



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 17TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2001 AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, Hales, Saltzman and Sten, 5.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Harry Auerbach, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and Officer John Scruggs, Sergeant at Arms.

Items No. 1228 and 1229 were pulled for discussion and on a Y-5 roll call, the balance of Consent Agenda was adopted.

Mayor Katz left at 9:45 a.m. and returned at 11:55 a.m.

Mayor Katz left at 12:25 p.m. and returned for Item No. 1240

1219 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Accept the Lloyd District Development Strategy (Report introduced by Mayor Katz) (Y-4)	Disposition: ACCEPTED
1220 TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM - Accept report and recommendations of the Portland Office of Transportation Bicycle Master Plan Five-Year Update (Report introduced by Commissioner Hales) (Y-4)	ACCEPTED
CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION	
1221 Cash investment balances August 30 through September 26, 2001 (Report; Treasurer) (Y-5)	PLACED ON FILE
Mayor Vera Katz	
*1222 Pay claim of Trong Nguyen (Ordinance) (Y-5)	176009
*1223 Amend agreement with Group Mackenzie to provide architectural and engineering services for design and construction of Fire Station 12 and provide for payment (Ordinance; amend Agreement No. 33187) (Y-5)	176010

OCTOBER 17, 2001

<p>*1224 Renew provisions of the Special Downtown Services Agreement with the Association for Portland Progress for a period of one year (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">176011</p>
<p>*1225 Ratify execution of change order by the owner representative for Portland Public Safety Facility Addition and Remodel (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">176012</p>
<p>*1226 Contract with Hennebery Eddy Architects, Inc. to provide architectural and engineering services for the remodel of Fire Station 28 (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">176013</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Charlie Hales</p>	
<p>*1227 Authorize settlement of claim by Bank of the West (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">176014</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p>	
<p>1228 Authorize the City to enter into contracts with seven named agencies to provide early childhood services (Ordinance) Motion to accept amendment to remove the emergency clause: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.</p>	<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED NOVEMBER 7, 2001 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>*1229 Authorize the Office of Sustainable Development to release grants to local residents and businesses from the Green Investment Fund (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center">176017</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Erik Sten</p>	
<p>*1230 Agreement with Lutheran Community Services for \$58,400 for the Parkrose Target Area and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">176015</p>
<p>1231 Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality to investigate contamination threats to the well field in the Columbia South Shore and achieve contamination clean-up (Second Reading Agenda No. 1201) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">176016</p>
<p align="center">REGULAR AGENDA</p>	

OCTOBER 17, 2001

<p>1232 Accept a presentation for Crime Prevention Month, Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and the Hands and Words are not for Hurting Week Program (Report introduced by Mayor Katz and Commissioner Saltzman) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">ACCEPTED</p>
<p align="center">Mayor Vera Katz</p>	
<p>1233 Support Community Partnership Agreement to review Multnomah County Business Income Tax and City Business License Fee (Resolution) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">36034</p>
<p>S-1234 Adopt Diversity Development/Affirmative Action Guiding Principles and a Strategic Development Plan (Resolution) Motion to accept the Substitute: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Hales. (Y-5) 6:00 p.m. Session Motion to pull Item 1234 off the table to be voted on: Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Hales. (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">SUBSTITUTE 36035</p>
<p>*1235 Amend Contract with Conkling, Fiskum & McCormick, Inc. (Ordinance; amend Contract No.33809) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">176018</p>
<p>*1236 Authorize a one-time exception to City Code Section 4.12.040 to allow overtime payment for eligible non-represented employees for work necessitated by a District Council of Trade Unions strike (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">176019</p>
<p>S- *1237 Revise City Employee Transition Services Program and establish a pilot offering of a Retirement Severance Program in the Water Bureau (Ordinance) Motion to accept the Substitute: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Hales. (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">SUBSTITUTE 176020</p>
<p>*1238 Agreement with Multnomah County, acting by and through its Sheriff's Office, for reimbursement of the Police Bureau for fingerprint network components to be installed in the county temporary booking facility (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">176021</p>
<p>S-1239 Amend City Code relating to parades and processions (Second Reading Agenda 1195; Repeal Chapter 16.60, add Chapters 7.22 and 16.65; adopt administrative regulations) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">SUBSTITUTE 176022</p>

OCTOBER 17, 2001

<p>1240 Authorize Memorandum of Understanding and Reimbursement Agreement with the Portland Office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to participate in the Portland Joint Terrorism Task Force (Second Reading Agenda No. 1214) (Y-4; N-1, Hales)</p>	<p>176023</p>
<p>City Auditor Gary Blackmer</p>	
<p>1241 Assess property for sidewalk repair by the Bureau of Maintenance for billing processed through September 7, 2001 (Hearing; Ordinance; Y1044))</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING OCTOBER 24, 2001 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>Communications</p>	
<p>1242 Request of Dan Handelman to address Council regarding the Portland Joint Terrorism Task Force (Communication)</p>	<p>PLACED ON FILE</p>
<p>1243 Request of Kathleen Juergens to address Council regarding the Portland Joint Terrorism Task Force (Communication)</p>	<p>PLACED ON FILE</p>
<p>1244 Request of Diane Lane to address Council regarding the Portland Joint Terrorism Task Force (Communication)</p>	<p>PLACED ON FILE</p>
<p>1245 Request of Bonnie Tinker to address Council regarding the Portland Joint Terrorism Task Force (Communication)</p>	<p>PLACED ON FILE</p>
<p>1246 Request of Ken Spice to address Council regarding how testimony is taken by Council (Communication)</p>	<p>PLACED ON FILE</p>

At 1:19 p.m., Council recessed.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 17TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2001 AT 6:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, Hales, Saltzman and Sten, 5.

Commissioner Sten arrived late.

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

	Disposition:
S-1234 Adopt Diversity Development/Affirmative Action Guiding Principles and a Strategic Development Plan (Resolution) Motion to pull Item 1234 off the table to be voted on: Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Hales. (Y-4)	SUBSTITUTE 36035
1247 TIME CERTAIN: 6:00 PM - Amend the Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Maps to implement the Southwest Community Plan Vision, Policies and Objectives (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz; amend Ordinance No. 174667, Ordinance No. 171699 and Resolution No. 35649)	CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 14, 2001 AT 9:30 AM TIME CERTAIN

At 10:00 p.m., Council recessed.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 18TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2001 AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, Hales, Saltzman and Sten, 5.

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

<p>S-1248 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM – Direct the Bureau of Planning, Office of Management and Finance and the Portland Development Commission to undertake an analysis of tax increment and other financing tools, including the creation of a new urban renewal district, to implement the West End action agenda (Previous Agenda 1158; Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>Motion to accept the Substitute: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.</p> <p>Motion to add the language to include the Office of Management and Finance: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi.</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p>Disposition:</p> <p>SUBSTITUTE 36036</p>
<p>1249 Adopt changes to the Central City Plan to add a West End Action Chart, a West End Urban Design Plan, two new actions to the Economic Development Action Chart, one new action to the Transportation Action Chart, and the designation of an entertainment district to the Culture and Entertainment Map (Previous Agenda 1159; Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>Motion to continue this item to November 21, 2001: Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman.</p>	<p>CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 21, 2001 AT 9:30 AM TIME CERTAIN</p>
<p>1250 Adopt the West End Policy as an element within the Central City Plan and the Comprehensive Plan, and implement this policy through Planning Commission recommended revisions to the Zoning Code and to the zoning and Comprehensive Plan maps (Previous Agenda 1160; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p>	<p>CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 21, 2001 AT 9:30 AM TIME CERTAIN</p>

OCTOBER 18, 2001

REGULAR AGENDA

1251 Direct the staff of the Portland Development Commission and the Bureau of Housing and Community Development to work with the Housing Authority of Portland to develop, by January 1, 2002, a No Net Loss Funding Plan for 2001 to 2006 to fund the preservation or replacement of 1200 more low income units in the Central City; establish timelines for completing the Central City housing inventory and refining the implementation strategies relative to the No Net Loss Policy; and invite private sector and governmental partners to join in these efforts (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz, Commissioners Saltzman and Sten)

36038

(Y-5)

Mayor Vera Katz

1252 Direct the Bureau of Planning to prepare an Ordinance with Zoning Code language that implements the alternative regulatory proposal for the portion of the West End north of SW Salmon Street and west of SW 11th Avenue (Resolution)

36037

(Y-5)

S-1253 Adopt and implement revisions to the Zoning Code to foster new residential and mixed-use development in the area zoned RX south of SW Salmon Street bounded by SW Ninth Avenue, SW 14th Avenue, and SW Market Street (Ordinance)

**SUBSTITUTE
PASSED TO
SECOND READING
OCTOBER 24, 2001
AT 9:30 AM**

At 4:25 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love
Clerk of the Council

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

OCTOBER 17, 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.

OCTOBER 17, 2001 9:30 AM

Katz: Any items to be pulled off the consent agenda?

Francesconi: 1228 I asked to be pulled.

Katz: And somebody also requested 1229. All right. Anybody else want to remove any items from the consent agenda? If not, roll call on the consent agenda.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] all right. 1228.

Item No. 1228.

Katz: I'm also going to remove the emergency clause after that.

*****: You'll need a motion.

Saltzman: I'll make that motion.

Francesconi: Second.

Katz: Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [gavel pounded] all right. Commissioner Francesconi, did you want to say anything?

Francesconi: It's just that the problem -- these programs are terrific programs, these early childhood programs identified in 1227. The problem is it authorizes a three-year contract, and at a time when we're cutting police, fire, and parks, and at a time the city faces a \$14 million shortfall at a minimum in meeting basic services, at a time that the county is eliminating \$22 million, creating a new program at the city outside of its mission for three years is something we need to think about. So I think it would be appropriate to think about it a little bit, and so that's why I think this needs a little more thought.

Katz: I recommended also the removal of the emergency clause. As you all remember, did I put this in the forecast, but when we did all of that, things have dramatically changed. We are now in a recession. That was not the case when we identified expenditures for this program. In a recession, one of our top priorities is job retraining, and though there are some federal funds, as we are doing a serious task of recruiting and working with companies to retain them here so we can save some jobs, one of the things that we do need is funds for retraining of workers. And funds to meet the needs of those companies that we're trying to keep in the city. The other item that has hit us, two other items, is september 11th, which has placed tremendous strain on the resources of both the fire and police bureau. We also have an increased number of demonstrations that require resources to protect the demonstrators and also the public. Hopefully we aren't going to need to do much activity on that score. And -- and two other issues, we are in the middle of a strike negotiations, and I think we have to be very prudent about expenditure of resources whether we budgeted them or not. And finally, we are now facing, because of the recession, but primarily because of quest's refusal to pay their franchise fee, over \$4 million of budget cuts that I need to do right now. And I asked the council a couple of months ago, please don't expend this money until we have resolved some of the budget issues. Council wanted to appropriate this money, and it was done. But quite frankly, I don't know where to go. I cannot and will not make major reductions in police and fire at this time when I think our business here in the city is core business. Core business only. And so because times have changed, I need a little bit of time to work with the council to talk with the council on where they want to go to find those budget savings, not only now, but later this year

OCTOBER 17, 2001

when we start the work for the budget in -- for the next fiscal year. And I have to tell you, quite frankly, the next fiscal year is not only going to be the \$6 million, but it will also be the \$5 million that we don't have that is part of our negotiations package with detu. So business is going to have to be very, very different. The city -- the city programs are going to have to be many of them are going to have to be curtailed, and I don't think now is the time to make those kinds of expenditures. So that's the reason for pulling it off. Yes, commissioner.

Saltzman: I appreciate everything you've said, but i'm going to ask that we go ahead and approve these contracts, because this is the culmination of a commitment that the city council made back in august 2000 to create this early childhood investment fund with an initial level of \$1 million, and the goal was to invest -- and one of the reasons we did that was because we recognized early childhood development is a critical component of any economic development strategy. And the resolution we passed in august asked me to report in march of 2001 with recommendations of how to invest that money with the focus strategy that will create a significant impact on as many children as possible. In march of 2001 I came back with my recommendations, the recommendations were to allocate \$700,000 a year to the six head start, early head start providers in Portland, and then \$300,000 a year split equally between the two relief nurseries. So this motion -- this item before us today is simply the finally spending the money that we committed ourselves to do back in august of 2000. I realize -- and consistent with the economic conditions we are in, consistent with the requests that all agencies reduce general fund appropriations by 1.6%, I have committed to all of to you make that cut of 1.6% of this amount, but I still feel the need of these investments. As we enter a recession, as we talk about the september 11th events, we have to recognize that these organizations providing services to families in stress and children are critical. And they have a public safety, a direct link to public safety. I just talked to assistant chief drew kirkland and he reminded me that -- of the chronic nuisance calls in all of our precincts, 43 to 55% of those calls are domestic violence-related. So the extent that we can deal with families in crisis, families in stress and to deal with domestic violence, to deal with child abuse, hopefully we're going to free up more people off the phones and doing their duties. And I do think that the recession is a key time when these services are as critical as ever. As I said, when ma's boyfriend is unemployed while ma works taking care of the kids, that's not a good situation. We need the services the relief nurseries provide to work with these families very much. So this is the culmination of a policy I believe we have made the commitment to do this. The six or seven agencies are all relying on this. They'll be here - - I told them to be here at 10:00. They were all going to be here and prepared to testify as to why they're -- they're counting on this money as of last year. They've put it into their budgets, and as to the commitment, I believe with any general fund expenditure, it's always reviewable and subject to annual appropriation.

Katz: Well, let me just say that we need to make an amendment to this, because this does call for an emergency.

Harry Auerbach, Office of the City Attorney: You just did this.

Saltzman: This is first reading.

Katz: However, there are also other issues that I want to identify. That is that usually we manage grant programs through a bureau, not through a commissioner's office. So I would like to at some point --

Saltzman: Right. And i've spoken to the bureau of housing and community development about that.

Katz: You need to make an amendment to this.

Saltzman: We don't have to amend the contracts. We have to amend the contracts, but not the ordinance before us. Because we will also amend the contracts to reduce the amount --

Katz: I'll have someone else take a look at it.

Sten: If we're making comments, I --

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Katz: Excuse me. Harry? Did you want to say anything?

Auerbach: No.

Katz: I'm sorry.

Sten: I understand this has been a heated issue on the council all along. I'm frustrated we're going to do it again. I think we should look at whether we can continue to perform these functions, but we should do it in the same way we're going to look at the entire adopted budget later in the fall. I think to meet this year's goals we have to trim everything, and I really don't want to be in a position where I start coming back to council picking programs I don't want to fund. They exist throughout the bureaus that are in everybody's budget and say, let's just not do these ones. My two cents on this is that I voted for this in the context of making one of the most major changes in tax structures in the last 24 months that was before us, which was taking all of the incremented interstate, all of the tax increment that was going to be generated around interstate off of the tax books and into the city's budget through pdc. That has an effect on the schools and the county, and although I don't think we should or have to legally do any quid pro quo, not because we have to or the county was holding it for ransom, put money back into the early childhood programs that get funded by the other groups was the appropriate policy choice. Now it's the adopted budget. I don't want to jump to conclusions that in the absolutely necessary need to respond to a recession and security that early childhood programs that we did I think on a very contentious vote, but nonetheless there was the policy of the council should be the first thing to get axed as opposed to they take the hit -- I really want to be measured about this, but it feels like here we are taking another stab at it using a different approach when this was a policy debate from the very beginning that obviously was a disagreement. I think we should look at the whole budget, not line items if we're going to make reductions.

Katz: That's really the reason for this discussion, because I will be starting with your bureaus to look at the entire budget, and quite frankly, though the instructions have been to take 1.4% across the board, that is not going to be possible. So I need a little bit of flexibility on all the budgets, and this is a critical component of it. So that's the reason it will go if -- i'll open it up for conversation with the community right now if anybody wants to testify. But it will pass on to second.

Saltzman: I'd like to request a second reading occur I believe november 7th.

Katz: Because?

Saltzman: I think that will give us time to deal with all the issues with respect --

Katz: That's fine. Well, whatever time we have.

Hales: Are there people here to testify?

Saltzman: I asked them to be here at 10:00. There are a couple here now. If they care to testify, they're certainly welcome to.

Hales: I'm not sure, we might need more conversation than just testimony.

Katz: This may not be the time. Feel free to come and testify, but we'll have conversation -- I will have conversations with the council on how we want to manage the budget reductions that we have to face. So there will be plenty of time for further discussion. That was really the request to delay this. Did you want to testify on this item? Okay. Go ahead.

Saltzman: I think you're on the next item, actually.

*****: I know I am.

Katz: Identify yourself for the record.

Tom O'keefe: Tom o'keefe. I support this. I think we should support these kids, and there are a lot of kids in need. If we're looking at budget cuts, why not withdraw the \$1 million that you pledged to the arts community? A lot of people I know in lower income brackets can't afford the tickets to see the opera and this is and that. That's \$1 million you pledged to their fund-raising campaign. But there's a million there, i'd just as soon see the money go to the kids.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Katz: Thank you. You'll see my budget recommendations at the appropriate time. Okay. Come on up.

At 9:45 a.m., Mayor Katz left.

Lorraine Barton, Volunteers of America: I'm lorraine barton, from volunteers of america. We provide for the relief nursery there. We currently have -- the nursery has been operating for ten years. With the city money it would be able to take families off our current waiting list. The changes we see in those families are profound. As dan has mentioned, around their ability to be able to function as citizens and provide for their children. With a cut or without that money, that means those families would not be served, and especially during a time in which there is a recession and more families being on the poverty level it is even more imperative to be able to provide those services. So I know that the budget is very tight and I know that there's a lot of conversation that you all have to make, but just for you to keep in the forefront of your minds that we're talking about children, and we're talking about parents. Thank you.

Francesconi: Did you want to testify? Come on. Please do. The mayor had to go to a mediation. She's trying to help us settle the strike. Just by the luck of the draw here, i'm the president of the council -- or the unluck of the draw -- i'm the president of the council. Go ahead.

*****: I'll make --

Francesconi: Just say your name, please.

Cynthia Wells, Director, Early Head Start Program: Cynthia wells, the director for early head start program in Portland. We serve 257 families in the north-northeast and southeast of the Portland area. There's about 15,000 children under four years of age within that area, and about 5,000 of those children are eligible for our services. So we can only serve a very small portion. I think the money that's in the budget right now that was going to be used for early childhood services, it isn't going to make a huge impact on those 5,000 children, but what it will do is allow the head start community to leverage federal and state dollars to bring in more money into the community. I think that's the important piece. Without that money to leverage those other dollars, those children have absolutely no hope of being served. And with the economy now in a recession, these are the children that will be the most vulnerable and the most impacted. So i'd just like you to take that into consideration and -- when you're looking at the budget. Thank you.

Francesconi: So I want to be a little clear. If any council members wants to say something, then let's move on. Thank you for testifying. My -- the reason I pulled this off was three years. Earlier I had testified -- agreed to support it for one year. This was three-year commitment. The other reason is, we need some conversations with the county, which I hope will occur before the next hearing. Because traditionally the county has been responsible for this. And we need to have some conversations with them about, is this their highest priority, because frankly, that's why I think that was the root of the urban renewal discussion. The money wasn't pulled from these early childhood programs, it was pulled from the county. So I hope that conversation can happen when it comes back. Because clearly these are critical programs, and even more critical now. Okay. Does anybody else -- I don't want to necessarily have the last word.

Saltzman: I wanted to add on that point, the resolution in august did ask me to actually meet with the county and discuss these issues. In fact, commissioner nato, mayor becker from gresham and I cochaired a group to look at early childhood investment strategies and this was chosen to be a complimentary strategy to the many other things the county is doing.

Francesconi: Pam, you get the last word.

Pam Arden, Caring Community Coordinator: Thank you. I have short letter I handed to the secretary so we -- so you can have this for your file. I'm pam arden, the caring community coordinator for north Portland. I'm here to request continued support for the Portland relief nursery.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

You're aware of James John School being a S.U.N. School and we advocated to have that become such an entity so we could work with early childhood issues in North Portland. And specifically in St. Johns. And we have a campus idea going and the Portland relief nursery that will be built in St. Johns is a cornerstone of that policy up there. And what we'd like to have happen for the children and the families of North Portland. So if I could help us out, I'd appreciate it. Sorry, I came in late so I'm trying to pick up as I go. But I appreciate the time.

Francesconi: So this is going to pass on to second reading, but I do think kay, do you -- I think you should commissioner Saltzman be given a chance to have whoever you want testify at the second reading. I would recommend that, because I think it's fair in light of what's happening. So I don't think you need to choose right now, but if you want to have people testify --

Saltzman: Let's have Kay Teran, and then we'll close it. We're on this item right now, and --

Kay Teran, Volunteers of America: Good morning. I'm not sure what preceded me. I'm Kay Teran, president, CEO, Volunteers of America Oregon. My understanding is that before you today is the consideration of reducing the early childhood budget by about 50%.

Francesconi: Let me set it, Kay. In fairness, you didn't know this was going to lap. The issue is, do we approve the contracts right now for a three-year period, or just delay it to -- and the vote is not going to happen today. Or do we delay it for further consideration. That's what's technically in front of the council at the moment, not reducing it, but delaying.

Teran: Okay. Then I can speak to that. This is Kay Teran. I would strongly encourage you to give us a three-year contract. For planning purposes, as an administrator it's very difficult to plan not knowing what the reality is. It also is very difficult to plan for families who are most in need. If we do not have some sense of security, some sense of consistency, some sense of continuity. I came here prepared to say that the voice that's not coming to this table this morning are the children. They're never able to come before you and say to you how important their needs are. So those of us who represent them have to convince you that this is the wisest, the best investment you can make. Dollars invested well in early childhood are dollars saved down the road. I can't say strongly enough that -- make the commitment, keep that commitment, give us those three-year contracts, long-term, it's the best use of those dollars. So I would strongly encourage you to allow the contracts to go forward and not permit any kind of a delay. It's not fair to the children.

Francesconi: Thank you, Kay.

Saltzman: This will move to second reading of November 7th. Good.

*****: Thank you.

Francesconi: Okay. Now we're on to a time certain, which is --

Moore: We need 1229 first.

Francesconi: I'm sorry. Something else got pulled. 1229. Karla, could you read it?

Item No. 1229.

Tom O'Keefe, United Community Action Network: Tom O'Keefe, United Community Action Network. I support the ordinance. I wish I knew what some of the grants were going to be. As you know, I do not support when this was -- when this whole thing was put together in order to fund it, you raised residential garbage rates, took up the franchise fee from 3.5 to 5%, which is the ceiling to support the green building initiative, but you did not raise business rates. I'd still like to see that straightened up. It's not fair that residential puts the money forward to help developers and other things, when you don't have the business community to chip in too with higher garbage rates. I'm in favor of it, but the entire project needs to be spread evenly across the entire rate base. And we'd like to see that take place. I know it's a code change, but it can be done. Unfortunately the residential customers are the ones that pick up the bill here. And it's not fair to the -- to those customers and it needs to be spread evenly and across the entire rate base. Thank you.

Saltzman: Tom, if you want a list of the investment that's being funded, we can provide that to you. The office of sustainable development --

OCTOBER 17, 2001

O'keefe: You'll look at raising business rates?

Saltzman: We have looked into it.

Francesconi: Anybody else care to testify? Roll call.

Francesconi: I want to support this. I'm going to vote aye, but I actually voted against the original amendment -- ordinance for the reasons that were just expressed. Because I didn't feel it was fair then, and I don't feel it's fair now, frankly, for residents to subsidize even good business practices here without doing the same. I asked the question at the time of susan anderson about having -- looking at the commercial side, which I think could be done. And I was told that could happen. So you don't need to respond right now, commissioner sam, but I do think that it's really important we in government, that we fund good programs, but I also think the source of the funding in terms of issues of fundamental fairness are also very critical to us. Aye.

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

Francesconi: Okay. Now we're ready for the time certain. And that is 1219.

Item No. 1219.

Francesconi: Don't worry, we got all the contentiousness out of us. So we're going to have a nice friendly happy hearing here. I hope. Go ahead.

Sarah King, Portland Development Commission: Good morning. I'm sarah king with the Portland development commission. As many of you know, it's been a pretty exciting year so far in the lloyd district. We've had the Oregon convention center under construction, we've had light rail come to lloyd district, we've opened -- just complete and opened the east bank esplanade and there's currently a residential tower and an office tower in the district. There have been -- it's very exciting to see all these developments happen, because there are a great deal of opportunities in the district. If you read the article in "the Oregonian" this morning you know there are a lot of opportunities in the district. There are a lot a constraints as well. Capitalizing on these opportunities is what we're here to talk to you about today. As I said before, the word is opportunity, because there are so many things that could happen here. Currently we've got about 14,000 jobs and 1,000 housing units in the lloyd district, but really there's the extras for a whole lot more. The district's only about half built out. We've got a lot of vacant and under enveloped land, and we could be putting a lot more jobs, housing and tourist venues here in the district. Helping the lloyd district reach its potential is the purpose of the lloyd district development strategy. This 15-month process resulted in a common blueprint -- common vision and a district blueprint for public and private investment in the district. A main goal of the strategy is to leverage private dollars for district investment and particularly to take advantage of the urban renewal funds that are available through the urban -- the Oregon convention center urban renewal area, which is a district that will close in 2012. I want to say a word about the rose quarter, because although the rose quarter is part of the lloyd district target area, because of its unusual circumstances, the future planning for the rose quarter is on a separate but concurrent track, and we have just completed that planning effort as well. 16 steering committee members met for 15 months to create this strategy. The steering committee had a variety of other input, lloyd and I both interviewed property owners that weren't represented on the steering committee. We had two very well attended open houses. We received over 300 surveys from citizens about what they thought about the lloyd district and its future, what they'd like to see. Moreover, we had actually our steering committee helped pdc select a multidisciplinary consulting team to assist us, and that was led by lloyd linley and -- with the assistance of elaine cogan. And additionally staff from many agencies and the lloyd district, transportation management association helped craft this strategy. I think I can speak for the steering committee and pdc when I say this strategy is something we're all excited to begin implementing and we have in fact started to implement it already. This is not a plan that is going to sit on the shelf. I'll talk a little about the implementation we've undergone in a few minutes, but for right now i'd like to turn it over to lloyd, to tell you more about the vision and areas of strategy emphasis.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Lloyd Lindley: Thanks, sarah. I spent most of my life on this kind of work, and sitting here before you with this seems a little bit trivial in view of the current affairs that have been going on and the issues that you deal with, but I think vigilance in this area and staying the course and conducting business as usual is extremely important. I appreciate the work that you council members do under these circumstances. What I want to do is talk to you about the framework, then talk about the vision, and discuss the concept and tell you a little about our strategy emphasis, then i'm going to turn it back to sarah to discuss the implementation strategy and the next steps. The lloyd district has been talked about as being somewhat fragmented. One of our key issues or key approaches was to create connectivity in the district and to look at that framework. One is the district is a central city gateway. It has employment, shopping, entertainment, and major discontinuation attractors. It also has great views. It sits about 100 feet above the river and has spectacular views out over the city and to the east toward mt. Hood. The framework is also composed of a well connected transportation system. In particular, a multimodal system, and there is quality development there. Good transit and after a lot of discussion with one-on-one interviews, as sarah mentioned with private developers and people in the neighborhoods as well as property owners and businesses, we felt zoning was appropriate for the district. With the steering committee, we established 28 guiding principles, and eight vision statements. And what i'd like to do is read you our overall vision and paraphrase the vision statements. After significant public input, the lloyd district envisioned by the steering committee and the community has new urban housing, thriving specialty shops, and a variety of different types of office space and attractive mixed use developments. It is an area noted for diverse dining and entertainment options, noted for diverse -- and a robust tourist economy. All parts of the district are incorporated are -- are interconnected by pedestrian friendly walkways, tree-lined streets, bicycle way and transit and contain many parks and plazas for active and respite. The district vision had subdivision statements, and i'm going to run through these quickly. 24-hour community, which is consistent with our goal for the central city, pedestrians should be able to walk comfortably throughout the district, housing should be affordable for people who live and work in the district, and the transportation system should offer many choices in terms of modes and connections. The district should be recognized as an active and vital part of the central city and people who come to the district should enjoy unique amenities, such as the convention center and so forth. The rose quarter and the restaurants and hotels. It should also have safe and easy access to the bluff, the edge that overlooks the river and downtown Portland and access to the east side esplanade and the pedestrian system that runs around the river. The concept strategy in a way reinforces the 1987 Oregon convention center strategy that was done in response to the Oregon convention center, but expands that into housing. That occ strategy had no housing in its proposal, and in a way the criticism has been that the lloyd district has no there, there, and it is really not a 24-hour community, it's really an episodic place where people come and go from work, from events, and the major move in this is to incorporate housing and to try and create real neighborhoods and places in this district. And to do that the other significant piece is to try and create better connectivity and more pedestrian friendly streets, places where people feel very comfortable to bike and walk. The strategy had four areas of emphasis. One is around the convention center, which is consistent with the 87 occ strategy. Two is the area north of the convention center, which is looked at as an opportunity for housing. Thirdly is the Broadway Weidler corridor, creating an anchor at the west end of the 15th and 16th Broadway Weidler shopping district and the central core, creating a public amenity and increased development. The Oregon convention center area, the two major missions there is to secure a major hotel site and redevelop properties around the convention center that with a support visitor and tourist activities in the district. The second is to improve pedestrian connections, identify additional near term pedestrian improvements in the district, create a system of quiet streets that promote housing, and easier access throughout the district and to construct a pedestrian bridge that would create a link

OCTOBER 17, 2001

over i-5 to the rose quarter and in the future on to the river. Residential development is one of our key emphasis areas, and the idea there is to provide financial incentives to construct housing for all income levels, provide and market housing in the district for those who work in the district and to implement middle income residential ownership programs. Innocent housing in the residential subarea, that's that area north of the Oregon convention center, and you can see in the little diagrams here the one on the top shows 14th avenue adjacent to lloyd center, trying to soften the edge of lloyd center and look at very developing that area more in the scale and the texture of Broadway and Weidler and creating more housing opportunities to link into Elliott, Irvington and Sullivan's Gull much. You can see some of the other products. We've looked at product such as do it yourself lofts, and we're also looking at more high-rise kinds of housing opportunities, and you can see the Cascadia, which is currently under construction on the lower right-hand corner. The central core is really a catalyst project. It would be perhaps a phased project that would encourage development of local -- of a local public attractor and would include public open space and some cultural uses. We would also look at exploring incentives to increase the supply and diversity of office space. This is all about economic development of the district. We need to be vigilant about that as we were -- when we looked at the 25-year plan for the downtown area and said we need to continue the kind of effort that we've had in downtown over the last 25 years, and we should continue the same vigilance in the Lloyd district. And you can see in the lower left-hand corner, major public plaza and public open space with higher density residential and mixed -- and a mix of uses of office and commercial types of uses. The Broadway Weidler corridor also is fragile, as Sarah said, it needs to continue to be encouraged to unfold and our points there are to implement phase three and phase four of the Broadway Weidler corridor plan, which are street improvements similar to those from 15th, 16th, to 10th, and to sustain street orient the retail and services within the district. And you can see the results of a storefront plan at the Mountain Shop on 7th and Broadway, which was just completed just in the last few weeks and reopened. The entrance used to be on the side, we have a corner entrance and we're focusing on that intersection. In -- encourage the development of niche office and flex office outside of the central city core and up in the upper little illustration you see product that we worked with Eric Covey and Associates who was our economist and market consultant, who helped us develop some products that might fit into the market there, and these are little flex office space kinds of developments. On that note I'd like to turn it back to Sarah.

King: Sure. This strategy would not be complete without an implementation strategy to help us get there, and our strategy certainly includes a very large implementation matrix. It's probably got more stuff than we'll ever have time and/or money to do, but there's a lot in here. As you can see, it covers elements such as housing, economics development, parks and open space, streets, streetscape, art, tourism, identity issues, and so on. Now, in this implementation strategy, as I said, we've got a lot in here, and we did not do a comprehensive prioritization because that is something we will do at PDC through our five-year planning process which we're just beginning. We'll be working with stakeholders to not only prioritize projects, but put time lines and costs behind them and it will certainly guide our tax increment funding expenditure in the district throughout its life. As I said, we've started to begin implementation of this plan. Our housing staff and economic development staff at PDC have begun their housing and economic development strategies of housing is near completion and economic is just beginning and should be done by the end of this year. And that is a specific focus look at plans, programs, and further actions -- housing units in the district. Northeast 7th to northeast 10th, moving the street improvements west to where they are now. That would be done probably through like phase one through an I.I.D. With tax increment financing help. And we have begun working with RAC to implement a way finding and arts program in the district to help give identity as well as to help orient visitors to the district to the various areas and attractions in the district. What I'd like to do right now is introduce to you many of the steering

OCTOBER 17, 2001

committee folks that are here in the audience and several of them would like to say a few words to you. So I'm going to see who we've got. We've got Jeff from the Oregon convention center, we've got Karen Woodruff from Ashforth Pacific, we've got Lynn Coward from Sullivan's Gulch, Wanda from Lloyd Center Mall, John from the Caleroga Terrace, Pal even broad forward, Dick Levy, and back there is Elaine Cogan, one of our consultants. Am I missing -- Jay Isaac with the Trail Blazers. And Barbara Sack with the Bureau of Planning. I have missed anybody? Okay. Great. I'm going to step off now and give our folks a couple of -- an opportunity to speak with you.

Karen Woodruff, Ashforth Pacific: My name is Karen Woodruff with Ashforth Pacific. Our CEO has requested that I read the following letter. Dear Mayor Katz and members of the council. I apologize for not being able to address you in person today, but unfortunately business calls. Please do not interpret my absence as a lack of commitment to the Lloyd District or the City of Portland. As chairman of the Lloyd District Development Strategy Steering Committee, I have witnessed a high level of neighborhood pride and enthusiasm. The dedication of our committee inspires my confidence that the Lloyd District has a bright future. The plan before you is a product of hard work that kept us focused for some 18 months. This plan identifies them -- over the next ten years and beyond and suggests a time frame in which these changes should happen. Before I describe some of the major points of our strategy, I would like to thank my committee members for their tireless participation, Sarah King and the Portland Development Commission, our technical team, and finally Lloyd and everyone on his project team. The document produced by this talented group will be our guidebook, an important tool which we will use as our -- as our neighborhood continues to grow. Let there be no doubt about it. Growth is the key word. Our committee was unanimous in feeling that our neighborhood should continue to add to the over \$1 billion of private and public funding that has been invested in the Lloyd District over the past ten years, picking up where the 1988 strategic plan left off. Our momentum must be sustained. The plan before you includes a number of important features that I would like to highlight. First it is important to keep in mind this is a conceptual plan. This strategy outlined is not intended as a precise prescription or formula for district development. Rather it presents an array of potential themes and key elements that combine to form a coherent vision for future development. We therefore ask that you concentrate on the type of addition and changes that can take place rather than the exact form and location depicted in the plan. Second, I ask you to concentrate on the following themes. A diverse 24-hour neighborhood. Currently the Lloyd District benefits from a strong combination of diverse businesses that draw many different types of people to the district. From entertainment to retail, to office employment, to hotels, to residential, to multiple transportation options, the Lloyd District has all the underpinnings of a true 24-hour neighborhood. Our plan outlines the strategy for strengthening this condition. We mentioned the addition of a convention center hotel and have identified two locations that might be suitable for such a project. We also suggest the construction of additional housing units, both rental and condominium, spread throughout the district, especially south of Weidler Street. Connections between subneighborhoods. The district is both blessed and cursed with three of the state's largest destinations. The Rose Garden Arena, the Oregon Convention Center, and the Lloyd Center Mall. These buildings have the ability to attract thousands of people to special events and therefore to the Lloyd District as well. The challenge is to give visitors a reason to remain in the district rather than to simply attend their particular function and then leave. In order to attract people to stay, the district must connect these sites with additional uses and make the streets invite can to the pedestrian. Our plan addresses these issues by calling for everything from better way finding signage to transit improvements including the extension of the streetcar system to the district. We would also like to see the development of more park space and a system of quiet streets that will encourage residential development. Increase jobs and housing. Your committee realizes the Lloyd District and our city cannot survive in the long term without a system in place to stimulate job creation in the central city. Attracting new companies to our area and nurturing the existing ones is

OCTOBER 17, 2001

key to making our plan a success. Without the engine of profitable and growing business, whatever their size, it will be difficult to deliver any elements of the plan. With regard to housing, our committee recognizes additional housing units are needed within the district. A strong housing program complete with both condominium and apartment units is key to our continued growth. The development plan addresses this issue with a number of different suggestions. High-rise, mid-rise, and town homes are contemplated. The jobs and housing issues are so important we developed two additional subcommittees for each topic. These committees are still meeting to develop the best plan to encourage a strong base and a balanced housing program within our neighborhood. Finally, we need your help to make this plan a reality. The lloyd district has the strength of our urban renewal district, our business improvement district, and our transportation management association. Who all stand behind this plan. However, your strong endorsement and ongoing commitment as -- is essential if we are to successfully capitalize on the enormous potential of the district to become a healthy and vibrant downtown neighborhood. The lloyd district has been referred to at times as complete and in need of no more additional help with its growth. I hope this plan demonstrates that in fact we are not complete, but just beginning to grow and realize our potential. Again, I regret I could not address you today in person, but please formally adopt this plan and join us in making our vision a reality. Sincerely, henry ashforth.

Francesconi: Thank you. Who is next? Richard?

Richard Levy: Richard levy, 2611 northeast 17th avenue, Portland. I really was wearing several hats aside from my commercial real estate hat. I was president of the northeast broadway business association when this process began. Also have been an irvington resident for 32 years. A lot of what you've already heard is what we've spent 15, 17 months distilling. There are probably two points i'd like to make to you. One is that we're still -- the lloyd district is still a district in transition. It is far from complete, it is far from an exciting place to be in the evenings, it's actually rather lonesome and very quiet. Downtown has become exciting and, you know, the place to be. The pearl district is exciting. 21st and 23rd avenues are interesting places for people to walk. The only interesting area in the lloyd district to walk currently is frankly the broadway corridor, and that's not very many blocks of that. So I would urge you as you look at this plan and as you help us with street planning, transportation planning, new traffic lights or changes in lighting and transportation is probably a key here, keep in mind the need for an additional streetcar in the district, an additional pedestrian opportunities to cross both north and east into the neighborhoods. The links currently, you take your life in your own hands sometimes crossing broadway at some places, crossing the 15th, 16th, whatever you call that kind of ring road at the end. I also watch people running across Multnomah and lloyd boulevard. So the streets are not friendly for walking. They're barely tolerable I think for bicyclists. So as we go forward and the zoning is there, there are lots of good things in place, but this is not a completed district. And it's not planned the way the pearl district was. It was not an adopted plan at one time. This has come together over, what, 50, 60 years at least since the lloyd family started developing it. I'm not asking you for a lot of money, i'm asking for continued interest in the corridor, and concentrating some of pdc's efforts to help with retaining businesses in the area and reutilizing property in the area. A lot of the property is fast food restaurants that take up a whole block. Those are poor uses of entire blocks of the district. Four square blocks of parking garages are poor uses of the area of the lloyd district. And lastly, as you look at our plan, I want to compliment lloyd on a remarkable redo of the broadway -- of the mlk-grand couplet. He has wonderful ideas and beautiful buildings. It would be nice to see those before I die. [laughter] thank you.

Francesconi: Richard, you weren't saying you would never ask us for money, are you?

Levy: No.

Francesconi: I can't think so.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Pauline Bradford: Good morning. My name is Pauline Bradford, and I live on Northeast First and Elliott. I've been around this neighborhood for about 50-some years, so I've seen a lot of stuff come and go over time. Anyway, I would urge your support of this plan to work toward recreating a neighborhood. It was a neighborhood once, now we want to recreate it. And increasing the economic development of this uniquely located part of Portland, because if you stop and think about it, it is really uniquely located. It has transportation coming in from everywhere. And it's close to downtown, close to lots of high density housing, really. I mean, and a variety of housing as you look at the neighborhoods to the north and east of it. And as you are aware, every area is different. But as population increases, multiple uses of some real estate is essential to filling out the city in an exciting way. And this plan also leads room to preserve a few of the historic ethnic structures still left within the district. And also, I personally think that the institutional uses that are there gives some stability and they can be capitalized to enhance the attractiveness of the area. And I think I'll stop there. Thank you.

Francesconi: Thank you.

Jeff Blosser, Director, Oregon Convention Center: Jeff Blosser, director of the convention center. I've been here since 1989, I consider Lloyd District kind of a diamond in the rough. And seeing the development just since 1989 has been fantastic. What I would really encourage in this plan, what I see in this plan is the connection of east and west, the central business core. And I think that goes all the way down from now with the East Bank Esplanade and all the way to the Rose Quarter development that we become a part of the central city. I think from our business or our attracting visitors from out of town, that needs to continue to happen, and that's what this plan calls for. People like to be in areas where people are. And I think the housing and the 24-hour activity community will really make that happen for us, and when we bring visitors into town, they like to play and be in a vibrant community, and that's really what we want for the district as well. We have a lot of entertainment options in the district, but I think the real key components from the visitor standpoint and the tourism standpoint is improvement to the access, like Dick talked about in terms of pedestrian access where people can actually walk around the district when things get improved, I think we need much better signage, individuals do not know how to come out of a hotel and get to the Rose Quarter or Convention Center. Broadway-Weidler shopping, I think that's key for a successful district. I think too the other part of this is that in a development in the public-private partnership is a higher end retail and restaurant scenario. In terms of the district to really round it out. Obviously you probably thought I wasn't going to get out of here without talking about a headquarter hotel. I think Lloyd's plan in the committee's commitment to the vision of the tourist part of what we do, the headquarter hotel I think is essential to continue to reap the benefits of the public Portland public schools that have already been developed and the investment of the convention center and the Rose Quarter will allow us to really turn that into a very unique opportunity for Portland. So I would encourage the city council to support this and also again continue to make sure this doesn't sit on the shelf and that we take the opportunity over the next ten or 11 years whether we have the funds available to make this vision a reality. Thank you.

Saltzman: Did I hear somebody say there is a designated site where that headquarter hotel would go? Is it still the property just north of the convention center?

Blosser: There's actually several locations.

Saltzman: That are highlighted in this vision?

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

Saltzman: Okay.

Francesconi: Are there any other questions from the council?

Levy: There are two design that's show the overlay of where they might go.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Francesconi: Maybe -- i've got two questions. The first question I should have asked pdc. On the economic development side, the stimulus side, to bring more jobs into the area, I know housing is at the top of the list, but on the job side, do you have any ideas as to what we need to do? And --

Levy: We do, but i'm one of the members serving on the economic development task force of this group. We just began meeting last night. Because of staffing reasons, pdc got this part of it done before the housing, and the economic development components were actually begun. So in three months you will see an addition to the economic development strategy outlined a little more clearly, I believe.

Francesconi: Okay. There may be some urgency to this, as you know. The second question is, do you want to -- a major league baseball stadium nearby?

Blosser: I'm afraid to answer that question. [laughter] portions of the rose quarter plan have it in. I don't think this plan calls for that. And I -- I sat on the rose quarter steering committee, and I think the plan the rose quarter has come up with is acknowledging that opportunity, but not necessarily saying that's the best for the district based on some of the opportunities it's probably the best way to qualify that at this point.

Bradford: And you know elliott doesn't want it.

Francesconi: Anybody else want to weigh in? You don't have to. Okay. Now we'll open this up for public testimony. Come on up, sir. I live at 3817 north williams avenue, boise neighborhood. I'm here to testify for a different reason, but i'd like to compliment the design, because it inquires a bike trail through the sullivan gulch area. I think so far it looks good. Thanks.

Francesconi: I can guess what item you're here on testify on. Okay. Roll call. Again for those who may have come in late, the only reason the mayor isn't here, and she's coming back shortly, is because she's working on trying to settle the strike. She's in mediation on that issue. So she sends her regrets that she couldn't be here. Just briefly, it was said here that this is a central city gateway, lloyd center, so really how we become a more active central city is really important, and the lloyd center is already a big start on that. You've pushed it east of the river, and how we kind of think of ourselves as a central city with frankly the central eastside eventually part of that is really, really important to the future of our whole city. You have a lot of talent there as well as a lot of opportunities, and you've already got major investment there, which frankly we need a whole lot more of than our cities. So you can help show us how to do that. The issue of housing is critical to all of our neighborhood business districts this. Is true in st. Johns and lents as it is here. And it's great to see the recognition, how far we've come in the recent past to that. The issue of economic investment right now is really, really critical. I know if hank ashford were here he would have led to that. That issue of how we do that and take advantage of the blazers investigation, the lloyd center investment, and really leverage this is really important. I was glad to see you also talked about parks and the east bank is not far away, and everything you're talking about can really activate that, and then further link it to the central city, the central eastside, which I think it would be good if you could think even more about how to do that, frankly. But this -- it is an exciting time, and you know, we are in a slow-down now, so there won't be did there may not be a lot of private investment immediately, but if we prepare for it, so when it starts to happen we're ready, instead of putting people through a very long process, now's the time to set it in place. And the lloyd center and this whole area is just ripe for a major investment. Because you really as someone said, it's an area in transition, we're a city in transition, we're becoming a big city, and the lloyd center is a critical part of that. Aye. Thanks for your work.

