wracking it is to come to this table and say anything, let alone something so personal. And it's just vitally important that we hear these stories and that the public hears these stories. Because I think that there is a pervasive belief that people who are chronically homeless, people who are experiencing mental illness or addiction are lost causes, and you are proof that human beings are not lost causes. And we need our whole community to really step up and be willing to support us in this challenge and not -- show compassion and develop understanding and I just want to thank you.

**Justin:** Thank you, Chloe. And there's a lot of people out there like me that, if they just had that basic need, shelter, met, they would thrive.

**Eudaly:** I have seen it in my own family. I have a family member with a similar story too, different kind of childhood trauma, but turned to drugs for self-medicating, turned to crime to support the habit, ended up in prison, seemed trapped in that cycle. And it really was housing and treatment through DePaul that allowed him to end that cycle, and he's now a peer support councilor for Central City. So, I know it can happen and we just need to hear more of these stories.

**Justin:** For sure, yeah. Happy I could be of help. Thanks for listening to me.

**Wheeler:** Appreciate you being here. We're going to combine commissioner Fritz's two amendments into one called Fritz 1. Please call the roll.

**Eudaly:** Aye.

**Fritz:** Well, as chair Kafoury and the mayor and everybody knows, we're putting a lot of money into the Unity Center in hope that it is going to help solve the problem of people being outside and getting into our police justice system, which is obviously not helpful. So, it's really important that the main thing I think that is lacking in the Unity Center at this point is those supportive beds to move people in there, once they have gotten medications and gotten stable. So, thank you for accepting this amendment. Aye.

**Fish:** And I appreciate what commissioner Fritz has just highlighted. Because one of the quandaries we have is that when someone is released from an emergency room from a jail bed, from the Unity Center, from Bud Clark Commons when the service center closes, they are right back on the street. And that is not our goal. Our goal is to move them to a better place. So, thank you for the amendments. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye.

**Wheeler:** Aye. The amendment is adopted. Thank you. I'll open it up to public testimony. Three minutes each. If you could please state your name for the record. We do not need to know your address.

**Moore-Love:** We have five people signed up. The first three are Mary Sipe, Joe Walsh, and Mimi German. I think Mimi left. We'll go with Andy Miller.

**Mary Sipe:** My name's Mary Sipe, and Justin said something that – one of his quotes about “Don't judge people about the choices they make when you don't know their options that they have to choose from.” And that really rings true with me, and I want to just kind of touch on something that I don't hear much conversation about. And that is, I kind of see the premise that if we build it, they will come. And unfortunately, many will come, but some will not. What I would like to ask is, are we creating a parallel plan to address those people

October 18, 2017

that don't have the ability to make the choices or that make choices that continue to be barriers to their housing. I think a good example of this, if you watch the Tent City USA report on KGW last week, it's very interesting to me, they followed a woman named Willow who was disabled, and they talked about how she got \$700 in SSI benefits. And right off the bat, you're thinking, "Wow, nobody can afford an apartment under \$700 a month. However, under Section 42, with those kinds of benefits, she could afford a \$400 apartment in the building where I live and she would be getting food stamps. There's probably 100 people that are in the building where I live that are in that situation. So, what immediately clicks in my mind is, what is happening to prevent this individual from getting into housing? Is it her Pitbull? Who knows. Is it something else that is going on? What I would like to ask is: There are going to be people that fall through the cracks that, we need to have a plan for how do we figure out a way to reach out to them and bring them in off of the street. And I have shared with you the story of my family member who I tried to help who, because of his mental illness, saw me as the enemy and as wanting to institutionalize him. So along with all of this, with providing the supportive housing, I would just like to be sure that we don't forget that we need to have some contingency plan over here for those individuals that can't make the right choices or that -- just because you decide to have a dog, should that be the reason you can't get into housing? Section 42 buildings in my neighborhood all accept pets but they usually have certain breed restrictions. So, there's just certain things like that that I think, if we could dig a little deeper, get out there and ask people, "What is it that is standing in your way?" And, you know, no matter how many beds we have, or how many units we have, there are going to be those individuals. So, thank you for listening.

**Wheeler:** Thanks. Mary. I'm always appreciative of your detailed understanding of these issues. That's very helpful testimony.

**Sipe:** Thank you! I appreciate your appreciation. [Laughter]

**Wheeler:** Good morning.

**Joe Walsh:** Good morning. My name is Joe Walsh. I represent Individuals for Justice. One of the phenomenal things that's happened this morning is, I'm going to agree with a lot of people here that I have fought with for the last ten years. Commissioner Fish, I agree with you. I agree with chairperson Kafoury. I agree with Mark, and don't fall off the chair, where I disagree with all of you, all of you, is, you know that there are not 2,000 people on our streets. It's more like four, five, depending on who you're talking to, it could be as high as six! So why 2? How do we decide on 2,000 in ten years? And why are we bragging about that? And you say to me, "I'm going to get all 2,000 people in six months. I'm going to take them and those millions of dollars and I'm getting these people off the streets." I would be right with you. Let's go. But you're not saying that. You're saying 2,000. And Mark, if he was honest, which I think he is, would tell you there are 16,000 hanging by their fingertips in garages. On beds. Friends' houses. In the hallways. Look, folks, I'm just going to say this for the 50th time going back ten years: It's the same sermon I gave ten years ago. You're gonna fail! You're going to fail! I said it five years ago. "You're gonna fail." I said it two years ago, "You're gonna fail." And I'm saying it today. You're gonna take that \$258 million and screw it up. Because it's associated with this. You use affordable housing and then you use people on the streets to make affordable housing more acceptable and they are not connected. If you're on the street with no money and you're a drug addict, you have nothing to do with affordable housing. Nothing. We need someone to help. Someone to reach down and say, here, here's a peanut butter sandwich. You, mayor, put those people in jail! How is that? That's what I argue with you. How much failure can you all take, how much, until you say stop. Who the hell's succeeding? Salt Lake City is. New York is. California's learning, but you're not interested in that. So, what is the interest? You guys

October 18, 2017

are corrupt.

**Wheeler:** Thank you for that testimony. Very good. We heard you.

**Walsh:** That's what you are. You are corrupt: [shouting]

**Wheeler:** Good morning.

**Andy Miller:** Good morning. My name is Andy Miller executive director of Human Solutions, we are your partners in east Portland and east county on the issues of Homelessness and housing, and I'm here today to urge your support for this resolution and to say thank you. Thank you for prioritizing permanent supportive housing today with this resolution, and in the bond framework that you adopted a week ago. It's a critical component to any city strategy in addressing homelessness, especially the issue of chronic homelessness, and is approving national best practice. So, I'm pleased to see us moving forward. As you all know, and as we as providers know, permanent supportive housing is one of the most difficult types of housing to create. It involves the braiding and bringing together of funding sources that often don't play well together in the sand box. So, it requires a level of intentionality and a level of work upstream with the funders themselves to coordinate those funding streams in a way that achieves the results that this resolution says this community wants to achieve the creation of permanent supportive housing units, so I applaud you for understanding that. One specific piece I want to underline that often gets left out of our public dialog around homelessness are the issues of families experiencing homelessness, and in particular, the need of families with children for permanent supportive housing. Our public dialogue, especially recently, around homelessness, has focused heavily on what the community sees in the streets, and that's a reasonable place to focus because that's what we see every day. At human solutions we operate a no-turn-away shelter for families experiencing homelessness. And because of that and because of the way that the homeless family system works, right now, our community is typically not seeing kids and their parents waking up in tents and trailers and heading to school in the morning because they all have a place to sleep at night and that's in the shelter. But to give you an idea of what's happened in that system, somewhat quietly and invisibly to the community, we completed the construction of the Family Center in February 2016, and it's a shelter that has sleeping capacity for 130 kids and their parents on any given night. Almost immediately after opening, our numbers were up at 160. Flash forward 18 months, last night we had 424 kids and their parents sheltered here in Multnomah County. We can't keep infinitely expanding that system, and it's very clear to us as a provider that a subset of the family population is in deep need of supportive housing. They all need affordable housing, but the specific type of housing we're prioritizing here, often, it's not the family population that folks are thinking of. So, I want to encourage us, as we move forward, to stay focused and do the work to find out how big the need is among the family population, or we're not going to solve that problem. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Thank you. We appreciate it. Thanks for being here.

**Moore-Love:** Lightning is the last person who signed up.

**Wheeler:** Very good, come on up!

**Fish:** While Lightning is coming forward, colleagues, Heather Lyons, who is here, submitted her testimony, it's in the record.

**Moore-Love:** I'm sorry, Gary Cobb did sign up, but I thought he wasn't speaking, so... Gary Cobb?

**Wheeler:** Good morning!

**Lightning:** Good morning. I represent Lightning Superwatchdog X. One of the things I want to focus on again is, we can have great aspirational dreams, and we can talk some great talk, and, you know, politicians are good at that, but at the end of the day, we need funding. Commissioner Saltzman, Affordable Housing Bond. That's called needing funding,

October 18, 2017

understanding that up front, and then beginning to create the supportive permanent housing. Now with that in mind, we can calculate out to 2000 from the bond, it isn't close to that, but we're going to do some real good numbers when it's all said and done. Again, I'm looking at turnkey development opportunities there and staying within the legal framework of doing that. But keeping that in mind, again, president Hughes, I sat alongside of you on that convention center hotel, I lobbied – I'm not a lobbyist for the record – on your behalf to push that through. Congratulations. That's your legacy. The Affordable Housing Bond is commissioner Saltzman's legacy. The challenge to you at Metro, 125 million dollar bond, that's your challenge. That's a match to bond over here. The challenge of Multnomah county, \$125 million bond. That's your challenge. Put the money on the table. Show me the money for these units. Show me the money. Aspirational dreams are only dreams. You are going to wake up and those units may not be there. Show me the money. Now, some more money. Tektronix, the tech industry coming into this city, I'm appalled at your behavior. Shame on you: I want you to step up and start showing where the real money is but start funding these type of units. Workforce housing. Start sponsoring people laying on a sidewalk. Just one company coming into town, walk out on a sidewalk and say I'm going to sponsor you for the year. I'm going to provide you housing for the full year. With supportive housing. I'm going to fund that from my company. That's what we need. Every company coming into town, take one person off the sidewalk, fund them, sponsor them, put them into housing. Give them services. Provide them jobs. Just do it! To my good friend Phil Knight, just do it. That's what we need. Funding. We need more funding. We need sponsorship, stand up, get the job done, tech industry. I'm watching you. Superunicorns in future? I don't think so unless you take care of the most vulnerable people in this city, you'll never receive that status. Thank you, gentlemen and ladies. I know that's not politically correct to say anymore because of Chloe Eudaly, but who gives a shit?

**Wheeler:** Alright, let's remember we have an FCC license. Family TV.

[shouting]

**Wheeler:** Good morning.

**Gary Cobb** Good morning, mayor Wheeler, city commissioners, my name is Gary Cobb, I'm the community outreach coordinator at Central City Concern. I want to say that Central City Concern certainly welcomes this resolution that is being brought forward. Our name was mentioned couple of times here. A lot of things were mentioned that kind of highlights the importance of supportive housing. For me, on a professional level, on a personal level, I can give two accounts. Supportive housing worked for me about 17 years ago, that springboarded me into long term employment, long term recovery, and into homeownership. I see that happening daily with folks. Also, if Justin is still here, I think his story highlights what can be done daily, where outreach workers that I get to work with, we can locate someone because they're stably housed, and we can get them plugged into the services on a regular basis, and, I don't want to have us look at 2000 units as, it's only serving 2000 people. We know that, over the history, that these units can be multiplied. People can get in and out of them, you know, it all depends on an individual basis, what those folks may need, and so, I look at it in a way that -- I want to leave with the words that I heard somebody say. I shared this with Chair Kafoury last night, that these are small steps that create big changes, not only in the individuals that would use this housing, but what you'll get back in investment, you know, you'll get the taxpayers back into the system. You'll get the good neighbors that I know that I am and many of my colleagues are that use supportive housing to be where they are at today. So, we encourage a unanimous yes vote on this and look forward to partnering with you all. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Thanks for your testimony. Thanks for your long standing leadership. Is there

October 18, 2017

any further testimony?

**Moore-Love:** That's all that signed up. We did have a request.

**Wheeler:** In 30 seconds or less? 'Cause we're way behind.

**Mike Whitney:** Mike Whitney. So, I would just like to add to this that other countries when they have natural disasters, they will send in organizations. People do become homeless in mass amounts all the time. So, I think what we have here, along with this and many other things, we may want to start to consider is emergency relief efforts. And what that includes is the same thing we did after Katrina or anything else, except with a twist. We'll have homeless people there, with the people that are helping. We'll have all the services there. Not big, huge relief efforts like a natural disaster, but this should be treated like a disaster. So, I just wanted to slip that into your mind as one of the tools in the box.

**Wheeler:** Great! Thank you. Appreciate your testimony. Please call the roll.

**Eudaly:** So, I just want to address a couple comments that were made during the testimony. I don't shy away from debate or critique on our policy solutions and I look forward to most public testimony but it's extremely counterproductive for community members to come here and spread misinformation and misunderstanding in the public. I have confidence that most of you who are in this chambers today understand that some of the things said were just a misrepresentation of reality but I'm concerned for people listening and watching in the community that they may think that we think creating 2,000 units is going to solve our housing crisis, and it's obviously not. So, just to be clear, this is one essential piece of a multifaceted solution to alleviating and eventually solving our housing crisis. And it is targeted to a specific population of individuals experiencing mental illness, drug addiction, significant disability, or some combination thereof. Not all two to 4,000 people who are homeless or living in temporary shelter require permanent supportive housing. Many have simply been economically displaced from their housing. So, we're not building permanently supportive housing for those people. We're doing other things like tenant protections, our inclusionary zoning plan, building housing through our housing bond, our residential infill program, pausing enforcement on tiny homes and RVs, and working with our state and federal delegations on finding more funding and more solutions for what is a national housing crisis. Now, for my closing statements. I'm sincerely grateful to serve alongside colleagues who have committed to improving the lives of the most vulnerable people in our city. What we're doing today is setting the sails to greater stability and greater quality of life for thousands of people, and I'm very eager and anxious to see that happen. So, I want to thank my staff, Jamie and Marshall, for collaborating on this effort, as well as the staff from commissioner Fish's office, and mayor Wheeler's office. I am grateful for the partnership with Multnomah County, especially Chair Kafoury, and her office, and I wish them luck on their own resolution tomorrow. Hopefully there'll be a different tone in the room. I also want to give a special, warm thankyou to Mark Jolin, who I've really enjoyed working with this year, and all of the staff at A Home for Everyone, and the Joint Office of Homeless Services for being the stewards of these bold visions and for being so capable and ready for whatever challenges we throw their way. Because of them, and the other conveners listed in the resolution, I have great hope that not only will we accomplish these goals, but we will have a clear path to doing even more. I'm very pleased to vote aye.

**Fritz:** Well first, thank you, commissioner Fish, for being the council's champion on this resolution, and to your chief of staff who identified a lot of good things to do next. When I arrived here in Portland in 1986, I went to work at OHSU on their two units. They, at that time, had a crisis unit for people coming in needing stabilization, and then a step-down unit, where people could stay for as long as it took to get better, and that meant that we, as nurses, did therapy, there was actually a chance to see whether the medications they were

October 18, 2017

given were working or not. And people did stay until they got better. And Dammasch State Hospital was available for people who were not getting better, and needed long-term care. Over the course of the '90s, Dammasch was closed. OHSU decided it was going to share the concern of unfunded care, the insurance companies, mental health parity, decided that they would have new codes as to what they would pay for and what they would not, so that people who said they were feeling suicidal would get admitted. People who had the knowledge and self-awareness to know "I'm addicted to drugs or alcohol," did not get admitted, and so, those folks were on the street, we started discharging more and more people who didn't have anywhere to go and who were just given a bus ticket. And I vividly remember the day that we discharged a man with no shoes. And the bus ticket. Because that was all we had available. And then, of course, we, as the staff, though, "Well, we should have a clothes closet. We should bring in our old, you know, usable shoes and things, so that people could have something to wear home. Hopefully to wear home. But even then, we knew that there wasn't anywhere for them to go to. So when I ran for city council in 2006 and 2008, people would ask me, "Why are you running for the county?" You know, the county does health care and human services, and that's what you have been working on, but I had, also, as a hobby, kind of got passionate about land use planning. And so, but for a long time, I had been on the Planning Commission and I felt there was nobody like me on the Portland city council who could represent a lot of different interests on that council and that's why I ran for the city job. That and public campaign financing which I have really wanted to make work and have something who could be pointed at as someone who would not have gotten elected without it. Over the nine years I've been on the council, we have done more and more things where it's absolutely clear that my previous work experience and life experience tie so much into everything we do at the city. Most prominent, of course, is the Department of Justice Settlement Agreement where we are directed by the U.S. Department of Justice, to stop giving disparate treatment to people experiencing mental health crisis. Commissioner Fish has long time led this push for permanent supportive housing which is even more obvious now, as I've mentioned, that the Unity Center brought together several of the city hospitals into an emergency room, where it's hoped that people would not need admitting. They could get counseling there. They could get their medicines refilled, And that they would have somewhere to go after they were feeling stable, and that's a piece that is just not there yet, and that's why it's crucial. Of course, if we could wave a magic wand and immediately have 2,000 units of housing with services, we would want to do that. It's much more responsible to say that, it's going to take a lot of effort and a lot of money, and we're going to do it correctly. So, I particularly appreciate chair Kafoury and of course, the Joint Office and Home Forward for coordinating with the city for the first time since I've been here. Also, I'm particularly proud of having helped elect Dr. Sharon Meieran to the County Board of Commissioners because she is giving that in-depth and ongoing "what's going on in the emergency room" feedback as to what is working and what's not working. So, I'm really proud to be able to vote yes on this resolution. I'm really glad that we are finally bringing a coordinated system including comprehensive mental health and addiction services. Aye.

