



JULY 11, 2001

<b>Mayor Vera Katz</b>		
<b>*853</b>	Authorize contract with construction consultant on claims resulting from the Tanner Creek Stream Diversion Project (Ordinance)  (Y-4)	<b>175758</b>
<b>*854</b>	Authorize City Attorney to sign a stipulated agreement allowing the Personal Representative of the Estate of Anna P. Silny to distribute the net remainder of the Estate to the Friends of the Mounted Patrol, an Oregon non-profit corporation (Ordinance)  (Y-4)	<b>175759</b>
<b>*855</b>	Authorize donation of one hundred firearms to the Oregon State Police Forensic Laboratory for use in their Firearms Reference Collection (Ordinance)  (Y-4)	<b>175760</b>
<b>*856</b>	Authorize lease with Sun T. Chong and Kon R. Chong for retail space in The 1900 Building (Ordinance)  (Y-4)	<b>175761</b>
<b>Commissioner Charlie Hales</b>		
<b>*857</b>	Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with the Portland Development Commission to provide an additional \$15,000 and to provide additional time for planning and construction of transportation and streetscape improvements on NE Alberta Street from NE Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard through NE 15th Avenue (Ordinance; amend Agreement No. 51295)  (Y-4)	<b>175762</b>
<b>*858</b>	Designate and assign certain City-owned park property in Gov. Tom McCall Waterfront Park as public right-of-way (Ordinance)  (Y-4)	<b>175763</b>
<b>*859</b>	Designate and assign certain City-owned park property in Earl Boyles Park as public street right-of-way for the Lents Urban Renewal Project (Ordinance)  (Y-4)	<b>175764</b>
<b>*860</b>	Amend contract with Nutter Corporation for extended bid items and additional work to the Rosemont Development Street and Utilities Improvements Project (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 33220)  (Y-4)	<b>175765</b>
<b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b>		
<b>861</b>	Accept completion of the SW Parallel Interceptor Exploratory Potholing Project and authorize final payment to Kasey Cooper Excavating, Inc., Project No. 5502 (Report; Purchase Order No. 1024406)  (Y-4)	<b>ACCEPTED</b>

**JULY 11, 2001**

<p><b>862</b> Authorize acceptance of a grant from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality in the amount of \$75,000 for restoration of the Heron Rookery Wetlands in North Portland (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 18, 2001 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>Commissioner Erik Sten</b></p>	
<p><b>*863</b> Agreement with Portland Community Land Trust for \$100,000 and provide for payment (Ordinance) <b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>175766</b></p>
<p><b>*864</b> Contract with Central City Concern for \$486,376 to provide homeless services, including alcohol and drug services, employment services, and homeless facility maintenance and provide for payment (Ordinance) <b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>175767</b></p>
<p><b>*865</b> Agreement with JOIN for \$176,800 for outreach to homeless campers and provide for payment (Ordinance) <b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>175768</b></p>
<p><b>*866</b> Agreement with REACH Community Development Corporation, Inc. for \$70,000 for the Community Builders Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) <b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>175769</b></p>
<p><b>*867</b> Amend ordinance for agreement with the Metro Home Safety Repair Program for \$135,000 for the Senior Home Repair and Maintenance Program and provide for payment (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 175690) <b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>175770</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b></p>	
<p align="center"><b>Commissioner Jim Francesconi</b></p>	
<p><b>*868</b> Authorize application to the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department for a grant from the federally funded Land and Water Conservation Fund in the amount of \$59,000 to begin implementing the Wilkes Park Master Plan (Ordinance) <b>RESCHEDULED TO JULY 11, 2001 2:00 PM SESSION</b> <b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>175771</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>Commissioner Charlie Hales</b></p>	
<p><b>869</b> Create an Underground Consolidation Area Pilot Project for consolidation of utility facilities in a designated area into a common conduit system (Previous Agenda 806) ) <b>RESCHEDULED TO JULY 11, 2001 2:00 PM SESSION</b> <b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>36007</b></p>

**JULY 11, 2001**

<p><b>*870</b> Amend Title 18, Noise Control, to clarify authority for and means of enforcement, add regulations regarding certain sources of noise, and to increase maximum penalties (Previous Agenda 815 as amended; amend City Code Title 18) <b>RESCHEDULED TO JULY 11, 2001 2:00 PM SESSION</b></p> <p><b>Motion to amend as an emergency ordinance:</b> Moved by Commissioner Hales and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.</p> <p><b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p><b>175772</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Erik Sten</b></p> <p><b>*871</b> Authorize the Commissioner of Public Works to sign a Founding Partner Letter of Intent with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to join the Green Power Partnership (Ordinance) <b>RESCHEDULED TO JULY 11, 2001 2:00 PM SESSION</b></p> <p><b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p><b>175773</b></p>

At 11:37 a.m., Council recessed.

At 11:41 a.m., Council reconvened.

At 12:52 p.m., Council recessed.

**JULY 11, 2001**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 11th DAY OF JULY, 2001 AT 2:00 P.M.

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

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

<p><b>872</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Direct the Bureau of Planning and affected City Bureaus to develop a Marquam Hill Plan (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz) <b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p><b>Disposition:</b>  <b>36008</b></p>
<p><b>873</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 3:30 PM</b> – Amends the Comprehensive Plan map, zoning map and code to implement the Northwest Transition Zoning Project, transitioning an area in Northwest Portland from Industrial to Employment designations to facilitate mixed use development and limit development of inactive uses including Electronic Equipment Facilities near the Portland Streetcar (Previous Agenda 760; introduced by Mayor Katz; amend Title 33)</p>	<p><b>CONTINUED TO AUGUST 1, 2001 AT 2:00 PM</b></p>

At 3:56 p.m., Council recessed.

**JULY 12, 2001**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,  
OREGON WAS HELD THIS 12th DAY OF JULY, 2001 AT 2:00 P.M.

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

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

<p><b>*874</b>      <b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Adopt the final 2020 Parks Vision report (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Francesconi)</p> <p><b>Motion to adopt the report:</b> Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Hales.</p> <p><b>(Y-4)</b></p>	<p><b>Disposition:</b></p> <p><b>175774</b></p>
--	---

At 4:09 p.m., Council Adjourned.

**GARY BLACKMER**  
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love  
Clerk of the Council

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

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Closed Caption Transcript of Portland City Council Meeting**

This transcript was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast.

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

**JULY 11, 2001      9:30 AM**

**Katz:** Good morning everybody the Council will come to order Karla please call the roll.

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

**Katz:** Mayor is present. Commissioner Saltzman is on vacation. I just want to give everybody heads up for those of you who listen to us, we have a very special treat. I won't tell you what it is, but we have a very -- commissioner Francesconi and I have a special treat for everybody tomorrow at 2 o'clock. How about that for a teaser? All right. Consent agenda item. Anybody want to take any consent agenda items off the consent agenda? No? Anybody in the audience wanting to do that? Roll call on consent agenda.

**Francesconi:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [ gavel pounded ] all right. Item 849 time certain.

**Item 849.**

**Katz:** Commissioner Hales?

**Hales:** A couple comments before steve and other staff, I don't know if steve is going to be solo presenting here. Steve is going to present the report. We have -- i'm sure we have citizen testimony as well and people who worked on the task force. At the outset I want to say this is a case where process has been too long, and yet we haven't gotten far enough. That's no one in particular's fault. The council didn't fund this project for a long time, and then it took longer than maybe a lot of us would want, including the staff that worked on it. But I think what's more important is looking ahead and taking the work that's been done here and getting serious about some solutions. And we're going to have recommendations from the staff and from citizens about the solutions. I just want to say at the outset that the council I think needs to take -- pay close attention to this, because I think in downtown st. Johns our economic development goals and our neighborhood goals are in a fundamental conflict, because of problems in the street system. There's really nowhere else in the city where it's this bad. Where if we succeed in our job goals, we will fail in our neighborhood goals for downtown st. Johns. We're about to start a planning process there like we've done in other districts of the city, really trying to reinforce the character of the business district there to make it more pedestrian friendly, and the amount of truck traffic through downtown st. Johns caused by a good economy and all the industrial development of that part of the city is just completely in conflict with what we want to see at street level as a neighborhood. We have to grapple with that problem. I think there is no real solution short of another bridge across the willamette, and that we need another bridge across the willamette in that area. The short-term questions are the ones we get to deal with for now, because that's going to take some time and some serious money that we don't have today. But we've got to find it, we've got to build it and in the meantime we've got to figure out what the appropriate mitigation and damage control strategy is, and that's what we're here to grapple with today. But I think we need to pay close attention not just to the nuances of which versions of the recommendations and other recommendations from the citizens do we take for now, but how do we get to the real solution, which is finding another way for regional truck traffic to get across the river without having to

**JULY 11, 2001**

pound through downtown st. Johns. One other footnote here, council might remember, we had a discussion about the sellwood bridge not long ago, and we really came to a turning point in the regional planning process, because that neighborhood had said, we want to -- tacoma street to be a main street. And in the regional plan we made tacoma street a main street. And then the regional planning process looked at all the commuter traffic from clackamas county to Washington county and said, well, that's fine that tacoma street is a main street, but we're going to need a four-lane sellwood bridge in order to move these commuters. And the city council, the city of Portland said to metro, no, tacoma street is going to be a main street, neighborhood livability trumps traffic, find another way. And I think yes made an important turning point decision there and we need to apply that same kind of thinking to other places in the city, and there's no place where that is more needed than this terrible conflict we have in downtown st. Johns.

**Katz:** All right.

**Hales:** By way of introductions, those are the bigger issues we have to deal with beyond today's hearing.

**Katz:** Before you get to steve, I need a motion. We aren't adopting, we're accepting reports. There's a big difference between adoption and acceptance. So if it's all right with the council, lets change that word, which is usually our -- how we deal with reports.

**Hales:** So move.

**Katz:** Any objections? Hearing none. Let me just add that I sit on the i-5 Washington-oregon transportation study and the issue that commissioner Hales described is part of the discussion of that group. But that is as commissioner Hales -- that is long-term, and those options will be looked at by the group, and will be looked at in -- and seen if it's even doable. So there is -- there are eyes on the long-term. Come on up.

**Francesconi:** Maybe you can address this, but I think -- so the answer on the bridge is really to be funded I don't think you were -- it's a metro -- it's a regional funding question. I think.

**Hales:** That's right.

**Francesconi:** And then the question is, can it -- how has it been prioritized regionally in terms of project lists and what can we do to elevate it?

**Hales:** Let's take that up today. That's a good question for steve to lead into. And one of the things steve, I hope you'll do in your presentation, is explain the weird patchwork we have of state facilities and city streets in st. Johns, because some streets we control and others we don't, like lombard is still a state highway, so walk us through that as well, please.

**Katz:** And let me just say, when you talk about elevating it, we will probably by the end of this year have data, some recommendations by the task force on a lot of options along the i-5 corridor. And that may be the time that we ought to bring -- this is not for you steve, because you're not involved with that, but that may be the time that we ought to bring this whole -- all these issues to the council. Okay. Go ahead.

**Steve Gerber, Office of Transportation:** Mayor and commissioners, steve gerber, Portland office of transportation. Just to answer one question up front, I think we did play a role in the elevation of metro's regional review of the -- what they call the north willamette crossing in the regional transportation plan. A huge or significant role, that's up for debate, but we did play a role in the elevation of that with -- before the eyes of the metro commission. Ready for the slide show. I will go right into that. The st. Johns truck strategy had an advisory committee that was made up jointly of technical advisors and citizen advisors. The city of Portland had technical advisors, the port of Portland not only had technical advice for us, but also we were partnered with the port of Portland and they helped fund some of the project. We had representatives from the directly affected neighborhood, a couple of those neighborhoods opted out of having representation, but we kept



**JULY 11, 2001**

them notified at all times and apprised of meeting minutes, et cetera. We also importantly had representatives from trucking and trucking-related industries. The study area for the st. Johns truck strategy is in fact the west end of the columbia corridor, and is in the -- in association with the columbia corridor transportation plan. Transportation study. That incorporated the river gate industrial district, terminals 4 and 6, the smith bybee lakes area, st. Johns itself, and a few other properties east of Portland road. How did we get here? There's a long and perhaps I should emphasize a long history of concern. The first that i'm aware of at least in a formal form was in 1976, st. Johns water front access study. The city council themselves put a mandate to the Portland office of transportation in 1992. That occurred with the update of the transportation element at that time. The columbia corridor transportation study, which was adopted -- accepted in '99, is the first two-thirds of this overall project. There are very similar industry needs in st. Johns area to the columbia corridor, but there are some different circumstances between the west end and the eastern two-thirds. The council mandate for this particular portion of the columbia corridor transportation study include utilizing the existing local and regional street system. It was to be a short-term, two to five-year solution and not include more than \$10 million in solutions. We were to coordinate with other north Portland projects and careful analyze solutions as to not to shift the problem to a different location. We tried to do all those things at the same time. Doing all of those at the same time did result in some dissatisfaction and some dissent within the committee itself, and I would like to apprise you at this time that there is a minority report --

**Katz:** How many?

**Gerber:** As far as I know, one minority report. And I would recommend that that minority report be given a full hearing.

**Katz:** Somebody just said there are two minority reports.

**Gerber:** I was not apprised of that. If there are two, there are two. The situation, again, the request for the study came from the citizens to the council, and the council mandate to the Portland office of transportation. The situation itself in st. Johns is frequently -- frequent use of residential and retail commercial streets, particularly within the st. Johns pedestrian district. The core area of downtown st. Johns. A lot of this truck traffic is nonlocal. It is not stopping on the peninsula. The existing streets in the area do not provide well for the efficient movement of trucks and trucks are using too many streets. They're impacting a very large area. There is also inadequate information provided to the trucks as to where they ought to be. The objectives of the advisory committee were to identify ways in which truck routing can be improved to and from the st. Johns bridge, river gate and i-5, and to determine how nonlocal traffic impacts can be eliminated or reduced on residential and retail commercial interests we tried very hard to do that. There is also a primary goal for the north Portland transportation district, which talks about moving truck traffic around the neighborhood. While the recommendation before you does not move it all the way around the neighborhood, it comes closest to moving it around the neighborhood as opposed to the other routes available to the st. Johns bridge. Where are the trucks going? Based upon any two traffic modeling work and metro assumptions about 2020 for the peninsula, the truck trips across the -- to the st. John's bridge are less important for peninsula trucks than either columbia boulevard or marine drive. Two-thirds of the trips to the st. John's bridge are expected to be to and from i-5. About three-quarters of the heavy trucks expected to use the st. John's bridge will have no origin or destination on the peninsula. These are nonlocal trucks. Many of them are going to Portland manufacturing or distribution sites, but they're not stopping at the peninsula or on the peninsula. The first graphic here shows the general movement at the 2:00 p.m. Peak, and you can see the heaviest lines are on columbia boulevard, Portland, and marine drive. There is a heavy line also on the st. John's bridge. Moving to the next graphic, we can see however that at least in the p.m.

**JULY 11, 2001**

Peak the traffic is not expected to be from the river gate area to the st. John's bridge. There is very little impact on the st. John's bridge from river gate. This last slide shows that the most direct association with the st. John's bridge is for marine drive, Portland road, from the i-5 freeway. And again, this is modeling and this is based upon convenience to the movement of those vehicles, those heavy trucks. Fessenden is the most convenient and fastest route for heavy trucks at this time and at this time they are using that street. Strategy recommended by the advisory committee was to reduce the area of impact from the trucks, provide interim improvements to enhance the truck vehicle movement to and from the st. Johns bridge, in other words, get the trucks through in an efficient manner -- I guess that's enough said. But also to provide safety and convenience for the neighborhood environment, particularly for bicycle and pedestrian movement and particularly for crossing the flow of truck traffic. And that we will also continue to seek the elimination of trucks from the st. Johns town center and pedestrian district, which is the long-range regional issue. The available options identified include improved truck routing, more obvious route with a better flow for trucks with fewer delays. Also to reduce or eliminate for nonlocal truck traffic on fessenden and other residential retail commercial streets, provide improved safer pedestrian and bicycle environment, and to provide science, education and enforcement for the truck freight. At the present time the signage doesn't tell the truckers exactly what we would like to have them do. The recommendations before you are a systematic approach to the issues, and it has been -- has resulted in recommendations falling into two primary categories -- transportation improvements, including traffic calming and -- and administrative recommendations, including two regulations, three operational directives and one policy. The policy I speak of is which should be the truck streets. This was an issue before the council in '92 with the review of the transportation element. We have recommended that the previous truck streets, which are lombard, south from rivergate to st. Louis, to ivanhoe, to philadelphia in the st. Johns bridge be reinstated as major truck streets. At least in the interim. For this short-term recommendation. The transportation improvements are primarily traffic calming and safety notions. But we have to be careful about our traffic calming. For instance, fessenden is a major emergency response route, and there are certain things we cannot do there because they could interfere with fire and other emergency service delivery. But we were looking specifically at traffic calming and safety improvements on lombard from peer park to st. Louis, which we have recommended as a major truck street, on fessenden street and columbia way, from columbia way to st. Louis, we would very much like to see the trucks off of this street. St. Louis street from fessenden to lombard, and columbia boulevard from peninsula to chimney park. It doesn't happen frequently, but occasionally the truckers are aware of a jam before they get to the st. Johns bridge, and seek a way to avoid that jam by filtering through the neighborhood. Again, it doesn't happen often, but it has happened and there are some things we can do to make that less convenient for the truckers. The transportation improvements for trucks are primarily aimed at lombard and st. Louis and the ivanhoe intersection, which presently receiving truck flow from st. Louis and lombard is producing a constant flow of trucks on every signal phase which makes it difficult to get across ivanhoe street, which is in the pedestrian district. If we can convince and/or provide the solutions to put the truckers all on lombard, we could at least have one phase where the trucks were not flowing through the intersection making street crossings easier. The ivanhoe-philadelphia intersection to accommodate trucks and get them out of the way has -- as quickly as possible and on their way as quickly as possible also needs improvement. The intersection of columbia boulevard and Portland definitely needs improved signage and could also very well use a ramp that would provide eastbound access to columbia boulevard from buckman road. Burgard and lombard streets, as well as the columbia/lombard intersection could use improvements. Some of these areas are already mirrored by other improvements that have been recommended and are

**JULY 11, 2001**

within our tsp list at this time. Particularly along columbia boulevard, one of the major improvements in the area that should help would be the railroad overcrossings that will get trucks off of the route so there isn't a backlog because a train is crossing. This particular graphic shows the areas where we've recommended improvements or action. Number 1 is lombard, st. Louis, and ivanhoe. Actually, lombard only to st. Louis. Number 2 is fessenden, as well as number 3, which is st. Louis. We would hope to get the trucks going all the way around to the extent possible from columbia to bergard and not be cutting through the middle of the neighborhood on fessenden. Number 4 is columbia boulevard, where we have proposed improvements that would help to convince the truckers not to use local side streets. Number 5 is the intersection of st. Louis, lombard and ivanhoe, which is -- as I stated before has a double flow of trucks reaching it, which causes ivanhoe to have a continuous flow of trucks when the trucks are passing through. Number 6 is the intersection of ivanhoe with philadelphia, which leads directly to the st. Johns bridge, and has been the historical and is still at this time most common truck route through the area. The administrative recommendations include a follow-up by the advisory committee that we had, they would like to assure themselves and the rest of us that any short-term improvements that are made are effective. However, follow-up is a standard practice in our engineering sections when improvements are made. They've also recommended a program for education and enforcement, providing a point of contact not just for people who have complaints against truckers, but a point of contact also for truckers to receive information. Portions of this are already in place within the bureau of traffic management. We've also recommended a truck signing program, again, signing is not a new issue to the Portland office of transportation. There are efforts to update and replace obsolete sign that's are ongoing in the office of transportation, but not directly -- not directed to trucks. By themselves, at any rate. And the other administrative recommendation was to designate the truck streets and to comply with the metro designation, the metro designation does show those historic truck streets as connectors for the truck traffic. And that's the end of my slide show.

**Katz:** Okay. Let's put up the lights. Questions?

**Hales:** I might have some later. I assume there are committee members who want to testify?

**Gerber:** There are committee members from the advisory committee who would like to testify, as well as the minority report. So I suspect you'll hear committee members speaking on both sides of the recommendations, both in favor and opposed.

**Katz:** All right. Do we have committee members who have signed up to testify? Come on up. I'm going to take testimony from committee members first who are supportive of their report. Don't go away. Is anybody here from the committee that will speak in support of the report?

\*\*\*\*\*: I did not sign up, but I would like a chance to speak.

**Katz:** do you want to do that as a committee member? Then come on up. Anybody else from the committee speaking in support of the -- your report? All right.

\*\*\*\*\*: Mine is from both sides.

**Katz:** From both. And you are for, against your report?

\*\*\*\*\*: For.

**Katz:** All right. Why don't you let go of your seat for a minute.

\*\*\*\*\*: Oh, certainly.

**Katz:** You'll come back. Come on up if you're speaking for. And you're on the committee as well? All right. Why don't you move one of the chairs. And you're speaking for and against?

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

**Katz:** All right. You're going to identify problem areas?

\*\*\*\*\*: I'd like to -- a chance to explain it.

**Katz:** Is there a chair of the committee here? Okay. I'll let you start first. Go ahead.

JULY 11, 2001

\*\*\*\*\*: First i'd like to thank you --

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

**Ron Hernandez, Co-Chair for Committee:** Ron hernandez. I'm -- excuse me for my uneasiness. I'm a cochair for this committee, along with wayne plaster from the trucking industry. My address

--

**Katz:** That's all right. You don't need to give your address.

**Hernandez:** What I want to do is thank you for at least acknowledging this study and the strategy. I wanted to make a comment that goes along the lines that I feel that although this report has a lot of strategies and suggestions in it, I would ask that you guys would please, if you don't read much more of this recommendation, please at least acknowledge page 2, which has the recommendation of the advisory committee and be aware that there is a very, very strong desire in our neighborhood and on the peninsula that this study not stop here. I've been involved with this issue for almost ten years, living in the district for at least that long, depending on where -- came to this issue because of residual traffic that was an -- that was impacted by the trucks on the streets. I lived on ivanhoe, two blocks away from the intersection of st. Louis and ivanhoe. Believe it or not, I got a lot of residual traffic from that and I am the first part involved in this issue. So it brought me to this table, to this group to work on this. We've put a lot of effort into this. I appreciate that you guys have given us the opportunity to continue on this, and I would really like to stress that you guys look at this as a small part of what needs to continue as a long-term study for solutions. These recommendations -- and this is where i'd like to explain my for and against -- these recommendations, some of them are -- will take care of this very short-term issue. Will not fix the problem, and will -- some of them will increase the problem. Because what we're looking at is putting into place some things that I would hope that would be removable, completely removable with the implementation of some long-term solutions. An example, we're going to -- we're talking in here about putting in some signage, some barriers, some redirections that really need to be considered or implemented in such a way that they can be removed so that the livability of the neighborhood goes back to what it is desired to be. Long-term solution, really it requires that you do something with the trucks. And the added vehicle traffic that is not just the neighborhood residents, but the people who work and live -- not work, i'm sorry -- not live, but work in rivergate. Rivergate's capacity is being increased immensely. The port's plans for the rivergate three years ago anticipated growth for that area to more than double. Thus, requiring more than double the truck traffic and the studies that were made on the extras of the bridges were done at a level when the port's activities were not so great. So my point here is that this traffic that is increasing because of the rivergate's improvements in growth is greatly outdated the studies of the capacity of the st. Johns bridge. You're destroying a landmark for our city by allowing these vehicles and trucks to continue to pound the heck out of that bridge. It's evident because of the -- it should be evident to you that this is happening because of the anticipated closure of the repair of the bridge. I need to make sure that you understand that the city -- this committee, although most of us were reluctantly accepting the perimeters of this charge, we spent a majority of our time arguing the issue that this could not be fixed short-term. Most of us agreed that we had to live within the perimeters of this charge in hopes that we could move forward, continue to move forward, and that this would not be the end of it. That you guys would not see this report as something that everybody in north Portland is happy to live with. You'll find by the majority -- minority reports and some of the other comments that that is not the case. It is very much an issue for us that this is dealt with and not just accepted as, we're all happy that you guys are going to do something to temporarily route a truck around the streets. Some of the roads that are involved here are neighborhood -- are listed in the transportation element for the city as neighborhood streets. In other words, they have no business

**JULY 11, 2001**

being used for truck traffic and major neighborhood collectors, and so forth. And that one street is ivanhoe between st. Louis and philadelphia. That is a neighborhood street, and it has senior citizens crossing it constantly, it has children that play in the parking lots of apartments that are on that strip, it has limited signals and it is also one of the main strips that has excessive speed by vehicles and trucks. And I wish you guys -- I know you have busy schedules, but I wish I guys would go there and sit down on any part of that strip and watch for yourself what happens there on a normal day during the week, and even go there on the weekend. I'll close here with this. I'd like you guys also to be aware of the speeds that are in excess through these areas. The whole route that steve was showing that most of us reluctantly agree to accept as the truck route, you'll find that those streets are probably 25, 30 mile-an-hour speed limits through there. Ivanhoe is a 25 mile-an-hour speed limit because of its neighborhood area. I have personally followed vehicles and trucks at 35 and in excess of that on those strips. I've been on the st. Johns bridge following trucks, and some cars, they'll pass me, at 55 and 60 miles an hour. Signage is a great idea, very limited effectiveness. Put a cop at each end, you still have limited effectiveness. We need to do something to get these trucks and these other pass-through vehicles another alternative so that the plan for st. Johns is becoming a viable town center, becomes a reality. Truck traffic and the excessive pass-through vehicle traffic is not conducive for the dream that the city supposedly has for st. Johns.

**Katz:** The residents -- the residents of st. Johns have for themselves.

**Hernandez:** Exactly.

**Katz:** It's a change in attitude.

**Hernandez:** I also would state that the city is saying to us that this is what they would like our neighborhoods to also to be inclusive of.

**Katz:** I'm not disagreeing with you. There's a subtle difference, I just wanted to point it out.

**Hernandez:** I'm sorry, i'm taking that probably the wrong way. Anyway. In short, that's pretty much what i'd like to say. I do want you to be aware that there was a lot of effort put into this report, a lot of it -- work was done and a lot of reluctance to accept the limits we were given. And please be aware that we need and we want further involvement for -- from you and from the group that was involved.

**Katz:** Thank you. Nice job. Thank you. You can stay there. There may be questions. Feel free to stay. Go ahead.

**Jane McFarland, Port of Portland:** My name is jane mcfarland, i'm representing the port of Portland. Our address is 121 northwest everett, Portland, 97209. I think yesterday we sent our comment letter to the mayor and the council, and I do have a few copies with me today if other people would like them. I'm just going to highlight a few of the points made in that letter that are specific to the short range recommendations contained in the report. But first i'd like to commend the city for undertaking this effort and we appreciated being on the advisory committee. We see the st. Johns truck strategy as sort of the second half of the columbia corridor transportation plan that was adopted or accepted in 1999. This strategy recommends a comprehensive set of solutions, and I think the key to flair success is going to be in -- to their success is integrated implementation. Specifically we support enhancing designating and enhancing a route of philadelphia, ivanhoe, solution, and north lombard barred as the appropriate route for trucks traveling between the st. Johns bridge and the north Portland industrial areas, as well as to i-5 north. That's consistent with the regional transportation plan. We'd also agree with the measures to deter through truck trips on fessenden and north lombard east of the st. Johns central business district. However, the measures to deter the truck traffic should be undertaken when improvements to the truck streets are in place. Otherwise, you're going to have truck streets that are inadequate to serve both the existing and then the deterred trucks and I think this would result in a less safe and more congested situation than

**JULY 11, 2001**

question have out there today. -- we have out there today. Preserving and enhancing freight mobility on north columbia boulevard is a port priority, and we are concerned that certain recommended elements, such as curb extensions and mid-block crossings on columbia boulevard are inappropriate to a regional truck route. We also believe that if any signals are added to columbia boulevard, as part of pedestrian safety treatments, that they should be tied to a larger signal intertie project that was proposed and accepted through the columbia corridor transportation plan. In closing, we would ask that in accepting these recommendations, that the city commits to the affected businesses, industries and neighborhoods in st. Johns, not to undertake any traffic calming projects without in tandem doing the improvements to the truck streets. And again, thank you for undertaking this effort and allowing us to participate.

**John Yazzolino, Matlack Trucking:** I'm john, with matlack. I'm on the committee, and I recommend that this be approved, but as a trucking industry, we have a lot of trucks that move through the st. Johns area, and that's one major important thing, is that we keep the truck flow through that area until we reach that long-term solution. And it's very important to everybody, all the business folks down in that area, that we keep that truck traffic flowing. And just be very careful on how we approach that, and all the business representatives would like to be involved in any changes down the road. Thank you.

**Katz:** Why don't you give -- move over so he can get to the mike.

**Larry McCord, St. Johns Booster, Committee Member:** I'm loud anyway. Larry mcchord, st. Johns boosters, member of the committee. I was with the group I think from the very beginning, and we struggled very early on with your charge of basically improving truck flow, making it more efficient, while at the same time improving, maintaining the neighborhood, the pedestrian issues. And became very early obvious that there's some real conflicts going on. And the solution all seemed to go towards these long-term recommendation that's have been made to council to metro and so forth. But I would like to also recommend adoption of what we are recommending. Simply that the neighborhoods have been involved, business people, the trucking industry, and government. We've left that out, I think. Metro was here. The port was here. The city was here. And we have all struggled with these two basic things to find a way. You will hear arguing that, fine, eliminate the trucks completely. Take it off the st. Johns bridge. This is not a reality until there is a long-term solution. In the interim, we must use the st. Johns bridge. We must find a way through, we must improve truck flow in order to minimize the impact on the other streets. And that's what I think we're recommending. And this is why I also am saying, let's do something more than just another study and sort of say, well, it isn't quite right, but we don't have any money, let's forget about it. No. I understand this went on long before I was ever involved with it, and it will continue to go on. We need to find, even be it an interim and maybe not an adequate approach, an approach that does make some improvements. And we feel this will do it. So i'd like to recommend that -- your adoption of it.

**Hales:** I have a question to this group, and particularly focusing on what you, john, and jane said about the intermediate term. It may be that there's absolutely no disagreement about the long-term objective among any of the parties to this discussion. The only question is, how do we get there and how fast? How soon can we get that bridge built? And so let's assume there's a long-term and that might be it. And there's an intermediate term that means stuff like the street improvements, the traffic calming, and the latter of those two phases, three phases, costs a fair amount of money. The intermediate term of traffic calming costs some number of millions, a new bridge costs hundred or hundreds of millions. Then there's -- my question is, is there an immediate term? Is there an immediate term at all? One thing you said, I want to make sure I didn't hear you wrong, is essentially that we shouldn't start any of the truck routing changes until we make the physical

**JULY 11, 2001**

improvements to the street. I don't want to put those words in your mouth, but my question to you is, do you see an immediate term? In other words, one thing that sort of came to mind after reading your report and seeing the minority report, what if we did signage and routing and enforcement right away, with the understanding that we don't have the money right now to do the traffic calming work and we certainly don't have the money to build a \$150 million, but we might be able with a concerted effort between pdot and the police bureau, we have to talk about north precinct's involvement in this phase, if there is an enforcement effort, but what about the immediate term? What do you see us doing in the immediate term, you know, two months from now as opposed to two years from now or longer?

**Yazzolino:** I'd like to speak to that. I don't think you could do any until you make sure that the route you designate is free-flowing. And the recommended intersection changes, those I think would be the first thing that you would have to do before you tried to redirect traffic. Because right now, you know, the intersections at lombard and ivanhoe, those are very difficult to get through for a big truck, and if you take all the additional trucks off of fessenden, try to get them to route around to lombard, it's going to be a nightmare. You'll have businesses tied up, trucks tied up, you'll have - - it will be a mess. So I think the priority is to get the street improvements in place and then start your signage.

**Hales:** Anybody else want to comment on that?

**Katz:** Bring the mike to you.

**Hernandez:** What i'd like to point out in -- as part of what will happen when you start combining and consolidating the truck routes, what you're going to find is in -- even on the nonpeak hours for this activity, these truck trips, you're going to have people that are going to start diverting from thigs truck routes to get around the trucks themselves. You're going to have major impacts from the residual traffic going into the neighborhoods that I think needs to be considered along with the improvement that's were -- we've talked about. We need to do stuff to take that into consideration as well that we're not dumping will the traffic that's already on that road onto the other roads inside the neighborhoods. If you follow what i'm saying. I think that you do need to do some of the improvements to these intersections before you start telling people, this is what needs to happen, where you need to go. But at the same time I think that that needs to be immediate. I think you need to tell the trucks that they cannot go this route, they need to go that route. And get it set up that way. So again, I urge that we move forward quickly with whatever we plan to do. And again, i'd like to stress that you're talking about changing intersections. You have to look at the long-term of that neighborhood area, what you want it to look like or what we would love it to look like. You take outhouses, you're going to put them back? I'm just using that for an example. Please keep that in mind as well.

**McFarland:** While there was some consideration of some more dramatic engineering of the intersections around ivanhoe and st. Louis that did include acquiring additional right of way, traffic engineering with pdot did identify some fairly low investment things that could be done to improve those intersections. I think on ivanhoe there was the removal of three parking spaces, and I think an addition of a signal that would allow more of a free-flow so you could let a platoon of vehicles get through a kind of a series of s-turns that are required, and then possibly have an all-pedestrian phase sort of a pedestrian scramble phase they're known as. So that would introduce pedestrian safety and also give trucks a sense of some efficiency, even though -- that doesn't need to be high speed, sometimes efficiencies are just gained by not having to start and stop at three different simultaneous intersections.

