



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 8TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2001 AT 9:30 A.M.

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

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Harry Auerbach, Senior Deputy City Attorney.

<p>DUE TO THE ABSENCE OF TWO COUNCIL MEMBERS NO EMERGENCY ORDINANCES WERE CONSIDERED THIS WEEK</p> <p>ALSO, ITEMS WERE NOT HEARD UNDER A CONSENT AGENDA</p> <p>968 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Amend City Code Chapter 16.40 regarding regulation of Limited Passenger Transportation Permits (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Francesconi; amend Code 16.40.900 through 950)</p>	<p>Disposition:</p> <p>CONTINUED TO AUGUST 15, 2001 AT 10:30 AM TIME CERTAIN</p>
<p>REGULAR AGENDA</p> <p>969 Accept bid of Andersen Pacific Contractors, Inc., to furnish Columbia Blvd. Wastewater Treatment Plant environmental enhancement project for \$527,500 (Purchasing Report - Bid No. 100793) (Y-3)</p>	<p>ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT</p>
<p>970 Vacate a certain portion of NE Mallory Avenue between NE Russett and NE Baldwin Street, and a portion of NE Baldwin Street between NE Mallory Avenue and NE Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, under certain conditions (Second Reading Agenda 921; Ordinance by Order of Council; C-9842) (Y-3)</p>	<p>175835</p>
<p>971 Vacate a certain portion of NE Baldwin Street west of NE Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, under certain conditions (Second Reading Agenda 922; Ordinance by Order of Council C-9990) (Y-3)</p>	<p>175836</p>
<p>Mayor Vera Katz</p>	

AUGUST 8, 2001

<p>972 Authorize a temporary loan from the Sewer System Construction Fund in the amount of \$1 million to the Interstate Corridor fund to provide interim financing for the Piedmont Place Mixed Use Development Project (Previous Agenda 960)</p>	<p>REFERRED TO COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION</p>
<p>Commissioner Charlie Hales</p>	
<p>973 Amend Title 33, Planning and Zoning, to clarify multiple regulations (Previous Agenda 967; amend Title 33) (Y-3)</p>	<p>175837 AS AMENDED</p>

At 10:49 a.m., Council recessed.

AUGUST 8, 2001

WEDNESDAY, 2:00 PM, AUGUST 8, 2001

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

AUGUST 9, 2001

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 9TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2001 AT 2:00 P.M.

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

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Kathryn Beaumont, Senior Deputy City Attorney.

S-974 **TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM** - 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 964; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz; amend Title 33) **Rescheduled from Wednesday, August 8, 2001 at 2:00 p.m. Time Certain.**

**CONTINUED TO
AUGUST 15, 2001
AT 9:30 AM
TIME CERTAIN**

At 2:10 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.

AUGUST 8, 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.**

AUGUST 8, 2001 9:30 AM

Francesconi: We have no consent agenda. Let's start with time certain.

Item 968.

Francesconi: We have jim wadsworth and mr. Hamilton. Why don't you come forward with a report. The taxi industry is the blue color side of our transportation system, and we have working folks operating the taxis, and taking care of a lot of working folks. It doesn't get some of the attention that maybe other parts of our transportation system get. That are not quite as glamorous. One of the things we need to do, and we have for a long time, is make it a more level playing field by putting some regulations on the towncar side of the operation. And so we're going to hear about the regulatory side, some other regulations here today. Jim, go ahead.

Jim Wadsworth, Director, Bureau of Licenses (BOL): Good morning. I'm jim wadsworth of the bureau of licenses. With me is john hamilton, the taxi supervisor for the city. We met with you in august of last year with a draft ground transportation white paper, and among the items in the white paper that we talked about was the interaction of all the different types of ground transportation providers and the fact that we had a singular regulation in place for just the taxis. And that we needed to put into place those regulations that would keep that playing field level and provide for the very distinct different types of services that ground transportation providers made available to the traveling public. The three major types of ground transportation that we have are taxis, the executive cars, or towncars, and the shuttles. The especially assisted transportation vehicles, shuttles and the executive cars are all part of a group called the limited passenger transportation group, and that's the ordinance that's in front of you today. This ordinance deals with those limited passenger transportation providers that are different from taxis but need to have some complimentary regulation in place to be able to have the entire system work well together.

Executive cars in most cases provide a reservation-type service. They are normally a luxury sedan.

The airport or downtown hotels are generally the place that most of the trips that these providers make originate or end. The port, as you recall last year, regulated towncars. We had a large number of unregulated transportation providers out at the airport, oftentimes over a hundred vehicles vying for half of that in trips, maybe 50, 60 trips a day. So there was a large supply and not much demand. Last year the port regulated towncars and limited the number of towncar providers that can work the airport. That took a lot of the executive cars out of the equation. We do have companies, though, that are very active in the executive car business and are doing quite well, and you'll hear from some of those folks today in favor of the regulations that we're proposing, and we've worked with them in trying to craft regulations that will fit their industry as well as be complimentary to the taxi regulations. With the clearly defined types of service, and by defining the fares and fare ceilings that these companies may charge, then we can make sure that we have all service providers working together and providing service that is complimentary. Taxis provide on-demand service. Executive cars provide more reservation service with the exception being the airport, where we have visitors that come in and within that -- want that executive car service when they arrive, and may not know a company here in Portland. So the port has provided for that. And shuttles provide multiple-passenger service on a regular basis. The port is beginning their regulation process on shuttles at this time, and our ordinance that we're proposing both for

AUGUST 8, 2001

executive cars and shuttles is complementary. The ordinance addresses basic areas of authority, permits, penalties and appeals. The authority of the taxicab board of review to adopt the uniform set of conditions that apply to all the limited passenger transportation permits by category is in the ordinance. The board will be authorized to make inspections, tests, ask require reports and records just as we do of the taxi companies and -- in being able to determine whether the taxi companies are viable and providing the service they're supposed to provide. The board also has the authority as it does with the taxis to delegate some of that authority to the taxi supervisors, so the administration process can flow smoothly and that we can have consistent and fair administration. The new code requires that all the limited passenger transportation operators have permits. In the past we have not permitted the companies to provide all the service, and those permits will be issued by the bureau of licenses and by the supervisor. Penalties. We are in the process of defining penalties in the taxi code, something that we have not had in place before, and we're defining the civil penalties that will be issued for violations. This code also will allow that the civil penalties to be issued by the supervisor with an appeal to the board, and to the code hearings office, which is currently done with taxis. This ordinance won't solve all of the problems that we have with the ground transportation industry. Sometimes they need to be tweaked, sometimes they need to be changed. We're working through such changes right now, after a relative period of having our ordinance flow along for lack of a better term. We are looking at the entire ground transportation industry as we make these changes so that as we change, as we bring an ordinance to council that will help us regulate and help us enforce and help us provide better transportation services to all the citizens of Portland, that we will bring something that will also enhance the ability of the companies that provide this service and the drivers that provide this service to be able to do their best as well. So are there any questions?