**Fish:** Thank you for joining us today, and reminding us that everybody at some point in their life, has a setback. The question is, what kind of hand do we extend to lift someone up? Two months ago, I could buy life insurance, I can't today. Two months ago, my life was moving along in one direction, and now I have what's called a preexisting condition, subject to the whims of how the congress decides to do healthcare. We hit bumps along the road. The question is as a community, how do we embrace people at a time of need? And how do we help them? And this is just one of many tools, and this is a tool that has worked for 30 years. We're, in a sense, putting old wine in a new bottle, but we're saying

October 18, 2017

we're going to make this commitment. And I'm very proud of this day. I believe that there's a couple relationships in local government that are really important. But I don't think there's one that's more important than the relationship between a county chair and a mayor. I've served with four mayors in several county chairs, they are both independent actors, they both have separate responsibilities, but when a county chair and a mayor link arms and focus on a problem, really amazing things can happen, and I have such high hopes for this partnership between Deborah Kafoury and Ted Wheeler. And I'm gonna do everything I can to help support that relationship. So, Deborah, thank you for all the work that you've done, and thank you for joining us today, and I hope those kind words give me a pass tomorrow when I'm before you. Ian and Mark and Justin, thank you for joining us in your testimony. Michael Buonocore is not here, but let's give him a shout out because Home Forward is constantly stepping up with Section 8 vouchers to help us meet the goal. To Kurt and Javier and Shannon and all of our friends at the Housing Bureau, thank you for your role. Heather Lyons is here, Corporation for supportive housing, I remember the day sometime in 1990 when I met Roseanne Hagerty and she told me about supportive housing. And it was still a glimmer, it was an idea, it hadn't become embraced widely. The Corporation for Supportive Housing, in my opinion, has done more to spread that gospel and to create the technical infrastructure to allow communities to move on this. So, Heather, thanks to you and Central City Concern for hosting the Supportive Housing Summit, which I felt was really important to hear from our friends in Seattle and Los Angeles and to share ideas. Thanks to Dennis Thoreau, who was one of my favorite writers when he had another career, and Dennis had a big hand in the op-ed, and thank you for helping us tell our story. To Mayor Wheeler, and commissioner Eudaly and all my colleagues, it's an honor to serve with you during these challenging times. We have done some good work this year. To my staff, Jamie Dunphy, Amira Streeter and Sonia Schmanski, thank you very much for your great work. All the effort you put into this. And I want to close by just acknowledging three women. Rosanne Hagerty, who in 1990 broke every rule in New York and said we're going to do something different. Thankfully the mayor accepted that challenge. That mayor was David Dinkins, followed by Giuliani, which shows it was such a good idea it became nonpartisan. To Gretchen, who, when I came to Portland, gave me the opportunity to serve on what was then called Housing Authority of Portland. And regularly challenged me to do more. I'm so grateful as is Amanda for the role she played in my life. And then, to Susan Emmunds, who regularly comes to this body and challenges us to do more for people that have so little. And those three voices really helped shape my view of the subject. And as long as I have the honor of serving on this body, I will be pushing to make sure we provide a roof over the head of the most vulnerable people in our community. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Thank you, commissioner Fish, for your tireless devotion to more permanent supportive housing. It certainly is an idea that's proven over the last 20, 30 years, and government does well when we invest in proven ideas that work. This certainly is one of those ideas that works. It's just a matter of getting the cooperation going between the county, Home Forward, which have good partnerships, if Metro can step up and play a role, satisfying the regions need for permanent supportive housing that much the better. So, I just want to thank you for this and pleased to vote aye.

**Wheeler:** Well, I want to add my name to the long list of those who are thanking all of our partners, Chair Kafoury, thank you for being here today. We certainly appreciate it. Commissioner Fish, thank you for your important leadership on this initiative. I'm very enthusiastically supportive of this. There is a lot of anger and frustration in our community about the escalating situation with regard to the people who are living on our streets. And ultimately, I believe people in this city are compassionate and they want to be able to get

October 18, 2017

their arms around something. They want a positive approach to helping to participate in solving this problem. And I believe they are asking us to take bold leadership when it comes to the issue of homelessness and people living on our streets. This is such an initiative. It's not the totality of what we're doing to address the situation, but it will be a big part of our approach going forward. And I am excited to provide what leadership I can to this initiative. I intend to put the resources of my administration fully behind this effort. And at the end of the day I believe this is the right response. This is both a compassionate and effective response that will help address the chronically homeless who live on the streets in our community. We know this works. And to the testimony we heard earlier, I'll take that as a challenge rather than criticism, what was said here. We will take additional resources. And I have been very clear about that. So, over the course of the coming months as we develop the plan, and there will be resources, chair, in our fall bump to help finance the research that needs to be done over the next nine months for the plan as we lay it out. I want to make sure that we're not just engaging ourselves here in this room but we're truly engaging all of the community. The faith community, the business community, our nonprofit and philanthropic sectors, all of those in institutions throughout Multnomah County, and ultimately, I hope everybody individually sees a role for them to play as we get behind this effort. We can show other communities up and down the west coast how to actually make progress on this seemingly intractable issue, and we know that this is a strategy that will work for us. So, I happily vote aye, along with my colleagues. The resolution is adopted as amended. Thank you. We'll take a five-minute compassion break.

**Item 1141.**

**Wheeler:** This apartment building, 28th Street Lofts will have 18 of the 119 units of affordable households earning up to 80% of area median income for 99 years as part of the inclusionary housing program. The developer, the Urban Development Group actually had a vested building permit prior to inclusionary housing going into effect in February of this year, but they elected to participate in the program in order to benefit from the parking exemption and other incentives that were available through the program. The multiple unit limited tax exemption, or multi-program, is one of the financial incentives provided to inclusionary housing projects choosing to make units affordable, rather than paying the so-called fee in lieu. Each multi-application comes before city council for approval. In addition to the 10-year exemption provided by the multi, this project will receive an exemption to the Affordable Housing Construction excise tax that otherwise would have been due on the affordable units. This project will join the other four projects that have already been approved under the Inclusionary Housing Program, making a total of 31 units affordable in otherwise market rate developments. Director Creager!

**Kurt Creager, Director, Portland Housing Bureau:** Thank you, mayor, members of council, Kurt Creager, Housing Bureau director. I just want to frame this by saying that when inclusionary housing was enacted by council December 21 last year, there's a lot of sound and fury about how the market would be impaired. And some of that has been carried on in this new year, 2017, as the market itself has become overbuilt and softened. The good news here is that developers who are taking full stock of their financial options are choosing to opt in to the structure of offsets that you created when inclusionary housing was crafted. And we think this is the beginning of a trend. And we're obviously very closely interested in all of their success. Mindful that we have about a five-year supply of vested projects that have already been accepted by BDS, those have not yet converted to full construction drawings. So, we remain open for business, and we'll work with any other developers that are currently in the pipeline. Dory Van Bockel leads the team within BDS to assist developers, and is here to specifically answer your questions about this particular project.

October 18, 2017

**Dory Van Bockel, Portland Housing Bureau:** Good morning.

**Wheeler:** Good morning.

**Van Bockel:** Or, are we in the afternoon yet?

**Wheeler:** Close.

**Van Bockel:** Are there any -- the opening statements by mayor Wheeler pretty well described the project. It's 119 units with 18 of those being affordable and it's a mix of studio and one-bedroom units available in inner northeast Portland.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Any questions, colleagues? Carla, is there any public testimony on this item, 1141?

**Moore-Love:** No one signed up.

**Wheeler:** Please call the roll.

**Eudaly:** Aye. **Fritz:** Thank you for your diligence. Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Good work and thank you to Urban Development Group. Aye.

**Wheeler:** Aye. The ordinance is adopted. Thank you very much for that. Kurt, we have a group of people coming in at about 12:15 and I note that item 1142 you have requested 30 minutes. Do you think you could squeeze it in 20 minutes?

**Creager:** We can squeeze it in.

**Wheeler:** Very good. 1142, please.

**Fish:** Well, Kurt, can I just also frame a question? The question we had in our office is how is this policy different than the existing policy?

**Creager:** I would be happy to do so.

**Fish:** If the answer is not much, your presentation can be even skinnier.

**Creager:** Well Suzan Zuniga is here, and --

**Wheeler:** Well, let's not take testimony until the item has been read, please. 1142.

**Item 1142.**

**Wheeler:** Now.

**Kurt Creager, Director, Portland Housing Bureau:** Kurt Creager, director of housing. Members of council, mayor Wheeler, this policy establishes, really, for the first time, a formal policy for green building that will be used by Portland Housing Bureau. When we were created seven years ago out of the housing functions of now Prosper Portland, then PDC, and the Bureau of Housing and Community Development, we referenced the PDC policy, which had been previously and still, to this day, to essentially use LEED Gold. Leadership in Environment and Energy Development Standards.

**Dory Van Bockel, Portland Housing Bureau:** Well, actually, it was originally it was a completely separate policy from the policy for city facilities, and it was just for affordable housing. And over time it started to align with the city policy.

**Creager:** So, this is more specific. We focused narrowly on the three things that make the biggest difference to the residents of the households themselves, indoor air quality, energy consumption, and water consumption. Because in LEED, you can get points for things that don't necessarily have a tangible, measurable impact on a resident's health or their cost of living. Just for the people that might be watching this on tv, this applies to buildings of 20 or more units for which the Housing Bureau has a 10% or greater financial stake or city owned properties. It doesn't affect privately owned properties and if people are using private financing, they are free to do what they think is right under the construct of other city policies and development regulations. We wanted to very much be clear about this policy, so Suzanne Zuniga was tasked with convening stakeholders over the last year to devise and derive the right standard going forward. And I'm pleased that she's a designer, so she has this background herself, as an architect and lead professional, and she's here to describe in greater detail the actual policy.

**Suzanne Zuniga, Portland Housing Bureau:** Good morning. Okay. So, I think you

October 18, 2017

already know the background, which isn't coming up... This happened before. So, I think you know the background. There was a policy that was special for affordable housing over time, and after the Housing Bureau was formed, we just kind of fell back on PDC's policy which eventually matched the city's. The city's policy is LEED Gold for new buildings and LEED Silver for existing. This policy – it looks like none of my slides are going to show up. So, there was a lot of community engagement. We had five meetings, we had several reviews of drafts. We included all of the stakeholders, architects, developers, contractors, green building consultants, and then we made sure to coordinate with other funders and all of our partners. As Kurt said, it's applicable to 20 units or more, affordable housing only, and 10% funding from PHB, or owned by us. So, you know what the big objectives are in improved tenant health and meet our climate action plan, environmental stewardship and all that which I can't see. [Laughter] But the practical objective in what we were really going after was to carve out, if you will, from LEED and Earth Advantage the bigger programs which have many, many measures that you can choose from to get all your points to carve out the measures that had the most benefit on multi-family housing. And to really focus on that and get our points for those measures. So that's what this policy is meant to do. And it focuses on energy, water and indoor air quality, it sets long term goals for energy and water to get to 50% energy reduction and to get to zero net energy by 2050 and 50% water reduction by 2040. I'll just wing it. [Laughter]

**Saltzman:** Doing good.

**Wheeler:** At least you got the machine turned on. That's farther than a lot of people get.

**Zuniga:** [Laughter] So, we have been watching where our money is going on our affordable housing projects and started to feel like it was getting very expensive to continue to do LEED Gold, and we weren't sure what we were getting for that, so we've paid a lot of attention, talked to our stakeholders, talked to everybody, the green building consultants, really did a lot of research to really understand, what are the measures that really matter and make a difference in our buildings? And that's where we focused. And then, we set very high targets for those measures. And then, we commissioned a cost study with PSU through the Climate Action Collaborative to compare LEED Gold, meeting LEED Gold and meeting our policy. And we even used three of our recent projects with real, actual data to test the analysis, and the study shows we should see a slight reduction in first cost because there are fewer measures. And this policy is more streamlined, so there's a lot less documentation involved, a lot less administration, a lot less cost for certifications, but we're maintaining those two certifications so that we have that credibility, that third party verification.

**Fish:** Since we can't see the PowerPoint, Karla, can people at home see the PowerPoint? Can we get the camera back on the people who are testifying? Or our screens don't work? And mayor, I'm just going to make a point here, of personal privilege, since my bureaus spend the most time doing PowerPoints: Every single council session, we have a technical failure that is not Karla's fault, it's not anyone's fault in this room. But it's entirely disrespectful to the people who are watching at home, and to the people who spent all this time preparing PowerPoints. And I respectfully ask that we fix this problem, and not go week to week hoping and praying a PowerPoint works, when people have spent all the time. Someone needs to be responsible for it. It isn't the council clerk. It's not Karla's job. She has a million other things on her plate.

**Wheeler:** I agree. nominate nick Fish. All in favor? Commissioner, you're right. I just looked, it's actually working at home. I don't know what the deal is with the PowerPoint. We'll look into that and see if we can figure it out.

**Creager:** And we'll make part of the permanent record.

**Fish:** That doesn't help people watching it now. And mayor, if we have to, I would like to

October 18, 2017

add something in the Fall bump to have a professional come in and fix it because it's embarrassing that this happens every week. And Karla should not be put in the middle of disappointed people who can't run PowerPoints.

**Wheeler:** Alright! Very good.

**Zuniga:** So, to summarize the policy, for energy efficiency, we set targets for an EUI, which is an energy use intensity, and that is the amount of energy used per square foot per year in a building. It's a good metric that works across various programs and that's why we chose to use that one. They will meet the targets that we've set that will decrease every three to six years until we get to net zero at 2050. We'll obviously be reviewing this annually and checking those metrics and deciding if we can get there faster. Depending on the market and technology. Two other pieces of the policy for energy have to do with solar and electric vehicles charging. We just felt like it was a good move to position our projects to take advantage of those technologies as they continue to develop. So, our projects will have a choice of either installing solar and EV charging or just being solar and EV ready so that they have the infrastructure there which is a very small incremental cost when you're in new construction. They will have that infrastructure there, and ready to accept those technologies as they continue to evolve and the cost continues to go down. The other measure is for water. We have a target of water reduction based on a federal metric to reduce water by 50% by 2040, so similarly, we will see water reductions that will go down incrementally every three to five years until we get to the 50% reduction.

**Fish:** Is it your recommendation that in the multi-family property area that we fund, that we mandate individual meters per unit, so we can actually enforce some of these guidelines?

**Zuniga:** We can enforce this guideline just through the plumbing fixtures. It's really just the rating of each plumbing fixture, and that can be documented.

**Fish:** I see. Less flow? But, I'm curious because, as you know, the utilities have been trying to crack the code about how to get more discounts to needy people. Does any of your policy contemplate at some point individual meters?

**Zuniga:** Not in this policy. We are talking about it with our partners a lot. And some of our partners are testing it and putting net metering in some buildings. It's quite expensive, and that's why people are hesitating to really jump on that. We're looking for other ways and whether we can just do it with software rather than actual physical meters trying to find the best way to get at that.

**Fish:** Thank you.

**Zuniga:** And then, the other piece, the third piece, is indoor air quality, which is the most important for tenant health, and we have three measures for that, one is a no-smoking policy indoors. The second puts limits on airborne toxics like volatile organic compounds, it's using the strictest measure from California standards, and the other one is to have a balanced ventilation system so that – code already requires buildings to exhaust air out of kitchens and bathrooms; this will require them to provide the same amount of fresh air supply. So instead of you open your window, we will be providing that fresh air that is conditioned, and filtered, et cetera. So, those are the basic provisions for energy, water and indoor air quality. And then, quickly I'll just go through, there's a lot on the back end, sort of baseline requirements to ensure we're getting the performance we want. Lots of coordination meetings that required lots of testing and inspection that's required all through design, all through construction. We even do sort of a pre-blower door test so that by the time we get to the end of construction and commissioning, we will pass that blower door test, we will pass the commissioning that will get the performance that was designed in to meet this policy. We're also asking them to commission again at seven years after construction as a check-in to make sure again that the building is continuing to perform as it was designed. The systems are balanced, maintenance is being done, et cetera, et

October 18, 2017

cetera. In terms of compliance, they will submit regular reports to us. They will submit their final certification, and we will be doing this for ourselves eventually. And there's a \$5,000 penalty if they don't comply. That's not that large, but really, the loan agreement with us is the bigger leverage that we have in terms of getting compliance, and the three construction coordinators work with these projects from inception all the way through construction, so we will be monitoring progress and making sure there really is a good faith effort. That's it.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Colleagues?

**Fish:** We have a big celebration coming up, so, can I ask you to, Kurt, send me in writing, since this is the first reading, we have heard a lot of people come to council saying we should backtrack on our green building policy, on our opportunity agenda, and on our fair wage policy. That's been a constant drumbeat in terms of reducing the cost of some of our housing. Between now and the vote, would you let me know if this green policy that you're proposing in any way backtracks on any of the policies that we currently have in place around green buildings?

**Creager:** I would be happy to. And it will also allow me to enter into the record the PSU's report, which I just saw this morning for the first time, so, I'll include that in my response.

**Fish:** Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Well, on the indoor quality, you said the fresh air will now be conditioned. Does that mean air conditioned?

**Zuniga:** Well, no.

**Saltzman:** Okay. I was just wondering.

**Zuniga:** It will be heated. It won't be air conditioned. And we're doing a study right now on air conditioning because we see the climate changing, we have the data on that, we're looking at how much our buildings will overheat as time goes on. We have commissioned a study also with PSU through the Climate Action Collaborative to study how much -- what the need is going to be, how much we can do with the shell passively, and then if we have to, what are the best active systems. And we are running energy models and all kinds of studies to really understand that issue because we know it's ahead of us.

**Saltzman:** Yeah, I would agree. I mean, I think, with climate change happening, and it seems like the humane thing to require. I have gone to enough groundbreaking, ribbon cuttings of our affordable housing facilities in the summertime to realize how hot these places are for the individuals who are going to end up living in them.

**Zuniga:** Currently is a fallback. Much of our projects are using portable units that plug into a window panel so that we can get to the units that are overheating, which are usually the west side and the top. We don't often need it on the north side on the bottom. So, we are mostly doing that. It allows us the flexibility to get air conditioning to the units that need it.

**Saltzman:** Okay. Great. Thanks.

**Wheeler:** Colleagues, any further questions or comments? This is a first reading of a nonemergency ordinance. I did forget, that, I apologize. Is there any public testimony on this item?

**Moore-Love:** We have one person, Isaac Johnson.

**Wheeler:** My apologies. Come on up.

**Isaac Johnson:** Hi. I'm Isaac Johnson, I'm a principal at Ankrom-Moisan Architects, and we employ about 200 people here in Old Town. We're one of the leading designers of multi-family housing on the west coast. I would like to speak in favor of new PHB green building policy and specifically in favor of setting long term goals to reduce energy consumption. Our firm has a history of designing over 2500 affordable homes including one of the largest passive house projects in North America. We design both market rate and affordable homes, and the affordable projects often lead the industry in reducing energy use. This is because investors such as the City of Portland and operators are long

October 18, 2017

term owners and will realize the payback of this investment. Over the 25 years I have been doing affordable housing, I have witnessed a growing awareness and implementation of sustainable building practices. Features that were aspirational 15 years ago are now standard practice, and it's time for a policy that looks forward from here and gently raises the bar. The American Institute of Architects champions the 2030 plan to progressively achieve carbon neutral buildings by the year 2030. This PHB policy sets a similar goal for net zero by the year 2050. We can hit this mark. The technology and knowledge is on hand today, especially here, in the city of Portland. Design professionals are aspirational and optimistic. We want to save the world, and this policy is an ally in that fight. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Thank you, we appreciate it. Good morning.

**Mike Steffen:** Good morning. It may even be afternoon. [Laughter] I'm Mike Steffen, director of innovation at Walsh Construction Company, and I'm here on behalf of Walsh to voice my support for PHB's efforts to create a streamlined and vital green building policy, a policy that should reduce the demands of green certification while ensuring that the deep benefits of green building are included in Portland's affordable housing moving forward. I believe PHB should be commended for focusing on energy efficiency and air quality as the core measures of green building that benefit our community and the residents of the buildings. Without a doubt, there are small incremental costs involved in bringing these measures into our buildings. However, these buildings are long term assets to the community and that minimum up-front investment in these critical measures will certainly pay off over the long term. As part of the policy, PHB has proposed life cycle cost analysis to assist with decision making. Walsh has used such tools in the past and we believe that is another strong element in the policy and look forward to seeing how that plays out on future projects. Thank you for your time. Apologies for being short of breath. I just ran up the stairs.