Hales: Well, lloyd, you said something at the outset that I want to key off of, which is that somehow this might seem unimportant. I disagree. I think the work that you've done is going to have -- is going to have lasting value, and I really appreciate the good collaborative effort that's gone into this. And the creative diagram you've created for a very long process of implementation. One of the things that I heard in the last few weeks was a wonderful commentary from a guy that

OCTOBER 17, 2001

you and I have worked with, fred kent, with the project for public spaces. He talked about how in the immediate aftermath of the september 11th attacks new yorkers started spontaneously gathering in places like union square and prospect park, and that the importance of creating real public places that people care about and participate in civic life in was for him reaffirmed by that. And there ought to be places where in times of local or national joy or sadness people come together. And you've staked that out as one of the objectives in this district. By contrast, there was an article in the new york times about a suburb in new jersey that had lost a lot of people to the attacks, and that in that particular suburb the only place they have to put up the annual christmas tree is the median strip on highway 35. Because they never got around to creating places that people care about, other than their own private property. And so why this stuff matters is that the only way you get those kind of civic assets is by deliberate planning and action. They don't happen spontaneously, as the new jersey suburbs demonstrated. And they are the result of planning and design and effort and implementation. So what you've done here really matters on a human level as well as on an architectural and real estate level. So I think that's going to be very valuable to us as a community over time. I see nothing in here, I -- nothing in here I disagree with. I think you're on the right track. Would I just issue a challenge and a warning to pdc, I think pdc is doing a great job across the board, but i'm going to continue to sort of nail the ladder a little higher, and that is pdc's in this job in this district and every other district is not simply to increase the pace of what was going to happen anyway, but is to build the leadership projects that implement the plan. There are a lot of people who can build generic retail development or generic office development in this district without our help. Our job is to help make the transition as we've done in the pearl district, as we've done in the central city. From what the real estate market would have produced anyway, to what the plan says we want. And that's hard. And that's expensive. And that's why we have urban renewal districts. So i'm going to continue to play that kind of nag and watchdog role with pdc, because frankly I don't want to see anymore buildings like the agricultural marketing center. Sorry to name names. We shouldn't be building buildings that the market can produce without our help. We should be producing buildings like the belmont dairy and the cascadian and a lot of the stuff you see in the central city that wouldn't have happened but for the urban renewal agency. I played that nag role when I bugged the agency to buy the sizzler site across the street from the convention center, because what the market was going to produce there was a burger joint. And that isn't good enough, and you all believe that passionately. So the implementation phase here is -- will require help from the council as well as an activist and bold effort by pdc to make this plan happen by taking some risks and doing some things that the market won't do anyway, and that will embolden and encourage the property owners in the district to stretch as well. So again, that's not so much a criticism as a challenge. It's going to be hard for you, it's going to be hard for us, but this plan can be realized I think for -- with the combination of the consensus you have, the good design ideas that you've adopted and some action in the marketplace when the opportunity is there and when we can get the resources and the Portland public schools together to make it happen. So look forward to that, and I think five years from now, ten years from now, 50 years from now, this will make a difference. Thank you. Aye.

Saltzman: This is a great vision document, and it's made better by the fact all of the various groups stand united behind it, neighborhood groups, business groups, and it's a great piece of gee graphic area to be working with. I've always been amazed that this area really hasn't taken off. It does have some great retail and great open space, it has some great institutional uses there, but in between, there's a lot of under developed properties and in fact when I first started my environmental engineering business in 1989, my first job was doing an environmental assessment of a piece of property right on 13th and broadway. I thought -- and lo and behold, nothing's happened to that property since. Did I that job for dick coolly. He hired me to do that job. And to this day i'm amazed nothing has happened there yet. So I think this plan provides sort of the fabric and certainly

OCTOBER 17, 2001

we've got to make sure we can get the economy going to provide the fuel to make this into a reality. It's a good framework for us to be operating under and you can count on our continued support for our efforts. Aye.

Sten: It's all been said, but it's a very nice piece of work. Both the neighborhoods and the businesses and all the professionals who worked on this, there's just -- there's an unlimited potential and the great thing I think with the way this is coming forward and I think it's been there for a while, the ability to do it in a way that compliments existing neighborhoods. There's a lot of space for housing, I think housing is missing in the district. And also I think it will help the demographics a lot. This may not be exactly right, but I think it's something along the lines of there's more housing units in irvington now but less people. So is it more dense or less dense is my rhetorical question. I think getting more people into the area is bidding condominiums, there's a lot of products that could help fill out the niches of who could live there and give it a lot of vibrancy. With the new office tower coming in and other things, even in this bad time, there's sign that's maybe it's been slower than people would have thought, but we haven't messed it up either. There's plenty of time if we can use this document as a guide post to get it right. It's a very good piece of work. Aye.

Francesconi: Thank you, everybody. Your welcome to stay for the rest. We have some good things on the agenda here. Okay. The next is -- why don't you read the next time certain, item 1220.

Item No. 1220.

Hales: While roger is setting up and getting ready to make this presentation to us, I just want to preface this with, this is more good news about Portland. And more signs of our leadership locally and nationally, so this is an opportunity for us to celebrate some good work and look ahead at what might be next. I think commissioner Francesconi in particular is aware of the little intramural fight we've had over the last couple months to ensure funding for the next phase of the spring water corridor project. You were helpful in lobbying that and other members were as well. We just did secure \$3.9 million in regionally approved federal transportation money to build those three bridges across the johnson creek, the railroad, and mccloughlin boulevard to connect the spring water corridor trail that already exists to the sellwood neighborhood, and thus ultimately to omsi and to the east bank esplanade. So that was just one more box checked off in the long list of action items about how we get to be, as we've just been recognized this week, the best bicycle city in north america. We've been recognized in the past as being the best bicycle city in the united states, but they've upgraded us, bicycle magazine has, upgraded us and said -- is that my computer? I'm sorry. [beeping]

Francesconi: Mayor, we thought you were going to come and announce you settled the strike.

Hales: Sorry, that was my computer making that noise.

Katz: There's an offer on the table.

Hales: Hopefully this is an incoming e-mail about another award for Portland. But let me turn it off and we can get rid of this distraction. My apologies. Wow. [beeping] I think I did it. No, I didn't. [laughter] i'll leave it alone and see if it stops making noise. So with that, roger is here from the office of transportation to talk about the update of the plan, and I know there are others here from the bicycle transportation alliance and from our advisory committee here as well and from other parts of pdot that have work order this effort. But I just want to say at the outset that we should give ourselves a collective pat on the back for being the best bicycle city in north america and we should give roger geller and his team at pdot a pat on the back for making that so. Thank you.

Roger Gellar, Office of Transportation: Thank you, commissioner Hales. Before I begin I want to make sure we've got the technology working. My name is roger gellar. The city's bicycle coordinator in the office of transportation. These are difficult times for more than one reason.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Nevertheless, I'm pleased to present to you a generally positive and optimistic report on the state of bicycling in Portland. I'm pleased because I truly believe bicycling represents salvation for much of what ails us, literally and figuratively. I'm pleased because I'd like to help the city. In my mind, the ability of all our citizens to bicycle about freely and safely in their city is an important measure of the health of both the city and its residents. My presentation represents a five-year update on the progress we've made since council adopted the bicycle master plan in 1996. To keep things interesting I'm going to ask you quiz questions to highlight some of the points I wish to make. Please feel free to answer. [laughter] here's question number 1. What percentage of trips made by dutch citizens 75 years old and older are by bicycle? Keep in mind in Portland, approximately 2% of all trips are made by bicycle. The answer is c, 24%. The netherlands has made a concerted effort to create a country where its citizens truly have a choice about how to get around. Think what would it be like to be 75 years old and feel confident enough, secure enough, safe enough and be fit enough to conduct almost one quarter of your trips by bicycle. We know how to do that and we've been taking steps to create that type of environment here in Portland. Researchers analyzing what the dutch have done point to six elements. Providing good facilities for bicycling, urban design oriented to people and not automobiles. Traffic calming in residential neighborhoods. Stricter enforcement of traffic regulations protecting cyclists. Better traffic education for motorists and nonmotorists and restrictions on automobile use. These ideas do not sound at all foreign to us. With the exception of imposing revisions on automobile use, in Portland we're proceeding with improvements in all other categories, and it's paying off nicely. In the five years since the bicycle master plan was adopted, we've made a well considered investment in developing bikeways throughout the city. At the beginning of 1996, we had 111 developed bikeway miles. Today we have 226 miles. We have seen this investment pay off in the number of our residents using their bicycles for transportation. Year after year, we see increases in the number of people riding bicycles at our many locations throughout all districts of the city. Bicycle traffic across the three main bicycle bridges, the Broadway, Burnside and Hawthorne, that's grown from 3,000 daily trips in 1995 to more than 6300 daily trips in this past summer. Bike trips across the Absentee bridge, which to our knowledge never totalled more than 400 per day, has exploded to more than 1200 daily trips with the opening of the East Bank Esplanade. In the Lloyd district, thanks to the investment development of good bicycling facilities and to the leadership shown by the Lloyd District Transportation Management Association, bicycle commuting has more than doubled in the past two years from 2% to 5%. More important than the gross numbers is evidence that we're continuing to attract new riders to the system. A 600 cyclist survey found one-third began using their bicycle for commuting within the previous two years. One-fifth began the previous year. This is good news. And it demonstrates in giving people a legitimate choice about how to get around the city, more and more people are choosing to make bicycling a part of their daily lives. At the same time that ridership is up, the number of reported bicycle crashes in Portland is heading steady. Based on this I'm confident in stating our bicycle crash rate is declining. This translates into reported feelings of safety by Portland cyclists. Between the summers of 2000 and 2001, more than 70% of 1,000 surveyed cyclists reported feeling somewhat or very safe while riding Portland streets. Less than 10% reported feeling not very safe when riding their bicycles. It has been a combination of providing good facilities reducing traffic speeds through traffic calming measures, increasing enforcement, that's resulted in more people using bicycles and feeling secure about doing so. Our land use pattern certainly helps. And results in relatively short trip distances that are easily accommodated by bicycle. Which leads us to question number 2. How long does it take to travel by bicycle from Northwest and Front Avenues to the Rose Quarter, including parking? The answer is c, ten minutes. One of the best kept secrets in Portland is how quick it is to bicycle, particularly in the inner city. The fastest most direct route from that area of Northwest Portland to the inner northeast is the River Walk. Attracting people to buy Columbia Gorge is also about nuance. One

OCTOBER 17, 2001

stretch of road that's bad for buys columbia gorge, and people stay away. Which unfortunately is a situation on front avenue. Where abandoned rail lines remain a threat to safe cycling. This is an issue that continues to vehicles our bicycle advisory committee. Bicycle lanes along front avenue are essential, especially with a continuing development in the river district. Yet more important than bicycle lanes on the street is the need to remove the front rail lines that cut across the street at an acute angle and are notorious for causing bicycle crashes. We're moving out of service rails and designing new rails, including streetcar lines that work well for people on bicycles is an important element in further reducing our bicycle crash rate. Our efforts to provide a good bicycling environment in Portland are generally on the right track. Whereas national buys columbia gorge rates are declining, Portland is bucking that trend. With a well developed bike lane network in place in much of the city, there are and other important areas in which we can focus our efforts to make Portland more bike friendly. I'll discussion four such areas. Bicycle parking, off-street paths, promotion for bicycling, and better motorist behavior. Bicycle parking. The city code that went into effect in january of '97 included provisions for more and better bicycle parking. This is generally resulted in high quality commuter bike parking in the many new buildings we've seen rise in the past five years. Yet problems with implementation persist. For example, our commercial districts and business places should send a message that they welcome and encourage people on bicycles. These are the places where people commonly go. And if secure attractive bicycling parking is provided it will be seen as areas where cyclists are welcome. Entire blocks in the river district have been constructed without visible bike parking. Our bicycle advisory committee has made resolution of this a top priority and we're working both internally with pdot and the office of planning and development review to make sure our commercial districts send the right message. It will be -- interesting to know with the conversion of pay stations and the retirement of parking meters we're converting posts to bike parking. Off-veto paths. Part of the success we've seen in increasing bike ridership can be attributed to the excellent pathway system we continue to develop. Portland parks and recreation has done a wonderful job developing pathways throughout the city. In the past five years, we've seen the opening of spring water corridor trail, peninsula crossing trail, additions to the marine drive trail, the east bank esplanade and the portions of the columbia slough trail. Next year we'll benefit from the omsi to spring water trail. Our recommended trail network of almost 100 miles is more than half complete. And it integrate well with our network of on-street bikeways. Trails or off-street pads are important incubators for new cyclists. Novice cyclist and families with children find them an ideal place to ride. People will often take to riding on the streets. The problems we're beginning to see on the paths, the conflicts between pedestrian and part time on bicycles, result in part from their popularity and in part from a design that does not adequately consider the transportation function performed by these trails. We need to design highly functional trails that provide both a park like experience but also serve well those using them fore transportation. There's additional work to be done, there's still many cyclists who believe they can ride at top speed anywhere they're allowed to ride, and that's not the case. Pdot, parks and Multnomah county are beginning to talk about how to -- since function follows form, we should be sure-to-design them well. Promotion of bicycling. Portland's bikeway network is perhaps the best kept secret in town. It's currently possible to ride on developed bikeways throughout the city and access almost any destination. Yet many people are still unaware. That's why we need to continue to promote, just how easy a city Portland is to get around in by bicycle. We need to clear up some of the misperception that's people have about using a bicycle for transportation. For example, question number 3. A trip by bicycle from either hawthorne, Multnomah village, hollywood, or kenton to pge park takes approximately how long? The answer is again c, about 25 minutes. [laughter] most people grossly overestimate --

Hales: Depends on whether you stop for beer at the luck labrador. Could be a day and a half. [laughter]

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Gellar: At 10 miles per hour, a pace at which the average person can wear normal clothing and not work up a sweat, a mile is traveled? Just six minutes. Given that half of all urban trips are three miles or less, the bicycle becomes a very reasonable alternative to the car. For the past three years we've offered the very popular summer cycle bike rides. These rides leave after work four evenings per week from neighborhoods throughout the city and introduce novice cyclists to a bikeway network. The rides are slow-paced. The pleasure experienced by participants is reflected in the fact that many if not most participate in more than one tour. Another project that offers great promotional benefit is the comprehensive signing of our bikeway network. We were awarded a federal grant to develop a signing system for our existing bikeways. We feel once people have visible evidence of where the routes go and where they are, we believe ridership will grow even faster than it has. Better motorist behavior. This is a real important one. The number 1 reason people say they don't ride is because they fear for their safety. The reason people fear is because of automobile drivers. By providing 226 miles of bikeways we've created many safe places on city streets for people on bicycles. Remember, we want to create a city where 75-year-olds can ride comfortably on the street along with their 9-year-old grandchildren. Aggressive motorist behavior scares people on bicycles, it scares people walking, and it scares other motorists. Removing -- we're moving in the right direction with enforcement. Photo radar and red light running cameras are good tools for encouraging what should be universally acceptable behavior. In that vein I urge the council to consider reallocating the resources that are currently dedicated to bicycle law enforcement to a more rigorous effort and enforcing proper and legal motorist behavior. After all, it's reporting about motorist that's are among the top complaints in our neighborhoods year after year. Of course -- driving unpredictably through traffic, riding too fast by people walking, these are selfish behaviors and they do little to recommend bicycling to others. Yielding to pedestrians is a basic rule of operating any vehicle. I suggest people using bicycles ride in the manner that demonstrates just how enjoyable an activity it truly is. Truly urban bicycling is one of the most pleasurable activities to be undertaken in Portland. The more bikeable is a city, the better is it a place to live. According to the federal center for disease control, it is also a healthier place. That is why so many people are still cycling in the netherlands. Everything they've done with traffic and urban design supports bicycling, and as a result, in their eighth decade, they're still fit enough to do it. In the u.s., Portland exemplifies good urban design into creating a bikeable city. It is why municipalities throughout the u.s. Look to us for ideas and information. It is why we have recently been designated a bicycle friendly community. It why we have three times been recognized by bicycling magazine as america's most bicycle friendly city. Most recently this year when they named us the best overall city for bicycling in north america. And it is one of the reasons why "fortune" magazine recognizes Portland as a wonderful place to live. Urban bicycling is truly one of life's greatest pleasures. It's one of the great pleasures of our childhood and it's no less than a pleasure in our adult years. We've made great strides in the past five years. We should feel proud of the commitment and the effort we've shown. In 2034, i'll be 75 years old. I hope we continue on the path that will allow me to comfortably, and courtesly drive my bicycle on our city streets. Thank you for your time.

Hales: Thanks, roger. Good report.

Francesconi: First let's see if there's any questions. Does any council have any questions? Actually, I have one. I understand the better motorist behavior and the promotion efforts and especially the pathways and parks and i'll say it -- more about that later has really tried to emphasize the pathways. On the issue of bicycle parking, will it doesn't matter to me where I park my bicycle, so I guess my question is, do you have any data saying that improved bicycle parking actually increases bicycle ridership?

Rick Williams, Executive Director, Lloyd District Transportation Management Association: As a matter of fact, yes. Rick williams, the executive director of the lloyd district transportation

OCTOBER 17, 2001

management association is here to provide testimony, and they've done a wonderful job in the lloyd district of increasing the bike parking in the last few years. I believe it's about -- a couple of years ago they had about 250 parking spaces and they had about 250 maybe a little more bike commuters.

They've made an intensive effort to provide more bike parking in the lloyd district. They now have roughly 650 parking spaces in the district, now they have roughly 650 bicycle commuters in the district. It's hard to say cause and effort, but that's really been the only change in the past two years in the district. The on-street facilities has have been there, the bike central, a place for bicyclists to shower has been there, the only thing that's changed has been the provision of bike parking, good bike parking and some promotional efforts they've done not district.

Saltzman: You mentioned during the discussion about bike parking, the need for visible bike parking. Is it more important that it be visible as opposed to just being there? If there's signage that locates, indicates there's bike parking in a garage, does that -- which I think many developers prefer, doesn't that save the same purpose?

Williams: A visible sign would work or signing in a good location. The problem with parking in a garage is if there's not somebody to work over it and if it's out of the flow of normal street traffic, it could invite vandalism and theft. You want it to be under watchful eyes. As long as there's a clear sign that indicates where it is, that works just fine.

Hales: I want to flag one issue that roger mentioned for just later, at least scrutiny by the council, and that is there are other departments that really need to have this philosophy for this plan to get realized. I think generally the police bureau is doing a pretty good job. I wish the mayor was here, but I guess the traffic division's monthly report, and I think it's reasonable that the traffic division spend some of its efforts citing bicyclist who's are operating unsafely, as roger said, we have a responsibility, bicyclists have a responsibility to operate safely, but if you look at the injury and fatality reports, there's still a very disproportional situation on the street when you talk about a 5,000-pound suv and a bicyclist, when those collisions happen, they're bad. And they're fatal in some cases. And that issue of motorist behavior and the safety of the bicyclists on the street given the obvious disadvantage in protection that a bicyclist has is very important. So I just want to keep watching that issue and make sure that most of our effort in the police bureau is going into dealing with unsafe motorists behavior and maybe a tiny fraction going to deal with particularly object noxious bicycle riders because the damage a bicycle can do to an suv is pretty minimal compared to the other way around. That's just something for us to watch. Roger is right to call it out, we have to watch it and make sure that frankly all the precincts are operating consistently about this, because I don't think they are now. Traffic is doing a good job, but at the precinct level there's some wild variations in what the philosophy is in terms of how they deal with people on the street.

Francesconi: Let's open this up for testimony.

*****: I'm sorry, commissioner, i've invite add few people to --

Francesconi: I'm sorry.

*****: I've asked keith lyden, dr. Jane moore, the manager of Oregon health division, katherine tarlow, and rick williams from the lloyd district transportation management association and --

Hales: Why don't you all four come up and pull up another chair and we can take you as a panel.

*****: Dr. Moore has a few slides.

Hales: Keith, are you on first?

*****: I'm not sure, but i'll be glad to go first.

Hales: Okay.

Keith Lyden, Chair, Bicycle Advisory Committee: Thank you. My name is keith lyden, I live at 4021 southeast 26th place for the record. I am the chair of the bicycle advisory committee and i'm happy to be here today, particularly when we're already talking about the good news of receiving another award from bicycling magazine. As roger has talked about, the bike master plan has a number of very ambitious goals, and the city's been making great progress in accomplishing those

OCTOBER 17, 2001

goals and benchmarks. The success is due in large part to the bicycle staff and charlie, you already complimented them, and they deserve the come limiting. Also some of the other city bureaus have been pitching in as well, maintenance bureau I think is also for taking care of hazards on the street and so on, has done a great job. We have some nonprofit organizations also doing a tremendous job with bicycle education and promotion, bta and the community cycling center. And also of course all the people who are getting out and riding and taking advantage of the new facilities. We certainly have some challenges ahead of us. I just want to touch on a couple areas. One is the bike routes. You see on roger's map they're making a tremendous difference in terms of mileage, but we also have still some pretty important gaps in places where bike lanes end and you go through a fairly challenging section and they pick up again. But these I think are real deterrent, particularly to new riders. You are going along, everything is fine, and the bike lane drops off and you're in a wild situation, all least you feel for a little while, before it gets safer again. So I think those are critical. Another area is planning. One of the key policies in the bike master plan is to make the bicycle an integral part of daily life in Portland. In order for that to happen it has to be an integral part of planning in Portland. And as yes talking about in the lloyd district, it certainly has been there, but I think there's some other cases where it has not been. A couple eggs in some mixed use areas we're also trying to promote redevelopment, I don't think bicycling has been addressed or in one case has not been addressed very well to date, and that's the gateway plan and its -- in its preliminary form does not have any bicycle facilities on 102nd, which is on the bike master plan. It's a critical route because there aren't that many. We're concerned about the outcome there. For the interstate max area, there was a very thorough public process to deal with how to really accommodate all modes along interstate max, buses, pedestrians, bicyclist and so forth, and a solution was reached which did not have bike lanes on the entire length, but most of it, and that was a compromise supported by everybody. I understand there are some interests or at least supporting maybe taking bicycle lanes off of interstate now. So I just feel that is also another concern that needs to be part of planning as we go forward. Roger touched on also planning -- touched on the streetcar, and i'd like to second those remarks. I think it's going to be very important that future streetcar lines are planned in good coordination with bicycle routes because of the inherent danger attracts problems for bicycles. Anything worth doing is almost always going to be financially and politically challenging. I think the Portland city council has shown you folks are up to the task, and have done a great job so far, so speaking for myself and the bac, i'd like to compliment you on good work done. Thank you.

Hales: Thanks for your help.

Francesconi: Go ahead.

Jane Moore, Oregon State Public Health Agency: Great. Thank you. Members of the city council, i'm dr. Jane moore, I work for our state public health agency. I also am a Portland resident and work in Portland in the lloyd district, which has been the topic of a lot of discussion this morning. On both counts I want to commend all of you for your support for making Portland a very bikeable and walkable city. And you may wonder why as a health professional i'd be interested in this issue. And I want to start off very quickly showing you some slides that will provide an explanation. What you're going to see are some happens of the united states that show year by year the growing epidemic of obesity in our country. I want you to pay particular attention as the years go by to the states turning darker and darker, which are representing increasing levels much obesity in the population. We always like the gaps -- gasps from the people when they see these maps. The light blue states have more than 10% of the population meeting a criteria for obesity, dark blue more than 15%, and red is more than 20%. I'm -- in public health, when a condition affects more than 10% of the population we consider we have an epidemic. And we clearly have a major epidemic of obesity on our hands. In Oregon, we go to the next one, 20% of our adult population is obese, 37% are overweight, that's well over half of the adult population, and if you consider young people, Oregon students are quickly following suit. So why are we concerned? Obesity is directly

OCTOBER 17, 2001

related to the diseases which are now major causes of premature death and disability. Things like heart disease and stroke, diabetes, arthritis, some cancers. The costs of these diseases are staggering in Oregon it's over \$1 billion a year just for hospital costs. And these costs are soon going to exceed our ability to pay for treatment as baby boomers age and develop these diseases. So how do we turn this around? Part of the solution is actually to reengineer physical activity into our daily routine. Currently 72% of Oregon adults and 50% of high school students do not meet recommended levels of physical activity, and that is simply 30 minutes a day of moderate level physical activity for most days of the week. The centers for disease control and prevention believe that replacing trips made by auto with walking and bicycling are the first target for communities in supporting daily physical activity. And in that vein, they are supporting an initiative that they're active community environments. Portland already has done a great job in this vein, and staff from your city department of transportation are actually providing their expertise to an active community environments group that's working here in Oregon. I urge you to continue your efforts to make Portland even more bikeable and walkable and I would urge you in addition to do some really sincere promotion of walking and bicycling as an alternative to the use of automobiles. It's making the city a healthier place, but it's also extremely critical for the health of the city's residents. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you.

Francesconi: Thank you. Rick?

Williams: Commissioners, my name is Rick Williams, executive director of the Lloyd District Transportation Management Association. We're a private nonprofit business association. We represent 53 businesses and 8,000 employees in the Lloyd District. We're here today to express and reiterate our support for the city's bike program, its efforts and investments in promoting bicycling as a commute option in the central city. We've been the beneficiary, the TMA, five-year partnership with you to involve Lloyd District businesses and their employees in choosing bicycling as a commute option. We believe results of this partnership have truly paid off. In 1997, as Roger mentioned earlier, there were 292 bicycle parking spaces in the Lloyd District. Today there are 657, which is a 125% increase in facilities available to bicyclists in the Lloyd District since 1997. It was interesting that every space added was a result of a voluntary effort between Lloyd District businesses and the city of Portland. Businesses like Kaiser, Lloyd Center Mall, Double Tree, State of Oregon, and Metro purchased these racks and placed them on their properties in areas identified by the Lloyd District TMA and citizen volunteers. In most cases, the businesses in the Lloyd District, their property, exceed the city's bicycle code requirement for bicycle parking. In the past year alone, the TMA purchased 33 racks and had them installed on private properties through our bike rack fund program. TMA maintains a backlog of our own and we will give a free back rack to any business in the district who requests one. We currently had 11 requests, and we're back ordered. We're getting those racks produced right now in partnership with the city of Portland. And have begun discussion with 14 additional businesses about bike parking on their sites. We also have initiated an art rack program in the Lloyd District with monies raised from a bicycle raffle that we conducted last spring. We've used this money to 11 ran money from owners in the district to purchase six unique district-themed art racks in the Lloyd District. It's a tandem bicycle. In total, six racks have been purchased, four by businesses, we've already installed the racks in front of the Lloyd Center tower and in the Liberty Plaza tower out in front of the Liberty tower. Two will be installed at the Lloyd Center Mall and another will be placed at the Oregon Convention Center. To answer Commissioner Francesconi's question, some people will say that bike parking doesn't necessarily mean more bicyclists, we believe there's a direct relationship and we think we can prove it. We do a comprehensive survey every year of 6,000 employees in the Lloyd District with a 75% return rate. In 1997, about 2% of employees in the Lloyd District commuted to work by bike. That represents about 260 employees. Today 5% of our employees now regularly commute by bike to the Lloyd District. In numbers, that

OCTOBER 17, 2001

represents an increase of about 390 people biking over the level in 1997, or 38%. That 38% is important to note, demonstrates that bike trips in the lloyd district are going at three times the rate of auto trips in the lloyd district. In other words, we're starting to effect a change in the market share of trips in the lloyd district. Others say 5% is not a significant number. People just don't want to bike. We would argue that we have just touched the tip of the iceberg in terms of the market for bicyclists. That same survey that I talked to you about indicates that there's 17% of the 6,000 employee who's were surveyed indicated that they've never commuted to work but they want to, by bike. So we've initiated a partnership with the city and our businesses to expand our outreach and educational efforts to assist that 17% of interested people to give bicycling a try. Some of the programs we sponsor are the lloyd district bike commute day, we conduct free bicycle helmet fitting clinics in the district, we sponsor guided lloyd district social rides, and we also sell tri-met bikes on transit passes out of our offices. Of all these efforts, the partnership with the city has been there, with the bike lanes and the infrastructure they've invested in our district. We believe bicycling white sox, we believe it's a good investment. The 300 racks we've added to the district have cost about \$30,000 over the course of the last three years. The 360 bicyclists we've added can fill your old town parking garage at a cost of \$9 million. We think your investment is a good one. We encourage you to keep up the good work. Thank you.

Francesconi: And you certainly answered my question. [laughter]

Catherine Ciarlo, Director, Bicycle Transportation Alliance: I am catherine, the executive director of the bicycle transportation alliance, a 2500-member bicycle advocacy organization headquartered in Portland. I'm pleased to be here today to mark the five-year birthday of the bicycle master plan. I'm pleased because it's an opportunity to measure our progress toward integrating bikes into Portland's transportation system, and i'm thrilled because that progress has been so great. But i'm also pleased because we're seeing such results to our conscious effort to set out a plan to implement that plan, and to reap the benefits of that plan. As commissioner Hales mentioned earlier, we have been declared the b.e.s. Bicycling city in north america and that's not an accidental designation that. Comes from planning and hard work and we're glad to see it pay off. I want to mention as a member of national bicycling organization called the thunder head alliance, I see Portland held up around the country as a model for effective bicycle planning. And i'm proud to be from the city. Of course the down side is that my colleagues from other states think my job is easy, and in fact it probably is easier than a lot of their jobs. But as an advocate, it's also my job to urge all of us to keep our sights high and what i'm going to do is rain a little bit on today's parade, at least cloud on it, by sounding a note of caution. And that's this -- our five-year master plan check-in looks great. We've hit benchmarks, we've seen huge increases in riderships, but meeting our ten-year benchmarks is going to be much, much harder. Many of the easy projects are done, increasingly providing bicycle access is going to require difficult choices, and it's going to take political will. Making those projects happen will mean prioritizing a transportation system that truly accommodates and incorporates bicycles, and it's going to mean sticking to that priority even if it costs money, even if it means impacting auto travel or parking. In turn, it will mean explaining to the community that setting these priorities isn't just good for Portland's national image, but that it's good for Portland. That it's good for our air quality, it's good for our neighborhoods, it's good for our health, and it's good for business. And so in the spirit of a love letter with suggestions from the advocacy community, i'd like to urge the council to continue your leadership and vision, and to address the following challenges in the coming years as the choices get a little bit harder. Some of those challenges have been mentioned already. They include adequately maintaining existing bike markings, and bike facilities. They include ensuring that pdot's education, funding and program priorities support bicycling even in the absence of a specific bicycle program. It means figuring out a way to meet downtown bike parking requirements as has been talked about earlier. It means reinstating the city's traffic calming program, which is important for bicycling and walking and

OCTOBER 17, 2001

neighborhood. It means enforcement. We've talked a little bit about enforcement before, I think there's nothing more important at this point than that sense of safety that bicyclists have on the street and I wanted to mention something that bta has done, which is work with kgw tv and the Oregon department of transportation to put together a series of six share the road tv commercials. That campaign addresses both bicycle behavior and motorist behavior on the roads. And finally, ensuring that our newly developing commercial areas like north interstate are truly accessible by bicycle and that we integrate bicycles into the planning of those areas as keith mentioned. Finally we encourage the council to fully support the work of the transportation options division at p dot. That work is crucial to getting more people on bikes and equally importantly to helping Portland residents understand how bicycles are good for their neighborhoods. As someone who advocates for bicycling, and as a Portlander who's proud of my city, I urge you on the council to do everything in your power to ensure that the 10-year bicycle master plan check-in is as rosy as today's check-in. Finally I want to give special thanks to commissioner Hales and to the pdot staff for their work in making the bicycle master plan a success, and I want to thank the entire council for your careful consideration of and support for bicycling issues over the years, and for allowing us to get where we are today. Congratulations.

Francesconi: Thank you. Any questions anyone? Okay. Let's open this up for public testimony. I'm going to ask people to be brief on this, because we still have other items and we're behind schedule here. So come on up. Is there anybody that wants to testify? Come on, sir.

Morgan Will: Again, my name is mogan will, I live at 3817 north williams avenue. I'd -- i'm a citizen and constituent, i'd like to encourage to you support bicycling in Portland. In the efforts of the advisory council and the people who spoke earlier. I want to stress the importance of off the four elements that roger geller spoke about and one of them was off-road trails and he talked a lot about distances from different parts of Portland, say somebody wanted to go to a pge park game, off-road trails provide bicyclists opportunities to ride without traveling through stoplights without having to worry about cars, and -- so I just want to add that element. I also as you know, i'm working with an effort to create a banfield corridor project which is a bicycle trail and greenway through the i-84 corridor. I believe this would be one of knows types of trails that would help do that. One other element I don't have an agenda, but I wanted to encourage the council and the commissioners to work with pdot to look at -- pdot to look at other trails such as that, because I noticed on the map that roger geller pointed out, it's sort of a peripheral program. There's a lot of on-street trails in the inner eastside, but the off-road trails are sort of a 205, east side esplanade on the river, and the core of citizens live in the neighborhoods and there's not a lot of off-road trail options there. So I like what i'm seeing with the work going on, but as a citizen I would like to encourage more off-road trails through the interior part of the community. Thanks.

Francesconi: Thank you. Any other testimony? Roll call on the report.

Francesconi: Very quick personal story. Two years ago the bicycle alliance during your report offered to take me on my own personal bicycle tour to show me how to get downtown on my bicycle. I didn't take them up on it. Then two things changed. One is, I could no longer run and I started becoming that obese statistic because I couldn't run anymore, and the second thing that happened is the east bank esplanade. Now i'm happy to tell you I found my own route, though it needs work, on the north end of the east bank esplanade, and across the esplanade coming to work. So now I don't do it as much as I should, but I now can tell you i'm an infrequent bicycle commuter and it's mainly because of the east coast bank. My role in trying to advance the report is on the pathways on the trails. That is very important to me personally, but also to the whole parks and the whole 2020 plan which parks has instituted. Soon you can maybe bicycle quicker from boring during peak rush hour traffic to downtown Portland as soon as we can meet -- connect that. And that's a very high priority for parks. But also sullivan's gulch is a our screen, our master plan as -- to complete it. The 40-mile loop has been a dream for a long time, and frankly we're being very

OCTOBER 17, 2001

intentional how to close that and complete the loop in north Portland. Having said all, that there's a lot of conflicts, because these paths are so popular, so the bicyclists are right to want to have more use. But so do pedestrians, so do joggers, so do skateboarders, so do people wanting to walk their dogs. So we've got to -- this is symbolic of a host of problems. I'm not convinced that bicycling is the answer to all of Portland's problems. But it is an important element in being the city we want to be. Aye.

Hales: This is a great day in terms of our accomplishments so far. I think Katherine is right to challenge us now that we've done some of the easy stuff to work through the hard stuff in front of us. But the level of support that we have in the community is probably the greatest asset that we have for this. We have great people in pdot, the council has been consistently supported, but now we have a community that is -- has gotten used to the notion that you ought to be able to get around on a bicycle, and that's probably our greatest strength. So be careful what you wish for, you may get it. Now that we have all these thousands of people bicycling, their expectations are higher and they're going to get high err yet. So Adelai Stevenson when I feel the heat, I see the light. There will be more people to see the heat and -- aye.

Saltzman: Good master plan. We've got very impressive results. I think the one thing I continue to have concerns about is I believe Chief Kroeker noted this earlier on in his tenure is pedestrian bicycle facilities are the largest category facilities the city now has, and we need to continue to make sure motorists are more aware of bicyclists. I still think for the most part what I observe most motorists are oblivious to bikes and it shows up in the casualties and we need to work on that more. I'd love to say we have great separated bikeways as the ultimate solution, but we all know that can't be the total solution. But we've got to work more on motorist awareness of bicycle paths, bicycle lanes and bicycles. Aye.

Sten: It's really terrific. I think some of the things Roger cited show we could get a lot further and sometimes when we get rated the best in the country it's because of how bad everywhere else is. [laughter] I've seen that in a few issues I've worked. In this case I think it's both, because with 2% of the trips we really can't say that's the model we're not satisfied, I don't think, but I think we are -- it is an incredible amount of work, planning and implementation. The next phase should work, and it -- there is a lot of conflicts, but the only way you solve those is to keep working through it and getting the physical infrastructure in place. We have such a skewed system where so much of the space has been -- there's been very little space in the past given to bicycles, it's going to take a while to rebuild it. I think the way to get through that is to get used to each other and build the physical infrastructure properly and train people to do right practices. All of you have been amazing in your vigor and consistency, and I want to thank Commissioner Hales as well. Aye.

Francesconi: Thanks, everybody. Now we're on the regular agenda, so it's 1232.

Item No. 1232.

Saltzman: This is introduced by Mayor Katz and myself. This is hands are not for hurting, hand and words are not for hurting week. As we know, October is crime prevention month, and domestic violence awareness month, and this project is a creative way of working towards both goals. The community has a responsibility for creating an environment where violence is unacceptable. I'm hopeful this new campaign will bring our communities awareness about the tragedy of domestic violence and other forms of violence to new heights. This is a quality of life issue. Certainly for the people directly involved but ultimately for the entire community. If we want to make a livable Portland we must make Portland free from violence. So I want to conclude before I hand it over to Marcia and Jean by commending Marcia Dennis and the staff of the office of neighborhood involvement for their continued support and raising awareness of this. There will be several events throughout this week that Marcia will talk about or Jean will talk about too. With that I'll turn it over to Marcia Dennis.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Marcia Dennis, Office of Neighborhood Involvement: Thank you, commissioner Saltzman and other members of the council. I am Marcia Dennis, I live in southeast Portland and I work for the office of neighborhood involvements crime prevention program. And one of the -- just one of the many things that I do as a crime prevention practitioner is to work with the hands and words are not for hurting project. I would like to clarify one thing. This is also the YWCA's national campaign for the week without violence. So this year for the first time in Portland we've formed a partnership with Jean and the YWCA in Portland to do something they've done in Salem for about four years. To plan week-long activities, to raise the community's awareness of violence and ways to reduce violence in everyone's lives. I would like to take just a moment to publicly thank the people who attended our press conference on Monday. There were many people there in support who have become partners in this effort besides Commissioner Saltzman who read the proclamation and made some very good remarks, Chief Kroeker and other police bureau personnel, including Assistant Chief Andrew Kirkland, and Captain Larry Radcliff and Officer Henry Gripper who wrote our news release for us, we have partnered with the Youth Employment Institute, the graffiti removal crew is actually going to be involved in our Friday and Saturday activity at Lloyd Center, where we're going to create a mural. Multnomah County has become a great partner, and the commission there is going to hear a presentation tomorrow and take the hands and words are not for hurting pledge, and through their efforts and their translators we now have materials in Spanish, we're getting them in Russian and Vietnamese. So we'll be able to reach out with this message to other members of the community. A couple of other people I want to mention, Kneel Lomax, who I met through one of my block captains, has become very involved and interested in helping us with getting out the word of nonviolence. Heather Hawkins of the Lloyd Center, so that ties in with your earlier presentation, Lloyd Center has offered us space to do our community mural project, and last but not least, Starbucks is providing coffee for three of our evening events this week and I just wanted to thank them publicly. The hands and words are not for hurting project did start in Salem about four years ago, and it's not just for children and as you heard in April, it has however made some very impressive differences in schools across the country. It's in more than 40 states, the Walnut Middle School in Grand Island, Nebraska, has reported a steady drop in behavior problems, calling this project the frosting that made the difference with all of their character education curriculum. They've only had three behavior referrals in the first quarter of the school year. Which is a huge improvement. Portland School Board members took the pledge last week and traced their hands on purple paper. We do with all of the violence in the world today, need to take responsibility where we can to reduce the violence that's happening, and we may not have control over terrorist events, but one person at a time we can change the things that are within our power to change. We can influence our children by being role models, which is why it's important to get people like Neil Lomax and figures, the NFL is going to be getting involved with us, San Diego Chargers are taking the hands pledge, and a couple of quotes I'd like to share with you. I don't have this one directly, but I heard it on the radio. A rabbi in London wrote a letter after the terrorist events that said, again, this is a paraphrase, if our nations do not begin to make their children's welfare their first priority, we'll never have peace in the world. And Sarah Beuhl, a recognized speaker on domestic violence issues, says, the way we treat our children determines the level of crime in our community. So I'm going to let Jean make a few comments and then we're going to end with asking you as a council to retrace your hands and take the pledge. You did it so graciously in April, and we made a display that was up for quite a while outside Council Chambers, and somebody liked it so well that it disappeared.

Saltzman: We'll go ahead and trace our hands while Jean is talking. Does it matter which hand we use? We need to move on.

*****: I know.

*****: You just have to sign across the palm of your hand.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Dennis: We're creating a community collage. The police bureau command staff have taken the pledge, and other bureaus are going to be putting this up.

*******:** With gretchen kafoury's leadership, the fund has trade to -- tried to estimate the level of violence against women, particularly domestic violence in our community. And they estimate that over 60,000 women were abused by their intimate partners last year in the greater Portland area. 60,000 women. In many cases, the children of those women watched while that violence took place. This week without violence is our attempt to do three things. One is to bring awareness of the level of violence, particularly domestic violence, in our community in Portland, Oregon. We know what effect terrorism has had in our country and how we can striking back against terrorism. But we need to have the same kind of effort to strike back against domestic violence. We secondly want to ensure that as many as possible all of the shelters are full, which they are now, and we can work toward more shelters for victims of domestic violence so when someone calls in a situation of vie election, they aren't told they have to wait. Pack your suitcase, have it ready and wait. That's the message consistently to victims of domestic violence now. And thirdly and why the hands pledges is important, is prevention is what's going to be the long-term cure. And we hope by having you sign the hands pledge, having the county commissioners sign the hands pledge, having neil sign the pledge, people that are recognizable in our community that say, I will not use my hands or words for hurting, when other people see that, they will understand that this is a community wide effort. We're going to lloyd center with this message this weekend, as you recognize, it's an important district in our community to try and influence parents and children to take the hands pledge and your hands will be the most visible hands in the lloyd center area this weekend. So thank you for your willingness to take the pledge and thank you for your commitment to reducing violence in our community and increasing the quality of life for all of us.

Saltzman: Thank you very much.

Dennis: Thank you can I make one fast comments? It's pertaining to the bike thing. I've just become a bicyclist. I took my bike out of the garage after it hung there for eight years. I've ridden in holland -- it's flat. So get rid of the hills in Portland and it will be a much better place to ride. [laughter]

Francesconi: Is there any testimony on this item? Roll call on this item.

Francesconi: It's -- will it's never more important for our international community, our country, and here at the local level that we not use our hands or words for hurting ourselves or others. I'd like particularly the emphasis on my hands, my words. So you are really trying to start with the individual, and it's not only for the 60,000, which is a shocking figure, of women that are victims in our own community, but all the other kinds of violence in our own community. And frankly as was -- you said very well, we can't do some things about international terrorism, but we can do things in our local community about domestic violence, about youth violence, about juvenile crime and other things. And if we had the same degree of focus on these issues, we would be a stronger community. So thank you for your leadership. The only thing I think you may be way over estimating the significance of city commissioner hands, but that's your decision. Aye.

Hales: Aye.

Saltzman: Good work and thanks a lot for bringing this to our attention. Aye.

Sten: Aye.

Item No. 1233.

Francesconi: The next item is 1233. The mayor is trying -- in mediation trying to settle the strike. I'm just going to use her words to introduce this before I call people up. My passion for approving -- my, the mayor's passion for approving this resolution calls for completing the economic competitive analysis and review of the bit, blf is to keep Portland-based companies in Portland. It's her first statement. However, we are in -- an aging city with expensive problems. The city and county count on income from the business tax to pay for the basic services, citizen and businesses

OCTOBER 17, 2001

rely on, such as fire, police and parks. So simply cutting the tax is not a realistic option. We will never be the lowest cost business location but we continue to be the best. The challenges to make sure the cost is commensurate with the value of doing business here. The last thing we want to do is have an overly complicated goldberg business tax system that needlessly drives away Portland-based firms. It has been a decade since we evaluated the structure of our local business taxes. So today we have in front of us a public private partnership to review and update the city and county business taxes and to evaluate how Portland and Multnomah county rank in terms of business environment competitiveness. Identify best practices for each element of our local economy, and compare to us what other cities and counties are doing. We will set economic goals for each of our target industries and we will identify measurable objectives and insure we're getting results. Both the evaluation of our local business taxes and completion of the economic competitive analysis are key building blocks for our future economic growth. We appreciate the a.p.p., the chamber, the county, and pdc have joined us as partners in this effort. So now could I call up representatives of the a.p.p., the chamber, pdc, the county, come on up. Whoever is here. Go ahead.

Don McClave, President and Chief Executive Officer, Association of Portland Progress:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here this morning. I'm don, president of the Portland metropolitan chamber of commerce. With me is kim kimbrough, president and chief executive officer of the association of Portland progress, which has advocated for Portland's downtown for nearly a quarter century now. The background of the business community involvement goes back many, many years. We have been concerned about two things in Oregon for at least six or seven years. One is the slow-down in growth in job creation, which took place really beginning about 1995. The second is the steady loss of share of jobs and growth in Multnomah county in the city of Portland. And that is due to a variety of factors. I think probably everybody saw the press conference that the governor had yesterday in seaside talking about his -- the state's program to try and attract a few more tourists and the reporter was covering it noted based on a press release that Oregon now ranks last in the west in terms of job growth. What she didn't say of course is that this is the fifth consecutive year that's been the case, and we know and the license people who deal with the license tax in the city and the business income tax in the county know those revenues have been flat, are declining for some time. So we are pleased that we are at a point now where we are all agreeing to look at the impact of taxes. This has been done before as you know the piece that hasn't been done well is having to determine who pays the tax, figuring out a way to be corrected. In a 1993 previous city counsel, changed the structure, did damage that no one had anticipated and within a month rescinded the tax and we have made really essentially no changes in it for many years. So it needs to be looked at, but it also needs to be looked at not only in the context of what it does to business today in the city and in the county, but also what it does in terms of future jobs that might be generated here and the best example I can give you of how that works is that 20 years ago beyond the memory I realize of most of us except guys like me that are old, is that the business community and pdc partnered in a study which was conducted by sri, which really scoped the region, scoped the straight and that was one of the 71st times when we realized collectively how great the potential of the electronics manufacturing industry was for Oregon, the chip business and that led to a restructuring of the state tax code and it led to a number of things that the city did, and other jurisdictions in the region did, to make this an attractive venue for high-tech. If you told anybody in 1980 that high-tech would be the largest employer in the state of Oregon and would have surpassed the timber industry at its peak, I don't think -- I think any of us would have said you were nuts. At that time there were eight or ten firms in the state, there are 650 now, the bulk of which are in the metropolitan area. So we are pleased that pdc is looking not only at the tax structure as it exists, but at the kinds of opportunities that might be there for us going forward. Thank you.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Kim Kimbrough, Association for Portland Progress: I'm going to speak -- kim. Kimbro with a.p.p. I'm going to speak about the nut and bolts about how committed we are to this effort and how thrilled we are at the leadership on the part of the city and the county to recognize this effort needs to be done together, because businesses are not better in the center city or inside the city of Portland aren't just in the city of Portland and also in Multnomah county. I would point out that the boards of directors of both the chamber and a.p.p. Unanimously endorsed this cooperative partnership agreement last month, and as you are aware, the county followed suit a couple of weeks ago. On behalf of the business community, this truly is a partnership and this is spelled out in the agreement that you have before you, a.p.p. And the chamber will both provide a separate representation from separate firms a senior cpa senior level cpa with public tax policy experience to assist in this endeavor, a.p.p. Will also provide an economic consultant that has substantial background in public finance and taxation. Additionally, once the technical group has finished their work, which of the three parties that I mention will earlier will be a part, along with the appropriate representatives from the city and the county as well as pdc, if there is a need -- if there are some conflicting conclusions, if the data is inclusive, if there are areas that don't appear to -- result that's don't appear to be consistent when the trends as they relate to collections are compared to real job growth or real job decline as the case might be in some industries, the chamber and a.p.p. Have agreed to step up and to pay the costs for a national caliber public accounting firm to come in and actually audit the results and audit the recommendations. Additionally, and I have been asked to mention this and I certainly will, as part of the competitive analysis being led by pdc of which this b.i.t., blt analysis is an integral part, we -- once we have worked out the details of the scope and degree upon the process for engaging the consulting team to help us in this once a decade or more exercise, if pdc is not in a position to fully absorb the cost, we will assuming all those -- all of us are still on the same page at that point, still forward and assist as well in trying to raise the additional resources for that. And that is a pledge from. A.p.p. And the chamber as well. We couldn't be more pleased in this effort, and this really is a partnership, this is not just us sitting up here trying to take credit for something or vice versa, it truly is a partnership and I -- we're very encouraged by the results. Thank you for your leadership in entertaining it.