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Katz:** Thank you, everybody. Thank you. All right. Rest of the committee members who have a minority report? I understand there are two minority reports. Are both of you members of the committee?

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

**Katz:** Okay. Come on up. We won't put the clock on you since you are members of the committee, but everybody else will have the timer on.

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

**Donna Babbitt, Advisor on Committee:** Okay. I'll just jump right in. Donna babbitt, I live on north willamette boulevard. Most near to lombard and reno. I sit on the committee in an advisory capacity, and I have participated now close to two years, since the summer months of '99, and i'm pleased to be here. I put together a packet for you to -- for information, for you to kind of follow a pathway of some of the things i've followed through. And it's broke down into three sections. I'm not going to go in detail. I'm going to be brief. I think you'll probably hear quite a few things over and over again, but people are passionate and -- in our community about the truck issue. Just one or two points about process. If the advisory committee continues, the neighborhood people should have an independent committee so that what happened originally as consensus turned into vote, and when you have so many entities representing port of Portland, pdot, all of these, you come down to a vote, then the neighborhood people feel as though they really never have the words they want to say. That would be a thought of mine if you do continue this. As far as the truck movement, i've heard some interesting things up to this point. And of course you know our objectives, that is on the first page. And of course the very profound one is to eliminate or reduce on residential and retail commercial streets, how truck traffic can be curbed. The history is in the second part of this report. That's pretty much said and done. I'd like you to read it, though. And the last part is some wonderful comments from all of the community people in the friends of cathedral park and st. Johns area, and I took the time to run them all off for you. On that list, you will see two that keep popping up. Of course, you've mentioned it. We're not here to build the bridge today. But that was very popular, and of course removing trucks from the bridge, 18,000 pounds or more. From the st. Johns bridge.

**Katz:** Let me interrupt you for a second. The issue of the other bridge is being discussed in another forum. Are you all involved and participating in that?

**Babbitt:** No. At least for myself, I always wanted that considered as part of our advisory committee. It seemed to get put into the ballpark of metro in the beginning as long-term. The classification is long-term, short-term.

**Katz:** We'll have to get back to you and let you know when those hearings in the public -- in the -- and the information is going on. Steve, you know the study. Okay. Make sure that residents in st. Johns at least are aware of it and can come, there's a public forum at the beginning and I think at the end of every meeting. Okay.

**Babbitt:** Okay. Specifically i'll want to hone in on what's going to give you some answers that are more cost effective. And what the citizens i've talked to and have called me at home and have come to the meetings have talked to me about. Specifically, as far as the fatal flaws in the majority report, I believe mr. Hernandez touched on it very briefly. But there are two intersections in this proposal, and of course they are the lombard-st. Louis-ivanhoe. Ivanhoe is within the pedestrian district. These -- this corner and st. Johns, north st. Johns and lombard, which is a curb very close to me, and these are curbs, they're the past history -- in the past history you'll read how children have been affected and the elderly. This is very important to me personally. So in looking at is that, when you say to a community, we're coming in here to help you resolve truck traffic, and we want to look at moving it around, reducing it, or taking it away, does it make sense to say on the



**JULY 11, 2001**

other hand, but by the way, we think these two intersections that you have here would be very helpful to straighten out two s-curves. That doesn't make sense, and it's counterproductive to the purpose of the committee. In doing this, you'd have to remove at these two intersections i've mentioned, land. Or the homes and the apartment structures. Some of which houses low-income people that we have in our community. That's counterproductive, that is not short-term. That's long-term, because I agree, you can't put those back. So those are the two fatal flaws. I don't want -- at least from my perspective, that considered at all. I don't think it is productive at all, and I think people would be up in arms about it from what i've seen in the -- and the comments and heard from them. As far as something that would be productive for you to look at, in my list on the next page here, minority report, mandate all truck traffic on the already established truck route. And that is u.s. Highway 30, to i-405, to fremont bridge, to marine drive and reversed. Now, I have talked to a lot of people about this, and some of the old-timers. They said, you know, that fremont bridge is there for such purpose. But our increase of trucks just keeps happening. Why aren't you saying things at that committee? I said, well, I am. So let's look at what we could do. It's very cost effective, because all have you -- you have to do is put up the correct signage. And I mean the correct signage. And have penalties and fines. Some enforcement behind it that would carry some teeth and weight to it. Because the major fact that I learned in that advisory committee is 85% of all trucks coming through at the peak hour is from out of state trucks. And I think that's what you were mentioning, mayor Katz. Through fessenden, the road to fessenden and of course short-cutting over. So if you were to look at just a big circle and look at that peninsula and mandating it in, it also takes approximately five to seven minutes longer. Now, while we're supportive to make improvements, and of course we have to think of commodity, if you first know the fact that 85% are out of state, and aren't there for your purposes right there on your peninsula, then those are the people you have to think about mandating out of that pedestrian district. That makes sense. So if you put the proper signage and don't allow them to take that route, you keep it on the peripheral. Okay. Now. As far as building the bridge, we've discussed it. I'd love to be involved in that further. But I do want to make mention at the end of that second point there, mr. Brown, who may speak today, accounted 193 trucks back in 1993. I might be one or two off. I'm the person that sat there with my gas mask on for 264 trucks at peak hours. And it was quite a feat. But it's too many. It's very dangerous, and there's all kinds of activities that go on with speeding through there. As far as building a road between the cut -- in the cut there, north-south between north ida and north carrie, this is a good project. I think it would be somewhat cost effective, i'm not sure if you're going to look at that at long-term or not. But it would take a lot of the flow, at least from the east-west angle, to put them through on Portland road and then a lot of them would bypass the st. Johns community at large. So would I look at that. Then of course the no trucks over 18,000 pounds. I won't -- want to make two points about this. What you're going to hear is a lot of support in this. I really support what a lot of citizens have come up with. Our -- at our may 6 open house, before that and after that, that is most popular thing to do, and it's very cost effective. And i'll tell you why. I got involved with talking to some of the city people about what it would take, and some of the state people, about the measurements of our st. Johns bridge. And the walkways. And our walkways are approximately four feet in extension across. The lanes are very narrow. And I don't know, i'm sure you've taken that bridge occasionally at least at rush hour, maybe shall and what you're going over you kind of pray to lean to the right a little, so the oncoming trucks won't knock you out of the ballpark. So when you're using that bridge, and it's peak hours, it would be very cost effective to change some of the weight restrictions. It can be done. I think there's a misconception in the advisory committee that what they deem as the only way you can change it is for safety purposes. I hear a lot of the advisory committees talk about safety purposes for truckers. That is

**JULY 11, 2001**

not the only -- what they mean, safety issues for truckers. Because I had many citizens call me at home and say, I was walking across the st. Johns bridge, and the right hand angle turn, the rear wheels of these trucks come up and enter onto the walkway. So it would be possible, there are two issues you can help support our change on that. And that is to bring up the narrow lanes. It can be done with that, and there are already on an established route that is u.s. 30. So it could be changed very easily. So this also would be very cost effective. As far as the process and ivanhoe, I think as a pedestrian district for all -- where all these trucks are going through, and knowing 85% of them are out of state, that I think you should look at who lives there and what the people want. So please read all those comments. It's wonderful. They have great ideas to find matching funds for you, too. So thank you for your time.

**Katz:** Thank you for your work on this.

**Hales:** A couple questions.

**Katz:** Go ahead. Both of you stay there.

**Raymond Piltz, member of Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association, Land Use Co-Chair**

**St. Johns Neighborhood Association:** I'm raymond piltz, 7209 north buchanan. I'm also a member of the cathedral park neighborhood association, but i'm on the board of the st. Johns neighborhood association as a cochair on land use. I've been less time than donna i'm probably better qualified than most. I've put over 60 years out there in the north and i've seen all the changes from the shipyards to what has become now a major shipping point with terminal 4 and 5. And the big trucks are really hurting us in the north end. It's tough. Now they're 53 feet, very few of them can manage some of the side streets. Years ago we had a child run over on the corner of ivanhoe and st. Louis. And they want to straighten that, that's going to be difficult for them. That wasn't researched as well as they should have. The new low-cost health center is there, and representatives from the county say, we're not giving you that counsel -- that corner to the city. So that's going to be a problem in itself. It's just got -- it's not finished yet, and here we have plans for cutting off the corner for the parking for the low-cost health center already. We need coordination there. But besides that, we don't want the trucks going faster through our neighborhood. That -- I think they're missing the whole point here. We as residents are really -- we're interested in them being successful, but we're not interested in them running through our neighborhoods faster with more pollution, more trucks, so forth. We just as soon the large trucks were eliminated from our bridges. I have a few pieces of concrete that various residents have dropped by myself -- my how, if you'd like to see them. The state is going to finally get around to repairing the bridge. They said next year. That would be a wonderful time to access their knowledge, what happens, when they go down the one lane. And it will bring everything right away up front. Trucks working and -- in shipping for 40 years, trucks are going to take the line of least resistance. And the problem with large trucks is, a lot of times they're not necessarily familiar with the route they're going. So therefore, they end up going over curbs, running over a child, for instance, i'd hate to have my name on that which I can see they're advocating putting on st. Louis and ivanhoe to lombard. All that's going to do is speed up the traffic. It is not going to do our end any good whatsoever. It's going to be a harm to the north end residents. The trucking industry outweighs us in this committee. We have regular votes, it ends up 12-3, maybe 12-4, whatever. It's hopeless. We've got the port, we've got the city, the county, metro. We're dead in the water. I'll tell you the truth, i'm thoroughly discouraged with studies, committees, citizens involvement. It's like beating your head against the wall. Because we have argued in these committees to come on, listen to us. Put something down. Will it doesn't do any good. These preconceived notions the city comes in with, and i'm sure it was that way, because from the very beginning they wanted to put that chicane, and by golly, there it was. Save your millions. For the long term. The short-term stuff we're not

**JULY 11, 2001**

against. A lot of this report is great. Helps traffic so forth, get some of it out of the neighborhood. Signage is a lot of it. But you can stop the damage to the bridge overnight. Jump scales at each end. Boy, them truck letters go nuts. Word will be out in 24 hours and all them overweight trucks that are transferring back and forth in town, they'll avoid that bridge like poison, because it costs a lot of money when you're overweight and running over the bridges and stuff. And it's doing a tremendous amount of damage. We'd sure appreciate your help.

**Katz:** Thank you. Questions?

**Hales:** A couple questions. Ray, one thing you said really I want to focus on. That is trucks do take the line of least resistance.

**Piltz:** Right.

**Hales:** I want to go to one of your minority report recommendations. I'm worried about it, if we were to adopt it, because i'm afraid your right, and that is lombard is a state highway. And we don't get to sign -- we don't get to control traffic flow on lombard. We can't prohibit trucks or weight limit trucks s that right, steve? We the city don't have the legal authority to do that today with lombard, because lombard today --

\*\*\*\*\*: Is a bypass, right.

**Hales:** If we were to take your suggestion, trying to force the trucks to stay on the interstate, take the fremont bridge, you're right, donna, that's why that system was created. We have a history in this country of building transportation capacity to move commerce and then filling it up with commuters and we did it once again with both the minnesota freeway and the fremont bridge, generation after generation wove done it over and over again. State system wouldn't we end up with most of those trucks trying to go down lombard?

**Piltz:** Lombard is almost self-regulating, because it's such a bottleneck. There are so many parking spots, there are so many driveways and small businesses, and lights that are not necessarily that well coordinated. It is occasionally I see them, and I know he doesn't know where he's going when a truck is going down lombard with one of these 53-footers, because he should no better. Because it's going to take him forever to get someplace where he can hit columbia boulevard.

**Babbitt:** That's a point well taken. I had a citizen that brought me a letter that they had written about lombard being claimed as under the state system. And actually from philadelphia going west, it is not. It is not.

**Hales:** Philadelphia west?

**Piltz:** M-hmm. Lombard west. I'm sorry. From the point of philadelphia. Since it's not under that, you could on the west side -- you're getting a lot of trucks there coming over the bridge too, especially at peak hours, from what I saw. If you mandated them at the onramp there, to go through, they will end up on the fremont bridge, 405, fremont bridge, marine drive. They have access to all the terminals. It just makes it a little longer.

**Hales:** One other question, where did you come up with the 18,000 pound figure? Because the report talks about the fact that a bus weighs 37,000 pounds, and a home heating oil truck weighs 35 to 50,000 pounds. Why 18,000? In other words, with 18,000, if we were going to take your suggestion, i'm interested in the idea of a weight limit per se, but i'm not sure about 18,000. It seems you'd also be prohibiting or making illegal a lot of regular delivery kind of trucks that you want to get to the neighborhood.

**Piltz:** I think that can be taken a step further and local deliveries would be exempt without a doubt. And 18,000 is figuring a deuce and a half, which would still be a single axle.

**Hales:** I see.

**Babbitt:** My one comment on that, way early on in the process I went down and visited the fire department and talked to the guys down there and, what would happen if weight levels were down?

**JULY 11, 2001**

We'd still think about emergency vehicles, you know, and your smaller vans like delivery services, are within that range. And I want to make it clear, on the advisory committee we never said to local deliveries. We've talked about 18,000 pounds less. Our emphasis was not to remove trucks totally from the streets of st. Johns. Or off that bridge. I'd have to live in a fair land to believe that. So -- but I think his point is well given there too.

**Katz:** Thank you. Thank you both. How many people want to testify on this item? Let me see a show of hands. We can do three minutes. If council keeps asking a lot of questions, I may have to go to two. Because we've got a full agenda. But we'll start with three.

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

**Katz:** Mikey, why don't you start. Identify yourself for the record.

**Mikey Jones, Committee Member:** I'm mikey jones, I live at 2716 northeast mason. I sat on the committee for several months. It was kind of discouraging, but we won't go there. It's mostly all of this is a matter of perspective. One of the things nobody's talked about is, there is no place for the people who live under the bridge, or want to use the park to say, how come in '97 huh-uh money you were going to fixed bridge and you didn't, and you didn't fix 90 '98 or '99. And then in 2000 you even moved it on. Fixing the bridge is important. The trucks are tearing the bridge up. It's that simple. Now, the state comes out, and this is why it's a matter of perspective. The state says, that bridge is safe. And what they mean is, if you've got a big truck, the bridge isn't going to fall down. But if you're underneath dodging 25 pounds of concrete, it's not safe. And that's a perspective that we have to start to look at. Start to look at what's this going to do to st. Johns. All right. There's a lot of -- the port, the port's one of my favorite things. They talk about growth. The truth is, t-4 is now down to two people per acre. It's not an effective use of anything. Less than 5%, and these are the state's own figures, of trucks that come over or going to the -- over the st. Johns bridge are headed for rivergate. And the other thing people haven't talked about is one-third, one-third of the truck traffic at peak hours are gasoline tankers. It's not. You go out and see them one after the other. And it comes from two terminals, arco and chevron. They would not be under a hardship to have to take i-5. I mean, maybe you can't make a law or something. The other thing is, steve here misrepresents a lot of facts. I've talked and written letters to the federal government, and they say it's a community's absolute right to stop short-cutters. And that's what this traffic is about. You haven't had anybody stand up and say one businessman who's -- who actually his business is between columbia and lombard -- columbia and marine drive. His business is right there. Why does he have to go to st. Johns? He doesn't, unless he wants to shortcut. The other thing is there's a bit of fraud with the port, too, because i'm old enough, and i've testified quite a few times before any of you were here, i've had the port stand up and say just as they said on the jail, there will be no traffic through st. Johns. Over and over again they say that. No, our entranceway is marine drive and columbia. That's what they say. But the main impetus came from the port. The truth is that always when the city's planned, they never planned truck routes through st. Johns. You could close it tomorrow. If you wanted to do it, you could do it. The thing is, i'm talking about now, a short-term solution of only \$10 million, there's a lot better places to spend that \$10 million. To help all your -- all you would be doing is increasing the traffic, cutting shortcutting to i-5. One -- the other thing is signage. I have to laugh when I hear about signage. Do you think those truckers that are shortcutting don't know where they are? Do you think they just got off highway 30 on a whim and thought, oh, maybe i'll end up on -- in vancouver? They know exactly where they are. And as soon as you put up barricades or blockage, they'll know where they are when they shortcut those.

**Katz:** I could sit here and listen to you all day. But we've got --

**Jones:** Okay. My three minutes is up.

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Robin Wynn, St. Johns resident:** My name is robin, and I live in st. Johns. I own a house right just real close to the corner of st. Louis and lombard. I'm on ivanhoe. So one of the recommendations from mr. Gerber is to take that light out and make an s-curve and take outhouses which I can't I don't walk five houses down the road to go to the 7-eleven, because it's not safe for me to cross st. Louis. Maybe at 10:30, but then it's not safe. For other reasons. And I do not walk to the bus stop to philadelphia in the morning. But I do take the bus every day downtown. The truck traffic is very extensive, and it really detracts from the community. And i've kind of -- i've been trying to pay attention to the advisory committee's reporting. I've read the majority and the minority reports for both neighborhood associations. And what I see is the -- as the solution, it seems so simple to stick with something that we already have. We don't have to spend much money. I have the 2040 plan map, where one of the suggestion assist to build the bridge from f-4 to u.s. 30. And I know \$10 million won't do that, but that's something that's just right on the horizon of what the state is considering. It just seems like maybe we ought to give the state the \$10 million and join forces with them and get that bridge built and in the meantime, just go ahead and have the trucks bypass st. Johns and go up the fremont. That's a huge, big bridge. And I think it will take like five to eight more minutes for the truckers to go that way, but they don't have to stop and start. Because they sit in there, lined up on the streets, their emissions into the atmosphere are increasing by just going through a community. I think it's better for the environment for them to just travel at their normal rate of speed up 40, 45 marine drive and columbia. I can't -- I think if I were a trucker i'd probably want to take what seems to be the shortest route. But there are thousands of people who live in this neighborhood who pay property taxes that pay for all these things that we're talking about today. Because we don't have a sales tax. So I feel like i'm funding these solutions, and the gerber report seems to be full of very permanent solutions, like when you take outhouses through condemnation and you move streets and you bring trucks down st. Johns street and ivanhoe, you've increased the problem. Made it worse. And when we have already got this huge bypass. And I think the u.s. 30 bypass is through st. Johns bridge up ivanhoe eastward, and to i-5. But the trucks, I don't see that many trucks going down lombard. They're coming down ivanhoe to go to t-4. As I understand it, that's not the u.s. 30 bypass. So we're not even talking about closing down the 30 bypass. We're saying, stop going through our neighborhoods. And I know my three minutes is probably up, but I wrote a very well versed thing, so would I like for you to read it, because it -- I think it lends itself to the spirit of why we're here, and how easy it is to come up with the very best solution that everybody wins. And once the t-4 bridge is in, and I think we can convince the state, metro, odot, I forget who's doing it all, once we convince them that's exactly what we want and we join forces, then within two to three years, we have a total solution and our \$10 million is for something that's for long-term. Thank you very much.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Lee Reynolds, 9816 N Leonard St.:** My name is lee reynolds. I live at 9816 north leonard street. My report is on page 10, you can read it. I've been sitting here listening, and I have correspondence from the Oregon state highway department and from the national federal highway commission. Lombard street eastbound from philadelphia going east out towards 82nd avenue is not a truck route. Fessenden street is not on the national highway system either. The only part that's on the national highway system is from the st. Johns bridge north on ivanhoe through solution, north on lombard, to columbia boulevard and on north to marine drive. The -- as stated earlier, there's not any traffic that flows to terminal 4. The only thing going down that way is empty vans going to a container storage united, and a few -- if you follow one of those vans coming off the bridge going that way, sometimes they signal, sometimes they don't, but they have to make a very sharp u-turn to

**JULY 11, 2001**

get into that container facility. So be very careful. If they come off i-5-columbia boulevard, they've got a straight shot into that container storage. Otherwise, all of that truck traffic has absolutely no business going anywhere else except all the way north, lombard to columbia boulevard to marine drive. There is no -- there's no reason for them to be coming through there. Also, mr. -- the man from matlock spoke up, where they are located, there's enough poison in that ten acres to kill the entire city of Portland. And I would like to see that entire facility, because they do not own the land, the city of Portland owns the land, I don't know where to move them to, but move them clear out of there. The worst offenders are the gasoline trucks. Arco is the worst. I suggest that there be something put up to stop them, go directly to their terminal and tell them they will not use fessenden street, and if they are caught on fessenden street, truck drivers should be fined and they should be fined. For using that route through there with gasoline trucks. Going to vancouver, Washington. So that's about all I have to say.

**Katz:** Thank you very much. Questions? Karla?

**Katz:** Who wants to start? Anne, why don't you start.

**Ann Gardner, representing Schnitzer Steel:** I will. I'm anne gardner, representing schnitzer steel. We have in north Portland recycling a scrap operation that annually recycles about 400,000 tons of scrap that's generated throughout the region, and we process this scrap, we sell it to local foundries and mills, where it is further processed and used in the region. We employed about 100 folks at the scrap facility, many of whom live in close-in neighborhoods, including st. Johns. We're here to support the work the city has done, realizing there was limited scope and a limited budget to work with. And trying to address and balance the issues of truck access and neighborhood livability. We'd like to encourage council to accept the recommendation and find the resources to fund the full package. Again, as has been mentioned earlier, it would be a mistake not to fund the truck requirements if we shift to traffic calming only. We need to accommodate the trucks. With respect to the conversations about limiting the truck access to the st. Johns bridge, it's hard not to overreact. The st. Johns bridge is part of the regional transportation system, and mayor Katz talked earlier about the challenges we have within that system as particularly noted with the i-5 corridor. And there is a multistate commission that's looking at that very challenging issue, and solutions need to be looked at on a regional basis. We also need to remember the relationship between businesses in -- on north Portland and rivergate and the northwest industrial district. I think that's largely misunderstood and not really appreciated the extent of that relationship, and do you have a letter from that also speaks to that. As a final note, if as you move forward you begin to explore weight limits on local deliveries, we would hope that you would look at this on a citywide basis and not just on a neighborhood basis. Those types of carriers, as I understand it, weren't necessarily involved in the conversations that have happened to date and we would need to make sure they were included in the work that goes forward. But as a final except, i'd encourage you to accept the work that's been done today. I know there are other issues, large issues that have been on the table for some time, and hope that you would continue looking at solutions for those.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Good morning. Thanks for hearing what we have to say. I'll just start off by saying --

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

**Trevor Nelson:** I'm trevor nelson, i've been involved in north Portland or st. Johns community work for the last four years, and what really got me started was the trucks on the bridge. So here it is, coming to a head, and i've learned a lot, and had some fun and met some great people, and yourselves included. Commissioner Hales totally stole my thunder.

**Hales:** Sorry.

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Nelson:** The sellwood precedent and the neighborhood goals and the jobs goals conflict was -- is key here. It's how do we fix this? That's the big question. And I guess if you look at the study and you look at the things that are being recommended, my personal issue is right now pedestrian safety. The two intersections directly off the st. Johns bridge through the pedestrian district, they're not going to work long-term or short-term. They're going to compromise pedestrian safety of the district. They're going to compromise the economics development of the district. We're trying to put through a -- what we're now calling the st. Johns lombard plan. We have ellen wax from the Portland planning bureau who is working at the beginnings of that, and i'm honestly very worried this is going to compromise the efforts that's going to bring through. We're spending -- we're going to spend a lot of money to figure out how to make st. Johns a viable place to work, live, and play. We've got one of the best parks in the city. Flat out, cathedral park is absolutely fabulous. We have a possible -- we have possibilities to connect from the st. Johns town center to cathedral park, to floris park, to maybe even you could take the trail and go all the way down to northwest Portland. We also have good opportunity for the people of linton to connect to us. That's all going to be compromised because of the trucks. Now, i'm not saying you've got to remove the trucks from the bridge. I'm saying we need to find a middle ground, and a really easy solution that doesn't cost a lot could be, let's take away one lane each way, have a center turn lane so the busses can pull out if they need to, add bike lanes, and there you have it. You have a buffer zone for a bike lane. It's going to get fix and finished. We've got lewis and clark expo 2006 coming, we've got -- which cathedral park is going to be a part of, because they slept there for a couple of nights. But yet it's almost impossible from the town center to access that park, forest park, and the reverse because of the barrier simply put of the trucks and the state bypass. Rounding off the corners is going to increase the pedestrian crossings. Increasing the speed makes it just uncomfortable. Rounding off the corner at ivanhoe-st. Louis and lombard, that's going to create the same type of barrier that lombard and richmond to ivanhoe did 20 years ago. So we're first to look at -- historically we made a mistake, possibly. It's now the most dangerous corner on st. Johns. It's the most problematic corner in st. Johns. Now we're going to do it on the other end of the downtown. I know i'm out of town.

**Katz:** But i'm going to ask you a question. See if you can fit whatever you want to finish to my question. I know that we've talked about the st. Johns lombard, the town center at least scoping the work that the community and you said it, that you identified with the bureau of planning. How does the majority report hamper that for you, if we accept it?

**Nelson:** Well, it takes -- it begins to build the framework upon a faulty foundation, and I believe that what i'm saying is, if you don't use -- I work in the architecture business, and if you build a bad foundation, it's a problem for as long as that building stands. And to me if the transportation network is the foundation which the land use network hangs upon, and from there you economic interplay of that. But all of it comes down to, how you get the people to where the businesses are, how you get people from where the businesses are, and how you get people between the businesses. And then relating all of that to their homes and st. Johns downtown, it's nice. I live within friends that live in cathedral park that they don't walk to the park because it's dangerous. They don't want to the community center. They 11 four blocks away. These are the kind of things that we're trying to address in the plan and come up with an objective solution that could be a win-win for everybody. We don't want to limit freight, we don't want to limit our tourism opportunities, we don't want to limit our businesses.

**Katz:** Okay. Thank you.

**Nelson:** We're just trying to make a good place for everybody to be.

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Katz:** And I appreciate your response. And i'm going to make a recommendation later on that we take a look at two elements, one is the i-5 by-state work we're doing, and second is to make sure that when we start working with the community conflict with what the community wants to do. Because this was a transportation only study, we don't do that anymore, but you've been working on it for ten years and things have changed. Now we do bring other people into working together, so we aren't in conflict. Go ahead.

**Beatrice Walker, St. Johns resident:** I'm beatrice walker, I live in st. Johns. I've been listening to everything here that everyone has to say, and my conclusion is that this configuration is sort after permanent thing. It's not a thing that solution to this. And we're going to be having them working on the cathedral bridge, which will cut down on the traffic or back it up a long ways, because there's a lot of people that use that for going to and from work besides all the trucks. So something will have to be done about the trucks when they start working on that anyway. And it looks to me like it's going to be a long-term solution that's going to do anything about the truck -- trucks going through st. Johns. There just doesn't seem to me by listening to what's all gone on here that we have any really short-term solutions to it. Trucks have to be more careful. What are you going to do about that? You can't stop them every time one comes across that bridge, or we'd be there 24 hours a day.

**Katz:** Anybody else? All right. Come on up.

**Sharon Nasset, North Portland Resident:** My name is sharon, I live in north Portland.

**Katz:** She does come to the meetings.

**Nasset:** And I was at one last night. I actually am here representing the north Portland business association, who is business friendly. We do mostly have the businesses that are the small businesses in north Portland, but we also want the trucking industry to do well because they support the people that are out there because they live there. One of the things about the trucks is we counted them, we had 1500 trucks a day, that's not vans and things, crossing the st. Johns bridge. That's about 200 days a year if they don't come on holidays. The amount of truck traffic is large and the other thing is, it is beneficial for the truckers not on have to come true our town with the hazardous materials. If the -- if we stick with the present proposal, which is to give them a little different route out to the areas, that would be good for right now. Right now we do have unrestricted traffic. They just run through the town as you want. When you come over the st. Johns bridge, the first street in our town is the truck route. The next one is the main street. We would like to revitalize that and actually make that part of our town. The other thing that's not being looked at is those 1500 trucks that go to those areas out there also have employees at those companies. You have the beam that have drove out there that are the secretaries, bookkeepers, all those people. And that transportation also goes through st. Johns. The number 1 place that the study here showed they wanted to go is i-5. That's because they need to go north and south. In Portland, fortunately they put all of the industrial areas, or most of the large industrial areas, out -- at one end. We have swan island, northwest industrial area, rivergate and vancouver's industrial area all in the same end of town. Creating a system of highway that is pedestrian as well as truck friendly that connects these routes together can take 15 or 20 minutes off of the route of a truck and when you have 1500 trucks a day, that's some time. You also when you're connected to the interstate area and all the industries, you have the opportunity not to come back with an empty load, but to be able to pick something up close by. You're not dealing with pedestrians, and you're not taking hazardous material which is stressful to truck drivers, through our neighborhoods. They know that they are causing problems. When they say people can't walk to cathedral park, we have a school on one side and those kids are actually drove to cathedral park which is four blocks away and downhill. And you cannot go up and you do not ever see children walking on ivanhoe, because



**JULY 11, 2001**

you don't know if the trucks are going to blow them under the tires. The only thing that is a solution I agree with everybody that's come up here. We don't want widening and changing of our streets. Not just because it would be friendly to the trucks, but because --

**Katz:** You have 21 seconds. I know you have a solution. Go ahead.

**Nasset:** Oh. I was supposed to bring an odot map and I missed the person. I did bring a copy. I've been okaying with odot-i-5 transportation proposal number 8, a proposal of running a bridge from highway 30 across through the cut through Portland road to Jantzen beach and across to the northwest industrial area, the industrial area of Vancouver, and there's already an existing highway that puts everybody back on i-5 at a point where i-5 is three lanes or more. This would put all of the major industrial areas into one loop, and they would be able to go back and forth and service each other. The other thing that was proposed and missed the number 8 option is to connect up Swan Island with this. Swan Island and Jantzen are the largest trucking industry areas, two zip codes in the state.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Nasset:** By putting a second way off of Swan Island so they could deliver there it would be wonderful.

**Katz:** Thank you. Thank you. Grab the mike and identify yourself for the record.

**Marian Warfield, St. Johns resident:** Good morning. I'm Marion and I live in St. Johns. No surprise there. I don't know if I have a lot to add to everybody everything that's already been said to -- without repeating what's been said. We feel like -- I feel like I'm speaking for many people, that we're constantly battling for our community's integrity from landfill, all the stuff that happened even before that, the butcher shops, everything, the blood and the rivers -- in the rivers, the jails and now we're being turned in addition a truck stop town. We're -- the city is now spending so much money renovating our downtown and encouraging so much progress and encouraging our pedestrian designated area, and there's a lot to be gained from that. This is a dichotomy to have -- not have a stronger mandate and -- I need energy from you guys contesting the fact we have got -- you would even want to dream of -- that speeding up these trucks would be any kind of a solution. It's just a total dichotomy from the kind of community we are. We are a pedestrian designated area, and -- they don't go together. They do not -- and the thing is, we do have options available. That are already in place as temporary options that can lead into long-term options. We're obviously -- we continue to have more trucks, we're going to continue to have more people live in our community and we can't settle for something temporary. It has to be something more long range. To speed up the mileage -- the speed of the trucks is -- it doesn't go. We have more options than that. It's -- I do want to say that I have a lot -- I do -- a deep respect for truckers. I think it's a very hard job. I think they're constantly -- they are being, you know, thrown a lot of curves, and it seems as if we don't appreciate them. I for one, I do. I sincerely do. But these are hazardous materials and I would think you want our -- to protect your own investments, which is your community of St. Johns. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Time Miles, 9125 N Time Oil Rd, representing a manufacturer in the area:** Good morning. My name is Tim Miles, 9125 North Tymoile Road. I'm representing a manufacturer in the area, we manufacture car haulers. We currently -- we normally employ about 500 people. Because the industry is down, we don't have that many right now. But I'm in favor of the St. Johns truck strategy, and I also live right off Lombard, one block off Lombard, and we employ most of our employees are right in that area, and I also am the purchasing manager, and as the purchasing manager, when we went to this location, we took a lot of thought and were -- on where the vendors order. Most of our large vendors are on the highway 30. All of our steel, gasses and everything

**JULY 11, 2001**

comes from there and of course all those trucks are over the 18,000-pound limit and we do take delivery daily of the materials we use to manufacture our car haulers. Closing down the truck traffic on st. Johns bridge would definitely cripple us. The traffic that we use I know that I take on probably 12 to 14 deliveries a day of large trucks coming from the area over the st. Johns bridge to boydston. So I would -- I think the long term is the bridge, of course, the new bridge, but right now i'm very much in favor of the st. Johns truck strategy. Thank you.

**Katz:** Okay. Thank you. All right, council, could I say --

**Nasset:** Could I say one thing?

**Katz:** Yes.

**Nasset:** Odot's next meeting having to do with a new bridge is july 17th at kaiser.

**Katz:** Okay. Did everybody get that? And it's at what time?

**Nasset:** 7:00 to 9 o'clock in kaiser hall. Which is on interstate avenue.

**Katz:** They are now breaking down some of the options.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** And that's what we'll be speak ball game that night.

**Katz:** And that one will be discussed -- we've decided the task among the task forces to look at each one of those options. Okay. Has everybody got the date? All right. You didn't get the date?

**Hales:** July 17th.

**Katz:** July 17th. 7:00 to 9:00. All right, council. Choices?

**Hales:** I'd like to get steve back up for a couple minutes and then maybe suggest some things here. I haven't had a chance to look in detail yet at the designs, and maybe they haven't been designed in detail, so we heard some testimony about what those intersection improvements would mean in terms of actually rounding corners, removing buildings, speeding trucks through the neighborhood. Can you tell us a little bit more about those intersection improvements? At least what the committee thought they were proposing as opposed to what people might perceive them to be -- I don't know if there's a gap there or not.