**Fritz:** Thank you for making it.

**Wheeler:** Good exercise! Absolutely. This is a first reading of a nonemergency ordinance. It moves to second reading. Thanks everybody for your testimony. So, colleagues, we now have a proclamation honoring the Portland Thorns. And I don't know if we want to start -- commissioner Fish and commissioner Fritz, if you have some introductory comments --

**Fish:** No, let commissioner Fritz.

**Fritz:** I certainly do. Very glad to see you all here today. Thank you for coming to City Hall. It's absolutely fantastic to have our Thorns win the cup a second time. It's just fantastic. I'm really happy that we have something to celebrate. As I said on Sunday evening, for me, watching the final on Saturday was two hours when I didn't think about anything else than watching the game and cheering. Of course, getting almost to heart failure by the end of it. But I reflected, too, that for you, for the players, the coaches, it was more than two hours. It was not only the entire season building up to that, but your careers. As student athletes in college, the way that the team comes together, international players and local players, so thank you for the joint effort of everything coming together for that glorious moment when it blew the whistle, finally. [Laughter]

**Wheeler:** So today, we have head coach Mark Parsons and Katherine Reynolds, one of our awesome star Thorns here, we have lots of fans, lots of supporters here today. Excellent. So, we have a longstanding tradition that goes all the way back to the founding of our city. We have these proclamations. And when we read them, we are actually making a statement on behalf of the entire city council and the entire community. And I know that over the last several days, you have had lots and lots of attention and interviews and public appearances, and we just could not let it go without a proclamation. A number of us participated in the phenomenal event on Sunday evening, and it was so great to see -- I don't know, there were probably, what? 20ish thousand people there. It was a huge crowd.

October 18, 2017

Bigger than ever fills the chambers. We'll call it 20,000, right? And if it wasn't factually 20,000,

**Fritz:** It sounded like it. [Laughter]

**Wheeler:** Yeah! We'll have the photos on the internet comparing to other events soon. It's just been great. And so, as the mayor, I have the honor of reading this proclamation on behalf of all of my colleagues here. "Whereas the Portland Thorns, FC, were founded in 2012 as the women's professional soccer club here in the Rose City, joining the national women's soccer league for its inaugural season in 2013, and whereas the Thorns are the best attended women's professional sports team in the world, averaging 17,653 fans per game, and whereas the Rose City Riveters and the City of Portland are proud to cheer on –" Oh, now, here's where you've set me up. I totally see it. "Celeste... Boreal? [All laughing] Dagny, Britt, Adriana, Tobin, Amandeen, Linsdsey, Kendal, Savannah, Megan, Allie, Tyler, Emily, Meg, Nadia, Hailey, Katherine, Christine, Emily, Ashley, and Mallory, the amazing members of this incredible team..."

**Fritz:** Whose full names are actually in the proclamation.

**Wheeler:** I wasn't going to embarrass myself any further, commissioner. "Whereas the Rose City Riveters and the City of Portland acknowledge the leadership of team owner Merit Paulsen, general manager and president of soccer, Gavin Wilkinson, head coach Mark Parsons, assistant coaches Nadine Angerer, Rich Gunney and Sophie Clough, performance manager Garga Caserta, and athletic trainer Beckie Cruz, whereas the Thorns held an impressive 14-5-5 record and finished the season with an eight-game unbroken streak, and whereas the thorns established a new team record for wins: 14 shutouts: 11 and points: 47 during the regular season; whereas the dominant Thorns became the only NWSL team to qualify for the post-season in four of the league's first five seasons; whereas the Thorns brought home their second National Women's Soccer League championship after a 1-0 win over the North Carolina Courage on October 14th in Orlando, Florida, now therefore, I, Ted Wheeler, mayor of the city of Portland, Oregon, the City of Roses, and Soccer City, USA, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, October 18, 2017, to be a day of recognition for the Portland Thorns, FC, in Portland, and encourage all residents to observe this day." Thank you on behalf of all of us and congratulations. [Applause] We're so proud of you. Could we get a photo with both of you and all of the fans? Why don't you guys come up here too, and the city council? Let's all get in this together. Why don't we do that?

[Picture taking]

**Wheeler:** Thank you, everybody. [Applause]

\*\*\*\*\*: Thanks for having us.

**Wheeler:** 1143, please, Karla.

**Item 1143.**

**Fish:** Mayor, we have taken a two-hour presentation and boiled it down to an hour and a half. And I'm just going to turn it over to Teresa Elliott, chief engineer of Portland Water Bureau, for what will take, at most, three minutes.

**Teresa Elliott, Portland Water Bureau:** Good morning. I'm Teresa Elliot, chief engineer Portland Water Bureau. I guess it's probably afternoon by now. And yes, it will probably be about three minutes max. We have a – Portland Water Bureau annexed the Sylvan Water District in 1986 and the Pin Ridge Main Replacement Project is in the southwest hills that takes over the Sylvan water district. We have done a couple of planning studies that have identified some mains that are undersized and don't meet desired fire flow demands that are currently in place. And we also have some services that are operating just above the Oregon Health Department's recommended minimum service levels for pressure, and so, this project will both improve the fire flow and the water service pressures in the area. It will

October 18, 2017

improve our service reliability and fire suppression capacity. And to do that, we're planning to increase the pipe sizes that are there to bring them up to more code. Our primary impacts that we're expecting to the neighbors will be construction traffic during the project. And with that, I'm going to let Ben talk about this ordinance.

**Ben Gossett, Portland Water Bureau:** That was a tough act to follow. My name is Ben Gossett, I'm the right of way manager for the Portland Water Bureau. And I'll just add to Teresa's comments that when these mains were taken over by annexation in 1986, many of them, in addition to being undersized or located in private roads, this project will acquire four easements in private roads from three individual owners that will enable us to maintain the new facilities that we construct. We will be conducting all of our negotiations in accordance with city best practices and conforming to state and federal law. This ordinance does authorize use of the city's eminent domain authority. I don't anticipate that that will be necessary. The easements are located within a traveled roadway where other roadway easements already exist. And as Teresa noted, there are considerable benefits to the adjacent property owners.

**Fish:** Colleagues, let me just underscore something, 'cause this is a routine matter. The bureau's policy is to negotiate with the property owners in good faith to seek a fair deal. What we also do, though, when we come to council with these matters is, we also have, as a backstop, an eminent domain authority. It's rarely, if ever, used. And the negotiations are normally fruitful.

**Elliot:** And with that, we're here for questions.

**Wheeler:** Colleagues, any further questions?

**Fritz:** Do we know whether the owners are likely to be happy about this? Do we know whether the owners have the agreement, are likely to be agreeing?

**Gossett:** We have not reached formal agreement. They are aware of the project. They are aware of this ordinance. They were advised of their right to be here today to testify. They are aware of the location of the easements. We'll go through a process to value the easements and make a formal offer.

**Fritz:** Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Is from any public testimony?

**Moore-Love:** No one signed up.

**Wheeler:** Anything else? This is a first reading of a non-emergency ordinance. It moves to second reading. Thank you very much for your testimony and your patience. Thank you. Next item, 1144.

**Fish:** Mayor, do you mind if we just do 1145 as a second vote? 'Cause after that, I have to leave.

**Wheeler:** Not at all. 1145, go ahead.

**Item 1145.**

**Wheeler:** So, colleagues, you've already taken extensive testimony on this item, it's a second reading, please call the roll.

**Eudaly:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

**Wheeler:** Aye. The ordinance is adopted, please call 1144.

**Item 1144.**

**Wheeler:** Commissioner Saltzman.

**Saltzman:** Thank you, mayor. Well, this ordinance is analogous to the one we just talked about, with respect to the right-of-ways for the Water Bureau. This provides the Portland Bureau of Transportation the authority to acquire property, to install ADA ramps in the street project, this grind overlay project, along North Columbia Boulevard. The property rights needed are for construction of, as I said, ADA facilities upgrades, triggered by the paving project, and as with the water bureau, we used eminent domain as a last resort, but

October 18, 2017

we do want to have that arrow in our quiver.

**Marty Maloney, Portland Bureau of Transportation:** The only thing I'd really like to add is that we have also reached out to all the effective property owners, sending out general information to them, and invited them to be at council as well, so, you know, but if you have any other questions, feel free to...

**Fritz:** Could you just give us your name please?

**Maloney:** Oh, sorry! [Laughter] Marty Maloney with PBOT Right-Of-Way.

**Fritz:** Thank you for doing all the good work.

**Wheeler:** Any further questions? Is there any public testimony on this item? The only person left is Mary. Faithful Mary. [All laughing] Very good. This is a first reading, non-emergency ordinance, moves to second reading and we are adjourned until 2:00 p.m.

**at 12:32 PM council recessed.**

**This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript.**

**Key: \*\*\*\*\* means unidentified speaker.**

**October 18, 2017                      2:00 PM**

**Wheeler:** Good afternoon, everybody. This is the afternoon session of the Portland City Council. Karla, please call the roll.

**[roll call taken]**

**Wheeler:** Karla, could you please read items 1146 through 1148?

**Item 1146.**

**Item 1147.**

**Item 1148.**

**Wheeler:** Today's session is a continuation of the Central City 2035 matter. We held hearings and took public testimony on September 7, September 14, and September 20. There's no public testimony today. Commissioner Fritz?

**Fritz:** Thank you, mayor. Since one of the things we're discussing is potential conflicts of interest for one of the advisory committees, I do need to say on the record that I am the co-owner of a condominium at Northwest Flanders and 8th. There are 27 other co-owners, and I think the likelihood of them wanting to anything to their building in terms of demolishing and rebuilding are slim to none. And that particular property is to have less height. So, I'm going to continue to participate but I did just want to say on the record that I certainly know the area very well. Because I visit my son and daughter-in-law quite a lot.

**Wheeler:** Thank you commissioner Fritz. Today we're going to discuss items of interest to council members and decide if we want to consider amendments if amendments are not already on the table. The topics that we have on today's list are the following: First: The West Quadrant SAC property ownership. Second: The height and FAR. Third: Scenic views. Fourth: The transportation system plan. Fifth: Zoning and use allowances, and sixth: Green buildings. So, here's how staff and I propose that this works. The staff will come up, they will introduce the topics that will include the following for each of these items: Some background, any proposed amendment, and if there's handouts or PowerPoints, that will be the appropriate time for that. We'll identify which council member or council members asked that these issues be discussed, and then we'll give the commissioner who requested the item to be on the agenda first shot at beginning the discussion. After the council has had a chance to ask questions and hold a discussion, I'll call the question, and I'll ask if there are -- if there's the desire to put forward an amendment related to this topic. If there's no amendment proposed after the discussion, because some of these amendments were put on the table for discussion purposes, and after all, the testimony and discussion, the commissioner may wish to withdraw the amendment. So, if there's no amendment I'll move on to the next item. Just to be clear, if there's no second on an item, the proposed amendment will not be part of the amendment package that will be heard on January 18. And at the very tag end of our meeting, staff is going to confirm the items that will be the subject of the hearing on January 18<sup>th</sup>, and any items that we'll return to for more discussion on November 2nd or December 6th. Does that make sense to folks? Very good. And if you didn't follow that, don't worry about it. The staff is well prepped, and they will guide us through this. Joe, can you kick things off with

October 18, 2017

an overview of the height and FAR in the central city? And as per usual, people could just identify themselves for the record, that's always helpful.

**Joe Zehnder, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Good afternoon, commissioners and mayor. I'm Joe Zehnder, chief planner for the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. The first item, since so much of what we're talk about today are amendments or issues related to maximum building heights and floor area ratios in the central city, I wanted to do a quick overview of what those are about and how we treat them in the plan. And I'm going to use a few slides to do that. This set is not so consequential, but you have a lot of important slides to look at today, that are going to help you with your decision. So, Central City Heights. This just shows you before the 1980s Central City Plan, our heights in the central city were pretty liberal. 460 feet was sort of the norm, and with the '88 plan, we started to move into a regime that's more close to what we have today, which that we use where we allow greater building heights for specific policy purposes. And that's part of what I'm going to explain today. Second, it's really important, as we talk about heights in the central city, to understand that we're applying a system of maximum building heights on a very unique situation of these 200 foot by 200 foot blocks. That's really small for an American city. That's 200 feet by 200 feet that doesn't have an alley either. So, the development of that block is pretty tricky. All the loading, all the access, everything is around the perimeter of that lot. We incorporate extra height into our maximum heights to allow flexibility to work around some of the challenges that causes. Third, I wanted to point out: The way we do maximum building heights also works hand in hand with the floor area ratios. And floor area ratio, right, is the system by which we calculate how many square feet of development you can put on a site. So, this slide you're looking at is sort of a typical 200-foot by 200-foot central city block. The way floor area ratio works is, you take the square feet of that size of that site and multiply it by the ratio, and that's how much you get to build. And so, sort of the lower corner where the site is built out with complete block is often, or possibly how that looks like. But part of the reason for adding height is to allow buildings to be designed in a variety of ways and still accomplish the amount of development we want to see in the central city. That total floor area ratio plus bonuses these days. You can use it in situations where you are trying to preserve part of the site, and build around it and still get your square feet in there. You can use it in situations where you're not only trying to not just preserve part of the site, but use part of the site for a for a lower intensive use like a plaza, and go up even higher. And you could use it just because of the business purposes that that's your -- the type of building that you're trying to build. So, the two work together, and then, finally, I just wanted to talk about - there's sort of nine principles, nine considerations that you're gonna see in these discussions of height. Where do we allow more height in the central city? Typically -- and you'll see it -- we use it where we want for have the most development. FAR, the floor area, and the height goes hand in hand. For policy purposes, we have always put that in the downtown downtown, and along our transit mall, because we're trying to maximize close access and business support for the transit mall. Secondly, we make sure that our height works with the amount of floor area, the amount of square feet that we want in a different part of the central city. Third, and this is something that we have introduced with or emphasized in this plan, that we want to provide extra height to provide flexibility for both the design of our buildings that you don't have to just extrude up a solid block. You have the ability to go with smaller floor plates, and do some architecture as you go higher, and you have the ability to work with some really complicated sites, for instance the one we'll talk about today are the bridge heads that have constraints due to ramps and the like. Four, in this plan, in this version, you're going to see that we only allow more heights in return for a bonus. So, our new system, wherever we are raising height, that's only achievable by accessing it through one

October 18, 2017

of our central city bonuses. So where do you see lower heights or moves to lower heights in the central city? We use them first to preserve the character historic districts. You're gonna see that today. Old Town/Chinatown, Grand Avenue are two examples we're gonna talk about today. We lower heights to protect designated views. You're gonna see a number of cases of that today. We use it to reduce shadows on parks and open spaces. This is part of, actually, the origins of our tradition of Step Down to the River, and we use it as a transition to neighborhoods, so on the edges of the central city. Today, I think we're talking about southeast 12th. We tend to taper down the heights there, so they can create transition. So, this map that you're seeing, is sort of a summary of where we have increased and decreased heights as part of this plan. The orange are height increases. The blue are height decreases. And there's a couple of situations I think these are green on the central east side, where, because it was industrial in the past, you don't even have maximum heights. Industrial zones, you can just build. So, we have put those on there. So that's the universe of changes that we're gonna be talking about today. And when we get to that section of those amendments, we'll walk through them. Any questions on this background? Does that make sense? Okay. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Very good. I'm sorry, I should have -- are we moving on to the first item?

**Zehnder:** Yes.

**Wheeler:** Okay. The first is item A, this is the west quadrant advisory -- the SAC property ownership issue. I'll turn it over to you now.

**Sallie Edmunds, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Thank you. Thank you, Joe. So, now that you have that background that Joe just provided to you, we would like to report on some of the work we did in response to commissioner Fritz' request related to the West Quadrant SAC, stakeholder advisory committee. So, just briefly, for those of you who are new to City Council, we started the Central City planning process by developing some overall policy guidance and then three high level plans for different Central City geographies. And those are listed on the screen before you. Each of these groups had a committee that advised BPS staff and the committees were comprised of people who had some sort of stake in the outcomes, like advocates for affordable housing, neighborhood interests, environmental interests and of course, property owners, business owners, and people who work in the area. So, each group reviewed and discussed drafts and concepts that staff developed, but staff produced the final products that went to the Planning and Sustainability Commission. So, after the quadrant processes, we worked on a number of additional studies that included a scenic resource inventory that led to all the scenic view work before you. We did a bonus and transfer study that started our work on prioritizing the affordable housing bonus. And those materials and implementation strategies developed as part of that were not part of any of the quadrant planning work committees. So once all the processes that I just described were complete, staff began to integrate it into an early version of the Central City 2035 draft that you have before you. So, this screen just shows some background on the West Quadrant SAC. Just the chronology of the different, the final meeting, July 2014, and outlines the when the letter went to the ombudsman and the letter to the concerned Portlanders, and on 216, BPS requested after-the-fact disclosures from the various SAC members. So, and the next slide here shows, it's kind of the summary of disclosure and all this material is in Volume 6 of the Central City Plan. So, 26 people filled out the form, some others did not. And, some were more complete than others. So, Commissioner Fritz asked us to prepare a map showing the West Quadrant SAC ownership and that is what is on the screen. And that is what Karla just distributed to you today. And so, while we got some specific information from the disclosure forms, the most information we got was derived from the Multnomah County tax data sorted by the address to which the tax bill is sent. And so, that's how we generated this, and then we

October 18, 2017

checked it, compared it with the disclosure forms that we received. So, the map on your screen is the same color palate as the one Joe just talked about. And so, it builds off the blue and the oranges. Again, the light orange are height increases, the light blue are height decreases, and when those colors are dark – so, the dark orange are height increases, properties that are owned by SAC members. The dark blue are height decreases on properties owned by SAC members. There's also some cross hatching on the map. And that comes from our buildable lands inventory you may recall from our comprehensive plan process. So, there are two different types of those. Some are vacant, underutilized, and some are nonvacant but considered underutilized lots. So, what does this show? I guess it shows that height increases on the Stakeholder Advisory-owned properties are scattered around the west quadrant. Some are height increases. Some are decreases. Many of the increases are on properties that are not expected to redevelop over the next 20 years, the lifetime of this plan. In addition to the ones that are not cross hatched, there are a few that are that are actually under development right now such as the one right next to the building that we work in, the 1900 building. So, that's shown here as a BLI site, but it's actually under development right now. In some cases, you'll see that one particular block has half blue and half orange. And that's generally, if not always, because there is a height increase in that general area, but there's a view corridor that transects that area, so there's a decrease for that view corridor area. The other reason why the blue pattern is kind of complicated is that there are views from a variety of points such as Washington Park, Terwilliger and others, and they are views of Mount Hood, Mt. St. Helens, Mount Adams, and that sort of thing. So, they're crisscrossing all across the central city, which ends up with this kind of interesting pattern. So, I think that's everything I had prepared.

**Wheeler:** Commissioner Fritz.

**Fritz:** Thank you. First of all, thank you, staff, for working on this so diligently. I know you've been putting a lot of work in, and in fact, things continue to evolve up to the last minute. The map we have in front of us shows all of the height increases and decreases as well as the ones from the stakeholder advisory committee. I also want to thank the community members who are here even though there's no testimony, and those who raised concerns. Also, the ombudsman for writing her reports. My intention is not to isolate individual property owners. I believe that since there has been the question about whether or not self-interest may have played a role in this, it really behooves us to look at the whole patterns and see where the patterns make sense and where they don't. One of the key ones that I think doesn't make sense is the small area around the Morrison Bridge head. We're going to have that as a separate amendment. What would be helpful to me, before our next work session, is if we could get the maps with the view sheds written in. Because, try as I might with the straight lines that are on here, I can't see why some properties are increased -- you can see why there are decreased ones, but others are increased. And so, I can't imagine what lines could be drawn that would make sense of what I'm seeing in the patterns of this map. So, I apologize to council, I had hoped that we would be even further along than we are, but we have the data now. Would that be acceptable if we tied this one over to next time?

**Wheeler:** Very good.

**Fish:** Let me just add, commissioner, that, now we have this data, the question that I'll be interested in having my colleagues address is: As to any property that you have identified as potentially having, let's call it "a cloud over it," what's the position of staff in terms of the recommendation on the merits? Is there a reason to take the action that's been proposed? And if not why not? And what's been the public testimony? I think it's important to identify these properties, but I think it's equally important to hear the arguments pro and con, whatever changes are proposed, because ultimately, we get to look at this fresh. Whatever

October 18, 2017

the advisory committees have done we're the final actors. And my interest is in getting it right. And that is a balance of a lot of factors that frankly go well beyond the question of who owns the property. It goes to the question of how, what kind of community are we building, and is any recommendation on a particular site consistent with the various things that you put before us earlier? And if not, why not?