Francesconi: Are there any questions from the council?

Saltzman: A couple questions. I certainly welcome this study, and this partnership, government and private sector to take a look at this. I guess I wanted to maybe find out a little bit what your thinking is and if you're reticent to offer your thinking as to where we're going, i'll understand. Nevertheless i'm going to push a little bit. What are some of the -- basically we have an income tax that's similar to a state income tax code, as you mentioned in the '80s when we revised our tax coat to encourage the electronics industry, it was either through tax credits, tax deductions or probably even tax rate revisions. Are those some of the tools you might think would come out of this, or some of the principles I guess you would expect the city and the county to adopt under the section that calls about adopting the principles? Are those some of the things you might be asking us to --

Kimbrough: Commissioner, i'll let don speak to that as well, but let me note first that this is not about just reducing the amount of tax these business pays to the city or the county. This -- let's back up a second and look at the big picture and recognize there have been huge -- the projections and the realities of collections for this huge -- as you are well aware, the b.i.t. And the blt respectively are substantial parts of the revenue stream for the local government. And we are missing the projections in both jurisdictions by seven figures and in one case by eight figures. That is a substantial -- the sad part is while we can point to some indicators, we can't quantifiably say, here's why that happened. And here's why -- what we can do to offset that in the future. That's absolutely critical, because that impacts all of us in terms of the service that's we expect and the quality of life we enjoy and the delivery of basic city services. We're not trying to --

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Saltzman: I understand that. That's 89 here in the agreement. The intent is not to reduce -- revenues to the city --

Kimbrough: not at all. The intent is to try to grow those revenues by making this tax system more equitable first and foremost, and secondly hopefully structured in such a way it will provide an incentives for those types of industries that had we done this back in the early '80s a don mentioned and structured it so that it actively encouraged, for instance, we didn't do this, but as a for instance, i.t. Businesses, instead of the 600 we might have 6,000 today, had this been an 77 as opposed to an impediment. And that's the kind of --

Saltzman: Given the recommendation it has to maintain a certain amount of revenue, we're looking at I guess what I suggested -- i'm trying to get some sense, incentives means to me, credits, reductions, lower rates for certain industries.

Kimbrough: It means a fair and more equitable approach, recognize hag we need to provide incentives and incentives might be removing an impediment. There are lots of ways. Incentives don't mean throwing cash, by any meanings. We're talking about tax policy here, not necessarily traditional economic grants and lens. So it -- the word incentive does mean something differently in that regard, but ultimately what we have heard from many of you individually and from your staff that's work on this, both at the city and the county, is that while no we don't want -- we all understand. We're knot trying to reduce the income stream from this substantial revenue source, we do want to make sure at the end of the day that it is fair and that it is less of an impediment to growing jobs we believe that once this analysis by the technical team that I spoke about earlier is complete, that there's going to be some very clear correlations between -- by industry sector and industry type, between the -- the payers and the reductions in real jobs that are available to our community. It's going to be very interesting to see where the jobs have occurred and where the tax rate has declined, and I bet there's a huge correlation. If we dig a little deeper I think we're going to find reason.

McClave: Let me answer that in a different way by example. This -- I think you know that the role -- a major role the chamber has played is to encourage the city to broaden the study from when it initially started out too look at the tack structure to look at the broader look at what the prospects are for the city and the county in terms of the kinds of jobs that might be generated going forward. So that you've got that as a platform under which you might evaluate any changes that are made in the tax code. And I don't think either of us have said neither organization has said that there should be any kind of necessarily tax changes. We have lots of anecdotal stories, we know of certain kinds of businesses that are severely disadvantaged in Portland, whether that translates to growth or not going forward, remains to be seen. The kinds of changes that resulted from the study 20 years ago really dealt most with the state tax code. For example, the waters edge provision which meant you only taxed profits in Oregon of companies that might invest here is what jump-started investment by the japanese here and led to significant investment by other companies as well. We didn't give up anything. We didn't have it to start with. We wouldn't have gotten it had we not modified the code. Ultimately that led to what was incorporated by the legislature in 1993 in the strategic investment act that also capped capital investment in equipment in technology-based firms and allowed it to be appreciated more rapidly because of the fact that the equipment is very expensive and it gets obsolete very quickly. And again, that wasn't giving up anything that we had, it was facilitating additional investment and expansion. It didn't create the explosion here, it certainly abetted it and enabled us to maximize it. It also going back to a company which was mentioned in an earlier context, backer, that was the first source agreement the city signed. And the -- those kind of agreements have been very easy to negotiate. Multnomah county has done it with two major firms that located there during the '80s. It's a way -- it's a way to maximize resources and revenues. What woe don't want to fall into is what frank letter new york did 20 years ago, what was called the mayor koch approach, is that people leave, you lose revenue so you tax everybody else more and

OCTOBER 17, 2001

make it worse. And I think we're -- where we are and i'll let kim speak for himself if he wishes to do so, and where I know -- we've been told Multnomah county is that we do study, we see what it tells us, and then we decide what to do with it.

Saltzman: I guess the goals are maximize jobs, maximize economic growth, and maximize revenues.

McClave: Tax base.

Saltzman: Okay. I think it's good to be a great study. We look forward to participating.

Francesconi: Are there any other questions? Okay. Thanks. Is there anybody else that would like to --

*****: Thank you very much.

Francesconi: Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to testify? I guess this is not an emergency, so it --

*****: This is a resolution.

Francesconi: So we vote on it. Roll call, please.

Francesconi: I support this. There's actually -- we have the steep eggs rise in unemployment in the country in addition to -- and I guess there's four reasons that everybody in this room here I think has common ground to work on this. One is the first group that's going to suffer are the most vulnerable. So all those on welfare to work programs, all those -- there's -- they're the first that are going to be gone. So there's our common interest. The second is the revenue questions. Parks, schools, the session, they're talking about a special session in salem that could devastate Portland public and all the schools because of the drop in the income tax. I won't go through the numbers for parks and schools, et cetera. The third area we have in common, there is some uncertainty about exactly what to do. The part I like the best about this study is the economic analysis. We have to see what really are our strength and what are realistic target industries and realistic strategies compared to our real competitors, and frankly, I sense some frustration on the part of all the council, i'm speak for myself on my own part, because sometimes we all care about jobs but we have been -- and -- but we've been unable to evaluate what works. On the business income tax, my bureau, jim wadsworth and cynthia were here, have spent a lot of time looking at this. I think we need to put this in broader context before we do anything. But I do believe that the way the business income tax is structured does work to the disadvantage of sole proprietors and small Portland public schools in certain industries. And where you only have those, the b.i.t. And the city, that creates a major problem. I think it appropriate to put this in a larger context so we can see how this fits and what else we can did. The last area we have, folks, we need each other. Whether the issue is schools, parks, business, public safety, the government can't do all this by ourselves. And private sector can't do it by our zest. And boy, over the next coming years Oregon is going to need each other if we're going to preserve the quality of life that we love. Aye.

Hales: Good luck. Aye.

Saltzman: Again, I look forward to the recommendations. I think it's going to be a thought-provoking -- I know it will be a thought-provoking exercise and I believe we'll have some tangible action items to consider before us. I have full confidence in that. I would just say to echo commissioner Francesconi's mention of the small business owners compensation issue, I think we also recognize clearly retailers are at a locational disadvantage inside Multnomah county too, and that's another sector I would be welcome to some ideas on how we can deal with that as well. Good luck and we'll look forward to it. Aye.

Sten: I think it's the right step and i'm glad to see you stepping forward. I hope -- I think it will take a lot of work to get members of the different organizations looking at this. I'm always hopeful on these things, this comes up more than -- our tax structure is archaic, it needs to be redone and i've been able to get 9 out of 10 people to agree to that statement. I think i've been able to get 1 out of 10, which is usually me, to agree to any idea I have about how to fix it, and you're going to need

OCTOBER 17, 2001

a lot more than five out of ten to get something done. I think the process is going to be important too. What I found is on all sides there's a lot of mythology about what happens, and it -- so far I have not seen a critical mass of people willing to say, okay, this doesn't make sense, but i'm -- I don't think we're going to get a system that makes perfect sense to everybody, so at some point critical mass has to step up and say i'll change it to make it better and I think that's more an organizing issue than it is a study, but I think the study is the first step and I hope we'll be thinking about how to organize people around the results. Aye.

Mayor Katz returned at 11:55 a.m.

Katz: As most of you know, I gave a presentation on what I thought we needed to do to stimulate the economy now that we are in a recession, and I don't think stimulating only tourism is the answer. It's job training, it's working to retain the companies like freightliner, and recruiting companies that will bring jobs, good paying jobs into the area. And when we do recruiting or retention discussions, most of the conversations come around these issues as well as the enterprise zone and the possibility of tax abatements if there is an investment, a substantial investment. But I also have to tell you that we need to take a look at what the business climate is in terms of our business income tax. I said then and i'm going to say today that reducing it is really not a realistic option when this council is going to have to make some major budget reductions now in an -- and in the next couple of months. But to see whether we are competitive in certain targeted industries, whether we're willing to take some risks if we make some changes, that's all worth a discussion. Steve Janik chaired a committee, I think it was eight or ten years ago, and there were some issues they identified, but did not tackle because there were hot button issues. That may be something this group might want to look at to see if there really are any changes that we can implement. We will never be the lowest cost business location. And i'm not sure we want to be that. We want to provide the service, but we also have to be competitive in every area. And this is well worth looking at it. It will also assist us as we make some very tough budget decisions and look at the possibility of making some changes somewhere in terms of our revenue picture. So i'm really pleased that a.p.p. And the chamber and pdc are going to work through this and I thank you for coming up with an agreement that we all can support. Aye. [gavel pounded]

Francesconi: Okay. We're at 1234.

Item No. 1234.

Katz: Come on up. Let me just set the stage. Remember we separated ourselves from the county and gave Yvonne a charge for a diversity development and affirmative action principles and a strategic plan. And this is what they are bringing to us.

Yvonne Deckard, Director, Bureau of Human Resources: Good morning, mayor and city council, my name is Yvonne and i'm the director of bureau of human resources. I want to start off by going back a the ways and talking about what we've -- how we got here. On August 18th, 1999, the city council approved resolution 173680 calling for all city bureaus to develop their affirmative action compliance strategies. On August -- on September 20th, 2000, the council approved an ordinance to establish the diversity development affirmative action office within the bureau of human resources. Shortly after that on October 30th of 2000, I went out and found this gentleman, Joseph Quinones, and he joined the staff and became the manager of the city's diversity development of affirmative action program and also charged him with developing a citywide strategy and approach for our diversity plan. We talked a lot in September at the council session on the 20th about the need to go beyond affirmative action and to really look at diversity for the city. Once again you've heard from me type and time again that diversity is something that you look through your organization and by being there and looking around you can see it. It's not something that you have to pick up a piece of paper and read a report to discover whether or not you have diversified

OCTOBER 17, 2001

your work force. And that's what we've been moving toward. Since Joseph has been on staff, we've had an opportunity to meet with each of you. We've met with all of the bureau directors, EEO representatives throughout the city, we've also met with various community groups and organizations from the community at large. The resolution that we bring before you today is a result of those meetings and the valuable feedback that we've received. The resolution is -- that you are adopting is to adopt the developmental guiding principles that you have in exhibit A which provides for the implementation of the diversity development strategy in the city, adoption of the diversity development affirmative action plan which is exhibit B, it also is adopting or affirming the authority of the bureau of human resources director and -- in concert with the diversity development affirmative action office to provide leadership and direction for citywide implementation of the developmental -- of the strategic development plan. It's calling for us to establish a citywide diversity development of coordination committee as described in the plan, and to Klamath Basin rate with city bureaus to provide leadership and foster diversity development and affirmative action activity and strategies, including supporting trainings and communication. The bureau of human resources will be back to you to the city council in late spring to -- asking you or requesting that you adopt a new citywide affirmative action plan. The development strategy will become a part of that plan. We will schedule a work session with you to discuss the plan prior to finalizing and submitting an ordinance. The bureau of human resource assist currently working on a citywide performance management program which incorporates a process for council to evaluate bureau directors on the diversity developmental affirmative action process and strategies and it also enables bureau directors to evaluate their managers and supervisors. This program will be tied to our merit pay system. At this time I'd like to introduce or turn it over to Joseph, who will talk about the mission, vision, guiding principles of the plan and some of the accomplishments that we've made over the last 12 months.

Joseph Quinones, Manager, Diversity Development and Affirmative Action: My name is Joseph, I am the manager of the diversity development affirmative action office for the city of Portland. Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you. I came to work here almost a year ago. It -- the 30th of this month it will be a year. One of the reasons I came to work here is because as part of the process of applying for the job and interviewing for the job and going through all of that, I evaluated the city to see if this was a place I wanted to come to, where I wanted to do my work. At that time I made an assessment that said that the city was really in a ready position to start looking at these issues seriously and to move forward in trying to change -- make the changes necessary to the city could be more inclusive and develop the work force it needs to provide services to the citizens of Pored. That was a year ago. What I'm happy to report is that one year later, having been here now, I was accurate in my initial assessment. So I'm really quite satisfied with being here. I'm quite satisfied with the way the city is prepared and ready to move forward on some of these issues. In terms of the principles, mission and vision for the organization for where we're headed, you have that in front of you, I want to point out that really diversity development is about good business practice. It's not about doing the right thing or moral correctness, but doing good business practice both in how we attract and retain and utilize our work force and how we manage them and how we design and deliver the kinds of services we intend to deliver. All of those things are affected by good business practices in the area of diversity development. So when you look at the principles, it is that it's good business practice, it is that everyone involved in this is a stakeholder and responsible for carrying out what we want to accomplish as a city. And it requires a comprehensive approach that takes both that approach that's inherent in the affirmative action and other kinds of regulation that's guide us and have brought us to this point. And diversity development itself is a theory and approach to inclusion. Those things require us to have a comprehensive approach, which I believe this plan and its updating as we move through it will provide for the city. Our mission that is the mission of the diversity development and affirmative

OCTOBER 17, 2001

action office, really is to support the development of a culturally confidence work force and by that I mean a work force that is really able to -- that is individuals who are really able to manage diverse work teams effectively that provide services to a multicultural population effectively. That is, they have developed their own self awareness and self understanding and awareness of the community as well that they're trying to serve. Additionally, our mission is to direct and monitor activities that support the increased inclusiveness in the organization culture for the city. So we can reduce any kind of barriers that might exist in terms of how we operate as a city, our practices and so forth, so people who have been feeling marginalized or left out of the process of working for the city will feel included in that process and can be better utilized by the city. And finally, it is also that we continue to ensure that the city remains in comply wants with all of the regulations we have to meet in order to do our jobs here. So that's all of the civil lights legislation that we're all concerned with.

The vision as we see it in the office is -- for the city is that we see the city as an effective multicultural organization with a culture which your that's inclusive and supports cultural competency in the work force. We also see the work force itself as being diverse in a number of areas, and cull centrally confident. And that the -- they bring -- that the culture itself within the city and work force in the city come together to provide effective services to the citizenry here. The plan is really about developing a strategic approach to infrastructure construction so we can take these things forward, these notions of how corey -- and make it a more diverse population -- i'm sorry, serve the population better and how do we look at whatever barriers might exist within the city to inclusion and remove those barriers. That's what the plan generally is intended to do. Along with that, is the notion of bias reduction, that which is institutionalized, and is that which is part of our makeup as people that we bring to work with us and that we might exercise in performance of our jobs. Our job -- my office's job is to help reduce those things. Let's see. Accomplishments. Excuse me. Well, one of the things we've done is we've staffed the office. We've hired an affirmative action office investigate horse whose responsibility is to look at grievances that arrive out of violations or apparent violations of people's rights. And that is beverly dean, and we also have a senior administrative support, who is implementing a new data system. We have moved away from the previous reporting system that we had in place to a new one, the previous one was -- has just gone out of my mind. In any case, it's gone and we've moved to a different system that allows us to be more precise in reporting to you how our bureaus are doing in terms of their hiring and promotional practices and retention practices. We've met with the city and have done an analysis that have brought us to this point. We have established the vision and the mission for our office, we have conducted a review of the training programs that have been available and we've now begun to offer new trainings, and those trainings are in place. We have also already begun from day one actually to provide services to the bureaus across the city in terms of their affirmative action accomplishments and diversification and diversity development. And we have also involved ourselves in treating a number of liaisons with community-based organizations to help us look at this plan, to formulate it, which will help us in the future to do the same kind of things. Those are the primary accomplishments we've made over the last year.

Francesconi: Are there any questions from the council? I just have one. Have all the bureaus turned in their affirmative action plans? Are they on time now?

Deckard: The compliance strategies that the bureau were charged with, we have one for every bureau. And one of the things that we will be doing at this point, joseph has been doing is really going through and assessing those plans. One of the big differences in our structure today is that we have a lot more one-on-one, or hands-on involvement with the embryos, helping them to, one, identify what their issues are within the bureaus, and to come up with defective trainings or other processes to deal with those st. Louis. So we are also helping them to go back through and reassess their compliance strategies to make sure they're, one, doable, and two, they're -- if there are other ways to assist them in expanding them.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Francesconi: I was going to say this later, but on behalf of the fire bureau and me personally, I want to thank you for doing exactly that regarding the issues around a certain fire station. And this is going to -- what your recommendation assist going to come out very shortly, but I wanted to thank you for that.

Saltzman: How many formal complaints have we had in the last year that have been investigated?

Quinones: My office has investigated -- I have that number. Hold on.

Saltzman: Approximately.

Quinones: We've investigated one dozen -- 11 complaints. Most of those in the area of sexual harassment.

Deckard: What question wanted to really do with this new approach is to -- as much as possible is to take a preventive approach and go in and do assessments for bureaus so that we can help them to identify areas where there may be problems ahead of time and actually put mechanisms in place to help -- to assist the bureaus in addressing those issues. Generally when you're addressing these issues before a problem occurs, people are more receptive to understanding and meeting that challenge.

Quinones: We've also supported bureaus as they've conducted their own investigations, so we've provided technical support to them. The 11 we're talking about are ones we took on as an office.

Saltzman: Thanks.

Katz: And how many of those 11 were actually cases that really did result in sexual harassment?

Quinones: There were four that -- and then others we have -- we couldn't find but they've taken it to other levels.

Katz: You found out of those 11, four.

Quinones: Yes.

Katz: Okay.

Francesconi: Any other questions? Does anybody else want to testify?

Francesconi: Is this -- Louise, hello, is this the one you want to testify on?

Louise Weidlich, Director, Neighborhood Protective Association: Mayor Katz, members of the council, how do you do, I'm Mrs. Louise Weidlich, director of the neighborhood protective association. I just got a copy of this 1234 ordinance, diversity development affirmative action guiding principles and a strategic development plan. You've got a lot here, and on the second, whereas the city of Portland is excited to serving all citizens of the city in most respectful effective and efficient manner possible, would I like to have in the most honest manner position. You have missed one of the main differences between diversity and integrity, because you are assuming that you're giving preferences probably to people that are of various races and creed and so forth, but they may not be the most efficient and best person for the job. You -- the whole process of our constitution is one that you -- is from hard work and doing what is honest and upright and efficient. And I am sure if I may say so, I don't know whether this is true, but maybe with some of the employees you already have might have fouled up your water billion dollar fiasco in your computer deal. Who did you get to handle those issues? Are they minorities, or are they the most honest and most best --

Francesconi: You've crossed a line you shouldn't have crossed.

Weidlich: What line?

Francesconi: Implication that diversity has anything to do with that other issue. That was very inappropriate.

Weidlich: Affirmative action does --

Katz: Let her continue.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Weidlich: My one question I would like to ask is whereas the city experiences an implementing affirmative action plans to meet its responsibilities under federal affirmative action guidelines, did you get special money from the federal government to help implement this?

Katz: We'll answer the questions after you finish.

Weidlich: Oh, okay. So I notice here it's federal, which is not giving adequate provision for states' rights. Would I like to bring up article 1, section 20 of the Oregon straight constitution. No law shall be passed granting to any citizen or class of citizens privileges or immune advertise which upon the same terms shall not belong to all citizens. Our whole state does not listen to that law and as far as I know, the lush has not repealed it. As article 1, section 20 of our Oregon state constitution. Diversity of employees is not to me a mandate, not to me being harmonious, increasing the harmoniousness and getting along well with each other is much more crucial than diversity, because diversity tends to agitate and separate people. Thank you very much.

Francesconi: Thank you. Any other testimony? Do you feel a need to correct anything that was said? In terms of -- not in terms of the -- but in terms of why we're doing this, or the federal funding or any of that stuff. Not the water bill issue.

*******:** Not really. On the issue of federal funding, we're not receiving any dedicated federal funds to put -- to do any -- this program. And our goal is to make sure that the city is -- as we service our communities as a whole, that we also are work -- our work force is reflective of those communities and we have an environment of -- that's inclusive.

Francesconi: Any more testimony on this? Okay. Is this a report? Roll call.

Moore: We have a substitute on this one.

Saltzman: It does say substitute on my copy.

Francesconi: I think there is a substitute.

Saltzman: Move to substitute.

Hales: Second.

Francesconi: Louise, if I understood you right, we agree on one thing, and that is that we haven't followed the constitution and given all of our citizens the same privileges as others. And it's my belief that citizens particularly of color have not -- did not benefit the same the rest of our citizens and it's reflected in homeownership rates, wage rates, employment rates, as far as you should go. Do I think we should try to correct this with other approaches other than a business approach? Maybe yes, but they haven't worked. The main thing I want to highlight is the testimony about good business practice and the last thing that yvonne said in her testimony, which is that you have to tie wage compensation to accomplishing these goals. And that is what we need to do, because frankly folks the rest hasn't worked. I'm particularly impatient with myself on this issue, i'm impatient with my brothers, and i'm impatient with the city. But I start with myself. In looking at this brief conversation I had with Portland chamber of commerce host add meeting with some business leaders, the -- the minority business leaders with skeptical efforts to increase diversity to the business community until one ceo said, and I don't think he would mind me saying it, because he should be commended for this, george from wells fargo said, he was really quiet through most of the meeting. At the end he said 15% of my salary is tied to my effort to diversify wells fargo and my efforts to have minority contracts purchased. When he said that, the suspicious in the room vanished. And then people were a lot closer to me than they were to me, that's for sure. So the question here is, how do we put this in our performance appraisals for our bureau managers and tie compensation to accomplishing these goals? I almost introduced an amendment to that effect until I believe that the approach in the -- and the people we need to have confidence in, they know how to do this. They've demonstrated not only fire bureau but in rah variety of areas. The main reason I wanted to pull dhr and centralize is because I think we needed your help and expertise. And we're lucky that yvonne is the human resources manager and we're lucky that she has the judgment to hire wisdom to hire joseph, because have you talent. You have to have availability not only with the

OCTOBER 17, 2001

bureaus, but the with community folks. So you are reaching out to community folks and establishing some relationships with had. I believe race in this city is one of the most important issues we need to have some conversations about. I believe -- i'm not saying there's going to be riots, but i'm not saying there's not. In -- unless, but with can't talk about that issue unless we have more credibility ourselves. Go out and talk about it now, although I they we should have some conversations about race, we'll be much more productive if we can demonstrate it. The way to do this is to make ate good business practice, tie to it compensation. There's a lot of strength, we learn a lot. We represent a broader group, there's a lot of talent and skulls. We're a better fire bureau because we're becoming more diverse. We would be a better parks bureau if we had more southeast asian workers to reach into these apartment complexes and bring them into our community centers. It's not a question of handouts, it's a question of making us more effective. And that's what you're talking about. That's why I reacted so much to earlier testimony. Aye.

Hales: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye.

Sten: I just want to thank joseph and yvonne for your great work. It's something you just have to keep going on day in and day out, and sometimes there's big issues, but I think it's more actually just working all of the mind numbingly boring organizational details and I recognize you're actually working on both fronts, the big and small. Aye.

Katz: We are a large corporation, public corporation, and we've had a variety of disparate attempts across the bureaus, and this is a way for us to really focus and -- on citywide on the principles that you identified. So I know that we're going to have to help you, and you'll need to spell out carefully what you want us to do, but we're all on that -- we're all responsible for making this happen. Aye.

Francesconi: 1235.

Item No. 1235.

Deckard: Good afternoon, my name is yvonne deckard, the director of human resources. You have before you an ordinance amending the contract for fiskum and mccormick, which is an organization we've contracted with to help on the strategic and the planning in the strike. Earlier this year in july council approved a \$30,000 set aside, bhr has spent \$20,000 of that 30,000 as of this point. In the event that the city does find itself in a strike with the dctu we're asking that we amend that contract by another 20,000 for a total of 40 so we're asking for a \$10,000 increase.

Francesconi: Are there any questions?

Saltzman: That's only for actual expenditures. Correct?

Deckard: Correct.

Francesconi: Any other questions? Any testimony? It's an emergency ordinance, roll call.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye.

Francesconi: 1236.

Item No. 1236.

Francesconi: Yvonne, is this you again?

Deckard: Yes. Once again my name is yvonne deckard, the director of human resources. The ordinance before you produces for a one-time exception to city code 4.12.040 related to payment of overtime. In the event of a dctu strike, nonrepresentative employees who are flsa exempt and not eligible to receive overtime may be requested to work in excess of 40 hours in order to minimize disruption to the -- to city services. Currently 60 code allows for payment of overtime to employee who's qualify as exempt administrators or professionals as defined by the fair labor standards act for work related to or necessitated by the declaration of an emergency. Whereas the strike would not be considered an emergency in the true sense, it is peru department to anticipate the city may require employees to work beyond their normal 40 hours of work in order to continue city services.

The ordinance directs bureau directors to establish a process for approving overtime for the work necessitated by the dctu strike within their representative bureaus.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Francesconi: Any questions? Any testimony from the audience? Roll call. Aye.

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

Mayor Katz left at 12:25 p.m.

Francesconi: 1237.

Item No. 1237.

*******:** This is the last one.

Francesconi: Commissioner Sten?

Sten: I probably will not make a presentation given the lateness of the hour, unless people want one. As I everybody is aware, we have quite a financial shortfall in the water bureau thanks to our problems with the computer, and we're trying to get -- if possible and this will be a long-term project, make some lemonades out of the lemon and look for ways to work with our employees to bring costs down. Along those lines one of the things we're going to try, it will be a voluntary program, it a little more of a typically private sector approach, but it's to offer incentive packages to employees who are retirement eligible or close to retirement. I've had quite a few people come to me and say that they would retire, but for some financial incentive at this point they can't pull it off.

We're trying to find some places where it's cost effective for the bureau to help people ease into retirement, but also save some money over time. It will be a completely voluntary program so there not be any forced layoffs at this point. It will be offered immediately to nonrepresented positions and not to represented positions until we negotiate with the union, although I don't expect a problem in getting to an agreement with the union as it is voluntary. And so nobody will be in the position of having to take these. Our hope is to get the costs of running the department down about 10% and this would be really the first step in trying to do that. It will -- we'll know more after we see how this all works. And it may be something that human resources brings back to look at for the city at a -- as a whole. This gives us authority to try it.

Francesconi: Yvonne, I think you evaluated this and you -- you agree that this is the right approach.

Deckard: Sure. We've worked very closely with the water bureau and the commissioner's office to develop this pilot program. And we do think it's the right thing to do. We believe at this point that this program -- we want to start off with the program in the water bureau because there's a great need there at this time. And it's a great opportunity for us to put a very innovative program in place that we think will aid the city as we are faced with other fiscal emergencies and reorganizations and downsizing, but it allows us to -- because this type of a program has to be offered to a broad spectrum of employee, we've defined the broad spectrum as being a bureau or -- and/or an office. So it's not something that unlike the regular target of severance that would you offer on an individual basis, would you offer to it the entire embryo, and those individuals that are eligible for it then were able to sit down and negotiate the parameters of that type of program based on demographics and their fiscal restraints. Our hope is that we will do this in the water embryo, it will give us an opportunity over the next few months to really see how the program works, to work out some of the bugs that we may have in it, and -- in a controlled environment and be prepared to come back to the city council somewhere around the first of the year, probably wanting to -- requesting to expand it citywide.

Francesconi: Any other questions?

Saltzman: The voluntary furloughs, those are new citywide?

Deckard: Yes. Let me talk to you about also changes in the employee assistance program, because that's another thing this ordinance does. The purpose of the ets program is to provide bureaus with the flexibility and hr management tools during the time of fiscal emergency down turns and/or reorganization. In february of 2000 the city council documented the revision and enhancement to

OCTOBER 17, 2001

the original program that was established in 1997 as we continue to face fiscal challenges, the ability of the city to transition to work -- this work force becomes increasingly important. We -- in the employee -- the target of severance program we're proposing three changes to the original program that was put in place. One is that when the council does declare a fiscal emergency that the program is activated and that certain programs continue indefinitely and is applied at the discretion or approval of the bhr director. We're also on the target of severance program reducing the program somewhat, bureaus will pay minimum for a minimum of six months of combination pay. The bureau of human resources may approve and negotiate one week for every year worked up to an additional six months for total of one year base pay. What we've done is we've dropped the sick leave provision from the program as we -- as you approved it in february. We've also made some adjustments on the medical dental vision cobra pay in which the city was paying up to six months and we've reduced that to two to five months. We've added the voluntary furlough program, and the purpose of that is to create savings during budgetary shortfalls of fiscal crises ease through unpaid leave of absence under the volunteer furlough program all eligible employees have the option to take unpaid leave, however, all leaves for employees defined as essential may be denied by the bureau if they aren't in the position to let it -- to let a particular individual go. It's important to note in program will need to be bargained and be consistent with all federal and state wage and hourly laws. And so the furlough program will actually allow bureaus to consider requests from employees that want to reduce their workweek or want to take some time off and what it does is it allows the city to continue their benefits, the benefits to that employee in order to have a savings. We're also continuing to recommend and encourage bureaus in this program to consider things such as reduced work weeks, going down to 72-hour work weeks that may result in at least a 10% savings for a bureau if they can still deliver services at that rate. We're trying to make sure we give the bureau and our employees as much flexibility that we can that still allows us to deliver services to the public and -- in a responsible manner.

Francesconi: Any other questions? Okay. Is there any testimony on this? Roll call.

Moore: We have a substitute on this also.

Saltzman: Move substitute.

Hales: Second.

*****: Did you --

Saltzman: We just moved the substitute.

*****: Oh.

Francesconi: This is an --

Auerbach: You're voting on the ordinance itself?

Francesconi: I think we're voting on the substitute. Okay. This is a proven business strategy to save costs to the taxpayers, but also do 90 a fair way to the workers. So I appreciate commissioner Sten bringing this forward. I also appreciate the change, because personally and I know this is true from all -- from also commissioner Sten, we're interested in rewarding the workers fairly, but some of the payouts to the top managers frankly in my opinion and in others', was too much. So with these changes that will remedy that. So I appreciate you bringing this forward as you said you would. Aye.

Hales: Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Sten: I want to thank yvonne and her bureau for working on this. It's been very quick notice and either I think we have -- I agree the old packages were a good idea, but they were -- they didn't leave enough flexibility to negotiate a fair payout, and they were too high. And in this case we think we have numbers that will be both in our financial interest and the employees' financial interest if that's not true, nobody will take it so we'll know soon enough. And I appreciate it. Thanks. Aye.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Auerbach: Now you need to vote again to adopt the ordinance as substituted.

Francesconi: God, you're technical. These lawyers. [laughter] aye.

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

*****: Thank you.

Francesconi: 1238.

Item No. 1238.

Francesconi: Is there any testimony on this from anybody? Roll call. Aye.

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

Francesconi: A substitute, 1213. -- 1239.

*****: That was it.

Francesconi: No, that was 1238.

*****: Oh, i'm sorry. My mistake.

Francesconi: 1239. Go ahead and read it.

Item No. 1239.

Saltzman: I'm move to substitute.

Moore: It was already substituted this week. This is second reading today.

Francesconi: Roll call. I think by dropping the insurance requirement on most parades, it allows fewer public demonstrations to require permits. And therefore it makes it easier to peacefully demonstrate. And I think now at this moment where we are in our history as the country and both as a city, we do need to make it easier for folks to demonstrate against government action or anything else. I also believe, though, that by having a permit when you're blocking streets it actually -- that helps, because then by getting a permit you can do something illegal. You can block the streets. And I think that's good too. So I think the changes here, and we really had a lot of help from the aclu who we listened to on this issue, make this a better amendment and a better ordinance. And I think there were some disagreements that in terms of language monitor versus communication experts, I forgot the word, but we, work these out. So this one yes were able to come together again. It took great advocacy not just from the aclu, but from dan and others and it also took a listening attitude which we should thank on behalf of the mayor and her staff. I know sam adams worked hard on this, jim wadsworth from licensing worked hard. Aye.

Hales: On this item and the next I think we could slip into the impression that what matters is what's on the books, that the deliberation about the policy or the ordinance language is what matters. And it does matter. I'm not saying that's irrelevant. But I think on both of these items it also is the responsibility of us as members of the council to pay attention to how it's administered. We talked about the building permit process yesterday. What's that have to do with parades or joint terrorism task force? This much, and that is people of goodwill can make bad law and a lousy administrative procedure work. People who aren't paying attention aren't going to be saved or protected by good law. So our police bureau and how the licensing bureau and the other actors administer this matters a lot. And -- I appreciate the work that's gone into trying to come up with a better policy and I think this is better. But I think our vigilance needs to be applied not just to the issue that's in front of us once a year or once every five years, but also how it's administered. In central precinct, in all the other precincts throughout the city, how this gets administrated will matter and will result in either justice or injustice regardless of what's on the page. And I think that's all of our responsibilities, not just the commissioner in charge of the police bureau or in charge of the license bureau, although I know, jim, you care about this, but all of us need to pay attention to how it works in reality as well. And I will. Aye.

Saltzman: Good work to the mayor's office, sam adams, aclu, cop watch and all the citizen that's participated in making this hopefully a good process, but the test will be in the pudding and I hope all sides will work together to make this work. Aye.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Sten: Anything that's a very big improvement, and getting rid of the fee and some of the other things will make it more user friendly. I agree with commissioner Hales, you can have all the rules you want, have you to enforce them correct limit that's the theme of the whole terrorism task force. The rules were clear, but are they followed. And I think there's a clear set of rules now that are much better and we can make sure they are followed and I also think the aclu for their help on this on short notice. Aye.

Francesconi: Let's take just 30 seconds, because the mayor wanted to try to be here for this. Let's see if the mayor's in a position where she can come. She asked me if she could only on -- come on 1240. Let's find out if she could. We'll be back in a minute. Should we take 1241 and let her know?

Francesconi: That's good. 1241.

Item No. 1241.

Francesconi: Is there any testimony on this? Roll call.

*******:** This goes to second reading.

Francesconi: Sorry. Okay.

*******:** Were there any remonstrances?

Hales: I don't believe there were on this one.

Francesconi: Okay. Let's -- I think that's appropriate. Let's start -- we're going to -- we may stop in the middle, let's go ahead and start with 1242.

Item No. 1242.

Dan Handelman, Peace and Justice Works and Portland Cop Watch: Good morning, commissioners. I'm really -- I really appreciate the time to do this ahead of the vote. My name is dan handelman, i'm with peace and justice works and Portland cop watch. You have already received written testimony from me. It was with regards to the Portland joint terrorism task force. I also forwarded you an article regarding how the news service avoids using the word "terrorism" because it is such an emotionally charged term. I'd like to sum rise what happened in the last three weeks. First, dozens of people, many of whom represented mainstream social justice organizations like the japanese american citizens league, the aclu, league of women voters, national organization for women, the Oregon sierra club, several labor unions and others expressed their concerns about the task force and how it's structured even in the shadow of the attacks on new york city and Washington, d.c.. While i'm not sure everyone who testified in opposition is necessarily pro choice, I am fairly confidence that all of them are opposed to people using violence to attack women on the way to clinics, bombing buildings or shooting doctors. I think it was unconscionable to pit the abortion rights community against others in the community by inviting them to praise the fbi. Ace understand it, both naral and planned parenthood have requested to talk with the city to work out the civil rights concerns raced. Similarly I don't think anybody who testified here is in favor of terrorism, which is to say physically attacking civilian populations in the u.s. To influence public policy. I would also suggest people who testified here recognize there is a particularly heightened sense of threat of an attack on this country, including an anthrax scare that's become prominent in the last few weeks. But still these real threats do not justify a permanent eight-member task force that is not accountable to the citizens of Portland. I would like to repeat some of the key points I meet in my written testimony first that the activities are not reviewable by city council, according to your own city attorney and the mayor's aide. They have repeated fbi's legally questionable stance that the federal guidelines prohibit civilian oversight of the fbi. Second that the only activities of the criminal intelligence united that are reviewable have not been clearly defined. The officers -- do they feel reports that meet Oregon standards as a criminal intelligence unit and turn over those files that would be illegal interoregon law to the fbi? We don't know. Yes told two weeks ago the fbi's loser standards will leave files in place for ten to 20 years whereas Portland's files are reviewed every two years. I'd like to pint out san francisco's police department does not participate in their

OCTOBER 17, 2001

joint terrorism task force as it is inconsistent with first amendment activities. I'd like to encourage to you clarify for the police and the public the differences between lawful first amendment protest, nonviolent civil disobedience, vandalism, sabotage, arson. Finally, I encourage you to put this item back on the agenda for discussion within the next six months. When there is not a deadline to renew the agreement, when the events of september eleventh are further in the past and we could have a dialogue that would lead to changes. By postponing this dialogue between last november and last month the ground work was laid for the contentious atmosphere that occurred on october 3.

In six months it would give the chief -- if you hear nothing else I said this morning, please consider the idea of this interim review. I thank you very much for your time.

Francesconi: And you did it within three minutes. Unless anybody on the council objects, since we've begun this process, why don't we just hear all the communications? Is that all right? 1243. Just stick within three minutes.

Item No. 1243.

Francesconi: I appreciated your use of the procedural rules. So go ahead.

Kathleen Juergens: My testimony today will not be about the Portland joint terrorism task force itself since I expected that vote to be over by the time I spoke but about the many problems with the procedures that were used to enact the task force. This will be hard having only three minutes.

This task force was first enacted in addition law last november by an emergency ordinance which was drafted in violation of city code 3.02.040 g 2 b and placed on the consent agenda in violation of city code 3.02.036. The council has since acknowledged that placing this on the consent agenda was a mistake. Although I have yet to hear anyone apologize for this mistake or thank dan handelmann for pointing it out. The original ordinance contained blatantly unconstitutional language. We are told this too was a mistake. After this vote the mayor's office released a memorandum reassuring us the vote was no big deal since this task force has been around since 1997. It was anything but reassuring to us to find out such a drastic piece of public policy as federalizing part of our local police force was being done for over three years completely out of the you be eye. As of yesterday, the mayor's chief of staff has told "the Portland tribune" that the police chief can participate in the task force on his own authority. He tells thus vote today is just to allow the city to accept federal overtime funds. Well, that's not what the ordinance before you says. So what sam adams is saying is even if the council votes this down today, the Portland police will go ahead and participate in the task force anyway. If it does not seriously worry the other four of you this is the position of the mayor's office, it should. This most recent ordinance was originally written as an emergency ordinance again without an adequate explanation of just what the emergency is, and did not receive enough votes to pass in this form. It does not appear this little irregularity would have been noticed by anybody if it hadn't been for citizen activists. Again, you're welcome. Throughout this recent public hearing, a hearing we worked so hard to get, a hearing that we now found out was irrelevant, the mayor showed blatant bias, letting one pro speaker ramble on for 7 1/2 minutes while keeping the rest of us to two minutes. Her explanation for this was that he was invited. Well, that shows bias too. The mayor invited eight speakers to testify for the task force and only four against. And was much stricter about keeping the second group to their time limits. That's not just bad public policy, I believe it's unconstitutional. The first amendment does not allow government to treat groups of citizens differently based on the content of what they say. When citizens are confronted with such blatant bias it is not realistic to expect we will sit there and take it. We were accused of being uncivil and offensive, and references were made to school board meetings. School board activists resorted to disruptive tactics only after attending meetings for many years and concluding they could not get a fair hearing any other way. I wish the mayor were here to hear this -- if you're trying to make sure the same thing happens at city council, you're doing a great job. We all know the fbi has historically broken far more laws than they've ever enforced. Portland police have a long and sordid history of violating the law, particularly -- now we see the city council doesn't even

OCTOBER 17, 2001

bother following its own code when giving its stamp of approval for all -- to all the foregoing. It's a sad comment when anarchists such as myself are the most law abiding people in town. Thank you.

Francesconi: Thank you. Again, thanks for being within the time. Okay. 1244.

Item No. 1244.

Diane Lane: Diane lane, southeast Portland. Effective antiterrorism measures address root causes. Terrorism expert ariel moreary stated, quote, terrorism does not grow in a vacuum. Surely you must fight terrorism and take measures to prevent it. But you can't rely on police. The answer is in the political domain, end, quote. Let's apply that locally. Environmentalists claim that clearcutting disturbs ecological balance and destroys watersheds. Animal activists claim that researchers who use animals have not contributed to any significant cures, but often perform bogus experiments to keep grant money flowing. The activists have evidence that animals are often abused unnecessarily. Toes concerns are clearly not fanatical or evil, but rather quite reasonable and rational. And yet activists who express them have no significant voice in the political process. Antiterrorism measures do exist besides the task force. You could commit to the use of salvaged wood for building projects. You could create a peace council. You could provide a decision-making process that addresses all reasonable concerns. The uncivil behavior at the october 3rd hearing reflected the intense frustration of bringing important concerns to council and then having them dismissed. Why suspect there a public format for genuine dialogue regarding important issues such as the task force? A format that allows all concerns to be voiced and given equal weight instead of giving so much consideration to law enforcement and business desires. Public hearings need to be held before drafting ordinances. Otherwise, even if some amendments are made, they usually cover only minor points. Leaving the essence of the ordinance untouched. For instance, during the pgtf hearings, several people brought evidence of fbi and cia use civil rights abuses to your attention, and still most of you voted for the ordinance renewal fully aware it included no meaningful safeguards. I'd like you to think about the following statement. Quote -- terrorist movements seldom flourish where people can shape their own future. Even a limited form of participatory democracy can go a long way toward diffusing a situation that might otherwise foster violence. Thank you.

Francesconi: Thank you. 1245.

Item No. 1245.

Bonnie Tinker: Bonnie tinker from northeast Portland. I'm glad to have this opportunity to speak to you and surprised to have it before your vote, so I hope it might actually impact the outcome. We are in a between freedom and fear. It's clear we all feel the fear. It's a fear that has been loose in the world for many years now, a fear of terrorism, and it is now come home so that we understand that the same terrorism also threatens us. And of course the question always is, when you are afraid, how do you answer that fear without giving up freedom? What worries me is that we have moved toward giving up our freedoms because of this fear. We all know that the fbi has a terrible reputation around civil liberties. Very valid concerns were raced around the civil liberties issues with the Portland joint terrorism task force. I'm very disappointed they have not been adequately considered and that we did not find another way to do business where we could engage a full dialogue and come to community solutions. There are state safeguards to protect us in police spying. This terrorism task force deliberately sir couple vents those state safeguards. That's a dangerous road to go down. We have heard testimony that in fact it is not necessary to deposit ties Portland police officers as federal agents in order to have cooperation between the police and the fbi. Why then are we taking that additional step? I wish you would take the time to consider this more deeply and in a community fashion. Fear often leads us to make decisions in great haste. Dan, you mentioned that many people are afraid, including gay people. I want you to know that as a gay person, I have been afraid of homophobia and afraid of lon mabon, but i'm much more afraid

OCTOBER 17, 2001

of giving these kind of powers to the Portland police and putting them in that kind of alliance with the fbi. So please, don't make a yes vote in my name. When we are afraid we often do act in haste.

And what has been said is haste makes waste. Freedom is a terrible thing to waste. It is terrible to give back one's freedom because we are afraid. Charlie Hales faced the public fear with courage. And voted no on this task force. I would like to ask all of you to look for that same kind of courage, to responsibly lead a public that is afraid but to lead us in a way that protects our freedoms. Please, say no to selling out our freedom and say yes to community dialogue and community solutions. Thank you.

Francesconi: Thank you, bonnie. And 1246.

Item No. 1246.