**Gerber:** Unfortunately there is a gap there. For which I apologize. That must be my fault. I didn't communicate well enough. But we did first talk about the idea of removing housing. Primarily what we were talking about was a situation where we could take out amounts along one side of lombard west of the town center, move lombard over, put in some sound walls, and reduce truck impacts in that manner. I was totally unacceptable. It would have create add harder wall within the -- not within the pedestrian district, but within st. Johns itself than exists now from the flow of trucks. So it wasn't a viable option. We also talked about widening the corner at the intersection of lombard and st. Louis. And in one type of widening that corner, some additional property could or probably would have been necessary, and that would have -- a residential property, excuse me. We also found out that was totally unacceptable. Even in part. We wouldn't have to be taking the whole lot if we made the lot less viable. That was also considered to be an awful thing. So we are sort of looking more strongly at making changes on the other side of the road, which affected the new health clinic. I did spend several weeks trying to coordinate with the new health clinic before it was designed, and finalized. But at that time they were having some difficulties and it was very difficult to get ahold of the Multnomah county personnel in charge, and by the time I did get in charge, they were telling me they had all 90% drawing and -- a 90% drawing and we wouldn't be able to talk. However, I have since learned that that is not necessarily the case. That there is pore cooperation than that in Multnomah county. And from what we have looked at, and again, this is speculation, if we were to use a portion of their parking lot, it's unlikely to affect more than one possibly two parking spaces. And it's not so much that we would change the shape or size of the intersection, but make the intersection work better. We also talked about the idea of necking down st. Louis so it was virtually impossible or at least very difficult to get an

**JULY 11, 2001**

18-wheeler off of st. Louis into that neighborhood. That of course could very likely affect fire trucks as well, and all of these things are a consideration that we carry forward. We would like to make some design changes that would make the intersections work better, but clearly we have to be careful of removing housing, affecting other people's property, and emergency response. And all those things are -- we are aware of all those things.

**Hales:** One of the questions I had, it was mentioned a couple of times in testimony, really more indirectly than I would have expected, and that is the odot work next year, right? Next summer they're going to start construction, they're going to go down to one or two lanes on a day-to-day basis while they do the construction. That's going to last, what, a year?

**Gerber:** At least.

**Hales:** Two years? So we have a massive traffic calming experiment courtesy of odot about to be launched.

**Gerber:** How many times did they move that forward?

**Hales:** I think this time it's funded, so from what I understand from odot that project is a happening thing and it's going to happen next year. In many other cases -- I want to talk about money in a minute -- there is simply no money for a lot of the rest of these ideas, whether they're majority report or not, but there is money for the repair and renovation of the st. Johns bridge and that project is fund and it's going forward. My question is, to what extent in the late part of your work once we finally came to understand that project is going to happen, did you and the committee try to figure out how to synergize between what you're talking about and this two-year-long traffic calming experiment?

**Gerber:** Almost from the very beginning. There was concern that we not lose the opportunity to find out what happens, where the trucks go, where the st. Johns -- were the st. Johns to shut down or diminish in capacity to some significant degree. As it turns out, Portland office of transportation will be providing the traffic management program for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the st. Johns bridge, which will put us on the street. And we can be doing traffic counts to find out what happens to that traffic and where it's going. And we in conversation about that at this time.

**Hales:** I have not yet been personally involved with those -- in those conversation, but I want to get involved in those conversations. For example, the last such project like this was a very short-term project. It was the repair of the i-5 bridge where we had to replace the axle that lifts the bridge. That was a pretty spectacular project. We put in place with a cooperative effort between the city and odot some temporary changes in traffic management, some of which we kept. For example, the who've lane that we put in as a temporary measure for the i-5 bridge work, we've kept. And now it's been made permanent. And now they're trying to create a campaign I don't know lane on the Washington side. I think it falls to me to start these conversations with the regional 1 office of odot and the staff in our office and pdot that's been working on this. I guess you suggested some recommendations, vera, but we ought to spend some time in discussion. It seems to me we could do everybody a disservice by either adopting one or these -- of these reports -- accepting one of these reports or accepting one and failing to accept the other, because I don't think that's really the issue here. There are some differences of opinion between the majority and the minority, but actually I don't believe there's very much of a difference of objective. I don't think there's much -- there's not as much -- there's less disagreement than meets the eye, in my opinion. Because the objectives are very similar. We want to -- a healthy pedestrian oriented town center, and -- in st. Johns and we want trucks to go elsewhere. We all agree on that. And even the trucking industry, there's not -- it's certainly not their preferred route to drive through a commercial -- a neighborhood commercial district. So going to a -- I guess my instinct say there's an opportunity here with the i-5 work being done and a two-year-long construction, if not darn near closure of the st. Johns bridge

**JULY 11, 2001**

while it's being worked on, coupled with the fact that folks, we could adopt this majority report and scare some of you, but we need to disclose, we don't have a dime to do the capital work described in this -- the capital work described in this report. We are out of money in transportation in Portland. And we stand in some danger of being in worse shape in a few months than we are today. And the state, although they have some new money, authorized by the legislature, hasn't budgeted where that money is going to go yet. So I think we don't want to either scare anybody or encourage anybody by simply accepting a report and having you go out of this hearing saying, oh, damn they're going to build that awful intersection. No, we're not. We're not going to build anything in the foreseeable future. Because there is simply not the money to do it until we form an urban renewal district in st. Johns and that has to come from the community that they want one. Because that's where the money will come to do capitol improvements. Period. There is no money in the city's general fund budget, and there's no money in the city's transportation budget to build those improvements. And we would do you a disservice to shine you on and let you think there is. So until there is an urban renewal district in st. Johns, there will not be money for street improvements.

**Katz:** If there will be.

**Hales:** Until. There's no likely money to come from any other sores. What i'd like to do is combine what you're doing on the i-5 process with some collaboration with odot, abuse one more thing, then i'll --

**Katz:** Also, the bureau of planning work.

**Hales:** I am not willing to accept an outcome where we approve and try to build improvements that compromise what you're doing in the planning process. And i'm not willing to accept an outcome where we just keep studying this for four more years. I think there's some things that we can do not short term. Short term meaning about when they start the work next year on the bridge. And i'm interested in truck route changes and weight limits starting then. I'm not sure what the weight limits should be, i'm not sure what the truck route should look like. But we've got to have a traffic management plan for that bridge, and i'd like to figure out a way to mesh what both of majority and the minority are looking for here.

**Katz:** So are you suggesting accepting --

**Hales:** I'd say accept both. But this is not just to give everybody a pat on the head. There's been a lot of good work done here, by the committee members and other since citizens this. Is an amazing amount of work and good testimony. My instincts say there's a lot of agreement here, and some opportunity with the construction work and the mitigation plan that has to be crafted. Odot has to do a mitigation plan fore that bridge work. And we get to talk with them about it. And I think we should take these two report and try to get as much leverage with odot as we can and then have what we do last until both the routing of trucks through st. Johns until there is another bridge, and in forwarding the objectives of the planning effort and not building an improvement that has to be taken out some years from now when the planning process is done and an urban renewal district gets formed. So I guess my suggestion or motion, if -- would be to accept both of these reports and then instruct my office, me and p dot, to start now and -- in negotiations with odot and the members of this committee on how the traffic management plan for the repair and renovation of the st. Johns bridge can advance the objectives of these two reports.

**Katz:** All right. Further discussion?

**Francesconi:** One question, just for staff. Did the committee consider what commissioner Hales just said, the closure of the bridge and the traffic management plan and what effect that would have on either the majority recommendations or the minority? Was that discussed by the committee?

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Gerber:** We did discuss primarily identifying what happens. We might -- we talked about the fact we might find out the trucks don't need the st. Johns bridge and that it wouldn't bother them that much. We might find out it was critical for them. We talked a good deal about finding out how it affected trucks. We did not talk a great deal with traffic management plan, and where to direct the trucks to, although obvious from the discussion you've heard, there are some very strong opinions about where the trucks should be directed to or at least not where they should be at.

**Francesconi:** Here's my opinion, for what it's worth. I defer to the commissioner in charge, commissioner Hales on an issue like this. This is a complicated matter. I am concerned that -- i'm not sure why we had a study or why we allowed the citizens to continue grappling with this if we knew we didn't have any money and we knew -- and there were the same objectives going along. So i'm not sure why we spent so much time and effort on this thing. And I think there are some fundamental disagreements between the majority and minority in the meantime. I'm just concerned if we don't do anything, it's going to sit, you know, the same situation that it is now in st. Johns, which is not good because of the truck traffic. Until this issue was raised, that at least the majority does some improvements for the area. But I -- because I have been along those streets and it's a mess at the moment. But if we want to defer it to the traffic management plan from the bridge closure, that's fine. But then I think we also have to expedite our efforts at metro this. Will mean some tough choices if we push more aggressively for the bridge, because it's my understanding that there may somebody questions about light rail, the trails, some other things that we want funded. And so this would mean we have to agree that this is our highest priority. So regardless of what we do in the transportation management side, we're going to have to get clear on our priorities for metro and then push aggressively for it.

**Katz:** I just want to add that the bridge itself, or the discussion of a bridge is up for serious work and study. There are a lot of factors, including environmental issues, that are going to have to be addressed. So it's not a given yet, but at least it's being looked at seriously by the task force. And it's part of metro 2040. I just wanted to say that even if we had the money, we wouldn't -- we couldn't be doing that immediately.

**Hales:** If you want, i'll restate my motion.

**Katz:** Yeah. I -- I know -- is there anything you heard that is contractictory to what we've just said? -- contradictory to what we just said?

**Babbitt:** Only one thing.

**Katz:** Come on up.

**Babbitt:** What I hear is -- as -- at least from the advisory committee, because I didn't realize the money wasn't going to be there. This is like, now I know. And all this work -- what is contradicting, I know myself, coming there for friends of cathedral park, neighborhood people, i've heard mr. Pilltz say time and time again, we need to look at the closure of the bridge. So if it comes back together, consider that it would be total closure. What would be developed would something -- would be something to look at as the long range if it worked. So bringing those ideas together and some we've already gotten into should really have been the objective. But that segment was in my opinion apples put aside. So when you ask that question, at least from my standpoint as advisory committee member, that was not looked at seriously. It really should have, because we live there and that was important.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Did you have anything you wanted to add? Did you hear anything contradicting --

**Nelson:** What did I hear was -- i'm trevor nelson, st. Johns resident. I think the mitigation report has been done. I have a copy of it that I just handed to a friend of mine to report it for our target area. So a lot of that is pretty far along.

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Hales:** A draft, right?

**Nelson:** I think that's the final.

**Hales:** It's not final until --

**Nelson:** Right. But -- so be careful not to push the project back farther than it's been already. We were supposed to have this almost done by now.

**Hales:** Fair point.

**Katz:** All right.

**Hales:** I'll talk about that which we vote. Fair point. Delaying that would be a -- the worst thing we could do. Let me make a motion and we can each discuss it and maybe I can elaborate more when we vote. I'm going to move that we accept both the majority and the minority report, and that the council instruct commissioner in charge of transportation to return to the council prior to the beginning of work on the st. Johns bridge repair with -- with a report back from this committee, folks, I'm going to ask you to stay on and keep working together on how as many of the objectives of the committee's work can be accomplished as possible in the mitigation plan for the repair of the st. Johns bridge. And let's -- in other words, I don't want to put these reports on the shelf. I don't want to subsume them in a multiyear planning effort, but I don't want what we do to be in conflict with that neighborhood planning effort. I said earlier, I think there's an opportunity here for a lot more common ground than we have unfortunately seen in the presentation of the two reports. My motion would be that we accept both and instruct me to come back with a report to the council on the mitigation plan and how it meshes with these two reports. That's a motion.

**Francesconi:** Second.

**Katz:** Does the council -- does the council want to do any discussion? Roll call.

**Francesconi:** Aye.

**Hales:** First, I want to thank the folks that have work order this for so long. To answer jim's question, this thing got started before -- as I think somebody pointed out, before any of us was on the city council. That doesn't -- the buck stops here now, but the reason it seems a little strange to some of us is that I think then-commissioner blumenauer appointed this committee and got this thing started. But of course this is a problem that's been studied for a very long time, too long. As I said at the outset, we have a policy in Portland. It's not new to this city council, though. I think we've done a good job of implementing it, that neighborhood livability trumps regional transportation objectives. It's not that we're -- it's not that we're hostile to regional transportation, but starting with the mt. Hood freeway decision, and most recently and most clearly on point with respect to this project with the sellwood bridge decision, this council and its predecessors have said the livability of the community is the priority and that moving people around the region will come second to that. And that policy has been applied systematically all over the city with the exception of downtown st. Johns. And this is the last worst place in terms of the conflict between those strategies of regional transportation and neighborhood livability. And we've got to fix and it we've got to get the priorities straight. And I believe in order to get those priorities straight that we have to build another bridge across the willamette. It has been 20 years since we have built a bridge across the willamette river, or across the columbia river, and those two bridges, the i-205 bridges were funded with 90% federal money. 90%. How we build bridges across the rivers today in a climate where it's very difficult to get federal money and certainly not at 90% and we're -- where local and state funds are in short supply, I don't know. It's our responsibility to find the ways and means to get that done. I'm -- in making this motion and voting for it I'm also saying we're not going to implement any of the construction recommendations in this report until we come back to council with the mitigation plan for the bridge repair. So thank you, steve, for good work. Thanks

**JULY 11, 2001**

citizens for good work as well. Let's please keep working together into this next phase and try to make some of this real. Thank you. Aye.

**Sten:** This is a very complicated piece of work. I want to thank everybody's who's worked on it, staff and citizens. The substance i've learned a lot today. I see the problem every time I go out there, but the substance of how to solve it is not quite there, but I think you're on track. Probably i'm more impressed by the demeanor. This is an incredible difficult issue that's putting a hardship on the neighborhood, and both sides, business and residents, have had a remarkable tone and willingness to keep working on this. So I think commissioner Hales has done as good a job as anybody could do trying to lay out a path to get to a final set of actions, and it is hard to do the planning when you don't have the money, but I think money is better spent if you're doing the planning first. And in this case I think we're more likely to be able to compete for hard-to-find dollars if there's a really tight plan that business and neighborhood leaders can agree on. We're not quite there yet, but it is remarkable how well you've handled yourself on this and it gives me hope what seems to be an intractable problem could be solved. I look forward to seeing what you bring back next. Aye.

**Katz:** Thank you. Again. Thanks to everybody. This was a long process, a lot of people involved. I'm glad the commissioner moved to accept both the reports, because -- the third one is a separate study that we're not going to accept that one right today, but we'll accept the minority report and the majority report. And I want to say that it's going to be important that we work together with the planning bureau at this point with the community, and I really would like to set aside all discussions right now about any urban renewal districts or anything until our work starts with the community and until the community tells us what it is that they would like and then until we look at our fiscal situation we have now found ourselves in very dire financial administrates in light of the collective bargaining issues we are involved in. And I want to say to the council, hold off until we know where we are financially before we make any decisions on any urban renewal districts. Aye. [ gavel pounded ] okay. 850. Thank you, everybody.

**Item 850.**

**Katz:** Let's take about a two-minute recess. Don't anybody go.

At 11:37 a.m., Council recessed.

At 11:41 a.m., Council reconvened.

**Katz:** Commissioner Sten?

**Sten:** I thought i'd take a couple minutes. This is a hot topic and I want to thank everybody for hanging in through the truck strategy issue. People have been here since 10:30. What I want to do is take a couple minutes and frame where we are and what today's presentation too. I'm in the interesting position of presenting a report that's already been reported on to a great length. The draft report which I circulated ten days was front page news and the revised report also was. So I think some of the substance has been out there and I think all of the reporting has been accurate. So what we'd like to do today is in a little more detail walk the council through exactly where we see the current situation to be, hopefully for the community who will be watching this and reporters who will help us get the word out, update people on where the system is. And what we expect to have happen in the next couple of months. Before I do that, I want to -- there's been a lot of media inquiry. The reporting has been good and accurate, and it's good to get out there what's happened. The way would I describe it just to put some context to this, there's really what I would break down as about four sets of issues that are being talked about. One is what happened in the past, and what was the decision making that led to us both buying and turning on a system that has been utterly flawed, the second has been, and this is what today's report is about, what is the status of that

**JULY 11, 2001**

system as we sit here today, what's the short-term prognosis. The third is what's the long-term future of the system. One of the reasons we bought this system, it's hard to not feel ironic about it, there's a lot of things we'd like to do with the bills that the old system couldn't do. Like monthly billing, a transportation issue, storm water discount, and we need to take a hard look and make sure this system is going to get us where we want to go. That issue we're going to come back to council with a whole full report next week and so tim grewe from the office of management and finance, ken rust and ron bergman have been assigned by the mayor at my request to lead an independent team, independent of the water bureau, who of course work closely with us, to assess the future of this system. That work plan, and i'd like to bring out the work plan publicly so people can question it, will be before the council next week. The final question is the fourth issue is really whatever losses are sustained from this, how are we going to pay for them and who's responsible for that? That will be a much longer term discussion. We have made -- you'll see this in the presentation today, significant cuts into our operations, and are taking the steps we need to keep the water bureau solvent and not pass this cost on to the ray payers. We also -- I do thought believe the city has the sole responsibility for the financial problems that we've been caused. I think the vendor is going to have to share in the loss to our ratepayers. That's an issue that I think will be resolved after we get the system finished. What i've agreed to very explicitly, we're working jointly with the vendor, they have a strong team in Portland from all over the world, it's an international company, and we're going to get this system working, one, two, we're going to get into negotiating once we know the final bill and we can account for the final losses, we're going to attempt to negotiate a settlement and if we cannot reach agreement on a settlement, you go into legal discussions. But at this point it's -- obviously we have our concerns, but it's a partnership to try and fix it with a full agreement on both sides that there is some accounting that has to be done. So I think you have -- what happened in the past, where are we now, what's the future of the system and who's going to pay for it. It's the second one we're focusing on today. Let me say, i'd like to say a few words on what's happened in the past. Many of the discussions in the newspaper over the last couple of weeks, I think they were accurate and good reporting, are about, did we make a bad decision to turn this computer on and did we make a bad decision to buy the computer. What surfaced in the last couple weeks is information that shows that some of the employees in our operations had very big misgiving. They put some of them in writing and in some ways they were not seen by people who should have seen them and in some they were seen but were not agreed to. It's been my estimation, any time you try to take a complicated 16 months of decision making and wrap it up in a couple of sound bytes, that what these issues are are judgment. I've not found any evidence that anybody misrepresented anything to any person, that people made decisions based on anything other than the public's interest. What I found is that at various stages of the project -- was used to make a decision, beginning with choosing this vendor, choosing the lowest price product available was one of the judgment and choosing to turn it on. I did come to the conclusion, and do believe that some of those judgments could have been avoided. The I did not come to the conclusion that they were things that people did dishonestly, but I think our flow of information was not as good as could it have been and I personally feel responsible for having a situation in which concerns were raised that were not heard by everybody involved, including mine. That's an unacceptable flow and I think we were on a -- run a city and a corporation in which our goal is for am employees to be heard. However, I would say that at the middle management level, those judgments were listened to, and there was informed decisions made to turn the system on. It wasn't that those memos were tossed in the recycling bin, it was that they were red and there was I think the wrong judgment made that those problems had been address and that decision was not shared with all the people who could have brought more eyes to it. It is my conclusion that we made some bad judgments



**JULY 11, 2001**

and that some of those decisions should not have happened. As of ten days ago, mike rosenberger, who is a dear friend and I think an honest person, we agreed that because of those collective bad judgments it was a time for a time in management and he offered his resignation. It was not a happy day for me. I think everybody who has worked with mike knows him to be an honest and hard working public servant. He was the administrator and he and I both concluded under both of our watch judgments that could have been avoided were made, and that really what was needed at that point was not so much somebody to say, this is entirely my fault, because it's a collective fault of everybody's, and some of the things I think couldn't have -- have been avoided. What we came to the conclusion on was a change in leadership was needed in order to get some fresh eyes to change the mix, and there comes a point when you're you change direction and that's what mike and I agreed. As of ten days ago I have appointed mort as the interim director. We've agreed on a six-month appointment and the reason I picked six months, and you'll see this in this presentation today, after all the things i've learned in the last 16 months, I will be not making any absolute guarantees when everything will work, but it our strong projection that we will have the system functioning sometime this fall. I would like to have more focused on the system for the first three months not on the leadership change and sometime this fall I will begin working request personnel, national search and recruitment for a permanent executive director and we'll go through a very public hiring process, I expect if we don't wear him out, mort will apply and be a good candidate, but it will be an open process. I wanted to lay that just long enough to focus on the problem at hand and I have great confidence he can take this on. The final piece that I think is important to note is that the other thing that became clear in the last couple weeks is that the bureau's belief on the scope of the problem was woefully low. We reported back -- I don't have the number in front of me -- essentially that somewhere under 15,000 accounts was the amount of accounts that had problems. It turns out that number was much more like 38 to 40,000 last february when we reported back. Again, I do not see events that anybody purposely, including mike, I don't think he ever would distort that number, I think what it showed is just how deeply we were not in control of this system and the numbers we believed to be the case were just flat wrong. That's very bad news, because we had 38,000 problem accounts instead of roundly speaking 15,000. We then projected that by july 1st we would be in the range of 6, 7,000 problem accounts at the pace we were going and hopefully be on track to fix it. The good news, just the half full glass as opposed to the half empty, what you'll see is we're close to 10,000 problem accounts from what was 40, instead of 15, so three-quarters of the problems in terms of individual accounts have been fixed. I believe based on both the method we're using and the pace we're doing that we'll be someplace this fall in a position in which all of the accounts should be working. We will not declare victory until that happens, we're not going to say that's a guaranteed piece, but if you -- what we're going to do is show the path of progress and allow to you make your own decisions both in the community and the council about whether we're on track. On a percentage basis and a speed basis, we're moving faster than I thought we would by february. But the problem was much bigger than I thought at the same time. So we have cleaned up about 75% of the problems, but the problem was about twice as big as I thought. And so those are all the things that came together. It was the sum total of not good information flow when we turned the system on, underestimating the problem, I think through a misunderstanding in the system and all these things led me to believe it was time to make a management change as mike agreed so. So mort i'm going to invite to come up and walk you through this. I also would like to say this is a pray dude to next week's discussion when we talk about the future of the system. It's my belief that -- would I say beyond a shadow of a doubt making this system work at this point would be the most economically efficient thing to do. At the we started with a plan b from scratch we would have to buy a whole new system. If that's

JULY 11, 2001

impossible, or if that's going to cost more than buying a new system, we should buy a new system -- new system. That's what we're going to ask ken and ron and tim to look at. Any plan b that we would take would take a long time. So no matter whether we come to a conclusion, my hunch is, but it's just that, is that we will probably find it's more economic call to keep making this system work and get it to the point rather than scrapping it. Anything that we would do would take a lot of time, so rather -- whether we stick with this system as I think is probably likely, as painful as it's been, or we take a much more radical approach and make a huge change, that will take quite some time. If you started tomorrow it would take a very long time to get another system. There isn't one you can buy and just plug in. So no matter what we do, it is absolutely pivotal that we get this system billing every single one of our customers accurately and we get that done in the next several months. What I see with this report, this is really about how do we get this system to being functional. And by functional I mean every single person and business that uses water and sewer gets a bill on time that's accurate. And the debt collection services and all of the other things work. We have to get to that whether we make a change or not or else we're going to basically be in huge trouble. I believe we will get there, then the question that we have to look at along the way is now that this thing is doing the baseline functions, it is a vehicle that's going to get us where we want to be. And I think that's a question that will take longer to get to and we'll have time to line that out next week. Really that's a little bit long-winded, but given the amount of attention this has had, I think it needed more context and wanted to get that on the record. -- record. Let me turn this over to the man in the middle, mort.

**Katz:** Mort is going to do a detailed presentation because of the sensitivity of this issue and the fact that a lot of citizens want to have the information. Then i'm going to ask purb to come up and then i'm going to ask tim to do a brief outline of what he's work plan will look like and what we may anticipate hearing from him and his team of consultants that are going to review to see which direction we ought to be going.

**Mort Anoushiravani, Interim Administrator of the Bureau of Water Works :** Thank you, commissioner and the mayor. What I would like to do is go over a presentation that talks about the progress that we have made for our cis since last february. Also what the status is, and where we are going to be going to bring system stability. Over the next few months as commissioner Sten mentioned just a minute ago.

**Katz:** I recommend that the council members who have 12 o'clock or 1 o'clock appointments to cancel them.

**Anoushiravani:** What i'll be talking about is the status of billing and how many bills are -- how many we have been able to mail out to our customers and collect, talk about the system functionality of what's re -- what remains to be done and what has been done, talk about the finances, and how we're handling our finances and cash flows, and talk a little bit about the customer service that remains on the top of our list to provide the best customer service for our ratepayers. In terms of the status of billing, what i've listed here are a list of type of accounts we have. And we have about 180,000 services, however, we always have to maintain a larger number of accounts because of the multiple accounts that some services have. So right now there is about 240 accounts -- 240,000 accounts that we have to maintain. So it's much larger than just the number of services. In terms of -- in terms of the status of billing here, i'd like to share with you where we were in february, and as commissioner Sten mentioned, at that time our estimate was much smaller than what we thought our problem accounts were. At that time because of the limited reporting tools that we have, our estimate was about eight to 9,000 accounts or so. And since then, this has been the progress we have made in terms of the different problem categories that we have. Basically one of the larger problem areas we have, the sewer only accounts and we

**JULY 11, 2001**

have about 14,000 of those accounts, and as of today, we have about 2500 left to be billed and we think we're going to get that done by the end of august. And we're on very good recovery path for that. In terms of the status of incorrect billing, that has been corrected and we are not generating incorrect bills right now, and if there are any, there are no backlogs, as we do have manual interventions and -- so there won't be any incorrect bills going out. And then also a couple of the problem categories, we have taken care of -- I just would like to bring your attention to the bottom lines that from february roughly about 40,000 problem accounts, we are less than 12,000 right now. I would think by the end -- end of the next month we are basically have caught up and corrected those problems, just a word of clarification, on the zero numbers that we're going to have, we are going to have zero in terms of the backlog, but just in the course of doing everyday business, that will generate a few problem accounts and that's just normal. And we -- had it in the old system too. In terms of system function and where we are, these are the major function a little that we're working on that we have to fix to bring it -- to bring stability to the system. One is the water incentive pricing and we are not -- now testing it and that basically affects about a thousand of our customers. Pay plans, we are not testing and we have a team of the consult apartments at -- that work Portland and some place else to figure that out, and we are in the process of testing that and putting that in place and the significance of that is that has to work in order for the debt recovery system to work. So those two have to go together. And for the sodnrs account, the test assisting complete and we've mailed the majority of those accounts and those are -- that's our remaining -- the functionality function of the problem. There are other problems in terms of meter reading and things like that. Maybe the highest priority for us if you will is toll get the debt recovery system working, because one of the largest uncollected revenue stream that we have is caused by not having this debt recovery functionality in place. And we are shooting for october 1st to have that up and running. And then the next functionality for us is the version 4. And that version will bring a lot more -- a lot more flexibility and robustness, if you will, to the system. If we can do that. And for right now, the estimate is that we'll get it sometime to the first quarter 2002 and with the -- doing about a couple months of testing, we should have it on line by july of 2002. Now i'd like to spend a few minutes talking about will the financial situation. Obviously that's a major issue for us as well as b.e.s., and first i'm going to share with you the uncollected revenues we had that we have also called it shortfalls and I want to mention that this doesn't mean this is lost money. In fact, it is our belief and our plan to collect the majority of this revenue. In sum total, there is about 25.5 million dollars of uncollected revenue out there. And the largest component of it are the past due balances on the accounts that we haven't been able to collect. And also there is about \$13 million in unbilled accounts that we're working very hard to get those bills out over the next couple of months or so. And then there were some other smaller losses, they are significant numbers in terms of their size, that they would be lost because, for example, our practices or the fact that we didn't have money in the bank, so we are not -- that's going to be -- we're not going to be collecting interest on those earnings, and also in terms of late fees, so so -- since we have suspended the charging for them, obviously that revenue will be lost. Then I would like to turn that to -- back to what I means in terms of total losses. The way we have estimated that, we have put a model in place that looks at different assumptions in terms of the collection rates as well as the timing of function a little and their ability to collect. And we have identified best case and worse case scenarios for those. And that's what this -- this is why -- this indicates the total losses could be. And the next one i've divided it into the water and the b.e.s. Losses. And roughly the water losses could be someplace between 4 and \$6 million and b.e.s. Is about 6 to \$9 million, and the other thing is there is -- there is some conservativeness, if you will, plug in addition these models that actually -- the outcome could be better than -- that could be better than our best guest, but we want

**JULY 11, 2001**

to be careful that we characterize as reasonably as possible of what the potential losses could be of the in terms of what we are doing to management and build with that situation, there are basically two tracks. One is to work on getting our cash flow increase and improved. That's one track. The other one is to reduce and contain -- contain our expenditure. On the getting the cash in the door, if you will, we are basically working really, really hard on getting the bills out, we do have a manual debt recovery. It does generate work for us, but it has brought significant cash flow for us also. And also we are offering no interest payment plans for our customers, as a means -- as a means -- as a means of encouraging them for payment. On the cost cutting and the delaying expenditures side, we have instituted a hiring freeze. We have reduced our operating budget both last year and this year, and we are going to be delaying at least \$10 million in capital program for this fiscal year that's just began. Also we have relied to draw down on reserves to use that to basically deal with some of the losses we have, and also we are postponing the bond sale plans we had until next spring, and the reason we want to delay it, we want to be in a much better financial situation before we go to sell bonds, so that will not basically affect our rating that we have, which is the best rating we can have, aa-1. Also we are reviewing some of our more practices and policies that we are doing that could either help in terms of reducing costs as well as maybe helping with the cash flow situation. And there are some examples in the report that we -- that went out and was submitted on July 5th, what some of those are. Just to share you a little bit of a static in terms of the cash flow, it looks like that we are beginning on a positive trend for the cash flow. This is a graph that depicts our weekly cash receipts and basically three out of the last four weeks we have beat the plan numbers, so that's -- that is very good and encouraging. Also we have some other tools to try to trend our cash flow situation, and this one -- positive bureau we are going to reducing our reserve to 13.5 million dollars, and that would be the cash flow situation based on the scenarios I shared with you a couple minutes ago that would show the worse case and the best case scenario. And the water funds are actually composed of our operating funds, if you will, with -- which is discharged, that we are going to have about 8.5 million dollars for our operating reserves there, and our capital program fund, that's going to have \$5 million reserve. Which you see, the big jump, that's where we're going to be selling bonds for about \$33 million or so next spring. Until terms of the customer service as I mentioned, that remains one of our highest priorities. That is our number 1 priority work to provide good customer service to our customers. And to deal with that issue we have reassigned a number of people in the bureau to work on the cis and the call center ask all that. We have hired a number of limited staff to help with the could center -- call center and the billing problem and the manual debt recovery. Also we have established some new work practices to assist our customers. We have had expanded hours for customer service. For a period of time we said -- we had Saturday hours, but after a few months we found it -- customers weren't using that very much, so we have discontinued that. But we still have our hours extended until 7:00 p.m. One issue we're going to be dealing with is as the debt recovery happens at the faster pace, this is going to increase our workload, and we're going to be dealing with that. Not that -- now that we have additional people in customer service, our hold times and customer service level seems to be stabilized and at the -- at a fairly acceptable level. In terms of what the next steps are and what the plans are, we are going to continue working with the convenient -- vendors and others to solve the billing problems, to get the bills out and we're going to make sure we're going to have automatic debt recovery estimates possible, stabilizing the system obviously is a major work for us and we've already begun work with Tim and his team to start this assessment process and have a draft work plan and a resolution that Tim is going to bring before the council next week.

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Katz:** Okay. Let's put up it lights. Let me ask one question, and this is a question to b.e.s. Too. Mort, I assume you've reviewed the numbers and the numbers that you have showed us are accurate.

**Anoushiravani:** Yes. That is correct, mayor. We worked with b.e.s. In fact, their numbers come from them, actually, that we plug into our models.

**Katz:** So you at -- b.e.s. Agree was those numbers?

**Anoushiravani:** We provided our own numbers in their report.

**Katz:** Okay. And you have reviewed those as well?

**Anoushiravani:** Right.

**Katz:** All right. Questions of mort? Well let's bring purb up.

**Francesconi:** I have some questions. Before I do that, I wanted to comment on commissioner Sten's opening and to say how terrific it was. And how much we appreciate, and I appreciate what he's doing. He's identified kind of the keys here, and he's all of them. We have to focus on all of the resources on fixing the problem, and that means an effective billing system and also an effective collection system. We have to minimize harm to the ratepayers, which he's done and which we've been addressed here. Three, we have to learn from this. And four, and above all, we have to be open with the public as he's being. So I guess I want to thank him on behalf of us. I want to acknowledge we were all on the city council when this happened. And now with that in mind, I have to ask a couple of questions. One is, first is, and this is the only retrospective question that i'm going too ask at this point, in looking at that first report to the council that commissioner Sten referenced, in retrospect, I have two problems with it. One is the number that we were given. And the number I think was 9,000 or so. And it was just for bills that would never -- that had never been build, but there was another number for bills that had been just billed once that had been stuck. And so when you -- what you weren't in charge at the time, but being off by 30,000 accounts. That is a problem. So I don't know if you want -- how did that -- do you have anything more to say on how that happened? My question second, you could wrap it in -- up in terms of that concern, the whole emphasis on collection, and how much money was not coming in on a monthly basis. I did not realize and I probably should have, that prior to us going to the new system, we sent out 350 letters a day on collections, we made 200 phone calls and actually turned off 40 I think -- those are very heavy collection efforts. Since we haven't done any of that, and none of that was really discussed with the council that I recall, so those are the two problems I have with that first report. I don't know if you want to comment on either of those.