**Wheeler:** Very good. Any further discussion on this item before we move to the next topic? Alright, Rachel, you're up next. We're moving to height and FAR. And I have five proposed amendments there, but I'll let you start up.

**Rachel Hoy, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Thank you, mayor. I have a list here of eight items. And those eight items align with the items that were part of the agenda in your packet. So, I'll be going through each of these today.

**Fish:** By the way, thanks for the cheat sheet she gave us, and thank you also for blowing it up so we can read it. Thank you for both.

**Hoy:** So, the first item here, Old Town/Roseland Theater height area, through public testimony we received a proposal to restore the height on the Roseland Theater and the adjacent blocks between Southwest 5th, Broadway, and then from Burnside north to Everett. So, it's that six-block area that you see in the maps here. So, the map on the left is the recommended draft proposal which was to lower heights in this area. The main reason being that the heights that were set, and what exists today is 460 feet in the six-block area. There was thinking that the commercial corridor would continue north, so big pink and further south, that would continue north of Burnside. Part of the reason for staff's proposal to reduce the heights to a base of 250 and then an opportunity to get to 325 through bonuses was mostly, we didn't see that pattern unfold. That the commercial corridor just has not proceeded north in that way. So, it was in an attempt to right size height in this area. We do have a lot of smaller blocks and buildings that have been built that some of them are historic resources. However, we know that the site is also along the transit mall, and there is future development potential in this area. So, the amendment to put forward -- the mayor's amendment is to restore heights in this six-block area to the 460 feet that exist today. And that is shown in the map on the right-hand side.

**Fish:** How tall is the big pink?

**Hoy:** Big pink is 545 feet.

**Fish:** So, 460 feet would be roughly 90% of the big pink.

**Hoy:** That's correct.

**Fish:** So, we could have potentially six blocks that have buildings with roughly the same height of the big pink on this side of Burnside?

**Hoy:** So that's the height envelope that's there today. And the way that we have set height, we set these height envelopes and it offers a pattern within this area. We certainly wouldn't expect that every block would have a building of that height. Mostly because the pattern that exists today, we have existing buildings. In order to consolidate a space of that size, it would be challenging to see that level of development on each of these blocks.

**Fish:** Okay.

**Hoy:** So, I was going to turn it over to you, mayor.

**Wheeler:** You did an excellent job of describing this and I appreciate the process we've set up today. This is actually very helpful for me and I'm sure [inaudible].

**Saltzman:** Is the appropriate point, if I want to support this amendment, to second it?

**Wheeler:** Yeah! Sure, if you'd like.

**Saltzman:** Yeah, I would second this.

**Wheeler:** Great. That makes it easy. I'm sensitive to the fact that it's adjacent to the historic district and that was something I certainly considered. It's also on the transit mall, and as you know, this is obviously the central city, and it's the area where, if we're going to

October 18, 2017

seek density, it's the most appropriate place to locate it. It takes some of the pressure off the established neighborhoods. So, I appreciate commissioner Saltzman's seconding that amendment. I don't know if there's further discussion on this before I call the question. Commissioner Fish.

**Fish:** I'm going to propose, mayor, that we not actually take votes until we have gone through the whole package. And the reason is I want to make sure that if, for example, you and commissioner Saltzman put down a marker about this site. I would like to see what our collective positions are on some sister amendments and I would like to see the whole. If we start doing it piecemeal, we could end up making either inconsistent decisions or we might have to revisit. So, if I might suggest, let's take the part 1 amendments, let's go through them, see if there's a second, and then come back and vote on them, after we have a chance to see the forest from the trees.

**Fritz:** I think actually what's being proposed is: As long as they are seconded, they move on to January for public comment.

**Hoy:** We just need a second.

**Wheeler:** That is seconded, so that amendment is on the table. And it'll be available for further discussion.

**Fish:** Which works great for me, because I'd like to see the context and not walk in piecemeal.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Excellent. So, we'll move on to the second item. The Old town Roseland Theater.

**Hoy:** Okay. So, the next item is in new town: Chinatown/Japantown within the historic district. And through public testimony, we received a proposal to restore height on the block highlighted in red on the left. And it's within the historic district and the historic district is the area that is highlighted in green, but this is the block in question, I have highlighted in red for you. The existing heights –

**Fritz:** I'm sorry, I'm lost. Which map were you looking at?

**\*\*\*\*:** The Powerpoint?

**Hoy:** Yes, on the Powerpoint here, I've highlighted the block within the historic district in red, then the historic district in red,

**Fritz:** Okay, thank you.

**Hoy:** – I just wanted to give you the picture of, at least for these maps, the area that is the historic district is in green. Oh, I'm sorry, so page 7 in the packet. If you're looking at the packet that was distributed.

**Fritz:** Thank you.

**Hoy:** So, the existing heights in this northern portion of the historic district are 300 feet, bonus-able to 425 feet. And that's the full four-block area there to the north, and that northern part of the historic district. The recommended draft proposed to reduce heights in this four-block area to 125 feet. We felt that in this area it would better align, that height reduction would better align with future development, development expectations, and the overall character of the historic district.

**Fish:** So, I'm going to second the mayor's amendment. I got a briefing from BPS, Joe and his team, and what persuaded me was looking at the context in terms of surrounding buildings. And Mr. Zehnder, my recollection is: Either to the west or the northwest, there's a building that's about 160 feet. Or maybe I got it reversed.

**Hoy:** That's right.

**Fish:** But anyway, that's how you landed at 160.

**Zehnder:** Correct.

**Fish:** 'Cause there's an apartment building across the way, and you felt that it was consistent, and so that's what persuaded me.

October 18, 2017

**Zehnder:** Yeah, we're trying to protect the character of the district, but also be fair and also look for precedent within the district. So that's how we arrived at that.

**Fritz:** I might give an alternative opinion. 'Cause I was going to support the initial amendment. I've heard from the Landmarks Commission, they sent us a briefing that even the increase from 125 to 160 is about three more stories, would put a lot of more pressure on development and demolition. Currently the tallest building in this small historic district is 75 feet, which is Prosper Portland's building. So, 160 feet would be a huge difference and not likely to get through Historic Landmarks Commission. We have got a problem in that when we don't set realistic expectations, we put a lot of pressure on our commissions to then preserve the district with something that fundamentally can't be passed by historic review.

**Fish:** Commissioner, here's another thing that I found compelling. It currently is allowed up to 350 feet with bonus height option to 425. And I think that when we're talking about substantially reducing the value of an existing piece of property from a legacy property owner in an area that's frankly been neglected for a long time by the city, I want to be careful about how much value we're taking away when we change the height. So, since it's currently eligible to 425, I thought 160, which is consistent with the building adjacent, was a worthy compromise. It is a two-thirds reduction of what is currently allowed, and if I were a property owner I would be surprised to learn the value of my property has been substantially reduced by a reduction like that.

**Fritz:** I would just say that having a property in the historic district raises the value of the property in particular if it's not being overshadowed by another incongruent building. But, so, we can move forward with the amendment as proposed by the mayor and Commissioner Fish, and I'll signal that I will be advocating for an alternative proposal and we'll be looking for public input on it.

**Wheeler:** Yeah, that's good. So, B2 is also on the table along with B1. And I just want to point out, Commissioner Fish is right, that the Pacific Tower immediately adjacent, is 160 feet, and that's also consistent with the East Portland/Grand Avenue Historic District, which is the same height, so...

**Fritz:** But they are not in the district, with all due respect.

**Wheeler:** That's correct, that is correct, but in terms of the Landmarks Commission approval, I don't anticipate that being a problem. Not saying it couldn't be, but I don't anticipate that.

**Fritz:** So, I would like to put this into the record, and if you could have it for next time, it does show where the historic districts are, including this, is in the historic district, but now going to be more similar to the other adjacent properties not in the district.

**Wheeler:** Yeah, that'd be great. Uh, item B3.

**Hoy:** So, this next item is adjacent to the historic district, but it's right outside the district. Through testimony we received, we had a proposal to restore the current height to 350 with an option to bonus to 425. And I have highlighted – the proposal came in for, on the left-hand side there, the block that's highlighted in red. The staff recommendation, through the recommended draft, which is to lower heights in this area to a base height of 250 with the ability to get to 325. So, this is a similar -- the recommended draft here and the proposal we had is very similar to what I described for the area just south of this, where the Roseland Theater is. Again, it was basically in an effort to right-size heights and looking the at what the pattern of development is that we see in the area.

**Wheeler:** And again, adjacent to the transit mall.

**Hoy:** Yes. Correct. So, as we looked at this more closely, it is adjacent to the transit mall, and there is potential for additional development. What we would suggest, and the mayor's amendment being put forward, is to restore base height to 350 with the option to bonus to

October 18, 2017

425 for the four blocks in this area, not just the one block highlighted in red on your screen, but that floor block area to be consistent with the pattern of development that we're seeing in that area.

**Wheeler:** Is there a second?

**Saltzman:** Yeah, I'll second that.

**Wheeler:** Commissioner Saltzman seconds B3. Any further conversation on B3?

**Fritz:** May I just make a process suggestion? I would really like us to not rush to be the first person to second, because that kind of shuts down the discussion. So, if we could possibly have discussion, if any, before seeking a second? Otherwise, I'm going to be very quick to jump in, and I don't really want to do that.

**Wheeler:** Sounds good. B4.

**Hoy:** So, this next item, and actually the next three slides that I have here focus on three existing buildings. Big Pink, Pac West, and Wells Fargo. This first building, I'll get to the slide in a moment, but I want to describe for you, for these three buildings, today these buildings have nonconforming status because they are taller and have higher FARs than exist in the central city today, but were approved and met zoning regulations in place at the time. So, what that means is they are nonconforming. They can rebuild if they were destroyed in a fire, today they can rebuild to the same height and same FAR. Our code allows that today. However, we have heard some concerns from the building owners that they have expressed concerns related to insuring and financing the buildings when they have nonconforming status. So, we would recommend, and the mayor's amendment to put forward here, is to provide these buildings with heights and FARs that they have today as constructed. So, I wanted to just then go through each of these slides to tell you what that would be. So, for Big Pink, what we -- the existing height of that building today -- and Big Pink is -- the FAR is fine and consistent with what's on our FAR map at 15:1, but their current height is 545 feet, so we would, through the mayor's amendment, make that request that the height would be set at 545. So that's Big Pink. Let me go through all three of them quickly here to show you. For PacWest and Wells Fargo, the amendment would be for Wells Fargo. It's a building at 555 feet. So, the request amendment would be to put that at 555. Pac West is 430 feet. And in fact, our height maps were already reflecting that this particular area could bonus to 460, so we're just recommending maintaining that. So, they would have their height at 430, but there would be the ability to get to 460 in the future.

**Fritz:** So that's an amendment.

**Hoy:** That's correct. And then, for Pac West and Wells Fargo, they both are built at a higher FAR, a higher massing than what's on the map today. So, for Wells Fargo, that would be changing their floor area ratio to 18:1 and changing Pac West's floor area ratio to 15:1.

**Fish:** Is there an unintended consequence of this? I'm reading the staff comments about essentially giving them conforming status which they claim, at least, has some benefits in terms of getting insurance and other things. But, is there a potential unintended consequence of doing this? I can't imagine that -- this isn't New York City, where they tear down buildings like Big Pink to put up other luxury buildings, but is there a public interest in not allowing them to be conforming in this instance? Are we giving something up that at some point down the road we could regret?

**Zehnder:** Well, you know, part of our recommendation is that we judge that the risk was not worth holding on to the nonconforming status. We think for these buildings, for the scale of investment that they are, it's a reasonable thing to have height and FAR match their current envelopes. If they were to be redeveloped, and the market would support that scale of development on these sites with tearing down a building of that scale in Portland,

October 18, 2017

we would be in a different economic situation than we are right now for sure. And the building would still be an anomaly, but it would be replacing something that's sort of been at that scale for a long time. We didn't think, for urban design purposes, or the likelihood of impact, that it was a risk.

**Fish:** I'll second the mayor's amendment.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Any further discussion? B4 is on the table. B5?

**Hoy:** This is on Riverplace. I'm going to turn this over to Joe to briefly go through with you.

**Zehnder:** Okay, so I have a brief set of slides to talk about the Riverplace height proposed height changes. This is a mid-rise development down on the waterfront, and the property owners worked with the Planning and Sustainability Commission to request a height increase that the Planning and Sustainability Commission approved to take it to, I believe it's a maximum of 200 feet. And also, at the Planning and Sustainability Commission, we increased the floor area ratio from 4:1 to 5:1, and that move was primarily to better ensure that we were likely to get maximum use of the inclusionary housing program because of the benefits that come with being a 5:1 site. The owners of the site are now requesting additional height up to 400 feet on part of the site. And 325? And part of the reasoning is, the argument is that for the rest of South Waterfront, the height – our approach to height and the maximum heights should apply to this portion of the northern section of what today we would call South Waterfront. In the past, South Waterfront didn't exist then. It was an industrial area. So, there is precedent for increasing the height and bringing it into conformance and treating it for both development purposes and urban design purposes the same way we're treating the rest of South Waterfront. And that would be a height of 325 feet.

**Saltzman:** I thought on that slide you showed South Waterfront was at 250.

**Zehnder:** Uh, bonusable.

**Saltzman:** Bonusable to 350?

**Hoy:** 325.

**Zehnder:** 325. So, I'm talking about – the maximum heights here I'm talking about are bonusable heights.

**Fritz:** So, just looking at that slide, I oppose this amendment, because, you see that the property on the west behind the proposed increase is at 200 feet. We have a comprehensive plan policy that says there's a step-down to the river. So, increasing the height in the middle of this development would go up rather than down to the river.

**Zehnder:** Well, so, where we are in the proposal is to, we're continuing our evaluation of this proposal from the applicant. And part of what we're doing is taking a look at this with the topography in mind as well, commissioner, because from Naito down to this site, there's a significant drop on the bluff and I believe the 200 feet is on the side of the bluff up to Naito, so you need to look at the topography. So, what we are proposing is to continue this to bring it back for more discussion, but the approach – I wanted to share with you the approach that we are working on, which is, whatever the height increase is that we consider for the site, the one that came out of the PSC, or something more, that we're going to require a Central City Master Plan Provision to apply to the site. And we talked about this probably most recently in terms of the post office site in the central city Broadway corridor. And what that says is, to redevelop a piece of land that's shown on the map, you have to go through a process that involves city staff and the Design Commission and a public hearing that considers a full sort of range of criteria and things that you need to show that you've figured out so that we can see the development of the whole site. If you can remember the discussion around the post office site, there it's a site that's a big single piece of land now, which in many ways is the same as this site, and we want to talk about where the streets are going to be, and how you're going to use height, and how you

October 18, 2017

move around your floor area, and what other amenities you're going to provide, and do that in more detail as the design develops. We would apply that approach to this site. And then, the other things that we're continuing to work on, and we'll bring back that I think can hopefully help address the question you're raising, commissioner, is, we're looking at shadow studies for whatever height proposal for the proposal being requested as well as some alternatives, the impact of different heights on view corridors, and we'll bring all that information back to share.

**Fritz:** With all due respect, it's not like the post office site. There was already a lot of development there. We're already constrained in terms of parking and infrastructure needs. We have had umpteen changes to the road configuration in that whole area. So, asking planning staff to go through this entire exercise seems like a big burden for a single property owner.

**Zehnder:** Well, commissioner, I think what persuaded us and I think the Planning and Sustainability Commission in the first place was, what's allowed there today under our allowances, height, and FAR is a lot more than what's built there. This was one of our first foray – one of our first, into waterfront development in the '80s and '90s. And bringing more development there and new investment there, we think, is gonna be very valuable for this part of the waterfront to both activate it more, and to tie it into South Waterfront. There are ways to do this reinvestment. It's a significant reinvestment, that could be quite beneficial and a quite beneficial addition to the waterfront. How you design it is critical to accomplishing that. So, also, the approach that we're trying to do now is take a look at the heights with the same kind of methods that we're using now for the view corridors and other things. When we did this in the past, in the '80s, our approach to this was different in that regard. Now, we think, let's look at the site and the real situation, look at the bluff and show you that information to be able to consider additional heights. At the Planning and Sustainability Commission level, they were willing to step it up a notch. We want to do some additional analysis to see if there's still a case for doing that. There may or may not be.

**Fritz:** It's certainly more than a notch. Do you know, what's the ownership pattern in that area? Are they all rental units or are some of them condominiums?

**Zehnder:** Yeah, this is a single rental piece of property. That's why it's unique and valuable. The condominium property is Riverplace Phase 1, which is just across Montgomery, and so, that is a condominium process, and so, that has many owners.

**Fritz:** Yeah, so, when this is redeveloped, if it does, then all those renters will be out, won't they?

**Zehnder:** Those renters would be, but the number of units would be significantly increased, potentially, depending how big it is, and whatever is built in the next generation would be subject to our inclusionary housing policy, so we have the real possibility of getting a mix of affordable housing into the new development. So, the baseline sort of things that we get from redevelopment and reinvestment, especially in a situation like this, seemed like they offer a good deal of public value as well as real estate value.

**Fish:** Can I touch on another area of concern? So, some earlier amendments, you noted that the properties were adjacent to a transit corridor. And that was, in your judgment, critical to allowing substantial height. The one thing we know about Riverplace right now is, it's somewhat isolated. And, when you come out of Riverplace, you're on a failed – you're essentially on a failed part of our transportation system. And we know that because I-5 is backed up forever, and all the traffic that's trying to head north and then make a right turn on the bridge is hopelessly stymied at rush hour, and I know that there's now light-rail, but in terms of that particular parcel, it is sort of isolated, landlocked, and the road that you get on, whether it's Harbor -- what's right out front?

October 18, 2017

**Zehnder:** I think harbor.

**Fish:** Harbor, and then, if you have an hour, you can get to the next intersection and hope and a prayer you can get on the bridge. [All laughing] I mean, it's – so, to what extent should we be anticipating the significant impacts on traffic circulation and on our system, particularly in light of the fact that that's a huge choke point because it's where I-5 terminates?

**Zehnder:** So, both these points work well together. Today, without any change at all, the site has 4:1 FAR. That's bonusable. So, the only – and that determines the number of square feet that could be built on the piece of land. The only addition to that we are proposing is to increase it to 5:1 and mostly, that's so we that we have a better shot at getting more of the affordable housing. And 5:1, an additional 1:1 floor area ratio on that site is about 370,000 square feet of development. Second thing, you're absolutely right that the portals, the northern and southern way in and out of South Waterfront are documented to be constrained. The amount of additional -- but at the end, we have projects in the transportation system plan that are anticipating that the district is going to continue to build out, and that we have some ideas that are regularly updated, honestly, in terms of projects, about how to deal with those choke points. We haven't budgeted for them, they are not funded yet, but they are in the TSP. So, we know at some point, the level of development and level of traffic trips [indiscernible] and we need to proceed with those projects and through the development review process, a certain amount of that improvement will be linked to the development that pushes us over that edge or helps us trigger the need for that project at that time. So that's why we want to add this site to the required master plan area because that creates a point where not just department of -- Bureau of Transportation planning, but their development review folks can get in and look at the detailed, sort of, based on what's really being proposed, not just the square feet of development but how much parking they are providing, all these things that would affect both trip generation and the localized traffic impact, get assessed, have to be mitigated, get solved, and could affect the economics of the project, so this idea that's been floating around for this superblock kind of development there may or may not happen when the economics are really examined, and all the cost of what it's going to take to do that come into play. All we're doing in this move is opening the possibility to do that and to design it in a way that is taller than is allowed today. And marginally allows more floor area.