Saltzman: What is the fundamental point of the regulation? Who is benefiting from this? Are customers going to be the beneficiaries of this, or is it the owners, drivers? Who is the primary beneficiary of bringing this sector in -- under regulation, permitting and did you say -- I thought I heard you say that there will be a maximum rate set. Is that correct?

Wadsworth: Commissioner Saltzman, in the -- as far as the -- who do the regulations benefit, they directly benefit the traveling public that will utilize this service. And -- an unregulated -- in an unregulated environment, passengers often will end up being either overcharged, undercharged, they will not know what the charges are that may be there, they may want to -- want a taxi and put - - be put into a towncar by a doorman or a starter that is looking for a tip fore lack of a better word from one of the companies. We work very closely with the hotels in the downtown area to identify those instances where we have someone that's working for the hotels that's doing that, and the hotels take action.

Saltzman: So --

Wadsworth: The provider -- the citizens really get the first benefit, and that's what we look at each time we do an ordinance.

Saltzman: If you take a towncar from the hilton to the airport, you will know there will be a fixed rate for that? Just like our --

Wadsworth: We will -- we can require posted rates. We will require --

Saltzman: You can set them as well?

Wadsworth: That's exactly right. We can set a minimum or maximum rate. In the cases of towncars, since they provide a premium or luxury-type service, we want to set a rate for those towncars that will be in excess of what the taxicabs charge. For the shuttle providers, we want to set a ceiling of what they can charge, because their rates should be less per person than what the taxis would charge. And that provides consistent pricing scheme for the level of service that the customer is receiving. The drivers and companies also benefit from this, particularly the drivers. If we've got an unregulated industry out there operating that can pose as a taxi, perform the same type

AUGUST 8, 2001

of service that a taxi provides, then that unregulated provider can go in and take rides away from the taxi industry, take rides away from the shuttle industry. They can pose as whatever type of provider the customer wants, and impact those other areas. So you have drivers, then, in the taxi industry, and we hear from taxi drivers, you'll probably hear today from Michael Tolley, the taxi driver representative on the board, that these -- this unregulated industry was really causing a lot of problems until the port began to regulate, and there's still some problems out there that this regulation should do its best to help us correct. So everyone receives a benefit from this, and, again, you'll hear from the executive car companies today that will tell you the same thing.

Saltzman: Thanks.

Francesconi: Did you want to say anything, John?

John Hamilton, Taxi Supervisor, (BOL): I would, thank you. I'm John Hamilton, taxi supervisor for the city. I would like to state a distinction, I think an important one between the regulation of taxi cabs and the limited passenger transportation providers that Jim has described here today. That is we believe that the limited passenger transportation companies that we consider to be niche markets and therefore limited, that the market will probably work better toward helping it to regulate itself, and so our regulations will -- at this time will focus on public safety and service quality issues and convenience. One of the things we've been concerned about is that some of the town car operators have allegedly been working without any commercial insurance, and some without any insurance. This will help to take care of that. We regulate cabs and the number of cabs because they're considered common carriers, and we expect a lot more out of the taxi industry, so we want to make sure that they do have some protection. What we require is that they provide all universal service to everybody, every day of the year, 24 hours a day, including wheelchair accessible service. The board is always addressing these issues, and we have subcommittees working on that issue right now. But I just think when it comes to figuring demand, the standards here are a lot more liberal than they are for the taxi industry, so we are -- in looking for the balance between regulation and market forces, we're giving what the lpts we're giving them the benefit of having more self regulation through market forces. I think that's an important distinction.

Francesconi: Okay. Before maybe we should invite the taxi board representatives next, including Michael actually and anybody else that's here. Before I do that, if I could make a comment, you bring, John, a blue collar work ethic to this, but with an M.I.T. Degree on the effect of regulation, unregulation in a market. We're very lucky to have you.

Hamilton: Thank you.

Francesconi: Okay. I would ask you what your button is all about, but I think I'll pass. [laughter] okay.

*****: Blue collar --

Francesconi: His button says "ready to walk," for the public.

Hamilton: Hope we don't have to.

Francesconi: Let's open this up to the taxicab board. Is anybody else here?

*****: Good morning.

Francesconi: That "ready to walk" has nothing to do with the issue we're talking about today.

Michael Tolley, Taxicab Board of Review: Thank you for clarifying that. [laughter] I'm here today to give an enthusiastic support to the unanimous recommendation of the taxicab board of review to have this much-needed and long-overdue ordinance added to the city code.

*****: Can you identify yourself for the record?

Francesconi: Thank you for doing that. Actually, you can keep doing that for me.

Tolley: Michael Tolley.

*****: Thank you.

Tolley: This ordinance and the accompanying regulations of the product of well over a year of work by the taxi board and staff. The ordinance provides a framework for limited passenger

AUGUST 8, 2001

transportation, including the over 200 specially attended transportation vehicles or medical cars, and two previously unregulated segments of the market, shuttle transportation and executive car service, brings them under the regulatory umbrella. The ordinance is, as I said, a framework that lays out -- lays out definitions, authority of the taxicab board, a framework for permitting comprehensively penalties for code violations and an appeals process. Since the regulations are new, those contained in board order 1640120.007, i'm sure they'll need periodic review and revision, tweaking, as jim said, but they are designed to level the playing field and to be able to take a segment of the market that has been highly regulated and, again, create that level playing field with a segment of the market that's been totally unregulated. One of the things i'd like to personally like to see added at some point is a prohibition against offering granting or paying a gratuity or kick-back by any driver covered under chapter 16.40 to any hotel employee. That's just an example of something we might look at in the future, but -- like I said, this is a product of many, many months of work, and there will probably need to be changes along the way, but this is a starting point.

Francesconi: Thank you. Any questions? This is ray miles from broadway cab. And broadway cab, it's been my experience, has been one of the most creative of all the cab companies -- creative of all the cab companies.

Ray Miles, Broadway Cab: I'm here today to lend my support. I think jim and john, michael and the taxicab board have done a lot of work over the last really the last almost three years that i've been in the industry to draft this, get it in place, so it is definitely a huge step in the right direction.

Francesconi: Thank you. Questions? Any members of the public now, do we have a sign-up sheet?

Moore: Come up three at a time.