Ken Spice: Good afternoon, my name is ken spice, I live in southeast Portland. I teach geography at Portland state, work full-time at a high-tech company downtown and volunteer for a great number of community organizations. Over the last couple of years i've sat in this chamber on multiple occasion and quite frankly i've been appalled at the way the council in particular the mayor deals with public input. I'm here today to introduce -- to address the matter -- manner in which council hears public communications. For those of you watching at home who might not be familiar with this term, public communications is the technicality in city code that a citizen must invoke in written in order to address our elected officials unless you happen to be well connected enough to lobby the commissioners behind closed doors. While am I attempted to try to address the general rudeness and disrespect with which this council and in particular the mayor display towards those members of the public who they disagree with, I recognize this is a losing battle. Therefore, while it may be impossible to stop the mayor from acting the part of the kindergarten teacher gone bad, it should be an easy matter to convince the majority of you to make a few changes that would go a long way toward affirming the -- I have four issues i'd like the council to address today. First there's an issue of city code. The first passage dealing with public communications occurs in 3.02.030, a section of code that lays out the general order of items on the agenda. It places so-called time certain items first, public communications second, and the rest of the regular agenda last. This is fair to the public who must take time off work midday or otherwise alter their schedules. Specifies the details of public communications that this request to address council must be written, it must include certain items like an address, and behind one of the many commas is a clause noting that the public communication would generally be placed at the end of the wednesday morning agenda. This is the method that council has been using. It is far less friendly to public participation, and the clause conflicts with the section detailing the order of the council's agenda. Clearly one of these must be deleted as they -- conflict. The council clerk has reported the council intends to amend the official order of business section in favor of the complying with the person thetical statement relegating public input to the end of the meetings. I can't believe you're going to dismantle a long-standing section of code giving a great deal of respect to public participation in fair of a more recently added clause which shuns such participation. My first request is that the council enact legislation to strike the clause leaving public participation near the top of the agenda where it belongs. Next, i'd like the council to join me in affirming that two is not equal to three. Even when the mayor says it is. To suggest one can say in two minutes what one can say in three minutes is moronic to say the least. Give the public three minutes, 180 seconds, both during communication and during special occasions where sign-up sheets are used to do any less is to show your disrespect for public participation. Thirdly, i'm requesting the council add a 30-second warning bell to its current system. Thereby avoiding the friction that results when a thought has to be rushed to be finished or be chastised by the mayor for exceeding the three minutes. If I thought it would help would I also ask the council to help the mayor enforce such time limit fairly but i'm afraid that's too much to ask. Finally, there's sometimes a large public interest in an item before you. Because none of you seem to be the top of -- type of politician who is willing to stay late, i'd

OCTOBER 17, 2001

ask you exercise forethought in planning, decide how long you're willing to stay on those days, divide by three or four minutes and figure out how many speakers you can hear so the rest of us can go back and return next week. Thank you.

Saltzman: What's the -- could you give me the code section again?

Spice: First is 3.02.030, section b.

Hales: Thank you.

Francesconi: Thank you all for your very respectful testimony. And helpful testimony. Now let's see if the mayor wants to come here or not.

Francesconi: Why don't you go ahead and read item 1240.

Mayor Katz returned.

Item No. 1240.

Francesconi: Roll call.

Francesconi: Civil liberties, freedom of speech of assembly and freedom from persecution form the foundation of a free society. And you've helped remind us of that. But to be truly free, we must also not be hostages to fear. We must fail-safe in our homes, at work, and in our public places. At the time of this first vote, anthrax was a threat. Now it's a reality. Because our police bureaus participation in the task force I believe increases our protection our citizens protection from terrorism, without necessarily diluting our state and federal protected rights, it won my support. I do believe that this we should watch this and that it should come back to the council for our review in a year. To make sure that it's being effective. I'm also aware of some of the history of the fbi as alleged, but I think what i'm also aware of is how the fbi really helped us crack the klu klux klan and how I believe we need to work with them to try to make our citizens safe. Aye.

Hales: I'm not going to reiterate what I said at the other vote, but I want to point out a couple of things for the future. Because I think we are going to get back to this issue. And although there were some very good points made about civil liberties, i'm not going to reiterate those. I tried to focus last time on a couple of management issues. One was what do we do when eight is not enough, and we have a significant problem. How do those eight officers work with everybody else. I never heard a coherent explanation from the chief, frankly, and i'm not sure administratively how that's supposed to work. So I think that's a problem. Secondly, how will we ever know that we're -- that it's okay to stand down and let these folks go back to normal duties? And i'm not sure if anybody can describe that. I believe this is not going to be a one-month wonder, it's going to go for a long time. The threat is going to go on for a long time. Maybe we won't be the council who faces that question, of when is enough and when -- but some council is going to have to address that. I want to focus on another issue, something caused me to ponder, I don't think this is something you did, I think this is something that happened to us. When you and I came on the council we had a police chief named tom potter, and we had a theory that Portland was known for around the country that community policing was the best way to police an urban area. And since then we've had really an erosion of that ideal. Not because we've had bad guys as police chiefs or because we as a city council have made a policy change, but I think there's been a programatic erosion of the idea much community policing. We've had an auto theft task force, a marijuana task force, a gang enforcement team, a neighborhood response team, a new riot squad, i'm not sure what we call them, but they've got alter 18 vehicles and suvs, the joint terrorism task force, and periodic police at least during better budget years for helicopters and other aircraft. Think about that sort of parade of special assignments. We have now again not because I don't think vera you sat there and -- sat there and said we're going to go that way, frankly I didn't sit here and say we haven't go that way, but we a -- as a council have an oversight and policy responsibility of our bureau, whether it's promoting bicycling and transit in my bureau or promoting after school recreation in jim's bureau, or whether

OCTOBER 17, 2001

we're going to abandon the idea of community policing. And i'm concerned that the joint terrorism task force, aside from the other issues we've talked about, is one more case of taking an approach of specialized assignments dealing with the threat of the month rather than consistently practicing community policing. And I want to get to that big picture issue at some point. You're going to be talking about budget reductions here shortly or we all are, I need to be engaged in and will be engaged n. Because it's my responsibility here, and I think it's all of ours, the question of are we still in the business of community policing or are we in the business of supporting a variety of niches in the police bureau where people get special assignment, special tools, even special status to do specialized work. And if somebody wants to make a case that that's a better way to police Portland, then they should come here and make that case. But we have drifted to this new world of lots of specialized task forces. I don't recall -- I don't think I missed meeting where the city council said we're going to have lots of specialized task force and fit community policing in where we can. And I hope it's not that bad. But i'm worried that we're drifting in that direction and that this is one more instance of that drift. And I think we need to stop that drift and take a look and say which way are we going and how much of our work force is going to be in specialized task forces rather it's for drugs or gangs or auto theft or graffiti or anything else and how much of our work force is going to be on foot and on bicycles and at neighborhood meetings and all that other stuff that tom potter was preaching when I came on the city council nine years ago. There hasn't been a day where we said, tom was crazy, that was a silly idea, we're going to stop doing that, but yet all these instances have pulled us away from that ideal. And I want to reexamine that question. So that will be one more way to get back at the question that we discussed and debated here. Aye. No. [laughter] sorry. Carried away.

Saltzman: I think many of you feel that we have not admitted to a mistake to hear this as an emergency ordinance. I think I speak for all of us, each one of us has probably said it was a mistake. We recognize that mistake. If you needed normal apology, I apologize. But in the same breath I am absolutely unapologetic for our participation in the joint terrorism task force. And I think you have to realize we have had a very fair process. I think the mayor bent over backwards. I sometimes feel she's fair to a flaw in allowing people to speak and get their point of view across, whether it's a public hearing, a budget meeting, or going out in the community and meeting with people. We did not orchestrate the pro choice forces to come here and testify. They've had over 30 years of dealing with domestic terrorism threats, bombs, anthrax. It's old hat to them. We did not have to orchestrate them to come here and testify. They did out of their own. And I think whether you felt your points weren't heard, they were heard. I guess every attorney who argues a case, or even those of us who argue in support of an amendment and we lose, we feel our valid points were not heard by the judge or by the jury or by our colleagues. You just got to recognize that's the facts. We are up here to make a decision, we listen to all points of view and somebody usually end up losing, some point of view end up winning. And we need to move on and I look forward to at least leaving this up for a year and we'll revisit when we renew it next year. Aye.

Sten: This has been a very tough issue for me. I think it's an important slew. I'm not whining or complaining. I think there's still more thought to be done and a lot of these pieces of it. I think I have said publicly I think we blew it last year and I think i've said i'm sorry, I am sorry how it was handled last november. It was a mistake to put it on the consent. The language was a mistake. Last year as I looked at it, obviously too hastily, my -- as I looked at it I believed that the fbi does operate in Portland, it -- period. And I believed as 8 looked at it last year it made more sense to formalize that relationship than to have them working in -- informally. The police do cooperate with the fbi, whether or not there's a task force that. Was my logic at the time. I then became convinced that probably didn't make sense. Because many of the arguments i've heard from the community. I also at that time as I mulled on it for the nearly year after that, believe that there was not a significant terrorist threat in Portland. I know many people still believe there's not a

OCTOBER 17, 2001

significant terrorist threat. I do believe there's a threat. I don't know how real it is in Portland, but it's very sobering to sit with the people in my office and think through how we're going to look at mail to try and be calm on these issues. There's things going on and I think they have to be investigated. That doesn't make it to me crystal clear this task force is the only or the b.e.s. Way to do it. There's been a lot of lecturing by a lot of different sides of a lot of people in this community and I don't have a lecture for anybody. I do believe we need to investigate terrorism aggressively. In my mind, and I won't try -- because i'm speaking off the cuff get the actual definition right, but to me it's fairly clear what's terrorist activity and what's political activity and it has to do with violence for me. And I do split with some people that I think significant violence against property is terrorism, although I don't count graffiti as terrorism. And so we'd have to -- I think we have some work as a community to define it. I think it makes more sense to work with the fbi on this than not. I don't think that by a 90-10 margin. I think it by a very close call, and it troubles me quite a bit. In thinking that, I do think we need to do absolutely everything in our power to provide civilian oversight. I think civilian oversight is ultimately -- I look forward for the world and I actually try to work very hard on causes as Diane says, and I think causes are the issue. Until you change causes you have to deal with the facts and some of these effects are very, very real. I think that the way that we -- in a world where there is military and police and you need these things, you have to have oversight. And it has to be third party oversight. The mayor has made a public promise to me and it's not under coercion, that we will have civilian oversight over the criminal investigation. That has not happened in the past outside of the mayor herself and the city attorney's office, and it has been the city attorney ha has -- that has looked as though little I believe we should have somebody other than the city attorney looking at these files. The mayor has agreed to that. I do intend to come back and -- in partnership with something to provide that. I think at this point I think through the independence police review function would be the best way. The aclu has shared a letter with me yesterday that calls into question our city attorney's analysis that the fbi work cannot be monitored in any way, shape or form. I intend to look into that. I do think by putting more active -- I understand the difference and I understand perfectly, it's not like I don't hear people, that there's a difference between the fbi files and the criminal investigation unit. I do however know those officers are the same people. And, yes, there is a way they can put it in one file and not show it, but I think active investigation or oversight of the ciu will shed quite a bit of light for citizens on what is happening there. I did -- I want to look into this issue of whether or not there is a way to look at the fbi's files and whether or not what's being allege second degree it's a matter of policy, not a matter of law. I don't profess to know the answer to who's right on that, but i'm going to spend more time looking at this. For me it not a crystal clear decision. It's something that I think I have to weigh quite a bit and I think whichever direction we go we will have the fbi in town. We will have very, very clear lines that need to be drawn on civil cite, we'll have a threat to this community and it's imperative we all work together whether i'm wrong or somebody else is wrong on the specific issue of whether or not we should formalize the task force and I hope to join with everybody of goodwill on both sides of this issue to try and do that, because I think the issues really are community safety, protection of civil lights, civilian oversight and I think those are things that need to be in place, period. And my hope is that over time, I don't exactly know what -- I took to heart dan's point of view as it would be nice to have a hearing on some of these issues outside of a heated vote and outside of I think what is a feeling of national emergency on all kinds of fronts and a lot of emotion. And I think the emotion is very real. I think the emotion of fear, the -- on many different sides is all there and so I think it would make a lot of sense to try and find ways to talk about both the bigger issues outside of a vote in the upcoming year. Aye.

Katz: I can't allow commissioner Hales's remarks to go unanswered, because I really think that we're creating an urban myth, commissioner Hales. You comment whether eight is not enough, and many times eight is not enough. And in fact, we do then bring in as many officers as we need to

OCTOBER 17, 2001

make sure that we have enough protection for both the demonstrators as well as the public. So it's far more than eight when necessary. In terms of the programmatic erosion on community policing, let me remind you that even when I asked Tom Potter to stay, we had all the special task force with the exception of two. We had the bomb unit, we had the marijuana task force, we had -- the community and I made a couple of decisions. One was we had a lot of crime violence, gun violence, especially with our young people. That was the reason the YGAT got established. You all supported it. If you look at the data now, we've had incredible reports -- results. And you'll hear a report coming back to this council in the next week or so. The other one I established was the auto task force. Auto theft task force. Because of the huge numbers of auto theft and the community asking you to please do something about it. If you look at the numbers, the auto theft numbers have reduced as well. We still have the neighborhood response officers, we now have a senior officer, neighborhood officer, community officer who is a many district chief that deals with the overall issues for that particular community. And we've done something that we haven't done whether it's Tom Potter or even Charles Moose. We now are responding because the crime rate is at a 30-year low, we now have the ability to go back to cases that homicide case that's have not been resolved and we also have the ability to respond to burglaries, where in previous years you asked residents to please send a report, the report was never sent back in many occasions, and consequently the crime rate was low. We are now actually investigate those cases as well as investigating car larceny. And the crime numbers are still overall are still staying as low as they did last year. There's maybe a 1% increase even with that additional activity. There's a what the community has been asking us. So the fact that you claim that we are eroding community policing is not accurate, and I really appreciated that this urban myth not continue. Because it's wrong information that you're providing. Aye. [gavel pounded]

At 1:19 p.m., Council recessed.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

OCTOBER 17, 2001

6:00 PM

Katz: It's nice to have you all here. I heard not all of you are testifying. Is that true? [laughter] I have to tell you, before we start, we have a procedural issue we need to deal with on another matter, but i'm very happy to see all here, and quite frankly i'm very happy that we are finally at least beginning the first step, since this is only the first reading, to closure. God bless all of you for sticking with us. All right. We need to pull item 1234 off the table. I need to have a second, because you didn't vote on it.

Item No. 1234.

Francesconi: Right.

Katz: Okay. That's the affirmative action. So I need a motion.

Francesconi: So moved.

Hales: Second.

Katz: [roll call]

Francesconi: The mayor was kind. I was the president of the council by draw and she was trying to settle the strike and I forgot to have us vote on this item. So anyway. Aye.

Hales: Details, details. Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Katz: We all make mistakes. I made one last week. Aye. [gavel pounded] all right. Thank you. Let's read 1247.

Item No. 1247.

Francesconi: It was a good discussion, it really was.

Katz: All right. Let me just start by thanking everybody that has stuck with us on the southwest community plan, that by november -- when is it? November 14th we will have a final vote I hope. What we're going to do, I want to remind the council that what's in front of you, it's the planning commission's recommendations. And there are several items that will be presented to you that are coming from the neighborhood that -- where they disagree. I have to say that most of the items were agreed upon, but there were several that the neighborhoods have disagreed on. We are going to break this up by neighborhood, so you will hear all the discussion by neighborhood. So if you've got any questions about those items, make a note, because on the 14th we'll have to come back and make a decision on whether you want to discuss the items that the planning commission supported that you may not support. Am I making myself clear? Okay. And then we'll vote on all of that on the 14th. So.

Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning (BOP): Thank you, madam mayor, gil kelley, planning director, and with me is deborah stein from the planning bureau. I don't need to testify. This is really the deborah show tonight. She's toiled for years bringing this to fruition. I just wanted to introduce this by thanking all of those that I worked with on this one. I think it was my first week on the job the mayor said to me, there are a couple things i'm going to hand you that you may not like very much, but I want you to fix them. One was the land division code rewrite and the second was the southwest plan, and I think it was a little while after that I got the west end and the macadam, but this was one she wanted to see brought to closure soon. Honestly all I had to do was turn to deborah and allow her to trust her own instincts. I think that we stood back and really listened to the community and that was largely through deborah and marie johnson, brad and reece who work order this project over the last year very intensively, and allowed us to reframe the entire question or set of questions that's involved here. And I think all that it became relatively easy, and I think in so doing we've gone a long way to healing our relations between the city, in particular the

OCTOBER 17, 2001

planning bureau and the southwest community at large. It's not that every single item was ironed out, but for the most part I think we really turned this thing around, and that's owed in great measure to Deborah's leadership on this. So I just wanted to particularly thank her for that.

*****: Thank you.

Katz: Deborah?

Deborah Stein, BOP: Thank you. I'll be brief as well. I'm Deborah Stein with the bureau of planning. I'm very pleased to be here tonight. You all know how long and challenging this process has been, but I believe everybody who's been involved has learned a lot. I feel very proud of the collective efforts of city staff, both the current staff and past staff who've worked on this project, and I feel proud of the work of the numerous citizens who have stayed involved throughout this process, the hard work, creative thinking, and spirit of collaboration all brought us here tonight. So I feel very good about that. I'm going to hand it over to Marie Johnson.

Katz: Okay. Marie Johnson. Marie Johnson was the work horse on this. I could have used a better term.

Marie Johnson, BOP: That's okay. Marie Johnson, planning bureau staff. First I want to call your attention to the legal record, which is over in this corner of the room. Now that we've dispensed with that I'd like to introduce you to the other staff on the project, Brad Carter is handling the laptop and will be able to show us later in the presentation zoning and other relevant mapping information for sites as you're hearing testimony. That's Brad. And Reece is back here. So that's -- that makes up the southwest community plan team today. I also would like to start with thank yous. Any success is a team effort, and we've been fortunate in having a really strong team that's made up of great staff and great community members. I particularly want to thank the Sweeney staff, Leonard Gard has put in a lot of time and energy has been a really important person to bounce ideas off of and help us understand the best ways to move forward. Sylvia has been very supportive, the task forces had three representatives, I've had the honor of working with Mark Seper and he's a gentleman and a hard worker and worthy collaborator. There are numerous community activists and you'll hear from them, and I appreciate all their energy and again, their spirit of cooperation and collaboration. I'm going to start -- my presentation really is to provide a context and given -- give an overview of what's been happening in the last year since we last came to you on the southwest community plan. So I'm going to start by saying what's been going on in the last year, give you an overview of some of the key topics you're likely to hear of, and then run through a matrix we put together to aid you in tonight's hearing. So we were last at the city council in July 2000 talking about the southwest community plan vision and policies and objectives. Since then, we've worked with neighborhood leadership on developing approach to wrapping up the work on the southwest community plan, specifically working on the zoning code and comprehensive plan amendments, and we completed that work last fall and developing our process. Then from fall until spring, we actually did the work of looking at previous mapping work and came up with a draft proposal that we could take forward into community meetings and discuss. That was the working draft map. And then in May, published a proposed comprehensive plan zoning map and then went to planning commission this summer and published their recommendations in September. As we were doing this work, we operated from some base assumptions and we felt it was really important that we're clear about the basis for our work. The first assumption was that any work that we did had to be the outcome of an open process that included a variety of people in the process, not only neighborhood leadership who have been instrumental in this process, but other community members as well. We also wanted to honor the work that had been done previously, specifically the neighborhoods work in '97 and the planning commission's tentative

OCTOBER 17, 2001

recommendations in '98. Last summer, when council was considering the southwest community plan policies, they directed us to coordinate the work -- our work with the city's response to the endangered species act, so that was one of our base assumptions. We also needed to pay attention to the connections between this project and other projects, and i'll temperature on -- touch on that briefly in a few minutes. In this phase the project we had very specific limitations on one of the -- and one of the parameters of the project was that we were working only with existing base zones and also design overlay zone. We were not looking at developing any special or new zoning tools such as plan districts and overlays. We looked at ways that we could promote pedestrian orientation and commercial areas, provide opportunities for additional housing and commercial development, and encourage compatible development within the mixed use area specifically the hills day town center, Multnomah main street macadam main street and garden home main street. And we also looked at our zoning proposal to look for appropriate changes for key institutions. The public involvement process had several different components. As I mentioned previously, last fall we worked with community activists to determine an appropriate process for completing this phase of the work. In march as we were nearing the time when we could share our thinking with the broader community, we sent a project update to approximately 10,000 people. This told them what had been going on recently, let them know how to stay involved in the process, let them know about community events that were coming up. This was sent to any property owner that we felt might be affected by any new proposals. In april we held two workshops in southwest to look at our work and that was really done collaboratively between the neighborhood associations and the staff, where we worked side by side to explain to people what the proposals were, what their basis was and get their input. And then after the proposal was developed, we held an open house in june. In addition to these specific elements, we had ongoing consultation with the sweeney task force attending regular meetings, and met and talked regularly with the neighborhood leaderships. We sent legal and other notices to property owners, all property owners where we expect there might be some change to their land use designation. This included not only the measure 56 requirements we made to people who had properties proposed for zone changes, but also we mailed them to other properties. We provided a monthly updates to the southwest community plan web page, this included the most current map proposals as well as any documents that were relevant. And we were in regular contact with the local press. We had regular coverage by the three neighborhood papers and "the Oregonian." there are a couple of projects that will carry forward some of the elements we anticipated in the southwest community plan. The first is actually two elements. One is what we're calling the barbur boulevard envelope, and west Portland town center. Now, I think we recognized that barbur boulevard and the area around capital highway where -- what is now designated as the west Portland town center are very important areas with some interesting challenges and really require a lot of attention, more attention and resources than we were able to devote in the southwest community plan process. So working with community activists we identified a boundary for this area that we call the barbur envelope, and within that boundary we agreed to keep the existing zoning and comprehensive plan designations and -- until a future planning process could be done that would be more targeted on this area. Another effort that had been moving forward in the southwest community plan process and has since stalled in Washington county is the raleigh hills town center. That was to include some portion of area along beaverton hillsdale highway potentially to shattuck road. So that was going on until just I believe a year or year and a half ago and is now on hold. Previous proposals based on that town center designation and other planning that was happening in Washington county we -- were rethought in our process and looked at in the merits of what is actually happening right there. The other project which I

OCTOBER 17, 2001

know you're very familiar with is the marquam hill plan, and that's looking at planning for the institutions in the marquam hill area. So the areas that are existing institutional uses up in marquam hill are not being prepared, but are being handled in that process. I'd like to take just a minute to review some of the key issues that we dealt with in our process, and i'm not going to highlight any specific sites, but just give you an overview of some of the challenges that we dealt with and some of the approaches we took. The environmental issues in southwest are critical. Southwest has the highest concentration of riparian habitat and any -- in any developed portion of Portland. There are other areas like johnson creek that are also very important. Southwest has fanno creek, stevens creek and try I don't know creek. So we will to keep that in mind. We also again needed to respond to council's directive to coordinate our work with the endangered species act, and particularly any work that might be upcoming to update the environmental overlay zones. At the same time we had budgetary and time constraints that made it very difficult for us to do site by site analysis. So whatever approach we took to zoning needed to keep in mind the environmental issues while at the same time providing us with process that was manageable given our constraints. When planning commission looked at staff's proposal for the areas that were identified as environmentally significant, they supported the staff's thinking in a couple of -- and -- in one significant area. Staff developed our zoning proposals in -- based on some work that's being done by environmental planners and the bureau of planning, and that work has -- in that work we have developed an inventory of areas that have significance for riparian systems in the city. So we looked at that inventory that had the basis of which has -- was developed with the input from independent scientists, we used that inventory as it applied in southwest to determine which lands had some kind of riparian significance in -- and which did not. In our process we -- the staff supported keeping the existing zoning on any property within -- with riparian significance. Planning commission agreed with that approach. So on sites that had environmental significance, planning commission said keep the existing zoning, in many of those properties the comprehensive plan designation actually called for a higher density designation, planning commission supported the approach of actually changing the comprehensive plan designation to match the zoning. So you might have a situation where the zoning was r-10, the comprehensive plan was r-7, if there was identified riparian resource, planning commission said let's change the comprehensive plan to match the existing zoning. On sites that were -- did not have identified riparian significance, they supported staff's approach of actually changing the zoning to match the comprehensive plan. So again, if you took the example of a property that has r-10 zoning and r-7 comprehensive plan designation, if there were no identified riparian resources, planning commission supported changing the zoning to match the comprehensive plan so there would actually be an upzoning from r-10 to r-7. Another issue that we had to deal with, most of those properties were residential properties and the approach we took applied primarily to residential properties. But there were other questions related to residential infill. We had to look at the southwest area and the development patterns, the area is hilly, has infrastructure issues, transportation and some areas is -- access to transit is sometimes limited. And much of the area is pretty much built out. So what planning commission supported was taking an approach that we looked at previous neighborhood association proposals to increase density where there was some thinking that that was appropriate, and staff forwarded those recommendations. And modified those recommendations mostly when we heard advice from technical advisors such as office of transportation staff that the infrastructure was not adequate to accommodate the potential additional growth. There were also challenges to be dealt with in the commercial areas. Many of southwest is developed during the '50s, '60s, and '70s when the commercial pattern tends to be much more focused on convenience for the auto than

OCTOBER 17, 2001

convenience for the pedestrian. So we have that existing development pattern. At the same time I think the 60 recognizes that we'd like to promote a more pedestrian oriented environment. Changing some of the zoning from existing zoning to more pedestrian oriented zoning can and -- in some cases create problems for property owners, particularly complying with the development center, so that's one of the issues we needed to recognize and address. We also I think had a lot of interest in the neighborhoods in finding ways to promote housing within these mixed use areas, and I think some frustration with the tools that we currently have to do that. So we had to look at how do we provide a mix of housing when the only tool we had to deal with was base zoning. So what we did was we looked at the existing pattern and really focused on the mixed use areas, and in those areas we found it was most appropriate to change the zoning from a more auto oriented designation to a more pedestrian oriented zoning. We decided that it made sense to avoid using the commercial mixed use zoning on properties that have existing commercial designations and commercial uses because that zone -- the requirements in that zoning for 50% housing can create problems for existing development. We did retain a small amount of general commercial zoning and cn 2 zoning on existing auto oriented uses, particularly gas stations within mixed use areas. And then outside the mixed use areas, we retained some of the commercial zoning and relied on code provisions that implement the transportation planning rule to provide more of a pedestrian orientation. The next area that we looked at were institutions. The southwest community plan was always intended to implement the institutional residential zoning designation for institutions within the southwest community plan area. Currently -- the way institutions have a couple of different zoning provisions, and one is they can have an ir zoning, or institutional residential zone and they go through impact mitigation plan, or they have -- they're zoned under residential zone and they go through a conditional use master plan. Currently both lewis and clark and pcc sylvania have conditional use master plans in effect. This change from the way we have done zoning for institutions to changing to the ir zoning, it's a complicated issue, it's difficult for a lot of people to understand, and the community has raised concerns about what their opportunities are for having input in that process. Planning commission's recommendation was to zone -- apply the ir zoning to all land owned by institutions that they plan for possible campus expansion, and keep the existing zoning and comprehensive plan designations for properties at the institutions do not currently own. The final topic that I want to mention is town center and main street boundaries. In this process I already said that the raleigh hills town center is being -- was to be handled primarily under the lead of Washington county, and the west Portland town center designation is applies, but the long-term - - it's uncertain if that designation will continue into the future. So really we only had one town center that we were dealing with boundary issues, and that's the hillsdale town center. They had a process earlier in the southwest community plan to develop boundaries, but there had always been an agreement that at some point in southwest community plan we would consider expanding that to a broader area, so that was considered in our process. We also were establishing boundaries for macadam main street, Multnomah, and garden home main streets. The implications of the boundaries to the zoning map. In hillsdale the expansion of the hillsdale town center boundary means there will be an expansion to hillsdale plan district, and the primary outcome of this is that there will be design overlay applied to commercial designations, multifamily designations and r2.5 designations. There's also some restrictions on use on commercial businesses. Within the main streets we supported the application of the design overlay to multifamily owned -- zoned properties. So that's the staff's presentation. I would like to call your attention to this table that we've given you prior to the hearing, and kind of walk you through that hopefully answer any questions you might have, and then we'll turn it over to the task force to give their presentation. So

OCTOBER 17, 2001

what you see before you, hopefully you've had a chance to look at this before, is the table, and what we did is we organized the table to correspond with the order in which you'll hear testimony tonight. So the first neighborhood you'll hear testimony about tonight is bridal mile, and that's the neighborhood at the top of your -- I guess this example has hilldale. So you'll see up in the right-hand corner the neighborhood's name, and then you'll see the top shaded line it says, the neighborhood and then it says the topic. So if you wanted to go back after the hearing and refer to any of your background materials on the specific topics you'd know what topic to look under. We filled in some of the table for you. For sites that you've already received testimony on, we provided some very brief information, and this includes the location of the site, the planning commission's zoning recommendation, current zoning, current comprehensive plan designation, requester, and the reasons for the requester's testimony. We also have a box here for you to check if you would like to discuss this item at the next session on november 14th. Our suggestion is you check this box if there -- if this is a site that you need more information prior to making a decision, or it's a site where you would like to make a decision -- consider a decision other than planning commission's recommendation.

Katz: So we will have to keep track of that.

Johnson: Right. This is a working table for you to use as you're going through the hearing. Now, the neighborhoods -- we're going to keep you on your toes.

Francesconi: Could you make these tables for us all the time?

Johnson: Right below that we have blank space for you to put your comments. I have to say I was reminded of the work sheets we used to get in school as children. There's a place for you to provide your comments. For every neighborhood we've included a couple of spaces for any testimony about sites that are not already included in the table. Because we anticipate that there will be people coming in with proposals that haven't been heard previously so they're not reflected in the materials we've provided you, but we've provided this layout so you can keep track of what you've heard and who you've heard it from. So I hope that you find that helpful. And I think now we turn it over to jared.

Katz: Come on up. Thank you, marie.

Jer Retzer, Chair, Southwest Comp Plan Task Force: Good evening, i'm jer, i'll keep my remarks brief because I know you're going to have a long evening. Southwest neighborhoods are pleased to see the southwest community plan reach this milestone. It has been a long time coming.

The southwest plan map has had a very turbulent history. S a -- as you know, the planning commission halted deliberations over the map over three years ago so it's fair to ask, what has changed since then and why should we adopt the plan now? Southwest neighborhoods and the bureau of planning have made great progress in the last three years. Several of us warned back then that watershed and infrastructure, the barbur boulevard-west Portland policy -- town center -- it posed major hurdles. History proved us right and the planning commission bogged down, making case by case decisions in response to literally hundreds of amendments. The fundamental cause was a disconnect between the city and neighborhood land use priorities. Since august 1998, however, we developed in the city council -- and the city council approved new policies for the area that are compatible with neighborhood goals and acceptable to the city. This work was groundbreaking in several areas, notably watershed and citizen involvement. Planning commission members were very helpful in some of this work. We did not win every issue, but by and large the neighborhoods are satisfied with the result. Also since 1998 the city endangered species act response have elevated attention toward environmental resources. My preference dating back over three years was for watershed plan district for the area just as we have for other city watersheds. It

OCTOBER 17, 2001

seemed reasonable to me, however, to defer this request pending esa and e zone work. However, late last year as these projects stretched out it became clear we would need a different approach to complete the map and as a minimum prevent further harm. That's when the city proposed the criteria which is generally pleased the neighborhoods to retain the base zone for residential lots that include significant resources as documented on the draft resource significant map. This was a good compromise, it resolved most of the problem sites while imposing a minimal penalty on development potential. It was definitely not perfect, however, as you will hear. It does not address transportation or other critical infrastructure deficiencies or desired neighborhood character. I hope that you will listen carefully to neighborhood and citizen concerns in these areas. We also decided that given the difficult history of the barbur boulevard west Portland town center, the best course was to exclude these areas from the current proposal. I am hopeful if we bring this phase to a happy close, that the neighborhoods will support a separate comprehensive and coordinated planning process for these areas in the near future. Finally and critically important in the three years since the planning commission last considered the zoning map, we found a new spirit of teamwork and support from the city and among the neighborhoods. While we certainly did not win every point, we have in general been very pleased with the openness, professionalism, and teamwork demonstrated by gil kelley's planning staff, notably deborah stein, marie johnson, brad carter, and elizabeth reece. They have gone a long way toward reestablishing the trust to the neighborhoods that was sledged by the '96 proposed map. The support of the mayor and her assistant was also critical. And the planning commission resolved several differences with the neighborhoods and the bureau and -- in adopting the proposal before you. While the neighborhoods will raise a number of points where we disagree with the commission proposal this evening, please keep in mind this is against a backdrop of thousands of properties where we support the current proposal. In deference to a long evening ahead and to avoid having every neighborhood repeat their support for the -- the task force participants have authorized me to say that except where you have -- except where you hear otherwise, we support the currently proposed map and we also greatly appreciate the fine efforts of the staff. In fact, some neighborhoods, including my own crestwood, are not planning to make a formal statement, but want to you know we support the current proposed map. Let me take a step back for a minute to address two questions. Some of the council and the public may ask, why should we approve this map since it does not seem to create a lot of new development potential? I think there are a least three reasons to do this. First you should a prove to it keep faith with the neighborhoods. Hundreds of volunteers have devoted tens of thousands of hours or nearly seven years in hopes that the plan could lead to a better community. This map represents the neighborhoods' good faith effort to zone for livability as instructed by the city and updated by the city to address environmental and other concerns. You'll hear this evening a number of concerns from the neighborhoods but overall the product and process have been good. Second, numbers are deceiving, and in the time since the community plan effort began, there have been considerable infill. When you consider this as well as upzoning the proposed map, opportunities for accessory dwelling units and corner duplexes and the potential for the barbur area, you'll find southwest is supporting city and metro goals. Third, you should bring -- approve to it bring to it closure for this process and to pave the way for future projects. Finally, some of the community may ask, why do we have to change anything? The fact is that change is occurring, whether we like it or not. We currently have a 20-year-old comprehensive plan map for our area based upon out of date policies. This map represents the best efforts of your neighborhood association and city to promote desired neighborhood character. Currently it's fairly easy for developers to argue for change based upon an out of date comprehensive plan. And -- a newly

OCTOBER 17, 2001

approved map and consistent policies will better ensure compatible development and also give property owners the certainty they need to invest in their property. The seven-year history of the southwest plan has unfortunately made it difficult for some to know what to do with their property.

For example, did they stay or sell, remodel or leave it alone? Approving this map will help restore certainty and lead to more investment in the community. Finally, i'd like to request that you keep the record open tonight for comments on any new proposals you may hear. Thank you for your consideration.

Katz: Thank you. All right. So let me see if I understand. We'll take it neighborhood by neighborhood, we will hear testimony from the neighborhood association, if they have testimony on some of the items that are before us, there may be other testimony on other items that we may want to note. The council needs to ask questions after the neighborhood that we're working with is completed, because you'll have to make some decisions in november on those particular zone changes. So if you need more information, now would be the time or after the neighborhood is finished with their testimony, you then need to ask some questions or get some clarification. I would recommend that if you need further council discussion you make a note of it or if you've made up your mind make a note of it and then we'll move on. All right. Let's start with bridal mile.

We start with the neighborhood association. Correct, marie? Okay. And then -- this will be for every neighborhood. Karla has a list of people who want to testify, then anybody else from the neighborhood that hasn't signed up can testify. My hope is that only if you have some new material for us. And then if the council has any questions, we might have the technical advisors testify. Okay. Go ahead.

Victor Von Salza, Chair, Bridlemile Neighborhood Association: Good evening, i'm going to be talking about site number 2 on page 1. The corner of southwest shattuck and beaverton hillsdale highway. I just wanted to say a few words why this is on your sheet here at the top. The reason that the bridal mile neighborhood, about why we're asking for storefront commercial at this corner, back in 1996 the city of Portland published a forward-looking document entitled, southwest communicated plan, shaping your future. On page 12 that talked specifically about the beaverton hillsdale highway, and it said the following -- the southwest community plan could create a land use pattern of pedestrian accessible commercial and residential development. The plan could consider zoning designations that support neighborhood commercial development instead of the existing auto oriented commercial development. The bridal -- in 1997 the bridal mile neighborhood association embraced these concepts and -- in its vision statement where we talked about completing sidewalks, developing pedestrian islands at the major intersection and changing the commercial general along beaverton hillsdale to commercial storefront. The rules and constraints of the current process didn't allow the bureau planning or the planning commission to change this because it would see us, would not allow some of the existing uses there. And ironically that left the neighborhood advocating this future vision that had originally come from the city. This zoning map was to -- supposed to help to us move forward towards our shared future, and that is why we have persisted in recommending cs for this. And I just wanted to reiterate the many positive and statements about what a wonderful process this has been working with the bureau of planning staff. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Karla, we'll need to flag three minutes for everybody.

Chris Richter: My name is chris richter, my wife and I -- my wife and myself and my wife want to own the property on 5215 --

Katz: Get closer to the mike.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Richter: At 5215 southwest beaverton hillsdale. That's the corner of shattuck and beaverton hillsdale. That has been a topic in the storefront commercial. We've talked with the staff, they've been very helpful, it's in a learning curve for all of us.

Saltzman: Which corner is that?

Richter: The northeast corner.

Katz: This is the site 2?

Richter: Yes.

Katz: Okay.

Richter: And they have changed -- we were general commercial, they talked about going bag to -- going to storefront. It is now back to general commercial. For a while it was just us, now it's been changed to all four corners, and as a property owner there I think that's fair and i'd like to keep it the way the staff is recommended.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead, sir.

Greg Hathaway, Attorney, Davis Wright Tremaine: Members of the city council, mayor Katz, greg hathaway. I'm an attorney at davis wright tremaine. I represent bingham investment company, who as -- has property located at shattuck road and beaverton hillsdale highway, which is probably identified as site 2 on your checklist. The bingham property is the rite aid store at that intersection next to the albertsons store. That property was purchased by bingham in the 1970s, the store was constructed in 1978, it was formerly a payless store and its successor in interest is rite aid. I'd like to echo what the gentleman just talked about with regards to why it's significant that the planning commission has recommended general commercial for this intersection. Because at the hearing last summer before the planning commission, the staff actually was recommending as was the neighborhood, that the center -- this intersection primarily be store front commercial. But because of testimony that was provided at that hearing, as well as testimony from the city of Portland staff, the planning commission determined that it was inappropriate to put storefront commercial at this intersection. I have submitted a letter into this record why i've attached a letter from susan feldman to marie johnson that talks about the concerns by the city of Portland planning staff as to putting storefront commercial at this intersection, which would alter the general commercial designation. And I think the bottom line is the planning commissions come up with the fairest approach to balance, trying to preserve existing uses as well as trying to encourage at some point in the future a more pedestrian friendly area. And I think the planning commission has struck that balance by maintaining the commercial -- general commercial designation. The concern that susan feldman expressed in her memo to the planning commission was that it's difficult to put a storefront commercial designation on this existing general commercial uses because it's totally in conflict and doesn't truly carry out the store front commercial uses. Instead, with the planning commission -- what the planning commission is saying to you, is maintain the general commercial on this property to allow the existing uses to continue as conforming uses as opposed to nonconforming uses to she can -- they can make the appropriate alterations, and if there is going to be future redevelopment, even under your own designation and the transportation planning rule, you will be able to accommodate what I think the neighborhood wants to achieve, which is a more pedestrian friendly development and the planning commission I believe believes that you can do that under the existing zoning designation for the property.

Katz: Thank you.

*******:** I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have.

Katz: Karla, anybody else?

Moore: Not for that neighborhood.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Katz: Let me ask the council if they have any technical questions that they want to ask or -- or nontechnical questions.

Francesconi: Procedurally it might help, on some I may not need it, but i'm assuming the planning staff still has the current opinion that susan feldman had. I just want to make -- I guess procedurally it might be good to have planning staff available at each one too.

Katz: Let me -- planning staff is representing the planning commission. So it's the pc, not politically correct, but the planning commission recommendations. So for that particular site it's cg. It's on the work sheet.

Francesconi: I want to know if staff --

Katz: That's the same thing. They're representing the planning commission.

Francesconi: I know, but I guess -- I want staff's own opinion. Here it's just been represented that susan feldman had an opinion, but I guess I just want to know, does staff agree with that still?

*****: That is a staff opinion.

Francesconi: Is that your real opinion or the planning commission's opinion? Is that appropriate for me to ask?

Katz: You can ask anything you want. Whether she answers it or not is something else.

*****: The proposal that staff had forwarded was based on proposals thinking that the raleigh hills town center plan was moving forward, and that we would have a whole set of tools to go along with it, the town center. And staff and our -- in our work forwarded the neighborhoods' proposal that had previously been supported by planning commission. I think there's a lot of good thinking in the planning commission's recommendation, and i'll i'm sympathetic to where the community's interest, I think the transportation planning rule in this case is probably sufficient to provide a pedestrian orientation that you're looking for.

Francesconi: Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Further questions on bridal mile. Why don't you just stay there. All right. Let's move on then, and you heard the -- did we hear -- did we hear anything on site 1?

*****: You might hear that.

Katz: Let's go to swirl and healy heights.

*****: There's no testimony from those neighborhoods.

Katz: There's no testimony from those neighborhoods. Oh, you're wonderful. [laughter] homestead. Because I haven't found it on my sheets yet. It's the second sheet you all have.

*****: Good evening.

Katz: Good evening.

*****: I just want to respond specifically to some of these sites and have another general statement. Regarding site 1 in the homestead neighborhood --

Katz: You're representing the neighborhood association. You need to identify yourself.

Anton Vetterloin, Homestead Neighborhood Association: Anton vetterloin. On site one the neighborhood has taken no further position since the planning commission basically denied the zone change. They saw information that we didn't see, so we don't -- we didn't take any further position on that.

Katz: So on that one, you are supporting the planning commission's recommendation? You don't care.

Vetterloin: We originally agreed with the owner to upzone it to r-2, but then the planning commission rationale for not denying that -- the neighborhood has not taken a position either way.

Katz: I remember that site. Okay.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Vetterloin: Site 2. The homestead neighborhood association supports the zone change to cs as the owner is requesting. That had always been our intention, it got overlooked in our letter to the planning commission a few months ago. And then further issues, I sent a fax -- faxed some information in to all the counselors and the mora couple days ago regarding property at 10th and begins, the southwest corner, 1010 southwest gibbs, and this property to my knowledge is being -- it's split zoned between cs and cm, according to the planning commission recommendation, and the neighborhood voted -- we'd like to see the whole property zoned cs. Upzoned to cs.

Katz: We don't have that one in front of us.

Vetterloin: That's not -- yeah, you don't -- you don't have that.

Katz: This is where we do our own work. [laughter] you know what would help, marie, if you note that and maybe do -- do a matrix very similar to that for the council -- oh, you're wonderful. All right.

Vetterloin: 1010 southwest gibbs. Okay. And then the planning bureau had proposed earlier to the planning commission that up to four blocks of this area around 10th and gibbs be zoned cs. The neighborhood -- the main reason the neighborhood objected to the cs zone for such a large area is that it was at odds with the homestead neighborhood plan and our express desire to limit commercial activity on the hill to just that which serves the neighborhoods and institutions daily needs, to the people who are up there. We were concerned that excessive amount of cs would allow an all commercial build-out of these blocks, which at a 3-1 fa -- f.a.r. Would be more than the neighborhood needs and would attract traffic from outside the area to the already overburdened area streets. Specifically at a 3-1 f.a.r., each block could be -- could have 120,000 square feet of commercial on it at four blocks, that's 480,000 square feet, ohsu is proposing 650,000 to 1 million new square feet of building area up on the hill, which isn't that much more than this full build-out if that whole cs area that was proposed by the planning commission was built out. They're planning 900 new parking spaces, they're planning to improve their transportation demand management program to accommodate this, and it's doubtful any commercial uses next door would have that kind of program at all.

Katz: Could you give us the parameters on this one?

Vetterloin: Yeah. It's basically the corner of -- the intersection of 10th and gibbs, it blocks on all four corners of 10th and gibbs. We're proposing --

Saltzman: Is that where the bank used to be?

Vetterloin: The bank, plaid pantry and pretty much all the blocks on -- the planning commission wanted to just have full block zoning. And the neighborhood said, we'd like to just limit the cs zoning to what's currently cn2 commercial, and the rest we'd like to -- there's another five-block area we'd like to see upzoned to cm, and the planning commission agreed with that. We want to see a neighborhood village area up there. We'd like to see commercial activity, but we think that up to 120,000 square feet which I believe cm would allow at full build-out is plenty for neighborhood commercial uses, the neighborhood needs. The streets up there we don't feel are up to handling, you know, up to 480,000 square feet of new commercial.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. So we have two additional -- I know they're very close in the area, and - - all right. Yes, sir.

Richard Davidson: Good evening. My name is richard davidson, I have lived on veterans hospital road and 10th avenue for the last 26 years. I've been waiting for the evolution of the homestead village for quite some time and been involved in all of the planning processes that go back to the middle '80s. And i've acquired some properties that are in the old cn2 zone, the new

OCTOBER 17, 2001

cm, and potentially the new cs. And what I specifically want to speak about tonight is -- can I have someone hand this out?

Katz: Go ahead.

Lois Miller: Okay. Anton talked about the cs zoning for a four-block region, and I am not proposing that, I am proposing only a cs zoning for half a block. My request for the cs zoning for half a block that abuts veterans hospital road, this cs zoning was approved by the planning staff in the may 23rd, 2000 map -- that was in the southwest community plan. This property is identified, and you can take a look at the map, the zone on this was changed back to cm by the planning commission, which creates a split block, cs-cm split block, which is much more difficult to develop. I think that a point that has not been brought up that this is the prime block for development for our neighborhood village, which has you know has no restaurants, no hotels, no anything of support neighborhood business for ohsu, which is in a major growth curve. I'm proposing that the northern half of that block has already been you might say approved by everybody for the cs zoning. I'm proposing that the southern just half of that block just be zoned cs also, so we have a full block zoning of cs there. If that was so, that would be the only full block cs zoning in the homestead village. The rest of it would be cm and cs, it's much easier to work with than cm.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. Further testimony for homestead?