**Saltzman:** How does that all relate to the concept of Step Down to the River?

**Zehnder:** So, Step Down to the River, what we would like to bring back to you is show you what we can accomplish here vis a vis Step Down to the River by taking into consideration the bluff and the tall -- even all the approaches, even what the Planning and Sustainability Commission has recommended for this, pushes taller buildings to the back of the site towards the west up against the hillside, then tapers it down to the waterfront with I believe at the parts of the block closest to the waterfront are like 125. So, this is four blocks. This is not just -- it's one site but it's four city blocks. We're tapering those heights across that. We're proposing to do that. Considering doing that.

**Fish:** But why are we assuming that there would be an inclusionary housing play here? Is the zoning requiring that, or is the applicant saying that is the intent rather than -- 'Cause right now it's a mix of, well, let's face it, there's the Riverplace Athletic Club, which is not housing, there's retail... They are essentially proposing to take the Riverplace Athletic Club site and redevelop it. What why do we assume that inclusionary housing would apply to any development there?

**Zehnder:** Well, there's no guarantee. But what makes it likely is inclusionary housing is triggered by a building of 20 units or more. So, at the scale we're talking about here, and it's several buildings, it seems the economics of it are going to include residential and

October 18, 2017

include buildings that are more than 20 units. So, what's being talked about is no more than the current program would require, and that's only triggered, really, if you build residential of a certain scale or you need to get bonus floor area. So, part of what happens when you see a proposal like this, it can be very exciting to see the potential of something like this, but at the zoning level, we're just opening the opportunity for someone to come in and try. And we have set the thresholds at a point where we don't want you to try beyond this because our judgment is on the public benefit, it either has negative consequences that we want to avoid or the public benefit is not compelling enough. On the height and arrangement of the height, we want to bring that back to you, to talk about that. On the amount of floor area, we think it's a reasonable move to go from 4:1 to 5:1, especially in the context that we have inclusionary housing now. We think it's really opportune that we have created this Central City Master Plan tool. We have been needing this for a long time honestly, and applying it to this site no matter what we do with heights, even if we left it the way it is now it's something we would want to do because we will get a better project out of it and gives it more flexibility.

**Fritz:** Is there a second for this?

**Wheeler:** So, my understanding is you're coming back on the 6th with further analysis? I can either take a second now and we can offer amendments on the 6<sup>th</sup>, or we can just move this to the 6th.

**Eudaly:** I'll second it.

**Wheeler:** So, we have a second, and we'll have further presentation and discussion on this on the 6th taking into account the questions asked by commissioner Fritz and Fish and Saltzman.

**Fish:** Can I just add that I have seen -- I have not had a briefing on this directly. My staff person has. But I have seen some diagrams and I think that the applicant has been very smart in showing what a world class Japanese architect of the moment, who also just did the Japanese garden, might do with a beautiful tower but one of the things I'm interested, Joe, in knowing more, is, what are the range of things could they do as of right at that site? Because as we know, as you go from that site south, you know, there's some office buildings, there's a long-term -- there's a kind of a hotel that has long term occupancy. There's a mix -- there's soon to be a grocery store. I would just be interested in the various options they could do at the site, and does that include office towers? And office towers is not so good for us in terms of inclusionary housing.

**Zehnder:** Okay. We'll bring that back.

**Hoy:** And, can I just clarify for the record, this is a motion and second more for purposes of giving staff direction. There's not actually an amendment on the table yet. Staff is just getting direction. Okay.

**Wheeler:** Right. Exactly correct.

**Zehnder:** Today is just direction, then we'll bring it back.

**Wheeler:** Good. And colleagues, I'm sorry, I have to take a call, so I'm going to take this over to our trusted council president for B6.

**Fish:** Just as her amendment is coming up! [Laughter] Well done.

**Fritz:** I think this next one's yours actually, Commissioner Fish.

**Hoy:** So, the next item is related to an area right on the edge of the central city, and the central east side along Southeast 12th Avenue. And through public testimony, we received a proposal to cap the height at 50 feet. And this would be inclusive of bonus. So, 50 feet would be as high as you could go. So, the picture I'm showing you here is actually what exists today. So, the base height along this area is 50 feet. And the hatch lines there allow a project to get to 125 through bonus. So that's in the existing code today and through Central City 2035, we have not proposed to change that. This is a no-change area from

October 18, 2017

what exists today and what's in Central City 2035. We would recommend maintaining this base height of 50 with the ability to go to 125 through bonuses, so we would not recommend, or we're not proposing an amendment on this item, but it was something that we understand the commission was interested in learning more about and discussing.

**Fish:** Just to be clear, I'm interested in learning more, but I shouldn't be -- I don't know why there's a y next to my name. I think this is one we were interested in learning more about but -- I don't have a strong opinion yet.

**Fritz:** Aren't we changing the bonuses so it's only bonuses for affordable housing?

**Hoy:** That's right. That's correct. In this area with a base height of 50 if they wanted to go above 50 it's bonus height, and they would have the affordable housing, build it on site or pay into the fund. There's also the option for historic preservation, but your first bonus is affordable housing.

**Fritz:** Commissioner Fish, I'm not following. Are you interested in proposing this, having heard a little more? Or do you want to hear more?

**Fish:** I never proposed it.

**Fritz:** So, I need a mover as well as a second if anyone is interested. Seeing none, let's go to the next one. Thank you.

**Hoy:** So, the next item is related to height along the park blocks, and through testimony, we received several letters that requested lowering heights along the park blocks, both sides, and the testimony was anywhere from "Lower the heights to 75 feet," some requests were 100 feet, applying to both sides of the park blocks. In addition, we had some requests to consider requiring what we call "stepbacks" in the building, so maybe you'd have a podium then upper floors step back after six stories. And there was an interest in, also, removing any eligibility for bonus height along the park blocks. So, that's just laying out for you everything we heard through testimony. So, this photo here shows you, in green, the full extent of the park blocks, and you'll see on both sides of the park blocks through Central City 2035, we're proposing the requirement of shadow study on both sides. So, what that means is, the shadow study, any increase in height, using bonus height on either side of the park blocks, the applicant would have to provide us with a shadow study. And the reason for that is to see what kind of shadow would be on the park at different dates and different times of the day, and the code would require that if too much shadow is on the park, then the applicant needs to work with the design team and design commission to figure out how you would do things like step back your building, maybe provide a setback, so we don't have as much shade on the building. The whole purpose of that shadow study is to make sure we provide light and air to the park blocks. So, staff wouldn't recommend amending the heights because we feel that the shadow study requirement will help get us there to meet that purpose of making sure that there is sunlight and air along the park blocks.

**Fritz:** Commissioner Eudaly, would you like to speak to your amendment?

**Eudaly:** Yeah, I'm sorry, I'm not feeling well at all, and having a little hard time tracking all of this information. But I had raised an issue with this. First of all, what is the current height restriction? I'm sorry if you have already said that.

**Hoy:** The heights vary along the park blocks today. So, for example down in the area around PSU, we have base heights of 100 feet. And as you head north, through bonus, you may be able to get to 175. Heading further north towards Burnside again base heights could be at 250 with a chance to get to 460. North of Burnside, it really fluctuates again a base height of 100 with the ability to get to 250. But any time you're going to propose a project that's going to go above that base height, the shadow study will kick in.

**Eudaly:** So, we're not giving additional height, we're just saying we don't think we need to restrict it because we have this shadow study requirement in place.

October 18, 2017

**Hoy:** That's staff's recommendation, that through the shadow study, that study will make sure that sufficient setbacks of the building and stepbacks in the building will occur to make sure that the shadows on the park are limited at certain times of day and days of the year.

**Eudaly:** And I raise this just because the park blocks are really kind of a unique treasure in our city, and, you know, they already get quite a bit of shade from existing buildings, and canopy. I was just concerned that we were going to allow more. So, thanks for the explanation. And I don't feel like I need to pursue this unless someone else wants to jump on in.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Thank you. Commissioner Eudaly, B8. It's my understanding B8 has already been moved and seconded so this is just really discussion, is that correct?

**Hoy:** That's right. This is the existing amendment for the Morrison Bridge head. And it's already on the list as the mayor has said. The amendments, so I'll just explain here, on the left-hand side, what we have is what exists today, which is that the bridge head, the heights are 75 feet and commissioner Fritz's amendment is to maintain those existing conditions with that height. The proposal, which is on the map to your right, is that the base height doesn't change, it stays at 75 feet, with the potential for bonus height to 250. So that is both recommended draft and commissioner Fritz's amendment. I would just want to turn it over to you if you'd like to have any further discussion related to that.

**Fritz:** Well, thank you. As it shows from the map here, it again would not have a Step Down to the River because parcels behind are already developed at 235, so that would definitely block out their views. Again, when you look at the map of the historic districts, there's the Yamhill on one side, there's the Skidmore on the other side, so, having a huge building at the end of the bridge head doesn't seem, to me, to be appropriate. It's going to be blocking views from the east to the west side, and also going to be impeding traffic, which, the Morrison is one of the main routes that central east side industrial area gets is freight to I-5 going south. So, I've got multiple other responses, but that's basically it. Of all the properties with potential conflicts of interest, that's the one that's most troubling.

**Wheeler:** So, could I hear the staff rationale? And commissioner Fritz has done a very good job of explaining her rationale, and she and I have had conversations about this. Taking into account what the current policy has been with regard to stepping down to the river, and juxtaposing that against some of the conversations we have had about the potential for these sites to be difficult to develop, and/or the opportunity for signature developments here as a gateway entry into the city, tell me how, with the height proposal in place, the bonusable up to 250, how could you reconcile, or how could you guide the future of that site? It's nice to sit here and think we could get a marquee signature development opportunity there that's an amazing entryway to the city, but there's no real guarantee of that. So, what gives you confidence that this is the right thing to do, or alternatively, what information do you have to suggest this is a particularly difficult site to develop under the current height restrictions?

**Zehnder:** So, the site itself although these maps are not showing it, of course, two-thirds of it are ramps off of the Morrison Bridge. So, there's major transportation at the structure that's impacting the site. We explored, for a good while, how to develop in and around those ramps. So, one of the obstacles to overcome is the cost to sufficiently sort of rearrange and reengineer those ramps to keep them in service or not. And the policy guidance we have on that is that even on those ramps, it's the northern ramp is important for the central east side, and the access to the freeway, for our freight on the central east side, and we have that industrial sanctuary policy. So that one, and our balancing of policies, we all expect stays in service or some version of it does. The one on the south side may be more adjustable. So, it's got to be big enough to warrant that kind of

October 18, 2017

investment and trouble. At the same time, we have the Step Down to the River policy. We also have had, since the '80s a policy of animating the riverfront, of connecting the two sides of the river and bringing activity down to Waterfront Park and to the riverfront. And, as the commissioner said, we have two very important historic districts that are along this stretch of Naito, too. So, they are what they are. We're gonna protect them, but they are always going to be a smaller scale because that's part of their character. So, the opportunity is to bring more square feet, more people, more residential units, more office users down to this edge and have sort of quick and animating access to Waterfront Park and the activities there and this part of our downtown. They are limited. They happen to align with our bridge heads, and we have – the two that we focused on in this plan are the Hawthorne Bridge head and Morrison Bridge head. The Hawthorne bridge head is a bigger district, so I think it's a little easier to see. The Morrison Bridge head is just these three blocks. I mean, it's relatively tight. So that's the principles. Step Down to the River -- parts of Step Down to the River that we tried to honor is that even though it's a taller height, it grades up as you go back toward the transit mall and heart of downtown. Part of Step Down to the River and the business district was, even if you're three blocks off the river, you get views if you get tall enough, because each of those blocks gets to be taller than the one closer to the waterfront. That kind of principal stays.

**Wheeler:** So, how did you pick the 250 versus, say, 235?

**Zehnder:** You know, I think we looked at it in terms of our standard sort of Central City building height modules. What the floor area -- how much floor area we're also allowing on these blocks. And so, what's reasonable to give them a chance to design? Part of what the extra height here allows you to do too is deal with the fact that your floor plates are going to have to potentially be nonstandard to deal with the transportation infrastructure, and we looked at shadow analysis for how that would impact Waterfront Park. Much beyond 250, we thought, was too impactful for too long.

**Wheeler:** If you came down to 235, do you believe that substantially impacts the economics to the degree that you won't get a development there? Is that your concern?

**Zehnder:** You know, I believe that 235, 250, given this site, given our market, is probably not that significant.

**Wheeler:** Okay. And then, just one –

**Zehnder:** There's no specific program that we have for the site. Maybe at one time, mayor, when we were earlier in the quadrant plans, there was sort of active discussion of development. Remember the public market was part of this?

**Wheeler:** Sure. Yeah.

**Zehnder:** But this is just a site now. It doesn't have that, so...

**Wheeler:** Okay. So, let me ask you just one last question and I'll stop here. So, you mentioned there's the transportation infrastructure, the Morrison onramps, offramps, all of that. Is the burden on the developer to deal with those issues? Where does that burden lie? Is that with the city, is it with the county, with the developer, is it with all three?

**Zehnder:** Um, you know, it's with all three -- I believe – and if PBOT – if Mauricio Le Clerk's here, I'd ask him to chime in if I'm gonna get this wrong, there's county ownership involved in here too, because these are bridge facilities, so somebody is going to have to pay to make these changes happen. And part of what we've always assumed is that the project's gonna carry that.

**Wheeler:** Isn't the assumption, though, that the developer will – I mean, why are you providing -- I'm trying to figure out why you need the additional height to incentivize them that if they are not the ones bearing the cost.

**Zehnder:** No, the assumption is that the project would bear that cost.

**Wheeler:** The project would bear that cost. Okay.

October 18, 2017

**Zehnder:** Yeah. It's just a county facility.

**Wheeler:** Okay. That's all I needed to know. Thank you. This has been moved and seconded. I don't know if people have other --

**Fish:** I have a question. And I mean this question to be provocative. There's a big split of opinion about how we should develop these bridge heads. It's reflected in some of the conversations on this council. Is the eastern end of the Burnside Bridge at the Burnside Bridge head, is that a cautionary tale or is that a model?

**Zehnder:** Well, it depends how you look at the architecture. [Laughter]

**Eudaly:** What if you can't look at it?

**Wheeler:** Well answered, Joe. [Laughter]

**Fish:** I think I read somewhere that it sold recently, and it's the most valuable real estate, one of the most expensive buildings that's been turned over. So, there's no accounting for certain things, but beyond the aesth-- but more generally.

**Zehnder:** You know, commissioner, I think I would be misrepresenting if I could guarantee world class architecture based on the moves that we're talking about today.

**Fish:** Architecture aside, the size and the scale of that building, and its location.

**Zehnder:** Oh, you know, that's an odd -- a different sort of circumstance because there's this industrial land between the waterfront and that sort of little quadrant there. And I'm not even really sure what the maximum heights are allowed there. I would argue that with better -- with different -- to me, the having a tall building at that bridge head is not a problem. The architecture may not be warranting the sort of aspiration we have for these gateways to the central city. But having a tall building there is actually, in an urban design sense, makes sense.

**Wheeler:** Very good. So, this will come back as part of the hearing package on January 18. Is that correct?

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

**Wheeler:** Very good. So, the next set of issues relate to scenic views. And C1 is the view of the city skyline from the I-84 overpass. I think that's commissioner Saltzman's, so why don't we skip that one for the moment. Same with C2 and C3, let's hold off. I hear a door open.

\*\*\*\*\*: Leaving now.

**Wheeler:** Leaving? This is scintillating. Why would anybody be leaving? C4: The view of Mount Hood from Salmon Springs.

**Mindy Brooks, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Mindy Brooks with Planning and Sustainability. We'll jump ahead then we can jump back once Saltzman is here.

**Wheeler:** Great.

**Brooks:** Let me turn my page. So, this one was already entered as an amendment and seconded, so we're just mostly bringing it back so there can be discussion, and I was just going to do a quick summary again of the issues surrounding this one. So, today, there are five locations where you can see Mount Hood from the riverfront along the west side. And the one that could be protected is the one from Salmon Springs, it's the right location if you're going to protect a view, it also has the least impact of the five on development. But it does have considerable impact anyway on the central east side, so it would require reduction of today's heights which are 100 to 200 bonusable to 175 to 275. It would need to come down along the MLK/Grand corridor to 50 to 55 feet with no bonus option. And the other complicating factor here is that this area is a streetcar local improvement district for the streetcar along MLK/Grand. And there are 29 properties in the view corridor that were assessed as part of that. And that assessment did include many factors, including allowable height and FAR. And with the height reductions, the base FAR could not be

October 18, 2017

utilized on those sites. And I'll just stop there and turn it over to you for discussion or questions.

**Wheeler:** This has been a really -- this is a difficult one for me, of all the decisions in this package. It's probably been the hardest. And it's been somewhat entertaining to speak to other people who have also held six different positions on this particular one. I think it is important that we protect critical view corridors. This one is difficult, however, because there is definitely going to be an impact in terms of the long-term goals around development in the central east side. This cuts a swath right in the middle of it. We had testimony three-ish weeks ago from some folks who are serving on that advisory committee. They also wrestled with this, and ultimately, they decided to go on the side of not protecting this particular view corridor, but they expressed the importance of making sure that we do protect other corridors. Similarly, the Planning and Sustainability Commission had also, I believe, had the opportunity to look at this, and they had gone back and forth and ultimately sided on the side of supporting the long-term goals for the central east side. So, I just want to put out there that this one I think is very challenging. I don't want to tip my hand to commissioner Saltzman's protections on view corridors, but I'll just say I'm inclined to support those. This one, if I had to take a vote today, I'm 51% opposed to protecting that view corridor, but we have until January 18, so we'll see what happens. Commissioner Fritz?

**Fritz:** You want to keep it on the table?

**Wheeler:** It's already on the table. We already moved it and seconded it.

**Brooks:** It's already been, yeah, moved and seconded.

**Saltzman:** I'm sorry, I was out of the room for a second.

**Fritz:** [indiscernible] the person who moved and seconded it withdraw it?

**Edmunds:** No need for a second.

**Eudaly:** We're coming back to yours, commissioner.

**Saltzman:** Oh, okay. Okay.

**Wheeler:** We voted no on all your stuff. [Laughter]

\*\*\*\*\*: Do you want to clarify?

**Lauren King, Office of the City Attorney:** Yeah, I mean, I think since it's been moved and seconded it's on the table, and then, if no one votes for it later, then it just goes away or --

**Wheeler:** Yeah. You know, I wanted it on the table because I wanted to hear the public testimony and I wanted to hear the professional testimony. I'm glad we've had conversations. It's been useful for me. So, with that, we will move back to C1, which is the view of the city skyline from the I-84 overpass. Commissioner Saltzman's items. We'll start with Mindy.