**Anoushiravani:** I can take a crack at it, commissioner. As you said, I wasn't intimately involved with it --

**Sten:** Why don't you take the first one and i'll take the second one. That was my decision.

**Anoushiravani:** Okay. In terms of the number of bills, a couple of things happened. We didn't have some of the reporting and query functionality or tools, if you will, to find that -- what that number was the and that was the best we could basically come up with at that time. The other thing, as you correctly identified, if you separate will the never build -- never build accounts, that's -- billed accounts, that's a different number than the -- than you say, how many problem accounts you have. So those were the reason for those. But definitely we didn't have a good reporting mechanism until about mid-may or. So that's a lot more reliable. If you look at the charts and all that, we have a may 17th date there also. That's when we got the report and capability in place to track those better.

**Sten:** On the second issue, we -- I think it -- this was just a plain -- in retrospect a mistake, but let me say where it came from. It became clear last summer a year ago that we had a substantial number of people that hadn't been build. It was smaller than -- billed. It was smaller than I

**JULY 11, 2001**

thought. Part of what happened in terms of the numbers being higher is that we believed incorrectly that if somebody had no changes to the account their account was fine. That turned out to be a wrong assumption and so there was -- there's a whole subset of accounts where something went wrong in the computer during the normal course of business. We didn't see that happening until this spring. And I think -- i'm not a technical expert, but I think it was happening all along but we didn't see that. We could not always in the early stage of this distinguish what had happened on each account. And so I made what I would say is a management and to some extent in the good sense I think political and public relations decision that we shouldn't be in collections on people if we couldn't be 100% sure that they had been billed right. The problem is we stopped collections on everyone, even though at our very worst day, 80% of the accounts never had a problem, and so because of the amount of reminder notices we actually do send, and our annual loss rate is less than -- is about a half of 1%age pointed, part of that is -- it's friendly, but it's consistent, the letters go out and it's a slow process, and if you make a payment you don't get shut off, whether it's a partial payment, but what happened is without that push going on the 80% of the people that usually -- that they were billed normally, that's a huge part of the revenue. About it half of the revenue we have in -- haven't collected bills that have properly been billed but not paid. So I miscalculated that in thinking that what a public relations disaster if we send collections notices to people who didn't get a proper bill. Unfortunately I couldn't distinguish how to separated those two because we couldn't do it and I think it had a very unintended consequence. I underestimated the number of people who got a normal bill who got a reminder notice. Also we couldn't distinguish between those two. So that problem snowballed and it was a policy decision to not do collections. Now, the other problem we're still working on is the october date is now we're doing collections but we're doing it by phone rather than by computer. And we need to get the computer system doing it manually. That's pretty bluntly what happened.

**Katz:** That's priority.

**Francesconi:** A couple other things, mort. It important -- i'm not going to be here next week so maybe you can respond if this request is inappropriate. I think it's important that we have milestone moment that's we give reports to the council. You were terrific about coming in and briefing me and laying at this out. And I don't know that weekly reports -- you can provide those, but what i'm more interested in is milestone moments. You mentioned one. The accounts receivable. A payment plan that you expect by the end of july. We need to know, does -- can the system do that? If the system cannot do that, then we can't get to collection and then I do think it answers the longer term issue as, does the system work. So that is very critical. The next date is going to be the collection date of october 1st. And I think we need some status reports as to as we're approaching that. Are we going to make that date? Because the worse case scenario is december first, and we need to know those are -- is that a fair -- does that make sense to you?

**Anoushiravani:** Absolutely, commissioner. I'll be more than glad to provide monthly briefings, similar to what we are doing with our supply planning, if you will. In terms of you know where we are and where the progress is.

**Francesconi:** On the match to those key dates. The next one hopefully we're going to get to this next one. It's the issue of the version 4. My question to you is, we had a lot of modifications. I don't know what the technical term is -- to version three. Are we going to have to go through all these modifications for version 4?

**Anoushiravani:** The short answer is to some extent, yes. Where we are right now, commissioner, is we believe that we will get the system stabilized over the next few months, and then there is going to be some changes we have to do both in terms of other upgrade that's are basically attached to this system in terms of their databases and there could be some potential hardware changes that

**JULY 11, 2001**

we have to do before going to version 4. Version 4 for those people that are actually using it now, that -- that's a lot more flexible and robust system. So if as a part of the work that tim's team is going to do under assessment is going to indicate that's a viable system, the next logical step in that progression would be to go to version 4 to take advantage of some of those features. So the answer to that is we are on that path, and we are going to make a decision as we conduct our assessment to see whether that's what we're going to do or not.

**Francesconi:** Just two other areas then i'm done. It's on this question of, something I didn't realize, but we are leasing the information or the software, we don't own it.

**Anoushiravani:** Right.

**Francesconi:** Now, if we owned it, we would no code and we don't have a right to that. But it may or -- may be relevant on fixing the problem. I guess the question is, the effect we don't own the system, does that create any barrier to us fixing the system?

**Anoushiravani:** What I can tell you, what I understand from it, commissioner, is not owning the system, it's a very normal way of doing business.

**Francesconi:** I understand that.

**Anoushiravani:** There are a lot of corporations, people do it that way also. And then there is an implied assumption that if we own the source code, if you will, and then we have to have a slew of experts in house to be able to maintain and support it, whereas right now the vendor is going to be responsible for the support of it also. So in my mind, that is not a big huge issue, if you will, because, for example, if we owned the source code we might have it be still experiencing the same problems. So I don't see that as something that determines whether this was a good thing or a bad thing.

**Sten:** Let me say real quick, I want to be clear, I think mort is, that -- I want to get people's thoughts on the table since you're not going to be here next week, all of this stuff needs to be very clearly on the table. What we want to do is round up all these kinds of thoughts people have so we can answer them explicit through this medium term inquiry. Those are the kind of questions we need answered. What we can give today is pretty informed opinion. Mort knows about this as much as anybody, but we're not going to land on those opinions until we go through the process with tim.

**Francesconi:** I just reread your excellent memo from last week in which you asked for that in writing. I had missed that, so i'll -- but these are it. The last question, can you -- we don't -- the commissioner, nobody wants to repeat these mistakes. We want to make sure the system is the stable before storm water discounts and other changes, transportation, et cetera. Can you define what you mean by stable and how long does have it to be stable before we institute other changes?

**Anoushiravani:** Actually that is going to be a definition we have to agree on. But right now in my mind stability is we can produce a cycle of billing which for us would mean 91 days without basically any problem. We'll go through a cycle of collection if you will, and also be able to review -- reduce some of the workaround and the manual workaround we're doing and reducing some of our additional staff that we have devoted to this project. So to me that's what I would say. Before we go ahead and make those changes.

**Francesconi:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Okay. Purb. Come on up quickly.

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

**Katz:** Before you go ahead, anybody else for the rest of the morning -- I know. We're going to move the rest of the morning calendar to 2 o'clock. Is that all right? I don't see people here for the rest of the calendar anyway, because I think this is going to take a while. Okay.

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Jay Forman, Chairman of Water Committee, Portland Utilities Review Board (PURB):** I'm jay formick, chairman of the water committee of the Portland utilities review board. I'll open by saying thank you to commissioner Sten and the whole council for calling for the investigation of the functionality of the open vision system. This is an extremely important issue. I'm obviously sort of speaking to the audience when I say that. It ranges not only from the collection issues but it ranges right to whether or not the bureau of environmental services can complete projects under construction right now. Owing to the pressure on bonding issues that the open vision problems are placing. The purb is looking forward to a better flow of information from the water bureau. We've always had confidence in the expertise and the competence of water bureau staff. That's not been an issue. It's been an issue of communication, and we are very happy to see that that is coming up and the changes are very welcome. With specific regards to other issues, i'm going to turn this over to the chairman of the Portland utilities review board. Go ahead, jim.

**Jim Abrahamson, Chairman, PURB:** I'm jim, the chair of purb. Good afternoon. I'd like to offer some additional comments and observations related to this issue. Please bear with me if sometimes I belabor the obvious. First of all, time is of the essence. B.e.s. Is facing a requirement to sell upwards of 200 million bonds, \$200 million in bonds possibly in the fall of 2000 -- 2002 next year. This would be required for continuing financing of the cso program. In order for the city to maintain its bond rating, the water billing system collection system must be operating and correctly and efficiently well before the sale of those bonds. It's possible that that bond sale could be delayed, but my understanding is if it's delayed it may force b.e.s. To suspend construction of some of those projects and that suspension will probably be in late summer or fall 2002. A tremendous sense of urgency needs to be generated to focus full attention on fixing and/or replacing the cis. Where is the goal line? Fundamentally the goal line of the independent review and the long-term solution process seems quite simple. Assess open vision, system as it exists today, determine the capability and viability of that system, develop a plan to implement technical and process improvements and/or repairs, including potential replacement if that system is found to be unrepairable or unsuitable to the city's needs. Implement a plan that needs the bond deadline with a combination of computer and human resource if's necessary, and then complete the drive to a long-term solution which is a working cis utility billing system that operates accurately, efficiently, with a minimum of human interaction, and that easily accepts changes and modifications. In reality, though, this is a very complex process with many opportunities for time slippage and loss of focus if it's not approached on a holistic and coordinated basis. If you ask different people what's important, you get different answers. Some people will say that the bill backlog and the cash flow is the most important issue. Some people will say the -- say the selections issue is most important, some people will say meeting the bond issue is most important, some people will say the evaluation of the system is the most important. The fact of the matter is they're all important and they're all subparts of the same general issue. And as if those respect enough, there's also other critical pieces of the puzzle. There's addressing the systems and process shortcomings that were identified in the audit. The fundamental capabilities of the alignment of the corporate interests with those with the city of Portland. And there's the development of plan b, which a purb would argue is a process that would probably be developed in parallel with the evaluation. So you don't independent up in a situation where you spend a certain amount of time evaluating the system, determining it does need to be replace and then you start thinking about plan b. Start thinking about plan b early. What is required if you forgive the military reference here is almost an operation overlord type of planning and coordination that pulls together all of the pieces of the puzzle to complete the entire operation. The key being strong project management. Where have you detailed goals, time lines, executive and political support, and accountability and sufficient



**JULY 11, 2001**

financial resources. With regard to the independent review process, looks pretty good so far. The independent review process coordinated by tim grewe, affords the city an excellent to opportunity to assess current approximate, identify and implement long-term solutions and meet the needs of the bond sale. There are a couple of other issues. The city needs to be providing human resources issues to complete the task. Recognizing it's going to be difficult to pinpoint those costs at this point in time because we don't have a full idea of the animal that we're dealing with. We don't know how big this thing is yet. So the cost and the human requirements will change. But be ready depending on how this issue breaks, this could be a very expensive, very long-time consuming process. Some of the other issues related to this relate to the company themselves. The city of Portland is licensing the open vision software from the company. We do not own the software. There are a couple of issues that pop to mind. One is to what extent will they allow an independent external technical review of their proprietary software? The second is what i've been calling the a team and b team issue this. Is not to be confused with plan b. This is a business model issue. This is -- that is if this they get a contract somewhere down the road to implement or to institute open vision with another city or agency, are they then going to take their top programmers and top talented and move to it that project where they are going to be actually getting a big payday, if you will? And leave us with, you know, not top-flight programmers and technical people? That's the a team and b team f they get another project, what kind of technical support can we expect? A third issue is what happened if they exit this business? If they just say, we tried on open vision, we're having trouble getting new customers, this doesn't seem to be work can, we're going to get out of the business. Do we have the capability of being able to buy the software that we have now? Do we have the technical knowledge necessary in-house now to maintain and upgrade the system or are we going to be left with a series of technical manuals and good luck? Our future relationship with the company and their corporate commitment to stick with this system should be a critical component of the decision whether or not to replace the system. Few final observations. First, the water bureau under mort's -- under mort presents an excellent opportunity for a complete coming clean of operation. With no surprises. Part of that is continuing to identify and communicate the full extent of the damage that has been done to ratepayers. And providing on an ongoing basis a complete disclosure of information. A purb and many others have been frustrated in the past with what we perceived as delays, inadequate answers and possible strategic misdirections that we would get from the water bureau when we ask questions about the cis. It's our hope that we won't have to face this situation again with the water bureau or with any other city bureaus. Full commitment, full communications from the independent review team should be required obviously to the council and to purb. Finally, last observations, as we all know, city utility rates are increasing rapidly. There are a lot of expensive vital projects to develop, and legal mandate that must be met. The specter of ratepayer revolt which benefits nobody is looming even greater over all of us. We all need to redouble our efforts to keep utility rate increases as low as possible, and to avoid future embarrassing and expensive mistakes like we have here with the water bureau cis.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right. We'll have open testimony in a few minutes, but thank you, gentlemen. Questions? Good work. Tim. Let me just say on the -- just before tim begins his testimony, that i've made an executive decision that any other computer system changes, major changes will not be dealt with by the individual bureaus. We -- now that we have an asr system in place, it will be done in a different manner. So I just want to flag that. There's part of the -- that's part of the issues in terms of looking back and saying, should we have been doing business differently. Okay.

**Tim Grewe:** I'm going to try to be -- tim grewe, chief administrative officer. I'm going to be brief, given the long morning you've had, and because I think a lot of the issues that will be covered have

**JULY 11, 2001**

already been talked about. I haven't heard anything presented by the people prior to me where that issue isn't already on a list someplace and --

**Katz:** Bring the other mike closer to you.

**Grewe:** Is that better? Will later this week, as in tomorrow or Friday, we will circulate to you a resolution that will be filed for council consideration next week, which will basically charge me, which is what you've already done in effect, to conduct an assessment of the overall open vision system. That resolution will lay out for you the project management structure, the rolls of the -- roles of the various organizations throughout the city that will be involved in the project, it will assign authority to me, the CAO, to conduct the assessment and where necessary implement corrective actions, resolution will also provide information on ongoing communications and interactions with the council, the commissioners in charge, the bureaus, the public and the general public, and finally it will provide a preliminary list of issues, both financial and tactical, that we will be concentrating on as we move through the assessment. But I want to be clear, that's not going to be a static list. It's very likely that issues will develop as we go through this process, we'll be adding things to the list. We will continually try to keep that prioritized. Because time is precious and in this case for this system time is money, I want to assure you we already have been taking action and -- in advance of this resolution. Ron Bergman has been temporarily reassigned from his duties as B.E.S. -- BGS director to head this project team. He has extensive project management, he also has experience with technology systems, including the installation of our current financial management system here in Portland. He's well into the process of identifying issues, talking to people, working on a work plan, and identifying the team members he believes he will need to get this job done. We've also been involved in what you previously heard, the review of the staff's report that was presented to you, and we feel that degree that we were able to look at the methodologies and the data you have an accurate report before you.

**Katz:** So you also think that the information in the report is accurate.

**Grewe:** Yes. And I want to highlight, though, that there is minimal time to get behind the numbers and into the data that's the source of the numbers, but I think the bureau has gone a credible job of correcting prior deficiencies and more accurately reporting the situation. And in that regard, just for a moment, you're going to find me very cautious to be using dates. I agree with the commissioner, we need to be clear about those milestone decisions and let the -- that the council understands when those are being made and why recommendations or decisions are going forward. I think what is going to be more important is that we agree on some key performance measurements related to this system, both financial and technical and that we are regularly feeding status information into you as to how progress is being made. That will be the best way of assessing whether or not we are getting to stability of the system. And I'll provide further information on that next week and Commissioner Francesconi, I'll try to you -- to talk to you in advance of your leaving.

**Francesconi:** You're going to give a list of performance measurements?

**Grewe:** Question. We've not had time to assess how readily the data is available, what we would like to do is give you weekly updates on those key performance measurements and we have to go and test to see if we dock that with the resources we have available. Let me conclude by -- I also wanted to point out, we are working hard to form the it -- i.t. Advisory team. Northwest natural gas has already committed to us, so we will have access to their i.t. Manager, and the reason that's important is they've gone through a similar process of installing a billing system that really didn't work, and then went through the added process of assessment and installation of a new system. So we'll have access to the manager that was responsible for that. And there's other it managers stepping forward as well.

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Katz:** Let me say in the media people were saying it's only government that's screwing things up, and I need to remind everybody that in this particular issue will it was a private sector also that had difficulty in developing a system.

**Grewe:** So we will learn from their experience and they'll help us, guide as we go through the assessment and take action into the future.

**Katz:** That doesn't mean us feel any better, but these are issues that even the private sector finds difficult to deal with.

**Grewe:** Yes. The final thing i'll tell you about today is, it's very likely we're going to need to engage some type of i.t. Quality assurance consultant. These are people that come in and really can get into the data and assess whether or not the system is working as has been specified and whether that -- whether problems being encountered will be resolvable in the future, so it's a good second opinion from individuals who are not connected with the people designing these programs. So again, you'll receive a resolution which you'll -- will have a bunch of attachments to it, tomorrow or friday, and we'll be calling around to your offices to see if you have questions or concerns about that and we'll be back before you on wednesday for you to take official action in terms of giving us the charge.

**Katz:** Just make sure that you touch base with commissioner Francesconi. Anybody else gone next week? No. Okay. Before --

**Francesconi:** I'll give you just -- as I should have given commissioner Sten, a list of issues. But only one question. You touched on it, but one is our outside expertise. These areas have -- are very complicated. It's my understanding 50% of these systems fail in the public and private says terror. So it's not only northwest natural gas, but it happens 50% of the time in -- and part of the reason is they're so complicated. I'm not convinced we have the expertise in-house to help us. Do you have some specific plans to get outside expertise?

**Grewe:** Yes.

**Francesconi:** You don't need to tell me now, but have you identified --

**Grewe:** We will have some of the best i.t. Managers I believe in the state, and maybe beyond the state. They'll be volunteering their time in most cases to help guide us as we move forward. So they'll be questioning the work plan, the process, providing information on items they think we're overlooking that we need to look at, those types of things. But I think to get into this system, and make a judgment as to whether or not it is going to work as we had intended to it work, all the things that were cited previously, will it have the flexibility, really is going to take a talent that I don't think is in the city, somebody to understand this database, understands how they've programmed the database, and making a judgment for us, educating us and making a judgment for us as an independent consultant as to whether or not we're going to be able to achieve -- achieve the things the system is set out to achieve. Hopefully it will be more technical than qualitative.

**Katz:** Questions of tim? Thank you.

**Grewe:** Thank you.

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

**Katz:** Anybody else want to testify? Then we'll take a break and we'll take everything else at the front of the calendar at 2 o'clock. John, why don't you start.

\*\*\*\*\*: Mine is very short.

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

**John Wish, member of PURB:** John wish, i'm a member of purb. And a citizen of Portland. I want to thank the council and particularly mayor Katz and commissioner Sten for the political leadership and for doing what would have happened in the private sector and asking for the resignation of the water bureau administrator. And I thank you for that. I think it was absolutely

**JULY 11, 2001**

necessary. Thank you for the leadership of how your -- you got your arms around this now. I had an e-mail conversation with mort over the weekend, and raised two questions with him in e-mail about cash flow, one question about cash flow and the other question about problem accounts. I have copies for you here of that e-mail correspondence. I don't feel that mort answered those questions. I think the council should ask for those questions to be answered. So that's my testimony.

**Katz:** Okay. Mort, you've just been challenged. All right. Thank you.

**Frank Gearhart, Gresham resident:** Frank gearhart, from gresham. I want to compliment the council for getting on this thing. Better late than never. This has -- the -- this has developed into a situation where we're not only involved in financial problems, but we're involved in the long-term strategy for the water supply system for the Portland metropolitan area. And I would just like to address a couple issues here. Number 1, the long-term contracts of the regional water providers, and that is a good share of the cash income for the revenue for the Portland water bureau. That's up in the air right now, and the regional providers, I don't think we have to stretch our imagination to think they're going to balk on really going forward without their terms being met. And so i'd like to suggest that in the interim here, consisting -- since this thing isn't going to be settled overnight, that we think seriously on the -- and the water bureau and commissioner Sten, to issue -- work on five-year contracts, rather than this long-term contract, I think that's imperative to get things moving here. Another issue that i'd like to bring up is that commissioner Sten has initiated the so-called regional providers supply initiative. And certainly this whole situation has developed here in the last year has thrown a monkey wrench in that thing. The providers out there, at least in the last couple meetings, have not been very aggressive in wanting to follow suit on this regional water that's already -- and so I would like to suggest that the council and the commissioner take a serious look at stepping back and not staking the lead on this -- taking the lead on this, because obvious the situations we're not financial did I -- the water bureau step back and the city provide initiative here for getting this thing moving with the regional providers. I think that's imperative to get things going here. Another thing that I think I would like to suggest that they look at here in this regional energy concept is more citizen involvement. I think it is critical that the citizens be involved not just testimony, but to be a committee set up of citizens to work with whoever is going to govern this thing. And I think it's a critical stage of who's going to carry the ball on this. I don't feel from my perspective that the water bureau is in a situation to do that. And I guess I hope that we as citizens can use our influence to keep this thing rolling, because we're in a critical state here right now. What's going to happen to our water supply system over the next 50 or 100 years is right on the table now, and we hopefully will not be sidetracked by this catastrophe that's happened in your billing situation in the water bureau. Thank you.

**Katz:** Questions? All right. John, i'm going to ask mort to respond in e-mail to the questions, and get the response to us. And john, if you're still not happy, respond back to mort and we'll have an e-mail conversation. Is there anybody else who wants to testify? All right. Is the council ready? Are there any other questions? Then let's move to accept the report. Roll call.

**Francesconi:** Just on that last comment before, I disagree with you, frank. Commissioner Sten initiated the regional water supply issue. He's perfect to lead it with the water bureau. We've got to fix this problem. I can understand how it can cause a temporary blip, but we need to fix this problem and get back to that with commissioner Sten in the lead. I want to thank two other people, groups, all those employees who I visited in the water bureau. They didn't create this problem. And they're trying to answer these calls, get these bills out, they're dealing with a hellish situation. And they're to be commended for hanging in there with no -- can you imagine? I can't imagine the kind of calls they're getting. So -- and the other group in addition to the city people are the

**JULY 11, 2001**

ratepayers that are paying. It my understanding more people are paying now. And that's good. 95, I don't know what the percentage is, the high, very high percentage of these bills are accurate and people are paying it. They're not using the excuse. And we need am ratepayers to do that. I guess the only new thing I would say here is that after we focus on fixing the problem and the bills, and including a collection system, I do any we need a retrospective outside look at what went wrong. And we need some outsiders to evaluate it from the perspective of what lessons to be learned. The mayor's just come up with one that really i.t. Systems of this mag sued, this city should be under one umbrella, but I think we need an outside look at this. I would like us to set a date at a fairly -- some point, but i'm not going to leave to it me to set that date. In your work plan and resolution next week, I would appreciate it if there's an item about an outside retrospective look once the problem is fixed. So that we can air it, learn some lessons, respond to the public, and then move on. Other than that, we're -- I appreciate the direction we're heading. Aye.

**Hales:** I just want to support the good work that's been doing here by commissioner Sten and the bureau to work our way out of the tough situation. I hear nothing that causes me any dissidence about the way you're proceeding. I think you're handling this well, I second jim's comments about the -- all the good employees at the bureau and the council should -- I think we all do -- send our encouragement and support to them, because they're doing a good job, and this is an unhappy chapter in otherwise long and successful story. I'm not sure jim exactly what you meant about an outside look. I guess before we hire a consultant to evaluate the work of a consultant we might want to remember the auditor and see what role we want the auditor to play after the fact. They do performance audits all the time, so I would rather use the talented we have there before we go outside or at least examine that as an option. But we certainly have plenty of talent available there as well as in the bureau itself to figure out what lessons we need to learn and how we make sure that other bureaus doing other work can avoid this problem. So good work so far. I look forward to the resolution of it all. Thank you. Aye.

**Sten:** I've said most of what I have foe say. It's been a very tough situation and I want to thank the council for their thoughtful help today and also for your recognition of the water bureau employees, and everybody. But particularly those folks that have been on the phones and trying to make this thing work. It's very difficult to try and work through the problems with the computer system one by wynn, and people are understandably angry when they call. So I appreciate that and would like to thank the purb for your work and I do agree we had communication problems, I want to push on you a little to help solve the problems, be clear in what you need and work with us, because it's not going to get -- you're not going -- we're not going to snap our fingers and get all the information, but we're on track to doing that. Our goal as this has really become such a big problem, is to make no excuses, but to try and explain as best we can what went wrong and learn from it. That's all you can do. And some of these things perhaps could have been avoided. Had we had better systems in place, but we've got to make it right now and we're going to move quickly under mort's leadership, and i'd like to close by making very direct thank you to the mayor and to tim grewe and if I went to them in crisis saying I need help and this is a team here and they stepped up and gave us a hand. And I very much appreciate that. Aye.

**Katz:** Let me say something very personal. Any of us could have found ourselves in the same situation, and I want to say something to commissioner Sten. He stood up and he said, it was my fault. I'll take responsibility. And that's a difficult thing for anybody to say, whether you're working in the bureau, certainly very difficult for an elected official to say. And I want to congratulate him on that. Because it would have been easier, far easier for him to point fingers all over the map. But he didn't do that. And because he didn't do that, we now have a team and we're going to work together and we're going to get it resolved. So thank you. A final point I want to

**JULY 11, 2001**

make. It is unacceptable for any city employee to keep information from the commissioner in charge and from the mayor. Who in the final analysis, whoever he or she may end up being here in the future, is ultimately by the public held responsible. Not by our charter, but by the public. And it's irresponsible for anybody from any bureau to keep that information from the citizens. And whether it's the water bureau or any other bureau that has information, that information needs to be shared. We cannot continue operating that way. And I know it's sensitive, because you don't want to point fingers from one bureau to another, from one commission or another. We are working in a political environment. But that is not an excuse for keeping information from especially from a commissioner in charge. Lesson to be learned. Never do that again. Thank you, everybody, for working hard. Mort, I don't know if you asked for this assignment, but if you did, you're going to have it, and we're going to hold you accountable as well. And tim, we're giving you the assignment with your team. We will not interfere with your work. You will need the assistance of the bureau, both b.e.s. And water in addition to your outside consultants. And make sure that you keep us informed. I vote aye. Thank you, everybody. We stand adjourned until 2 o'clock.

At 12:52 p.m., Council recessed.

**JULY 11, 2001**

**JULY 11, 2001      2:00 PM**

**Katz:** Good afternoon the Council will come to order please call the roll.

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

**Katz:** Mayor is present. Commissioner Saltzman is on vacation. We have 40 korean university students from our sister city. Am I wrong? [ laughter ] all right. And you're here for a month studying english language and american culture. You're sponsored -- I love it. Sponsored by Portland state university. And you find the city dull? [ laughter ] or just the two of you found the city dull? Well, we hope that you -- we hope that you -- commissioner Hales says we may be dull. We hope that you enjoy your stay. We hope that it's a wonderful experience at the university. We hope that you teach us something. We have a lot to learn, because we have learned from you in the past. I've been to your city and I christened a ship for Portland named "Portland" that can't get into the harbor because we have not a deep enough channel. But it did come into the harbor a couple of weeks ago, but it was half full. So we have our problems too. But have a wonderful time and enjoy the city. There are a lot of things that are going on in the city. So stay well, don't get arrested, and stay out of jail, all right? [ laughter ] because i'm not coming to bail you out. [ laughter ] all right. We left off at our regular agenda item, so let's do 868.

**Item 868.**

**Katz:** Does anybody want to testify on this item? If not, roll call.

**Francesconi:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [ gavel pounded ] 869.

**Item 869.**

**Katz:** We -- this was delayed. Correct, commissioner Hales? Does anybody want to -- does anybody know anything about this? Does anybody want to testify? All right. This is not an emergency, so it passes on to second. All right. Go ahead.

**Ben Walters, Office of the City Attorney:** I know something about it. Ben walters with the city attorneys office. Don gardner asked me to be here. He has staffed they. I told him this had been held over from this morning. I was just in attendance, don asked me to come if there are legal questions. I don't otherwise have a presentation.

**Francesconi:** Don had a complete presentation for us last time. I thought it was here on previous agendas so we could vote on it.

**Hales:** It's not here as a second reading?

**Katz:** No. I don't think we discussed it.

**Moore:** He had some people who wanted to testify, or --

**Hales:** That's right. He wanted to give them the opportunity to testify.

**Walters:** And I did speak to mr. Gardner about that. He indicated that he has talked to folks and he seems to have allayed most of the concerns. We have a meeting with one of the industry representatives next week to talk through some of how this is going to be arranged and followed through on. I don't know if anybody is here to testify.

**Katz:** I'll ask in a minute. Was this referred back to --

**Hales:** No.

**Katz:** So we can vote on it now.

**Hales:** Yes. He just wanted to give them the opportunity to testify or to have anything further to say about this.

**Katz:** Is anybody here to testify on it?

**Francesconi:** There is an issue I guess somebody talked to me, one of the utility companies talked to me about it yesterday or the day before. I flagged it to don gardner. And one of the companies,

**JULY 11, 2001**

very responsible company is concerned about how they are actually involved in the process. The engineers have given quite a bit of authority, and i'm wondering if commissioner if -- because i'm in your area, and I just got flagged yesterday, but there's a concern about how they will be involved themselves. So i'm wondering if you could look at that issue.

**Hales:** I think we can follow up with them. It sounds like there's a meeting next week anyway. My recommendation would be that we schedule this for second reading next week, because --

**Walters:** I think it was held over for a vote today.

**Hales:** So we can go ahead and vote on it and meet with those folks after the fact. I'm comfortable with that.

**Katz:** Okay. Thank you. Nobody wants to testify on this item. All right. Roll call.

**Francesconi:** I'm going to vote aye, but I -- the issue of having a specific role for the utilities involved in the process and maybe a way of checking, we're giving a lot of authority to the city engineer, which is appropriate, but if there was a way to appeal that to the commissioner in charge - - and those two issues are not listed in this ordinance, so maybe if you could just look at those two issues, I trust that you will deal with them, commissioner. They were just flagged to me as a late entry. Aye.

**Hales:** Fair concerns. I think without being flippant I think you can always appeal the commissioner in charge in any of these bureaus, including a decision of the city engineer. I'll double-check that. I just want to commend don gardner for his innovative way to bring order to the chaos now going on in our streets with all the fiber optic installation. I think this is a good policy and we'll make it work for the utilities as well as for all the citizens who have been frustrated by seeing streets torn upper six months. Aye.

**Sten:** We've worked with transportation, they've done a terrific job from the cable office's standpoint. I'm glad this is here. This will really make a difference. Aye.

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [ gavel pounded ] thank you. I need -- item 870, then I need a suspension of the rules to make this an emergency -- a suspension of the rules.

**Hales:** So moved.

**Katz:** Second? Trust me on this.

**Francesconi:** Second. Sorry.

**Katz:** Hearing no objection, so ordered. [ gavel pounded ]

**Katz:** This is a roll call vote. Roll call.

**Francesconi:** I think these are very good first steps to deal with a vexing problem. There is a balance between commercial interests, residential interests, but we do need to have some quiet, peace and quiet in our neighborhoods, and I think this does not go so far as to stifle legitimate and necessary commercial enterprise, and to make our city -- it won't make our city too boring, either, but it will give peace and quiet to our citizens. Aye.

**Hales:** Thanks, paul, for good work. More to come. This is a work in progress, but this is progress. Thank you. Aye.

**Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** I want to thank paul and certainly my office, who saw to -- sort of took this little project on because of all the complaints about noise in all different types of noises as living in a neighborhood that is very urban and very 24/7, I can certainly understand that. So you've got your work cut out for you. The time table should be soon era they're than later. And we'll be waiting for the next installment. Aye. Thank you. All right. And my neighborhood isn't boring, so come visit it. It's in northwest Portland. 871.

**Katz:** Okay. Commissioner Sten, did you want to add anything?



**JULY 11, 2001**

**Sten:** I don't think so. This is an important action we're joining up with epa and some other folks around the country. We actually a long time ago bought a certain percentage of our electricity through green sources so we're not chaining anything, we've already taken this step, it's really recognizing and joining with a coalition of folks that want to promote the idea of using green power sources. It's a good thing to do. Something we've already done as well.

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

**Francesconi:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [ gavel pounded ] all right. We're now to the afternoon schedule. Time certain, 872.

**Item 872.**

**Katz:** If all of you recall, we had a work session, we had a hearing, I don't know, we had a lot of discussion. Several work sessions. We went out on a tour, and we gave gil and susan the assignment to come back to a resolution. And the resolution looks like the constitution of the united states. I've never seen a resolution this long within -- with an exhibit this long. But what I think it took, it took a lot of collaboration among a lot of people, and -- in getting to some agreement about what folks wanted to cover in the study plan that's going to be ahead of us. So I accept your long, windy resolution. And would now like to hear from you.

**Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning:** I'll try to make my speaking portion less windy and more to the point. Gil kelley, planning director, and with me is susan hartnet from the planning bureau. Jim walker representing Oregon health sciences university is also here, as are representatives of a number of community and neighborhood groups today. As the mayor mentioned, we were last here with a work session in may, and you asked us to come back in about 60 days time with a resolution that would frame the process that we're about to undertake with Oregon health sciences university and the neighborhood on a 30-year development plan, including a satellite campus for Oregon health sciences university. We're back at day 65 with a resolution.