*****: Mayor Katz, members of the city council, i've worked on plans for marquam hill and the homestead neighborhoods since the 1950s, and this last plan for the seven years, and as it happens, I discovered today that in order to bring this up on the 14th, I need to speak with you tonight, and i'm requesting that the zoning on the east side of southwest 12th avenue be recognized for what it is, predominantly used at this time, which is r2 and r25. I have the only undeveloped lot on that street and I have saved it all these years to build myself a retirement home. At this stage I would like to develop it as a three-plex between the one I already own. It's currently zoned r-5, has been - - I had three-plexes there before r5 was a designation. I haven't argued about it because we did get the neighborhood to come around on the cs and the cm zones. When we're talking about upzoning to cs and including so many more units of space that can be used as offices, which would necessitate more traffic on the hill, when we now have up to 40,000 vehicles per day going to and through that hill, and the only accesses are terwilliger and fair mount. Every car that gets there has to come off one of those two roads. So it compromises the hill, and i've been a proponent of keeping as much housing up there for employees and students of the school, because you cannot park on that hill unless you live there or pay rent for the space. There are no curbside parkings except in the neighborhood. There's none in the institutional areas. Seven of the nine lots currently on that side, on the east side of 12th street are currently multiples. Either duplexes or three-plexes. They can exist in a single family area, and the neighbors went with that, but if we're going to rediscuss increasing any of the zoning up there, then we'd like to have this one three-block area discussed as well. I haven't given an outline of the questions to marie, as I said, I wasn't aware that if I didn't bring it up tonight it couldn't be discussed between now and on the 14th. And as I say, I do have plans in the cm area on southwest 11th to put in a senior housing apartments with a restaurant on the main floor, and parking underneath, and now i've decided I don't need a single house up there, i'm hold enough at 73, if I ever get anything built up there i'll move into the apartments.

Katz: So let me see if I understand. What is that property zoned right now? R5?

*****: It's zoned r5.

Saltzman: Where is it again?

OCTOBER 17, 2001

*****: On the east side of 12th avenue.

Katz: Take a look at your -- I just noticed it.

*****: From gibbs to --

*****: Stop moving it for a second. Where is it right now? Okay. Right over there. Did you have a conversation with the neighborhood association on this?

Miller: Oh, yes. They've known that that's what I wanted all along, but they voted to make all of that r5.

Katz: R5.

Miller: And not go with the r25 and the r2. I have the only buildable lot there and via three-plex on either side which I could continue renting under r5, and I have nine students who live in those six apartments. But i'd like to build another three-plex in between them.

Katz: Okay.

*****: I'm not going to move into a single house. I want to -- eventually I want to get my retirement apartments there.

Katz: Okay.

*****: Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: So as opposed to -- that's another new one. So we've got four. We've got the eastside southwest 12th, the 1010 southwest gibbs, the corner of 10th and gibbs, all four corners. Oh, we've got more? One more.

Moore: This is the homestead group.

Katz: Site 1? All right.

*****: Site 1, 1139 southwest gibbs.

Katz: Why don't you identify yourself.

Coventry Boucher: I'm coventry, and this is larry and you guys are going to come up? No? Come on up. My husband mark and his sister michelle. I lived at that site for four years. I bought the house in 1995. Moved two years ago with my husband to a new house not very far away and we've been renting the house that exists there. We would like to have the property rezoned so that we could put some additional single family style units on the property. We feel like it would benefit the neighborhood by improving the appearance. Right now the lot is sort of overrun. Create new housing within walking distance to ohsu, which is very desirable, and create a nice transition from the houses which are directly to our west, and then the apartments which are directly to our east. We're smack dab in the middle of those two areas. We did take our proposal to the neighborhood association on june 5th, and that night we had a vote and they voted in support of our proposal which was originally for r2. So then we took our proposal to the planning commission, and they did not recommend changing the zoning on our property. My understanding is because of the way the map looks to have our property rezoned it would create an anomaly, there would be one -- the property directly to the north of us would remain r5, they're not requesting a change, and then ours would be r2, so there would be three different zones within that area on the map. We did get as I said neighborhood support for r2. We would be fine with r1 as well, which is what the planning commission came back and said to us that if we could get our neighbor to agree to change his property to r1 as well, that they would be fine with that. We did talk to our neighbor, he doesn't necessarily want to change the zone on his property, and we don't obviously want to force him to do that. We would be fine with r1, that would also meet our goals of being able to put two additional units on there. We don't necessarily have neighborhood association approval for that. My understanding is their primary concern is that that gives us an opportunity to build another

OCTOBER 17, 2001

apartment building. We talked with them about that at the June 5th meeting and gave them our word that we wouldn't. We did talk about possible legal assurance that's we could give them and really after talking with an attorney found that there wasn't really anything we could provide legally to them to say we will not build an atrocity on that property. So it does come down to our word, and we're here to say we weren't going to build an apartment building, we want to build two additional single family style units that would be very attractive, very modest, like the current property, and really create some much-needed single family-style housing up there within walking distance of OHSU.

Katz: The neighborhood association did support r2?

*****: They did.

Saltzman: That allows you to do what you want to do?

*****: Within a very short time frame. We understand the land use rules are changing. That we would have to apply for a round-up to actually get two additional units on there, because it's the size of our lot and the sides of our current property. We know that those rules are going to change in March, so depending on when this map gets finalized, we may have a very tiny window to go ahead and get plans approved for three units.

Katz: Does anybody want to comment on that? [inaudible]

*****: So at the least we would like r2, we would also be happy with r1.

Katz: Okay. Did you want to say something?

*****: I was just going to show our idea. This is the existing house and the idea is simply to duplicate it three times and create a nice single family sort of area. This area here is really unusable. The tenants, there's no way that -- to really access that. It's not really a usable back yard or side yard. There's a large apartment building here and it's pretty well overgrown. So what we're proposing on this lot is to build two more small single family rental units. That's the idea.

Katz: Okay. Questions? Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Anybody else for homestead? Council need any technical assistance on this one?

Saltzman: We're going to --

Hales: We're going to get a staff recommendation at some point?

Katz: Yes.

Francesconi: Do you object to what they just proposed?

*****: No.

Katz: Do you -- did you nod yes or no?

*****: We do not object.

Katz: For r1 or r2.

*****: Either. I think it might be helpful for council to look at that request in relationship to the request that Lois Miller made, because I believe they're on the same side of 12th street. So you might want to look at those all together and the 14th.

Katz: In your matrix why don't you put them all together and then identify your recommendations on that. Okay. Hillsdale.

Wes Risher, President, Hillsdale Neighborhood Association: Mayor Katz and council, my name is Wes, the president of the Hillsdale neighborhood association. Myself and Bob will split our time this evening representing the neighborhood. I just want to address item 1, I believe, site 1 on your matrix. I think the other items that we had in our letter to council regarding the Barbur Boulevard envelope and the town center plan have been addressed with the staff presentation. Bob's going to talk about the town center boundary. Specific to the property locate the at 7200 Southwest Capital Hill Road --

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Katz: Site 1?

Risher: Site 1. I just want to emphasize the neighborhood's position with regard to retaining the zoning designation of r7 on that specific parcel. That gets to the issue of parks purchased that land in addition to two others, to the other adjacent parcels are vacant this. One has an existing home. It came to parks through the green space local share money, and when the neighborhood was trying to get the additional acreage to add to Stevens Creek Nature Park we didn't can request the house at the time, but the owner of the house and the adjacent parcel sold all three together and now that parks owns it and the city owns it, the neighborhood has been exploring the idea of renovating the existing structure and seeing it put back on the tax base. I've met with commissioner Francesconi's staff person and Jim Shalin and have numerous conversations with others, we're still exploring the idea of renovation of the house trying to get a CDC or potentially habitat for humanity involved in the project to see the house renovated and put back as a single family home. And that's the reason why Wade Rake likes to retain the zoning on that parcel instead of chaining it to the open space zone.

Katz: I have a note here that parks is now supporting the r7 designation.

Risher: I heard that, but I haven't seen correspondence. So if that's the case, this is I guess a moot point at this point.

Francesconi: Sort of. I mean, yes, but -- [laughter] I've actually gotten involved, I didn't meet with you, but I've been to the site, we've even talked to CDC trying to get them interested in the house, which so far they haven't been interested from parks either. How about if we agree, we, parks -- the problem is we got the land from Metro's money saying it was going to be open space. So we have an agreement with Metro on the property for which we got money. That's the issue. And frankly, it also we think is more appropriate than open space, we being parks. How about this? What if we leave it for our -- at r7, but we also request that the comprehensive plan designation for the property be changed to open space? Then later on it will make it easier to take it from r7?

*****: How does that work exactly --

Francesconi: I don't know. [laughter] I was hoping you wouldn't ask that question. But we have staff right here that's going to answer.

*****: My question is if it stays O.S. As the underlying zone and the structure is renovated and retained as a tax lot as a single family home, there's a conflict that we --

Francesconi: I thought you were going to move it.

*****: The idea is to leave it on the property. Moving it is simply unaffordable.

Francesconi: We're trying to work out a compromise here.

*****: We are. And I mentioned to Darlene the neighborhood was committed to a six-month time --

Katz: You've got a couple weeks.

Risher: A six-month time frame whereby we would commit to having a decision on the structure and know whether or not it was possible to renovate it and see it back in use by March 18th of 2000. If not, that would then move toward demolition. March 18th, 2002. That's our position right now and unfortunately with the efforts in the neighborhood with the community plan and others we haven't had time to deal with this issue at this point in time. We'd like to have six months to truly explore the issue and come to a definitive answer.

Francesconi: Okay. This is one we need to work out.

Katz: Yes.

Francesconi: Because we would like to work it out. I thought we had, but --

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Bob Baldwin, Steering Committee, Hillsdale Town Center: I'm bob baldwin, a member of the hillsdale town center steering committee. I'm currently hillsdale's representative on the sweeney southwest community plan task force. Four years ago this month your council adopted the hillsdale town center plan. In that intervening four years, the citizens, the property owners, the businesses, professional people and the city have worked together to implement measures in the town center plan and very successfully. Gil kelley told the hillsdale business and professional association members this morning that hillsdale is a model town center. The matter before you is not on your matrix, but it is a proposal to expand the town center boundary westward to 30th.

Katz: That's the site 2, right? We have it on our matrix. We have a new copy.

Baldwin: Okay. This proposal to expand the town center boundary was included in the material that was adopted by the council in 1997. But action to expand the boundary was delayed because of conflicts and time and printing costs and so on, so that it would be woven into the southwest community plan. Four years later, here we are, and it's time to do this. This expansion is supported by the hillsdale neighborhood association, the hillsdale business and professional association, the Multnomah neighborhood association, the heyhurst neighborhood association, the task force and the planning commission. The benefits of the expansion are to apply the action programs, the design review process, and the limitation on drive-in, drive-up and drive-through facilities in the expanded area. There are currently nine businesses, a major nonprofit community center, a day school, the robert gray middle school, two city parks, two churches, and a synagogue located in this expansion area. All of those properties should have the benefit of the programs that can be implemented under the town center. You will hear or you have heard of the opposition to this proposal raised by one person who maintains that expanding the town center boundary will mean vast increases in residential density and occupancy in this area. This area is already -- has already met the standards of metro and of the city for density. There are no zone changes and no comprehensive plan changes in this expanded area that would allow any additional residential development. In the event that such a proposal is forthcoming, it should be handled in the same way, a comprehensive plan amendment and a zone change, as everybody else. And to deny the benefits of town center inclusion to the property owners because there may be proposals for greater density in the future is simply unfair.

Katz: Thank you. Okay.

Katz: We're way behind in time. Go ahead, sir.

*******:** I want to go back --

Katz: You need to identify yourself.

Virgil Flath: Oh, i'm sorry. I'm virgil, and I live at 2911 southwest berththa boulevard. This is the area that is in question about having the hillsdale town center moved out west to 30th. I live on berththa boulevard. My wife and I have lived in this area since 1958. That's a long time ago. It's a nice area, and they -- at that time we bought a lot, we build a house and we raised two boys in that area. At that time there was a lot of empty hand in that area, but since then new homes have been built and it's turned into a nice residential neighborhood. There's no space left now, it's all built in with new homes. At that time hillsdale was a nice little shopping center. You wouldn't belief how complete it was. It had two grocery stores, it had a couple of auto repair shops, a hardware store, and a variety store, a lumberyard and a lot of other shops. One of the shops I remember was peterson's ice cream shop. They made wonderful ice cream there. Everybody enjoyed that. Now we have restaurants and coffee shops. All these other places are gone. They no longer exist. The place they have in question now, we have -- we live in a rural setting. There's no curbs, no sidewalks, and few storm sewers. We get our mail from the street like they do out in the country.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

But we like it, because the neighbors know neighbors and their children know their children. Hillsdale to me is not busting out. There is empty shops and to me there's a lot of open spaces yet. I walk the neighborhood, i'm retired, I walk the neighborhood, and I see a lot of vacancies and apartments. There's a section of condominiums that were built, townhouses on beaverton highway, that was a couple years ago, they sold one of them, the rest of them didn't sell, now they're trying to rent them. So I can see there's a lot of available apartments in that neighborhood. Besides, in our neighborhood we're a close-knit neighborhood. All the people enjoy living in a residential type of atmosphere, and we wouldn't want a bunch of apartments or businesses moving in alongside of us. I would like to invite the council or having a -- have a committee sent out to look at this area, and i'd be more than willing to go around with them and put some input into it. I thank you for listening.

Katz: Thank you.

Cindy Louie: Hi, i'm cindy, and I live at 6924 southwest 11th drive in wilson park, and i'm rather opposed to this whole thing.

Katz: Which whole thing?

Louie: Well, the big changes. I think it's better just to maintain what we have and just to keep the -- keep things in perspective as far as just maintaining the roads, the structures, things like that, rather than making huge changes. I'm worried about the traffic, i'm worried about higher crime, higher density, that kind of thing. I'm opposed to row housing. The neighborhood that I live in is wilson park, and it's been there since the '50s. I think most of my neighbors, just talking with them, they feel a lot like I do. And I know about peterson's ice cream, too. I remember that. So the bay - - basically I think would it -- I think less is more. I think having more open space is a better thing. That's pretty much it. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you. Anybody else? Go ahead. Come on up. Quickly. We're still in hillsdale. Have we got any more for hillsdale?

Moore: That's all who signed up.

Robert Clawa: I'm robert clawa, and I am one of your alternate transportation people. I live at 2040 southwest sunset boulevard. The issues that I have are largely the fact that the study missed one of the major important effects, one of the more important planning issues, which is the geological stability of the west hills. In 1996 when we had the heavy rains, the whole -- a lot of the hillside moved. You could see that by the power poles losing their guy wire tension. It's also shown in the city maps with the seismic events. The orange areas shown with seismic areas of having the accelerated ground motion are due to the fact a lot of the west hills in particularly the west side of that area are part of the landslide that happened about 2,000 years ago where the whole west hills area moved. The difficulty I have is the fact the current -- the expansion if we do put new buildings into this area, higher density buildings, we don't have a method shown that I can identify to require a geotechnical analysis in the soil construction. So you don't build it as a classic simple building under basic codes when you have basically a ground structure that isn't the classic assumption. Thank you for your time.

Katz: Are you specifically identifying an area that --

*******:** It's basically the western expansion of the hillsdale growth area. That's the area that has the highest movement.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. Karla? Let's go.

*******:** Do you want to call the neighborhood --

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Katz: We're still on hillsdale. Before we get -- karla, are we finished with hillsdale? All right. Any questions by the council technical questions on hillsdale? Okay. Thank you. Corbett-terwilliger.

Arnold Cogan: Good evening, mayor and members of the council. I'm arnold cogan, and this is boyd, who is president of the riverview cemetery association. I'm here representing the riverview association. They're located at 8421 southwest macadam in Portland. Riverview is a nonprofit organization. -- it is in at the present time has a need for long-term financial viability. Trends in the funeral and cemetery industry are moving in the direction of consolidation funeral homes and cemetery services. Riverview needs to add a funeral home to stay viable on its site. It wishes to build its funeral home on a site that's currently on macadam. I have a map here if you'd like to go over some of the physical parameters of the site and I can show that to you if you wish. But --

Katz: We don't have that as -- on our list, or do we?

*****: It here.

Katz: Marie? We don't have that.

*****: I'm sure you're all familiar with it.

Katz: This is the lewis -- no. All right.

*****: That's a second matter.

Katz: Okay. Go ahead.

*****: At any rate, this is the administration building for the cemetery. It located just off of macadam south of sellwood bridge. And that's where the cemetery wishes to build the funeral home. During the southwest community plan process, riverview originally requested a zone and comprehensive plan map change from r10 to general commercial, cg. So it could build the funeral home. Planning staff has recommended that the site be rezoned from its current r10 zone and that be redesignated as open space, which is the underlying designation for the rest of the site. What riverview now wishes to do, the funeral be allowed as a conditional use on that -- in that os zone, the planning commission has recommended that, and that's in their recommendation before you. That it be an o.s. Zone and changed from the r10. We support this recommendation, provided that we will be able to actually build the funeral home there. So we ask the city council to adopt the planning commission's recommendation. I should add that if there's concern about traffic, that little additional traffic will be generated on macadam. As a result of this funeral home. Since the funeral services and the parking will continue on the upper part of the cemetery off of taylor's ferry road and the -- so it would be important for you to understand that even though this would be the site of the funeral home, the upper site off of taylor's ferry road is where the chapel is currently located, where park is located, that's what bureal services take place now, all of the burial services would continue taking place there, even though the actual funeral home would be off of macadam. And that would continue. So we're asking that you concur and support and adopt the recommendations that the planning commission has made. So mr. Mcnaughten, president of the riverview board of trustees and I would be happy to answer any questions about this.

Saltzman: Is this written up on our sheets?

*****: I don't believe it is. Planning commission favored the o.s. Designation with the understanding that the cemetery would need to go through a quasi judicial process to get approval of the conditional use.

Katz: Okay. Further discussion? Further questions?

Saltzman: You're okay with that?

*****: Yes.

Katz: Identify yourself for the record.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

*****: I'm going to speak later.

Katz: Oh.

Francesconi: We were going to do that, but now that you've brought it to our attention -- no, i'm just kidding. [laughter]

Katz: That's a wooded area now?

Johnson: This is -- this area is as you're coming west over the sellwood bridge from sellwood into southwest Portland, you see a facility at the -- just opposite of the bridge, and what they're asking for -- and that area is currently zoned r10. What they're asking for is an o.s. Designation, a funeral home can be allowed as a conditional use under the o. S. Designation but they'd have to go through that process to determine whether that's appropriate and what the conditions would be.

*****: And we understand that.

Katz: Thank you. Okay. Thank you. The neighborhood association first for corbett-terwilliger. Don't be afraid to remind me, marie.

Jim Gardner, Corbett-Terwilliger Lair Hill Neighborhood Association: Good evening. My name is jim gardner, I live at 2930 southwest second avenue. I'm here tonight to present the testimony for the corbett-terwilliger lair hill neighborhood association regarding the southwest community plan. I have been chair of our neighborhood association's community plan steering committee is what we called it, since the beginning. So i've actually been involved for the full seven years. And believe me, I have a seven-year itch. The fact that this whole process, this lengthy process is nearly over is very gratifying to ctlh. But frankly we're disappointed that the process is going to result in only adoption of a comprehensive plan and zoning map, and not a full-blown neighborhood plan, which frankly we spent most of our time on. We think that is a shame, both for our neighborhood's sake, but it's also a shame really given the tremendous cost in public resources and by public I mean citizen time as well as staff time with an end result that really is far less than it could have been. But first a return to a positive note on this. We want to express our strong support for one zoning change being proposed. We have advocated for many years the zoning should be changed from r1 to r2 in the lair hill portion of the south Portland national historic district and we're very gratified the planning bureau staff and the planning commission support this change. You have in your briefing document on a site by site basis the other areas where the ctlh neighborhood disagrees with what's being proposed tonight. There's really neither the time tonight nor any good reason to go into these in detail. We do sincerely hope you'll consider our opinions with an open mind and not let your fatigue with this sometimes contentious process lead you to simply rubber stamp the planning commission's proposals. Tonight, though, I want to focus my comments on one issue, where we feel the most potential to actually influence the future shape of our neighborhood is being lost. There's an area along the east side of macadam avenue from nebraska street south to about the custer street alignment, this is an area that looks out over willamette park and the river and then on to mt. Hood. We have proposed from the beginning that -- for mixed use commercial zoning, cm zoning, on that area. To replace the current general commercial. And as you probably know, the cm zoning requires, doesn't just suggest, but it requires at least a 50/50 mix of commercial and residential when there is new development. In other words, you can have 50/50 split or you can have mostly residential, you just can't have mostly or entirely commercial. We feel the cm zone is ideal to help create increased housing density without having impact on existing residential areas, and its ideal to encourage the growth of mixed use areas. As with any zone change, though, applying cm to property that are now currently zoned cg does not affect those existing uses. And frankly, if this area is not suitable for the cm zone to try to influence the shape of the future development, then frankly nowhere in the city is. As the

OCTOBER 17, 2001

southwest community plan process went on, we became dismayed that the planning bureau staff and the planning commission seemed to turn their backs by and large on cm. It eventually was only applied where the mixed use situation currently existed, or to some currently residential property, but in property that's now zoned commercial, frankly it wasn't applied anywhere unless the property owner requested it or supported it. This attitude at first seems to be driven by concerns about measure 7. And later actually it seemed to be more a desire simply to avoid conflict. We feel that that is a very dangerous approach to take to planning in general. Zoning by its very nature involves telling a property owner that there are some things that can't be done on the property. This limitation on absolute property rights is justified by the greater community good. I'd ask you to please consider that you the council, as the ultimate policymakers for the city, consider whether you want in effect to delegate zoning decisions to each individual property owner. We strongly support cm zone for that piece of property and the planning commission recommendation as would the case along much of macadam is for cs instead. But as I said, regardless of the details of the outcome, we're very glad to reach a conclusion to the southwest community plan process. Council took great care to make sure that this turned out to be a fair and open citizen process. Please take as much care with the actual details of your decision.

Mayor Katz left.

Francesconi: Thank you. The mayor went back into mediation on the strike issue, so that's why she suddenly disappeared. Is there anyone else testifying on this property?

Moore: For corbett terwilliger?

Francesconi: Is it on this particular property?

*******:** I have no idea. Let's get a staff response. What's your position? It seems reasonable for what he was saying.

Johnson: Staff has supported the idea of providing mixed uses in these areas and projects like the belmont dairy project seem to make a lot of sense in this area. That project developed under the cs zoning. This area is currently used almost exclusively for commercial use and if these business owners wish to expand their uses, would have to comply at least in part with the cm standards and could create difficulty for them for doing expansion and financing those expansions. So staff had recommended the cs zone instead with the understanding that cs does allow housing. Eat the same time we recognize that the cs zoning does not require the housing and that's the neighborhood's intent.

Francesconi: Does council have any questions or issues here? Thank you. Next?

Francesconi: We've got a lot to do here. Let somebody begin.

Brian Lessler: Good evening, my name is brian lessler. Also known -- I own lot 5 and 6, block 67, directly across from lair hill park on barbur boulevard. Just immediately to the north of mr. Butterfield's property. I am not entirely sure because based on correspondence that I have versus the mapping that I see whether the council finally recommended to change the zoning -- zoning of cm2 to cn1 for our properties. So if I could get clarification on that, I could make my comments very short and simply say thank you.

Francesconi: Your property is not on our list. What's the answer?

Johnson: The planning commission support or recommendation of cn 1 on this property.

Lessler: The mapping is not consistent with that, and that's why i'm a little confused. The current mapping is still showing the cn 2 zoning and I guess our concern here is that we have short-term -- near-term plans for a mixed use development of this property.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Francesconi: But you wanted cn1, didn't you?

Lessler: We want it to remain as cn 2. The reason being is that although the f f.a.r. And the coverage is essentially similar, the cn1 substantially reduces in fact sets maximum parking limits on that property such that the mixed use office residential development is not feasible. It would limit us on a small site to about 2 1/2 or three parking spaces as opposed to the seven or eight that are necessary for small office building and residential development. So I think it -- in our opinion it would be a down zone. I believe it's going to affect the value of the property and just wanted to make sure that we ask your consideration specifically and clarify what the recommendation is from the planning commission and staff on this.

Saltzman: This is right across from lair hill park on barbur?

Lessler: yes sir, just to the north of the chiropractic office. It's presently a vacant piece of property.

Francesconi: Does staff want to respond?

Johnson: Actually I have a clarification. For this property the proposals for cn2 and for mr. Butterfield's property the proposal is for cn1. I apologize for the confusion.

Francesconi: You're okay with that?

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

Francesconi: I'm not sure --

*****: I was confused, now you can see why. I appreciate your consideration.

Mark Butterfield: My name is mark butterfield, my property is at 3007 southwest barbur and i'm just to the south of mr. Less letter's. My presence here was just to make a distinction between his property, his desires and my property. I have -- I agree with the designation that the comprehensive plan is designated -- the zoning of cn1, and that's all I have to say. Thank you.

Sten: There's an easy one.

Francesconi: Holy moses: Are we flexible or what? [laughter]

Hales: Let's quit while we're ahead:

Francesconi: Let's not try to explain the difference. Moving on.

*****: Thank you.

Moore: That's all for that neighborhood.

Hales: Sold.

Francesconi: Next. South burlingame. Up would help us if you would let us know right away if it's a the sheet. South burlingame, does anybody -- is there somebody -- nobody to testify?

*****: The next neighborhood is collins view.

Dave Johnston, Land Use Chair, Collinsview Neighborhood Association: I'm dave johnston, land use chair for the collinsview neighborhood association and speaking on behalf of the association. I do want to second jared's thanks to the staff, gil kelley's staff, and all the other staff members including betsy aims, amy schwartz and all the others that have worked with us out in the neighborhoods on this. They've stuck with it, it's often been contentious, they've come up with an excellent job. With respect to the map, the proposed map as it's before you compares very favorably with what collinsview submitted back in 1997. We urge you to go forward and adopt it essentially as it is. We think the staff has done an excellent job the. We think the planning commission has done an excellent job on it. With respect to collinsview, there are a few amendment that's we expect to have -- be brought before you tonight, and so we want to provide a little bit of information and comments from the neighborhood with respect to those. I'll try to do that quickly. The first one and probably the one that's had the greatest visibility is a proposal by lewis and clark for an institutional campus designation on presently the proposal is for about 30

OCTOBER 17, 2001

acres of riverview cemetery and for approximately four residential lots add joining their ball fields on fourth street and also add joining tryon creek state park. If you look in the briefing guide provided to you by the staff, both of the -- this is set forth as amended request number 4-3, the staff has done an excellent job of outlining it, but i'll add a few comments to that. Essentially we in the neighborhood agree with the staff, we agree with the technical comments and we agree with the planning commission that this is not had sufficient consideration of among other things the transportation and environmental conversations that would go with this zone change and it should be left for a quasi-judicial process. The proposal for this designation came forth very late in the process so the staff really hasn't had time to look at it adequately either. So all of us, the staff, the planning commission, the neighborhood, are in agreement that this should be left for later. We had originally proposed the land in riverview cemetery for open space, the land on fourth street to remain residentially zoned. With respect to some of our comments on it and in this I want to note that the neighborhood likes lewis and clark college as a neighbor, we supported their about for institutional residential zoning on the campus proper, and some other property they own. That's shown on the map. That's not at issue in this particular item. But with respect to a neighborhood comments on this item, the landowners along fourth street oppose having their land given this designation. They would prefer that it remain natural in the -- and the environment be protected, perhaps that it become part of tryon creek state park rather than the college if that should be in the works in the future. We can't be certain if lewis and clark will ever come into possession of this land. Some of the literature that's been given you letters, testimony before planning commission and so forth indicate that's there's an informal agreement of some sort between lewis and clark and riverview cemetery with respect to the 30 acres. However, i'd point out that even the cemetery board doesn't have authority to sell the land. That requires a vote of the cemetery membership being all those people that own plots in the land a year and a half ago the membership refused to give the board authority to sell the land. And you'll hear from other residents that support the natural character of the land. A second item on hood avenue has to do with change of zoning from r10, parentheses, r20. Some of the residents would prefer to keep the r20 zoning. The name proposed r10 in 1997 because we thought that was the largest lots that the city would allow under the new zoning proposal. The lots in that area are presently built out with good quality houses located toward the center of the lots, most of the lots are something just short of 20,000 square feet so they won't make two r10s, there are a few that don't have public streets reaching them, only private driveways. I think one goes up to 40,000 square feet. Those have large houses on them. The gist of which is it's unlikely that those lots could be redeveloped down to r10 because of not only the restrictive covenants in the deed, but also the way the houses are built on them. That is in the briefing guide as number 5-8. You may hear from someone on that. There is also one on number 2-6 on boones ferry road, a proposal by lowell patton that might come up again. The neighborhood agree was the planning commission's action on that. There's a letter dated june 1998 in the file describing the limitations with respect to the streets in that area. That's important because the map before you shows many streets that are cut through where in fact there are only unimproved right of ways and where there are restrictions on entry to boones ferry road from terwilliger such that transportation access to that site is very poor. I won't address that further but will leave to you the letter and the planning commission's thoughts on it should that one come up. I will leave it with that for the neighborhood's comments unless you have questions.

Saltzman: I have a question of marie. What trumps? Zoning code or cc & rs? It session on this latter property, the cc & rs prohibit structures less -- less than 15,000 square feet. So you couldn't do that in r10.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Johnson: The codes are a private contract and are not enforced in the city. They're subject to change and revision. By agreement by the property owners and it might be that there would be a time in the future where the property owners might desire smaller lots so that the city typically does not get involved in making our decisions based on those contracts.

Saltzman: So if we do upzone it to r10, each property owner would still have to subsequently -- they would have to amend the cc & rs?

Johnson: Would it be up to them and the homeowners association to determine how to deal with that situation.

Katy McFadden Katy mcfadden, I come as a representative of myself and two other people who live in my area. We oppose lewis and clark's proposal to rezone properties on forth street from an r10 designation to a dual description of r10 and institutional campus. This proposal change was submitted late in the planning review process and as a result, there is not time to adequately research the impact this future endeavor would have on a major portion of the area which is tryon creek state park. The planning commission has already rejected this proposal. As an owner, resident of one of these pieces of property, I oppose the zoning request to rezone my property. I will submit this for review and also a petition that I put together in july that was submitted to the city planning commissioners of many people opposing this.

Francesconi: Thank you very much. She did that in one minute. So if you folks can do it even quicker, this is good.

*****: Good evening, I live at 9205 southwest --

Francesconi: We give more weight to shorter testimony, too. [laughter]

Stephen Otto: In that case i'm done. No. [laughter] 9205 southwest viewpoint terrace. I'm here tonight representing many of my neighbors and fellow Portlanders tonight for just one important reason. To ask you to approve the southwest community plan as approved by the planning commission and rejected proposed amendments offered to you by the college that would change the zoning designation for riverview for us property adjacent to the colleges currently owned by the riverview cemetery. Riverview forest pictures which I submitted to you is the largest remaining urban forest within our city that does not have any permanent protections as a green space. This beautiful 130-acres or so forest is bordered by the willamette river, tryon creek park, and it's a forest brimming with all kinds of plant life, mature trees, numerous streams and abundant wildlife. It served as a vital part of our echo system and is an important corridor. Riverview cemeteries, the owners since 1883 when the corbett family arranged the sale, have recently expressed an interest at looking at some options for possible future did I vest which your. Metro for one is looking for -- at the forest for a potential open space, as are other environmental acquisitions and soon the city will be looking at the property as a future forest park on our city's southern border could provide a beautiful link from the water front to tryon creek park. The issue before you right now is whether to adopt or reject their last minute proposal to redesignate the forest so they may develop it asf they acquire it in the future. Reject the their proposal is in the best interest of our city for a variety of reasons. First of all the planning commission carefully considered their proposal and rejected it. While lewis and clark has attend add few of our meeting -- meetings, their proposal has varied in size from 20 to 100 acres. This amendment is not warranted it does not provide adequate time or notice for a full and complete appraisal and response. Lewis and clark are not the owners or less sees of any of this forest currently. This ill-suited and short-sighted proposal is the proverbial cart before the horse. Thirdly, there currently exists a wildlife corridor smack in the center of the this -- of this property which they wish to rezone for development the this corridor links tryon creek to the willamette river. Our quality of life along with the realities of limited infill areas make this forest

OCTOBER 17, 2001

within our city so incredibly and invaluable rare this is such a unique resource we should collectively pause before doing something that is I reputable. I ask you today to think and consider your responsibility to the city. While a zoning before -- decision is before you, your decision will have long-term impacts. It is the hope of many that you will decide to help Portland develop a lasting legacy in the forest, something not unlike our current forest park. No one save for a few trustees will ever thank you for enabling a small private college to destroy forest to build a soccer field. However, generations of Portlanders will praise your foresight and leadership for working to save this forest as a nature preserve that will make our city and each of us better. Thank you for your time this evening. I hope we have the opportunity to meet and -- in the weeks and months ahead to discuss plans for riverview forest. I'm confident that a plan can be formulated that will prove both beneficial to its current owners and to all the citizens of Portland not just a select few who attend a private college. Even though it's a college I myself graduated from. Thank you.

Francesconi: Thank you. If this is on the same issue and you don't have anything new to add, you can make it quick. Okay? Go ahead.

Lynn O'Brien Wolfe: I don't have anything new to add, but it's very brief and very quick. Okay. My name is Lynn O'Brien Wolfe. I live in the neighborhood association. I have been on the Collinsview neighborhood association board for almost ten years. The neighborhood worked for three years developing our neighborhood plan and the subsequent zoning map that was developed in conjunction with that. And I support the zoning recommendations made by the neighborhood and the most recent recommendations made by the planning commission. I am here to testify against the proposal by Lewis & Clark College to have property that they do not own rezoned for their benefit. And I hope that you many support the recommendation that the planning commission made on these parcels of land also.

Francesconi: Thank you very much.

Dixie Johnston: My name is Dixie Johnston. I wanted to add a couple of other points, comments to what Dave and Stephane said. Commissioner Hales, you made a wonderful comment a couple of months ago about the Goldberg scheme in our neighborhood. Lewis and Clark's college, its zoning proposal is an expansion or another aspect to the Goldberg situation in our neighborhood. We don't have the environmental protections and the transportation needs met in our neighborhood to make whatever their proposal is work. They have several ideas, it may not be athletic fields, it might be a reopening of their business school. We think that in the long run this could hurt the college, because it often -- they often change their mind on what they need. They've talked about 100 acres at the cemetery, they've talked about ten acres, now 30. They don't know what they want to use the land for. There is no concrete ideas that they are proposing. And they do change their minds on issues. This property at the cemetery perhaps may not be up for sale for a number of years. There's some legal issues here with the cemetery board, and so -- and also with the plot owners. The forestry people do not -- the fourth street people do not want their property zoned for its designation. Please keep this in mind. Perhaps in the future something new will happen. But until the owners are willing to sell their properties to anyone, I'm asking that this be kept as it is and that you will support the planning staff. By the way, if you support the planning commission recommendations and the planning staff, you are also showing great support to PDOT and to B.E.S., and the public safety bureaus in the city. Thank you.

Katz: We're on Collinsview, right?

Moore: Yes.

Scott Staff, Vice President, Lewis and Clark College: My name is Scott Staff, vice-president Lewis and Clark College. This is our land use attorney. If there are technical questions I would

OCTOBER 17, 2001

invite him to the podium. On behalf of our president, michael mooney and the college, congratulations on reaching the final decision point in the southwest community plan. We appreciate the efforts of planning staff who have helped lewis and clark engage in productive dialogue with the collinsview neighborhood association and its leaders. This evening I have four points to share with you. First, the southwest community plan's proposed zoning includes institutional residential base zoning for college owned land areas, including am currently approved campus areas and college-owned areas intended for future campus integration. The college appreciates the support these proposals have received from collinsview neighborhood association planning staff and the planning commission. Second, lewis and clark also proposes institutional campus comprehensive plan designation in two areas. Not currently owned by the college or in its legal control. The 30-acre parcel at riverview cemetery, and approximately 31/2 acres and four residentially zoned parcels south of the law school campus adjacent to our houston ball fields. This aspect of the college is more visionary in nature and calls for policy leadership by the city council. Policy direction from the city council is needed at this juncture to reduce uncertainty for all affected parties. Your policy direction will encourage the college to invest in long-range campus and facilities planning efforts that incorporate the new areas. It will assure residential snakes about the direction and extent of future campus growth and the impact mitigation actions that must accompany expansions. For the city it will require the college to go through the imp process in accordance with city requirements, including future expansion. Third point. This is not a last-minute request. The college's 1998 conditional use master plan approval discussed expanding the main campus north on to part of the riverview cemetery property. That proposal was thoroughly reviewed, including a public hearing before the city council, prior to its approval. So the college's desire to expand on to some of riverview cemetery's land has been known publicly for several years. The ic comprehensive plan designation proposal is a logical next step, consistent with the ir zoning changes proposed in the southwest community plan zoning plan. To inform neighbors lewis & clark college coordinated with the neighborhood association to mail notices to residents and make a detailed presentation that -- at a neighborhood association meeting last march. Finally, without a measure of certainty that an intensive planning effort of the kind called for in the imp process can result in official approval, any property owner, especially an institution like lewis and clark college, would be likely to defer that task in order to pursue other more pressing priorities with more predictable results. This causes uncertainty for institution and their neighbors. Indeed it is the problem the impact mitigation planning process was created to solve. Lewis and clark college requests that the city council change the comprehensive plan designation of these two limited areas to institutional campus as part of the southwest coupe adoption process. This concludes my testimony. I'd be pleased to answer your questions.

Saltzman: When does your master plan expire?

Staff: I believe our master plan expires in 2008.

Katz: If you want to -- what do you want to use the land for?

Staff: We would like the option to use it for a variety of traditional college purposes. Academic building, dormitories, but the purpose we think we would likely use it for is to develop -- is the development of athletic fields, the idea to develop fields on this property, the level land on the northwest boundary of our campus, and free up the land at houston ball fields for other development, probably housing for our law students.

Saltzman: Isn't this land pretty steep sloped?

Staff: Not the 30 acres we're talking about. There are several hundred acres in there. The portion we're talking about is the most level portion in their land.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Saltzman: The portion have you outlined in yellow?

Staff: Right.

Saltzman: 30.

Katz: Further questions?

Saltzman: Your other recourse would be to amend your master plan and bring this request to us that route as well? Is that correct?

Staff: Through the quasi judicial process.

Francesconi: What it -- is it you're concerned about?

Staff: The uncertainty, the expense, I think part of the issue with our neighbors in recent years has been the ad hoc nature of college land acquisitions. I think the great opportunity provided for the policymakers in this context is, this sets the boundaries. This tells everyone the extent of where the college can expand and through the imp process it demands an integrated collaborative process with the neighborhood to make sure that many values are accommodated through any development we might entertain.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. Are you next?

Boyd MacNaughton, President Board of Trustees, Riverview Cemetery: Mayor Katz, members of the council, good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is boyd mcaughten, i'm president of the board of trustees, and i'm speaking on its behalf. The cemetery's address is 188421 southwest macadam, 97201. I would like to give riverview's perspective on lewis and clark's request for a comprehensive plan map change for open space or from open space to institutional campus. Ic on a portion of our property. Riverview and the college have jointly identified a parcel of approximately 30 acres at the southwestern corner of our property. This area is contiguous to the college. We believe the college's request for comprehensive plan designation of ic for this parcel was in the best interest of the cemetery and fully supported. As a nonprofit organization, charged with providing cemetery related service and maintaining the grounds in -- in perpetuity. I'm sorry, i've stumbled over that word several times -- riverview must take steps to protect financial security. We were not a part of the original planning process for the southwest community plan. We were not on the map as first published, and we were not noticed by the city of Portland staff. We basically were swept into the last -- this last round at the last minute, and I think probably as a matter of convenience, but we just don't believe that the neighborhood has had the opportunity to meet with staff to really understand the access to the neighborhood, the issues of slope and proximity to the park. We've also recently met with the park and they have voiced concerns and I believe a letter was sent to you outlining their concerns which we concur with. I think the only other thing I have to say is that we see this as a significant opportunity for a fairly large parcel of property that has very important impacts on both the park and the creek, and one -- an opportunity that could be lost if it was -- as it has been kind of glossed over, and then -- and sort of adjunct to the process and not really been a significant part of the process. We just have a map of the neighborhood, its proximity to the park, this is our only access point off of into the neighborhood. It's basically on a ridge. All the drainage would go into the park and we're trying to see if we can cut down on the impervious surface these would kind of look like this. If the r20 designation were to go through.

Katz: Questions? Okay. Go ahead.

Tim Brooks, Winterbrook Planning: Tim brooks, winterbrook planning. Portland, 97204. Last week bob asked me to join him and some of the neighbors at englewood in a meeting at tryon park to discuss with stephanie winger and some of the city staff some of the issues that you've heard bob describe. And I can say without question that the park is behind the neighborhood's position on

OCTOBER 17, 2001

this. We also heard from city staff support for some of the issues and the approach that i'd like to outline for you. And I think in the interest of time and commissioner Saltzman's comment, I will move -- i'll try to read through this fairly quickly. If we just look at the reality of the neighborhood, it's a small, 100-acre neighborhood, it's not likely to grow dramatically any time soon, whether it's in the city or not. It's my understanding the city has no plans to annex any time soon. So we have a bit of time. And I think what the neighborhood would like to do is take some time before the city moves forward with new designations and try and craft a plan is and in -- an innovative plan for the neighborhood that recognizes the unique relationship to tryon creek park, maintains the quality of life while at the same time providing infill development and takes advantage of the unique opportunity here which is more than most parts of the tryon basin to help bring back the salmon and the biological integrity of tryon creek. So we'd like the opportunity to come up with a special plan for englewood. I think what is motivating the residents is the fear of half acre subdivision that's are popping up in other communities with big homes, three-car garages, long driveways, lots of impervious surface. Happy valley style of half-acre development provides a very strong incentive for the residents to try to find a better answer. Right now the tryon watershed is at a critical threshold. My understanding from stephanie wagner at the park is that we're at 24.9% impervious coverage, and at 25% coverage, that's normally where it's considered the streams go from impactive to nonsupporting at 25% streams characteristically have unstable channels, degraded water quality, lack the habitat needed to support aquatic species, species composition is comprised mainly of fish and insects tolerant of high levels of pollution and basically the stream may no longer be able to support salmon. And a visit to tryon park today will show the dramatic impacts of upstream development, even though you have a park with very wide forested riparian buffers, the stream is pretty much scoured out in many places down the bed -- down to bedrock, and yet, you still have steelhead there. And one of the things I really appreciated at the meeting with city staff was the comment that the city is even planning to restore coho to tryon creek. We believe that the neighborhood has an opportunity to make some real headway in meeting critical city goals for endangered species, being proactive and not reactive to watershed health and fish protection, working toward restoring properly functioning conditions, bringing back the salmon.

Katz: Thank you. [change of captioners. File named cc1017p2]

*****: Thank you.

Katz: Anybody else?

Moore: That's all for englewood.

Katz: Okay. Questions by council? All right. Let's go to arnold creek. We don't have anything for arnold -- we have two people. Neighborhood association? No. This is individuals? Okay.

Ann Farrell: My name is ann, and my husband and I have lived in arnold creek neighborhood for 23 years. Our dream has -- is always been to build a second home on our r20 zone today property. In -- one week after we brought the property we got a sewer assessment for 8300 for three sewer hookups, which we paid, and have enjoyed living in the neighborhood and now we are able to build our dream home and have always relied on the city to stand by its r10 overlay on the old existing property plan for the southwest neighborhood. What you have in front of you is our request to go to r10 zoning so we can add a second home, we have 337 feet of frontage on lancaster, we have our house sits right now existing to one side, only to the left side, so we have 183 feet of frontage for one lot, 150 for the other lot. We're planning on not having any steep uphill driveway or overlooming house, we plan a simple gentle turn in our driveway up on the side driving to the extra lot, and we have no objections from the neighborhood association, eare strongly supported by our neighbors, as well as we have no environmental concerns like streams or dense forests. And our

OCTOBER 17, 2001

plan is -- by looking at the pictures you're given there, my husband and I are gardeners, we've added 60 major trees and bushes to this area and landscaped it preparing for this extra lot that we're going to build.

Katz: Let me just interrupt you. What was the planning commission's recommendation on this?

Farrell: To stay r20.

Katz: Neighborhood association you said supports your change to r10?

*******:** That's correct.

Katz: Okay.

Francesconi: What's the staff think?

Johnson: The staff supported r -- our keeping the zoning and the comp plan because existing conservation zones on the site. That's the approach we took -- we took a consistent approach throughout the southwest plan area so that's the approach we took.

Farrell: And I have talked to the land use planning people at the city for the last three months, and there isn't as I can see it, and i'm just an individual homeowner, there isn't a stream on our property or dense forest. Or salmon or anything like that. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Sam Holmes: Good evening, mayor Katz and commissioners. My name is sam holmes, I reside at 12215 southwest 33rd and my wife and I own a vacant lot. It is described as -- it's in the arrowwood subdivision. The lot is presently zoned r20 but the present comprehensive plan calls for it to be zoned r10. The southwest community plan will change this so that both the zoning map and the comprehensive plan will be r20. The property will then not be a buildable site since it has an area of only 13,000 square feet and r20 zone requires 20,000. To have this property rezoned today so it complies with the present comprehensive plan can be done by making an application for a zoning map amendment and the payment of a fee of \$5700. Past actions of this sort have been rarely denied so it is very unlikely our request will be refused. However, after the southwest community plan is adopted, it will be almost impossible to get a zone change because it will then be a matter of amending the new comprehensive plan. Which is much more involved and for which a fee of \$20,000 will be charged. It is worthy of note that these exceptionally high fees are the same whether you're a homeowner with a half acre or spare lot or a developer with 1 hundred -- 100 acre parcel. Over the years many r20 properties have been rezoned r10 to comply with the comprehensive plan and single family homes have been built on them. We have postponed obtaining a zone change because in the absence of immediate plans to build, the high fee cannot be justified. We have owned this property since 1975 as an investment for our retirement. We have paid property taxes for 25 years, and an assessment for a sewer installed in 1980. If the property is zoned r20, it will be too small to build on and have little or no value. We are requesting that the southwest community plan comprehensive plan zoning map be amend "today show" this property as being zoned r10.