**Brooks:** Yeah. Let us jump back to that one here. Okay. So, this is a view of city skyline from 12th Avenue overpass over I-84, and this view has been protected since 1991 with height restrictions. Through this process, staff proposed moving the view point from 12th Avenue, which is circled in red, to a yet-to-be constructed bicycle and pedestrian overpass between 7th and 8th, which is circled in blue. The new overpass is in the TSP, and we anticipate that the bicycle and pedestrian traffic will move from 12<sup>th</sup> to this new bridge. So, we think it's the right location for a viewpoint. And there's an opportunity to design a viewpoint into that design of the bridge. We made assumptions about the alignment of the new bike/ped bridge, and we chose to put the viewpoint in what would be the middle of that, not knowing where it might actually be designed, but we do use GIS to set coordinates for that point, and an elevation for that point, so we're pretty confident in how it affects heights emanating from there to the skyline. So, today's existing height limitation, and I have indicated where we received testimony from the property that we received

October 18, 2017

testimony from, today there is an 80-foot height limit over most of that site to protect the view from 12th. Moving that view to the bike/ped bridge actually reduces impacts to the northern property, expands impacts a little bit to the southern property, but the property in question, the northern half of that property would go to 250 with an option to bonus to 325, while the southern portion drops to a 70-foot height limit. So again, we picked a centered alignment. You could certainly pick another alignment on here. The question was: "Why we would do this when we don't know exactly where the alignment would be?" And, so, you certainly could look at different alignments along that bridge. The other option would be to keep the viewpoint on 12th Avenue until the bridge is actually done and the viewpoint is put, and then move the viewpoint, which would mean retaining the 80-foot height limit over that property until the bridge is constructed. And I'll turn it over to Saltzman.

**Saltzman:** Well, I think that's the intent of my amendment, isn't that correct? Keep it at 12th Avenue until we know where the alignment for the pedestrian bridge actually is? And then re-establish?

**Brooks:** So, we can do that, mm-hmm, or yeah, we can wait and then reestablish or reassess, once we know where the point is, and adjust heights at that time.

**Saltzman:** Yeah, that would be what I'm recommending.

**Fritz:** And that's keeping the existing view corridor that's been there since 1991, is that right?

**Brooks:** That's what we would be doing there.

**Fritz:** Do we even need to have a discussion on that? Or...

**Brooks:** Yes. Because we did propose to change it so we would need to make an amendment to go back to the existing height limits.

**Fritz:** Okay. Then I'll second that.

**Wheeler:** Any further discussion on that? I just want to say, I think that's entirely appropriate, and I'll obviously support that as well. C2.

**Brooks:** Okay. This is a view of Mount Hood from Tillicum Crossing. Like the riverfront, there are five locations on bridges where you can see Mount Hood today, and all those, again, would be blocked by development in the future. This one from Tillicum, protecting it has the least impacts to development than all of the views from the bridges. We heard from one property owner where this view corridor crosses, and there would be a height limitation. We call this the Ivon Street Property. Today, this whole site is an I-H, heavy industrial use, it's being rezoned to an EX, so, it has no height limitations because it's a heavy industrial sight. The EX, then, we would apply height limits to it. Within the view corridor, it would be 60 feet; outside the view corridor, it would be a 100-foot base with an option to bonus to 250. You also see, on this map, the river environmental overlay zone that would be applied to all sites along the riverfront including this one. The area is circled in red, which is outside of the overlay zone and the view corridor is about .9 acres, it's larger than a standard city block, so we feel there's a lot of space on this site to get to those taller heights and be able to protect that view corridor. So, we recommend keeping the view corridor and height limits on the site. And I'll turn it over to commissioner Saltzman for that one.

**Saltzman:** Well, I think you made a pretty persuasive case just now. I proposed this amendment because it was, I felt, a piece of property that has some potential development, for what, I'm not quite sure. But it could be residential, it could be commercial. I think the owner has some interesting visions for that property, and that he felt limited by this proposal, so that's why I put forward the amendment. But I can't say that I'm in it 100%. I just --

**Edmunds:** Commissioner, we don't have an amendment specifically from you on this. Is it to not propose this view corridor? Is that your amendment?

October 18, 2017

**Saltzman:** I think that's what it would be. Yeah.

**Wheeler:** So, I'll chime in on this one. I actually was persuaded by the staff work that we should maintain this view corridor. What ultimately persuaded me was the demonstration that these sites are still highly developable even with the view corridor remaining intact.

**Saltzman:** And I can't say I disagree with that, having heard your presentation.

**Zehnder:** So, if there's no second it stays as staff recommended.

**Wheeler:** Are you okay with that?

**Saltzman:** Mm-hmm.

**Wheeler:** Okay. Very good. Next item, please, is C3: View of the Vista Bridge. This is also commissioner Saltzman.

**Brooks:** So today, there is an existing view from 18th avenue and height limits associated with that of about 30 to 45 feet along the northern side of Jefferson Street. The recommendation coming out of Planning and Sustainability Commission was to go to 75 feet along the northern side of the street because Jefferson Street is a commercial corridor along a light rail stop. Going to 75 feet does impact the view from 14th Avenue there, it would have some intrusion into the view. This view from 14th is a view from a car or bicycle. You can't see the bridge from the sidewalk, and there isn't an opportunity to develop a viewpoint here. So, Planning and Sustainability Commission also entered a new viewpoint in addition to the view from 14th. And that new viewpoint would be at Collins Circle which is at 18th, and this is a public open space next to the light rail stop where a viewpoint could be developed, and this 75 feet does not impact that view. So that's what Planning and Sustainability recommended and staff would continue to make that recommendation. And I'll turn that over to you for discussion.

**Saltzman:** I didn't actually offer that amendment.

**Fritz:** I think it was the mayor --

**Eudaly:** I raised it.

**Edmunds:** There were three commissioners were interested in discussing it. There weren't any amendments put on the table. That's the Mayor, Commissioner Fish, and Commissioner Eudaly.

**Eudaly:** Could we get that photo back, by any chance? Or did something just...

**Fritz:** Well, it's written in our script, what their amendment is.

**Eudaly:** Right, I need to see the image. I am confused by these images because, don't they both depict what the view would look like with possible development? Neither of them are current.

**Brooks:** That's right. This is - both of these depict what it would look like with 75 feet allowed along the northern portion. The top view is from 14th Avenue, which is where you cross I-405. The bottom view is then down at 18th, at Collins Circle.

**Eudaly:** And this is the same building in both...?

**Brooks:** So, the building that you see, if you look at the top picture, the building that is encroaching, then, upon the view, is then, in the lower picture, the one that is immediately to the right.

**Eudaly:** Okay. I mean, I raised this out of all the view corridors that were in play, I felt like this was the most unique one because unlike the mountain, which you can see from a very -- a variety of vantage points throughout the city, you really only have one opportunity to see the bridge, and it's a beautiful bridge, and it's an iconic view, so -- do we have any before photos to compare? I mean, I'm just finding this a little challenging to...

**Brooks:** I don't think there's a before photo in this set of pictures. We can certainly bring that back to you, if you'd like to see one. I will point out that you can see the bridge from Southwest 14<sup>th</sup>, then, because of the street and topography you can't see it again until about Collins Circle. So, there's really these two places are the places from which you can

October 18, 2017

protect this view.

**Fritz:** So, I'd like to join commissioner Eudaly's amendment and keep the Vista Bridge current protection as a view corridor from I-405 to the bridge, lower the heights to 25 from 20<sup>th</sup> to the bridge and 50 feet from 405 to Southwest 20<sup>th</sup>, and then also remove the proposed southwest or SW, whatever that means, 72 as a view of the Vista Bridge.

**Brooks:** Okay

**Eudaly:** And I would like to see, just a side-by-side comparison, would be really helpful, because I'm just not clear on how significant that change is.

**Brooks:** 'Kay.

**Wheeler:** So that's a motion and a second on C3. And I had one additional question on this: So, when you say the view from Collins Circle, is that from the sidewalk? Where is that view from?

**Brooks:** Sure. So, there's actually a circle in the middle of the road. It's like a roundabout there --

**Wheeler:** I'm familiar with the circle, I'm just trying to picture where --

**Brooks:** There's not actually a sidewalk there. I would call it kind of a goat path where people cross anyway. So, the pedestrian connectivity would need to be improved, and a sidewalk would need to be constructed across there for it to actually be a viewpoint.

**Wheeler:** Okay. So, you literally meant earlier then, and I wasn't sure, but you literally meant you would have to construct a public space in order to really create this view.

**Brooks:** You would want to improve this space that's there, that's really being used kind of ad hoc as a way for people to cross the street.

**Wheeler:** Okay. And, just so I'm clear, and I think I asked you this in a staff session: From the Vista Bridge itself, either of these configurations, obviously the status quo, or alternatively, even if we did this, you still do not block the view?

**Brooks:** Of Mount Hood from the Vista Bridge?

**Wheeler:** Yes.

**Brooks:** No. We've recommended lowering heights to protect that view.

**Wheeler:** Could I see -- and I think you may have already drawn one up. It may have been just one of those things I imagine at 3 in the morning. As long as you're doing a before picture,

**Brooks:** Yeah, you want to see that picture, too?

**Wheeler:** Can you give me a rendering, nothing fancy. Just like this is great.

**Brooks:** Yep.

**Wheeler:** Could you please superimpose what the view from the Vista Bridge would be like under this configuration? That'd be helpful for me.

**Brooks:** Mm-hmm. Sure. And I believe -- I will definitely bring those back. But I believe in the packet we gave you from the briefing, before the hearings, both of those are in that packet.

**Wheeler:** Yeah, I vaguely remember that, so I'll look for that.

**Brooks:** But we can definitely bring it back.

**Wheeler:** Okay. Great. Thank you. I appreciate it.

**Fritz:** And if I might amend what I just said, there's no harm in keeping SW72 as a view at the Vista Bridge.

**Brooks:** That's true.

**Fritz:** So, would that be all right if we do that, as well?

**Eudaly:** Sure.

**Fritz:** I've actually got one near my home that I want to have a little circle in the middle so I can look out on Mt. hood.

**Brooks:** It is a public open space that's not well-utilized because of the way that it's

October 18, 2017

configured. So...

**Fritz:** We can make it more welcoming.

**Eudaly:** I like "goat path." Could also be called a "desire line," couldn't it?

**Brooks:** Yes. [Laughter]

**Eudaly:** All right, nice to have options.

**Wheeler:** Good. So, we've got C4 we've already taken care of. So, we're now at C5. Japanese Garden.

**Brooks:** And that's, again, quickly, this one was already an amendment that was proposed and seconded to extend the view corridor down slope a bit more so that the potential trees impacting this view could be addressed.

**Fish:** I think we had this one by acclimation.

**Wheeler:** Yeah. That's right. Is there any further discussion on this item? So, we'll see this one back on January 18<sup>th</sup>. So that moves us to transportation.

**Brooks:** Thank you.

**Wheeler:** And we're starting with the I-5 Rose Quarter.

**Saltzman:** Did we do the Water Avenue realignment?

**Wheeler:** It's coming up.

**Mauricio LeClerc, Portland Bureau of Transportation:** Good afternoon. Mauricio LeClerc, PBOT.

**Art Pearce, Portland Bureau of Transportation:** Art Pearce, also from PBOT.

**LeClerc:** So, let's switch on gears here. We have a new Powerpoint. So, the amendment - - the packet, D I believe, has a table of proposed TSP project amendments. So, for discussion are Water Avenue and the Rose Quarter Interchange Projects related. I have a technical issue: What happens if we don't discuss the other ones? They are -- they are --  
\*\*\*\*\*: As consent.

**LeClerc:** Consent, right? So, is that the understanding?

**Zehnder:** Sally, do you want to clarify that? How are we handling the TSP ones, please?

\*\*\*\*\*: [audio not understandable].

**LeClerc:** All right. So, staff has proposed -- we received a lot of testimony and in some cases, we had some technical amendments to the TSP lists, for example, reconcile the work that we're doing with fire and police and emergency response, changing a few [indiscernible] here and there, but we consider them, at this point, minor amendments. Of course, you have the packets before you, and we are happy to discuss any of them with you. So, for discussion and for -- and with a motion -- or the Water Avenue and the Rose Quarter. For the first one, it's a request from OMSI, and there is no amendment -- I don't think there's an amendment proposed. So, we go through a motion. The second one, there is an amendment from commissioner Saltzman, so we'll get into it. So, on Water Avenue, the request was from OMSI to add a project that was left out, you know, basically, you can read the map. This is what OMSI is today, you see a big S, that's water avenue and we've moved it to the east as part of previous processes. Now OMSI just finished a master plan and -- which you can see at a high-level, conceptual level, on the right. And basically, what they call for is to realign Water Avenue, what you see here in light orange. Basically, the Water Avenue run parallel to the railroad tracks and that would allow Water Avenue to serve a more local function, to serve their internal campuses, you know, kids coming in, local service stuff. Water Avenue's a critical connection this side of the railroad because the only real, big, major street, so a lot of trucks and traffic goes through it. This would push it to the side, and allow OMSI to have a more pedestrian-oriented campus. Also, the design, what they have their masterplan, and what we would be recommended to the TSP, it's a wide street but primarily with a lot of new facilities. You can see where the trees are, bike separated facility running to the west of the railroad track, and then a large sidewalk

October 18, 2017

on the other side that will serve the OMSI new sites. And, in the middle, there will be local circ -- the circulation that we -- that Water carries today. So, our staff recommendation is to add it to the TSP list as Water Avenue Realignment Phase 2, and we'll bring back details later as to what the definition is.

**Fritz:** And I'd be glad to propose that.

**LeClerc:** Okay.

**Eudaly:** Second.

**LeClerc:** Okay!

**Wheeler:** Very good. We have a proposal and a second for D1. Thank you.

**LeClerc:** So, secondly, as for testimony, you hear a lot about this project, it's basically three TSP projects that make up the I-5 Broadway/Weidler Interchange project, also referred to as the Rose Quarter Interchange project. So, we want to provide you a brief summary of the process. We have two years that we worked on this. Some of you were here and voted for it in the past. But for benefit of the conversation, and the new council members, here's a history, as well as what the big ideas were, the elements of it and the amendment. So, basically, staff is saying "no" to remove these projects from the TSP, but commissioner Saltzman has amendments to an action item that accompanies this TSP. You'll find that on Volume 5A, page 114, action item 120 for those of you who memorized the Central City Plan. [Laughter] So, to provide the proper context, we have to go back to the 1960s and the radical transformation of the area, and that provides context to what we're trying to do, and what the heart of the project is. Basically, this area used to be Albina, the heart of the African-American community, a stable place, you can see here, a picture 1950 with a grid. It was also, before that, part of the city of Albina. But, you know, major interventions in the 1960s, the building of I-5, Emanuel Hospital, Memorial Coliseum radically changed the area and let a lot of these places-- and really broke apart what used to be a community. You can see the Memorial Coliseum. From a transportation perspective, a large community impact. From a transportation perspective, it led the area to be divided in half. You can see there what the pattern is today. Large super blocks, not a very pedestrian-friendly human-scaled place, with a big barrier with I-5 running through the middle of it. As part of -- so that's the framework for the Northeast Quadrant Plan. We did an inventory of historic resources. As you can see, compared to Elliot and Irvington, how much was lost. Yellow, orange and red were historic properties built before 1960. So, that provided context, and we also learn about some key sites that are remaining, like the Left Bank, used to be the Dude Ranch, and provided - it was a place during the jazz era in which great jazz players played. You can see Louie Armstrong at the bottom there. So, that fed into the context of what we wanted to do. At the same time, the freeway was built and it provides a regional -- a very important regional function -- actually state and national function as part of the interstate system. So, it funnels traffic from I-5, from the north and south, US 30, from across the river, I-405, also from and across the river and I-84. So, it's a major interchange. Usually in cases like this, when major interchanges come together, it gets bigger to accommodate all the traffic. What happens here is the opposite, it narrows down as it goes under Broadway/Weidler, everything narrows down to 2 lanes, and there are no shoulders provided. So, since the very -- you know, soon after it was built, all the way -- following decades, it became a problem. So, but at the same time, it provides regional mobility, also provide access to lower Albina, the Moda Center, Lloyd District, and much of north and northeast Portland. So, because it became a problem, it has a design problem, throughout the decades, the region and ODOT tried to find a solution for it. The latest one was the Greely Banfield project, proposed in 1996. But basically, you know, trying to address that issue that it's kind of a bottle-neck. So that project significantly expanded the freeway with a new fly-over, then it kind of goes to where Wheeler Avenue is

October 18, 2017

today, and also provided - expanded the width of the freeway, the footprint of it. It distorted all the local connections and it would have meant the loss of sidewalks and bicycle connections galore. So, I'll come back to compare this project to the one that we replaced it with in North-Northeast quadrant. So, with that context, I need to address a regional problem on the freeway, and I need to address local connections and placemaking. We engaged, in 2010, with ODOT on the north/northeast quadrant plan, led by the Bureau of Planning. And that led to the adoptive plan in 2012 and the facility plan that is part of ODOT's adoption. It was adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission, and subsequently, this freeway project was adopted by the region, and is now in the regional transportation plan. So, we started with a committee of 30 members of broad representation in the local community as well as regional representation, and we went through 19 meetings with the community, 14 subcommittees, many public events, over 85 community meetings and about 3,000 people directly participated in this. We developed over 70 options and we brought goals for the land use side and the transportation side. On the land use side, we're expected to have, as part of this plan, that now is embedded into the Central City Plan, 8,000 new housing units and 9,000 new jobs. As we begin to analyze the area, we know that development has happened along the Red and the Blue Line, along Lloyd. You can see development, but you don't see much in the area of the freeway. You haven't seen much, except it's very auto-dominated, and there's a lot of potential there, that hasn't been materialized, hasn't been tapped. And we even called it, you know, the doughnut -- the hole in the doughnut and that's the effect on the freeway, that it has on development as well. We worked together with ODOT and determined to have two major goals for addressing the freeway: Improve the safety and operations of the interchange itself. It has the highest freeway crash rates in the state, its short, weaving sections as part of the design of the freeway, and also, it's a top freight bottleneck in the United States. But also, at the same time, improving the interface with streets, improve bicycle safety mobility, increase pedestrian connectivity, and also enhance traffic access into the Rose Quarter and so forth. So, the primary barrier is the north-south connection, the barrier that I-5 creates, you see in orange where there are no crossings of I-5, so between Russell and Broadway there are no crossings in between Weidler, to the north, and between Weidler, which is actually -- can I use the mouse? From here to Multnomah, there's no crossing, either. So, particularly, freeway create a barrier east-west, and that's somewhat what this project addresses. Since adoption of the plan, we've discussed a lot about conflicts in this area, known as "the box," which is right here. All the traffic comes together, street car, people walking to east and west going to the events and Rose Garden arena. Everything comes together. It's a lot of conflict. There's a lot of well-documented bicycle collisions. For example, as part of the Vision Zero Action Plan, Broadway is identified as a high crash corridor, and is, in fact, the number one bicycle high-crash corridor in the city.