**Katz:** How many days did we give you?

**Kelley:** 60.

**Katz:** You're five days over.

**Kelley:** Yeah. I thought i'd get that out for the record right now. Although the resolution is long, let me just give you the four most important messages I think that are in that, and then susan is going to describe the scope of the work that we'll be undertaking over the next 18 months, approximately, to complete the long-range planning effort. First of all, I think it's important that we're engaging really in a very partnerlike fashion with a major employer and a major economic generator for future jobs in the central city with ohsu. But we're also doing that within the neighborhood context, and so we feel perhaps the most important message here is that this needs to be an open and collaborative process and using the legislative format rather than the quasi judicial we feel is the best road to go there. The resolution itself I think frames some important messages in that the first is that this sends a signal overtly from the city council to Oregon health sciences university's board that says very directly that we would like you to remain in the central city and expand second degree -- expand here. I also makes reference by the way to the potential for other future spin-off businesses to occur because one of the key functions for ohsu in Portland is the research function. And we see that growing over time. It also commends ohsu for -- commends ohsu for taking this step, which is hard for any institution, to take a 30-year long-term view and do that in a very open and dynamic way. So there's a commendation included for that. It confirms the legislative process that I mentioned a interest ago is the appropriate venue for this debate because it acknowledges both the university and the neighborhoods and the community at large in a way where we, really get to win-wins I think more appropriately than you can through a narrow quasi

**JULY 11, 2001**

judicial action. And as part of that legislative action, we're saying the whole issue about the tram, which would connect ohsu's hilltop campus with a potential campus in north macadam, it includes that in the legislative arena and debate. And so explicitly we would be looking at the tram and alternatives as well as the proposed north macadam site and understand alternative sites that might be feasible. And finally, it acknowledges very explicitly to the community at large and to the neighborhoods most affected that this whole planning process is being done within a neighborhood context, and that we really need to understand what the neighborhood concerns are and what their wishes are, and really try to maximize the benefit to the extent possible for neighborhoods. So I think those are the key messages in the resolution. We think it's important that you adopt this today so that we're sort of really officially out of the starting gate on this one and we've got -- we think our arms around all of the issues now. There are going to be a lot more nuances that we find out along the way, but we've assembled a group of representatives to advise me so that when we make proposals to the planning commission and council that has the benefit aside from larger public workshops has the benefit of really being at least a -- tested in in a way that gets us to the most kind of creative ideas that we can come up with in the process. So I will leave it there. I should mention the resolution you have -- that you are seeing now has gone through a process of its own. It's gone to the planning commission, it's gone to the Portland development commission leadership and I think cheryl is here today to -- that can report on that process. It's gone through interbureau process with review by pdot and b.e.s. And opdr and parks staff, and the resolution that was first drafted -- drafted six weeks or so ago has been changed to reflect those comments as well as comments we received from the neighborhoods.

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

**Susan Hartnett, Bureau of Planning:** Thank you. For the record, susan hartnett, bureau of planning. I want to take a couple minutes and hit some of the highlights of the work program. It is attached as an exhibit to the resolution. I'm going to use the flow chart, which is actually the last page of that exhibit to highlight some of the key elements of this planning process. The top line and the lines in green up there are sort of -- are community outreach and involvement activities. We have a community and technical advisory group that we've been meet can with since february. It's about 30 people all together. We've brought together interests from the neighborhoods, from the institutions on marquam hill, from some of the environmental and open space interest groups, such as the friends of terwilliger, as well as staff from the city bureaus that are going to be intimately involved in this process. We've spent the first several months with that group providing information about what this process will involve, and what ohsu's proposal is a proposed march couple hill plan which we can forward to the planning commission and ultimately to the city council. That would be the end of my presentation.

**Katz:** Questions? By council? Do you have a line-up of folks or do we just open it up?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** There's just a sign-up sheet.

**Katz:** Let's open it up to public testimony, then. Three at a time.

**Jim Walker, Executive Vice President, Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU):** Mayor and councilmen, my name is jim walker, and i'm the executive vice-president of ohsu. We've had a lot of conversations, we're going to have a lot more conversations, a lot of study needs to be done on this so we're going to keep this brief. I think one of the things just to mention briefly, there has been a whole lot of the focus when it comes to jobs when it comes to the connection with macadam and the tram, that's got a lot of attention. And those are very important items is the and stuff for the council to consider. But at the end of the day, our programs at ohsu are the things that will be more important at the end of the day and what those programs bring basically to the citizens of Oregon to the citizens of the region and especially because of our location to the citizens of Portland on that,

**JULY 11, 2001**

and we're not going to have time to get into those. We'll have a lot of those. But anyway, with that i'd like to pass it on to our provost dr. Alec.

**Leslie Hallick, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, OHSU:** For the record, my name is leslie halec, i'm the provost and vice-president for academic affairs. What it means is I worry about the education and research programs at ohsu. What I want to do, just a couple of minutes, is convey the sense of excitement of the point in time at which we're poised in Portland, at ohsu, and in Oregon and in the country. The best analogy I can think of, and it's because I have a lot of gray hair, is that in the '60s, the genetic code broke. And many of us who were in school during that time became molecular biologists. It was a field no one had heard of before that time and for three decades it made possible the discovery of genes that made viruses cause disease or death and -- and the ability to intervenes and -- intervene and prevent some of those activities. What's happened recently in the last few years is that the human genome project completion has given us a glimpse of what's to come in the next revolution. In that revolution in the '60s, that played out over the last three decade, biotechnology was born. The metropolitan area and -- in Portland and Oregon was not positioned to take advantage of that. There were half a dozen places in the country that were, seattle, boston, san francisco, the research triangle in north carolina, later san diego, and a couple of others. We were not for a couple of reasons. We didn't have the technology community we now have and we didn't have the research critical mass that we now have. This is a very different time. The human genome completion has provided us with a code for the entire dna sequence that makes up who you are. But that's just information. It's a line of letters. It doesn't help you one bit in curing disease until you understand how they work and what they do. If you can combine computer science and engineering with that information, a new field is just emerging. People don't even know what to call it. They're call it -- they're calling it a lot of different things, but they don't have a handle on even what it will look like, except that it's a new discipline. We're ideally positioned in this area to pull together the strengths both industrial and university research, to be real players, serious leaders in the country in that next revolution. Both at the university level and in the spin-out of companies that will capitalize on those inventions, translate them to true benefits for patients for citizens of both Portland and the state. So there's an incredible sense of excitement right now about the whole planning process in which we're engaged. Not gist because it -- we're being ordered to something that's a difficult challenge, but because it's going to make possible discoveries and developments that will really benefit all of us and all our kids and grand kids. So i'm extremely excited about where we are. We just finished an add with us legislative session, and one of the opens was they've granted us a very significant bond to build this infrastructure. So we're poised to take advantage of that and grow the next field, whatever it will become. And with that, i'd like to pass to dr. Edward newelle, to give you just a glimpse of the day in the life of a faculty member so you get at least a personalized feel for the complexity of our integrated mission.

\*\*\*\*\*: Thank you, doctor. Certainly I appreciate the opportunity, i've never had this opportunity before. This is a tough --

**Katz:** You do need to my yourself.

**Ed Neuwelt, Faculty Member, OHSU:** I'm sorry. I'm ed newell, a faculty member at the Oregon health sciences university and the Portland veterans hospital. My specialty is neurosurgery. I spend about a third of my time doing clinical neurosurgery. 400 general anesthesia cases as year, a third of my time doing research, eight federally funded grants and a third of my time teaching, doing injury prevention for students throughout the state in a program called think first, which has reached many Portland youth, and as well as having a science outreach program for Portland area high school students to learn biomedical research. The topic of expansion is very near and dear to

**JULY 11, 2001**

my hard, because it's just about this time three years ago that I was finishing a craniotomy and my beeper went off and there are certain number ones know, and the provost is one number that I know, and when I saw it goff on on -- off on my beeper I thought I better answer. He said good news and bad news. After a number of years all our laboratories would be in one location. Or we would have to go off the hill. To -- and at that point it would either be down at the river or out in beaverton. And I said, there's no way that I can stay at this university if I have to move off the hill, because the operating room doesn't work on a fixed schedule. Right now i'm waiting to hear from the operating room to use a special computer to do a brain tumor and it's probably going do happen in the next six hours. So I can't predict exactly when i'm going to have to go to the operating room. When i'm not doing that, I can run my laboratory. The third part is dealing with trying to get Portland youth involved in science. I brought here the final exams from the high school students that have taken our semester course where they're paired up with mentors throughout the university and we have high school students from virtually every high school in Portland. The first 3rd of the course is to hear the mentor's area of research. The second third of the course is that the students have to give a scientific journal club and the final is they have to write a four-page research proposal in the manner which dr. Jones had me do when I first came here 20 years ago. With the understanding that they -- many of them will go on through the summer and actually do the project. Not just watch test tubes, but do a hypothesis driven project. We've had a number of kids reh present their research on national levels, and I brought copies of these final exams if any of you want to look at them. These are -- they're very exciting and a lot of them I don't understand. [ laughter ] anyway, thank you for the opportunity.

**Katz:** If you don't understand, we're in real trouble. I think we'd like to see them.

\*\*\*\*\*: Can I come up?

**Katz:** Sure.

\*\*\*\*\*: I do what i'm told.

\*\*\*\*\*: Oh, yeah.

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

**Katz:** I will pass mine out on to commissioner Hales, who I think is --

**Hallick:** I think we'd be happy to answer any questions you might have but we don't want to take any more of your time.

**Katz:** We're just taking a quick look at -- bye, everybody. Have a good stay. Bye bye. Okay.

**Francesconi:** I have one question. I guess before I do that, jim, your comment about, we need to understand and appreciate the main campus, and all it does in terms of job creation and not just focus on macadam. I guess I do understand that, especially after our last informal. I think you gave us some numbers. Where you have 4,000 of our city residents work there, and an average wage of about \$31,000. You generate 230 million dollars in revenue. That's just center the employment side. Plus another \$90 million in people that visit. So you are our biggest economist engine right now, let along the future you were just talking about. Is and most of that happens at the main campus. But one way to take your remarks, which I don't think you meant it, but I want to ask you about it, is that therefore the spin-off that we create on macadam may not be research related, it may not generate tax increment revenue that is necessary to finance some of the public improvements to make this attractive to your doctors as well as the residents and neighborhood. So my only question to you is, if we do this and we end up approving the tram and making these investments, what assurances can you give us that we're going to be spinning off some tax increment at macadam to help pay for the improvements that you need, the neighborhoods need and the city needs?

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Walker:** I think when it comes to that, number 1, I want to make sure we make the statement that we think it will happen when it comes to the growth of ohsu, when it comes to the biotechnology, whatever the terms people are using. And I think one of the important things, and -- is to keep our programs. Because of the three different missions that we have, and the faculty interaction, that's why macadam becomes very important and the tram becomes very important. And when it comes to the biotechnology potential for down on macadam, it becomes very important. What the biotechnology spin-off companies basically want is access to our faculty. The people's brains. The brain power basically up on the hill and the discoveries that are going on. And they want quick access with that and they also want to be able to have the faculty -- faculty come down to their companies to provide guidance, whether that's for an hour or for a day. And they have to continue their functions of faculty. And that's where the transportation issue as we have talked about is very important with the tram. When it comes to an assurance how can we assure, can we provide insurance, we can't provide insurance. We have a very high level of confidence and we'll be showing you information that will reflect other communities that have the growth and research that we have had and what's happened in those areas. So I think we have a very strong level of confidence. Number 1, we have a very strong level of -- in the 200 million from the state makes it assured that we will grow in the research area. We're already nationally and internationally known. This infusion is going to even make us more important on that scale.

**Hallick:** Leslie hallick, provost at ohsu. Just a quick footnote. If history is very instructive here. If you look at ucsf or university of Washington, the ability to spin out companies right around the institution, and very close proximity, was the key factor in allowing that catalyst to occur, because the same individual who comes up request the idea in the initial discovery is really critical to its first development. Once there's a company developing something and it's the prototype, then it can grow and that proximity can't quite as critical. But to create those jobs and spin-out companies you're describing and that we need, they will work best if they're close. There's no question. And you can look at boston or ucsf and they call it the belt in Washington. You can really see where they've spawned right around the research centers.

**Katz:** Thank you. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Hi. It's not west end, you know that. You'll never forget -- forgive me. I know. It's nice to see you.

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

**Katz:** Do you want to start? Bring the mike closer to you.

**Kim Kimbrough, President and CEO, Association for Portland Progress:** I'm kim kimbrow, president and ceo of the association of Portland progress. I'm here today testifying on behalf of app, the association for Portland progress and to extend our whole support to the resolution before you today and to urge you to adopt it. We do not believe that it is being overly dramatic to say that the city of Portland is in our opinion as much as -- at a crossroads as is ohsu as symbolized by this decision on the part of one of the nation's leading research institutions to pursue development of a master plan for its future growth inside the city of Portland. While the 1990s were a decade of prosperity for this city, central Portland actually lost market share to the region as a whole. Primarily in its bread and butter markets of office. Job growth in the center city was mediocre at best during that same high growth period regionally, as the economy overall has slowed in the last few years, business license revenues have plateaued and might be at a point of declining. It's clearly a wake-up call to us in the business community and in the core of the city. At the same time, small infill development has flourished throughout the city, and in downtown as well. North macadam, immediately adjacent to the core of downtown, a prime redevelopment opportunity, encompassing 130 acres, has languished during that same period of prosperity. The ohsu master planning process before you today presents an opportunity to proactively address we believe four

**JULY 11, 2001**

issues. The first one is to create high quality jobs in the central and central Portland, in the center city. In new cutting-edge industries of the mind. Like biotechnology. Secondly to forge a partnership that will provide the catalyst for creating the kind of high-quality urban neighborhood in north macadam that we all desire. Thirdly, to support the growth of one of our largest employers and fourthly, to enhance the city's tax base for many years to come. We clearly understand that there's a lot of hard work ahead with regards -- hard work ahead with regards to resolving the final issues related to construction of a tram linking north macadam and the ohsu hill. The stakes are high. If we want to remain the heart of this great region, we have to rise to the occasion, we have to collectively work hard to retain and grow our existing businesses, and ohsu is a business, a substantial business as we've heard on numerous occasions. And ultimately make the hard decisions necessary to help this great institution achieve its potential inside the city of Portland. I so -- by so doing, the city will benefit greatly for generations to come. We ask for your support. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Sho Dozono, President, Azumano Travel Service and Chair, Portland Chamber of**

**Commerce:** Sho, president of azumano travel service, chair of the Portland chamber of commerce. Along with kim and other people have testified, I want to sort of borrow from leslie halec words of excitement. As a chamber and business person in Portland, we would -- we are excited about this opportunity that the legislature has given to our community, \$200 million bond levy that we will certainly support raising money to make sure that bond levy is passed by the citizens here, because we think this is one of the largest economic development opportunities to come to our community in a long, long time. And i'm -- I won't talk about the opportunity and the new discovery, but when know when dr. Brian dereker spoke at our breakfast, just looking at the audience we were so excited about opportunity, this one person wants -- one institution has brought to our communicated. This is one of the opportunities for us to become a world class research and development center. Mayor and city council has spoken about a world class city, and this is an opportunity for us to bring a different kind of opportunity and job creation. We have languished to some degree in our central city. Has a business representative, we think this is a critical juncture in our opportunity to really say to ohsu that we want them to stay here, we want them to continue to develop and -- in a world-class facility, opportunity to really develop new jobs and to maintain what they have. And commissioner Francesconi asked about some assurances, if you look at your document, it talks about growth, 1975 to 2000, fiscal year 1975, 80 million operating budget. This year, 841 million dollar operating budget. The employment, \$4,325, now 10,100. These are the past history that would tell you if continue to invest in that institution, they're likely to continue that growth for our city and our community. Again, there's a chart about university of Washington, I was very impressed with -- looking at their last three decades of growth in one of your charts, it talks about the spin-offs. We're excited about bringing new companies, global companies that will partner with ohsu to bring new kind of industry, clean industries that can bring jobs and lots of dollars not only to our local investment, but national, federal dollars that can really take us to a different plateau. So I hope that you will support this resolution, and as a business community, business person, I fully and enthusiastically support this resolution. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Ric Saito, representing North Macadam Development Council:** My name is ric saito, i'm here representing the north macadam development council. At the council work session in may, I provided testimony in support of the Oregon health sciences university expansion into the north macadam district. I'm here again today on behalf of the north mack adam development council to support this expansion by adopting the resolution that's been presented to you. The city has a

**JULY 11, 2001**

unique opportunity to capitalize on two different developments, potential developments. One is the expansion of ohsu. It will generate new jobs, new investment, new research and development. It will create continued enormous benefits for the region in which they and their anticipated spin-offs are located as mentioned by sho. The second development opportunity is north macadam. I'm surprised you would bring this up to you. North macadam will revitalize an under developed brown field site in -- and contribute to the continued redevelopment of the central city. The district will be a new urban center for jobs and housing, it will have an enhanced greenway, additional parks, and riverbank and water treatments that will improve fish habitat, helping to address the region's esa issues. Taken together, combining these two development opportunities can only result in exponential benefits to the city as a whole. The city needs to capture new job growth and investment. Ohsu will create new and -- investment and jobs. Ohsu needs space, north macadam has vacant land. North macadam needs investment to achieve the city's visions as well as their own. Ohsu locating within north macadam will stimulate this type of investment. It's vital to create this growth opportunity within the city. On north -- a north macadam adjunct campus cannot be a standalone facility as we understand it. If it's -- it's success depends on rapid and convenient access between the two campuses. Portland has been willing to be first in innovative transportation systems in the past and has a history of this. Max, the central city streetcar, to a larger region the commuter rail in Washington county, and high-speed rail in the northwest, are alley they're in place or under discussion. We believe the tram is a logical next step for Portland in which they can continue the leadership role in moving people. The tram should be seen as part of a comprehensive transportation system and solution. One group that has been addressing these challenges of transportation is the south Portland transportation alliance. The group is comprised of representatives of nmde, corbett terwilliger lair hill, ohsu, Portland state university, the alliance for Portland progress, central eastside industrial community, Portland development commission, Portland department of department of transportation, tri-met, and metro. While the tram is not part of their analysis, this transportation link fits into a combination of solutions that will contribute to solving our area wide historical transportation problems. It is clear that once the tram connects the two campuses, there are significant other public transportation benefits that can be linked to it. Several tri-met express and local lines can be diverted into north macadam, providing the transportation that north macadam needs.

**Katz:** Your time is up.

**Saito:** Okay. Ohsu is an ideal partner for many reasons. But their history in shaping transit habits is also very important, and -- in that they have achieved a 50% mode split and are striving for 60%. They've also helped north macadam in pursuing funding for transportation management association within our district.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Saito:** The vision of north macadam is not only to create a location for new jobs and housing and parks, but to create a world class place that embraces the river and enhances Portland's unique character of urban development. We urge you to support the ohsu proposal.

**Katz:** Thank you. Questions? Thank you, gentlemen.

**Katz:** John, why don't you go ahead first.

**John Carroll, :** Good afternoon, i'm john carroll. This is very exciting for me to sit here before you and talk about things that are pretty close to me. I sit here and share my thoughts from two perspectives, one as a citizen and the other as a participant. And a lot of planning has gone on as it relates to land use and certainly the streetcar. It's exciting for me. I'm also feeling a little old because I start making notes and I realized 18 years ago I was chairing the johns landing planning subcommittee and we got up to establishing the northern boundary and we looked at north

JULY 11, 2001

macadam and the area that we're talking about now and we said, that is so far out. It is so far down the road that we're probably not going to have enough time to think about that. 18 years later i'm sitting here talking to you about it. I'm a little excited about that. I participated 15 years ago in the central city plan. One of the back bones of the central city plan was transportation. And connecting these neighborhoods. Identifying the values of the neighborhoods. Ten years ago, somebody said give me six months, let's work on the streetcar. Ten years ago I was going to give it six months, it's now ten years in and in ten days we get to open the streetcar this. Is a very exciting time. Big picture from the standpoint of transportation and encouraging redevelopment -- the three principles, the three words we use in the document that was the basis for our streetcar plan was commitment, permanence and catalyst. And as we think about the opportunities in the north macadam area, certainly when you talk to a developer and i'm in the development business, and you ask is there -- are there opportunities for tax increment financing, is there going to be more than just institution that's are nonprofits that won't generate any tax increment, the answer is, with the kind of activity that ohsu is going to bring down, you will see an incredible amount of support services that are not tax exempt. You will see housing that is not tax exempt. You're going to see commercial and retail activities. And they're going to be there, because one, the district is accessible, there's a large job population, it is going to be comfortable to operate in. We're going to have access to the river, access to downtown, it will create an environment in which people like myself in the business that i'm involved in, are going to make private investments. Those private investments are taxable. Those taxable investments are the source of the funds to put the infrastructure in that you folks are going to need that we're going to need to encourage other people to come down. This group sitting up here, I -- they came in, they were looking at council and for them it was a bunch of suits going blah, blah, blah. But the reality is, those people stepped into a room to listen to a conversation about one of the most important issues, one of the most important events that this city has encountered and will encounter over the next several decades.

**Hales:** You don't have to be a korean to get that impression, by the way. [ laughter ]

**Carroll:** So I wanted to say, listen. This is big picture stuff. Let's get excited about it. What about the streetcar? What about the proposed tram? I'm advocating in -- rick did a very good job -- i'm advocate cannot just a streetcar or not just a tram and try to focus exclusively on that. I want us to step back and if it's -- excuse me. I want to step back and be able to focus on a regional transportation system, because ten years ago whether we talked about the streetcar, we said let's not have this be a photo opportunity, let's make sure it connects to mass transit. And light rail. So we can tell a story about how the region is going to operate. You put a system like that in place, you talk about the private sector opportunities and going down, i'm looking, talking about making money now, private sector opportunities to find themselves working next to an institution the size of ohsu, we don't lose them to the suburbs, we keep them downtown, you'll see the tax increment, you'll see the activity, you'll see the commitment to the river, you a --

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Larry Beck, resident, Corbett-Terwilliger Lair-Hill Neighborhood:** Larry beck, I live in the corbett terwilliger lair hill neighborhood association. I've worked with the no tram to ohsu group and i'm on the ctac committee for planning bureau. We have testimony, written testimony, which is available to you today that shawn brennan has prepared, which I hope you prepare -- you read before voting on this. There's some fairly detailed background and also recommendations for you in terms of dealing with the ordinance as a whole and some specific amendments and deletions and suggestions. So I do commend that to your reading. We want to focus today, I want to focus today not on the substantive issues that we dealt with at may third, but on the procedural issues, since that what we're here for, is this ordinance and --



**JULY 11, 2001**

**Katz:** It's a resolution.

**Beck:** Excuse me. My mistake. This resolution. And i'm recommending that you do not pass this ordinance. I think there's some basic resolution, excuse me. That you do not pass this resolution. There is a problem with treating marquam hill plan district as -- under a legislative process. We have one landowner. Plan districts are not intended for one landowner under our city code. So there's that procedural problem that's going to open up the whole process to challenge. Basically this is a quasi judicial process that's masquerading as a legislative process. So that's going to open it up to challenge and it will result in other challenges. Secondly I want to talk about the tram itself and the proposal to include the tram in the legislative process. We believe that is error as well. The second handout we have for you today is a letter from william cox that was delivered to all of you at the may 3rd work session, also sent to the city attorney a month ago. So that's included here as well. The details not only the Portland city code, reasons why this needs to be included as quasi judicial, but also Oregon common law. And because will the tram passes outside of this planned district, and also for most of its length and also out of the north macadam planned district, it cannot properly be dealt with in the context of those plan districts. We have and as Oregon law addresses, if you have a relatively small number of parcels that are going to have a very significant impact on those particular parcels and not just len citywide or area wide quasi judicial is the proper process. So we believe it would be err for you to include the tram as part of this legislative process. So I would commend mr. Cox letter to you to very view as well. Another concern that we have, this is just generally difficult with legislative process versus a quasi judicial process, we detailed for on you may 3rd the number of protections our city has. That would prevent this in the terwilliger guidelines, the south Portland historic district, just other code sections. And in quasi judicial you serve as a judicial body. You have to enforce existing law under the legislative plan or this legislative process, your legislators and you can change the law. And I think it's inappropriate for a novel proposal like this that doesn't exist as a use category anywhere, that you can change the law to make this happen. So that again I think is err and I think Portland -- people in the city of Portland count on those protections being enforce and not having you make changes.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Sean Brennan, 20 SW Gibbs St, 97201:** Mayor and commissioners, I live at 20 southwest gibbs, also part of the no tram to ohsu group. You'll notice i'm not wearing a suit so I hope that what I say doesn't go by as blah blah blah. Larry did give an outline of the kind of error we think this resolution will court. And by court I also mean that as open to challenge in court. We think we have delivered now a letter to the office of planning and development review director asking for her to pass on to the city attorneys office for determination as to the form of the process required terror for this tram decision. That is not a decision that can be made by the city council or by the planning commission without at least some advice and opinion from the city attorney's office, therefore they need to make that determination and the citation for that is 33.700.070-g, which gives that responsibility to the office of the city attorney.

**Katz:** Let me interrupt you. I'll give you your time. Kathryn, are you aware of all these legal issues? Are you prepared to respond to that today?

**Kathryn Beumont, Office of the City Attorney:** I'm aware of the principle issue they're raising as to whether or not the legislative request --

**Katz:** You would -- are you prepared to respond to that?

**Beumont:** Yes.

**Katz:** Okay. Go ahead.

**Brennan:** We have asked for a normal finance as a response to that. I don't know if they're prepared to provide that today or not. In any event, we've asked for that determination and that

**JULY 11, 2001**

should be made before this resolution is passed. The specific things we want to have out of the resolution concern the tram itself. We think that is a decision that should be made in a quasi judicial basis for the protection of the rights of the parties involved. Legislative process is intended for more general kinds of questions as to policy and determination for citywide kinds of issues. This has an effect on specific parties, in this case landowners property owners within the cthl neighborhood the north macadam neighbor and the plan district on the hill. We think those parties can be included in the process and we think the protection for the right after will the people involved would be better served by a quasi judicial process -- -- this resolution gives authority for reviews and evaluating am of the items that are -- for inclusion to the very agencies that have been openly advocating this plan all along. That's the bop and the planning -- the pdc have been openly advocating this proposal, particularly for the tram for months now. And we question their ability to objectively evaluate this particularly if not given direction by the council to do so on a third-party basis. Our confidence in this process as a legislative process is very low. We also think that as a matter of law, this should be considered a quasi judicial process because there are specific provisions in title 33 that require to be so. The cthl neighborhood is a national historic district. It also lies within a design district. Both of those provisions require that this be a type 3 process for review of any proposal that occurs or -- or goes through any of those areas included in that area this. Is outlined in the testimony we gave. We've asked for specific changes to the resolution, amendment and conclusions, also to the work plan. We ask that you give very careful consideration of that, hopefully you've had a chance to review it. We did supply the testimony idea. And we request that you do consider this and not pass this resolution as it is -- in its current form. Certainly without the amendments we suggested. We did provide this testimony also to the planning commission and bop. The suggestions and requests we made were not acted on, and basically ignored for the current resolution. We would like to have those considered at this level. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. Questions? Thanks. Karla?

**Katz:** The reason that I asked our city attorney at least for an overview is because it is a resolution, and unless I hear differently from the council, we will be acting on it, but unless -- if the city attorney tells thus is great legal problems, then we would delay. If that's -- that's the reason i've asked. She will submit or decide how to submit or -- a written response or some kind of a response to the query, but the council would like to have at least some indication of what her thinking is today. All right. Cheryl.

**Cheryl Twete, Portland Development Commission:** Good afternoon, mayor and council. Cheryl tweety, staff at the development commission. I'm here on behalf of don, the executive director of pdc to express our support for the resolution before you today. Don has submitted a letter that you have just received, which outlines some of the and/or critical issues to be dealt with as part of the marquam hill plan. Many of these issues and considerations impact one of our newest districts, the north macadam area. The commission is very interested in working with ohsu as a major economic generator westbound the city. One of the largest employers in the region. Both in terms of their marquam hill plan district and as well as the opportunities for -- in north macadam. Don also wanted me to express to you that he has had the opportunity to talk with a couple of our commissioner, marty brantly and commissioner john russell about the resolution and they have both endorsed the work and have committed to -- that the commission will work with the planning bureau and the other bureaus throughout this process every over the next year.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Barbara Walker:** My name is barbara walker. I haven't worked on the process that's brought this resolution to you, but I have had the privilege of working both with ohsu on its master plan, which

**JULY 11, 2001**

led to this, and on the north macadam district. I guess out of that I want to hit two or three big picture items for me. The first is that ohsu's needs to expand is real. I think only if we lost it could we fully appreciate how vital it is to Portland. The jobs, the economy, they've been well discussed today. But for many of us who are citizens who know the quality much its care and the quality of the research that goes into making that care available here, at the crossroads of the state's freeways, it is vital for health as well as economy and jobs that we keep ohsu here. I couldn't feel more strongly about that. From the north macadam standpoint, we looked from the beginning at the need to find the proper job base and the proper residential identity for north macadam. And we have hoped very much to have this incredible opportunity of the biotechnology, or whatever it's called, that's associated with that, become a real incubator industry, which can bureau and can place -- it will be as great as silicon valley if we can allow it to happen here. It will happen somewhere. Will it happen in Portland, or will it happen someplace else? I think we want it here. This brings to the head the tram question. I happen to be a friend and respect the people on the other side of the tram issue. But I believe just as strongly that the tram is a vital and appropriate solution. Someone may come up with something better, like a practical hot air balloon. But short of that, I can see nothing which would cause less impact to the forested hillsides to terwilliger boulevard and the parks and green space and open space around there, which I treasure and want to protect. It's very easy to look at the towers and say what you think. I would not mind a tram going over my house. I happen to believe that the issues of privacy, noise, et cetera, are not much different from the buses that pass by my house, look into my windows, look into my yards, the streetcars that used to go by as a child. We accept these as an -- as a necessity and we all do our part to make the city work. The last thing I want to say is, whether -- however you solve this legislative judicial thing, my plea is for you to make it work. And my plea is for you to keep in mind if ohsu cannot expand there, it will be sucked out like water out of a bathtub. And what would go there will not be single family houses, the impact, the roadways, you wouldn't get a 60% mode split out of whatever went there. And we would have far more impact to the neighborhood, the city, the economy, and everything else. So somehow make it work.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Moore:** That's all we had signed up.

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

**Robert Neurberger, Vice Chair, CTAC:** Mayor Katz, commissioners, my name is robert, I am a vice chairman of the homestead neighborhood association. I have the pleasure to serve on the ctac for the marquam hill study plan. I want to add a few things. There is absolutely from no one I have talked to or my participation in this process to date that in any way is critical of ohsu. Their mission, player goals, it's an important resource no. Question about it. My concern is -- as -- is we look past where do we go from today, and past the resolution. Issues about transportation. Impact on the neighborhoods. And preservation and enhancement of green spaces. One of the things -- it's not really -- my commented is not so much directed to the resolution, but that the things like the tram, the transportation issues we've talked about so far at ctap have not begun to addressed overall transportation issues. We have a transportation problem which council made their tour when the planning commission made their tour. Those bus trips had to be timed so that they didn't get caught up in the log jag of the traffic jam. The tram does not begin to address that. I don't want to turn this into a debate about tram. I just want to highlight the point that there are other important transportation issues that we have not yet begun to focus on and need to as part of our overall transportation planning for -- to make this marquam hill plan work. Thank you.

**Francesconi:** The planning director was not -- nodding his head affirmatively behind you.

**Neurberger:** Thank you.

**JULY 11, 2001**

**Katz:** All right. Gil and susan, come on up. Gil, and susan. You've heard the testimony. Any questions of staff?

**Francesconi:** I have one question. Is there any way to do this faster without sacrificing the citizen involvement process that you need to do this thing right?

**Kelley:** Well, we're a little nervous about the time frame. Susan's nervous every day and tells me so about the time frame we have already. I think legislative process, because they are open, are necessarily of a certain length. I wanted to emphasize the role of the ctac. We've recuted it slightly from a ctac to a ctac, which means they don't need to vote or take formal positions, they're free to do that as individuals before deliberative bodies like yourselves and the planning commission. We have reformed the notion that they're really there to help susan and I brainstorm through the best possible solutions here and I honestly am looking for the most win-wins we can get out of this. Because I think in are some potential benefits to the neighborhood that are very substantial that could come out of this, and I think that takes a the bit of time, and I -- in contrast to some of the comments that were made today about the bureau being actively advocating the tram, we haven't. It may appropriate for some other agencies to do that. We haven't. We actually want to take the time in that group to look at the questions underneath that are driving this, because I think that's the only way we're going to get to solution that's in the end you feel comfortable with and possibly some new ideas that come out that no one's thought of yet. So I think that does take a bit of time. We are conscious of ohsu's need for certainty within a certain time frame so we don't jeopardize our role in the regional situation here by taking too much time.

**Katz:** I can attest to that, because this is my bureau, and we've had some conversations about that, and what gil just said is exactly accurate.

**Francesconi:** I guess my last question, and then katherine can address it too, what -- why do you again, I think you said 90 your opening remarks, but in light of the testimony we had, why do you prefer a legislative as opposed to quasi judicial? Then we can get the legal opinion if the mayor wants to do it that way.

**Katz:** That's fine.

**Kelley:** I think when we started, probably both -- some elements of the neighborhoods and the ohsu institution preferred the quasi judicial. There's a lot of process just to go on to sort of convince people that I think the legislative is better and some have come around to that point of view and others have clearly not. Either side can take comfort in a narrower process. It might be a shorter trip to yes or to know, and you sort of risk everything. My question there was not about that so much as what gives the ability for the city as the intervener and convener here to really do the appropriate kind of balance can. Not restricted by strict land use criteria that are in the code, because we're looking at more than the tram here. We're looking at major build out of 5 million square feet more done and the potential for spin-off industry. That needs to be done in a more comprehensive fashion, which has the ability to reach out and take the neighborhood concerns in and to try to find solutions that may not be the outcome of a hearing officer decision, for example.