Harold Wood, Land I Transportation: My name is harold wood. My wife and I own lni transportation in beaverton. We are a specially attended transportation provider in that area. I've been a driver for over 35 years, and a resident of Oregon since I was born. I am a native. I've spent 20 years as an over-the-road truck driver and i've spent the last 21/2 years driving airport shuttle and medical transportation. But enough about me. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the city council for a chance to speak on what I consider a very important board order. This is part of the limited passenger transportation section in exhibit a of the draft you have before you. I'm referring to section 13, subsection a, at the bottom of page 4. What i'm concerned about are the words "specially attended transportation." a phrase that this order would require us to put on our vehicles. I think first and foremost, it is unnecessary. There's enough signage on our vehicles. Please refer to the pictures that I brought in. That is one of my vehicles. I have three taurus station wagons. They're all signed alike. They all say "medical transportation" across the back. Speaking not only for myself, but all of the specially attended transportation committees. This board order were to be passed, it would put undue strain on our budgets, most of us operate on a shoestring anyway, and there is no extra money to put the unnecessary signage on our vehicles. These are funds that can be better used for maintenance and upkeep of our fleets to keep our clients safe. As you can see from the photos, the current logos are more than satisfactory. There is no doubt that we are medical transportation only. The average cost of putting this on our vehicles would be approximately \$90 per car. As you can see from the photos, there is no room to put this on the side windows, and that's where this particular order would require us to put it. By putting it on the side of the car, on the paint, it would drop the resale value of the vehicle and make the car not able to be resold without repainting, costing us even more money. I believe that by putting the words "specially attended transportation" on the cars it makes it appear to be more like a taxicab, like we're advertising. And usually people disregard it anyway. And it is also overkill. What i'm asking is that the city council refer this board order on the bottom of page 4, number 13, vehicle identification safety and equipment, subparagraph a, be referred back to the taxi board for further review. Thank you, city

AUGUST 8, 2001

council members, president, for the opportunity to express my views and the views of the other specially attended transportation providers at this meeting.

Francesconi: Thank you for coming. What we'll do is have the bureau respond to each issue that's raised, so we'll have a response, but are there any questions from the council? Okay. Thank you, sir.

*****: Thank you.

Darrel Goodall, Town Car Service: Good morning. I'm darryl goodall, I own a towncar service, so that's all I can speak to. I refer a lot of my business to broadway cab, because I think they're very creative. I've been here since they started towncars at the airport, six or seven years ago. I was involved with the first group that came to town. Now I have my own company, and we have 13 cars running around town. We don't do hardly any business downtown. We're not in this group they're talking about, I guess. We have 3600 customers, and they're mostly corporate accounts, involved with nike, intel, hewlett-packard, and most of the big three accounting firms. They keep us busy. They pay for my cars over the years, and I just came in to whine a little bit about a couple of things in this exhibit that I thought should be whining about. First of all, the thing about having the cars be five years old or newer, I think ten out of my 13 cars are about five years old, pretty soon. As anybody around town knows cascade coach, they know that we keep our cars up and they're all clean and kept up, and i'd hate to replace them all next year. That's my problem, I guess. I don't like that idea. We have a car that has a problem with it, we get it fixed immediately. That's also one of the prerequisites to operate at the port. We're checked all the time by the port to see that our cars are in good shape, because we pick up people at the port. We have a guy out there now that checks your cars. And they also are going to -- at the port charge us \$1,000 plus \$200 handing fees starting the first of the year to keep our cars around the port. So I don't really want to spend another \$1300 for the city of Portland, I already have a business license. So I think we should put a lid on the number of cars for \$100 apiece, because I don't want to spend \$1300 just for something we're already paying for, it seems like. It seems like the city is trying to operate their show and the port of Portland is trying to operate their slow, and we've all been pretty well situated at the port now. They've got their act pretty well straightened up. It seems like the group from the city of Portland ought to get together with the port of Portland and get together. We're trying to run two different shows with two different sets of figures, and different sets of rules. I just think it's stupid. And the signage on the cars, it doesn't bother me because we don't go downtown this. Is -- I don't want to put a bunch of wording on my car. A lot of our customers, we've got a lot of customers, and we have markings on our cars, the name of the company, and the phone number. So I think that's ample. We don't hang around hotels and we don't tip anybody. That's always been one of my standards, if somebody at the hotel calls, we don't tip ya. We don't get a lot of calls, I guess. But we don't care. Executive sedan transportations shall have sunroofs and tv sets, I don't know where that came from. We have new lincoln sedans, and they seem to work just fine without all this garbage. I was talking with the people at the port yesterday, one of their rules is you have to have a stereo system in your car. I said, where did that come from? We never have a radio on when we have people in the car. They're looking at that now. But I guess my time is up.

Francesconi: Questions?

Saltzman: Where is all this stuff? I don't have all that in front of me. Is there a part of this ordinance --

*****: There's an exhibit a, I guess --

Saltzman: I guess I don't have exhibit a.

Harry Auerbach, Sr. Deputy Attorney: The -- excuse me, commissioner. The reference to the not more than five years old is in the definition of executive sedan transportation. 16.40.940, page 1. I think the others must be in the regulations. [inaudible]

AUGUST 8, 2001

Nancy Ayres, City Attorney's Office: Exhibit a is the condition -- established by the board subject to their order pursuant to the authority's ordinance, and at the end on the very last page, page 6, by the additional conditions for the executive sedan transportation providers, that's where the luxury-type items are listed. Would you like to see this?

Saltzman: Yeah, I would. That's where the requirement about sunroof and tvs and stereos --
*******:** Halo lighting.

Saltzman: This is where the signage requirement the previous gentleman was talking -- [inaudible]

Francesconi: These are regulations passed by the taxi board?

Ayres: Yes.

Francesconi: But -- that are in effect now or that --

Ayres: They will go into effect upon the passage of the ordinance.

Francesconi: It's unusual to have the regulations ahead of time.

Ayres: The conditions were established [inaudible]

Francesconi: That's probably better than normal. Normally they do this after we pass the regulations. I guess -- let's say the council, nancy, why don't you -- let's say the council just procedurally agreed -- disagreed with a regulation that's been adopted. Would we amend the ordinance and make it clear what our intent is in the ordinance that would supercede the regulations, or would we wait?

Ayres: I think you could send it back to the board with a direction as to an amendment of the conditions of the permitting conditions.

Francesconi: Okay. Thank you.

Saltzman: I think there are issues I want to have some discussion on.

Francesconi: Oh, I flagged it. And you should keep your individual lists, but i've flagged it to get a response.