**Saltzman:** It's number one?

**LeClerc:** Yeah. For bicycles. So, in terms of context, this is what you have before, the old design and the new design. I'll provide a little bit more context, but you can see already that we were gaining connectivity here with Hancock and with a proposed Clackamas connection. We're keeping primarily the old grid over Broadway/Weidler, Williams and Vancouver and North, in this case, would be to your left. This is the old design that basically would have shifted the grid, Vancouver, Williams and turn them into what we call frontage roads, basically a large interchange. This is the old design to your left. And instead, what this project is providing most east-west connections, lid, covers over the freeway that lesson the noise and visual impact of the freeway, provide, potentially some open space and some new bicycle and pedestrian facilities. In terms of the freeway itself,

October 18, 2017

the old design would have had a lot more lanes and the width would have been a lot bigger and actually, flying ramps over 1st Avenue to the east and Weidler to the west. And the new design adds one auxiliary lane in each direction, plus, you know, the rebuilding of the on and off ramps to accommodate that space. The new design is also less costly and has a smaller footprint. So, in terms of land use and development, it was important to provide access to the Portland Public School site, which is now in the plan – the Central City Master Plan site. We do that by realigning Flint, so Flint would be - which goes straight north-south and now goes diagonally and opened up that area for potential redevelopment. Also, a key idea developed, at the time, was the box around the box. You know, we mentioned that the box was very colluded, a lot of traffic, a lot of conflict. What if we were to provide a north and south connection that is more quiet space for pedestrian and cyclists to navigate so you don't have to enter the box in the first place, and you can ride around with your kid and so forth, and avoid the area altogether? So that's what you see when you see the design. This is basically a close-up of the interchange from a local perspective. So, here you have Vancouver/Williams. And all these will be replaced. But basically, by having to widen the freeway, you have to replace all the bridges. There's just not enough space to widen without doing that. So that allows us to replace all these bridges and build them up to standard. These are old bridges, so things would be seismically upgraded. And you would have one lid in the north, with this new Hancock connection, maintaining the connectivity, Broadway, Weidler, Vancouver, Williams, and adding a ped/bike only bridge at Clackamas. There's also benefits in the local traffic. In a way, we're going to change pattern. Today, people coming from Broadway have to go through the box, you know, go several extra blocks and then go through the Rose Quarter, which is basically an on-ramp during much of the day, to access. Now we're moving the on-ramp to a higher point on Weidler, so that there will be much less traffic going through the Rose Quarter. So that assists in the redevelopment of the Rose Quarter itself. And here's our concept drawing of what could be with a lid in the north, a lid in the middle and at Clackamas Bridge. But it's likely to be curved because of design. So, from our perspective, it's a good project for the region and for us. From a freeway perspective, it's been estimated that it may lead up to roughly 50% reduction in crashes based on simulation, by adding the ox lane. Less congestion as a result of those crashes, which is important for reliability purposes, for freight. Also, the shoulders themselves allow cars that are broken down to be moved, and also, ambulances and emergency vehicles to respond quickly. In terms of local circulation, we would have new facilities, new overpasses, seismically upgraded, better bicycle/pedestrian facilities, wide sidewalks, you know, bike separated facilities, we will have better connectivity that will assist development, and the lids would create place-making opportunities and also open space.

**Wheeler:** So, could you tell us more about the lids? And, you know, I think it's a great vision. It's also my understanding that the funding isn't there in this package for that. So, tell me more about the vision.

**LeClerc:** Yeah. The project, since then, has been funded by HB2017 and our understanding is, it funds the whole thing. It's funding the lids, it's funding the local improvements at this point.

**Wheeler:** So, four slides previous, you showed us right there. So, which of those lids are actually funded in this project?

**LeClerc:** At this point, it's the northern lid which is here, and the middle lid that replaces Williams and [indiscernible].

**Wheeler:** So, is it the whole area, three, four and five, that are designated there, as three, four and five?

**LeClerc:** Yeah. Plus the bridge here.

October 18, 2017

**Wheeler:** Okay, so, why are we leaving off the central one? Why not just close it?

**LeClerc:** That's a great question. The latest design has made the space smaller. So, at this point, there are two reasons why it's not necessary to build the structure above. But also, there's, at some point, you connect lids, and they become a tunnel, so there may be some technical issues in which there's new ventilation other systems, you know, different depths and clearances that need to be applied. So, again, this is a conceptual design that is just starting the process, and we may learn a lot about the lids, and we really want to maximize the opportunities that we...

**Wheeler:** Well, you know, I just hope that -- and I understand that, and I want to just get this out there on the record. I hope, conceptually, you know, we think bigger about this. Because this is an area of the city where you could redefine what this portion of the city is, through basically capping the freeway there, which is technologically completely feasible and you see in other cities, they put pedestrian ways, public spaces, fountains, parks, trees. I mean, there's really, virtually, an unlimited amount of things you could do, in a part of our city that's really been neglected.

**LeClerc:** Yeah. No doubt about it. Yeah.

**Wheeler:** So, I hope we keep pushing up the food chain for some of those visionary options.

**LeClerc:** So far, the cost does not cover that gap though. But yeah. That's certainly --

**Wheeler:** It never covers the interesting stuff, does it? That's why we have to be persistent.

**LeClerc:** [Laughter] Correct.

**Fish:** Mauricio, can I jump in for a sec?

**LeClerc:** Yes.

**Fish:** Can I just ask for some additional information, just to put on the record?

**LeClerc:** Yes.

**Fish:** So, I want to make sure that as we're making these decisions, we have an agreed-upon baseline of facts, and so, you referenced bike safety and some data on bike crashes, accidents, you know, as someone who is more of a pedestrian these days, I'm actually alarmed at the behavior I see on our streets. But I'd like to see that data, if I could.

**LeClerc:** Okay.

**Fish:** On the question of the accidents and the risks currently of the -- of the I-5 interchange -- and I'm talking about when you're going south on I-5 merging to get on to the Banfield while traffic's coming in, merging on to get in your lane, which has got to be one of the most dangerous merges in both ways, I'd like to have a better sense of the existing data on crashes and accidents and property damage because it seems to me, we should be able to agree on a baseline set of data there, hopefully. When you said, earlier, that some of the connectivity was connected to PPS, I take it you meant PPS in the sense that the Blanchard building? Not necessarily PPS as a long-term tenant of that site, correct?

**LeClerc:** Correct. Yeah.

**Fish:** So, whatever is contemplated there, it creates connectivity.

**LeClerc:** Right.

**Fish:** The question of having a shoulder for a car to get off -- or a disabled car or an emergency vehicle, that seems like a pretty basic thing. Can I have the citation to whatever the law is that encourages us to have shoulders? It seems a no-brainer, but I'd just like to make sure I understand what the current state of the law is in encouraging shoulders, and why that's important. Freight mobility, we have lots of different policies about freight mobility, and about -- so, one of our goals is, we want a truck that's going through the city to be able to get through I-5 in a reasonable amount of time. Do we have some good data

October 18, 2017

right now on how congestion is impacting freight mobility? And it's probably part of the quadrant plan, but if you could just point me in the right direction, 'cause I'd like to look at that. Sometimes, when we talk about congestion -- sometimes the debate is framed in terms of: Some congestion's okay, because if you fix the congestion, it'll get worse, that seems to be the argument that we hear from some people. And, the problem is, they both have climate impacts. Current congestion is not so good, and we've acknowledged that from the Rose Quarter to Vancouver, that part of I-5 runs through neighborhoods that historically have had their unfair share of bad air and environmental pollution, so, everyone's going to have a different view about congestion and its impacts. Any thoughts you have, though, about congestion under the status quo versus the potential growth in congestion.

**LeClerc:** Okay.

**Fish:** And then finally, there's a lot of conversations going on now, about reclaiming some history at this site. I won't go into all the details here, but there's a lot of well-intentioned people who have said that there's a way to honor the legacy of Albina and the missed opportunities under the Albina plan by re-imagining the Rose Quarter. And what I've seen of that depends very much on changing the connectivity of that area, both to the east and to the south. And in a sense, undoing some of the damage by re-creating the street grid and then opening up opportunities for more human scale development, and then thinking about how we reverse some history that has not quite worked out very well, and in some instances, we're not very proud of. And it will be helpful for me to better understand, as we go through this, how much of what we're talking about here facilitates the kinds of creative planning that people are doing at the grassroots level to reimagine that district, particularly around connectivity. So, those are things I'd like to know more about and I'd like to get, as much as possible, an understanding of agreed-upon facts. We can have debates about trade-offs, and we can have debates about priorities, and in a perfect world, we might spend the money differently somewhere else. Those are legitimate questions. But I want to make sure that I have the baseline understanding to go through, and I have to say that seeing some of these visions for a reimagined Rose Quarter, is very exciting and to the extent, our current circulation there works against those visions. That's very important to me. And that happens to be an equity play as much as it is a transportation play. So, those are just -- I'm sorry to load you up, but those are things that would be helpful for me.

**LeClerc:** Okay. I thought we're gonna address some of them as far as the conversation --

**Fish:** Even if you just point me in the right direction.

**LeClerc:** Yeah. We'll get you some facts. I think I have a lot of picture for the bike crashes here. Of course, I didn't bring it. But, yes, the -- we agree that we have -- this project will help development, not just for the area, but for the central city, and actually allows us to have this multi-modal, mixed-use area designation. It lifts the standards, the congestion mobility standards that we need to apply as part of redevelopment, so in a way, it makes redevelopment easier.

**Pearce:** Might be worth going into more detail on the specifics of the MMA. I think this is an important piece of the conversation.

**LeClerc:** Okay. So basically, we have cases in the central east side, for example, where ODOT put limits on development because of, you know, the impacts on the freeway. So, the Oregon planning system has a way -- an internal conflict. One is: Develop downtowns. Develop mixed-use areas. At the same time, say, don't add too much new cars to the freeways. Well, what happens is that, which one wins? Basically, by developing downtowns, you're actually leading to less traffic overall, no more connectivity, more pedestrian traffic. So, in a way, the state recognized that and created this MMA designation that basically says, if you meet these certain requirements, land use,

October 18, 2017

connectivity, density, which, certainly, the central city meets, then you don't have to respond to ODOT saying "You're adding, with this new zone change, you're adding too much traffic on to your -- on the freeway." So, in a way, by having an MMA, it's easier to apply new land use changes to the central city. However, safety standards do remain. So, when actually a development does have an impact on the freeway system, then ODOT cannot say, you know, "We need to respond to that." That is the case today. This is the worst safety spot in the state, so therefore, this project allows us to pursue the MMA destination and ODOT has given us concurrence that they agree that is an MMA, so long as we have this project in the books because this is how we address safety in the north-northeast quadrant area.

**Pearce;** So, the Rose Quarter project itself is part of us getting concurrence from ODOT to have an MMA, to further the development that we want to see on adjacent parcels.

**LeClerc:** Yeah. And this is into the future. Any new land use amendment for the central city has one less hurdle to do, technically-speaking. So, to summarize, and then we can get back to into some of commissioner Fish's questions – this, from our perspective, is an innovative design, it took a lot of compromise and I think we ended up with a good solution. For us, if we have completely rebuilt and seismic upgraded facilities, critical new improved pedestrian facilities, lids over the freeway, enhancing accessibility and livability, and redevelopment. So, we think that this is, potentially a good move. We very much agree with the mayor and commissioner Saltzman and commissioner Fish. So, and actually, the Planning Commission deliberated on this, as they put together their recommended draft for you, and they added, in this action item, some conditions on these TSP projects. So, I'll read – I'll paraphrase them because they'll actually long. But basically: One, we want the whole element, all of the elements of the project, not just a freeway. But actually, as part of the city's presentation, we want the lids, we want the pedestrian crossings, we want the local connections and improved connections and the bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Secondly, we should have city council sponsor equity strategy that begins to put together the opportunity this provides into the larger framework that we're talking about. So, in this case, it says condition of the development of a city council supported equity strategy, addressing issues related to the Broadway, you know, so, this project, including, historically, African-American community impacts, low-income housing and minorities, women small business community benefits. Thirdly, that the funding for this project would be done in a transparent way, and make sure that doesn't steal funds from east Portland. And fourth, that ODOT and PBOT evaluate congestion pricing as part of -- in the future. So, to go back to a little bit more detail as to what commissioner Fish was saying, there's a lot that can be – and actually, the mayor as well - - there's a lot that's going on now. The opportunity's big, so in a way, we've been meeting some bureaus, including Prosper Portland, OMF, PPS and housing. And begin to think about how does this project can influence some of the activities we have. This is a map provided by Prosper Portland. We have the Interstate urban renewal area. And there are some initiatives already there, with some committees going on, addressing community development, to the North-Northeast Community Development Initiative, the North-Northeast Neighborhood Housing Strategy that Housing's leading. We have activities and potential changes in the Rose Quarter area itself, and, you know, there's a big vision that is being developed there by the private sector, and we have, of course, development in existing and new development happening in the Oregon Convention Center URA including the Convention Center Hotel, the second phase of the Hassalo Oregon Square and the Lloyd Cinemas parking lot. So, the city's investing a lot. But at the same time, here comes a new project, and we want to be able to better tap into that. So, working with commissioner Saltzman, he has proposed an amendment, actually, to add to that action

October 18, 2017

item, edits to Number Four and a new Number Five. To Number Four, basically instead of saying “encourage to [indiscernible],” it will read “ODOT in partnership with PBOT will implement congestion pricing and TBM options to facilitate for climate impact as soon as feasible, and prior to the opening of this project.” And secondly, it’s a directive to city bureaus to work cooperatively to make sure that all the elements of the project are implemented, and to integrate the project with other city-led and community efforts that advance city goals in the Rose Quarter/ Lloyd District/Lower Albina, and immediate northeast Portland. Special attention will be given to opportunities to include more affordable housing, promote economic development and redevelopment, implement multi-modal transportation improvements including the green loop, which actually uses Clackamas Street, and the new bridge, and provide additional open spaces opportunities under overall equity strategy for city-led investments in the area. This is in your packet. ODOT would be one of the lead implementers of this action item. So, that is an amendment that is being proposed by the commissioner. So, I'll stop there.

**Eudaly:** I have a couple questions. First of all, thank you for that. This has been a challenging project to wrap my brain around, and as you may know, we've heard a lot of criticism from community members, unfortunately, after this was passed at the state level so it's somewhat reassuring to hear that this is a conversation that's been going on for two years and has involved a significant amount of community outreach and public involvement. So, the -- my main concern is, I am hearing some critiques of the bicycle infrastructure part of the plan, and I'm wondering if -- assuming we agree, kind of on the overall mission, if there's still going to be opportunities to make adjustments to that piece of it?

**LeClerc:** Yes. We will have a lot -- several years more of design.

**Eudaly:** Oh, boy. [laughter]

**LeClerc:** At this point, we don't have a design, but certainly we have the lids, the rebuilding of the infrastructure allows us to have much better than we have now. Hopefully state of the art facilities. So, we'll have conversations about that. ODOT has a process now, now that we have the funding, they start in environmental studies, so, we're going to get more details as we go along and we're happy to participate in making sure that we get the best bicycle facilities and the best sidewalks that we can for the project.

**Eudaly:** That is good to hear because you said Broadway was our number one bicycle crash corridor. So, even though this only affects a small segment of that street, you feel it will significantly alleviate the risk?

**LeClerc:** Yeah, we talked a lot about crashes. There's a higher concentration in this area because of all the movement. But also, this is the tapping into other efforts. We have a Central City In Motion effort, and we're going to be looking at providing better infrastructure. So, how can we tie these improvements to connect to the river, and then we have another project that hopefully will continue to improve Broadway and Weidler to the east, to Hollywood. So, that's sort of opportunities that we're kind of seeking to tap into.

**Eudaly:** Great. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Could I ask a question about the amendment? And I support congestion pricing and I support Dan's efforts, commissioner Saltzman's efforts. One possible hitch in all this: Who gets to decide that? Do we control that? Does the state control that or are we beholden to the federal government?

**Pearce:** A little bit of all of those things. So, as I understand it, the state would need to apply to the federal government for approval, and that is part of what the study that the state legislature directed ODOT Region One to undertake, is preparing a study of congestion pricing on I-5 and I-205 in order to apply for approval from the federal government to implement the program.

October 18, 2017

**Wheeler:** Okay. Because the one concern I have -- and again, I'll underscore it again. I support congestion pricing. I think it's absolutely the right strategy here. But I would hate to see all of the other aspects of this project go by the wayside and the funds return to the state so they could use it to expand I-205 if the federal government doesn't give us what we need right now, and so, I'm somewhat hesitant to throw down a gauntlet when I don't know who's picking it up on the other side.

**Pearce:** Sure. This, as an action item within the Central City Plan, is describing the intention and the directive to staff, so it's essentially telling us, "This is what our directive from you is to do." So, it's saying, this is what you want to see happen. It doesn't mean that the project can't happen if we don't meet that action.

**Wheeler:** I want to clarify, is that commissioner Saltzman's intent? 'Cause I'm not sure you got that right.

**Pearce:** Our intention is to see that happen.

**Saltzman:** Yes.

**Wheeler:** That is? Okay.

**Saltzman:** Well, it's not my intention to -- you know, I want to see this happen. And I think you have to push the bureaucracy in order to make something like this happen, because it's a relatively new concept, certainly on the west coast, it is a new concept. But, you know, I'm fully-cognizant of the fact that it may not happen before this project, and I certainly don't want to see this project fall by the wayside.

**Wheeler:** Then you have me standing shoulder to shoulder with you on this. This is obviously an important project for the state, and it's an important project for the city of Portland. I believe it has the opportunity to be transformational for this part of our city and I am hearing the concerns that others have raised in their testimony. I think they raised some valid points and there's opportunities, I believe, to address some of those concerns, as well. So, I certainly support it. Does Dan need a second?

**Fritz:** Second.

**Wheeler:** Okay. Commissioner Fritz cleverly jumped right out. She's good! So, commissioner Fritz seconds. I don't know if we have any further discussion on this.

**Fritz:** Just one other suggestion I have in the longer of the two amendments that commissioner Saltzman's put forward, if we could have some language in there about special attention to communities historically disadvantaged in Albina. To make it -- it does say about equity, but I think we need to be really intentional, as we have in the north/northeast housing strategy, to make sure that we're focusing on particularly folks who lived in the area. And I don't have particularly language for it.

**Pearce:** Yeah. Formal amendments will come back later.

**Wheeler:** Excellent.

**Fritz:** Thank you.

**Pearce:** And one note specific to congestion pricing: We understand we're working with the commissioner's office on bringing these further initiatives forward in the next month or so.

**Saltzman:** November 30.

**Pearce:** So, our intention is to bring a much clearer point to the congestion pricing conversation about six weeks from now.

**Wheeler:** Great. All right. Next item? If anybody wants to take a break at some point, just let me know.

**LeClerc:** Can you sit with me? I guess there's procedural things for the things we did not discuss --

**Edmunds:** Okay, so, there are two other items on table D, there's item 3 and item 4, and, PBOT staff believe these are minor, but we've grouped --

October 18, 2017

**LeClerc:** Actually, we're talking 4 --

**Edmunds:** I'm sorry, 4, 5 and 6 and then 7, 8, 9 and 10. Do you want to talk about these street classifications?

**LeClerc:** I did at the very beginning. Let me see. So, Number 4 is about minor amendments about the emergency response specifications, following conversations with Police and Fire. I think they're minor amendments, and make sense. Five is to retain the bikeway classification for 18th Avenue and Goose Hollow, that's where the tracks are as a bicycle classification. It's hard to put a bicycle lane there, but we're throwing some engineering in there, and there's a possibility. It's a good connection, it's hard to find something equivalent. So, we'd like to retain it so we can explore that option. Six, minor mapping errors. They just showed up and we're correcting them. Seven -

**Edmunds:** Maybe you should stop there.

**LeClerc:** Okay.

**Wheeler:** Do we have seconds for 5 and 6?

**Edmunds:** For 4, 5, and 6?

**Eudaly:** Second, second, second.

**Wheeler:** Thank you.

**LeClerc:** Alright. Seven is basically a minor amendment that -- a renaming of the project, Sullivan's Gulch Trail. We have a project to provide a better pedestrian and bicycle connections on Lloyd Avenue in the Lloyd district, above the bluff. There's also a Sullivan's Gulch trail project. In reality, the trail project calls for the two alignments, so in a way, we're combining that TSP to reflect the two alignments. And there's a, you know, the new bridge, with the view corridor, we're going to wrap around the design on this connection to the work -- the bridge work that we'll be doing as part of Sullivan's Crossing.

**Wheeler:** I'll move, any second on that?

**Eudaly:** Second.

**LeClerc:** And the last one is a revised description for Southwest Bond Avenue to include the South Waterfront street plan updates that I think came before you not too long ago.