Katz: It is now currently zoned r20, and in the comp plan it's zoned --

*******:** Designated r10.

Katz: Planning commission is recommending r20.

Johnson: We took an approach throughout the planning --

Katz: With regard to the conservation area. We'll have to come back and talk about that at some point. Thank you. Anybody else from arnold creek? All right. We are way -- we're about an hour behind. Marquam. Anybody here from marquam? Nobody? Okay. Come on up then.

Nancy Hand: My name is nancy hand and I live directly across the street from the site. I live in arnold creek neighborhood association, but since this is a neighbor, it directly affects me. The

OCTOBER 17, 2001

arnold creek neighborhood association strongly supports the marquam neighborhood association in their request to keep the existing zoning of r10. Most of the area is built out except for the church lot right on the corner. I have talked with the church and they are here, and they said they have no intention of selling. In fact they have plans themselves as the congregation grows to use more of the land themselves. There is no transition zone from the r10 zoning in arnold creek neighborhood association to r5 zoning density proposed in marquam neighborhood association which is adjacent to arnold creek. This proposal would detract from the livability of our neighborhood which is built out at r10 and to r10 development standards.

Sonny Boyd: I'm sonny boyd, the pastor and overseer of the properties at the church at 10558 on southwest 35th. Recently I was walking the neighborhood and had conversations with several of my neighbors who thought we were the ones pushing for this zoning change because we do have quite a bit of property there on the corner. And I kind of resent the fact that we got our name got bashed about in that. But even though it would benefit us to have it rezoned because we could sell off parts of it to make money, we have no plans to do so. The front of the property is covered with old growth timber, the back of the property is a nice open area for children to play, and it's there where everybody in the neighborhood can watch flair children -- their children, and we think it would be a real inconsideration and injustice to the neighborhood to rezone it any other thing. So we'd like to oppose the change as being a major land holder in that area.

Katz: What do you plan to -- i've seen the lot. What do you plan to use it for?

*****: The lot itself?

Katz: Yeah. It's huge.

*****: Yes, it is. It's huge. We don't really plan to change the lot that much. We have one building on it -- actually two buildings on it right now, but as the church grows we would like to take and use the existing building as a school building and meeting rooms, and then where we have the upper parking lot right now we actually have a permit already to put another building in there and that part of that property is at the back of the property, which would be the south end of it, I guess, would be used as parking. And the rest of it we'd like to keep as it is. The front of the property we just -- we wouldn't touch that for anything. It's beautiful, beautifully forested and I think it adds to the neighborhood.

Katz: Thank you. Questions?

Saltzman: I guess, what was the planning commission's rationale for r5 on this?

*****: I believe they identified there were some development potential there and that sometimes it's easier to promote development potential when you go from r10 to r5 because it creates subdividable lots, where an r10 to an r7 you can't always get an additional lot if you do the additional development potential. It's also across the street from jackson middle school, and then there's r7 proposal to the north.

*****: May I say something to that?

Katz: Sure. Quickly.

*****: Yes. I think that would be -- would be a real inconsideration and injustice to the people in the neighborhood who shopped for homes that were on that size property and to allow someone to come in and start developing and changing the look and feel of that property that they've got their life investments in it would be a real injustice.

Katz: Thank you.

*****: Thank you.

Katz: Okay. Anybody else from marquam? All right. Moving right along. West Portland park. This is the holly farm.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

*****: Correct.

Katz: All right. Neighborhood association.

David Gens, President, West Portland Park Neighborhood Association: Good evening, mayor Katz, commissioners. I'm David, president of West Portland Park Neighborhood Association. Please listen to our neighborhood tonight. West Portland Park has been a full participant in both the southwest community plan's iterations, the current process was severely compromised with the withdrawal of the West Portland town center and the Barbur Boulevard corridor from our neighborhood plan. These areas are integral parts of our neighborhood and you can't plan for the neighborhood without all of its parts. The potential issues have been resolved with diligent work by Marie Johnson, staff, and our local citizens. One substantial issue remains, and that's the block between Dickinson and Como, the Holly Farm. The 60 mandate R2 find 5 row house zoning. West Portland Park Neighborhood Association supports R5. Reasons supporting R5 to R -- not just -- currently we have 50% apartments in our neighborhood. Single family homes are sought, not attachments. Our neighborhood association proposed more upzoning or higher density than any other neighborhood not adjacent to the central city. I stress, please, look at our whole neighborhood, not just this one block. We are here for the political process to support us when the planning process has failed us. The block in contention is a half mile from Barbur Boulevard and targeted for higher density while some lots on Barbur Boulevard in other neighborhoods are allowed to stay at R7. West Portland Park Neighborhood Association has proposed other sites that at 2.5 zoning in our neighborhood. Be aware new attached homes on Old Capitol Highway are vacant. There is underdeveloped R2 land in our neighborhood. We value housing diversity, we need more R5, not less, to maintain the balance. And I'll leave some information with your clerk for further per --

Katz: Okay. Thanks.

Paul Mattson, Secretary/Treasurer, West Portland Park Neighborhood Association: I'm Paul Mattson, secretary/treasurer of the West Portland Park Neighborhood Association.

Katz: Do you want to move the mike closer in.

Matson: Sure. David covered some of the points also and I'll try not to repeat them. But my testimony is really focused in opposition to the proposed zoning -- upzoning along Capitol Highway between Dick 89son. If this zoning were changed from R5 to 2.5 would it likely be developed into row houses or some other form of attached high density housing. When what is needed are more single family residents. As David mentioned, 50% of the existing residences in West Portland Park Neighborhood Association are apartments or attached housing, and increasing the zoning in this area would just result in increasing this percentage further and the imbalance between single and multifamily housing that many people exist. The area has a number of large apartment complexes. There's one directly across the street with approximately 70 units. And it has been my observation that very few are occupied by households with school-age children, and this is particularly unfortunate because of the close proximity that this area has to Marquam School and Jackson Middle School. Both of these schools need to have more families living close by and it seems unlikely this would occur if this proposal were to be approved. I'm not sure why this is the case. I can only speculate the families with children prefer to live in single family homes can probably because they have yards and play areas and if they cannot find them they tend to move out of the area. We do not have any parks in our neighborhood either. I certainly don't want to give the impression that I'm against attached housing or high density housing, I just don't think it's the best choice for this area. Thank you.

Francesconi: Speaking of parks, would you like this property to be a park? [laughter]

OCTOBER 17, 2001

*****: Yes.

*****: We've proposed that to the city and I think you visited it yourself.

Francesconi: I have. And parks and I are both very interested in it.

Katz: It's a nice piece of property.

Francesconi: We're very interested in it. We've had discussion was a variety of people, including the owners about it. And i'd like to talk with you later outside of the presence of this hearing. I tried to reach you before today, my staff, we dropped the ball. But I want to talk to you about something, okay?

*****: Thank you very much.

Katz: Okay. Anybody else?

Francesconi: Soon.

Katz: For west Portland park. Come on up. The owners? Hold on -- off, and we'll bring you all three. Anybody else after them?

Moore: Yes.

Katz: Okay. Go ahead, sir.

*****: Good evening. Before I testify on this issue, I would like to thank the city of Portland and the neighborhood association for extending lots of help and understanding during the last tragedy that struck the united states and it affected the muslim community the most. And I would like to congratulate you, because when I chose the city six years ago to live in, I didn't know this would happen, what but -- but I think I made a good choice and I think you should congratulate you for having a safe and -- environment for everybody in the city. So thank you very much for that.

Katz: You're more than welcome.

*****: I would like --

Katz: Why don't we start from the beginning.

Issam S. Abu-Khater, Islamic School of Portland: My name is issam. I'm here on behalf of the islamic center of Portland, and the school. We worked -- I came here before you once before and we worked really in close cooperation with the neighborhood association, and we would like to -- our position on this is that we support the neighborhood association and this issue and the reason is --

Katz: I'm sorry, which issue now?

Abu-Khater: The holly farm lot. The reason for this is that in the past few years, we had lots of families, refugee families coming to Portland from let's say from iraq and also from somalia. And these families lived around the mosque, in that area. These families are being integrated into the community and also they've been working and most of them would like to live in that area. But it looks like due to the lack of adequate housing, they're moving outside that area. And our 2.5 -- r2.5 will not meet that requirement for having a home at that area. And a -- an affordable home, because the homes are very expensive. I myself live on 11532 southwest 58th court, and I know there are row houses in there. And they are still empty since a year ago, when I moved to that area. So I think we support having an r5 and not an r2.5 in that area. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you. Okay. Let's have the owners, three owners come on up.

*****: Actually, two owners and their son.

*****: He doesn't own anything.

Katz: He doesn't own anything? Hopefully you'll leave something for him in your will. [laughter]

Francesconi: You'll do anything to get a vote.

Katz: This one is easy:

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Francesconi: You lost two and you got one.

Eric Morrison: While these pictures are being distributed, if you could distribute those, I want to thank all of you for your patience with all of us. I'm -- it's just amazing what you're able to do, and I also want to thank Marie Johnson. She's got the patience of Job. I'm Eric Morrison, I live at 9707 Southwest 59th. I'll just read my little presentation here. Approximately 30 years ago land use legislation led to the creation -- let to metro and urban growth boundaries. We must keep our end of the bargain and allow the upward building of housing on appropriate sites. 1081 Southwest Capitol Highway is such a site. There are no environmental problems presented by the property. It is fronted by a major four-lane highway, Capitol Highway, providing easy access in and out of the city center via Barbur Boulevard or I-5. It is flat and ideal for affordable development, it is large enough to allow setbacks, green space and alley ways which are now necessary to meet the so-called snout house requirements. A road along one side of the property was widened by the city in anticipation of further development. Acres, I repeat, acres of complexes are right across the highway from the property. It is minutes by foot from a major bus stop and transit center and assisted living residents and a mosque. A branch library is parallel and directly across the side street from the property. Marquam grade school, complete with community playing fields and large open spaces a block and a half down the street. A middle school, Jackson, complete with tennis courts and playing fields is less than two miles away. Portland Community College is blocks away, there are businesses, convenience stores and restaurants two blocks from the property. For all of these reasons, we are asking for an R2 zoning designation. The same, I repeat, the same zoning designation the planning commission recommended in the 1998 version of the West Portland plan. The same density R2 that was used by Multnomah County to re-assess the property taxes in 1998. That's very important. That will be spoken to later. As a city and a state we say we are for building up and not out. We say we are for affordable housing. We say we are for mass transit. Here we are presented an opportunity to stand up for all of these principles. Please grant our request for an R2 zoning December 17th. As a family we thank you for your time and attention.

Katz: Thank you.

Betty Morrison: My name is Betty Morrison and I hope you're still listening. I would like to provide you with a bit of our family history. We -- our parents purchased the property in 1925. My mother was a very active neighborhood and -- neighbor and community leader. She started the hot lunch for children at our local grade school. She canned soup in our basement with the help of the neighbors and the -- in their yard. Our father was an egg man. He grew -- an ag man. He grew lots of holly. Christmas wreaths and bulk holly were packed in the shop on the property by the neighborhood women who were so happy to have the extra Christmas money, and have the camaraderie. My sister and I inherited the property after our mother passed away in 1927 at the age --

*****: '97.

Morrison: Thank you. [laughter] I didn't want to do this anyway. At the age of 98. After our father passed away in 2000 at the age of 104. That's correct.

Katz: My word.

Morrison: In 1998 we went off of the farming status because we could no longer fulfill the county's legal requirement for farming. The county appraiser whom I spoke with many times appraised the property for 26 units, two stories and R2 density this. Is reflected on our tax statement as a fair market value assessment. We have been paying taxes based on this assessment since 1998. My sister and I are only asking the zoning be restored to what we have been taxed upon, because

OCTOBER 17, 2001

that's the right thing to do. And we as owners would like to have a little bit of flexibility to do with our property as we wish. And finally, we want to see that the property is put to the best use for the neighborhood. And the community. Because we think that's the right thing to do. It's been my pleasure.

Zelta Adams: I'm zelta adams from san mateo, california. You might be interested to know that I lived in a lovely home on that beautiful property at 10819 southwest capitol highway for many years, beginning in 1928. And I visited mom and dad, alice and john, regularly after marrying and moving out, until dad died last year at age 104. This means a lot to me, this place. It has wonderful memories and so I just had to fly up from california today to add my voice to this request for a zoning change. It really seems so logical when one considers the location, surrounding property, and our hopes for the use of the land that the zone should really be r2. Looking at the map, the capitol highway corridor from i-5 and barbur boulevard passed pomona and near the Portland community college, that whole corridor is all zoned r2 or cn1, cn2 neighborhood commercial, with the exception of the library, which is next door to our property. Ours is the only privately owned property not zoned r2. So r2 just makes good sense. And if we can have it fairly and properly and honestly zoned r2, to reflect our tax assessment, we can possibly proceed through a trust to realize the hope we have of a park where the whole neighborhood can enjoy dad's beautiful holly trees. This land is our family's legacy. Before my sister and I make the decision whether or not this property should be developed or made into a park, it must first be zoned to its proper and legal density. Otherwise, as taxpayers, we have no way to determine its fair market value. My dad, john weeman, was a well known holly grower, and we have on our land many varieties of holly trees. This is a golden opportunity for our community to acquire such a nice piece of land. So I hope it will all work out for my sister, my folks, and for me. Dad and mom would be pleased, and so would be. My sister and i. Thank you for listening.

Katz: Thank you. Questions? Thank you. Anybody else? All right. Thank you. Anybody else?

Louise Roundtree: Good evening, mayor and commissioners. My name is louise roundtree, I live on southwest bacun avenue. I have in front of me not what i'm going to say. I used to deliver meals and wheels to the property we're talking about. I walk by the holly farm all the time. I'm a parent at marquam elementary, and we -- I would first love to see a park there. What I was going to speak to was keeping the zoning at r5 instead of r2. Just a few statistics to speak as a parent from marquam. We have a community of children from diverse cultural, ethnic and economic backgrounds. More than 35% of our students are on free and reduced lunch. 35%. Many of those students live in the apartments that are close to the elementary school, and they don't have yards. So a park would be a wonderful thing for the community there. Enrollment has dropped in recent years as families are unable to find modest attached homes on reasonably priced lots. Existing row houses in the area have almost no children. Many of the families we've already talked about are recent immigrants to the united states, and more than 20% of the children at the school speak english as a second language. Such families start their lives in this country living in the apartments on capitol, then seeking to move to detached homes. It's critical that we maintain the potential for more single family homes near the school or parks, and I will also comment as a little league parent that when we have little league going on the kid have nowhere to play because of the games. So we do need additional park space near the school. I would support the zoning for the park first, and if not, for the park, then I would still like to see the r5 for the detached houses. That's all I have. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you. Council have any questions or technical questions for technical staff?

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Francesconi: No, but I need to do further work on this. I may very well be recommending that we go to r2 for several reasons. And i'll talk to people about it later.

Katz: Okay. Far southwest. Anybody here from the neighborhood association? Anybody here from pcc? All right. Moving right along.

Saltzman: I have a question about the pcc one.

Katz: Oh, okay.

Saltzman: Could somebody explain to me why the planning commission is okay with doing it for property pcc but not okay for lewis and clark? Is it because pcc owns the property?

Johnson: Correct.

Saltzman: Okay.

Katz: All right. Thank you. Crestwood. Anybody here from crestwood? Thank you. Anybody here from ash creek? We've got issues on ash creek. Neighborhood association. You're representing the neighborhood association?

Jack Klinker, Task Force Representative, Ash Creek Neighborhood Association: Jack klinker, the task force representative for the ash creek neighborhood association. Good evening mayor Katz and commissioners. Ash creek has two items of concern about the southwest community plan zoning. They are our narrow alleys and also some higher density parcels in an otherwise uniformly zoned area. The narrow alleys are site 1, we have a number of alleys in ash creek that have very narrow and substandard right of ways and serve as streets. They're primarily located along garden home road there. Are several other such streets in other parts of the neighborhood. These alleys have a very narrow right of way, these alleys are three to four blocks long and have no cul-de-sacs for emergency equipment to turn around in. Many of these alleys serve double thick blocks. There is no 55th avenue. This means each alley is serving twice the area as would a normal up-to-standard street along a normal block. There are many houses along these alleys with minimal setbacks. Widening the alleys would have a negative impact of the character of the neighborhood. We disagree with the bureau of planning that only a relatively small number of additional units would be possible under r7 than the current r10. If r7 zoning would result in so few extra units, why doesn't the city forego them and leave the zoning r10? Even at the existing base zone a considerable amount of redevelopment will undoubtedly occur. We have been told by the bureau of planning that pdot would no allow development if the infrastructure is inadequate, but in two different conversations i've been told p dot assumes the infrastructure is adequate given a zoning. We have collected over 150 signatures from residents along these alleys that request that the zoning stay at r10 instead of being updesignated to r7. One more page here. The site 2 along kruger street. There are several parcels on the north side of the street between 55th and 64th that are to be updesignated to the comp plan r7. The rest is r10. We feel these lots are sensitive and should not be up designated. There are many seeps and seasonal surface water streams running through these parcels. Any additional building will increase hard surface run-off and -- yes. The bureau of planning has mentioned zoning map consistency having a few r7 lots like this in an ice r10 zone area does not seem to contribute to zoning map consistency. These parcels demonstrate an intended site effect of the southwest community plan zoning map approach. An environmentally sensitive area the smaller parcels tend to get up designated by the -- while the smaller -- in conclusion we believe the above changes limb prove the southwest community plan in ash creek. Please consider our issues. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you.

*******:** Three years ago --

Katz: You need to identify yourself.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Patty Lee: Oh, i'm patty lee. Mayor Katz and city commissioners, good evening. Three years ago as swni president, I came before you to ask that the southwest community plan be taken off the shelf. And finished. At that time you were noncommittal. But shortly thereafter mayor Katz decided it was time to finish the project. And I want to thank her for her vision, for deborah stein, for marie johnson, and your council funding. You all are incredible. Only one of two areas suggested for down zoning because of the environmental sensitivity and storm water problems. It was all r10 on the september 1996 map, and on the planning commission map when they quit. An interesting fact is the spot zoning of r7 lots will not produce any more housing than if it was all on zone r10. There are no storm water pipes, no ditches along this street, which is unpaved gravel street. All the water from basement sumps, roof drains go out to the street. And then they flow west downhill, cutting across the properties, because they're below the street. And they come into my property where I have a stream all winter long. On site disposal of storm water will not work. The clay soil in the area cannot absorb all the water. Also the water table is only four to six feet below the surface. The storm water manual does not have a recipe for the water problems in this area. Water from these three parcels has to flow north into the north fork of ash creek as they're below the street level. But there are intervening properties between these three parcels and the creek. So I urge you to consider the lack of infrastructure in this area and not exacerbate its storm water problems. Go with r10. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Dorothy Gauge, Chair, Ash Creek Neighborhood Association: My name is dorothy gauge, i'm chair of ash creek neighborhood association. Thank you, mayor and council members for enduring us this long. On behalf of the ash creek neighborhood association, we are requesting amendments to the draft southwest community zoning map in section 3, residential infill. Parcels along narrow dead end alleys between Multnomah boulevard and garden home road from southwest 54th to the county line -- were recommended for r7 by planning commission should be r10. And probably -- properties along -- which patty has already made reference to has been spot zoned mostly r10. As the mayor was greeted at the airport upon her return from new york, they stated how impressed she was with how much a group of people can do. We are here today with our petitions from concerned residents to impress the council with how much a group of people can do. We request down designations for the above identified properties for the following reasons. These areas do not have infrastructure to direct and accommodate the flow of waters away from properties. These areas are riddled with underground springs and seeps which contribute to the problem of subsurface and surface runoff, while the planning commission considered r10 zoning for properties along stream corridors, no mention was made of upland properties contiguous to environmental zones which are major contributors to surface water runoff with no storm drains. As we speak, they -- a metro committee is pursuing title 3 requires preserving streambeds as well as goal 5 to protect wildlife and habitat for the total stream bed. Also consideration of the impact of upland and adjacent canopies are being studied as they relate to ground water. These areas are steeply sloped and hilly while very few alleys are -- have ditches and no storm drains. These areas do not have decent streets, most are unimproved with potholes and -- in varying degrees of disrepair with 20 foot rights of way many of these alleys have 12 feet or less for traffic. The increased amount of traffic presents potential public safety hazards of monument all proportions. Ash creek neighborhood association invites your serious consideration of these requests. We have worked for more than four years on our neighborhood plans and we have met our dense if I requirements. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Anybody else?

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Michael Kisor: I'm michael kisor, 8103 southwest 54th avenue. I support the planning commission and the bureau of planning staff's recommendation to upzone from r10 to r7 the general neighborhood of ash creek along garden home road that we just heard about here from the neighborhood association. I believe the planning commission and the bureau of planning have carefully considered the issues and they have made sound recommendations for -- to upzone based on their rather complete understanding of the neighborhood. I ask you to affirm their recommendation to upzone. The ash creek neighborhood association has gone on record as opposing upzoning as you've just heard, alleging infrastructures inadequate and characterizing our streets as alleys. First i'd like to say this characterization of the streets as all lies is really very inflammatory and inaccurate. According to pdot's documentation that can be found on the web, you found the correct term is accruing street, which means the street is intentionally small, about 20-foot right of way, although not all of the streets are developed up to the right of way standards here, and the purpose of the cuing street is to reduce the narrow side of the street is to reduce storm water run-off issues, to keep traffic calm for safety purposes, and preserve neighborhood character. Existing street right of ways are adequate to handle any development that would occur in this area. I'd like to point out that as development occurs in the area, most of the streets will be improved by street improvement projects, which automatically would occur once a 50% majority of automatic yes votes has been -- occurs. So all the infrastructure issues that you've just heard would be addressed by such street improvement projects, including storm water run-off. Furthermore, i've talked to pdot's lara wentworth, the area plan section manager, and steven gerber, who is here tonight, senior transportation planner, about such infrastructure issues. They told me that pdot had looked into the matter and felt the infrastructure was adequate to accommodate upzoning to r7. Additionally, upzoning not significantly increase the number of houses in our area as you've heard the bureau of planning suggest. And I agree with that assessment, because if you look around there are a lot of houses and whatnot developed currently in the area that would preclude a great deal of further development on some of those properties. Clearly this will not have a significant impact on the neighborhood but will make a difference to some senior citizens in the area who do own land. And I do speak tonight to -- on behalf of my mother who is a landowner in this area and is counting on her investment in the property for her basically her retirement here, as well as the neighbor next door who feels much the same way and is very similar situation. Upzoning merely acknowledges the existing r 7 development and stream lines the development process for any undeveloped properties. I encourage you to support the planning commission and the bureau of planning staffer's recommendation to upzone our neighborhood. It has been carefully considered. We also have a petition, and it doesn't have as many names on it because the -- my next door neighbor circulated it. There are 26 names on this petition. I'll leave this with you. It represents roughly 95% of the doors that she knocked on are in favor of it there. Were only two people that refused to sign this petition. So I think in part the -- what you see in terms of the petitions gathered is who's knocking on the doors and what story they present. The neighborhood --

Francesconi: We've got it.

*****: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate it.

Francesconi: Thank you. Next? Any more on this?

Moore: That's all for ash creek who signed up.

Francesconi: Any questions, council? I have one for staff. If it really does go to r7, are we only talking a few houses?

*****: In the area between Multnomah boulevard and garden home boulevard, if we were to reach full build-out the difference would be approximately 12 units.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Francesconi: Thank you. Next?

Moore: Maplewood.

Gordon Trapp, Vice-Chair, Maplewood Neighborhood Association: Good evening, members of the council and the mayor. Gordon Trapp, representative of the maplewood neighborhood association, i'm vice chair. The address, 6825 southwest 63rd avenue, Portland. I guess there's a map up there, and you had one to look at. This area, it's designated as northwest corner of maplewood, but we call it the watershed area, and it's about three blocks by three blocks. And it is a true watershed area feeding all of its run-off water into very memorial hospital crick. -- into vermont crick. This area has severe problems with severe flooding in winter time. Originally these lots were all r20s as a barley subdivision and also hideaway hills. So they need all of that area. On every street except vermont itself it appears that street water washes on to some of the private properties. There are no curbs there, few catch basins and no waste from water piping. They accept where it goes under roadways. We have -- it appears that this condition has possibly damaged two houses. They would be one at the corner of 63rd and southwest california, a second one on southwest payton road, the one on the corner has been on the market quite a long time now, and it appears that in the winter time especially the basement, there's flooding in that basement and apparently due to some of the street water. The house on payton road is not occupied now and it cannot be occupied now. Two people who lived in it formerly indicated that in winter time storm, they could hear water running underneath the house off the road. The house is now developed a severe mold problem and it cannot be lived in, and something's got to be done about it. Actually, down that vermont creek, there's -- by your information that you have, there's an indication for sure that at least one spring and maybe two springs help feed vermont creek from the south side. We think that that needs to be protected and taken care of as well as it can be. We note also that on the north side of vermont creek, even if you go 2,000 feet to the north off of vermont creek up shattuck, there's property up there that they've held at r10 development. There's no homes on that. Would it seem like maybe that would be more useful for our -- r7 than r10. But anyway, we're in agreement. We think this r10 should be reserved and used to help protect the creek there. The planning commission and the staff helped arrange so three of the lots shown off vermont street would be kept at r10. We thank you for doing that, but it won't do the job. Because just those are at the very bottom of the hill, and all of this water in winter, we have several seeps through the various interior parts of that, and the water running off the road, and through one lot to another, the -- just having those three lots down on vermont at r10, that's good. They have banks that are right on vermont street, and there's signs of erosion already. But if this is rezoned to r7, upzoned, we're just sure that --

Katz: Sir --

*****: -- it's going to cause more problems.

Katz: Your time is up.

*****: Thank you very much. One last thing. I have to pass to you --

Katz: Thank you.

Corrine Webber: Good evening. My name is corrine webber, 6244 -- 45 southwest 39th avenue, Portland, zip 97221. I am on the maplewood board and i'm here to reinforce the remarks that gordon trap just presented to you in regard to the watershed issues in this northwest corner of maplewood. Before I go into any subject specifics, I would like to thank you for all your patience and recommend to you that you adopt the plan that has been presented to you by the maplewood neighborhood association. It appears pretty much as we had hoped on the current map before you, and we hope you would pass it. We just have this one issue and -- in this northwest corner that

OCTOBER 17, 2001

does concern us, and it has to do with the water shed issues that Gordon just addressed. Let me explain that this neighborhood is a very well-developed neighborhood. These are large lots, her large houses, they probably average around 3,000 square feet each. They are in excellent condition, well maintained, they'll be there for the next 20 years, they'll be there for the next 40 years and well beyond the southwest community plan. And very little changes will occur I'm sure in terms of movement of houses or tearing down houses, or -- that kind of thing in order to achieve this increased density. In fact as you look at the area, the opportunities for increased density are so minimal, that it doesn't seem reasonable that one would want to sacrifice the watershed problems just to achieve a few additional housing units, and at the same time, destabilize what is a very desirable neighborhood. And that is well established and will remain so with that -- if we don't interfere with it. The properties that are in question here along Vermont have tall conifers that are close to 100 years old. There's a lot of vegetation there, and permeable surface to catch this water before it flows south-northward across Vermont Street, and sweeps the oil and pollution into Vermont Creek. This is what we're trying to achieve. And we would very strongly recommend that the properties in this whole northwest corner be retained at the R10 zoning and not changed to the R7, and that you do not destabilize this neighborhood and change the whole character of the neighborhood for the sake of a few units. And that's the substance of my comments in regard to this. Again, thank you one and all for your patience with us.

Francesconi: Any questions? I have one question of staff. How many units are we talking about here?

Johnson: I don't have the figures for that.

Webber: I would estimate -- the shaded area north of California, you're probably looking at maybe four units additional. All of these properties are eligible for detached accessory dwelling units.

Katz: Thank you. Anybody else? All right. Multnomah. Neighborhood association.

Mark Helfand, Multnomah Neighborhood Association : Good evening, Mayor Katz and commissioners. I'm Mark Helfand, the delegate to the task force from Multnomah and representing the Multnomah neighborhood association. First I want to reaffirm Multnomah's support for the expansion of the Hillsdale town center boundary, which actually includes part of our neighborhood.

We're an alarmist neighborhood. At least that's our representation, and we find nothing to be alarmed about in Hillsdale's request. By the same token, on the map the Multnomah -- the town city, main street in Multnomah is designated as a special area too. We hope that it will have a design district that is bigger than the dots indicate on the map that covers the commercial and other areas where other housing might exist. We didn't really notice that until the last two days, and we're sorry that we didn't bring it up earlier. Multnomah otherwise differs from the planning commission on only two decisions. Site summaries of both were included in the city council guide.

The first, number 1, is on Canby -- I can't see it from here -- is on Canby west of 36th Avenue. The existing zone is R7, and Multnomah support R5 to encourage additional development of small detached single family housing. The planning commission favored R2 and R2.5, the comp plan designation, based on adjacent zoning in the neighborhood, unquote. The difference between planning commission's view and ours is a difference in the quality of information available to us, a map showing zoning without showing actual housing or topography can be deceiving. If you visit this site, you'll see a block of mostly recently renovated or new homes. The first two pages are pictures on the handout are -- of this street and this site. I'm going to draw your attention particularly to the first picture, the top picture on the second page which shows a house and a flag lot which is the kind of development that it's built out as, as R5 which we'd like to see more of.

There's considerable opportunity in this site, this whole area, for additional infill with new single

OCTOBER 17, 2001

family homes on small lots, and an r5 designation would promote that type of development. One planning commissioner opposed the planning commission decision because the r2.5 zoning would, quote, prohibit small lot detached single family residents, unquote. That planning commissioner was judging this issue based on the southwest community plan policies adopted by city council. The relative -- the relevant policies are community wide objectives 3 d as and b which encourage you to respect the scale and desired character of outside mixed use areas and housing objectives three and four which encourage us to increase opportunities for building more detached single family homes on smaller lots and to increase incentives for property owners to maintain an -- and improve their homes and rental properties so established neighborhoods remain stable and attract infill and redevelopment occur. The planning commission recommendation on canby does nothing to further these objectives and they cite no other objectives support their position. The other amendment, number 2 on moss, is a dramatic example of the same problem regarding the map.

Katz: Your time is up. Hold on for a second.

*****: Some neighborhoods got two speakers, three minutes each.

Katz: Just a minute. Relax.

*****: Sorry.

Katz: On site one, you're recommending r5?

*****: Yeah.

Katz: Okay. Not r7, r5.

*****: Yeah. We recommend r5.

Katz: All right. Do you want to quickly tell us what you want to tell us on moss?

*****: Visiting moss was a real eye-opener. I think that is an area that they thought was on the flat map looked very close to the apartments. The apartments are very -- are way down a slope across the street and it's really a different character of the area. I think that's the beauty of Multnomah, is that on a flat map there's a lot of mixture between muff and single family housing, but character can change from street to street.

Katz: And you support either r5 or 7 on that?

*****: Yeah.

Katz: Either one. Okay.

Hales: I've got a question, maybe marty can address it. You said you want -- you mentioned this in passing, it's not in the chart so i'm not sure what happened with planning commission discussion of this, you said maybe you didn't notice it until after that, but you said in passing you think more of the commercial district of the neighborhood ought to be in -- with the design overlay, right?

*****: Right.

Hales: Do you know how much more? Do you mean all the commercially zoned park sells?

Sucec: We understood those areas would be planned out and would have some design features, and marie -- of course we didn't ask, marie told us it's just a multifamily housing in these districts, but the main street does need a design overlay of some sort.

Helfand: Whatever housing might go for one thing, is -- where the dots are is where some brand-new row houses just went up. There's nothing that's going to affect them. And the place across the street, I don't think we want much in the whole village. Height restrictions, but not a whole lot of stylistic requirements. It an eclectic place. But we would like something that applies to the whole village.

Hales: This is also a question for staff, because I don't remember all the particulars, but let me put it to you in terms of intention. What do you think you're going to get with design review that you don't get with the base zone standards for storefront commercial? Most of the district is zoned store

OCTOBER 17, 2001

front commercial. Storefront commercial in the base zone says you've got to have plate glass -- what are you going to get in addition to what the base zone requirements require?

*****: Do you know what the height is on cs?

Johnson: It's 45 feet.

Hales: So you want a lower height.

Sucec: We want a lower height. The street are narrow and there's big slope from troy down to Multnomah boulevard.

Hales: I don't know if you get to that with design review. Are you talking about a plan district instead.

Sucec: That's really what we want. The one that works the best. I believe sheila told us it was a plan district, or ellen west. We actually do have one other disagreement with the planning commission.

Katz: Identify yourself.

Martie Sucec, Vice Chair, Multnomah Neighborhood Association: Marty sucec, vice chair of the neighborhood association. Before you press the button, I really want to thank everybody, but I especially want to thank deborah stein. She was in it when yes at our worst, and it was because she came and listened to us and thought about what we said that she saw us at our best. The staff was wonderful, of course, and you were too, but I always found her to be honest and willing to listen even when she was inadvertently insulted. Deborah, thank you very much. I'm dealing with number 3, and this is the kind of thing you shouldn't have to sit here and listen about. This is on southwest hume. It abuts -- this is number 3 -- you don't need to read it. You can look at the pictures. 18 feet, 20 feet wide, right of way, 12 feet, 15 feet, paved. Turn this to page 2. Page 2 is the lot in question. It's been recently remodeled. Most of the lot is taken up by the remodel. It is a very small lot left to be developed. The petitioners are asking for and asked it shortly before the planning commission hearings began, or very close to the end of the close of the record, asked for r7. This property abuts a commercial zone in the planning committee had come out and looked at this, because they know title 33, they would have known that this is a transitional area and by right these people can put another house on this lot. They're asking for an r5 designation they say because they want to build another house. It's really small lot that's left there. If they get an r5 they can by right put two other houses there because that's what section 33.110.240.i.2 on density. The lot or attached housing project may have one dwelling unit more than is allowed by the base zone. I just got my letter from you today, jim, about that, about title 33, and so this is something that shouldn't be before you. The neighborhood association did vote twice to oppose this amendment. Last -- this month they met and they -- the property owners were there, but they were going out of town and couldn't be informed about this. The neighborhood association didn't want to revisit its opposition, but it felt keenly that everybody should be talking to reach other here. That happens. You know, that hasn't happened yet, and you should haven't -- should haven't to deal with it, but I hope you will continue this so we, work it out. Thank you all. It's been nice to know you. Through all of this.

Katz: Thank you. Anybody else from Multnomah? We've got more? [change of captioners. File named cc1017p4.]

Gilbert Moore, 7428 SW 34th Ave.: It's my belief that it should be r-1 because surrounding the area it's all built up in apartments and I believe the best use for the property would be additional rental units, either rowhouses or apartments. To my knowledge there are no personal residents, I mean owners of personal residences living on that stretch at this time. That's all I have.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Katz: Since we don't have much information, this is -- what is it currently zoned? R-5?

*****: It's my belief it's r-5.

Katz: And the comp plan at r-5 as well?

*****: Well, the city recommended several years ago to put it to r-1, my understanding.

Katz: The planning commission recommended --

*****: I think I need --

Katz: You need to do -- okay. Okay. We'll put a question mark until you get to that.

*****: Okay.

Katz: Ma'am, are you with him? I guess.

Saltzman: His wife.

Katz: Okay. You've identified it. So we'll -- she'll come back and let us know the story about that property.

*****: Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Anybody else? Multnomah?

James Peterson: My name is James Peterson, 2502 S.W. Multnomah Boulevard. I just submitted a letter and a second letter with two other signatures against the proposed zone change on Southwest Hume. I think Marty did a really good job. I have a map here that I got at Metro, which was submitted by the City of Portland for compliance numbers sometime last couple months. And for some reason it shows the boundaries of these 24 concept areas which are significantly different than what's being proposed. I would like you in the future use this hard work that the citizens have done to determine these boundaries in the southwest to use for Metro's compliance areas. If that's possible. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Norman Fenton: I'm Norman Fenton. I'm representing 2537 S.W. Hume. My daughter, my son-in-law's house. They're in Philadelphia on business. First of all, the property was requested to be rezoned from r-7 to r-5. It was mentioned by the Multnomah Neighborhood Association, this is a small piece of property. No, it's 11,500 square feet. So the rezoning from r-7 down to r-5. Number 2, it's adjacent to commercial property. And the City of Portland has under the Southwest Community Plan, they want to promote more pedestrian oriented commercial zone and greater residential density in or near commercial zoning. This property is big enough to support an r-5 downzone from r-7, not making a flag lot because it has enough frontage on Southwest Hume Street, and it's one, it's two blocks from city transportation on Barbur Boulevard. It's five blocks from the Safeway store on 19th and Barbur and it's a bus ride down to the Fred Meyer Burlingame. So I believe that the r-5 zoning, which the staff recommended, and my daughter was notified they recommended before -- and Multnomah Neighborhood Association was contacted, they had no argument against it at the first meeting, but afterwards, which my daughter just ignored, they had a meeting and said they were opposed to it. They never called my daughter to come to the meeting, even to present her side of the story. That's what I got and I thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you. Let me understand, Marie. Planning Commission recommended what on this one?

Johnson: R-5. This was a proposal from the property owner to rezone their property r-5. It's currently adjacent to r-1, an r-1 property proposed to change to CG because there's an existing CG use on the property. The rest of the area is r-7. Staff had suggested that Planning Commission consider looking at a broader area for zone change rather than singling out this particular property. The Planning Commission said they would support r-5 on the property, and would consider, would

OCTOBER 17, 2001

support forwarding additional r-5 if the neighborhood supported it for any broader area, the neighborhood association doesn't support any -- any change in this area other than the commercial, change to the commercial designation.

*****: There was one more -- i'm sorry.

*****: Sorry.

Fenton: There was one more point. Title 33 is not in effect. Your now proposed title 34 is not in effect. So whatever was said before me about the you can build two houses, that isn't there yet. That's why we -- my daughter requested the r-5 zone.

Katz: Okay.

*****: Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Tim Loughlin: Mayor Katz, council, my name is tim loughlin. I live at 2643 s.w. Hume street. I'm not opposed to the r-5 zoning on the 2537 Hume street. This is a transitional zone lot, or a transition area lot next to a commercial zone. It also faces Multnomah street, which is a major throughfare. Like Mr. Fenton says, it's close to shopping, transportation. We're looking at increasing pedestrian traffic. It's ideal for that. Because of the location. Like I say, this is a transitional area between commercial and residential. I feel that this is a proper type zoning for this lot. And even for the rest of the street. We all face or most of us face Multnomah street, which is a heavy trafficked area. And I think increased density on these lots is appropriate zoning. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Mary Stupi: My name is Mary Stupi. I live at 2722 s.w. Hume street just up the street from where they want to rezone. And if you look at the pictures, basically we do live on an alleyway. And the way they want to rezone the property, i'm concerned that there may be off or street parking, not offstreet parking, which would prevent any emergency vehicles from access to our street from that end of the street. And that's my only concern on that. Because the zoning would allow them to have -- not have to provide the parking of vehicles.

Katz: Thank you.

Fenton: May I make another comment?

Katz: Quickly.

Fenton: This property is one lot in from a corner. There is plenty of access. The offstreet parking issue is not something that's going to cause a problem with a new development. They're required to have offstreet parking. The parking problems that are on this street are not caused by this property. So there really isn't a parking driving emergency vehicle issue that isn't already a problem.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else?

Alan Albright: I live at 2715 s.w. Hume street. That's at the top of the hill and up the street from this property. I've had to differ with Tim that this street is very narrow. It is an alleyway. Most people that come to visit you on this street miss this street because they think it's an alley. It looks like an alley. Jim's business is right on the corner, and that area is -- I don't know -- maybe 10 feet at that area. And if you go to access that road with somebody else coming down, you have to pull over into the gutter on to the gravel and stop to allow somebody to go by. It's already a problem. Adding more houses along the street is going to impact that. My daughter had a seizure and they had a very difficult time getting an ambulance and a fire truck up that street. And it took excessive amount of time. You know, we all moved into that neighborhood because it is a desirable place to live. And these people moved in as well, and now they want to come in and move in and change this and I don't think that's really right for the rest of us. I was told before coming here by one of

OCTOBER 17, 2001

the Multnomah commission people that this probably wouldn't make a big difference, that this was already determined and would already happen. I guess I feel --

Katz: Who told you that?

*****: One of the -- frank?

*****: Frank.

*****: Frank. Essentially told us that this was already kind of determined and it really wasn't going to make much difference for us to come down and complain but there's the majority of people that live on this little tiny street that are really against this. And I think that the it should be seriously considered. I encourage anybody that really is for this to go up that street and really take a look at it. This is not really a street. This is not what you live on. We have lots of apartments everywhere. But these are on like regular, developed streets that have plenty of room to get through.

Katz: Thank you.

*****: Thank you.

Francesconi: I wish frank had told me so I wouldn't have to stay here. [laughter]

Katz: Marie, did you just dismiss that one? It's not on the list.

*****: That's the same Hume street.

Katz: It is on the list? Did I miss it?

Johnson: It's number 3, I believe.

Katz: Ah.

*****: That's the one we've been talking about.

Katz: Okay. I threw the other sheet out. All right. Keep going. Okay.

Kerry Dinsmore: My name is Kerry Dinsmore. I live on southwest Hume and I am opposed to the zoning change. I moved to that area over 23 years ago just because of the suburban-rural feel. And we have a very small street. We measured it and it's 16 feet paved from one side to the other. I agree withal that when the garbage truck or any large truck comes up the street, you -- if they're stopped there you have to stop and turn around and go down the other side. It's more of an alley. People do miss the street when you give them directions. They go to Hume Court instead of Hume Street because it's so narrow and they don't notice it. The entrance on 26th and 30th, if somebody is trying to turn right or left on 20 those streets as we -- as you come up Hume, you have to wait until the car, if there's a car there, to come out or back up or whatever to get up that street, it's so narrow. So I am not in favor of the changing to higher density on any part of the block.

Katz: Thank you. Anybody else?

Lorna Ludwick: I'm Lorna Ludwick. I live at 2738 s.w. Hume Street and I am against the rezoning mainly because it is a very narrow street and you can't turn in if there's a car coming down. It's dangerous intersection there at 30 public because you can't see to the right because of a hedge and you take off, people coming up 30th can hit you if you don't step on it and go across the street. It's just a neighborhood that doesn't need density. It's very -- the lot, if you go look at it, the house takes up the majority of the lot. Plus their driveway. There's -- you get maybe an 800-square-foot house on the piece that's left. And they would have to park on the street. Parking on the street makes it so cars cannot get through. And that's been proven several times when people have had neighbors over. Okay. Thank you.

Katz: Go ahead.

Dave Nadal: My name is Dave, 3024 s.w. Florida Court number D. I have three requests. First, I urge city council to vote no on the southwest community plan map partly because this would inactivate the southwest policy document approved last year. My reason is that the overall thrust of

OCTOBER 17, 2001

the policy document is to aggressively promote and market the mixed use concept and the potential for cramming in hundreds of new residents in our commercial district. And that priority, and that priority for infrastructure is to go these areas not surrounding neighborhoods. Most southwest residents don't have the slightest idea this is the case. Early on I suggested policy and map votes by all southwest residents because of the possibly because of the millions of dollars spent on this project. But the suggestion met with indifference from the city and the neighborhood associations.

The southwest community plan is designed to create new and dominant hubs of activity which will, in fact, not complement single family neighborhoods but crowd you out by jamming the middle, as you would say in baseball. Since Oregon law does not mandate concurrent see of infrastructure development with residential development, this is crazy to encourage. My second request is you eliminate the proposed expansion pangs of the hills day town center bound pear boundary because it's a bad idea and almost nobody in the area knew about it. Homeowners of record near the area were not individually identified. The only mention in the bop notice mailer was a brief inconspicuous with us paragraph towards the end saying the mixed use center boundaries would be available for viewing. This isn't disputed and it's in the public record. The bop, in fact, believes this is adequate. Suspecting that this lack of knowledge I distributed notices to households. I have received approximately 160 individual written requests from homeowners requesting that you deny the town center expansion, 30 say that the public notice was inadequate and about 10 in favor. Only two or three of all of these responses, which is now over 200 and I still get 20 or 30 every day, said they had no awareness of it, two or three. It should be obvious that such an important future vision decision as a town center inclusion should be participated in by all area residents of the town center and the town center is an issue that goes way beyond any current zoning, way beyond, and the guaranteed benefits from town center designation are very minimal. The expansion was not a part of the southwest community plan except in so far there was physically inserted on the map during the very latest phases. Tonight the hillsdale represent I have said it was, quote, woven into the southwest community plan. In July a representative said it was, quote, discussed by the task force. Literally perhaps but as to any interference there was any meaningful citizen discussion as part of the southwest community task force process is completely inaccurate and the record backs me up. The plan process was overseen by the task force. I attended most of the task force meetings. I've also reviewed all the minutes of the task force. There was no public task force discussion or action at all about this expansion, except that every few months a hillsdale representative would quietly briefly ask when expansion would be made a part of the southwest community plan. Each time the request was rebuffed or ignored and one time the task force chair explicitly stated hillsdale would have to stay i-a take it up with the city specifically. It was obviously inserted at the last minute. My third request is to eliminate rowhouse and multifamily zoning for a group of 50 home owners in hayhurst. Commissioner have repeatedly said the southwest can have the plan it wants. When I recented -- these people are not getting what other people have gotten in their neighborhoods for no good reason as far as I can see.

Just to summarize neighborhood association representatives have given me no policy reasons for this area being included. And i'm suspicious about it because it is right outside the attorney center boundary proposed for expansion. And it would include a corner that they very much want to get all four sides within the town center with the expanded boundary for some legal reasons for I guess it helps the town center. It's also one final sense it's also contrary to the policy documents, which state the town centers are supposed to taper to neighborhood densities at their outside, at the outside. This is leap frogging single family neighborhoods and putting rowhouse zoning on the outside of the town center where there's single family zoning still inside. And I have comment

OCTOBER 17, 2001

sheets from people in that neighborhood. I've still got them on my door step and so forth and i'm going to submit requesting that they not have rowhouse zoning and some multifamily, too. But the only reason given to me by neighborhood association representatives for their not opposing that was that nobody came forward or was real active in that area. And that's not a good reason.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else?