Saltzman: Okay.

Ali, Town Car Service: My name is ali, i'm with a towncar service.

Francesconi: Pull the microphone a little closer, sir.

Ali: I work for Oregon towncar limousine service. I work in downtown Portland, where all the issues are. Being -- operating my business over five years, our business way of -- we have a contract with a couple luxury hotels in town and provide them -- they are a luxury hotel, they like to have a luxury sedan. We have a contract regarding to provide for them all our requirement as an insurance, as -- for i.d. Tax number, all the requirements they need, also we give them price scheduling to provide the service for them, because a lot of customers would like to have a luxury sedan. A lot of customer would like to have luxury sedan within five, ten minutes. And hotels as a luxury, they would like to have this kind of service. We have a location for us on -- for the hotel, if they need us, they can give us call within five, ten minutes, we can provide them luxury sedans. I don't understand where you mean you have to have a reservation. Because five, ten minutes, that's also a reservation time. We are -- I don't recommend one of -- we are -- the problem is they mix everybody together on the promise that affect everybody. Also when they say the tips, or kick-backs, I don't know what's wrong with that. Usually we give two dollars, three dollars for the guys, whoever is there when he load the bag we give them tips. I have no idea what is wrong with that. It's -- people work there, also they want to make money to give more service, and we also have them as they help us. But it's not meaning we are stealing the business from a taxicab business, oh, no, we just get the -- when they say we need towncar service, limousine, this is when we come to them. When the customers say we need taxicab, a hotels don't do that, they just grab any taxicabs parked in the zone. Sometimes no taxicabs. No one there. Sometimes the hotel calling for taxicab, they need a cab, a lot of taxicabs they don't respond to that because they think it's a -- they don't bother to coming there. And the customer waiting for, like, 15, 20 minutes, and he's mad. He say,

AUGUST 8, 2001

where's the taxicab? No one want to stop. The hotel have to call us to be there, because we are, when we tell them we will be five, ten minutes away, we'll be there for them for sure. Un -- and that's a big issue, all the hotels in downtown Portland is no taxicab coming on times, and no one there, no one respond to them. Sometime the taxicab provide for the customer differently. The hotels people, they work -- they are luxury hotel. They like to provide luxury service to the hotel to the guest of the hotel, because they want to -- the customer repeat for them. They don't have any problem. Because the driver is the first person and the last person to come to Portland here. And if the person was mean and the person take him back is mean to them, no on time, a lot of customers would be mad, and probably wouldn't come to Portland here or have a business here.

Francesconi: Your time is up. Do you want to -- one sentence to summarize? Are you done?

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

Francesconi: Okay. Just one question. What percentage of your business is this three to five-minute, you know, reservation, where you get business three to five minutes and then you end up tipping?

Ali: Not always tipping.

Francesconi: What percentage?

Ali: It's -- it depends. If we like to give or not.

Francesconi: What percentage of your total business comes in --

Ali: From the hotels?

Francesconi: Yes.

Ali: About 70%.

Francesconi: Is most of that 70%, do you get in three to five minutes? And then --

Ali: No. It's like about ten, 15 minutes. Ten, 15 minutes, sometimes three, four, five, six minutes. Usually 15 minutes, sometimes overnight, you know. But usually it's ten, 15 minutes reservations.

Francesconi: And then you give a tip?

Ali: Not always.

Francesconi: But most of the time?

Ali: Sometimes, not most of the time. A lot of companies, a lot of people, not companies that call, they are extaxicab drivers and they move to towncar service and they do that. Fact is, if you -- they are taxicab driver before.

Francesconi: Do you have any corporate clients?

Ali: Yes, we do.

Francesconi: Thank you, sir. Any other questions? Next.

Araham, Taj Majal Town Car: I don't have much to say. My name is araham, I am with the taj majal town car. I've been operating almost seven years. I have a question, the city expecting from us to have a new car, newer cars, why doesn't apply the same thing to the taxis too? Because we both are doing the same purpose, hauling people, so I want a taxi also has the same rules and regulations. That is my importance. Also, when the -- also I have one other issue. The hotels, when they call us, you know, so I went there to pick up the passenger, the guest from the hotel, and the guest was asking how come this driver doesn't have a baseball cap and a tee shirt, something like that. So they're thinking that we have to act like a taxi. I would like to recommend our city to have some kind of uniform for the taxis also, like we do.

Francesconi: Better be careful, because then we'll start regulating that you cover the whole city, and we'll start regulating prices. You better be careful for what you ask for here.

Araham: I've been -- i'm expected to look neat, good appearances, when we're making money on the cars, on our profession.

AUGUST 8, 2001

Francesconi: Okay. Any questions? We're going to get some responses, especially to the age of the vehicle question. I promise. It's an issue that we have some concerns about up here. Okay. Onward. Any more testimony here?

Moore: Yes.

Samson Atsberh: My name is samson, I work for willamette express shuttle. You never heard it before, from shuttles -- the shuttle service, we usually operate from the airport to the residential area, and then mostly from residential area to the airport. So the shuttle is suffering very much because of more regulation every time. And the shuttle -- i've been working for five years. One thing we -- I just want to remind you, with the whole regulation and everything is -- the main thing is the customer. People of Portland. Our most service comes from the customers, and that means when I pick up one person and he tells to sis sister, his father and everybody else, because shuttle is very affordable. Second of all, people like us because we are very reliable. Some taxi show up, some taxi doesn't show up. And people need some alternative. Once they start using our service, what they like about it is just like personal service, we are on time all the time. They miss people, they miss their flight because of the taxi didn't come. So once they start using, they always use us. That's why our business growing every time. But the only our concern is every time the city, the airport makes more, more rules for the shuttle, it's hard to exist. At the same time, the carpooling, like we are pooling together people to go together. It works in san francisco, new york city, some other places. We don't have four, five people to carpool with us. We try to teach people, we're trying to show people carpooling is the best thing that you can do for the -- for the traffic sake, for the pollution, for everything. And so the shuttle business is now I have a lot of my colleagues, they didn't even hear about this thing because nobody told them. And they could testify and explain a lot of things. Not only that, I could bring my customers to explain how they are satisfied with the shuttle business. So i'm asking council to see this thing to -- not to make more rules against us. Thank you.

Francesconi: Sir, you still have -- the question, what is it about the rules? We're not wiping out shuttles. So what are you upset about? What particular rule?

Atsberh: The rules -- i'm sure -- I don't have it with me, because I didn't get it. I just heard from somebody, because I come to the city, they say they give us your address, they don't send it to us. But that's another problem. But the main concern is, if you have one or two complaints, I heard that they say they're going to take your permit or something. That is unlikely -- you'll have complaints in any industry.