**Wheeler:** I'll move, is there a second?

**Eudaly:** Second.

**Brooks:** So, just to clarify, that was a motion and second for 4 through 10, and the mayor was making all of the first motions and the seconds -- I think Karla got it.

**Fish:** The mayor promised a more efficient government, and I think you're seeing what that looks like. [All laughing]

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

**Wheeler:** Yeah. Thank you.

**Troy Doss, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Troy Doss, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability. I'm here to talk to you about the Table E and the Zoning Map and Use Allowance amendments. First one is one for Volunteers of America. You may recall, there was a request. They currently have industrial zonings. IG-1. It's a site that's been used historically for several decades as both a short-term housing facility for women who are recovering from addiction as well as daycare. It's somewhat associated with the other use, but it's also available to the public at-large. Both operations are ran by Volunteers of America who are a nonprofit. They had requested -- that we rezone to EX, which would be a mixed-use zone, which would allow the use outright. However, because it's IG-1, it's in the industrial sanctuary, there's a lot of concern from adjacent industrial uses, as well as Central and East Side Industrial Council, that we find a fix that would allow them to retain their use and maybe even expand. But if they should not follow through with that, we're not left with EX zone property that now has a plethora of other uses that could be allowed on the site that might erode the industrial sanctuary. So, what we've come up with is a

October 18, 2017

concept of a code amendment that would say if the use is existing, operated by a nonprofit, it could continue and expand on-site up to a floor area ratio of about 3:1, it would give them approximately 120,000 square feet of development potential, and they would be able to continue on.

**Fish:** And that would not be subject to a conditional use?

**Doss:** It would not be subject to conditional use.

**Fish:** But it would be limited to the life of the project? They couldn't do a bait and switch?

**Doss:** Exactly. And so, they are assessing this proposal right now. They've given us a favorable review of it initially, but they'll look at it a little bit further, and we could work with them further to fine-tune that code.

**Fish:** I spoke to some folks at Central Eastside Industrial Council, and my understanding – and you'll tell me if I'm stating this accurately - is that they are supportive of the concept, they were uncomfortable with one of the proposed fixes.

**Doss:** They were uncomfortable with the zone change. So, if we could find a way to retain the current zoning and the protections it comes with while also allowing VOA to expand --

**Fish:** But they're not opposed to the proposed use of the site.

**Doss:** Nope. Not at all.

**Fish:** The VOA developing it for a community purpose?

**Doss:** Very supportive, in fact.

**Fish:** My view is: Whatever gets us to the finish line that brings the most people along, that allows them to leverage a piece of property for a significant community benefit, and if it's the staff recommendation, and it's -- and it's acceptable to all the parties, that's fine with me, and I appreciate your creative problem-solving here.

**Saltzman:** I would move that amendment.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Commissioner Saltzman moves. Is there a second?

**Fritz:** Second.

**Wheeler:** Second. And I understand part of this is that you'll continue to work further with VOA and EIC on the code to make this a possibility?

**Doss:** And we'll bring back the specifics.

**Wheeler:** Sounds like both parties are interested in doing that, which is great. I appreciate your work on that too. Good. Next item.

**Doss:** Next item is really a combination of number two and three here. And it deals with a similar – it's the same provision in the code. We have historically had a limitation on large-format retail in certain locations of the city, parts of the north Pearl, South Waterfront and this idea has also extended over to the OMSI station area, really trying to prevent a use that was akin to, like, a Costco that is very large in volume, attracts a lot of trips. 'Cause we just don't believe the transportation system's able to carry that. However, we have found that over time, the limitation at 40,000-square-feet is pretty limited. That's smaller than some grocery stores. So, the request has been to allow up to 50,000 square feet both in South Waterfront and at the OMSI area, and honestly, we would extend that to the other areas where this is applicable, and then, you could apply up to 60,000 square feet as a conditional use. We've talked briefly with both parties, they're comfortable with an amendment that would do something like that. They've actually requested that. So, that's where we're at on this one.

**Wheeler:** I'll move that. Is there a second?

**Fritz:** Second.

**Wheeler:** E4?

**Doss:** E4 is -- actually, I'm going to turn this one over to commissioner Eudaly who had a proposed amendment on T1.

**Eudaly:** Thank you, Troy. Colleagues, I have a number of talking points I'm going to run

October 18, 2017

through. I think they may answer most of your questions, and then we'll do our best to answer any follow-ups. So, I offer this rezoning amendment to help activate the large concrete pier that is along the North Pearl Riverfront. The pier is currently barely used, and one of the goals of the Central City plan is to activate the riverfront for a variety of activities, so that is the intent of this amendment. We were contacted by an individual who has a grand vision of bringing a flotel to this pier. It may very well be that that is not possible, but certainly, changing the zoning could enable a variety of other activities, whether it's boat rides from the pier, kayaks, food, beverage, performances, et cetera. So, regardless of what actually happens there, we're just wanting to open up the possibility of something more happening there. So, the current zoning is high density residential and it allows some commercial development, but that must be in the primary residential structure. Rezoning to a central commercial works fine for the existing condominium residential developments, and allows more flexibility for retail uses on these sites. Item E4 is the amendment. It will include three tax lots, two properties that are -- thanks for the visuals, by the way. I feel so fancy. Two properties that are adjacent to the pier and one rectangular site for the inlet to the north. The third property would become an isolated residentially-zoned site. If the two properties adjacent to the pier were the only sites rezoned to Central Commercial. Also, to clarify, the amendment applies CX to the comprehensive plan map, and the zoning map for these properties. Since I proposed this amendment at the September 7 city council hearing, I plan to reach out to affected property owners, and others who might be interested in the amendment, including the Pearl District and Northwest Industrial Associations. My staff is working with BPS staff to do that community outreach and send them formal notification of this map amendment prior to the January public hearing. That's all I've got.

**Fish:** Commissioner, I cannot support taking scarce, industrial land out of our inventory, I'm sorry. [Laughter] Of course, this is not Terminal 1 North, this is Terminal 1 South, and it's already zoned for residential. So, the only question here is, there's a lot of staff comments here about open house and notice. So, is there -- is that because there's -- this will be a surprise to the neighbors? Or this is required or what?

**Eudaly:** I think the individual I mentioned that has the interest in the pier has actually done his own outreach, so they should be aware that there's interest in this. But we have not done it ourselves.

**Edmunds:** We will be sending a noting prior to the January public hearing, so we will send it to those neighbors.

**Fish:** I'll second this so we can have further discussion.

**Wheeler:** And staff will work with commissioner Eudaly on the specific language around the amendment, is that correct? Very good. Excellent. Next item, please.

**Doss:** Okay. We're going to back to Ivon street. And there's actually two issues that are listed here. So, I'll start with 5, I don't really have a slide on this. It's really a minor amendment. As we were going through the process of addressing the retail limitation I discussed earlier, we had inserted a -- an exemption that allowed hotel uses to be allowed despite the retail limitation of 40,000 or 50,000 square feet. Because hotels are listed as a retail sales and service use under the code. We meant to carry that over. It was a mistake. It's an error in the code that's before you today, so we're just asking that we can re-amend that language to allow hotels where that limitation exists, and that would also allow for hotel at Ivon street, for instance.

**Wheeler:** I'll move it.

**Fritz:** Second.

**Doss:** And then, the last is for the same property. There was a request that -- by the property owner, "Why don't we allow housing as a conditional use here the same way we

October 18, 2017

did at OMSI?" So, just to give you a little bit of background on that, OMSI has currently -- a zoning pattern that's an employment/industrial zone that does allow housing as a conditional use. There was a lot of conversation when we brought the Southeast Quadrant Plan through, to say, "Should we retain that or not?" So, the proposal from both -- going through Planning Commission, city council was for the OMSI area, because the zoning currently allows it as conditional use, we're gonna retain that going forward. So, that's why we've done that there. The properties south of the station area there, the light rail station at Carruthers, are not zoned the same way. They're actually zoned Heavy Industrial. And if you see the photo here, you'll see that's the use that's currently there, it's the Ross Island Sand and Gravel Batch Plant, the area also has warehouses and other uses. But primarily, it's really zoned for heavy industrial. So, we are rezoning the area to allow EX, central employment. It would allow virtually every use that the code allows except for residential, and the reason we're doing that is, there is transportation impacts on the adjacent industrial use, which will retain its IH zoning, the Ross Island Sand and Gravel, could impact freight operations, it also cuts right across the trailhead for Spring Water/OMSI Trail, and it just doesn't seem like a site that is appropriate for housing. But there's so much flexibility still retained in the EX zoning itself that we felt that they were able to go forward with a number of different development scenarios there. So, our proposal would be to retain the prohibition housing at that site.

**Fish:** How long has the current property owner owned that land?

**Doss:** About four years.

**Fish:** And so, the property was acquired with these existing limitations?

**Doss:** Yes.

**Fish:** And, from your point of view, is this a close call or a clear call?

**Doss:** I believe it's a clear call.

**Fish:** Joe?

**Zehnder:** It's a clear call. The property was purchased as industrial. We're widely-expanding the kind of uses that can go on it, we're just not going with residential because the policies we're balancing here are protecting the industrial sanctuary, central eastside, but hooking it into the innovation quadrant, and offering, you know, offices, and other kind of uses, so it's a clear call from the public benefit of the policy purpose for us, as well. And residential here for those reasons and others is not appropriate at this time.

**Saltzman:** I think this is my amendment, but I agree with the rationales that have been offered.

**Wheeler:** Okay.

**Fish:** Are we down to one more?

**Wheeler:** Green buildings.

**Mindy Brooks, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability:** Mindy Brooks, planning and sustainability, and we're going to talk about ecoroofs, it's our last item for today, I believe. So, this again, this was already brought up as an amendment by commissioner Eudaly and seconded, but we wanted to give you an update on where we are on this. And I wanted to give a little bit of background, too, to make sure that everyone understands what the standard would be. So, this is a standard for new buildings over 20,000 square feet. The current recommended draft would have 60% of the rooftop going to ecoroof after you remove mechanical, fire/safety routes, all other things on the rooftop. The remaining 60% would need to be an ecoroof. And I wanted to clarify that that 20,000 square feet, that is the size of the whole building. Not the footprint, not the rooftop, the whole building. So, a half-block site, two stories, equals 20,000-square-feet, so it's going to pick up most new buildings in the central city. The way that it would work is, I just picked a recent development, all that gray area on that rooftop there is mechanical and fire evacuation

October 18, 2017

routes and HVAC and all that stuff would be removed first from the calculation, and the remaining area would be where you would look at for an ecoroof. So, the recommendation, before Eudaly's amendment, was 60% of that would go to ecoroof, and 40% could be used for other amenity spaces. So, just an example of this, in this example, the towers are all the mechanical space, no ecoroof, and then that podium has ecoroof plus amenity space, like this. Commissioner Eudaly's amendment would change the coverage to 100% of the remaining rooftop area, and then clarifying the issue around amenity space. So, really, the standard would work very similar to the way that we've written it today. It's more of a clarification about what we are calling "common outdoor area." So, instead of it being flexible, we would say, take your rooftop, subtract mechanical, fire and safety and common outdoor area." And then the rest needs to be ecoroof, 100% into ecoroof. So, that is what we're looking at. We don't have an amendment today because we have run into two topics that we have to address further. One is the fire code, which was amended in 2016 to specify size and dimension of ecoroof, so we're looking further into how do we address that and maximize ecoroof space? And then, the other has to do with architectural diversity. So, ecoroofs, per stormwater code, can go up to a slope of about 25%, beyond that, it's a little bit tricky, and so, we're trying to figure out how we can be flexible so we don't end up with just flat roofs on our new buildings, so we're hoping to come back soon with an actual amendment that gets at those two issues, as well.

**Fish:** Before you go to the second part of this, I'm just looking at the Eudaly amendment where you have a recommendation on One through Four. So, historically, BES has had a big role in ecoroofs, so, based on the clarifications that you've worked out, and there's still a couple things to be clarified, but, does BES support this approach now?

**Brooks:** Yeah. So, there's a staff that includes a team of BES, Bureau of Development Services, and our bureau to continue to make sure that it meets everybody's – and with Bureau of Development Services, we're also working with fire as well. So, make sure everybody's...

**Fish:** On the same page.

**Brooks:** On the same page. Yeah.

**Fish:** Thank you.

**Fritz:** And then, you're also looking more to historical buildings and smaller ones, right? current ones?

**Brooks:** Our current recommendation is to not go to a smaller size than 20,000 square feet. We think that picks up most of the stock of what will be new buildings in the central city.

**Fish:** What is an example -- and I agree with you that it's appropriate for us to look at incentives. The incentive used to be that you get a bonus. We tied it to the zoning code, right? Now we're creating a mandate. So, what's an example of an incentive that could be considered by the council?

**Brooks:** Um, well, there was a Grey to Green incentive that was a Sam Adams incentive that he put in place, and it was through Bureau of Environmental Services to help offset the cost of ecoroofs. And I don't have the stats with me right now, but quite a few ecoroofs were funded as part of that Grey to Green incentive. So, a monetary offset would be one option you could look at.

**Fish:** Right. So, that was using a subsidy program at BES to cover it, and unlikely that's going to come back. So, there might be other things that can be offered --

**Eudaly:** I'm sorry, I missed something. Incentives for smaller buildings? Or for existing buildings?

**Fish:** When it wasn't a mandate, then Commissioner Adams proposed using ratepayer subsidies to cover an offset. Probably not the best idea for us to pursue that option going

October 18, 2017

forward. So, the question is, what are –

**Eudaly:** But why would we need incentives if we're going to require something?

**Fish:** We're talking about the smaller foot – the smaller buildings. Okay. That's what I was looking for. So, I was just asking -- I was hoping to be educated about what are examples of incentives when you don't have a zoning code, and you don't have ratepayer dollars. What's left?

**Eudaly:** Warm fuzzies.

**Zehnder:** You don't have bonuses in this case, because this system's fully subscribed. So, it's -- our other few waivers speeding things up kind of approaches, but nothing that we've identified specifically yet.

**Fish:** And something, presumably, we're talking to some of those property owners to ask what would they view as an appropriate incentive?

**Zehnder:** We have not done that on part of this, but, uh, we can follow up on that.

**Fish:** We're carving this out, so, I mean, we'll get some feedback as to what they're looking for.

**Fritz:** Well, possibly, this would help with the energy rating which we're requiring. Because it would, you know, having more stuff on the top makes it cooler in the summer and warmer in the winter.

**Eudaly:** Oh yeah! How could this tie into the green building policy we just heard today?

**Fritz:** These are all good questions, and thank you, commissioner Eudaly, for raising this whole topic, because I think it is one, obviously staff has enjoyed digging into it more, and, I know you've had a lot of conversations with Audubon. So, thank you very much.

**Brooks:** So, ecoroofs are part of the Green Building policy. And they're in place today, we actually modeled a lot of this, the recommended code, out of the Green Building Policy, because as you pointed out, there are many reasons, not just stormwater reasons, to look at ecoroofs: They do decrease HVAC costs, they extend the life of a roof almost twice over what a standard roof is. So, there's a lot of reasons to consider ecoroof, and monetary reasons, as well, for the property owner.

**Fish:** I think the concern you flag, which I share is, on some of the smaller buildings, particularly historic structures, where we're talking about a whole host of changes that are going to add up, we want to assess the cost, the accumulative impact, and then see whether there's some way to off-set that cost so that someone isn't getting an unreinforced masonry bill, an ecoroof mandate, and a few other things.

**Brooks:** So, just to be clear, as this is proposed right now, it would apply only to new construction. So, this is not -- there isn't yet –

**Fish:** I'm talking about 5 through 7.

**Brooks:** Yeah, I don't believe that the 5 through 7 was looking at retrofit.

**Fish:** Well, it says, as well as retrofitting existing rooftops, so I'm just going off of your language.

**Brooks:** Oh! I'm sorry, which one are you looking at? Oh, underneath "Staff Comments"?

**Fish:** Yeah, hedge your bet on that one.

**Brooks:** Oh, office staff comments. Yes. Sorry, I was looking at number 5 here, the request from -- this came from GRIT, and the request was to apply it to new construction. But yeah, there's...

**Fish:** I'm agreeing with you.

**Brooks:** Yeah. Okay. [Laughter]

**Wheeler:** All right. That's it, good. So, Sally, why don't you tell us where we are with regard to the items we're going to cover in our next session?

**Edmunds:** Okay. So, on November 2, we will talk about the West Quadrant SAC property owner map again. But then, we will be moving on to a number of other topics, including

October 18, 2017

river and environmental items, and -- gosh, I don't have them all in front of me.

**Fritz:** And others. [Laughter]

**Edmunds:** And a number of others.

**Wheeler:** And the rest. [Laughter] Okay.

**Edmunds:** So, I just want to point out the schedule. So, we have, on the calendar, November 2nd, and December 6, to go through a variety of items just like we did today, and develop amendments in time for the January 18<sup>th</sup> public hearing. We will schedule another date in -- in probably March, to do some final votes on the amendments and then we will likely come back to you in May for a final council vote because that is currently when the comprehensive plan is scheduled to be complete. So we need to follow that.

**Fish:** Is November 2<sup>nd</sup> locked in stone? Did you say November 2<sup>nd</sup> for the next --

**Edmunds:** I did say November 2.

**Fish:** I'm looking where it's on my...

**Wheeler:** Is it November 2nd or November 6th?

**Edmunds:** It's November 2nd and December 6.

**Fish:** It's not on our calendar.

**Fritz:** Well, these are work sessions with the council, right? So I would suggest that we move it so that we can accommodate your schedule.

**Fish:** I was going ask if there's any way to move it to the following week.

**Moore-Love:** Not really. It's pretty booked. There isn't time.

**Fritz:** Even on a Tuesday morning work session time?

**Moore-Love:** There's a Wednesday morning, a Wednesday evening meeting, and the Thursday is booked from 2:00 to 3:30.

**Fritz:** Well, what about the Tuesdays where we kind of keep it held for work sessions coming up. Is there nothing there?

**Moore-Love:** The following week of the second, there's a work session on the 7th, 9:30 to 11:30.

**Fish:** Well, maybe we could, in the next 24 hours, see if there's a place that fits. If there's a way to move it to the next week that doesn't inconvenience my colleagues, I would ask us to consider it. If not, then we'll keep the date.

**Wheeler:** Let's see if we can work it out. So, we'll have --

**Moore-Love:** Do we need to announce it today?

**Edmunds:** If we need to be rolled to a date and time certain, it should be announced today. I'm sorry for that. It's a technicality. But because it is a land use matter, presumably, someone --

**Wheeler:** Can we announce it today and change it? What's the process for changing the date?

**Edmunds:** Yeah. So, we can announce today that the date and time certain is November 2nd. If it's going to be rescheduled for a date and time certain after November 2<sup>nd</sup>, we can post on the door, and post online, the new time.

**Wheeler:** Okay, so, let's do this, for those listening in, we're going to continue this conversation on November 2<sup>nd</sup> at what time?

**Moore-Love:** 2:00 p.m.

**Wheeler:** At 2:00 p.m. But heads-up, we will very likely be changing that date. So, stay tuned between now and then, and check the council agenda to see if we've changed the date.

**Fish:** And how much time do you expect for this next work session?

**Edmunds:** So, I had a moment to go grab my materials here. So, we have a couple of other green building items --

**Fish:** What's your guesstimate if you added it all up?

October 18, 2017

**Sally:** Oh, three hours.

**Fish:** Okay. That's good to know.

**Wheeler:** All right. With that, we are adjourned. Thank you, everyone.

**At 4:42 p.m. Council adjourned.**