Moore: That was all for Multnomah. We have a couple of people later from hillsdale and bridlemile. Louise and frank.

Katz: Whoa, whoa, whoa. Let's finish -- we're going backwards now?

Moore: I don't have any from hayhurst.

Katz: Let me make sure. Any technical questions with regard to Multnomah?

Francesconi: On the town center question, going from r-25 --

Katz: Just stay there.

Francesconi: What do you think? 45 do you think?

Johnson: I'm not sure. I'm not sure I understand. There mr. Nadal raised a couple of points. One was the recommended expansion of the hillsdale town center boundary. The zoning recommendations within the hillsdale town center boundary were made independently of determining the boundary except for the application of the design overlay. There is a proposal, or a recommendation for r-2.5 zoning west of the hillsdale town center boundary. I'm not remembering the street name.

*******:** Iowa.

*******:** Iowa. That was recommended by the hayhurst neighborhood in 1997, and staff forwarded that recommendation as part of our work. You know, we're continuing to forward that -- that proposal from '97 went through the '98 process, and again went through our process and has been supported by the neighborhood association.

Katz: Further questions?

Louise Weidlich: Yes. I'm this is louise, director of the neighborhood protective association, p.o. Box 19224, Portland, Oregon. Greetings again this evening. We have some property at 8020 s.w. Capitol highway and I approve of what the zoned it but there was -- there is a question in the fact that it's just across the street from handy andy's gas station as you know where that is. And it says that we can have a c-2-c-n 2 but there is a thing in the code that says parking is allowed if it is not next to a primary street. Offstreet parking. And I did not get an answer on what that includes, if we would be allowed to have the parking that we're using now.

Katz: Can somebody answer louise now? If not now, when?

Johnson: I think it's a little bit of a difficult question. My understanding, susan feldman's here to pipe in but my understanding is they continue to use the parking that they have but if they were to make any changes to the property then they would have to comply with a development standards that require the parking to not be between the building and the street. But that's my off the top of my head judgment. I would prefer to get more information before I said definitively.

Katz: Let's get more information. Anything else, louise?

Weidlich: Well, I didn't know I was going to oppose something on rowhousing but I don't know what the Multnomah -- would this -- is the eagles lodge site still being considered for rowhousing?

Katz: The who?

Johnson: That site except for very small sliver is within the barbur envelope and is not proposed for rezoning as part of the southwest community plan process. However, there is a property owner considering rowhouses on that property.

OCTOBER 17, 2001

Weidlich: I'm opposed to rowhousing.

Katz: I know you are. I know you are. [laughter]

Weidlich: Rowhousing. The article here was in the "Multnomah village post." "Multnomah is about to get another large rowhouse development. This time from neighborhoods may be able to live with it. James wink letter plans to demolish the old eagles lodge and build 57 rowhouse units on the 2.86-acre site on southwest 30th avenue. To make the bowl-shaped site more level he will begin with 15,000 cubic feet of fill dirt. He plans on five different housing types. Some will include live work space allowing for small home offices, others modeled on a development. Also based on the model the project may have a european street in which cars are permitted to drive in slow speeds but pedestrians have the right of way." my opposition against rowhousing in the Multnomah neighborhood or any neighborhood, and house prices will continue to sky rocket. Land with one house can now have -- would now be able to have eight or ten. Rowhouse cloning with increased density would change our beautiful city adding noise, pollution, crowding, no place for children to play, and crime. So I have a say in what happens in your neighborhood. Tell your neighbors voice your opposition to the density, overcrowding, destruction of the natural landscape, higher taxes, crime, and subsidized unaffordable housing which is not affordable. So that's -- thank you.

Katz: Thank you. All right. Anybody else want to testify that didn't sign up? I dare you. [laughter] it is 9:54. No, seriously, does anybody want to testify that did not sign up? Okay. Council members, is there anything -- marie is going to do is going to add those items that were not on our sheet. Is there anything else that you want her to do on the sites that you heard about? My recommendation would be on the sites that you think are problematic you ought to go see them because there's nothing like actually going up there and seeing the site. I've not seen the hume site and I need to go see it.

Saltzman: I guess my work sheet I marked some of them further discussion, not necessarily with council but I need further discussion and I wrote what my questions were.

Katz: That's fine. That's fine.

Saltzman: And our homework.

Katz: Anybody else? Okay. We'll have a work session then on november 14th. Staff will develop background materials on the sites for the council's review prior to the discussion and then deliberations on the 14th.

*****: They're for going back into other neighborhoods again?

Katz: No, sweetie, we went through them already. We went through them.

Weidlich: May I finish, please? I want to hand this out.

Katz: Which ones do you want to talk about?

Weidlich: I want to talk about rowhousing next to the west hills christian school. I have a letter in the resent post.

Katz: You don't want rowhouses, is that right?

Weidlich: I want to read my letter.

Weidlich: To the editor, this is in the --

Katz: I'm going to give you a minute because you did use your three minutes, louise.

Weidlich: This is on a different site.

Katz: I know. But --.

Weidlich: The southwest community plan is back again. There has been some compromises made but density is still there which should change the way of life for our whole neighborhood. Rowhousing is being considered that will change the quiet beauty of our neighborhood. One of the

OCTOBER 17, 2001

streets to be converted to rowhousing is moss street. A narrow street right across of for the west hills christian school. In talking to people there the school has ground from about 15 students to 440 students since they built a large addition. We understand that approximately 200 cars come by morning and evening to pick up their children. In asking what time to put about future expansion the principal, mr. Hassle, said the city would not allow it because of much traffic. Of too much traffic. What about adding rowhousing to the already heavy traffic? We must fight for the liveability of our neighborhoods. As this happens there will be more crime, more noise, and more destruction of the natural landscape. Subsidized public housing will add to our property taxes and higher rents.

Katz: Okay.

*******:** Express your opposition to city council hearing.

Katz: Okay. Thank you. Oregonians in action has a ballot measure coming up in the spring.

Katz: Louise -- louise -- time's up.

Weidlich: Thank you for allowing me to say that much. And I will give you copies of my --

Katz: Thank you. All right.

*******:** I want to know, this may not be the place and I didn't ask you how have you been feeling?

Katz: No, sir this is not the place. But thank you for asking. Thank you. Limited public testimony then will be allowed on november 14th. And we're just going to have to play it by ear how much and on where. And that really will depend -- give to it karla, louise. That really will depend on the council and the questions that council is asking and some decisions that the council's making. We'll have to be flexible on that. We'll have testimony on the sites where proposals were made tonight. And not on anything else. Correct?

Johnson: The sites where there are new proposals tonight that you have -- that haven't been considered.

Katz: Right. The ones in the blank spaces. And we'll -- all right. So let's make sure that we don't repeat ourselves. I guess that's it. So marie still has a little bit of work to do. We have a little bit of work to do. And we'll see each other on november 14th, and we stand adjourned until tomorrow when we have the west end proposal, not quite finished yet but getting there, 2 o'clock.

At 10:00 p.m., Council recessed.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

OCTOBER 18, 2001 2:00 PM

* * * [Gavel pounding]

Katz: Good afternoon, everybody. The council will come to order. Karla, please call the role.

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

Katz: I'm present. We have a full agenda for this afternoon.

Items No. 1248, 1249 and 1250.

Katz: Okay. Let me share with you what we're going to do. We're going to bring Gill and Graham up here to show with us where they finally landed. We will hear testimony on the action items, but we aren't going to act on them today, because I would like to make sure that the council is aware of what we actually are going to adopt. So we'll wait for that in the final package. And I think the council might be ready to adopt the recommendations of the planning commission for the southern part of the west end, and I think you're recommending that we do that as well. So why don't you come up, forward, and let's talk through where you finally landed and we'll open it up for public testimony on those issues. And then we'll have public testimony on the action chart and then we'll have public testimony, if there is any, on the zoning changes of the southern end. Okay? All right, come on up, then. And then we'll set a date where you'll come back with actual language, a code language, and then we'll have another hearing, hopefully we won't have too much testimony, since we're going to probably deal with it today, but we'll have another hearing, and then we'll finally put this one to rest and begin working on the west end. Okay.

Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning (BOP): Thank you. Gill Kelley, planning bureau. I'm going to be very brief here, and then Graham is actually going to walk you through a little more detail on the proposal. I wanted to just cover two or three things real quickly. First of all, as you'll recall the hearing back this summer we did a couple of things in the interim to craft the proposal that's in front of you. I would remind you that that proposal is an alternative to the proposal that was advanced by the planning commission. We took your guidance from the summer to try to craft something that incorporated the best parts of the planning commission proposal, but also gave more flexibility to creating a mixed use district in the area. We also heard a lot of debate on the housing preservation issues at that same hearing, and Wayman Winston will get more into those in his piece coming up. But we did convene a group of housing providers and advocates and others, business interests in the downtown, to just get some clarity on a couple of things. Let me just give you sort of the punch lines that came out of our housing decisions, which Wayman participated in the last one on. First of all, we did get agreement from everybody about what the numbers of at-risk units are in the west end, and the various levels of affordability. I think that was important to just get everybody on the same page. So I think we achieved that, and Wayman will be able to go into that in his presentation. The second piece of what we tried to do was get some rough idea of what the cost of protecting those units would be over time. And as compared to the roughly 23 million that would be theoretically available in current tax increment financing in the two remaining downtown districts. That's about 23 or \$24 million. The scale of the problem ultimately might be as much as twice that amount. That was simply to acknowledge that we needed some way to create a longer-term housing strategy that could open up the toolbox to a wider set of financial instruments that PDC and others could use to address the overall problem of those units being at risk. And basically the punch line there is we really needed a different approach than we have thought about so far, and that we really needed some group to have a dedicated focus on that. I know Commissioner Sten has been working hard to sort of create that kind of focused group. And I should mention that Wayman came in in our last session to talk about the housing, and I think delivered a proposal which does open that whole discussion up, and reach wide and try to get a bunch of -- a fresh look at a bunch

OCTOBER 18, 2001

of new tools, and I think his proposal was received with what this group at least called cautious optimism. And so I think there's a -- kind of a fresh beginning there, way to look at ways other than simply zoning and existing known dollars to help address that problem. Of the existing affordable housing units at risk. On the zoning part of the equation, keeping those units at no further risk was a key point that you pointed out in your hearings last summer, and we took that into the heart of crafting a new proposal. And the app participants included held that as one of the tenets of the scheme that graham will outline in a moment. The other objectives we focused on in creating this zoning alternative were the following. I mentioned putting no further risk through the zoning practice on existing housing units. Creating a truly mixed use district was another principle we tried to incorporate. That would in cases allow stand-alone commercial buildings. We tried an infill scale, so really given to quarter-block, half-block, and even smaller development. No particular incentives toward raising whole blocks and creating single use developments. At the full block scale. Creating a requirement to sort of have a neighborly character to even the commercial buildings. For example, have ground floor active use requirements and limiting the amount of parking on the ground floor, and also motivating some sense of scale of retail spaces for startup businesses and so forth. Another principal was to keep an eye toward preserving the west end as a neighborhood, and so that as new develop happens there are different preferences in the zoning scheme given to creating new residential units, which we imagine would be for the most part market rate, adding to the existing affordable housing base there. And a way to monitor on a whole category of sites that were actual were actually doing well and achieving new residential as part of the mix. And finally, I think another principal guiding this work was to try to, through this combination of things, motivate redevelopment of the district. Something, I think, we'd all like to see through an infill strategy. Really getting the right combination of tools here that would set the stage at least for redeveloping the district. In a way that continues it as a neighborhood, but makes it much more vital than it is now. And that leads to the third point, which is that we'd like to reinforce the notion, which is in your resolutions that, that we carry this forward, once settling the zoning, to the next step, which is really involving the city and stakeholders in creating a more specific development strategy for that future, particularly for the key catalyst investments in the district that would spark that redevelopment.

Francesconi: We didn't give you enough objectives to accomplish in one part of the city. [laughter]

Kelley: Yeah. So we tried doing all of those things. And I think the development strategy piece we'd like to continue to look at to get the right sort of boundaries and scope of that effort, but that would be a follow-up to this effort. So I wanted to turn it over to graham. And he's going to again sort of explain what actions are actually in front of you today that we'd like to act on you, and then those that will follow in a subsequent meeting.

Katz: Act on today meaning give you a verbal approval, because we're not going to be voting on anything today.

Kelley: Yes. Unless you're prepared to vote on the south of salmon.

Katz: The south of salmon?

*****: Yes.

Katz: You want us to do that today?

*****: I think that would be helpful.

Katz: All right. I guess 1248, did you want us to act on that as well?

*****: Yes.

Katz: Okay. Then we'll hold off 1249.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

*****: Yes.

Katz: Okay. And you want us to act on 1251, 1252, and 1253? Yes?

*****: Yes.

Katz: So everything except the action chart, okay. All right.

Graham Clark, BOP: And mayor, you've actually stolen my thunder. I've got all that on my first power play point slide here. Graham Clark, Bureau of Planning. How do I switch that -- yeah, there we go. So there's a whole bunch of fine print here. It's been that kind of a project, but what I wanted to do with this first slide is describe for you, first of all, the two resolutions and the ordinance that were offered in the middle of June, and then those, and the new ones that are offered today for your consideration. So first off, on June 21st we came in with the two resolutions and ordinances that Karla already mentioned. The first was to adopt the planning commission recommendation, the zoning code and map changes. We are not asking for your action on that one today. The second one, the resolution to adopt the action chart, as you just said mayor, that's correct, we're not looking for your action on that one today either. On a-3, that resolution where PDC, we are asking for your consideration and potential action on that today. The first thing I should say about that is the first thing I said four months ago on this one, the office of management and finance should always have been in that resolution. I've got a substitute resolution that incorporates them in the title.

Katz: This is 1248?

*****: That is 1248, that's correct.

Katz: Okay. So we need to do a substitute. Okay.

*****: That's correct. I've got the substitute resolution in front of me here.

Katz: All right.

*****: That's a very simple one. The items today before you is, first of all, the ordinance. I think Karla, was that 1251? Either way, it's one of those 1250s. This adopts the planning commission's recommendation south of Salmon for the most part, with a couple of key ingredients missing, and those are the ingredients that would sort of --

Katz: It's 1250.

Moore: 1252 and 1253.

Katz: And 1253.

*****: Thank you. What the south of Salmon ordinance does, then, is moving the planning commission's recommendation south of Salmon, minus those couple of kind of confusing elements that would otherwise cloud the picture. So some of them were proposed with the whole district in mind. What we're proposing is that you adopt the planning commission's recommendation for floor area ratio changes. And for some new floor area bonus options. And the reason we're doing this is, first of all, because it's half the district. It's half of the district that there's been very little concern expressed about, and there are a number of residential projects that are waiting in the wings, looking for a little more floor area ratio to go ahead and build. At least one of them is sort of a vertically subsidized residential project that we feel meets the planning commission's goals for the district.

Katz: And you have substitute language on that?

*****: I do have the substitute language, correct.

Katz: Okay.

*****: So the second one here under October 18th, it's the b-2 resolution there. Let's direct us planning staff to finalize the code language and et cetera for the north of Salmon piece that I'm going to describe in a couple of minutes here. That third one is adding OMF to the original

OCTOBER 18, 2001

resolution. And then the fourth one, i'd just like to raise the issue for you of four amendment requests that probably create ballot measure 56 notice issues for us. We're going to need to send a ballot measure 56 notice if council is interested in considering the extension of the newly adopted telco requirements that now apply north of burnside into the west end. There are a couple of provisions or amendment requests that have to do with parking. If they were extended or adopted for the west end or considered for the west end that creates a measure 56 notice issue. And there's another one, too, that I can think of --

*****: An implication of that would be the scheduling of the next hearing.

*****: Yes. So if council can let me know if this is your intent then I know what to put in that measure 56 notice, and either way we can get that done before the next hearing is tentatively scheduled for november 21st. Finally I thought i'd talk about november 21st briefly. We will introduce a new ordinance that substitutes for the original ordinance that moves the planning commission recommendation forward. So what it would do is say, you've dealt with most of south of salmon, here's what's left, let's move that forward as well. The second thing for november 21st, then, would be the resolution that adopts the action charts --

Katz: Let me correct that. It will be a substitute to the planning commission's recommendations.

Clark: Correct, yes. Yes, that's correct. And then the second item there would be adopt the action chart resolution as it was written after you've deliberated on the amendment request for action chart amendments, et cetera.

Katz: Right.

Clark: Okay? Sorry about all that confusion, but I felt I had to lay it out there. Okay. So gill described the proposal that we've developed for north of salmon, west of 11th. And he mentioned a number of elements, and I just thought i'd reiterate them before I jump in here and show you a map and go through the details of the proposal. The three elements that I wanted to highlight here are first off it preserves the central residential zone as the base zone in this approximately 15 blocks at the northwest corner of the west end. Second, it implements an infill strategy, which virtually all participants in the project have said are the right -- is the right thing to do. Third, it limits pressure on existing residential properties. Gill mentioned that, and that's certainly true. The method, then, that this alternative regulatory proposal uses, in these 15 blocks, there are really three categories that are considered within this method. The first off is underdeveloped sites. And within the proposal we've described underdeveloped sites as those with less than 1« to 1 f.a.r. For the most part this is single-story buildings. There are a couple of buildings that may have mezzanines within that would bump them over 1 to 1. So we went to 1.5 to 1 for f.a.r. The second is existing residential buildings. And the third is existing buildings in nonresidential use. So those are the three broad categories. I've got a map here that then describes what we're talking about. In the red we've got the sites that qualify as underdeveloped, given a 1.5 to 1 f.a.r. Limit. In the light blue we've got existing residential properties. And then all other properties within this area are considered existing nonresidential. And if you look at the breakdown of those, it's about -- it's almost a third, as underdeveloped properties. It's about a fifth as existing residential properties. And then the bulk, just over half, are nonresidential properties with buildings on them that are more than 1« to 1. I'm going to have a couple of -- i'm going to have a separate slide that describes what we're talking for each of these categories. For the underdeveloped sites, first off we propose to map each of these sites. We're looking to sort of set those sites in stone as of october 1st, 2001, and have that map not open to amendments. The reason we're looking to do that is that we're not looking to encourage disinvestment and demolition of properties in the west end. With our desire to create an infill strategy, we want to create infill on sites that today are underdeveloped. We don't

OCTOBER 18, 2001

want to open it up, you know, more broadly than that. The second item is that we're proposing a minimum floor ratio of 2 to 1. There have been concerns expressed throughout the west end hearings process that creating a whole lot more opportunity or flexibility on some of these sites, we may end up just with smallish buildings that don't really meet the potential of the district. So the minimum f.a.r. Is intended to avoid that. Third, on these underdeveloped sites, many of the commercial use categories would be allowed outright. Those allowed uses are retail sales and service, an office, and then also some institutional uses would be allowed outright on these properties. Commercial parking would retain its conditional use status. Today it's a conditional use status both in the rx and cx zone. The conditional use for commercial parking is the central city parking review. Third and fourth here, we're looking to have a differential development potential for residential uses as compared to commercial uses. So that was described three weeks before you, and I just want to get it in writing here. What we're talking about as 150 feet as a maximum feet for a commercial building with a 6 to 1 f.a.r. Base, in that area today, and bonusable to 9 to 1, the same as today. For residential uses, anything that has residential -- well, buildings may go above 150 feet if they have residential above 150 feet, and that is exclusively residential. So if you have residential above 150 feet, you can go as high as 250 feet. And there's today a provision where you can seek height bonuses that would allow you another 75 atop that. So 325. 9 to 1 would be the f.a.r. Base for these properties with residential above 150. And that f.a.r. Could be bonused as high as 12 to 1. So this has all been described in kind of a front and back page handout, but I just wanted to get it in the power play point so I could to it. So that second category, about 18% of the sites in this area, those are sites in residential use. We would also map them as of october 1st, 2001, we have very good data that the Portland development commission has gathered over a period of time, and we would use that as the baseline data for this map. We would expect the rx base zone to govern existing development and additions in this area. In case of demolition, again, the rx base zone could apply, or if residential units are replaced elsewhere -- and this is in the number of units and their affordability status -- elsewhere in the central city, then there is more flexibility for what can be built on that site. So the -- the developer who's looking to demolish and replace would first have to go through this conditional use -- wait, i'm sorry, i've jumped ahead here. Never mind. Retail sales and services for some institutional uses may replace these buildings. The third option is to go through a conditional use process. If it's approved before demolition, redevelopment may include those uses that I just described, however there's going to be a very high bar for being allowed to do this. The first bar is going to be, does it contribute to the neighborhood character? And that neighborhood character is going to be defined as the policy that council adopts for the west end. It's going to have a fair degree of sort of mixed use terminology. And it's also going to look at is the district developing as a residential and commercial area. In other words, if you're looking to build a commercial building, are you not -- are you knocking the district out of or into skew. Are you skewing the district and sort of minimizing its mixed use character. So the concept is there you may go after a conditional use process. If you gain the conditional use by showing that you are contributing to the neighborhood's mixed use character and you're not knocking the district into skew, then you may build those 100% commercial office or institutional buildings. Third, for the sites that are nonresidential use, this is about half of the properties in this area, first off this category includes all the sites that are not underdeveloped on that map and are not in residential use. So I just wanted to make that clear. The second is that the rx base zone again would govern existing development and additions. However, existing retail sales and service and office would become conforming uses. So this is a change. Today those uses are governed by the nonconforming use statuses. Third, in case of demolition, again, the existing rx

OCTOBER 18, 2001

zone base provisions apply, or there may be a conditional use applied for, and it would again be meeting the district character as described in the west end policy. So that's a whole lot of detail. I thought I had to go there. There are just a couple of other provisions that have been described. First off, with parking, there's an amendment to the central city management plan provisions. It would allow preservation parking. If you're building new spaces within a structure in the rx zone, you would be allowed to lease those across the street potentially if you're on 11th avenue to tenants or buildings across the street. Today if you're looking to build a parking structure and use preservation parking, which requires those long-term leases, you can't do it across the zoning line between rx and cx. This merely removes that barrier. And fourth, the ground floor conversions of existing structures, throughout the west end's rx zone, so this is 3/4 of the west end -- other than 3/4 of the west end it is rx. Frontages of existing buildings may convert ground floor space to residential -- i'm sorry -- to retail sales and service uses. The idea here is that there are some buildings that are two stories, maybe three stories, throughout the west end, that may be appropriate for retail sales and service, who knows, restaurant, other walkup kinds of retail uses, where that conversion could be allowed without requiring the residential that otherwise would be required as a refurbishment project. So those are all the details of the proposal. I want to stress that there is work to be done on the conditional use criteria. And there are a couple of other items still to be wrapped up that will be ready for you. I think we've got a tentative date for november 21st. We'll be back here with all that detail in specific code language on that date. This is the map that the planning commission recommended. The map actually doesn't change with this proposal. There may be -- well, i'm going to leave it at that. So the boundaries of the zoning that are -- that the planning commission recommended do not change with this proposal that's before you. Anything I missed in.

Kelley: Well, there was one provision, graham, that we talked about which has to do with should we see a full block development in the west end on either of those categories of parcels, which are now underdeveloped or are developed in commercial use, but for which a demolition could occur in a new project occur. If those occur at the full block scale, there would be a requirement to do 50/50 mixed use. At least 50% residential. Again, there that's a rule designed around keeping a mixed use character in the district. So we wouldn't outright prevent full block development, but we would mandate a mix of uses on that parcel. I should say, a lot of what graham described was sort of in the lines of what we want to prohibit and what we don't to see happen. I would sort of say that I think the -- the idea here is to actually engender a truly mixed use district that still functions like a neighborhood, but has a whole mix of things going on. And I think that this zoning template will allow that to happen. We certainly paid attention to protecting existing housing, gave some flexibility, and real focus on those sites that were now not contributing at all, the underdeveloped sites, to be redeveloped. And that middle category of buildings, which graham said is about half of the building inventory there, is now commercial, in commercial use, but is more than 1.5 to 1 f.a.r. Those we envision largely will remain for some period of time, but they may become uneconomic in the future. There we've said simply that we could go to either commercial or residential use, but the conditional use process would require a finding that whatever that proposal is at that point in time contributes to the sense of the west end as a neighborhood. And the crafting of that language is one of the key tasks in front of us in returning to you on the 21st, because I think the notion there is we want to make sure that as the -- as the redevelopment of those sites, which are now economically viable, but may not be in the future, occurs, that they are continuing to contribute to the sense of this as a neighborhood and not eroding from that character. I think that's a critical provision that we will be crafting the words of in the zoning code.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Katz: Thank you. Questions by council? All right.

*****: No questions, that's good.

Katz: Not yet. There will be probably later. And when had did you want -- did you want to talk to us a little bit about the south end? Or you'll give that to us a little later.

*****: What's your preference?

*****: Yeah, we should probably cover that.

Clark: Why don't we cover it now. In the south end we've got an ordinance before you that -- that moves the planning commission's changes to the base floor area ratio number. And also adds new bonuses that are specifically crafted, really, to allow residential development to proceed. The bonuses in the central city plan district today are based mainly on commercial development. So these bonuses are described or created to allow residential development. That is the bulk of the changes south of salmon that the planning commission recommends. We do -- the reason that we're proposing a change to the ordinance that was filed last thursday is because there were a couple of provisions that shouldn't have been in there. The planning commission had looked to change the structure of the rx zone and sort of remove it from the rx base zone and put it in the central city plan district as it applies to the west end. So were you to adopt that in an ordinance today it would create complications for what we'll be asking you to think about on november 21st, because rx also applies north of salmon. So we're asking that that be lifted out of the ordinance. As we see it, there is not a substantive change. It's not a change of intent or policy. It's more sort of a mechanism, mechanics kind of change. I want to be clear on what in the planning commission's ordinance is not in today's ordinance. First of all, it has no policy action chart or urban design map changes to the central city plan. Today's ordinance does not designate the west end sub-area. We're talking about doing that on november 21st. It does not decrease the maximum building heights north of salmon. So it's just -- it's kind of the functional things north of salmon that have removed out of this ordinance. There's one other critical thing in the ordinance today, and that is that we're asking that it have an effective date of january 1st, 2002. The reason for that is because we'd like the regulations for the whole west end to go into effect at the same time. Even though we're considering them in two separate ordinances or two separate days, january 1st, 2001 allows us to have all the policy language in place before the zoning code and map changes go into effect. So that's kind of the quick summary.

Saltzman: The new bonuses are in addition to existing bonuses?

Clark: Correct. There are ten bonuses today. These are another five proposed.

Katz: All right. Do we have the substitute language?

*****: Yes.

Katz: All right, everybody has them. Have you distributed them? Okay. This is not an emergency, so we'll move on to second for a vote, but I will ask for the introduction of the substitute language. This is for south of -- the south end of the west end. Let's do it now.

Saltzman: Okay. I'd move to substitute.

Francesconi: Second.

Katz: Any objection? Hearing none, so ordered. [gavel pounding] so good, people will be able to testify on this as well.

*****: So when you invite speakers to testify, they'll be testifying on this, and on the zoning proposal for --

Katz: They'll be able to testify on everything that's in front of us.

*****: Okay.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Katz: At least at this moment, which is the concepts you just identified for the north end, the substitute for the south end, the action charts.

*******:** Okay. But not the no net loss policy? You're doing that as I separate hearing following this?

Katz: I'm going to do that following.

*******:** I think there are people who want to address both points today.

Francesconi: Let's knock it off in one shot.

Katz: Do you want to do that?

Sten: We may have to take separate, because it's a lot for three minutes.

Katz: Let's take it separately.

Sten: If they want to address it in three minutes, they can.

Katz: Okay.

*******:** You would like us to return for questions you have after the testimony on these pieces.

Katz: For testimony.

*******:** Is there a reason for --

Katz: Let's add the language. I'll take a motion to add the language to include the office of management and finance in 1248. Do I hear --

Saltzman: So moved.

Francesconi: Second.

Katz: Do I hear objections? Hearing none, okay. [gavel pounding] this is just for an analysis to implement the west end. All right. We'll get through it. Okay. Since you came up late last time, why don't I extend the courtesies for you to come up first.

*******:** Thank you very much. I'm going to be very brief.

Katz: Why don't you grab a mic.

Greg Goodman, Co-Chair, West End Steering Committee: My name is greg goodman, co-chair, along with michael pal on the west end steering committee. My purpose up here today is quite frankly to tell you how impressed i've been with the working relationship that we've been able to have with the planning bureau and the housing advocates. And I think what's come before you today is a great compromise, but I actually don't even really call it a compromise. I call it something that's going to be very, very positive for the area, for downtown and for our community.

And gill, graham, michael, barbara, the list goes on. Were instrumental, and I shouldn't leave out steve siegel, who did a -- was fabulous in this process too. So I think a great deal has been accomplished. At the same time the devil's in the details. And i'm not concerned by that at all.

And I think with the relationship that we have, that it's going to be easy to get to something that's very, very positive, not get to something, pardon me, we're already there. I don't look for any difficulties. Very, very few issues that are still outstanding, probably may be with the exception of one, and I say maybe with the exception of one, we agree on it, it's just how do we get there, and so i'd just like to compliment the process. I'd like to compliment those of you who have been involved and everybody's input. So that the it.

Katz: Okay.

*******:** Thanks.

Katz: Thank you. All right, karla.

Brent Dorig: My name is brent dorig. I'm a student at Portland state university. I want to reiterate that the city of Portland preserve the burnside triangle, the affordable housing in the area and small businesses in the area. I am in full support of the action items presented. Also, just wanted to compliment the Portland development commission and other businesses in the area that

OCTOBER 18, 2001

are already taking the initiative to do street improvements as far as the facades of buildings. That's all I really have to say.

Katz: Thank you.

*****: You're welcome.

Katz: Go ahead, sir.

Rich Kibbons: I'm rich kibbons. Thank you for hearing me. Today I represent myself only in speaking to the city council concerning the burnside triangle. The queer-friendly businesses in this area have developed over a great number of years, providing entertainment, social gatherings, and some shopping. They need to continue and in their present locations. The city council has expressed concern that the queer community has not come forward in open support of the burnside triangle continuing its presence. Perhaps that's because many of us do not see ourselves as a minority group. I certainly don't. I've said that if the queer community has to develop a minority status to continue to participate, then maybe we should recognize ourselves as a minority. The issues you are considering today indeed foster additional -- indeed foster additional open support from our community, as well as provide constructive direction for future development. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Norm Costa: My name is norm costa. Mayor Katz, I want to thank you and the city councilmen for the proposed changes. I have seen since the last meeting. By the establishment of the burnside triangle advisory committee will assure our community a voice of the culturally sensitive area. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Jacob Brostoff: Thank you, mayor Katz. Other commissioners. I live at 831 southwest vista --

Katz: This is about your third visit here, right?

Brostoff: That's right. I'm becoming a regular.

Katz: Yeah, you're a regular.

Brostoff: I live at 831 southwest vista, apartment 104, Portland, 97205. I'll make this very brief. I've written my comments in more detail. I want to be clear that for this Portlander is home to many of the things that I cherish about living here, including diversity, affordable housing and thriving small businesses in the midst of a central city that is very lively. I'm here today to urge you to protect the west end's current residents, small business owners and patrons from the pressures of gentrification and displacement. I think you received a letter from the coalition of -- that talked about that, and the challenges that those forces bring to our city. I also want to express my support for some of the proposed action items that commissioner Saltzman has discussed to strengthen the small businesses, found throughout the west end, and to recognize and celebrate the special importance that the burnside triangle holds for Portland's sexual minorities. And I think the process is a lot farther along than when the planning commission began to consider proposals a year ago from staff and the west end steering committee. I think other stakeholders have made their voices heard, but I think there's still a lot to be done, especially in the implementation. As mr. Goodman said the devil is in the details. So on that note I think the first priority from my perspective is to assure that existing affordable housing is preserved and that more is created in the central city and specifically in the west end, especially given we're very short of our own goals for providing affordable housing for folks who can't afford the rents in the Portland. We certainly can't afford to lose what's there, so we need to build more and preserve what we have. Secondly, it's important to ensure that tomorrow's west end, like today's, provides a place for new and established small businesses to grow and thrive. The council can help do this by preserving the existable

OCTOBER 18, 2001

affordable small storefronts that small businesses inhabit in the district. There are tools available to you specifically, the way that you regulate development potential that can help do that. In addition some of the proposed action items talk about creating funds to support small business expansion, retention, recruitment and property ownership. And I think those are important tools to help insulate the existing viable small businesses in the west end and the triangle from the forces of commercial displacement. Finally I want to express my support for the concept of an advisory group made up of stakeholders in the burnside triangle. I think that could play a very important role in helping ensure that the implementation of the west end plan includes the sexual minority stakeholders that are there today. And recognizes the important -- the historic importance of the district to Portland's sexual minority community. This is a great city and I think it's partly a great city because its residents care a lot about its stewardship and I urge the council to give the residents, small business owners and patrons of the west end the tools they need to continue that stewardship tradition in a neighborhood that's moving into a changing and uncertain future. Thank you very much. I appreciate your time and your consideration.

Katz: Thank you. Karla?

Katz: Go ahead, sir. You may. Go ahead.

Ian Slingerland: Mayor Katz and commissioners, my name it's ian slingerland. I'm presenting testimony today on behalf of the community alliance of tenants, grassroots tenant control membership organization. In june I also provided testimony on behalf of the community alliance of tenants regarding the west end. And in that testimony we said city council should adopt no policy changes regarding the west end tonight. And there should be no intervention in the west end until the clear preservation plan that guarantees no net loss of affordable housing can be adopted as condition of west end policy changes. We ask this season again. In that testimony we also asked that a realistic preservation plan be developed that includes funding and regulatory strategies that place more of the burden of preservation and placement on the shoulders of those who will benefit from increasing rights in the west end. We ask that again. It appears council is preparing to move forward with proposals for the west end that give significant new development potential to some property owners without a preservation plan in place and without asking those property owners to bear some of the burden of preservational replacement. Council did pass a no net loss policy for the central city and significant work has done to develop strategies that could be used to implement a meaningful no net policy and today you're considering a resolution directing pdc to develop a no net loss funding plan. This is encourage, but nothing is in place. We should city council should adopt no policy changes in the west end today until a clear preservation plan that guarantees no net loss of affordable housing can be adopted as condition of west end policy changes. Further the city should build on the existing housing and require significantly fees for all new commercial development allowed by right on underdeveloped sites and through conditional use agreements where existing buildings are demolished. The west end as it exists today is a many wonderful neighborhood. There are many advantages for elderly, disabled, and low-income renters. Grocery stores and shopping are within walking distance. Light rail and fareless square make it affordable and convenient to get around. The west end houses more medical and social services the residents use and the wonderful downtown public library is within easy reach of homes in the areas. Planning efforts should build on these assets for existing residents. The city should not move toward with the development and revitalization efforts prior to implementing a preservation plan. Preserving affordable housing and protecting residents from displacement should be central, not secondary to plans for development of the west end. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Kerri Smith: Hi. My name is Kerri smith. I live at 7327 kellogg street. I work as a housing specialist for a shelter in old town with works to engage clients with mental illness. Our goal is to find permanent housing for clients and services that they will be continuing to require to address their mental health units. Services like 12th avenue clinic on 12th and stark. Currently this facility houses another housing project and another program. Many clients live within a two-block radius of that clinic in places like Washington plaza, the rosenbaum, the joyce and kent, and many others reside in the boundaries of the west end. I'm here to express my concern for this vulnerable population who have finally settled after addressing issues of psychiatric symptoms, criminal background, poor rental history, drug and alcohol issues, to name a few. I'm asking that you seriously consider some of the policy and tools that the bureau of planning has presented to help protect existing housing that -- and the properties mentioned earlier from conversion to other uses. Having said that, I believe that the funding strategies and goals should be clarified and set to reaffirm the no net loss guarantee that you and commissioners, and mayor, wisely committed to last month. For the clients I know living in the west end now, this guarantee is a critical piece. I believe that if we go forward with any type of commercial development in the west end, the parties who build should be held accountable to assist with our new no loss policy. There should be significant linkage fees for all new development being allowed in the west end and we should make use of any and all other tools we have identified to leverage funds to preserve and build affordable housing at zero to 30 f.m.i. Thank you.

Francesconi: Can I ask you a couple quick questions about your clients or the tenants?

Smith: Sure.

Francesconi: What percentage, roughly, are working?

Smith: Umm, less than 5.

Francesconi: Okay. Thanks.

Irwin Mandel: Good afternoon, mayor Katz, members of the council, miss moore. Irwin mandel, 1511 southwest park avenue. I'd like to return to the issue of parking. Surprise. At the last go-round on this session, I brought up the issue that I suggested about an additional bonus for -- for transferring undedicated general parking to sub surface parking lots. At the time -- sub service parking beneath the buildings. At the time commissioner Hales seems to have thought that was a good idea and wanted it included. It does seem to have disappeared from this latest recommendation. I'm curious why. It still seems like a rental idea to me, that a bonus for those people who develop their service parking lots, not to lose an income stream from the undedicated general parking that they have and permit them to transfer these -- some, if not all -- of the undedicated general parking to a subsurface use beneath the buildings built on the lots. It's not in here anywhere. One other comment. We were reassured, my wife and I were reassured last time, that the pc -- cctmp -- those initials get you -- cctmp protected us from wanton building of parking structures. I'm afraid the past history that I remember too well just says that this isn't true. I think both mayor Katz and commissioner Hales remember the days long and hours long hearing we had over a 12-story, 500-stall parking structure that was due to be built on block five. There were five million reasons why it didn't get built, but nevertheless this was all under the aegis of the cctmp. Nor has it prevented a ten-story parking -- or nine-story parking garage acting as a podium for a hotel on taylor now. My view of the cctmp is as a great document. There's only one thing wrong with it there's a little too much flexibility involved in the document for it to really preserve anything. Thank you. Any questions? I'd really like to have an answer, whoever, what happened.

Katz: We'll get one for you.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

*****: Okay, thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Francesconi: Were you setting up your wife's testimony with that last -- [laughter]

*****: I wasn't even going to bother. I really think --

Katz: Identify yourself.

Lili Mandel: Lili mandel, 1511 southwest park avenue. Let's have some guts and really have a vision and a plan. And I have a suggestion, if anybody has the guts to do it, is to not allow surface parking lots to exist anymore. I think they're up every five years. Does anybody have the guts to get rid of these things? They're awful. There's no reason for them. And then if you don't do that, then you're going to continue to allow parking structures in the west end. I would like to see buildings for people, not for cars. I cannot see doing this at all. And if we continue this way, this is really not going to end up being wonderful. It's bad now that we have all these surface parking lots. It's a mistake. It shouldn't be there. Now, instead, we'll have parking structures. I don't see this as going to produce a lively, wonderful, neighborhood. I think it is going to be a blight. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. We'll have graham or gill come back and talk to us. I remember the conversation that the mandels had with regard to parking, the parking structures, and the limits within today's code, which is -- you mumbled something about that, graham, today, but you didn't cover -- I don't think you covered the issue that mr. Mandel raised.

Katz: That's all who signed up for these. Anybody else want to testify on this? Okay, gill and graham, come up. Let's deal with the parking issue right now.

*****: Go for it.

Clark: Gill lobbed that one to me. The parking issue -- mr. Mandel's concept, if I can explain it, and if i've got it right, is that parking spaces that are on surface parking lots today, if they're undedicated general status, they are the most flexible, the most profitable types of spaces. Under requirements today, you build on that surface parking lot, your rights to that status go away. And if you want to get those spaces back you build them as preservation parking spaces. Those that have long-term leases to other surrounding buildings or tenants. Mr. Mandel's concept was that you could retain those rights to the undedicated general spaces if you built them beneath a redeveloped surface parking lot, a building on a redeveloped surface parking lot. And -- am I hearing you? Is that correct? Yes. I thought he might do this. [laughter] I think that the concept could provide -- and this is the way mr. Mandel put it too -- could provide a revenue stream for the redeveloped surface parking lot buildings. I think there's merit in that. My understanding is that it creates sort of policy questions within the cctmp. The goal has been to limit the number of spaces in the cctmp. This would not do that. On the other hand, neither does the planning commission recommendation, which talks about consolidation. So should council wish us to go forth and figure something out based on this concept, I think it's doable. I think it requires some time between pdot staff and the bureau of planning staff. I think it could be incorporated. Does that answer the question?

Katz: All right.

Hales: The question is what to incorporate?

Clark: Well, the way I have understood it, really it's a bonus space program. It's not a bonus floor area program. It is, instead, the spaces that you would otherwise lose to this pool that anybody can pull from are instead you retain those rights and you put them under your building.

Hales: That's one way to do it. The other way would be an f.a.r. Bonus. Your analysis talks about that.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Clark: What we've found about that bonus, and we've got a bonus in there for 2 to 1 underground parking, we don't believe that closes the fiscal gap between above ground or below ground. It may get there and sort of works at the margin as many other things can do, but nothing sort of some cold, hard cash appears to really close that margin.

Hales: Right, right. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't head that direction. I guess one of the things i'm troubled by is, you know, we're talking about a very small area here. And, you know, I guess we ought to think about, talk about, what kind of distortions we might create if we have either really tough policy or really permissive policy.

*****: Uh-huh.

Hales: And there's one little postage stamp of the central city and you can build buildings like the new hilton in the rest of the central city. I don't know if that's a good idea or not. I mean, i'm not a fan of that architectural type either, but we now allow that. You know, the ground floor retail, x layers of parking, and then the real building, whether it's office or housing or hotel on top of that. I don't know if we're requiring people to wrap those parking structures in glass, as they did on the 1000 broadway building or the hilton. I'm not sure if we're requiring that or they're just doing that.

But the effect is a little less obnoxious than a ground-level retail and then vacant window building above it, the traditional parking structure. But it's still a little problematical -- stop it, you two -- it's still a little problematical compared to the life -- a building that's really alive on every floor and has parking underneath it, like the fox tower. If we could figure out how to get every single new building to adopt the solution to the fox tower adopted, I suspect there's nobody that would be unhappy about that. But I can't figure out yet whether they can get there by any combination of incentives and regulations, but I want to hear about that.

*****: Right.

Hales: By the way, we should not assume that we're going to get at all this in the quote, unquote, update of the cctmp. I don't think we're going to do an update --

Katz: I was going to ask you that.

Hales: We ought to fix whatever code needs to be fixed when we have the code book open, like we now do here. As i've mentioned, i'm going to separately propose, for example, getting rid of the parking minimums in the code. We're going to do just that by ordinance, consider that by ordinance. We need to chunk this down and take on the salient issues rather than waiting for, you know, the gigantic planning project, whatever it is, the southwest community plan being another example, or, you know, or the cctmp update to solve all these problems. It takes too long. Everybody forgets where we started by the time we get to the end. And 25 buildings get built that we don't like while we're talking about what we want. So, you know, I think we should take this question on here. And frankly, if you, gill, and pdot say there's a solution, it's a combination of those incentives and those disincentives, let's not just adopt it for the west end, let's adopt it for the central city while we're at it.

Kelley: That's helpful to know. Thank you, commissioner Hales, because we've been sort of been operating on the notion that the cctmp would be coming up, and that's sort of been our advice from pdot and others, so we just sort of left a lot of questions. If that's changing, then that opens up -- I still think would like direction today. That would be helpful.

Francesconi: The idea of approaching it from the central city was my initial reaction, what commissioner Hales said. Given this economy, would we're going to have time before new buildings are built, but if we're going to do it do it in a broader arena. But if we're going to make a decision now, there's a person in the audience who actually does this for a living. If we're going to hear this, I guess we need to open that up a little bit.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

*****: It would be certainly subject to the hearing on the 21st, but --

Katz: We've got really nothing yet. What i'd like for both gill and graham to think about is what commissioner Hales recommended. I too would like to see something broader than just the west end. See what you bring in.

*****: Okay.

Katz: Then we'll have testimony on that and what other people think. That will give --

Hales: Are we talking separate on the 21st.

Katz: No.

Kelley: I'm not clear we could devise a new program, notice the central city in time for the 21st.

Francesconi: Let's get this over with. Let's get this done. This is an important issue. It should be done -- let's not tie it to this. That now I do have feelings.

Katz: What?

Hales: What are you saying? I'm sorry.

Francesconi: This is a bigger issue. That could open up a whole can of worms.

Hales: Of course it will, but let's try something and make a decision.

Katz: I've made a decision. Bring some ideas back for the west end, because then you won't need to do the notification and delay it further. Let's have that conversation. If the council feels comfortable with it for the west end, then we can extend it to the entire central city.

Hales: Right.

*****: Okay.

Katz: Is that --

Hales: But again, you know, i'm concerned -- I mean, my first reaction to the -- mr. Mandel's suggestion or both of their suggestions is great idea. Trouble is, again, we're talking about a district where not much has happened in the biggest real estate boom in living memory. And if we load it up with a lot of extra regulations, my prediction will be not much will happen there either in the next ten years, but buildings that we don't like will continue getting built around it in the rest of the central city. So that's why i'm inclined, mayor, and I think you are too, towards if we find a way, with a combination of thou shalt nots and here you go, here's an incentive, but you can't do that anymore, we find a combination that's got a chance of working in the marketplace and causing more people to build fox tower type buildings, then let's try it for a while.

*****: Right.

Hales: And not just in the west end. But I fear that there isn't than any such combination that will work in the marketplace right now. And we could either shut down development in the west end or shut down development in the whole central city. I'm not in favor of either of those outcomes. This is a sticky one. It's a difficult problem.

Kelley: Why don't we give you a progress report on the 21st. What we can't do is craft a whole new proposal and notice the central city in time for that.

Katz: Right, okay.

Hales: You don't have an idea to notice them about.

*****: Exactly.

Katz: Any questions of staff? Any for them to take a look at other than this one?

Hales: I'm interested in talking about the 1.5 to 1 versus 2 to 1 trigger, because there aren't very many 1<-story buildings in the central city.