**Francesconi:** Okay.

**Hales:** May I can -- maybe I can follow up and, vera, you're going to give katherine a chance to respond. I want to pose this question to both you and katherine, because frankly i'm puzzled by this dispute. Because I fear that both sides have invested all kinds of anxiety and hope in this decision, and they may both be wrong in that frankly when I looked at this and looked at the material that we got from the no tram coalition and just thought about this, it seems to me that regardless of whether or not the planning process look at a tram, it remains very likely that some portion of siting a tram is going to be a quasi judicial decision no matter what we do in the planning proper said. So i'm

**JULY 11, 2001**

puzzled that we're in this trench -- entrenched battle about whether or not it's going to be a quasi judicial or a legislative decision because I think my working assumption is it's going to be both.

\*\*\*\*\*: I think you're right. I can't imagine siting a 200-foot tower in an e-zone and having any legislative process prevent that from being a quasi judicial decision. Help me out. How is it that the worse fierce of the coalition could -- worse fears could be realized, rather than -- rather we choose realize them or not, that we could somehow draft the legislative process that would make it possible to make that decision and not exercise factual policy or legal judgment, or bump into any one of the number of resolutions. I'm just flummoxed by this dispute. I think both sides have invested all kinds of assumptions that aren't right.

**Kelley:** I think you're almost right on that. I would just add one more pieces, which I think the notion behind the legislative process is that we may give some parameters to the subsequent quasi judicial process, which there really isn't one. There isn't a clean one right now under the city code. And I think you're absolutely right, not enough would be known in the legislative process to make that decision. So some form of subsequent decision will have to be made with regard to the tram. The question is, what will that produce says look like and what will the criteria be for it? I think that's going to be part of what gets hammered out in the legislative so it's -- there's likely to be a two-step --

**Hales:** Partially hammered out. A lot of this stuff is already in the code. In the -- the e-zone regulations --

\*\*\*\*\*: Yeah. That's part true.

**Hales:** Maybe katherine wants to comment on that.

**Beaumont:** Thank you. I have had an opportunity to consider the argument that has been raised, that somehow the council is required to go to treat the march couple hail plan study, development of a marquam hill plan as a quasi judicial rather than a legislative -- through a jaws I judicial rather than a legislative process. And commissioner Hales, I think you're right. I think what might eventually emerge is a combination of two things. First a legislative process and then possibly a quasi judicial process to follow. The courts have established three hallmarks for a quasi judicial process. First that you're dealing with a very small circumscrib d geographic area, typically a property, or a single property owner. Secondly that you're required tos -- as part of whatever this process you're going through to apply preexisting criteria. Third that the process will result in a decision. Having considered those criteria, I don't think the process of developing a marquam hill plan is a quasi judicial process. As the resolution itself points out, this involves both public and privately owned property, not just property owned by ohsu, it involves 300 or more acres so there is a more than just a very closely circumscribed geographic area. While in general the city is required to measure any regulation that's it develops against the comprehensive plan or the statewide planning goals, there really are no preexisting criteria in the same way there are when we consider a conditional use or a variance or something of that nature. And finally, the process isn't necessarily bound to result in a specific decision as it is in the permit case, where you say, yes, it's approved or no it's denied. You will have the planning bureau will likely come back to you with a range of recommendations and you will have a range of policy choices. And in a sense this is no different than the -- than our typical process of developing a neighborhood plan or small area plan which we handle through a legislative process. So I respectfully disagree with the opinion that's been offered and do believe that the marquam hill plan can and should proceed through a legislative process.

**Katz:** Okay. Further questions? All right. Roll call.

**Francesconi:** Well, on this last issue first, I accept the opinion of the legal attorney for basically four reasons. One is that it isn't just one property. Two is, there isn't clear preexisting criteria, and

JULY 11, 2001

third, we've done it before for this kind of process. And number 4 is the issue that gel said. It's an appropriate balancing that we need to undertake. Folks, before I was a city commissioner, we would present cases to judges with very narrow criteria that in certain cases I don't believe they followed. They would weigh the balancing. Sitting up here with the city council over the last five years on an issue like this, you may have narrow criteria, legal criteria, but i'm not convinced we would fall el -- follow them. It's more appropriate that we balance interests in an issue this important not only to the neighborhood, the city, not only to the state, but the whole area. So I think for that fourth reason especially, that this is the most appropriate. I guess just briefly, this is perhaps -- it's easy to overstate things, but it is an exciting moment in human history, really. Not only for the city, but for human history when we can real liqueur things potentially like cancer. And I was at the chamber breakfast at -- that was referenced, and it's not just that this is important for high quality jobs in the city, which it is, and which macadam was designed for, it's not only that it can help create an urban high-quality you're plan neighborhood, which we're not going to be able to create without this, moo shy view, and it's not just that it's going to enhance a tax base to pay for parks and schools at a time we're having a heck of a time doing it, but the fourth reason that this is so important is just the hope that it provides for our city and for our community. When brian trucker spoke, it's easy to see sometimes the glass is half empty in Portland and we complain about different things. Me included. But the room was just uplifted by this one scientist who was doing it to cure people. And he showed slides of people coming to Portland that thought they were going to die. And it -- because of my own personal circumstance at the time, it was particularly touching. And these people from not dying one week to being cured the next, and this was happening in Portland, and it wasn't just the economic spin-off, the hope that it gave that room i've never seen anything like it. Ever. And so we need to seize this. This is something we can do. We can seize this. This is a turning point. And we can do it in a way that takes the neighborhood into condition context. I was really pleased to see the lawyer's brief at which they cited all the requests that the neighborhood had made to mid-gait this thing. And they said, we may not be able to do all of these, but they listed eight things that the neighborhood wanted, the homestead neighborhood wanted, and another five things that the friends of terwilliger -- and this was in the employer -- that this was in ohsu's brief. And so those are the kind of things we need work on. Now, the tram I personally have looked at it, I think, and I told the neighborhood, I wouldn't want this tram contrary to barbara walker's testimony, I wouldn't want this tram over my head, but I thought it was necessary to do this thing. What I think now is not the issue. Because i'm not sure, because I want you gil kelley, to independently evaluate this thing, and make a determination as to whether it's necessary. This process, and make a recommendation to us. This process legislatively will allow that to happen. And I also want you to look at these items to see if we could work on this to benefit a neighborhood that has had more of its share of distinction from a transportation standpoint especially. I want to you look at the issues of green' space and park's role to see whether we can preserve marquam. Not only to make a world class greenway, but we have marquam nature park and we can turn this into a win-win. Above all else, we have to seize this moment. Ogi combining with ohsu is the best thing that's happened in the history -- one of the best things to happen in our city. And we've got president situ right there that can join in with them. This is something. And they're already doing things for our kids. In this book that you just showed us. So this -- we need to do all we can to advance this. Aye. In a timely fashion. [ laughter ] aye.

**Hales:** Of course we need to could a plan for the place. But I want to review the warning that I have periodically issued about this, and that I issued I think when the council was up on the hill, and that is in this unfortunately polarized battle that we're already in, immersing itself in legalities and increments of mitigation, that we in danger of being confused -- we, I mean the city council

JULY 11, 2001

and the city at large -- being confuse and distract and diverted from the more important questions. And that is, what's the nature of the place that we're creating on the hill, and what's the nature of the place that we're going to create in north macadam? And we are in danger of losing sight of those basic planning questions. And I have told ohsu more times than they've enjoyed hearing that i'm not going to support a tram until I know what it's connecting. And I don't know yet whether it's connecting what we have up there today, which is a hodgepodge of ad hoc construction, acknowledged by their own planning effort that they've begun to try to do better than that, but that's what's there now. And on one side we're hearing -- and I too, jim, am moved and impressed by what's being accomplished there academically, but that's not what we're talking about in this room. What we're talking about in this room is place making. That's the planning process. And what we need to do, what our responsibility is is to know that the place that we're going to create on marquam hill and at north macadam is so good, that it justifies our approval. And then may or may not justify various transportation gadgets to make it work, whether they're streetcars or trams or hot air balloons, or whatever else we need. But I am worried. I just want to reiterate that worry, that in -- that's how planning get done in suburbia, folks. The question is, how far will the developer, in this case ohsu gets to wear that hat, guess which color it is, and be the -- the question is how far will the developer be able to have their way with us and how much mitigation and damage control do we get in exchange? And everybody forgets about creating a good place. The difference about Portland is we've usually gotten it right. And john carroll I think is still here, we've usually said, what kind of place are we going to create, and then what kind of transportation equipment do we need to make that place work? And -- instead of the other way around, the way it happens in suburbia and the way it happened in Portland for a while, we build the transportation thing first, the suburbia it's usually a freeway interchange, and figure out what kind of development works around that. Wrong. We say in Portland that we do it the other way around. We need to do it the other way around in this case too. I've been frustrated from this discussion from the beginning. Everybody got into an early pitched discussion about the tram, and I fear it's going to continue even longer, and that's fine, people can argue it's politics, it's democracy. But our job at this table, and in your office, is to make sure that arguing or not about the tram, that we do a good job of crafting a plan for the place of the hill, and of north macadam. And i'm trying to try to keep my eyes on that prize. This legislation sends us in that direction, mayor. I think that's appropriate. And that's why i'm going to vote for you. But that's why what i'm going to expect to see later on. Aye.

**Sten:** I do think this is the right next step. Very briefly, I think it's mostly been said. I think we've got two things we're striving to do that to me make sense. One to introduce try to capture as much opportunity and corollary development as we can with ohsu. I think it makes all kinds of sense to keep as much as this as we can close to the existing campus in town this. Is self-evident to me. Will but we also have -- i'm not sure it's related, but I think it will be exacerbated by whatever development happens, which I think the area has a transportation nightmare. I remember i'm looking at some of you and -- I know john perry was there, did I a coffee when I was running for office, it's one of not a ton, but the promises I had no idea to keep. I would help on the transportation mess over there. I think if you look at this neighborhood, it has been abused fore years. You've got these crazy freeway ramps and bridge ramps, and front avenue, and the whole thing is just really scar after scar. And so as I have listened to neighborhood -- people have different positions, even the activists here have different positions, but a piece of it that occurs to me, i'm not saying this is a big issue in and much itself, it's also the straw that's broken people's back. They've had one thing after another over the last 20 or 30 years that's disrespected the neighborhood. And so I made a joke that said, it's not so bad, you've got to go above it. I think we've got to come up with a way to take that issue on. My lofty goal is maybe these two things can

JULY 11, 2001

be -- can come together and maybe there's some synergy between fixing the neighborhoods overall, the abuse its gotten, and the need to get ohsu some traffic patterns. Even if you say which I don't think would be a good place to start at all, even if were you to say the tram is off the table, the problem remains. Ohsu's got to get people on and up there no matter what, whether they go to north macadam or not they're going to continue to see more traffic and it's going to get worse. So you've got to bring these two problems and if you do that in a quasi judicial way, understanding some people want to get to the fight you'll never be able to think broadly. So I think we've got to think broadly. Attempt to link these two problems and see if by helping ohsu become what it wants to be physically, we can solve some of these abuses the neighborhood has, because that's going to create money and investment and ways to change things and it's a huge infrastructure problem to fix there that's going to take some cash. So i'd like to at least take a stab at seeing if they can come together. If they cannot, I still think they dock better than what we have now, and I think a collaborative legislative process is the best way to talk that on, and the court remedies will remain. We're in a lot of situation and people always find a way to get into court, but it would be better to do it legislatively first. So I am hopeful. I think this is the first chance i've heard where I actually see a vehicle to attempt to get after some of this stuff and would like to lend as much as -- of a hand as I can to see that happen. I'm opt miss if I can, but I understand we have a lot of tough battles to get through for that. Aye.

**Katz:** Now that you finished the southwest community plan --

\*\*\*\*\*: Coming to you shortly.

**Katz:** It is coming to us, and congratulations, it's time to start on another major enterprise. I heard words such as scarred, abuse, dysfunctional. I didn't know whether we were talking about the neighborhood or north macadam or ohsu. Everything has been scarred, abused, and dysfunctional. And the wonderful opportunity that we have to take a neighborhood that has suffered through decade after decade and begin planning its future with the community involvement, what a wonderful opportunity it is to take a look at another brownfield and turn that into a green field, an - - and opportunities to connect neighborhoods with other neighborhoods. And to deal with the whole issue of i-5, which is part of john perrys and the transportation dilemma that they've been looking at for hall these years that has i'll tell you today, i've just been talking about it, it has not been forgotten. And that can be incorporated in the work that's being done at least looked at and flagged as an issue that needs to be resolved. And what a wonderful opportunity for the health sciences university. That in fact has found its place in this wonderful new world of research and development. I happen to have finished reading a document on the new economic development that cities ought to be looking at, and it's clearly the knowledge base, the research, the r & d, the building of gazelle companies, the churning of companies, the development of one after another. Almost scattered, but all providing some wealth of knowledge and wealth to the company and to the community at the same time. That's not to say that manufacturing industries aren't important and shouldn't stay here. They are the foundation of our economic development policy. But there is something else going on in the country and in the world and we have an opportunity with ohsu, oqi and Portland straight university to begin looking at that bright future and if that bright future means, and it should mean coming down to the city, we've always talked about the capital on the hill and then maybe one day it will come down and reach the neighborhood that it serves. Then this is a wonderful opportunity to do that, and to turn a brownfield into green field. Is it going to be easy? It ain't going to be easy. And it's not going to be cheap. And I have no idea where we're going toe get the resources from today. But we do have an urban renewal district, and we are working with odot, and the possibility to begin solving all of these issues over a period of time are very real today. They were not ten years ago. They are today. And I want to urge the community



**JULY 11, 2001**

and the neighborhood, because this is really -- commissioner Hales is right, it is about a sense of place. And quite frankly, I don't get a sense of place when i'm up on the hill I don't get a sense of place in north macadam, I don't get a sense of place in the neighborhoods. And if we can begin solving all of that, we'll -- we will have made a major contribution. Aye. [ gavel pounded ] all right. Thank you, everybody. 3:30. Right on the dot. 873.

**Item 873.**

**Katz:** All right, everybody. Could you clear the deck? We have another issue we're dealing with. Another neighborhood issue.

**Katz:** Are you ready? What did you forget? Just want to remind everybody at 2 o'clock tomorrow, commissioner Francesconi and I have something very special to share with the citizens here. We're going to have a little fun.

**Francesconi:** So come on back.

**Katz:** Did we read it? Yeah, we did.

**Hales:** Let's get the students to come back. I think we're boring.

**Katz:** I was going to challenge them, but that will come later. Go ahead.

**Kelley:** While barry man is getting set up, let me tell you where we left off. The last time we were here a few weeks ago, we had a series of discussions with neighborhood representatives and representatives of cnf corporation and the nearby church. We had seized on a possible workable alternative just the evening before we came to you last time, and needed some more time to sort of flesh that out and work with the various parties. We have had conversations with the various parties in the intervening period, and have the outline of something we think is going to resolve this. You'll hear probably some comments today about filling 90 and concerns and so forth, but we think we have the basic outline of something that will work. Barry will take you through that in a moment. What we propose to do is get some sense direction from you today, this is a good direction to move in and we'll be back then in -- i'll let barry tell us whether it's two weeks or three weeks with actual ordinance language for you to adopt so we can clear off the desk, that whole package of things we brought to you earlier.

**Katz:** If I recall correctly, we did agree to those. This is the only piece that was hanging.

**Kelley:** That's right.

**Katz:** All right.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** We're almost set up here.

**Kelley:** You'll recall generally the alternative we seize order was a combination of rezoning the core, cnf holdings and -- as ex designation with the d design overlay in combination with the requirement that to actually do any substantial building on those properties they be required to go through a quasi judicial master planning process so that to pull any building permit of substance other than remodeling the current buildings, they'd have to essentially get approval for a master plan for the long-term built-out of all those core properties. That's the essential thrust here and the debate has person about what are the criteria and conditions that attach to that.

**Barry Manning, Bureau of Planning:** Barry manning from the planning bureau. To pick up where gil left off, we looked at a different -- couple after different options. As gil mentioned, we worked through different objections with -- options with different parties prior to coming to you last back on june 20th. We considered three options, and I won't go through these individually, but we had settled on where it looked at a 4th option, which as was to rezone portions of that cnf property primarily to exd and allow new development after approval of a master plan and over the last two or three weeks we've been working on fleshing out how that fits together and we've had one meeting with most of the parties discussed that and see where we would go with that. I just want to show you a map of the area we're considering for that master plan right now. Once again

**JULY 11, 2001**

the gray -- we're looking at that area that's listed as subdistrict b. The gray shaded properties are properties that are owned by cnf and the green hatched properties here are properties that we would consider rezoning to exd. These are the core properties of cnf's area right now. Currently these two properties i'm pointing out have some development on them, as does this property in terms of an office building. There's also development on this property. And less development on these properties down here. As I said, the green area is the area we're considering for exd and that is part of the larger rezoning package we have already talked about, which are these areas in the pearl district and in the more southeastern portion of the northwest district association. The master plan concept would be new regulations in a newly created subdistrict b of the northwest plaster plan. Selected properties to exd, and the purpose of the master plan is generally to serve as a substitute, if you will, for the larger legislative planning process in a way, but it's really designed to ensure and promote mixed use development that has high quality design appropriate to an urban setting, active uses on the ground floor of buildings on major streets, a street pattern that provides for frequent convenient pedestrian and vehicle connection so trying to reestablish the grid in that area to the extent we can. Development that's pedestrian oriented and transit supportive so we're looking to get very urban development that meets the sidewalks and have entrances that face the streets. Transportation and park and demand management strategies that are appropriate to that area that lessen the need for vehicle parking and maybe single occupant vehicle trips in that area, more of a reliance on transit, if possible. And transitions between areas with different uses and intensities this. Is an area that we're working on for the code language, trying to enhance and intensify. We're really looking to make the transitions between this area and the other area on the basis of its future desired land uses and we're looking at ways we can do that. We're also looking at promoting efficient use of land in that area. As we have right now, the master plan concept would be required for the sites in the exd zone, so that would include those shaded parcels you saw. And the optional in the ig 1 zones. If somebody wanted to include properties that are peripheral to those ex zoned properties in the master plan, they could do that and they could for instance have them considered for rezone as a quasi judicial process as part of that master plan, or somebody that just had property in the ig-1 zone could apply for a master plan if they so determined it was an appropriate thing to do. But this is designed more for the peripheral properties around the cnf core properties. The master plan application would be very similar to either the conditional use master plan that you may be familiar with or the imp process. But we would have components for application that would include the boundaries of the properties and overall development scheme, what they expected to see in that area. Including the uses and activities on each of those development parcels, a site plan, and they may choose to write their own development and design standards that would be reviewed by the design commission and approved through a hearings officer, along with the transportation analysis and strategies. As I mentioned, the master plan proper assist is conceived of as a type 3 procedure. The applicant's encouraged to work with the surrounding property owners, which include st. Pa tricks church and others, residents recognize organization so nwda and other organizations in the area, and the city bureaus during formulation of that master plan and importantly we would encourage the applicant in this case cnf, presumably, to work closely with the planning team that's doing the northwest area plan so that the effort that we're doing legislatively is integrated with the master planning process. For cnf. Ultimately we would have -- of the master plan we'd have review and approval by the hearings officer, and the master plan would need to be found consistent with the purpose of the master plan, which we talked about. As well as the plan district that we've created for northwest, and meet some approval criteria that would address lands uses transportation and design issues. We're still working our way through some of those so they're in draft stage now. Some of the benefits of this, this option provides an

**JULY 11, 2001**

opportunity for cnf to move forward currently, start their master planning. They have certainty about their future in that area, begin planning on these properties in the interim period while the northwest area plans is being completed. So it doesn't hold them up. It let's them proceed. It also provides an opportunity for the neighborhood to -- interests to have -- to engage with cnf if their master planning process and work in a collaborative fashion for a planning of this fairly large and significant site in northwest. And as I mentioned earlier, the information sharing and coordination between the northwest area plan process and the cnf master planning process could lead to modification of the requirement if they found there was a need for that. Or could ultimately and possibly lead to an elimination after need for a master plan if through the master planning process development standards and the goals for that area could be somehow codified into development standards in a plan district through the northwest area plan process. So we're still working on ways to make that linkage happen. I just wanted to give you some of the feedback. We sent out draft code language back the day before 4th of July, so July 3rd. We haven't been able to integrate them into a draft but we hope to do that over the next couple of weeks, come back with final language. Some of the feedback we've heard so far is -- primarily the first two bullets from the neighborhood and neighborhood property owners and the second two from cnf, this is not an all encompassing list. There was concern the master plan consent September doesn't provide adequate links to the ongoing northwest area plan and the future vision for the area. Primarily on how it treats the edges of the cnf property, how well will it transition into the areas surrounding that property. As they're envisioned in the future, not as they're envisioned currently. So we're looking at ways to make the surrounding areas stronger and link more closely to the northwest area plan within the master plan context. There's also been a concern that the master plan concept needs to ensure there's comprehensive planning for that exd area and the peripheral ig1 properties over that entire cnf site to avoid piecemeal planning and development. We're want to see that planned as a whole over a potential piece mail planning. That's a concern for St. Pa tricks as well as they're bordered by a parcel that's currently zoned ig1 and if not included in the master planning process leaves them a bit of uncertainty about the development of that area, potential sale, things of that nature from the cnf standpoint, we've heard a couple of major points that the purpose statements should recognize and reflect the area will have an employment emphasis. We've talked about it having a mixed use character, but clearly cnf is a major employer and they anticipate that satisfactory to continue in that fashion and want the purpose statement to reflect it's going to haven't an employment emphasis in that area. And another one of their concerns was that the goals for street connectivity at the 200 by 460-foot block pattern may not be fully achievable throughout that plan area. A couple of the major points they've addressed. I do have the draft language we've been working with here with me. I would be happy to pass that out if you're interested. But ultimately what we're looking, council direction to do is to go back and finalize some code language with more input from the parties that have been working on this. As I said, return in two to three weeks with final code language and wrap up the entire zoning project.

**Katz:** So you are asking us for an approval of this concept today.

**Kelley:** Recognizing we'll stilling going through drafts and iterations of it.

**Katz:** So we're not voting on the issue, it's just the continuation. All right. Just wanted to clarify. All right. Let's put up the lights.

**Manning:** There are folks from I think nwda and cnf to testify.

**Katz:** Yes, I know. We'll get them up.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** We should clarify with the city attorney -- I think this is a continued -- I think --

**Katz:** We're going to continue --

**JULY 11, 2001**

\*\*\*\*\*: Date certain to date certain. So we'll need to specify the return date. I think three weeks is august 1st. That would probably be more workable. I'm just trying to read barry's body language.

\*\*\*\*\*: I think three weeks would give us -- that would be august 1st.

**Moore:** Yes.

**Katz:** All right. Let's bring representatives of nwda up to the table and cnf. I'm sorry, and the church. Let's start with cnf.

**Charles Dragon, Vice President of Administration for CNF:** We're always lucky, I guess we always begin. Good afternoon, and just want to take a moment or two of your time to express our -- on behalf of cnf, our appreciation for gil and his staff and all the hard work they've put in to try to formulate an option that we all can come to an agreement on. And although we have some issues that we need to work through, we're very positive if everybody keeps the lines of communication open and we keep working together we can resolve this. So i'm here to express cnf's support in the recommendation to the council that we continue for the next three weeks and try to resolve this issue.

**Hales:** Put your name into the record, please.

**Dragon:** Charles dragon, vice-president of administration for cnf, northwest Portland.

**Katz:** And I want to thank you for staying at the table. This is relatively new for all of you, but for you especially new, for we appreciate it.

**Dragon:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Okay. John?

**John Bradley, 2350 NW Johnson, representing NWDA Planning Committee:** Hi. My name is john bradley, I reside at 2350 northwest johnson. I'm here today representing the nwda planning committee. I'm here to say that we'll stick through this process. There's some on the planning committee that feel that we've kind of bent and tweaked what was an already set-up process and -- but we'll be here until the end. Another kind of ancillary concern that great many people have expressed is that we're worried that we're burning through the money that we're supposed to go to look at the whole nwda policy plan on a very small area. And those are our concerns.

**Katz:** And I want to thank you as well. This was sort of pushed on the table for you, and I appreciate your willingness to be a little bit more flexible. I don't -- I haven't talked to gil about the financing of this, so we'll have to have that conversation. Go ahead.

**John Czarnecici, 2742 NE Sager St., representing St. Patrick's Church:** Good afternoon. I'm john, I reside at 2742 northwest xavier street, i'm an architect and i'm representing the interests of st. Patrick's church. I'm also a parishioner, by the way, i'd also like to express support for the process and appreciation for seeing -- for seeing st. Patrick's being taken seriously as a stakeholder in this entire process. And look forward to use conclusion. As barry mentioned, perhaps our primary concern is absolutely our primary concern is the protection of st. Practice trick's church as a structure, and we also perhaps obviously support wholeheartedly the revitalization of the neighborhood. So thank you very much for included us in look forward to the continuation.

**Katz:** Thank you. Questions by the council? All right. Thank you. Anybody else? We have two of the best land use lawyers here. Are they just sitting and watching us? You're looking for work? [ laughter ] did you want to say anything? No? Steve? Anybody else want to testify? All right. Council, do you feel comfortable we've got at least this close as we possibly could get under all this controversy?

**Hales:** Yeah. I'm encouraged. I think this is really on the right track. I appreciate the stakeholders willingness to work with us and the approach that you're taking. We'll talk more with my staff about this. Last time I was given a hard time in saying I don't think the master plan process is ever -- has ever produced good development, and jillian corrected me and said probably

**JULY 11, 2001**

there's been one time it has and that was the university of Portland. And that was actually an example of what I think we're trying to get at here, which is we should be zoning for and planning for what we want rather than against what we don't want. And when we do that, whether it's in the master plan process or anything else, we get good development. And we did that with university of Portland. It was one of the first under the institutional residential no imp -- ir zone that basically we took a different approach from the old mitigation approach, berm it, screen it, hide it, do damage control and instead the new approach basically said, figure out a way to make this master plan thing and that -- in that case university, work in the neighborhood and advance the goals of the neighborhood. So I think that this is an opportunity to do that too, to really zone and plan for what we want and that's why i've been beating john up so much about the neighborhoods always are seeking damage control. Neighborhoods always want to keep things the same. My neighborhood, your neighborhood, everybody's neighborhood. That's our first impulse. But we're -- when it really works is when we zone and plan for what we want, rather than against what we fear. And I think you're on that track now. And that's what we'll get out of this.

**Katz:** Jillian, thank you.

**Hales:** She keeps me straight up on a regular basis.

**Katz:** It was a little rough that afternoon. Appreciate it. All right. So we'll continue august 1st. Is that right? So you'll have code language by august 1st and we'll be able -- we'll -- we'll have to have a hearing. And then we'll vote.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Right. Then we'll have our second reading in a week.

**Katz:** It's not over yet. All right. Thank you, everybody. We stand adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow.

At 3:56 p.m., Council recessed.

JULY 12, 2001

JULY 12, 2001 2:00 PM

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

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

**Katz:** Present. Commissioner Francesconi and I did a promo yesterday. We told you if you were going to be here or listen, that we had a special treat. And it's an interesting story, and it's just like Portland. And commissioner Francesconi said, isn't it nice to tell you this story today when we talk about a vision for parks and a vision for Portland. In the pearl district that has grown and developed and flourished, there is a new restaurant and it's called, piazza, italia, did I say it right, commissioner Francesconi?

**Francesconi:** Yes.

**Katz:** And the owner's name is gino, would you raise your hand? He's right here. And if you haven't been there, and I know i'm going to get all kinds of e-mails, why did you plug this restaurant and not my restaurant.

**Francesconi:** I will answer them for you, mayor.

**Katz:** But if you haven't been there, it's quite an experience, and I need to tell you something, in all the years that I have restaurants. I usually sit inside. There is something -- I don't like sitting outside with traffic and cars moving, but I did, and it was a whole new world that I saw sitting outside in the restaurant. And we had a little surprise, I think gino had set it up for us. But invited two artist to say come to Portland to get a sense of what this wonderful city is about, and gave them an opportunity to listen and to hear and to watch and to talk to people in the city. And these two artists are singers, and they come from italy, and they worked several years in both italy and europe with their on orchestra. And so I think gino invited them because he knew that jim and I were going to be there that night and sitting outside in the cafe we were serenaded, and it was a song about Portland done in italian and in english but I have to tell you, it had an incredible italian flavor to it. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** And we, we loved it. And i've always wanted to find songs about Portland, and so this one is the italian song about Portland, and I thought it would be nice to have all of us hear it and entertained so we have our guests. Mary and rosanna, composers and singers, why don't you come on forward, and we welcome you, and we'd like for you to do it in both english and italian. Come closer. Come closer so that we can pick you up with the camera. Okay. \m \m. [ applause ]

\*\*\*\*\*: Bravo: [ cheering and applause ]

**Katz:** Thank you so much. That was a joy. They have a cd, and -- [ laughter ] and it has the italian version of this, which is just as beautiful as the english version, so thank you. Thank you for honoring us. Gino, thank you for bringing them, and thank for you this wonderful experience, and we're thinking about, wouldn't it be wonderful if we asked all our ethnic groups in this city, the korean, the japanese, the italian, the spanish to think about a song, so we have a festival full of diversity with songs about Portland from all over the world. So, that's a thought. Think about it. Let me know what you think about it and we'll move on from there. Thank you very much. [ applause ]

**Hales:** This explains why those other people were here. I thought they were here for parks. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** We have a lansman here for you -- you don't know what that is, do you. Okay, well. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** Thank you, everybody, for your patience. 874.

**Item 874.**

**JULY 12, 2001**

**Francesconi:** We thought this was an appropriate way to begin this, for a couple reasons. One, as commissioner Hales says, Portland is going to become -- is the best european city in america, so we thought part of the strategy would be to bring more italians here. [ laughter ]

**Francesconi:** So, we're working on that. But, the other part we thought would be to have more piazzas, which is actually one of the things that the parks 20-20 plan that we are about to talk to you about, recommends. I guess Portland is a terrific place because of its places and its parks, but it's a terrific place because of its people, and the spirit of its people. I guess to introduce this, this has been the privilege of my life to be, to be associated with this, not only because parks are so important to our neighborhoods, especially now with the issues of growth, not only because parks is important to our young people, safe places, but it brings us together as a community, and it was witnessed through the efforts of the terrific parks staff and citizens that participated in this process. I've never been with such a high-powered group of citizens who represent all of us, not just one segment of it. So at the beginning, i'm not going to thank all of you individually, but joey and the whole committee that came together to kind of craft this vision, I want to thank you on behalf of all of our citizens. And then I also want to thank maryanne casan and all the park staff that worked to create a process. We merged the staff with the citizens to kind of create a product that was also realistic and doable. So, I want to thank them in advance. There's several themes here that we're going to hear, and i'm just going to be brief. But the first is we have to maintain what we have, and that means that we have to invest in our system, our current system, the way that our ancestors have invested in them. And that maybe we're not doing that, as we become, we, as american society, consumed with our own material possessions. So, that's one theme. The second, and this is an emerging theme for parks, it's been there, but now it's right at the forefront. And that is we have to work with our citizens with bes, and with planning to make sure that all of our citizens have access to nature, and so that's a second theme that you are going to hear. The third is a continuation of the efforts, in fact led by commissioner Hales, when he was parks commissioner, and that is developing inner generational community centers. I have learned that senior centers are essentially a thing of the past. Our generation, as we age, is going to want to mix with young people, and we need the inner generational experiences that frankly, I had growing up to, next door to my italian grandparents, and our kids criminal need that. Italy has other problems. They have no gangs in italy. None. Young people have a sense of belonging to their community. They have other issues, but there are no gangs in italy. And then, which is the fourth theme, that we need, even more safe places for our kids, which is anchored by the partnership with schools. Schools and parks are a magic combination that our ancestors put at the heart of our neighborhoods, and that theme is continued throughout this. And then the other -- the last theme is the urban piazzas, not just the mid town park blocks but we are talking about gateway and old town, talking about barber boulevard some day, talking about public places in the heart of our commercial districts that are owned by all the citizens, not just private economic interests, but they are designed and maintained and are programmed with activities that benefit the business community, as well as the public that comes. So these are the major themes. But it is important to all of us, especially those citizens that spent so much time and effort on this, that we execute this, so in order to execute it, we are in the process of creating a parks board and I know the council had some questions about that, and we're going to define it in a way that meets the concerns of everybody, but the purpose of the parks board, we are going to hear about is to make sure this doesn't sit on a shelf, and to get more citizen involvement in our budget process and our decision-making in parks. The second implementation is one, is a parks foundation that we're going to hear about. We have an exciting group of more than 20 business folks that are already coming together to raise money for parks, to supplement the public sector, and so those are two specific things that we're already in the process of executing.

**JULY 12, 2001**

The third, and this decision not yet made, but it will be some financing. The question about a bond measure in order to implement some of these things. Those are three specific follow-ups that make sure this doesn't sit on a shelf. So that's the introduction. Now to kick it all off, we're going to start with the chair of parks 2020. Joey. Did I do this right?