Francesconi: We're not going to take your permit with one or two complaints, I promise. We'll investigate it, but --

Atsberh: Yeah. Because if things like that, it affects us.

Francesconi: Okay.

Atsberh: I didn't go details because I didn't get this draft.

Francesconi: Okay. Thank you, sir. Nix. Questions? Next. Council, don't wait for me, just jump in if you have questions.

Abraham Dimissie: My name a abraham. Only a few points i'd like to express to the council, and one of them is this regulation. The ordinance, I do not have any opposition to all the ordinance. We need to be regulated, i'll tell you that much, because it gives us legitimacy to our business. But i've got a lot of concern. We could have all these rules and -- out there, but no enforcement, and we're out empty. And that's what's happening to us, we cannot do any business with the hotels, period. We only operate out of the airport. We're one of the companies that work on the demand from the airport, on demand line. The reason we cannot work out of the hotels is the kickbacks. It's not tips. That's a nice word. But it's a kickback. I pay taxes. I pay work mans camp, I pay insurance, I pay several things. It costs us. It costs us money left and right. The people we're bringing to the hotel, we cannot take them back. That's a loss for us. It's a lot of things as we give

AUGUST 8, 2001

them our card and they give it to the doorman to call, but they call somebody else. That's what happens. It's one of my biggest concerns, that needs to be answered. One way or another. It has to be answered. We are suffering. Those who are working legitimately, we are suffering. It has to be under control. In fact, there is a regulation, if they don't have no business permit, they cannot operate. If they don't have business registration, they cannot operate. But they do. Forget about the -- whether they have insurance or not. Just the basic things, they don't have. We cannot enforce, we're not an enforcement business, so we are -- nobody listens to us, but this is a good opportunity for us to express these concerns. The second thing I have to say about this, the taxi board -- I have no opposition to it, but I do -- we do not have anyone from our industry who could express our concern. I've driven taxi, Broadway, Rose City, I know the business. So it's nothing new that I do not know. I'm simply saying, I don't want -- I'm -- unfair bias rules to be imposed on us. That's going to be very difficult for us to operate. These are major concerns from our part. And if they -- if we need to be regulated, we need to be involved. We need to be part and parcel. We cannot just be on the side. And the way it is with the taxi review board, if it is only the concentration -- the taxis have got their own interest. And that's going to be magnified, it's obvious. But we have also interests as well. We do not service -- we service the same client, but different choices. And mostly most of our businesses on reservation, and at the same time the airport contract that we have. That's what we do. But we want to do it fair. I even have an extension, we haven't got hotels. Their parking, people will drive, they don't stay there, but they just park the car and -- these are the kind of business that takes place, and I don't think you are aware of it. But for most of us who are in transportation business, this is a loss of income. A loss of customers.

Saltzman: I don't understand that last point.

Dimissie: The last point, what I was trying to say, there are people who drive to the airport and they'll just park in the hotels and they pay the hotels for the parking and they go. Are they in the parking business, are they in the hotel business? That's the question I have. I don't know.

Saltzman: Earlier when you said you don't work the hotels because of the kickbacks --

Dimissie: We don't work the hotels. I'll give you --

Saltzman: Does that mean they simply will not call you when somebody asks for a town car?

Dimissie: When we bring our customers, drop them off, those customers who know who we are, they have access to us without any problem. But those people who bring from a demand line, we bring them to the hotel, we give them our business card to call us when they are ready to leave, give us an hour, half an hour early so we can don't to you. They give it to the doorman, the doorman doesn't call that number, he calls another number. And that's what I mean when we not doing business. We'd like to do business with the hotels in legitimate form. Not on a kickback form. Not under the table, in open form.

Saltzman: So if the customer actually uses your card to call you directly, there's no problem.

Dimissie: That's no problem. That's our customer. We will address that. But these are the kind of little techniques that takes place.

Saltzman: Okay. Thanks.

*****: Thank you.

Francesconi: Any more? Come on up, sir.

Dennis Jetty, General Manager, Radio Cab: My name is Dennis Jetty, I didn't plan on saying anything today, but the issue much kickbacks came up, and I would like to address that. So I could explain it a the bit. I think that there isn't a day goes by that we don't get complaints filtered to us, and I'm sure some of them go up to John, and they probably don't reach your level, but the basic problem at the hotels, I have a meeting with the manager of the Hilton hotel this month, is that we have people coming here visiting the city of Portland, and they will basically ask for a cab. I mean, some people ask for a town car, and that's fine. But they ask for a cab, and because the doormen are getting money, they will either call a town car without talking to the passenger, or they will say,

AUGUST 8, 2001

we'll get you a towncar, it's the same as a cab. I hear that all the time. It's the same as a cab. We have many, many customers that say, the doorman said it was the same as a cab, i'm up at the zoo, and it costing me 15 to \$18. They call us, it comes back, it's \$9. I have no problem with competition from towncar companies. I think the problem lies with unhappy people that come to Portland that are unhappy with being given something that they don't necessarily ask for. And the gentleman that spoke before me, I can understand his concerns, that he has customers that he -- he has a towncar service, he gives them his card and he isn't called back because a certain towncar service is given money to that person at the door. It used to be -- i've been in the business 30 years -- that the doormen at all the hotels were very -- had very good relations with all the cab drivers. They knew them by name. And now the relationship between cab drivers and doormen is almost universally negative. They do not want them on the stands, they continually harass them because they don't want them around so that they can get money to get a towncar there because it's money to them. That money basically has to be recouped, and it's recouped from the passenger that could have had a cheaper transportation. And not all of them want cheaper transportation. Some of them want towncars, I understand that. We do service some of the same customers, but there's an overlap, and some of our target is different. But that's the way that works. I think that's where the problem lies. And I would like everybody to come here that -- if they want certain transportation, that's fine. If they want a towncar, good. Get a towncar. If they want a cab, have that person get them a cab. Don't have them disappoint and don't have them mad at their stay in the city of Portland.

Francesconi: We're going to get into this in just a second with some of the issues, but is it important -- I guess from the cab perspective from your perspective, is it important that you have specially attended transportation written on a towncar, or that the vehicles be five years old or newer? Those are -- or that they have sunroofs or tvs?