**Charles Jordan, Director Bureau of Parks and Recreation:** I'm charles --

**Katz:** Anybody who has his full body on the front page of the willamette weekly. Whole body. [laughter]

**Katz:** Gets a chance to open this up.

**Jordan:** I have the pleasure --

**Katz:** Identify yourself, charles.

**Jordan:** Charles jordan, director of parks and recreation. It's really my pleasure to come here and thank you for your commitment. You stayed with us three years. And I know that at times we went through some challenging times with finances, but I want to thank you very much for your commitment to assist us in completing what we think is going to prove to be quite a legacy for this generation. We went out and engaged in a lot of dialogue with a lot of Portland citizens. We talked to thousands of people and they came and they shared their dreams and their ideas and their hopes for the future about their park system, but more importantly, they let us know how much they love and value this system, and much to our surprise, we were not ready for their understanding of the complexities of a park system. They understood a lot more than we had realized, and so for me, this has been a very productive three years. We think that we will be able to move forward in such a way that we will be able to maintain the connections that we have made. The relationships that we have made, and i'm hoping, I know mary anne, i'm driving you crazy trying to follow that, but the opportunity for us to take a very hard look at our system, the inventory of what we really have. We have done that, and now we are in the process of completing our capitol replacement plan, where we will decide whether or not it makes sense to renovate or to replace. All of that came out of the audit finding that we need to do something to protect this system, and I must say through the 2020 process, we have had a chance to do that. Let me say that commissioner Francesconi mentioned the park board and I never thought that after austin texas I would ever support another park board, but I don't need to tell you that things are changing, and as we look at some of the themes that are taking place, some of the conflicts we're having, you know, they come incrementally, we had the concession stands at Portland state university, we have memorials. We are talking about festivals, and also the user conflicts, and when they come incrementally, you don't realize that is taking place around you but when you stop and look back at all those conflicts, could they have been avoided, maybe not completely but they surely could have been mitigated. They are a weapon that we do not have in our arsenal, and that is a group of citizens who will have some continuity with the system, not just on an ad hoc basis and deal with a specific issue, but someone who goes along with us, who studies the culture of parks and recreation. If I had someone like that that I could have gone to, and I could have said, look, I need to test this on you. This is where we are. Here is the decision that we are thinking about making, now, give me your reaction. How do you think citizens are going to react to this because the park board will be composed of citizens from different parts of the city and different walks of life. Hopefully they will bring their perspective at a time when we need it the most, and once they give that advice, then they elevate and see the system whole, and that is what i'm hoping for. And there's no doubt in my mind, my decision-making process will improve tremendously, so I am really excited about the opportunity to work with a group of citizens who have been with us for the for the past three years who understands the system and whose made a commitment to insure we move forward with 2020.



**JULY 12, 2001**

**Katz:** Thank you, charles.

**Josephine Polk:** Thank you. The --

**Katz:** Identify yourself.

**Polk:** Josephine polk, citizen.

**Katz:** Good enough.

**Polk:** You don't care where I live. This project was introduced at the pittock mansion july 8, 1999, at an event with park friends and park advocates. People interested in participating on the team were invited by pp&r, Portland parks and recreation, to apply, and the team was selected with a view toward balance, that is balance in interest, experience, geographic location, et cetera. But it was charged at its first meeting in the love joy room in city hall in october of 1999<sup>20</sup> view the system in it's entirety, and to put aside special interest in parochial concerns. So here we are, july 12, 2001, and i'm happy to say in full force having had one resignation only, and one and a half, what I call, disappearances, however, both our, well, both our citizen and our staff attendance has been nothing short of remarkable, almost 100% for two years at every meeting. The results of our two-year labor, we present for you today, and they represent not the end, not the middle, but rather, the beginning of the future of parks, park programs, and open space in Portland. Jim mentioned this. The citizen and staff teams originally were separate. They were merged, which I must say was not without its rubs, but in the end what emerged was increased respect and understanding all the way around, and one plan. The public involvement area has been nothing short of really fantastic for all of us. It consisted of input and involvement from 14 constituency focus groups, such as jim users, horticulturist and mechanic groups, citizens with disabilities, et cetera. Six initial community meetings, six additional community meetings after the plan was, was presented in february to the public. Four cultural groups were consulted, russian, latino, asian, african-american, five interest groups, including a group of business leaders and artists. Four neighborhood associations, three urban renewal associations. There was a youth visioning activity devised by the students at the open meadow learning school. They created a design and park activity which then went out to eight -- nine middle schools. There was a questionnaire that was mailed and on the webb. The draft plan was introduced in february, as you know, and thus has been in the public domain for over four months. We had considerable feedback from that, at that time, and finally, there are booths at several community centers during this time. Our vision statement reads as follows -- do we have it up? There it is. And I -- I won't tell you how much executive time and hours this took. I hope you will like it. Portland's parks, public spaces, natural areas, and recreational opportunities give life and beauty to our city. These essential assets connect people to people, self and others. Portland's residence will treasure and care for this legacy, building on the past to provide for future generations. Our guiding principles took almost as long. And they are as follows -- essential element. This is the concept that parks, public spaces, and open space are essential urban elements. Fully equal in importance to schools, streets, sewers, and safety. Connected system. The concept that parks connect people to one another, people to place - - oh-oh, is that necessary? [ laughter ]

\*\*\*\*\*: Are we in california? [ laughter ]

**Polk:** Well, I will continue on.

**Katz:** Are you working with a video? But she needs to see -- okay. Okay.

**Polk:** Connected system. Concept that parks connect people to one another and people to people by being connected themselves, through trails, streets, paths, bike ways and connected natural areas, streams and rivers. Inclusive and accessible. The assurance that all residents have access to parks, no matter where in the city they live and all residents have access to programs regardless of their ability or their inability to pay. Stewardship. All residents become stewards of the natural

JULY 12, 2001

environment, sustain features for future generations, intrinsic value. All residence recognize the intricate -- interrelationships of all organisms with their environment without regard to their utility to humans. Excellence. Referring here to the need to strive for excellence in all aspects of the park system, just okay, or barely adequate won't do. Not the Portland way. Beauty and innovation. The conviction that beauty in an urban environment is, indeed, possible. We must, however, be innovative in our thinking, planning and design. Future needs, we must remember -- we must plan now for future public needs and demands. If we wait for the future to come, the future will be found wanting. Remember, we're still working on the only instead recommendations of 1903. We're considering, considering reconnecting the park blocks and finishing the 40-mile loop, et cetera, visions almost 100 years ago. Civic involvement. The park system belongs to all of us. Therefore, it is every resident's responsibility to become involved in its development, general care. Our objectives. Insure a legacy. The question is, are we, today's fathers and mothers, willing to step up to the challenge as did the fathers at the end of the 1800s and beginning of the 1900s. Provide a wide variety. Our parks and programs must reflect the diversity of needs and desires of our increasingly diverse population. Nature in the city. Rural havens, proximity to nature within an urban setting. Omstead envisioned this. It is possible. Walking city of the west. Speaks to the linkages of parks, plazas, scenic preserves, the cohesiveness of the entire system, which facilitate the connection of people-to-people and people-to-place. Promote community. In our public spaces belong to everyone, in general, but no one, in particular they are, indeed, critical for the preservation of a democratic society. Strategies. Both jim and charles have mentioned the parks board. We're really excited about this, and so are many of the, of our Portland colleagues. Among the purposes, the keeper of the vision, assure the adherence over time to the 2020 plan, providing continuity and long-term stability, provide advice and council to the commissioner and the director, based on the perspective of the citizen input. Provide a system-wide perspective. How the pieces fit together. Act as a quorum and also the advocacy rule. Capital plan, the Portland parks and recreation is, at this moment, engaged in a plan to study capital needs for the next 20 years, a monumental task, and I commend them for having started already and really getting to the nitty-gritty, as charles mentioned, identifying all park system needs, estimating capital costs, identifying the city's existing ability to fund current and projected capital costs, and identify multiple and specific funding strategies. Marketing and communication plan. The goal of this is to move the public's overwhelming support of parks to action. We know that by the several polls that have been done most recently, I believe, the beginning of the year, which indicate an approval rating of parks, upwards of 85%. But what the purpose of this plan is to move the public's overwhelming support into action by increasing public awareness of and educating opinion leaders as to the benefits provided by parks. Comprehensive partnership plan, we have begun to, to make progress on this, as well. The recognition that Portland parks and recreation cannot nor should not provide all park and recreational services in Portland. Partners, therefore, are critical participants in the implementation of this visit. The vision. Particularly, partnerships with schools, also, of course, partnerships with government agencies, bureaus, departments, businesses, neighborhood friends groups, and so on. And finally, funding plans. And my colleague, tony, is going to continue on with that.

**Mary Anne Cassin, Project Manager, Parks:** But not until time finished. [ laughter ]

**Cassin:** I am mary anne, the project manager. Sorry, tony.

**Francesconi:** That's how she ran the committee, too. [ laughter ]

**Cassin:** Somebody had to manage them. [ laughter ]

**Cassin:** We really struggled with how to characterize the park system, and as we looked at our polls, people said, we have got a wonderful park system, how can you say it needs any work. But

**JULY 12, 2001**

as the citizens went around and toured some of our facilities, they said yes, there are wonderful things about our park system but there are also some woeful things. The picture on the right is our university park community center, contrasted to the brand new southwest community center. The state of the system, despite the recent infusion of \$60 million, is still an old system. We went to recalculate the average age of our buildings, knowing that there were two new centers, so would it really change that figure? No, its still just about 60 years old is the average age of our buildings, and it's not just the buildings that are old, some of our park systems, our trees, everything about it is old. The park distribution is uneven. You will hear more about this when I talk about the subareas, but what we found is there is no single subarea of Portland that's perfect. All of them have limitations in one way or another, and some of them are very severe. It's not just staff that thinks that we're not keeping up with growth. The citizens in our poll said we're not doing a good job of this. And that we're not being responsive enough to emerging trends. Some of the emerging trends we have known about for quite a few years include such traditional park things, uses as soccer and walking but the need for these, is exploding at the same time that people are bringing new uses to parks, like walking dogs off-leash, skate boarding, and bmx biking. What kind of actions do we talk about? We have got pretty specific about this, and we were as numerical as we could be, just for guidelines. We said we needed to acquire 1,870 acres of parkland to keep the same proportion of parks, to open space, to people, which included 620 acres of natural area. We said that we needed 100 new sports fields, but we know we can provide that in different ways. You could do less of them, if they are synthetic turf but the raw number is 100 new sports fields. We said six full service community centers. They are not necessarily new buildings. They are not necessarily run by parks, but that the sub areas don't have equal access to these and they are very important to the system. We said we needed 150 additional miles of trails. We need to increase the urban forest. First, we need to get a good handle on it. We don't have a systemic inventory of how our trees are. How old they are. What -- where the different needs are, and lastly, you have you have heard a lot about this, but the public plazas and green connections was quite a responsive thing out in the community. Just one sentence on each of the subareas, to characterize what we found as we worked through the neighborhoods. Central city in northwest, if you look at raw acreage, you would say my goodness they have half the park acreage in the city but when you look at it, you say it's all locked up in forest park, and that there aren't enough active parks and there's -- it's some of the highest growth in the city, so that we have got to provide more.

**Katz:** Densest population in the state.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Thank you. I was just going to say that. [ laughter ]

**Cassin:** North has a pretty good cross-section of parks, and a fair amount of acreage, but we have some of the oldest parks in the system there. There is some of the original parts of the city, not the recently annexed ones, and so especially some of the infrastructure and trees are in poor shape there. Southwest, again, has quite a bit of acreage but they have quite a bit of it in habitat-type parks, and especially, south of i-5 and some of the other neighborhoods, like corbett. There are shortages of active parks. Northeast has a deficit in habitat of parks, and it's many miles for some of those children to learn about what is a natural habitat look like. Southeast has some dense neighborhoods, and some pockets of park deficiencies and a big issue there is community centers and access to the river, and lastly, outer east, we found some of our most severe deficiencies there. It's a high growth area. Again, we inherited some parks, quite a few parks from the county, but many of them are not developed, so we know we have got some huge needs there. Okay. Now, i'll let tony talk about funding.

**Tony Palermini:** My name is tony, and given the way this session started, i'd like to say, bonjorno. I'd say more but that's about all I know. I have four minutes, and I am going to use some

**JULY 12, 2001**

of that time to commend this lady sitting here on my left. Mary anne is a wonderful leader. She took a group of 24 people, who all seemed to want to talk at the same time. These are people who are well informed. They are articulate and very passionate about their piece of parks and recreation. Mary anne, through an educational process, brought us together. We went on tours. We met with the staff. She brought the staff vision team in and we educated each other, until I think we have coalesced around a plan that really represents what the public wants and what these folks, both in the staff and the citizen group, feel is important to keep Portland the kind of premier city when it comes to parks. So, ultimately, we did get down to, how are we going to pay for this. Okay. And that's always something that has to happen. When you come up with a, with a vision. We got help from courtney wilton, and you recall that courtney is the former executive director of the supervision commission. He worked with gordon wilson, and darren, and ruiay. He doesn't spell his last name right. But, he works for the city, as you well know --

**Katz:** Office of finance and management.

**Palermini:** Right. And he looked at our study and gave it his sign of approval. Now, what we asked courtney to do was look at other cities, and to pull out from those other cities with good, good park programs, what they had in common. And I will very quickly go through and tell you that in minneapolis, they had regional funding from the state. 50% of the operating budget for certain parts of their park system where it draws a lot of regional folks in, the state pays that. Seattle has an admission charge. A 5% admission charge, raise raises almost \$8 million for those folks up there. Ashland, down the valley here, they have a 5% meal tax, of which 1% goes to the acquisition of open space, and they also use their, a supplemental tax as minneapolis. Minneapolis uses their supplemental tax strictly for maintenance, and so forth. Ashland uses it for youth activities. So now we come down to, what our recommendation to you folks is with respect to how to fund this over a 20-year program, or over 20 years. As I told you last time during the briefing we think that charles and the staff need to look at the operation and economize wherever possible, to enhance and leverage wherever possible the volunteer program that they have. It's an excellent but it can be expanded and to form partnerships, particularly with the schools, the schools have land. They have buildings the public expects us to form those partnerships, so that would be our number one recommendation. And that's not to say that good things aren't happening and partnerships aren't occurring and so on. We are saying, redouble your efforts in that area. We recommend that a general obligation bond be put on the ballot in november of 2002. We have no sum of money as to how much that bond measure ought to be. That's for others to work out in terms of what of what our visions and objectives are. A \$75 million bond would result in a \$33, per year assessment on a house assessed at \$150,000. The bond measure is probably the quickest and best way to get an infusion of funds into the system, but it can't take care of the deferred maintenance. All of the deferred maintenance. I think you know that measure 47 placed some restrictions on those, on what can be -- what those dollars can be used for. So, we would recommend that you look at a local option. There is a gap of about \$1.67 between the measure 5 limit and measure 47 limit. And look at that as a possibility of dedicating money to maintenance, and deferred maintenance. You heard we have an average age of 60 years. We went out to the university park. We know that, that there's great needs in the city for that, and then lastly, niche taxes. I mentioned a few, like the meal taxes. Like the admission tax here in the Portland area or a tax on video cassette could raise a small amount of money, but it's something that does need to be explored. There have been earlier studies in 1987 on what kinds of dollars those would raise. Those two kinds of taxes. Need to look at those. For those special needs for youth programs and for, for maintenance, and so forth. So, just to conclude concludes we would hope that, that it's never easy to go to the public and say, we need additional money, but I think you have a

**JULY 12, 2001**

tremendous, tremendous amount of, of good will towards our parks, our studies show that, and so I think the public would be willing to support us in this endeavor. Thanks.

**Katz:** Thank you, tony. [ inaudible ]

**John Bethels, Citizen of Portland:** Hardly a day goes by that we have not been bombarded by or concerned about the ongoing cost of operations, maintenance, and expansion. I want to encourage the council to not remain in the maintenance mode, but to be innovative in funding and escrowing our future. Portland parks continues to do a good job in many areas in our city, parks, gardens, pools, community centers, open space, as well as trails. These physical assets, but more importantly, and especially the parks and programs, but in a tribune way, enhance, encourage, and educate our fellow citizens, in a very vital way, contributing to the fabric of our society in our city. Yes, the very cultures of our cities have the, the mystique opportunity to meet at cultural crossroads. Those crossroads, that will foster our standing, pride and ownership for our diverse citizens within our city. America has been referred to as a great melting pot, perhaps it ought to be really called a great salad bowl of a country because many different ethnic groups all mixed together with a flavor, in the community. Portland, being a part of great america, must continue to exist. Not exist, but to assist in providing such cultural, rich exchanges to our citizens. This will certainly add to the strength of the woven fabric of the society in which we live in. Talk about some of the inequities. While in some areas of our city, there certainly are inequities within the system, certain neighborhoods and particularly, cost and recovery. We need to be real honest about the issues in which we face. So, that denial does not zap the potential of productive energy that we can join our hands and energy together to address, find, and implement solutions that will make positive contributions to the future, leaving the fabric of our society. Parks 2020 is a step in the right direction. Yielding upon the legacy of the past. The foundational mainstay for our citizens today, and our children, both now and in the future. I want to thank you for your vote for this innovative plan as we join our hands together and move forward to bring about cultural diversity in such a way that everyone will be proud to say, I am a citizen of the city of Portland and I enjoy the parks and the livable open space. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. Okay. Let's put up the lights. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Questions? Nicely done. Okay. Let's open it up to public testimony..

**Katz:** Mr. Butler, why don't you start.

**Robert Butler, 824 SW 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 97205:** I am robert butler, 824 southwest 18th avenue, Portland, Oregon, 97205. We talked about the homes stead brothers, a famous, national organization that basically did master planning not only for Portland but all over the united states. And but they had a very clear message for citizens of Portland. It was in the 1903 report to the parks board. I will read you a sentence from it. You won't like it, but it's to the citizens. Politicians do not make good park commissioners because they are strongly biased and in the direction of deciding every question in the way that all will gain them and their party and their friends and votes and because they will sacrifice what seems to them such trivial things as matters of appearance to oblige people who are generally have some personal or selfish or party view. So, there's the message from them to the citizens. Conspicuously absent from this vision report, is a substantive goal of preserving our historical -- historic resources within our city parks. In fact, with that song we just heard very few names were mentioned in that song. One, sacajawea, sacajawea. We are we are rich because of her, sacajawea, and because of the statue of chief Multnomah in the coming of the white man, and I will read to you briefly what that 1903 dedication said for the coming of the white man statue. Erected a memorial, which you will recall, for generations yet unborn, the early history of the great Oregon country. Now, this area has been determined eligible as a national historic resource, worthy of nomination to the national historic register. It's of

**JULY 12, 2001**

concern to me why there's this omission in our vision of protecting our national resources, which are so rich here in our Portland parks. And it reminds me of the trout in the milk. The trout being the holocaust memorial. The milk being that fabric of historic memorials in Washington park. Lewis and Clark call them sacajawea, coming of the white man. The trout in the milk is the problem, and I'm concerned the fact that this was omitted consciously or unconsciously, is because blending those two would probably violate our national standards for preserving our historic resources. Now, I can't tell you why it's out, but I do want to say to you, historic preservation should be an integral part of our vision for the city. And regardless of whatever outcomes you want from the current litigation, I think our plan must have historic preservation as one of its components. Thank you.

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

**Katherine Bang:** Can I have the mike? My name is Katherine, and I was on the citizen's working group for the hollywood sandy plan. I'm also a member of the board of the grand park neighborhood association. And I'm here today to advocate for clauses in -- plaza insist our town centers. The pioneer courthouse square is often described as Portland's living room, and it is a wonderful, beautiful square that I really considered to be the heart of downtown Portland. It's where I like to bring my guests when I'm entertaining. I spent many wonderful occasions down there for the festivals. I recently saw the dalai lama there. The lighting of the christmas tree. It really is our living room. But today what I want to talk about is a family room for Portland. We need a more informal family room in the town centers. The metro 2040 plan has identified town centers throughout the area, and these are typically smaller versions of what downtown Portland is all about. They are usually -- they are commercial districts. They are fairly dense in their zoning. They are usually at the intersection of traffic corridors, so they are assessable to a lot of people. And they are usually boundaries of, of numerous neighborhood associations. The majority of Portland residents live closer to the town centers than they do to downtown Portland. So, this is where the day-to-day living occurs. This is the family room of Portland. Portland is always considered livable city, I mean, I think we really pride ourselves on that, that notion. And to me, livable city is more than just showing the city to my friends. It's how I feel living here, that I enjoy living here, and that I feel that I'm a valued citizen. And citizenship is not a passive experience. Good citizens are active participants in the city. And they need to be committed to the community, and I believe that the town centers and plazas are really a valuable component in promoting such citizen involvement. Because plazas are a gathering place, unlike a park, a plaza is a place for people to gather. Parks are a place where you go to relax, walk, jog. It might be a place for a sporting activity, or for children to play. Put plazas really serve a different function. They are a gathering location. They set the stage for a myriad of possibilities. Plazas might be the setting for a high school concert, a political rally, an informational fair, or a farmer's market. Hollywood has a farmer's market. A very successful farmer's market but right now it's occurring in a street that has to be barricaded every saturday. So, these events might be mundane for something like pioneer courthouse square, but they are really a value to the residents in these local neighborhoods. Portland has become a large city, and as a city grows, the downtown becomes more remote to many of the citizens, and I think that large cities lead to feeling anonymous, the feeling that you really have an impact, so I really urge the city to give some careful thought to developing these town centers, because I think it's a key to making the citizens of Portland feel that they still belong and that it's livable city. So please, bring family rooms to Portland. Our town centers need a public gathering place. We need a family room where citizens can continue to actively participate in the community. And to cook from the wonderful baseball move, field of dreams, if you build it, they will come. And I urge the city council to build plazas in our town centers.

**JULY 12, 2001**

**Francesconi:** That was beautiful testimony. You have done something historic. I am going to use the limited power invested in me as parks commissioner to create a new category of kind of urban parks, and that is, livingrooms are going to be plazas, but family rooms are going to be piazzas, okay.

\*\*\*\*\*: I think that's an excellent idea. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**David Ferriday, 216 SW Marconi, 97201:** I'm david, I am a Portland resident for well over 30 years. Maybe over 35 now. One of my interests is historic preservation. I am a past member and chairman of the resources committee of the american institute of architects. My wife has been a member and chairperson of the, of the landmarks commission, so this is, this has been of particular interest to us over the years. And I just would like to kind of underscore or underline or point arrows to a couple of things that some of the previous members spoke about. One, being stewardship, that joey mentioned. Joey polk, and the other being maintenance. We hear a lot about how we can easily get money to build new roads and new bridges, but to keep them whole over the years has been very difficult financially. I think that's, that's one thing that really has to be underlined. That maintenance question. And that stewardship question. Also, I look at this building. We just recently spent well over \$20 million for a historic restoration --

**Katz:** 30.

\*\*\*\*\*: Was it 30? Maybe that included the nonhistoric furniture. But anyway, whatever. [ laughter ]

**Ferriday:** I think we should be just very conscious of what our historic resources are in parks, as well as, for instance, this building, and be sure that that maintenance and stewardship element that was mentioned by some of these other speakers is, is kept foremost in our minds. Thanks.

**Katz:** Thank you. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I was remiss. We ought to ask the members of the task force here who would like to speak to come on up ahead of anybody else. Do they want to come up? Did you want to testify? I know I wanted jim zarin because this is the voice, in addition to him, mr. Zarin is the voice of parks in our regional partnership, and I didn't want -- did he leave for good? Oh, all right. I'm sorry. Anybody else on the task force that wants to testify? All right. Then we'll go back to the regular agenda.

**Jim Desmond, 1805 SE 23<sup>rd</sup> Ave., 97214:** My name is jim, and I live in southeast Portland and I am here to testify in my citizen capacity as a Portland resident and a member 2020 vision team and not metro or any agency. A critical threat of the 2020 parks report is the need to elevate the importance of parks in city planning, financing, and overall priorities. Too often parks are an afterthought and are relatively low priority, particularly in new development projects. Yet, some of our most stable neighborhoods, like laurelhurst are those built around large outstanding parks. Yet we have not always followed this proven model and learned from our experience. Every element of what this city does and what maybe most important to each of you individually or the bureaus you oversee, transportation, affordable housing, clean water, natural resource protection, health and safety education, all of these city services benefit directly from a thriving and excellent park system, and this report is a call for nothing less than a thriving and excellent park system across the board. From large regional and community scale parks to small neighborhood and pocket parks, for active recreation, natural enjoyment, trails and programming, for young and old in every neighborhood in the city. And my opinion, a high quality park should be at the forefront of the planning of every new development and redevelopment that the city has a hand in, be it high profile areas like the river district or the north macadam area or new neighborhoods in underplanned areas in southeast. We have recently witnessed the remarkable support for, in the high attendance figures at the southwest community center in gabriel park. And I was personally struck by the great

**JULY 12, 2001**

feeling of cooperation among all the city bureaus at the east side esplanade. It was great to hear so many commissioners compliment the project and have such a personal understanding of the intricacies, and it was encouraging for me to see all -- see so many key staff from pdc, transportation, planning, and parks, all there with their agencies having contributed to this plan. But, this sort of overall city commitment and extraordinary level of inner bureau cooperation that we saw for the east side esplanade should be the norm for parks projects, whether the other agencies have a direct hand in the planning and financing of these projects or not. We have a good park system but we can do much better, so i'm here to urge each of you to do what it takes to break down the silos and insure that every bureau be committed to helping the parks and reaction bureau realize the ambitious goals of our citizens as reflected in this report.

**Katz:** Thank you. I think it's fair to say that that has now been becoming the standard for not only parks, but a lot of the other work that we're doing in the city. Thanks to all the commissioners here who are willing to do that.

**Francesconi:** And jim, I called mike today and I talked to david but I want to publicly thank you, not just in your individual capacity, but as for metro, for all they have done in the natural areas, to work with Portland parks. Because of you, we acquired over 400 acres of natural areas over the last few years, and it wa, personally that have done that, so I just wanted to thank you publicly.

**Mike Houck, 5151 NW Cornell Rd., 97210, Aududon Society of Portland:** My name is mike, and I am here today representing the audubon society of Portland, and the 10,000 members that we have that reside primarily in Portland in the metropolitan region. Joey polk started out by commenting on the fact that folks put aside their individual agendas and really came together to create a holistic integrative and balanced vision and I want to second that, and I hope it will not be lost on council that this was not an assemblage of is special interest but an amalgam of interest that the parks be elevated in the councils and city's eyes as an integral, actually, we use the term, essential, of an he can logically healthy city but it is also a vision that goes into detail regarding individual elements of what constitutes a great park and natural area system for the city of Portland. And I am especially pleased, as a matter of fact, that it was not I who spent a lot of time speaking very eloquently and passionately for the need to integrate natural areas as part of, of a comprehensive park system. It was my colleagues on the vision team, and in fact, I could sit back and it was other folks who really made that, that very persuasive argument.

**Francesconi:** He trained them ahead of time.

**Houck:** I was very impressed, very relieved. And I have to say, that the reason i'm so excited about that is it does harken back to the 1903 omstead act. We will hear that referred to more and more today. I am pleased that I have another blue document that I can carry around with the report with which to give to people in the future but when I got started, my first involvement with parks was 1971, as a graduate student out of Portland state university, and I was asked by the improvement league, audubon society and others who were working to try to persuade the city that oaks bottom should not be filled for a parking lot for the children's museum, and a number of other uses. Back in 1971. We have come full circle in my opinion with the development of this report, back to the omstead report, as a great feature of a comprehensive park system. The vision also states clearly that, that the park system is part of a greater whole. That the trails are part of what should be a regional system of interconnective parks and natural areas and I believe that we have primarily to thank, in addition to jim's great work out of metro, jim really is to be thanked and i'm sorry he's not here. I'd like to thank him publicly for working at both ends. Both on the vision team and at metro, very diligently over, over a couple year period to get metro to adopt and basically to get the local governments and metro get together to adopt a regional park and green spaces plan. We have jim to thank for that.



**JULY 12, 2001**

**Katz:** Hear, hear.

**Houck:** And to reiterate tony palermini's financial report, it will take money, both in the short and long term to implement this vision. I urge council to move expeditiously to launch a campaign to pass the next bond measure. That will get us on the road to implementing the vision 2020. But, I would also like to say, such a campaign must be coordinated with metro, which will also seek a region-wide bond measure in the next few years, and whatever we need to do to make sure we are coordinated, we have got to put that effort out. Thank you very much.

**Katz:** Thank you, mike, for your work.

**Thomasima Gabriele, 3334 NW Vaughn, 97210, Vision Team:** I am a member of the vision team, and I want to really talk today from a couple of different perspectives, and bear with me as I will try to keep you on track about what perspective i'm speaking from at the moment. I think I was invited to come onto the vision team really from a pretty skeptical point of view. My first love, my first love really is cities. I believe that cities serve all people. They have the capacity to do that, and the potential to do that, sometimes they do and sometimes we're still working on it. However, I spent most of my time in my work life working on housing development, and in the real estate field, I have to admit that a lot of times when you look at a piece of property, you are always looking at it from, well, what can you use it for, and if you can't see what you can use it for, then you go onto the next piece of property, so when I talked with commissioner Francesconi about being on this group, I said I was very interested because I really never could figure out why lots of people said we needed parks because to me, I didn't understand what you use them for. It was an extremely wonderful education because I can sit here today and give you personal and sort of documented examples of why parks and our recreation programs are extremely valuable and what they really are doing for us. And I think the reason I kind of missed it, up until this point in my life, is the park system tends to be somewhat ephemeral in its values that we get to have. And I can best describe that value in two different ways. I have four pages of value, using lots of statistics about what parks give to the city of Portland and give to cities in general. And those kinds of contributions that it makes are things like it raises property values. It contributes to the economy through tourism. It makes the place an attractive location for new businesses to form and to grow and expand. And it certainly is a very low cost way, much more low cost way of developing good, healthy citizens from our children, compared to sort of remedial programs or sort of incarceration programs, which is maybe where some of those children end up without the kinds of parks programs that they have available to them. So that's sort of the, you know, the statistic. The hard facts, my developer friends would love this kind of information. But really, when I get down to where I really can feel and understand what the value of parks is, I go back to my own personal experience, and I just had the experience of having my sister and brother-in-law come to visit recently. They live in a suburb outside of baltimore. My sister is familiar with cities. She works in baltimore, my brother-in-law spends most of his time making sure he never sets foot in a city. He's kind of scared of them, really, to tell you the truth. And there was one day during the visit where I wasn't available. I had to go to a workshop and I said, i'm giving you my car. Go to the chinese classical garden. I'll see you at 3:00. And it cross -- and I crossed my fingers and walked out the door. So, when I got back my brother-in-law and I were talking and he said, we just had this great day, and I said really, well, how was it? What did you do? And he said well, we went to the chinese garden. It was wonderful. I had this really unusual tea. We went on this great tour. I learned all sorts of things. And then you know that place you took us for ice cream, which was actually at river place. We walked up there and got an ice cream cone. So he basically walked and this was the third day of his trip. He had went walked anywhere. We would park him on a bench, and my sister and I would walk across the bridge and come back and pick him up, so I kind of had

**JULY 12, 2001**

this idea he wasn't very physically active. When I thought about it afterward, the reason that he was willing to do that, and have a good time is that the city worked for him. He felt safe. The river helped him navigate. They knew where they were all the time because they could figure out that, that the river connected old town and the chinese garden with the place they had ice cream and they understood how the river and the bridges and the waterfront park worked, so they felt safe and secure and at each end they had a wonderful experience. Ice cream being one of those. And that is something that I think is in that ephemeral category but can't be overlooked because they went on a cruise after that, and i'm sure they talked to everybody about their experience in Portland. They spent money here. They will have other people come and visit here. I felt great because they had a good time. And I think as someone else said earlier, we get to have that experience every day because we feel safe here. We know how to navigate our city and there is wonderful things to experience. And the parks bureau is a component, more often than I realized, in having that experience occur. The other personal experience that I just want to mention, which is more on the youth development side of things, is my son, who's now 20, got to grow up next to mcclay park, and the other day I asked him, what was it that worked about -- did I do anything right when I was being your parent. [ laughter ]

**Gabriele:** And he said, mom, you did okay. And I said well, what did I do? And he said, the thing about not letting me watch television was essential because it gave me the opportunity to read and do my art and what really saved me from being in despair, feeling like I was deprived or feeling like I was, whatever problems I had, I knew I always could go down to the creek. The creek in mcclay park, and somehow for him, that was his touch stone, and I don't think he'll ever forget that experience, nor when you ask him, will he vote for a bond measure, he will because he will understand the value that that particular park, that happened to be down at the end of his street, had in his life. Given he's only 20, he's already figured out it was a really important experience. I want to leave you with kind of my personal analysis of what, where I think we stand today. We created this vision, and I actually think that, that we're doing a good job on three fourths of the vision. I think our system today does give life and beauty to our city, based on my personal experience and is all the statistics. It is doing that. I think it's connecting people to their, to themselves, to their -- to this place, and to others. I think my personal example said that, too. And I know from all of the polls that we had, that residents do treasure and care for the park system we have today. I think the thing that i'd like to leave you all with is we have a challenge that's insidiously inserted in the last sentence of the vision statement, which is that we care for the legacy of our parks, that we build on the past to provide for future generations. And I can -- other people here have talked about funding mechanisms. They have talked about having to do natural areas. And urban plazas, and historic preservation, and what I experience throughout this whole process is everybody has something they passionately care about in this park system or feel it should provide, and I think it's going to take all of us citizens, staff, public officials, to have the fortitude to stay true to this vision and to put the effort and the will and the money behind it because if you are like me, it's easy to lose sight of value. Because, it's not -- you have to kind of think about it. So, I just want to leave you with, this is a really valuable system, and we need to keep supporting it, and there will be tough times ahead to try to balance all of the competing needs for money.

**Katz:** Thank you. Thank you for serving on the task force, for your eloquent work and words. We said nice things about you. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** We would never have said it if we knew you were coming back.

**Jim Zarin, Citizens of Portland:** I figured it wouldn't be said if I were here after I left. Thank you very much. I'm jim, member of the citizens of Portland, live in southwest Portland. I said in various forms, including at least one or more meetings of this committee over the last two years

**JULY 12, 2001**

that i'm the father of an 8-year-old, who lives in a part of the city of Portland such that, and grew up in that part of the city of Portland, such that when we go to other parts of the city, or to the other cities and there's a swing set, she said, look, daddy, a swing, which sums up part of what the problem is, which we need to have neighborhood places where kids can play, where parents can meet and talk and bond and we can build a community. And I guess I just want to say a couple things. One of the messages I think that's in this report, and I think we all feel strongly about, and I know I do, is that the message we're trying to send with the report, and to you, as the leadership of the city, what we want to do over the next 20 years is build great public places. That's about the public realm. Commissioner Francesconi is talking about piazzas, and I think it's, whether you call them that or plazas. Town centers, that's a part of the discussion we haven't had traditionally. We talked about parks, per se, and open spaces and green spaces and I think it's great that part of the vocabulary is including those because it's part of the broader notion that what we are trying to do is create a great public realm, great public places where people can congregate and bond and relate to each other and to this place called Portland, so I think part of the message is this notion of building great public realm with all of its manifestations. And then related to that is the idea that what this is about is more than just parks and great public spaces. It's about building community and about building a great city. And this relates to, to what many of us have worked hard at the regional level where we are trying to do livable communities in a regional context. And we want parks, open spaces, green spaces and recreational programs because of their intrinsic work in and of themselves but equally, if not more importantly we want them because they contribute to making great local communities. Places we want to be and raise kids and live and work and retire. And I think that's another part of the message here. We were advocating for great park systems for the city because we want a great park system because of the intrinsic value but also because of what it does to contribute to making this a great city and region. So, I think that the second part of the message, and I guess the last thing i'd like to say, is that I really like to think that you, as the elected leadership of the city and all of us that are participating in this effort, would think of this as the beginning of an effort to implement this, so while I realize the politics of talking about the need for, perhaps, a bond levy in 2002, is i'd like to see that we're buying into a 20-year vision that's going to require an implementation and series of bond measures and every other mechanism that we can think of, but I think in a way, the citizens will be, and the voters and taxpayers will be more like toll buy in if they truly understand this is a 20-year vision, that at the end of which there will be this fantastic system that will be improved in all the ways that we'd like to see. If we stay the course and make the long-term commitment incrementally over a 20-year period, as opposed to us having a lot of publicity about this now, maybe making a real effort to get something done in the next couple years and then have everybody be unclear about what's going to happen after that. So I hope we make kind of a 20-year commitment to implement a 20-year vision and as I say, I think ironically or paradoxically, voters and taxpayers will be more likely to buy in if they are presented with a 20-year vision and way of getting there. We don't have to do it all at once but we can do it collectively, as a city, over the next 20 years. So, thank you very much.

**Katz:** Thank you, jim. All right. How many people want to testify? Okay. Three minutes.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**John Lashly, 4912 SE 33<sup>rd</sup>, Volunteer Portland Public Schools:** Mayor Katz, commissioners, I am john lashly, live at 4912 southeast 33rd avenue, and i'm here as a volunteer for the Portland schools. I was asked by interim superintendent, jim shersinger, to come and represent he and the board in the support of the 2020 plan and the efforts that had gone into it and the volunteer citizen members of the committee and also the staff. Historically, going back not too far back to the early 80s, there was a kind of interagency competitive mistrust existing between the Portland schools and

**JULY 12, 2001**

the park bureau, but through the efforts of some wonderful staff members of the park bureau, namely, rich gunderson and paul keenan, that began to change, and gradually, developed into what I think we now have as an enlightened collaboration between the bureaus, and this staff relationship between the agencies is continued through the efforts of mary anne and david judd. I think charles jordan likes to think that the city parks have, some of the city parks have schools adjacent to them. [ laughter ]

**Lashley:** We like to think that some of the city schools have parks adjacent to them. [ laughter ]

**Lashley:** And the real point of that is that it is both, and that the two, the schools and the parks have a necessary intimate relationship, and we should be working toward a very seamless collaboration, and I think that is in the process. I think the attitude on the part of commissioner, or the part of charles jordan and the part of the employees of the park bureau, is exactly that. And they are working to bring about this kind of relationship, as none of you needs to be told, many park bureau activities and functions happen on school district property, and many school district functions and activities happen on park bureau property, and all of the people involved are citizens of the city and surrounding area, who deserve to have a service that they don't have to try to sort through which agency is providing it, and how do the rules differ from one to the other. And we applaud what the park bureau is doing and we support them, and we, of course, have concerns about how we can fund the continuing maintenance, the operating costs of our functions, and those that the park bureau has, as well, but we know the significance and the value to the city of long-term planning, of an open-eyed, creative and I might even say, artistic view of how our city can one day be in terms of its parks, and service to citizens. Thank you very much.

**Francesconi:** John, thank for coming.

**Mark Topey:** Hi, I am mark topey, and I live in downtown Portland. And i'm a tennis player and advocate, and first of all i'd like to thank the city of Portland for resurfacing the Washington park, tennis courts where I played last weekend, and I had a wonderful experience. I played terrible tennis and lost badly, but nonetheless, the park was gorgeous, and, and i'm a little distraught in the past, when I have gone to tennis courts this past weekend, I took some kids, volunteer and I took some kids to irving park and waited quite a while to get on the courts and a lot of other people were waiting a while to get on courts. I am a little did I say wrought knowing that there are several places in the appendix that the facilities are being looked at to make roller parks and so forth. And I was wondering what I could do, as a member of the, of the city of Portland to get involved in that conversation.

**Francesconi:** We'll have somebody from parks to you with you. We're looking at the tennis center and some things that we can do there so tennis is on the screen. Maybe david, if you could - - we'll take your name and then we'll plug you in.

**Topey:** Thanks.

**Barbara Walker, 1891 SW Hawthorne, 97201:** My name is barbara, 1819 southwest harris. I've come to support the 2020 vision plan, and to congratulate joey polk, mary anne, the committee, and staff, and the park bureau for reaching out to the new members of the community, to be on that committee so it wasn't just the same old faces but really represented a broader view than those of us you see all the time. I am delighted both personally and on behalf of the 40-mile loop land trust that Portland parks and recreation has created this successor to the park's futures. Building a system of parks and trails was initially proposed by john charles in 1903. Nearly a century later, the 2020 plan recognizes a system of connected parks and trails for the first time since the omstead proposal, as an essential component. It's wonderful to see how responsive this report is to a huge variety of inputs and concerns that were raised. We all applaud the citizens and staff for their hard work to develop the guiding principles to analyze the existing facilities and to forecast the future

**JULY 12, 2001**

demands. We're particularly pleased that a special section was devoted to the trails, and developed for that. The 40-mile loop master plan, based on the omstead proposed system of parkways will be 20 years old next year, despite many gaps, the trail uses increasing and the network is ever expanding. We want to urge you to work together to make the vision a reality. Not just the trail system, but the vision of a truly comprehensive integrated park system. The system is the main word that's been used over and over again here. It's not only that it's a 20-year plan, but it's the -- this proposal, for the first time, looks at all the component parks, parts of the parks, and recreation bureau, as a truly balanced, integrated system. The system as a whole is worth far more than the individual parks. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. Okay. Proceed.

**Dixie Johnston, 0550 SW Palatine Hill Rd., 97219:** 0550 southwest pal tin hill road. I want to comment the entire parks bureau and everyone who worked on this 2020 vision plan. It's an excellent plan for the future. There are many of us who did attend meetings that, that you don't see here. There was wonderful citizen participation. They listened to everybody who spoke, very clearly, and I think it's a great plan for the future. And a lot of us would like very much, as ordinary citizens, to help work for the parks bureau for future plans because we think there's a good atmosphere, a positive atmosphere, and we'd like to continue this heritage that we have in this city of citizen participation. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you, dixie. Lily?

**Lili Mandel, 1511 SW Park Ave., 97201:** Hi. Lili mandel. You were actually ahead of me. My name was last. Lily mandel, 1511 southwest park avenue. Don't worry. I did not come here to sing. And so --

**Hales:** Oh, darn. [ laughter ]

**Mandel:** Sorry to disappoint you. I really come here for big king charles jordan. [ speaking in italian ]

**Mandel:** I come here to support this 2020 vision because after reading willamette week, charles jordan explained to me why we should give all this money to parks. At first, I thought, why shouldn't the money go to the police. That's much more important, or the firefighters or the transportation bureau. Or, any environment, any other place, rather the park. To me, that should be last. But after king jordan explained the important social services, the park provided, I changed my mind. In fact, I wasn't even going to come here, I wasn't going to bother. Now, I would like porlazzas, not piazzas, because we are Portland. And well, I wrote something else. I'm not going to -- i'm going to be nice and not put this in. [ laughter ]

**Mandel:** I took my husband's advice, and decided to end up being nice. All I want to say is, long live the king of parks. Thank you. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** Thank you, lily. [ applause ]

**Katz:** Wait a minute, I have to be evenhanded. Thanks very much. Thank you. [ laughter ]

**Katz:** All right.

**Gary, 7528 SE Foster Rd., 97206 Association of Community Organization for Reform Now (ACORN):** I am gary --

**Katz:** Could you talk a little louder?

**Gary:** I live at 6921 southeast 6th avenue. I live in the park area. I'm an acorn member, and that's an association of community organization for reform now. We're democratic, grass-roots association for the lower, middle income working families. For 30 years, acorn has been winning victories for families and by its members across the nation, acorn chapters are across predatory lending, wages, fair and affordable housing and school reform. Which you are all very familiar with. Acorn began in april of 2000, and since then members and staff have worked hard to form 11

**JULY 12, 2001**

active chapters with a total of 1300 member families. And the urban renewal boundary, acorn has 400 members, about 10% of the homes in the area. And members of the acorn organization has spent countless hours visiting door-to-door, one-to-one on the residence, with the residence. Acorn members and residents are concerned about the urban renewal project going in our area. We're concerned about the raise in property taxes forcing residents that have spent generations in the area, who will probably have to move out because of the tax values. The development that is going on. We're concerned about the choices of the projects, that emphasize the image and not the infrastructure. Now we're concerned about the parks, safety, and development traffic issues and employment opportunities. We'd like to present our platform to you, to see 19,000 residents that have signed onto the platform saying that the issues are priorities for them and contribute to their ability to remain in their neighborhoods. We have attended meetings. We have held our own rally. We have knocked on doors. And these are the things that the neighborhood, that the neighbors need to know. They need to be talked to, need to be heard. We are coming to you to gain support for these issues. Portland development commission refuses to commit to any of these items that we are seeking assistance in, and we would like to set up meetings with each of you individually to further explain our situation and discuss where the city council can support the lents residents I would also like to thank commissioner Hales and erik for being at events in their support in the lents neighborhood. Thank you.

**Katz:** Could you please address the parks vision? This was a report on the parks vision. Do you want to comment on this, specifically?

**Gary:** What?

**Katz:** This parks vision, this is what we are here for today.

**Gary:** Group security --

**Katz:** I --

**Gary:** No camping signs, increased nighttime security, rest rooms, opened during park hours. That's in lents park. Earl park and glenwood, increased nighttime security, improve maintenance, park facilities, and lighting throughout the park.

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

**Francesconi:** Emily, do you want to -- do you need to leave? She should have been part of the panel.

**Katz:** Come on and take the chair. Why don't you start.

**Emily Crumpacker, 3637 SW 57<sup>th</sup>, 97221, Portland Parks Foundation:** Oh, well, a gentleman next to me. I am emily, and I am a mother, a good citizen, although in coming downtown today, I also had to make a stop at the and get a parking ticket so i'm not sure how good that citizenship is.

**Hales:** You are a good citizen, you paid it. [ laughter ]

**Crumpacker:** And a business person. This is my city, both my parents were born and raised in Portland, and all their parents lived in, in Portland. My husband came to Portland in 1970, and will not leave, no matter what. While we were involved in public schools, we were about all very supportive, and it is my great pleasure to be a member of the Portland parks foundation board. I met charles jordan while I was on a committee working on a project at university park. David judd and I spent three years standing in muddy soccer fields next to each other, and barb and I were in local together. I was a rally girl and she was the valedictorian, so maybe that makes some difference, too, but my interest in parks is historical. For many years I grew up in Portland, used the parks, and in later life, I was -- I lived in paris for about four years and in watching the density of Portland grow, it reminds me of the, the, of paris in a way from the standpoint of the people tumbling out of their apartments into the little squares that were used for older people with their poodles and younger people with many children. In fact, just yesterday I sent four people back to

JULY 12, 2001

paris, but they were in Portland and while they were here, they were at Washington park, and laurelhurst park, mt. Tabor and the chinese garden. I think with the Portland parks foundation board, the omstead's would be very proud because it's made up of citizens, very interested and passionate citizens. I find with the committees, all the committees i've been on in my life, I have never worked with such a group of people that do what they say they are going to do. Can't wait to get it done, and have such a passion for parks and the people of Portland. Actually, we even let some politicians come. Jim comes, charles comes, david judd comes. [ laughter ]

**Crumpacker:** So, and they are welcome. Our goal for this, for this foundation is to take the existing parks and renovate them where necessary, and given the committee, this will always include historical preservation because so many people on the committee are so dedicated to Portland for their use -- for their growing up here and their ability to abuse parks as children and now reuse them again as grownups. Land acquisition, as land gets shorter and harder to get, that's, that's very important to us, to try to find it, so that neighborhoods will have these squares, that will be community places. The scholarships, hopefully there will be no child left out, and with that, will come summer programs for swimming. For the, the, the soccer programs, if someone cannot afford it, with great hope, they will be given that opportunity. That is our third -- one of our goals in the, with the foundation. Another is the, to use the private sector to help support marketing, management of these parks, and the maintenance, and I had the great opportunity to go on a tour of the parks. David judd led the tour. However, the driver of the bus was a maintenance man, and he knew more about Portland, Portland as a city and the parks and wanted for the rest of his life to do that because he was so proud of what we have. Again, it is my great pleasure and I am so flattered to be a part of the foundation, and I think we have great things in store.

**Katz:** Thank you. Thank you for your service, as well. Your turn.

**Chet Orloff, 3332 NW Savier St., 97210:** Thank you. Members of the council, madam mayor, I am chet, citizen of Portland. I've just returned from italy, myself, three weeks, I should say studying the urban democracies there, and it raises a particular point that I would like to make with regard to this afternoon's discussion. Conversation. Rather than reiterate what has been said so eloquently by so many people here this afternoon, I would like to, to stress two things in particular. One is the issue of land banking. Point I made in a recent essay in the Oregonian which I think is critical to stewardship and critical to the future. This is not, in my opinion, nearly a 20-year vision or plan it, needs to be a 200-year vision plan. Just as, as your predecessors on the city council 150 years ago when they laid out park blocks and other parks were looking ahead more than 150 years, but 2 and 300 years. And we need to do the same thing. So I think land banking is a critical element that you, as a council, and members of the parks staff and board need to keep in mind. Second, and finally, I would say that these the single most important job before you now is to very carefully select the parks board. If you have a board that is somewhat like the library board has been in guiding and leading the library for the past years, we can have a park system that is equally strong, and is recognized singularly is the best in the nation, and just as the most important committee on any board is its nominating committee, and in a sense, you are the nominating committee for the parks board, and I urge you to take great care in selecting and choosing the members of that board from across our community. Because, they, in turn, will lead this board, just as those others led those great urban republics in italy. Thank you, and I do want to compliment and you charles and especially the staff of the parks bureau for this great work.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Betsy Wright, 3495 NW Thurman, 97210:** I am betsy wright, the former president of one of the parks and i've been asked to come because the current president was unable to attend. And he asked me to present his testimony in favor of the 2020 plan on behalf of the friends of forest park.

**JULY 12, 2001**

We strongly support the plan, obviously, and it's the most comprehensive master plan that, that has been created for parks and recreation in decades and it was very much needed, and, and forest park very much needs it. We firmly believe that parks play a central role in building our community and in shaping Portland's identity. This is an identity that says that the city that cares about protecting the environment, the city that supports open spaces and green spaces, and that Portlanders have easy access to the wonderful recreational opportunities within the metro area. But sadly, that reality, while we have set aside many natural areas, we don't have the capacity to care for them. And that certainly is true of forest park. The problem that we see there, there are many. There are clearly challenges that we see throughout the system, but we see them most clearly in forest park. To name a few of them, there is insignificant staffing and funding available for the annual maintenance to keep trails and trailheads safe and usable. And if they are not safe and usable, then the citizens aren't in there as much, which also impacts the safeness and usable. Insufficient staff and go funding for parks and recreation presence in the park, for operational programs, for public recreation, and this leads to inappropriate uses and conflicts between user groups. Insufficient capital in public use facilities and habitat quality. Examples include the huge parking issues at the end of, of thurmond street, and the entrance to forest park and the growing threat of nonnative invasive species. Friends groups, such as ours, have done things like providing annual funding for specific projects, and friends of forest park we have a summer maintenance program that we are funding. We have assembled a group of volunteer project managers and landscape and traffic engineers to evaluate options and develop concept design for a new entrance into the park. Hopefully, to allay some of the issues at the end of thurmond. We have also been working on, and have not yet completed but working for several years now on mcclay's renovations so that thompson and son will be able to bring his children back there and be glad to be there. We have joined forces with the three river's land conservation -- conservancy to solicit conservation easements and acquire key properties in that watershed. This area is not five minutes, not more than five minutes from downtown. It contains lands adjacent to the park, which are still designated commercial forest use. We believe that the public would rather have these lands added to the park, rather than clear cut.

**Katz:** I didn't know that.

**Wright:** But the friends groups can't do it all. We very much support the recommendations and strategies of the 2020 plan. The new funding sources, a park board and commission, a park foundation or trust, the expanded partnerships, the improved communication. And that item presenting on behalf of the current president, david pot, I want to say, as a 14-year transplant from oklahoma that I feel like an ambassador in Portland. When I first got here I began to seek out parks because that's my natural place and I take people to see parks and I can find, like the bus driver, I can find any of them. I really appreciate the public wealth that is in our parks and natural areas. We can't take it for granted. We must invest today to fulfill the plans and dreams of almost a century ago and we are the stewards of that wealth for future generations.

**Katz:** Thank you very much.

**Katz:** Anybody else?

**Moore:** That's all who signed up.

**Katz:** Anybody else in the audience wanting to testify? Come on up. We have an empty chair. Go ahead.

**Don Baack, 6495 SW Burlingame:** Thank you, mayor Katz, commissioners, I have got three points I want to talk about but before I do, I find the lack of getting publication out well in advance of this hearing is totally inappropriate and should not happen again and anything in this way. I have a printed copy today. I did get, like on monday afternoon, but I find it's inappropriate to have



**JULY 12, 2001**

such little time for the public to review this. This is a session of people that were involved in the thing. I do have three comments i'd like to make. Urban forestry, first of all, my observation in my neighborhood, we're losing some of our urban forestry just from lack of neglect and lack of information on the part of the people. Also, the trees are in the right-of-way, and they don't know that they don't have the authority to cut there. They don't know the alternatives like pruning trees or cutting them down, and today in reading this document, seeing that there is actually something of a tree liaison, that's the first time I heard of it, and i've been involved in the city in the last five years so you are not getting the word out, and the word that's getting out is not very effective. I think we need some other sources of information. Set up a website so that we can go some place other than to someone defined -- it is defined like someone who has a chipper in the trunk. He's not interested in what's happening in the city, so it needs to be looked at very carefully. Second, this thing overlooks entirely what's happened in the natural trends and wealth in this nation. In Portland, in the appendix, our population is going from 16% to 24% of the population. Now, that's the people that were be at worst, in this city and nationally, the publication has been out telling them we're having increased incidence of diabetes, overweight, and many other things associated with overeating and eating the wrong stuff. The key to that, and i'm involved with a study calls shape and leading the first group of the involvement, is change and lifestyle and really focuses on walking. And that leads me to trails. Trails, the way I look at it across this city, are huge for the older people, and there is a good section of trails but I want to point out one thing. It talks about southwest trails, it says Portland parks and recreation supports greater connectivity in the neighborhood and facilities, but pp&rs role is limited to improving trends to affected parks. That sounds like silo thinking to me. I want to see something added that says, but we enthusiastically support transportation efforts to develop trails in right-of-ways and in conjunction with parks. Trails in my mind don't stop at the park boundary and I don't care who has responsibility for doing the rest of it. I want to see it all done and put together and I think that this is very short-sighted with this kind of thing in a document. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Irwin Mandel:** 1511 southwest park avenue. Good afternoon, mayor Katz, members of the council. I certainly support the issue before us, the 2020 plan. I'd like to pick up on commissioner Hales quoted markers as the most european of american cities and I can tell you precisely what makes it so for my wife and myself. When we first started visiting Portland in nine odd years ago, and then decided to live here, there was one single feature in this city that really made it a european city for us, and continues to do. It's where I live. It's the south park blocks. This is a european grantalay, and what a shame it is that it has never been continued as the original plan called for. A sweet from up in the hills, over to the willamette river. Having this swath of greenery through the heart of an urban cosmopolitan city would make it a complete you are peen, no, Portland city, not even a european city but a uniquely Portland-type of city. We may or may not need the Portland lauses, but certainly these oasis that we have in this city makes it clearly probably the most livable city in the united states. And I know we saw many cities that we looked at before we retired and decided to move somewhere else from new york, and Portland, one of Portland's main attractions, and remains that for me, is my front yard. The south park blocks, and it is the parks. It is the greenery, the planters and everything else that makes for the amenities that we live so much. Thank you.

**Katz:** Move over a little bit.

**Bob Stilson, East District Maintenance Supervisor, PPR:** This will work. My name is bob, I am currently the east district parks maintenance supervisor for Portland parks. Member of 2020. I wasn't going to say anything today, but --

**JULY 12, 2001**

**Katz:** You were part of the vision?

**Stilson:** Yes, I was.

**Katz:** Well, we'll -- take the clock off.

**Stilson:** Well, I'll be brief. My wife of 25 years is currently a child therapist working as a school counselor in Washington county. In my role as a good husband, I am her sounding board as she tells me about the myriad of special needs kids in her school system. I constantly ask myself why and how our society can afford to incarcerate adults for more than \$30,000 a year, but we can't seem to find the money to spend on the children when they are young, thereby avoiding many of those problems. If nothing else, as a member of the 2020 committee, I have strongly advocated for the kids during the process, and certainly, I think that the 2020 plan addresses children adequately, to my satisfaction, anyway. Not only is focusing on the children, the morally right thing to do, but it makes good business sense. We're losing children in the schools, in the city. We need to attract more families to the city. We need to keep the kids out of trouble, and parks has a legacy of providing programs to do this. Parks and community centers are a place where kids of different cultures learn to play with each other, and understand each other. These kids are going to grow up to be voters. I can't tell you how many people we run into in the parks that are, are very strongly supportive of Portland parks, and they talk about the fond memories that they had when they played in the children -- in the parks, and when they participated in those programs when they were children. I turned 50 years old, so I'm not far from being a senior citizen, myself. And I know that as a senior citizen, we will have advocates, as I grow older, but there is nobody to speak for the kids, and I encourage Portland parks to take the lead in doing that, and I think that we are. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you very much.

**Worth Caldwell, Task Force Member:** I was on the task force.

**Katz:** You can go beyond three minutes.

**Caldwell:** No, no, I will be -- you can pretty much -- my remarks are encapsulated on page 35. [ laughter ]

**Caldwell:** Of the report, and what I'd like to amplify on is that while being on the task force, I was forced to read the omstead report. [ laughter ]

**Caldwell:** But it was very illuminating to me and one of the illuminations was that a lot of what he had wanted us to do never happened. And so that speaks to my point, that we have now incorporated a number of the omstead features into this newer plan, 100 years layer, and now we have a very fine document. We have a fine plan, and just about everybody that's come today has supported it. So now, we need the teeth to put into that plan so that it goes forward for the next 40 or 60 years, to make this plan happen, and I applaud the committee for suggesting that there be a park board set up, and I've heard a little bit, talked about that today and I hope that that is in the process now, and jet arloff remarked about the care that should be taken in bringing the members onto that board, but I think that's going to make a difference for the park system to have a, a group of citizens who are not involved politically with the city, who can ask some of the tough questions and perhaps, have some of the good answers. Okay.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Caldwell:** Thanks.

**Katz:** Anybody else? Does the council have any questions? If not, roll call. I need a motion to accept, to adopt the report.

**Francesconi:** So move.

**Katz:** A second?

**Hales:** Second.

**JULY 12, 2001**

**Katz:** Roll call.

**Francesconi:** I wish I wasn't talking first so the council could go but I want to say thank you, but instead of saying thank you, I want to say this, I am proud to be associated with these people. Starting with the council. This whole council understands and has understood that parks are an essential element of the city. They are not more important than schools, housing, transportation, public safety, but they are as important, and the council has worked hard to make the public investments both in capital and in maintenance. And I appreciate it. I would also like to specifically recognize two other bureaus that understand that, and have worked that. The first is pdc. We've used a lot of resources from pdc from the east bank esplanade, which is a tremendous unifying event to other things. Pdc understands this, and I will not list all the employees but I want to single out abe in his role in development. The other agency i'd like to thank, and I saw gill kelly. He left here. Gill kelly has been a tremendous addition to our city in general, and parks, in particular. He is elevated the importance of parks, open spaces, natural areas, to us and active parks to an essential role in planning the neighborhoods as well as planning the city. And we could not be where we were, are, and I think we have some exciting things ahead from north macadam to the waterfront park to the central east side to the neighborhoods in lents because of some of the work between planning, pdc, and parks, and bes for that matter, that are happening, and I want to acknowledge him. I want to say that i'm proud to work with the parks staff. Charles has been recognized here but we also have david judd. We have zara, the head of planning, lisa, mary rose, who staffed this effort with mary anne, who I recognized. I risk things when I don't name everybody but I wanted to name those folks, in particular, and the other group, I want to specifically recognize, all those maintenance people who not only drove that van, but are sitting in our park right now maintaining these facilities. I want to thank some of our citizens who have carried the torch for the last 30 years about the importance of parks. Barbara walker is one of the heroes of this city. We have joey polk. Another one who is here, I didn't see until this minute, is ester mcginnis. One of the reasons that we are doing this, folks, is five years ago, ester mcginnis said during the campaign now listen, we want you to elevate citizens from your background. We want you to put them and not just hand pick them, to make creative vision for the city and then create a parks board and make sure that citizens are in high places to actually execute this thing. So, I want to say thank you to ester. There are some people on the committee, mr. Walled well, mr. Gabriel and others who have helped translate the importance of parks to the business community. And emily was here. We need a closer relationship with the business community, folks, to execute this plan. We have always had a good relationship with neighborhood citizens, and we're developing it with key people in the business community because we contribute to business and other things. We have many challenges here as a city. I guess -- but we can do this together, is the main thing I want to say, just as parks bind us together as a community, you know, it's together through these various things that we can meet the challenges of how do we maintain our parks. How do we become more inclusive in our parks. We have very -- we don't reach out enough. There are parts of our city that are park deficient. We have user conflicts, but if we step back as a city and try to look at how fortunate we are, how much we have, how much we have been given, and how we need to share it collectively, and just rise above our self-interest just a little bit more, we can pass this on the city to others, the way it's been passed onto us. We can do this, not in one year. Not in 20 years. But, we can help carry on a proud tradition that we have inherited, that we have been part of for this past hundred years. And this is just an important step in that effort. Aye.

**Hales:** Well, jim, I want to commend you and the bureau and all the citizens that worked on this for a good piece of work. As good plan, and am very, very proud and happy to support it. Just a

**JULY 12, 2001**

couple of comments. You know, you, you are serious about but we joked a little bit today about piazzas and plazas and we got excellent testimony from catherine and others about that. And I think one of the few weaknesses I see in this plan is that when you look at the action item list, there really -- it isn't really mentioned. You believe in it. I believe in it, I think there is a common interest in a number of neighborhoods in creating that kind of park space plaza at the neighborhood level and in a city of half a million people that purports to be anything like a european city to have one acre of park space is not enough. And if it's not traditional to the park's mission. They are good at what they do but they are not good at, at managing hard space because what matters is programming and that's why we turned it over to a nonprofit with pioneer courthouse square and it works very well. So I guess it's a caveat rather than, than not even a quibble, when we translate this plan into action, it's, it's a fine plan but let's, let's remember that ingredient more explicitly in the action plan than we did in the vision plan, and again, the vision plan is certainly fine. I guess another, another concern that I want to mention, in terms of getting specific, is this whole issue of skateboard parks. We have a lot of them in Oregon now. We have a lot of parents and kids who drive to newberg or vancouver in order for their kids to practice a burgeoning form of recreation. And we mile about this because all of us are too old to do this but anybody who has a 13-year-old boy knows what I am talking about. About half of them are skate boarders, and we have places to play tennis, places to play volleyball and soccer and basketball and all the other sports we all enjoy, and we have precisely one, self-created place for this hugely popular form of recreation. That was the second one open now? Okay, we have two. And a city of half a million people of something like 50,000 kids under age 18, we need to do better than that. So, when we get specific about translating this into action, that's something that I think we should do. And again we have got a park system that has big shoulders. We have people doing everything from, from racing model airplanes and formula race cars to playing golf in our park system. We ought to be able to find places to do that. Somebody, I think it was don, you know, made a careful observation here about our tendency to plan in this city, which we do very well, maybe another phrase for Portland, like the european said, we should change the, the cars from the city that works to the city that plans because we plan at the drop of a hat and do it a lot, and the danger, of course, with any good plan is it doesn't get implemented. What gets it implemented? Money. That's the difference between the plans that aren't implemented and ones that are, and I want to reiterate my support, jim. I mentioned this when the mayor and I got sworn back in for another term, I said i'm ready to go to work on the next park's bond measure, I will go door to door with you and help pass it, and I want to reiterate that. I think that's a responsible implementation step. One implementation step in addition to the others that you have outlined so i'm very eager to see this very good piece of work. Bravo to you and to all your team, made real, real soon. Aye.

**Sten:** Well, to all of you and commissioner Francesconi, who I know has been there, while you are doing all of this, thank you. It's a very thorough document. It's visionary, and specific, which is hard to do, and it's also, I think, a pretty all encompassing plan, as well as an action agenda, which is also hard to do. Those are different things so I kind of feel like it's been said so I will give you the best testament I can to how much I appreciate this. I will do everything I can to implement it. Aye.

**Katz:** I don't know how many of you know that jim comes into the office with charles every time we do the budget. Pounds on the table. And makes utterly impossible demands for anybody to meet. And I recall the demand of funding, how many years, two years this, this particular plan and I hate to admit it. I rolled my eyes because I wanted to put more money into maintenance and some of the other things that I know are important, but he was right. And charles was right. And the product that you have put together is one that will last a long time, that is the second volume to

**JULY 12, 2001**

the omstead plan and that I commit to begin to implement. Those of us that don't have parks, miss a whole world that both commissioner Hales and commissioner Francesconi have shared, and they shared with us, but for many of us, it's a vicarious situation. I remember in the legislature, and I have to admit again, I wasn't sure quite what we were doing, but I remember passing the greenway plan and the 25-foot setback around the river. And I had no idea whether the implications of that was, and today we're talking about 100 feet, and we're talking about some say 100 to 200 feet, and we're talking about restoring the river and providing wonderful park opportunities around our river, both the willamette up here and down in other parks, parts of the region. I was also very fortunate to work with the wonderful people, the creation of the chinese classical garden that matches the japanese garden and it is an honor to have a garden like this in the city, and there were wonderful citizens who came up with resources to make that happen. In addition to the city, itself. And then the commitment on the part of the council to continue the work of commissioner lindbergh on the esplanade, so in just two years, two bustle parks, different parks. They are not the frisbee throwing park but two different parks for the city, and that work will continue, but I have to tell you, as much as I love the chinese classical garden and the work we did on that and the esplanade, and the joy of watching citizens in the symphony for the park in their own neighborhood parks coming in with the dogs and the chairs and the wine and the beer and the blanket, listening to the symphony in their neighborhood, free, the most wonderful experience for me, again, not as park commissioner, but somebody that was involved in, with the cherry blossom park, that is totally undeveloped, that had hardly any, any grass but the citizens of that community planted little trees and I was there when they planted trees and they gave us all gold shovels that I still use, and it was that joy on the part of citizens out in the east, they don't have the kind of parks that we enjoy here, that was really so touching and is so important for us to remember that there are a lot of communities that don't have those parks in their neighborhoods and those are the communities that we need to serve. We're also talking now with the bureau of planning about what can we do to redesign, especially high rises, change the codes to allow green areas around the buildings. Not only for the children, but just little mini parks around where people live, and we are looking at the codes now to allow us to do that, so we'll be bringing that to you in the, in the future. And as I see mike houck here, I think about all the opportunities in the very short time line for the river renaissance and for ross island that will become a natural area for us in this city, as well as other opportunities working with metro, willamette cove and even mccormick baxter somewhere down the road that will be turned to an experience for this community. To enjoy in the park. So, we are not working in silos any more. In fact, I have, again, not as park commissioner, but I have enjoyed my work with zara, who comes to meetings because she does -- is sort of the liaison with Portland development commission, that has done so much work as jim said, with the parks bureau, and i've learned a lot about parks and about what we ought to be thinking from zara, so thank you, and thank you for educating me, and so the silos will be broken. Interestingly enough at the esplanade park if you go up to the north, it was pdot that did part of the park. Parks bureau did the other part of the park, and the Portland development commission funded the park. And it was with great pride that transportation talks about their work and certainly with great pride that parks talks about their work and thank you everybody. We, as a council, commit to making this a living document. Aye. All right. Everybody, we stand adjourned. [ applause ]  
At 4:09 p.m., Council adjourned.