Jetty: I think there should be some separation. I don't know what that should be. That might be a little bit restrictive, five years. I think they should be a newer vehicle. I think there should be some kind of restriction on it. You don't -- of course if you go to that, then you have to go -- you might have to have an amendment of some type of antique vehicle, because somebody might come on with some kind of really nice old mercedes or something like that. But I think there should be some kind of separation. I think it's important also that people getting in a towncar know what they're going to pay. Not necessarily that the city get in the business of saying, you've got to pay this, like, for instance, cabs, but the other complaint I get are people -- they should know. They should ask. But they don't. And there's a variation, and I don't think it's clear -- I mean, i'm not -- i'm not casting any entire towncar industry, but there are some towncar that's don't tell them what the rates are going to be until they get to the end. They pretty much know what a cab is going to cost, and that's good. And I think there should be some kind of rates somewhere that they can give to passengers when they get in. I think that's important too.

Saltzman: I guess I thought one of the fundamental intent of our regulation was to establish rates for towncars. So you wouldn't have that situation any longer of a passenger not knowing what the fare would be to the airport.

Jetty: I'm just speaking to the fact I think that each towncar -- should have something that they give the passenger so they know what it is. We have to have ours posted.

Ayres: Commissioner Saltzman, the current regulation, proposed regulation that's in front of the -- that the board passes now, supplement -- supplementary to this ordinance, simply states the towncars have to charge a premium rate. There's no dollar amount in the current regulation.

Saltzman: And will the taxi board establish that through regulation?

Ayres: It could, yes. It has not as yet.

Jetty: And i'm not necessarily saying what that rate should be or should you put a certain amount on it, but people know what they're going to pay.

AUGUST 8, 2001

Saltzman: When i've been hit that same way, when the -- you show up and say you need a cab and they steer you toward a town car, they say it's going to be the same as a cab, I know how much i'm paying before I get in. But i'm really only guesstimating what a cab's going to be.

Jetty: And it's not supposed to be the same as a cab, either.

Francesconi: That's the problem.

Saltzman: So we're going to be able to deal with this issue.

Francesconi: Let's have the bureau come up. Let's respond and then let's move on. I know we're losing commissioner Sten in 45 minutes. We need to get through this. There's four issues, the first one was subparts. The first issue is the regulations. John, why don't you come forward and then you can answer these if you want. On the question of regulations, so there is -- at least the issue of five years or older --

Saltzman: Or newer.

Francesconi: Sorry. Specially attended transportation on the side of the vehicle, and then the question of sunroofs and tvs and other things. So could you address that question first? Do we need all those things?

Wadsworth: Let me address the last one first. Those are characteristics that may be in a vehicle that would be classified as an executive sedan.

Francesconi: But they are --

Wadsworth: They're not required to have those.

Saltzman: It says sedan transportation vehicles shall provide passenger amenities, and then it says, such as, upholstery, halo lighting, sunroof -- I think that means --

Wadsworth: We will "may" that. We were trying in the -- we were trying to describe what type of vehicle that would be, to make a distinction between that and the taxi vehicle.

Saltzman: Okay. I just think it's -- we have no business telling them they have to have tvs, sunroofs, phones --

Wadsworth: I would agree with you.

Francesconi: Okay. How about the five years or younger?

Wadsworth: One of the things we're trying to do is trying to look from a public safety standpoint, and also look from an industry standpoint on with an industry standard might be. Most of what we are finding in the industry standards say that those vehicles are usually five years or newer. There's not much in regulations in other cities that we can play off of. One of the things that we're also looking at and we've been talking about the taxi board has been safety inspections of those vehicles, having a vehicle safety inspection that would test brakes, that would test lights, that would test the tread depth of tires. There's a myriad of things, a list that we would go through that would be included, and -- in that safety inspection.

Francesconi: Is the issue safety or appearance that we're getting at with the five years or younger?

Wadsworth: It's more around safety, but it also is appearance. And it's also the type of transportation that's being provided. If it is luxury transportation, one of the things -- and I know commissioner Francesconi, you'll recall this, about two years ago we had a complaint from a citizen who had taken what they thought was an executive car at the airport prior to the airport regulating them, to find out that the executive car that he was getting ready to take was a pickup truck. And a rather old ford.

Francesconi: The problem --

*****: That's --

Francesconi: I guess I want to signal I have a problem with this, and let me tell you my older car is both safer and looks better than my wife's newer car. So -- and I -- so i'm not sure you're going to get at it with this --

AUGUST 8, 2001

Wadsworth: I think you heard dennis's comment that there might be classic cars or such that may have to be considered. And those are things that the taxi board can consider through the regulations. One thing I want to mention about --

Saltzman: The regulation says they shall be expensive, classic or vintage vehicles. So I guess by definition, vintage to me means something that's old, or classic.

Wadsworth: It could in fact could be. We wanted to mention we put that in there to allow for -- to allow the taxi supervisor to have some leeway in those vehicles.

Ayres: Could I refer council to the definition section again of the executive sedan transportation? The last sentence in subsection b is sort of an exemption or a way to get a waiver for those classical beautiful cars.

Saltzman: Why don't we have a similar requirement for taxicabs? That was the other -- I thought it was a valid point.

Wadsworth: At this point we do not have an age requirement on taxicabs. That's something that we are considering. You've got to remember that the numbers of those cabs are so many more that we're looking at those as we go along as well. I can remind you we're doing a rewrite of the ordinance on an ongoing basis, and we have been providing pieces of it as we've been going through it. And that is one of the items on the list along with the safety inspection and so forth.

Francesconi: Okay. I guess at the end here i'm going to ask council's opinion on some of these questions. Let's just get the questions out here. How about the specially attended transportation written on the same of the vehicle?

Wadsworth: Commissioner, we've -- we spoke with mr. Wood before council, and that will be taken up at the taxi board. You might recall we had a similar concern around the vehicles that were cabs that would be using the colors, and that those were to be designating words on there to indicate to the public what that transportation was. Most of the transportation -- the s.a.t. Transportation providers such as mr. Wood have vehicles that are other than black and white or yellow, or red and white vehicles. So that's something that we can work around, and in fact in the s.a.t. Portion of this, the rules for s.a.t.s, we have already addressed that with wilsonville cab company, which provides s.a.t. Service in Portland, but not cab service in Portland. And uses their cab vehicles. So we have something in will the regs already and we're looking at some sort of a decal or sticker that would identify those vehicles. So we -- I believe we can address that issue that mr. Woods is bringing forward.

Francesconi: I guess as one council member, I guess i'd like you to have the taxi board also look at the question of five years old or newer. Just to -- as to whether that is the appropriate standard.

Okay. The second issue, moving on beyond the regulations, the issue of the cost of enforcement -- well, the cost, at \$100 per vehicle, which was raised. Do you want to address that concern?

Wadsworth: That's the current cost for a ground transportation vehicle. A cab right now. And it's an annual fee. That's the -- that covers the cost of administration of the permit and so forth. That's what we put into place.

Francesconi: Which leads to the third question about, do we have -- will these rules be enforced? And if so, how?

Wadsworth: We're -- we have an agreement in place that began in july with the parking enforcement deputies to enforce the taxicab plate rules and other regulations that would be put into effect. The initial agreement covers just the taxicab rules. We will be working with them to include these as an amendment to that agreement. We also have talks going on right now with the tri-met police force and they have indicated to us that they wish to assist in regulation. And the port of Portland, the chief of the port police, chief michael bryant has given us a go ahead to talk with them about enforcing those as well. The ground transportation force at the airport already helps with taxi regulations, so those are the major areas that we're working to expand our enforcement in.

AUGUST 8, 2001

Francesconi: And then the last question I have before I turn it over to the council, any issues I missed or they want to raise, the question of membership of the taxi board. Will you address that?

Wadsworth: That's one that we broached a little bit in the ground transportation paper last year. Where we started talking about the fact that the ground transportation picture for the city and the region now can't be just looked at piece by piece. You've got to look at the entire picture to determine what effect each piece has on the whole ground transportation picture. One of the things that the board has talked about but we have not fully addressed, we've been busy working on other issues and trying to get regulations in place, but we have talked about what should that board's purview be. Should it include the entire ground transportation, should it be, instead of the taxicab board of review, should it be the ground transportation board of review. And should we redefine what that board has in place. We've added a driver representative to the board. And when we added that driver representative, we expanded the responsibilities for that driver to represent the s.a.t. Drivers and other regulated drivers as well. And you might recall michael being in and talking about those s.a.t. Drivers as well as taxi drivers. So we're looking at that. We do have two board industry spots right now, and one is usually one of the smaller cab companies, one is one of the larger cab companies. But we do need to look at that. Because if we ever going to be regulating those industries, we probably need that advisory capacity on the board.

Francesconi: So would i. So taxi board passing towncar regulations should include towncar and executive representations. So I think you should put it on your -- our work plan. I think that's a valid point. Okay. Any other issues that I missed or questions council wants to raise?

Saltzman: You hit all the issues. I guess I want to offer my two cents worth here. I don't know why you need to look at it. Why can't you just do it, amend the ordinance, put a representative on from the towncar, the lpt industry? It's just a little strange to have one industry sort of regulating another industry that has not -- that's not even represent order the board. I don't know what you need to look at. Let's -- it's just fundamental common sense. I'd say that. Secondly o. The five-year requirement, I guess I don't support that, but if you want to bring it back, bring it back in conjunction with a similar requirement for taxicab and we'll look at them both at the same time. And then on the sunroofs and tvs, that number 4, i'd say that's a rule I guess, the proper -- the proper parlance would be to request that the board delete it all together. I think it's -- we already have a requirement they shall be clean, rigorously maintained, uniform, everything else, just changing a shall to a may makes it stick out like it doesn't belong there. So i'd say get rid of it all together. And then the final point I had was that the rule also says executive sedan transportation vehicles shall be large, expensive classic or vintage. I guess i'm questioning about the word "large." large means they consume more fuel. I would any there are bmws, miles an hour say difficulties that don't necessarily fit in the category of large. There's probably some american cars too, or hopefully down the road that we should probably delete the word "large." I just don't think that's a necessary condition to be a luxury towncar.

Francesconi: At this point I think procedurally I think -- in terms of substance -- well, commissioner Sten, is there anything else you'd like to say?

Francesconi: In terms of substance, I agree with commissioner Saltzman. But in terms of process, we either would amend it for when we bring it back, so you could offer amendments, but from a process standpoint, part of the whole idea is to engage the group, and I don't -- I want to make sure there's not any unintended consequences. I think what you did is very good, and I agree with it. If it doesn't come back, you know, then I could see that it would be appropriate to make the amendments that you're talking about. But I would prefer to let the taxi board grapple with these things and if we don't like their answers, i'll second your amendments, commissioner Saltzman. That's what I would prefer to do from a process standpoint. Is that all right with you?

Saltzman: So we will see revised rules?

Francesconi: Yes. That's what I think we need.

AUGUST 8, 2001

Ayres: Commissioner Francesconi, just so you'll understand a little bit about what happened at the board in terms of some of these specific issues, the idea of putting the words on the outsides of the vehicles, "reservation only" and "s.a.t." was the -- the point of that was to distinguish these vehicles from tracks I cabs, and it was felt very strongly by some members of the board that kind of language was absolutely necessary in order to prevent the on-demand kind of work being done by these cabs. So that's where that -- those distinguishing characteristics came from. As you also know, our working group is working on revising the entire taxicab code section, and one of the things we had considered in -- and are going to be putting in front of the board is a reorganization of the membership of the board to more accurately reflect the larger scope of what this board has been doing. Currently the board does have authority to regulate these lpd vehicles under the current code, but it could be clarified and changing them, the board certainly would assist with that.

Francesconi: If I understood jim's testimony on the question of do you put specially attended transportation on the side, that they were going to take it back and look at it, as they did on the taxicabs, and maybe do it with a decal or something that addresses the concerns raised today. The idea of distinguishing it still needs to happen.

Ayres: This current regulation does not require that it be painted on the car. It just has to be applied to the car in a manner satisfactory to the supervisor. That could be currently under these regulations, it could be a decal.

Francesconi: What i'd prefer to do -- we're not voting on it now, so either we have amendments or you take it back to address these issues and we'll bring it back. So that's the way we're going to proceed in light of any specific amendments. Okay. Thank you. I think that's it for today. We don't vote today. Thank you for all the testimony, folks. Okay. Next item.

Francesconi: Nancy, I didn't recognize you earlier, you're doing terrific work on this. Thanks. Go ahead.

Item 969.

Francesconi: Is there anyone here to testify on this? This passes to second.

Auerbach: This is a purchasing report. You can go ahead and vote on it.

Francesconi: Keep correcting me. Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye.

Item 970.

Francesconi: This is a second reading. Aye.

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

Item 971.

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

Item No. 972.

Saltzman: I have spoken to the mayor about this and would request that this be set over to no later than three weeks.

Francesconi: Okay. I'd agree. Do you want a specific date, or do you want to bring it back?

Saltzman: I could just bring it back. It will probably be -- the 22nd would be --

Moore: The 22nd.

*******:** Are we just continuing it to the 22nd?

Francesconi: Yes.

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

Francesconi: Okay.

Item 973.

Francesconi: I was here, I forgot how we left this. We're not ready to vote on this, I don't think. Is -- has anything happened since the last -- remind me on where we're at procedurally.

Douglas Hardy, Office of Planning and Development Review: Basically the council had no issues with all of the amendments included in that package except for a proposed clarification for

AUGUST 8, 2001

the cascade planned district, cascade district planned district as it related to signs, and kermit robinson is here to address that.

Kermit Robinson, Office of Planning and Development Review: Commissioner Hales introduced an amendment to address the cascade station sign exemption that's in the code right now. The amendment would clarify the exemption to just apply to the subdistrict a and just to the land use standards in the sign code, such as area -- sign area height, et cetera. And there was questions about why the exemption was there, why do the exemption at all and what was the process being pursued to address the issue. The exemption was placed in there when the cascade station plan district was amended earlier this year or late last year, as I recall. And the reason for the exemption is the signs are to be controlled through a development agreement that the city is a part of through pdc, and the intent is that the development agreement will have actually more stringent controls or equally stringent controls in terms of area, size, et cetera, and there's also an ability through the development agreement to put a certain amount of control of the content, which we can't do through the sign code. The development agreement or at least the sign master plan part of the development agreement is within two weeks of being finalized, so the exemption, while it's been in place, hasn't caused us any problems and we're refining it so once we start building, we'll be actually to issuer mitts according to the agreement. And that's the intent of the amendment.

Francesconi: Can we vote on it? Do we have to do another reading on this?

Auerbach: You're not changing anything, this is the second reading? Go ahead and vote.

Francesconi: Let's just vote on it. Thanks for all your work on this. I'm not sure it was appreciated by me or by the public. But we appreciate you cleaning up this, which will make it easier for everybody. Aye.

Saltzman: Good work. Aye. **Sten:** Good job. Aye.

Francesconi: Thanks, everybody. We're adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow. And that will be brief. We're making progress on the issue of the park in northwest.

At 10:49 a.m., Council recessed.

AUGUST 9, 2001

AUGUST 9, 2001 2:00 PM

Francesconi: There were several issues raised last week or the week before --

Moore: Roll call.

Francesconi: Oh. Thank you. [roll call]

Item 974.

Francesconi: Commissioner Hales, commissioner -- and the mayor are on vacation. It's just my turn to be president of the senate, it had nothing to do -- president of the senate. President of the council. So that's why i'm doing this instead of the mayor. This came before the council several times, and there's urgent -- everybody would like to get this resolved, this issue. I raised at the last hearing, which I believe was last week, maybe the week before, it was last week, that there's an issue regarding the park that I wanted to have further negotiations with the party to see if we could make progress on it. At that time I represented that parks had talked to the developer and the property owner. I was wrong, it turns out. So I guess I made a point of saying this. Parks fully -- parks and I miscommunicated. Having said all that, I did meet with -- today with planning and with their lawyer, steve pfeifer. I've already forgotten your name, I apologize. Chuck dragon. We're making progress on this. So they need some time to check with their board on the issue of the park. And we also talked about the master plan and what we could accomplish through the master plan that could lead to helping with the park. Because I actually -- my own personal opinion now, a master planning process can actually help us produce a park. We could talk about that if you want. So that's -- the need for more time to kind of develop more specifics regarding how we would approach the parks issue is one reason that I am the one that suggested postponing this for a week. Will the second issue is, there were some other more technical issues, not unresolvable, but some issues that came up last night i'm not privy to in terms of -- that planning released their proposals at 6 o'clock or some time last night. As mr. Pfeifer wanted a little more time to respond to some of these, I don't know if the neighborhood needs more time or not to respond to some of those issues. Having said all that, we want to get this thing wrapped up. So my suggestion, which i've talked to the council about, i've talked to planning, I think we've talked to both sides here, is just to hold this open one week. That's all. And then let's bring it back. That will give -- and i'm not going to be involved anymore. It gives gil kelley time to talk with everybody and try to resolve this. Whether it's resolved or not, though, next week is it. We're going to have a decision on this next week. So that's what I propose. Is that okay with the council? Gil, is there anything you want to say? Is there anything anybody wants to say?

*****: A quick question.

Francesconi: Come on up, john.

Moore: Next week would be the 6:00 p.m. Session for the afternoon.

Francesconi: What's on the agenda?

Moore: There's nothing scheduled, so it would have to be 6 p.m., though. Unless they move it to a morning.

Francesconi: Should we put it on the morning calendar?

*****: Which morning?

Francesconi: A week from now. Put it on the morning calendar. Put it on the regular course in the morning, not at 6:00 p.m. Because this isn't going to take long. Go ahead.

John Bradley, Chair of Planning, NWDA: John bradley, 2350 northwest johnson, chair of planning for the nwda. My quick question is, I wanted to know if there were going to be any more

AUGUST 9, 2001

substantive changes to the proposal other than the last iteration we got. Because we're getting fairly happy with it. It's still --

Francesconi: The one you got yesterday?

*****: The one we got yesterday.

Francesconi: There could be.

Bradley: Because it was -- it's still a nature of a compromise, but some of the problems that we expressed last week, although the solutions are not perfect for us, the -- the additional safeguards put in place seem fairly good.

Francesconi: So you like what's done. And I don't know -- i'm not 100% sure that mr. Pfeifer and his client do, but maybe not. Part of the reason for -- the main reason in my mind for the week is to give us time to work through the park issues. But there are some issues on this. If -- hopefully there will be agreement and no issues raised and everybody will like the way you did. If there isn't, then the council will have to decide those issues next week.

*****: Thank you.

Francesconi: Okay.

Gil Kelley, Planning Director, Bureau of Planning: I guess I would add -- gil kelley, planning director -- I would add that rather than be in the same box next week, where we're taking in comments and releasing a revised draft the day before your meeting next week, I think we'd prefer to -- if anyone, and it's understandable since mr. Pfeifer needs time to look at this -- that if he or the church or any other party has some very specific minor amendments that they direct those to the council. We certainly would like to evaluate them and be able to tell you at the meeting if there are any suggested changes, but rather than having the planning period -- bureau produce another draft, I think maybe it might be counterproductive, and any comments come into the council. We'll comment on them verbally at the meeting.

Bradley: Yeah, because I received, and I think council has also, an e-mail from ed sullivan concerning some very specific comments the church had, and I wasn't sure --

Kelley: The sooner we get them the better. We would just share them with everybody. Rather than obliging ourselves to produce yet another draft ordinance --

Francesconi: That's fine. Okay, folks. We're going to hold this over until next week. Thank you, everybody. [gavel pounded]

Francesconi: We're adjourned.

At 2:10 p.m., Council adjourned.