Kelley: We were sort of aiming at the one-story buildings that might have a mezzanine in part of them. Might be a tall one-story.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Hales: Is there any such building? I don't know. There's certainly poor two-story buildings that we want to encourage redevelopment on those sites.

*****: Right.

Hales: So why are we being --

Kelley: Two-story buildings, I guess, occupy 2/3 of their site area would also qualify for this, but I think there are many two-story buildings we thought were actually contributing buildings in the area, wouldn't necessarily want to throw those into the -- since we've got a fair inventory of lots and sites already in that first category. But we could certainly look at that. How many others we'd be bringing in, I just don't have a sense of what the number is.

Hales: We ought to look, get a rough guesstimate of what it really means. You know, there's a project up the street where somebody's tearing down a pretty mediocre three or four-story office building in order to build a mixed use project on the west end.

*****: Right. Okay.

Hales: Granted with a lot of help from us, but they're doing it nevertheless.

*****: Right.

Katz: Anything else?

Sten: I'm glad to look at it. I think you've got it more right now. I mean, i'm less inclined when nothing's happening to put more buildings on the block. I'd like to push it into the places where clearly it's empty, or one-story. So i'm skeptical on that, but I don't have any problem looking at it.

Hales: Let's look at it.

Sten: Yeah.

Kelley: Unless there are other questions on the zoning piece, I just wanted to come back to the tie-in to housing, because a number of the speakers made that linkage again. It has the preservation of existing housing has clearly been linked through this discussion. We have done, I think, a reasonable job of that in terms of the zoning as far as it goes. Again, I think that the -- what wayman winston has done, he'll talk about this later --

Katz: Yeah.

Kelley: -- is very good in terms of broadening the tool kit. One of the exciting ideas there is to make seismic loans available to residential buildings as well as to commercial, and I think that policy alone could have a great effect. My only message here is that I think these two could be consistent, as with this proposal, the devil is in the detail. We've come a long way in the details of that. The details of the housing preservation strategy are going to need to be worked out over a period of months here, but I think what you're hearing from the two pieces today is consistent, and that was a fear early on that these were not really meshed together. I think wayman's just -- will put a lot of fresh air into the discussion.

Katz: We'll get to that in a minute. I'm going to ask if a vote now. On 1248, which directs the bureau of planning, pdc, to undertake an analysis of tax increment and financing tools and the potential creation of a new urban renewal area. Is the council ready?

Hales: What else are we going to vote on then?

Katz: We're going to vote on 1248, 1250, 1251. We're going to vote on 1252. And 1253. All right. Let's take --

Saltzman: Just 1248 now?

Katz: Just 1248 now. Roll call.

Francesconi: I'm just going to make brief comments, not going to cover all of them. Then if I forgot something i'll add it on the other ones. The main thing I want to say is my objective at least

OCTOBER 18, 2001

going into this west end were three. Gill, you listed more, but I had three. One is how do we preserve affordable housing. Two is how do we do good planning, which to me meant preserving that as primarily residential, but more mixed use, but we need a solid residential core to support the downtown community in my view, the business community. That was important. The third is how do we have something that actually happens so it doesn't sit there vacant. Those were the three objectives for me. I think we were presented a situation where nobody's fault, but we were pitting - - and in some situations it is unavoidable all the way through -- we were pitting affordable housing versus good planning, or we were pitting affordable housing versus the development, or we were pitting good planning versus the development. Now I think we're getting to the point -- we are at the point that we have a plan for a truly mixed income neighborhood that will preserve the affordable housing, because I do believe zoning has an impact on land prices, even though it's not - - and future land prices. And we can do it in a way that -- where it will actually happen. And so this has my unqualified support. It does for another reason. And that is this maybe the first time, at least since i've been a city commissioner, that i've been a little frightened for what's happening out in the city, from economic forces, which will have the most dramatic impact on our most vulnerable citizens. For us as a city to address this we're going to have some relationships where we have not had them before. So what I like the best about this, frankly, is that you have emerged from it, we need strong planning, with some more ability to do tougher things. I also appreciate the fact that we have a downtown business community, under leadership of commissioner Sten, that is forming more relationships with the affordable housing advocates, who truly understand that there's not enough money in the current system to provide the tools necessary to truly make housing affordable for -- not only for poor folks, but for working folks. So it's going to take those kinds of relationships for us to hang on to what we've got, let alone include more people into it.

*****: Uh-huh.

Francesconi: And so this was important for that reason. It's also important that we can move this off and move on to more difficult challenges that will threaten those relationships. But this is a good beginning. Aye.

Hales: Aye.

Saltzman: I just wanted to add that while i'm supporting the feasibilities, including the creation of a new urban renewal district, I have also expressed my concerns earlier that i'm going to be very concerned about how big that urban renewal district may be. I don't want it to be too big. I want to be judicious, smart, and not a grandiose district, because we are talking about highest value property in the city of Portland and that money right now goes to our general fund. Aye.

Sten: I'm very excited. You know, technically we're voting on the -- moving forward on a development strategy, and i've been wanting to get to a development strategy for a very long time. We couldn't get to it until we got through the zoning exercise. I just wanted to -- all of these are wrapped together, which is actually appropriate because I think we have to have the right zoning, money to execute it, and then we have to have partnerships between groups that I think have talked to each other and respected each other, but not really quite collaboratively related in the way you get stuff down. I think that's where we're headed right now. You have to have a different degree of collaboration to actually accomplish things as opposed to hearing each other. I think we're getting closer. You know, obviously this area has not developed, probably hit just more general comments and not do it on each vote, has not developed much in the last few years, and that has a good side because there's a lot of good unique buildings and special places and types of businesses that haven't thrived, and so the trick has been how can we preserve the old which makes it great with the new that I think is really needed in a lot of fronts. I think we've really hit the right balance. I

OCTOBER 18, 2001

think greg goodman had it right, that it isn't a compromise so much as we rethought a few things, because the dilemma I found myself is I do tend to like mixed use areas. I think having different types of uses right next to each other is more vibrant. I also think we need a very residential end of downtown, but I find, you know, kind of the south end of the district needs a little more pizzazz, where it is mostly residential. So I think there's a way to make this really something vibrant. The problem that I found myself in, and many of us did in June, trying to do one thing often came at the cost of the other. And there was a lot of fear if we allowed more mixed income, mixed use kind of development, it would take out the lower price housing, lower price commercial spaces. While there's no guarantee on any of these, I think we actually have a scheme now that really would lead one to believe that the two can be done together and the way that we've got the new alternative zoning I think really makes a distinction between properties that are already developed in a use that people would like to stay and property that ought to be developed. That distinction was what I think was really lacking. It seems very, very simple in retrospect, but I think that distinction was what was lacking in the earlier fight. I think we're really there now. I want to economy meant all of the people that worked on this. It's the whole room. So I won't try and name flails, but I think this was an effort in which people worked very, very hard. I don't think we would have had a bad result earlier, but I think we have a much result now. It's a great pleasure to vote aye.

Katz: I'll save my comments for the final vote on the entire package. Aye. All right. I need a motion or if no objections to bring 1249 back, then for what date?

*****: November 21st.

Katz: November 21st.

Francesconi: So moved.

Katz: Do I hear a second?

Saltzman: Second.

Katz: Any objections? Hearing none. [gavel pounding] 1250. Roll call. Wait a minute, this goes to second. This is an ordinance.

Hales: They can all come back at once, can't they?

Katz: Let's jump to 1252. 1252 is direct the bureau of planning to prepare an ordinance with zoning code language that implements an alternative regulatory proposals for the portion north, is what you heard.

*****: Right.

Katz: Included in that will be the discussion on the parking, which you'll bring back as well.

*****: Right.

Katz: All right. This is a resolution. Roll call.

Francesconi: The only thing I wanted to add is that my word of thanks, not only to the staff, but also to the participants, to kind of sit down with each other and hammer this thing out. Aye.

Hales: Aye.

Saltzman: Well, this is really sort of the nucleus of the discussions over the last, well, almost six months, so I want to say that it's very pleasing to me to see that we've come from a position of polarity, I think as graham referred to it, to what appears to be a strong consensus, and I attribute not only gill and the planning bureau, but the appb, housing advocates, and others who were able to sit down and have very worthwhile conversations. I think we've arrived at a point that will make this area change and is going to make a change in the type of area that we want it to be. Aye.

Sten: Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounding] 1253 moves to second reading. And now we are --

*****: We're at 1254.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Katz: What? Yeah, we're ready now for 1251.

*****: 1251.

Item No. 1251.

Katz: What you're going to hear is a wonderful example of how we resolve some policy disagreements that are -- that can be resolved. And it takes a lot of patience and it takes the ability for people to give-and-take. And I want to extend my thanks to commissioner Sten and wayman who was new on the job, like gill, comes in at a time when we deal with some very difficult issues, and he and commissioner Sten and some others got to closure on this issue and we're very pleased to bring this before the council. I want to turn this over to commissioner Sten now.

Sten: Thanks, mayor Katz. I'll be brief, but I just wanted to -- I think most people know this, but just share a little bit of background. Obviously the real heart-wrenching issue has been how do we preserve the affordable housing. And ultimately the goal, we've set a goal that this council has passed a policy of no net loss of affordable housing units in the central city. That's a floor.

Obviously as we build more and more units to do mixed income projects, to do things for people of all incomes. Our goal in the river district is to mirror the city as a whole. We've been reaching it actually. I would envision a future that we have more units of all income levels, including low income downtown. Unfortunately, over the last 10-20 years, particularly the last ten years have focused on when we as a community have been very focused on affordable housing, we've still lost units. I think we should aspire to more than a no net policy, but we should at least get there. That was the intention of the policy. By most people's estimation it's going to take somewhere in the range, to give a sense, 40 to \$50 million to preserve the affordable housing in the west end. That member a high number. You have to look at what it would really take if you were going to step out and do it. That's not a number anybody has. And so the fear has become, well, if we do things in the west end that speed up development, do we speed up the erosion of affordable housing? Those are tricky questions. I think the instinctive answer is yes. I think it's mostly true, but again we've lost a lot of housing in the city. From my point of view is we have to proactively save the housing and build new housing to replace that which we can't save. As important as zoning questions are, and I think we got the zoning as close to right as we could today, they're a secondary issue as compared to actually stepping up and doing the work. I appreciate mayor Katz's help. She's being modest. She made sure we compromised in a way that actually didn't compromise, solve the problem was the goal, rather than to compromise. What happened is when you're up against that kind of need, we had about \$20 million still due in the two downtown urban renewal districts, and there was a huge debate about how to spend that money. There's need to do mixed income, middle income, there's a lot of debate which things should be subsidized, but at the end of the day you cannot, even if we got all of the money, save the affordable housing. So I was really pushing to say let's put more money in the next five years into preservation. I still believe, and I don't think it's counter to what we're saying today, that that is the top priority, because once we lose it it costs three or four times as much to replace it. We have to recognize that. So anybody who stands for a mixed income agenda has got to recognize that we've got to save what we have if you ever want to get to a mixed income agenda, because you'll either have just a high end where you lose what you've already got or you will have to spend all the money that you put into mixed income replacing those units. That was really the urgency of me pushing on the five-year plan. Wayman came back to me, and I want to compliment him, and it's not a sure thing, but the way you get things done is with new partnerships, and I think that's what this is, with the idea of let's expand our scope a little bit, let's look at the whole central city, and in essence what this resolution says, based on wayman's leadership and chairman bradley was here from the development commission, I think

OCTOBER 18, 2001

he left, but he was also very helpful on this, was to say about pdc will commit to preserving and/or replacing 1200 units in the central city over the next five years. That's compares to about 400 that we could have done with the existing budget, and about 800 that could have been done with the higher budget number that I would have put forward. There's no magic way to do this, but I think the commitment is to find money in other urban renewal districts, to team in some innovative fashions, and wayman has come up with ideas with the housing authority to direct work. An also to be much more market savvy, by not just focusing in on one building at a time and push will price up, to really work the whole central city in a systemic fashion. We're going to propose the reinstatement of a partnership that existed a few years ago. We used to have a downtown housing reservation partnership that I think met quarterly. It was representatives of the chamber of commerce at that time, the housing authority, pdc, and I think the pilot project who got together to look really on almost a -- you know, task force basis each quarter on what are the buildings at risk, what can we do to save them. I think if we reinstated that on a central city basis and brought a little bit of the consistency and discipline and collaboration that would bring. Again, a task force won't do this, but the process will. And so wayman said if you'll take me up on the -- I will commit to figuring out a way to do 1200 units over the next five years if you'll get your hands off my budget. [laughter] and I said -- he didn't quite say it that way, but I understand --

Katz: No. That's too nice.

Sten: I said I think that's a fair deal. So what i'm proposing at this point, in partnership, and after wayman leaves, i've invited a couple of people to introduce to fill in the blanks, because they're partners we'll absolutely have to have on this, is that we take a look at this whole picture, the commitment is to come back in january with a specific tragedy to reach 1200 units, which is three times more than we were shooting to get, and these are 1200 units in addition to what's already programmed with the exception of the 400 units in the west end, that counts toward this, but it isn't counting other units we already budgeting for and saying okay, we did it. By january, and show people what we will do. To the extent that budgets need to be adopted or not -- adjusted, we can do that during the regular budget process. So i'm very pleased to do it. It's an ambitious goal, and here's our leader, wayman winston.

Wayman Winston, Director of Housing, Portland Development Commission: Thank you, commissioner Sten. My name is wayman winston. I'm the director of housing at the Portland development commission.

Katz: This is your first -- is this your first --

Winston: Yes, ma'am. Be gentle.

Katz: Umm. [laughter]

Winston: Yes, this is my first time and I hope will not be my last time before this ardent body. Before I go on, my chairman did have to leave. Marty brantley. I promised him that I would read his comments. They are brief and I will segue way in the comments that I have on the resolution. If my chairman was here, what he would say is today we'll be talking about the west end and downtown housing. Housing is a big part of the discussion of both zoning and a development strategy. And it's made us readdress housing in the west end and downtown. He was here to reassure the council that pdc is committed to a housing strategy that maximizes opportunities for both our low income and middle income citizens. And that pdc, the council, and our partners, we ask that you adopt the no net loss resolution and the goals that it describes. We should and will develop a consensus for all housing in the downtown and utilize our best efforts to establish housing in all parts of both the downtown and the central city. Pdc's goal is no net loss of low income housing, but we realize that we cannot do it by ourselves, that we need the cooperation, in

OCTOBER 18, 2001

fact a collaboration, of both our sister bureaus, our both public and private partners, to accomplish this major task. And as we work together, I know there will be some concerns about some of the specifics, but mr. Winston is here to indicate that we are committed to the goals that's been laid out by the city leadership and to work in a unified way to ultimately achieve the goals that's been described in the resolution. Those were the comments of my chairman. I have to give you kind of a preamble to no net loss. I've been in the city of Portland now for 58 days. It is a very unique and special american city. So many councils, so many mayors, would jump at the opportunity for development if the cost was low income people. That is clearly not the way things are done here in the city of Portland. The no net loss funding collaboration and the resolution are brought -- I brought forward to you today is really the progeny of the no net loss implementation tragedy that that basically had three primary goals. It described that the scale of the problem, it indicated that the scale of the problem was too large for any individual party in that it would be a challenge for all the parties working together. It suggested a menu of tools that were available. We simply took those tools and used it as a play book to begin to build a strategy that would effectively increase the number of low income unit that would be preserved and replace between now -- replaced between now and 2006. In proposing a no net loss funding collaboration, it started on a very important premise in building partnerships. And that is, is that the city of Portland had to agree on what resources that it was prepared to bring forward to address this issue. And it began with pdc's commitment of resources in its downtown housing implementation strategy. We've broadened that by -- at our october meeting, revising the seismic loan program as gill kelly described, that would allow us to look at additional nondowntown housing implementation resources that would be available to assist and focus on the large number of unreinforced masonry buildings that are also historically and architecturally significant that are currently under-utilized because they do not meet the city's earthquake guidelines. So to the extent we have an opportunity to have an incentive that would allow these buildings that are currently built, that exist downtown, are under-utilized, we believe it provides a great opportunity for both low income and middle income housing, and it complements the efforts presented by our colleagues in planning. The second part of the collaboration is for the city to focus and have a focus that we then can go to both the state and county and federal government and ask them for their assistance. There's been quite a bit of discussion around the need for low income housing. Pdc has simply tried to take a leadership role of putting the focus on implementing no net loss as soon as humanly possible, and that's to defined in the resolution by having a finalized plan by the end of this calendar year, by coming back by the spring of '02 with an updated inventory with the purpose of that inventory of allowing us to gauge how successful we are and understand the dynamic of the marketplace and to the extent we find facts that suggest that there are changes in the marketplace that we need to respond to, it would allow the commission the opportunity to amend the downtown plan to reflect those facts. We're suggesting this on a 12-month basis, that we would again update and take the polls of both the west end, downtown, and central city neighborhoods to determine what's going on with both low and moderate and market rate housing, and to use those annual calibrations as a way to adjust the plan. So as we talk about flexibility in the proposal, the flexibility is the they acknowledge that while we're here talking, we live in a society that's extremely dynamic and things do change, and that we need to have the ability that if 12, 18, 28, 48, 60 months from now, if things in fact have changed in many of the neighborhoods around housing we would have the ability to calibrate and adjust and respond to those changes. The plan is based again on the premise of starting with the 3 to 400 units that pdc is committing. A formal proposal to the housing authority of Portland. A formal proposal to the bureau of housing and community development. And what that proposal -- with that

OCTOBER 18, 2001

proposal completed and some agreement on how the city of Portland would address no net loss funding, the collaboration would then move on and make similar requests to both the state and county. It is a major task that we're undertaking here. We basically took the decision that it was far better to take a leadership role of trying to advance as best we could what I would describe as tactical no net loss. I just say tactical because in our society where sellers can choose to sell or not sell, we wanted to have the ability that in any given 12-month period, that if properties become available and that there are opportunities to either preserve or replace, that we would be able to accomplish that task. And I think i'll stop there and answer any questions that the mayor or the council might have. Again, thank you.

Katz: Questions of wayman?

Francesconi: Wayman, I have two questions. I'm going to save my compliments to you for closing. Which you deserve. The two questions are -- on the funding collaboration, and then the next steps, you know, I see the role for the public sector, and it's terrific how it's organized. I don't -- it's not clear to me what the role of the private sector is in terms of contributing to the solution. So that's a general question that you can respond to. As part of that, the issue of linkage fees. Where does that fit in this discussion?

Winston: On the first question, pdc simply began with saying that the city of Portland needed to make a commitment and to use that as a basis of proposing and soliciting others to join us. The private sector, the investment community, the banking community, is a critical part of accomplishing these tasks. Our goal was to send a clear message on the focus that's reflected in this resolution as the leverage in beginning those discussions with the private sector, both the for-profit part of the private sector as well as the nonprofit part of the private sector. Under question of linkage fees, the proposal is silent. It is primarily a funding proposal based upon reaching a goal of 1200 units. Decisions that i've made in the regulatory arena that would complement or add additional units would be something that would have to be determined by you and the commissioner of housing and others that have that interest. The proposal is silent on that and focuses primarily upon assembling the resources for preservation.

Francesconi: Has that been an effective strategy in there's a question as to timing. And now with this economy may not be the time, but has that been an effective strategy in other cities? For getting money for affordable housing.

Winston: Yes, but it's also a -- quite frankly a tactical -- it was my opinion that if we attempted to try to bring a collaboration with multiple issues, with multiple agendas, that have different forces at work, financing, funding, subsidy, regulation, we'd simply be biting off more than we could chew. It is my hope that by having an agreement on initiating the funding, it provides an environment where the parties will come together and say that if we can do it on the funding, certainly we can determine ways in which this would be incentives in the regulatory arena also.

Francesconi: Okay. Then my last question -- you have a sentence in here -- "need aggressive resolution of site assembly and site control issues." I think that might mean -- does that mean condemnation?

Winston: Yes.

Francesconi: Okay. And one of the concerns i've had here lately, and others have had, many others, is sometimes we're driving up the price of land in different neighborhood business districts and in the central city with our own purchasing of property, which makes it -- we've talked about zoning's impact on housing, land prices, housing. Sometimes it's our own activity that's doing that. Can you explain a little bit about how that works and why you think condemnation may be something we need to consider?

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Winston: Well, I want to accept the issue of bidding up and many times with the city is -- where the city is in fact responsible for inflation and prices. One way I would describe that is that if there was -- if it was communicated to the world tomorrow that all of the downtown housing was going to go into the west end, the result in my opinion would be that sellers would read that as I should get more money because there's more money there, and I think that's human nature. And so that to have a strategy that provides the opportunity to address preservation both in the west end, downtown, and central city, provides some opportunities that we can try to not hurt ourselves by aggressively being almost the primary player in some of the markets on a block-by-block basis. A number of cities, quite frankly, have not taken on this task. That is what I would describe as development without displacement. Two months ago, "nightline" had a program on the issue of gentrification. And I heard mayor after mayor fundamentally say if the price of attracting middle class families is the loss of poor people, I'll take that decision any day.

Katz: Which mayors were those?

Winston: Umm, detroit and atlanta. And there are other cities I could name that in fact very similar decisions and behaviors exist. That is those leaders there have concluded, in the competition for attracting middle class families and taxpayers, that they're prepared to throw to the economic wolves the least of our brothers and sisters, and I think this city, even with those who may criticize the actions that one takes, in fact is quite different than many, many major cities. That is the very things that you've talked about, of saying we're going to have development and we're going to figure out a way to do it in a way that it does not sacrifice low income families and low income citizens from having the same opportunity to live in neighborhoods throughout the city. On the condemnation, if I may --

Katz: Yes.

Winston: -- in the discussion with some members of the council, and I think this is true for the mayor, everyone has agreed that condemnation is a viable tool. The issue has been, is that there have been conditions that would lead one to believe that to condemn the property would have to get through the eye of the needle. And what I'm suggesting is a proposal that ties -- I'm not sure what it is yet, but the idea would be to have a set of criteria that is tied to the no net loss resolution and the overall policy of trying to preserve housing in the central city. And the question will be is there a significant public purpose that the city would in fact take private property. And the question is, is the no net loss and the goals of no net loss worthy enough that in fact that tool would be an option. Again, that would be both the criteria and then individual properties would come forward would be a decision that both you and the mayor and your colleagues would have to make.

Francesconi: Well, and this is for another day, but I appreciate that answer, but I think what sometimes happens, though, is that the public, people -- nobody wants to take people's private property, frankly, for any reason, but what sometimes happens -- but there are good reasons to do it in some occasions. Okay? But what sometimes happens is property owners are actually negotiating, and it keeps driving up the price. So in effect what's happening, doesn't happen -- this is not every circumstance of condemnation, but people are profiting from the public essentially for prices beyond the market. And I think that's the issue that you're -- one of the issues you're trying to get at.

Winston: That's correct.

Katz: Further questions? Wayman, thank you very much. There may be need to bring you back in after further testimony.

Winston: Thank you.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Katz: Thank you. And graham, before I forget, we do need to talk about the ballot measure 56. I did not -- I got a little note, but just holler if I forget.

Winston: And I may -- if I may, before I leave, I also want to thank gil and his staff, steve rutman and tonya parker. Their contribution was invaluable to even contemplate this idea. And I want to thank them for their effort to giving this approach a chance. Again, thank you.

Katz: Thank you, wayman.

Sten: Mayor, I had -- mainly to answer questions, but I had steve rudman from the housing authority, whose resources are a key to this. Martha mcclendon, and tonya parker.

Katz: Okay. Come up.

Sten: And also we'll white who's been doing a lot of work on economics issue. Wayman has been working on the funding. Martha is heading up the effort that we talked about when we passed the no net loss resolution to look at regulatory tools. At this point what we really have is a whole long laundry list of possible regulatory tools. They range from linkage to inclusionary zoning to all sorts of issues. I have not personally landed on which ones I think would work, because I haven't seen how they would work yet, but the goal is to bring back a set of possible regulatory actions for the central city around the first of the year, the same as the funding strategy and the implementation strategy. I don't exactly think you trade one off against the other, but I think to the extent, you know, this has generally been my philosophy, to the extent you can save things with a market-based approach, you tend to have to do less on the regulatory side. On the other hand there's some regulatory things that make good common sense. So I would like to look at funding strategy and regulatory strategy in one -- in one hearing later in the year. So that's what martha's going to head up. Mainly we can answer questions on that. Of course the bureau and housing authority are going to have to be absolutely key partners in this reinvigoration of an old partnership rather than a new partnership.

Katz: Okay, folks. Who wants to start?

Steve Rudman, Housing Authority of Portland: Steve rutman, housing authority of Portland, 135 southwest ash. Nice to be here. Housing authority's very supportive of the resolution, the notion of creating a funding plan to ensure we can meet the no net loss goals. I think it's really important that the discussions and hearings in the past several months have shined some new light on the problems of affordable housing and preservation, although as we know these issues aren't new. The solutions are harder and harder to come by, and we do need the best thinking of all sectors, not just the public sector. But we think the collaborative spirit here is very important. It's very important. Housing authority has several tools we're currently using to, taxes and financing, tax exemption, and the use of project-based section 8s. There's about 835 of those in the central city now. We have 7,000 total in Multnomah county. Our organization is looking at allocating more project-based section 8 locally. Of course there's a balance here between the vouchers that a resident has that can go shop on the open market versus the certainty of having a place for someone to go. So it's an important issue, but clearly I believe my board would be -- would consider strongly any overtures from the city of Portland. The last thing I want to say is what's important is trying to figure out how to keep this momentum going. And this notion of a central city, what I recall, housing partnership, I think it's absolutely critical, where it's not just government, but also businesses, the nonprofit development, and service sector advocates, private sector, working together. The dhpp that eric alluded to did produce almost 8,000 units, but most of that that was through pdc tax increment financing. If we're thinking about a health I didn't, mixed income, 24-hour city, that we have a framework, a partnership where the city leads it with all the other partners to look at all tools, both the financing tools and regulatory tools, regulatory tools to one incent

OCTOBER 18, 2001

market housing, like density bonuses, even some amenities funded with tax increment to produce a viable middle income kind of community where people want to invest, as well as incentives to regulatory tools to also promote more affordable housing, such as linkage fees or condominium conversion, but the way to do that is in the context where the financing tools and regulatory tools are all in one place. I think this idea of a partnership makes a great deal of sense. I think even more important is to finally look at the central city as a whole in terms of affordable housing and not through a piecemeal approach through funding sources or tax increment districts. Perhaps willing and ready to play whatever role we can to help.

Katz: Thank you, steve.

*****: Good afternoon, mayor, commissioners.

Katz: Tonya, identify yourself for the record.

Tonya Parker, Director, Bureau of Housing and Community Development (BHCD): I'm sorry. Tonya parker, director of the bureau of housing and community development. We are very excited about this partnership as well. We see it as a great tie-in to four of our strategic directions. Mainly afford housing preservation and safety net for those in need. We're also excited that we'll be working with some other partners at the table, as many people have said earlier this is a long time coming. I think what will be produced in the short time line that we have to come back to you in january will be something that will be constructive, fruitful. I think this partnership will continue long past these five years, is my hope. But I also know that there will be some challenges and a couple hurdles. Of course there's never enough resource. So that will be a big part of the discussion. We are working again on a tight time line. And then there's more of the delicate details to be worked out, such as staffing and things like that. Nevertheless, I think this is a task that we'll tackle cooperatively with pdc and hap and look forward to it. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Martha McClennan (BHCD): Martha mcclennan here can answer some questions regarding implementation strategy. You have some background you want to give?

McClennan: Martha mcclennan. I guess we -- between pdc, the planning bureau, and the housing authority, spent a couple of months since midsummer trying to come up with an inventory of a variety of strategies and tools that could be used to further the no net loss agenda. We provided the council with a strategy report about three weeks ago and we're continuing to do now the next step of planning the implementation work and really turning some of those concepts into concrete proposals. I'd be glad to answer any questions about the strategy report if people have those since I know we haven't had a quorum to discuss those really.

Katz: Yes. I did read the report, and there are a lot of ideas, some old, some new. My only recommendation, martha, would be to flag those that you think we need state approval. I think you flagged one, but there may be others. So if you can do that, so then we know if this is the route we want to go we need to then develop a legislative package.

*****: Certainly.

Katz: Okay.

*****: Thanks.

Francesconi: I have one question. The issue of inclusionary zoning is something i've looked at pretty hard. In fact, I worked on it for a year at the regional level. We actually had it passed by the metro council. And then we withdrew it, which I personally think it was a mistake. Now my predisposition to this is something that has to be done regionally, not by one city. I'm not saying i'm absolutely locked into that, but that's my predisposition sitting here. I guess my main question is, where is this at metro? Is it on their screen at all?

OCTOBER 18, 2001

McClennan: I don't know where it is on their screen in particular. There is a state prohibition on inclusionary strategies at this point. Again, at the phase we were in preparing this report we were just looking at what are the inventory possibilities. Certainly there are strategic issues and barriers and processes that we'd have to go through if the council chose to move forward on any particular strategies. That one is a very good point.

Will White, Housing Development Center: Madame mayor, commissioners, I'm Will White, housing development center. Glad to be back before you on this issue. I wanted to talk a little bit about some of the factual background in terms of housing goals that we've been discussing. I'll try to be brief in doing so. I think we all agree that the goal that we have for the central city is a mixed income community, housing for people at all income levels. The background that I've prepared some charts to, that you have before you, is based on data and time frames developed by the Portland development commission. And I just wanted to bring that to your attention, because there has been a theme lately that I've heard that the downtown is becoming home only to the very rich and the very poor. And that there is a woeful lack of housing for people at middle incomes. I don't believe that stands up to scrutiny, and I want to explain to you why that is. So the first chart that you can see here shows, again, based on the pdc data, the percentage of housing units in the downtown -- and again, I'd call to your attention that this study is -- does not include the river district, the Pearl, Goose Hollow, it's just the area that you can see here identified as downtown and the university district. So it's bounded by the Willamette River, Burnside, and 405. So as you can see, 17.5% of all existing housing stock is available to the middle income group, between 81 and 120% of median income. The city as a whole, and city council, has adopted trying to match the income profile of the city as a whole as a goal for all our urban renewal districts. 20% of the population in the city as a whole is in that income area. So the gap is, to me, a very small 2.5%. So I wanted to start by putting that forward. That's all existing housing stock.

Francesconi: Will, I don't want to interrupt this, but does that mean 80% are either rich or poor? I find that hard to believe, that only 20% of our residents are middle income.

White: Well, are in the 81 to 120% range. That's, again, a --

Francesconi: Oh, I'm sorry.

White: You could say 120 to 150 is also certainly middle income.

Katz: What's the -- what's the new median --

White: About 56,000.

McClennan: For a family of four.

Katz: For 120?

McClennan: No. That's 100% of median family of four is about 56,000.

Katz: Okay.

White: So this is the income level that brackets that. A little bit below it, a little bit above it. If we look instead -- this is all housing. Some of it might be 100 years old. Some of it is 18 months old. If we look at what's happened recently, we can see whether we're losing that middle income housing. Thank you. And according to the 15-year period examined by pdc's housing inventory, if you look here, this is all income levels of housing built for rental tenancy in the downtown area between 1985 and 2000. In fact, the housing built between 81 and 120% of median is the largest of all those categories. And just to compare that again, if you can turn one more chart, Martha, the -- as a percentage of the city's population, again, on the right you see the blue bar, 20% of the city's population is in that income level, but 42% of the units built downtown since 1985 serve people with those incomes. And then just because we are enlarging our view to look at the central city as a whole, and I want to commend Wayman in his proposal in doing so, as well as other

OCTOBER 18, 2001

commissioner Sten and others in supporting this enlarging of the city to not just look at subregions, if we step across burnside, with something of an artificial boundary, and look at what's happened in the last six or seven years in the river district, you can again see that the areas where there hasn't been so much downtown, the 121 to 150 and over 150% of median, as you all know just from walking and driving around the city and reading the newspaper has really taken off in the river district. And so as we look at the city as a whole, I think indeed we're doing a good job of achieving a broad mix of incomes. I don't see that there is a crater in the middle or a woeful lack of middle income housing. And I hope we continue to move forward on all fronts. It seems to me the question is what is the public role? Naturally the market will develop most of what's built at the high end. And our task is to see how we can achieve this 1200-unit goal over the next five years, which will certainly require substantial public subsidy.

Katz: Thank you.

*****: Thank you very much.

Katz: Questions? Thank you. Anybody want to testify, karla?

Moore: We have martin brantley, ralph austin and susan emmons.

*****: Go ahead. Marty left.

*****: Okay.

Moore: That's all.

Katz: That's it. Anybody else want to testify? Come on up, tom. All right, susan, why don't you start.

*****: I was going to let ralph go first.

Katz: Whatever.

Ralph Austin, CDN: My testimony is actually quite brief today. Hi. My name is ralph austin, 2724 northeast 39th, here representing cdn, as well as innovative housing, the organization that I work for. And the focus of my testimony today is really -- is the no net loss resolution. I like the language in the resolution. I commend commissioner Sten and commissioner Saltzman for teaming up on that. But I did want to comment on the money attached to that. I know that during the last several months there's been discussions of funding, ranging from 10 to 23 million of the urban renewal money. I've been working with will a little bit in scrutinizing some numbers, thinking that he's done on the global level, and commissioner Sten mentioned those global numbers today, which I agree with, and I just wanted to allude that if you really -- if you're really serious about the 1200-unit goal, that it's hard for me to imagine not tapping into that existing \$23 million, roughly, in urban renewal money. I think we're probably going to have a gap -- we do have an existing gap, and when we do have that 23 million in there, and I appreciate wayman's work that he's done on trying to figure out other strategies and partnerships to get to the goal, but I just wanted to mention that that existing funding that is there, the 23 million, I think is going to be critical to getting to the 1200 units. Just wanted to bring that to your attention.

Francesconi: Let me ask ralph one question.

Katz: Go ahead.

Francesconi: Do you think there's something particular about wayman's strategy that's not realistic?

Austin: I think it's too early to judge that right now. I don't want to be a wet blanket on any good idea. But I think that if all the -- of wayman's strategies and the things that people have collaborated with him on do come to fruition, I still think you need that money in there to make the all work.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Sten: Let me just say very briefly, is that when both commissioner Saltzman and I were pushing on the issue of the 23 million, as I analyzed that money, I -- I believe very, very strongly, which is where wayman and I started, that we can reach the middle income goals outlined downtown strategy without expending \$13 million. I'm having fun with this, but i'm very conservative compared to the liberals at app who want to put government money into things that I think the market can do. I still believe that. I believe we can get to those numbers. What wayman has really said to me is let's step back and do the work, figure out what the money needs, and then look at the budgets accordingly. And I think there's going to be -- you know, I think that's what we all need to do, because as some of will's numbers show, there's a lot of beliefs, myself included, about what the housing stock is, how much it needs to be subsidized. An it tends to be driven by position. I think as we look at it, you know, I would take the position that how we fund it isn't off the table. I'm not saying, you know, we shouldn't spend any more of the money that's targeted to one place to another place, but let's step back. The goal is the 1200 units. I embrace the goal of -- I forget the exact number -- of middle income units there in the west end, and let's figure out how to spend the money effectively to get both done. The number of middle income units proposed in the west end is the right number. It's an ambitious number. What I thought was really wrong was the 400 units proposed in low income wasn't ambitious enough for me. If it was too low that number then I felt you have to fight about money. Now we have goals I think appropriate in both ranges. Let's reconfigure the budgets and figure out how to do it is really what I would say. I don't think those questions are off the table as much, is that now we have to step back and figure it out.

Susan Emmons, Northwest Pilot Project: I'm susan emmons, director the northwest pilot project, 1430 southwest broadway. I'd like to just start by thanking gil kelley, barbara sack and graham for being very patient in explaining f.a.r. And all that zoning language. I am confident with the compromise that's come up with that we're going to get the protections we're looking for housing for very low income people this the west end. Have spent quite a number of hours with wayman in the last week on this proposal. And what he suggested to me in coming to us in his 58 days is that he's really looking to establish trust with the community of those who advocate for very low income people. As he pointed out to me yesterday he's an advocate, he's a housing advocate too. People in the business community have said, you know, you don't have the market on being a housing advocate. Ted gilbert is a housing advocate. So there are many of us out there, but some of us are very, very pointed on the very low income and feel that we need to protect them. And I guess along this issue of trust, i'd just like to say I just started my 17th year at the northwest pilot project, and wayman will be the sixth director of housing at pdc that i've worked with, and that includes sam, randy, neil hunter, michelle haines, rudy, all very good people, skilled, well-intentioned. After thinking about this hard, there isn't a lot of definition in this proposal. We have to take a leap of faith here to be involved with this. It isn't flushed without. I agree with greg goodman in the devil is in the details. But I would like to say publicly today that I am going to give wayman a fair shot at this. I think that we need to support him. I think we do need to establish trust. And I think that we also need to talk about accountability. I like his idea of broadening the area to the central city rather than just concentrating on the west end. Housing developers and others have really taught me that when we go after very limited properties we do get into trouble and we do raise up the price. And I think if we're looking at truly a no net loss and we have a broader area to look at, it's going to be easier for them to be successful with this. I would say that we accept pdc's commitment that there will be no double commitment. I think that's very important. We want assurances that resources won't be taken away from the neighborhoods, because in the years of dhpp there was criticism that we funneled money downtown at the expense

OCTOBER 18, 2001

of the neighborhoods and family housing. So I think that's something very important to look at. And one of the things we didn't hear yesterday -- would you mind taking that?

*****: Sure.

Austin: -- was just a breakdown. What are we looking in terms of production targets for income level? And since we didn't have a clear answer, and I know this is early in the process, I thought i'd just come forward today and make a proposal to wayman and others of what we think would be responsive, not only to what he suggested, what's in the central city currently, but tie it to need. And what you'll see attached to this, the very first page attached, is a page out of our consolidated plan. And again, what i've said in the past is, and i'll say it again, every community has to do a consolidated plan to get federal funds. Whether you do a great plan or a mediocre plan, you're probably going to get the same for your jurisdiction. We always do a fantastic plan in Portland. It doesn't affect our money. But again, we do this plan and it does affect our block grant money and how we spend it, but then we seem to put it on a shelf, and then we go over here with tax increment and never trot this out. I've done a briefing of the pdc commissioners, but I don't know how engaged or how much people understand where this really critical deficit is, and it's in the 0-30% category. Again, the other pages just show you how do you break down median income. I might just say that this is for a single person. So martha, mcclendon, again, can give you those family rates. I think that it's almost incomprehensible to many people that people could have such low incomes, but in fact those are the people we're seeing in our lobby. I think the other thing that's frightening me right now is we're not seeing some of the more characteristic people exclusively, we're having people come into our lobby for our services that are laid off, employees of freightliner, for instance. I mean, we're really seeing a new group of people who are struggling with their rents and facing eviction. So I think this is a bold goal. I support it. I would really like to see a lot of accountability, and wayman's promised this, quarterly reports. You know, not just coming up with a vision, but really coming in, reporting back. I don't want to be involved in a lot of meetings. I just want to know, you know, how are we doing against that goal? And I think that's very important. And again, i'd just like to close by saying, you know, one of the things that I really love about Portland, and I moved here from chicago in 1965, is not just the way the city is now, but the potential for what the city can become. I think that we're always in the process of building a city, and I think we can do things in Portland that haven't been done in any other city in the country. I know wayman agrees. And I know you know I like the novelty items, but this is something I wanted to give to wayman publicly. I'm sorry I don't have one for each of you, but I think again in our discussion yesterday he said city council, we really need to be clear about priorities, and I said, well, yeah what if city council's very clear about priorities? And that isn't a bit of conflict with the priorities of the pdc commissioners, and clearly it's going to be tough. He's given himself a very tough assignment. Wayman, could you just come up here for a minute? I just want to present this to you. This is -- I hope this works. Oh, yeah. I thought we really should give one to every city council member, but -- [laughter] it's like follow the money, and the resources. I mean, you can actually pass it around. It will only take quarters. [laughter] best of luck, because I think you've set yourself a huge task.

*****: Thank you for the money too.

*****: And I promise to support you and help you in any way I can.

Katz: Sure. [laughter]

Saltzman: Money in, money out. How's it come out?

*****: Actually, there is a way. Probably one your children could figure it out better than me.

Hales: Yes, that's true.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Saltzman: Thank you. Tom?

Tom O'keefe: Tom o'keefe. I too am little disappointed over the last ten years where a loss of housing has taken place, we've seen from the federal court house building go up, and so forth. And to me they still owe money on that. I'm not sure if -- you know, I like the goals. My main concern is low income and moderate income. We hear middle income. To me that's up this quite a ways when you're talking 80 to 120,000 to a family of four. I'm not sure if tax abatements are part of this project, or capital improvement. Tax exemptions. They used to call it. But i've always had concerns about that. If you start using that with developers, and it's not used, because the city uses different guidelines compared to the federal government. And as an example, several years back pdc and the city council worked together to give riverplace condominiums a tax exemption for ten years. That cost taxpayers \$2.7 million over ten years. It cost the city coffers \$1.5 million. The rest of the money would have gone into schools and so forth. Out of that 190 units that they were building, you only required them to put in ten units for low income and medium income residents. And those units, the studios of those units, they were calculating the rents out using a formula for two people in those units, which would have rented at that time was 495, or 428, which I pointed out to them, they could only be calculated if a one-person unit, and they reduced those rents down to 356. Now, those units that tax exemption, that was given to them, will come off line here shortly in another couple, three years. But so will those units come off line. They will no longer be rented, if they still are. And i'm questioning that those units are still available to low income and medium income. I think pdc needs to take an inventory of these tax abatements given to developers over the last ten years to see if those units are even still available to those income levels and i'm willing to bet several are not. Because i've looked at it myself. So when those units -- after the ten years, those units will not be available to low and medium income anymore. And so that will reduce the number. And those units will be rented at a higher rent increase. So for the ten-year tax exemption you gave them, which cost millions of dollars, not only to the city, but to the schools, in the long run you're reducing the number of housing available to low, medium and moderate income people. And so I have a concern, when it comes to tax abatements. Also the city guidelines -- and that was 5% you only required, less than 5%, out of 190 units you required them to put in ten units. That's less than 5%. Federal guidelines to receive tax exemptions, you have to put in 20% of your units. Now, I have a red code lately -- read code lately but code for the city required 10%. I would like you to look at moving that number up to where the federal government has, and to use the same formulas when it comes to calculating rents. And so after ten years, after using these tax abatements, which are problems, I don't have a problem with them, as long as they're being used reasonably, and -- the public is getting their money back, and after the ten years, we don't see a reduction in those housings, and those recently units are going to go sky high. Thanks.

Katz: Thank you. Anybody else? All right. If not, we'll take a roll call on 1251.

Francesconi: Just a couple things. One on an item I forgot earlier. Gill, this is more for you. On the development strategy on the west end, it's the point you -- you don't need to come up. It's the point that jacob and others made. You know, I do -- it is important, as you know, that the gay and lesbian community be included in the development strategy. I don't know what the committee are. For my own experience, creating these separate groups does a disservice to the minority community and the majority community, because then there isn't that exchange that needs to happen if we're really going to be the kind of inclusive place we need to be. So the idea of a separate committee i'm less interested in, unless you really tell me that's the best approach. But an intentional strategy that they're included goes without saying. Okay. The only points to make on

OCTOBER 18, 2001

this, I really like the central city focus. And I don't -- and I think you should stay with that. But the point that Susan made, the connections to the neighborhoods and how does this relate overall? I mean, the central city is really critical, because services are right there. But this issue is everywhere through the city. So if you just start with the central city, that's fine, because you don't want too broad a focus, but let's think about what's the next step so that we have a citywide approach. That's one suggestion. On the private sector side, we really have to figure out how to engage them. A thought -- and this is only a thought, but if it's just -- it the right thing to do, I'm not confident that it will sustain itself. But the working class folks that need to be in their businesses, because they need a work force, there's an incentive there. And they want to help the workers be nearby. Now, under -- with the permission of commissioner Sten, I've tried to do some employer assisted housing. With the little bond -- we need a little help to actually integrate that if - - and it might be a way to broaden that committee a little bit, to engage the private sector, that frankly right now I don't see that engaged in this. Not that they don't want to be, but I don't know how they get more engaged. So I know that's a general thought. The third thing, and this is a big, big step, you clearly have a terrific advocate, and you need it, 'cause nothing's going to happen, unless commissioner Sten is pushing this. We wouldn't be having discussion. You need that at the political level. But we also underneath the political level need a little more of a coherent system. We got pdc, housing and community development, we got housing authority, we got the county, and we've had some efforts to have a more coherent system under commissioner Kafoury that never quite made it despite her efforts. So we need a little more effective system here, and I'm not saying that we start right now, but it's out there as an issue. The last thing is we need some accountability. Too. The idea of regular reports, not only to Susan Emmons and the community, but to us. We trust you, Wayman, but we also want to see this, to see how we're doing. The last thing is just thanks. I hope I've thanked commissioner Sten. I also want to thank the mayor, because this wouldn't be happening without her. And it took a partnership to make this thing happen. Wayman, you've made a very good impression. You've taken -- I hope you take this the right way, Gill -- you've taken the opposite approach of Gill Kelly. Gill had an intentional strategy. He set the bar kind of low when he first came in, and then he's kept jumping over it, and he's rising in people's eyes. You've set the bar really high, Wayman, and now there's no place to go but down. So anyway, welcome to Portland. We're glad to have a fresh face. We need some outside perspective. And your approach has been refreshing, and your passion for poor folks came out in your first testimony. Aye.

Hales: Good work. Thank you. Aye.

Saltzman: Well, I'm just very pleased that we have a no net loss policy that we're about to put in place for the central city. I think it's something that we've made starts before, and we've never quite gotten there. This sets forth a clear -- I think what's different about this is there's clear leadership. The Portland development commission and Wayman Winston is stepping up to the plate and saying, you know, they're going to take the lead for this, and there's a clear goal. 1200 units over the next five years. I think nothing like clear leadership and a clear goal gets you off to a right start. And I hope that part of the strategy that will emerge, as I've talked about before, is the notion that we really need to have mixed incomes living together in the same building. I think that's a really key, both from an economic viability strategy of making affordable developments pencil out, but it also the right thing to do from an overall societal perspective too. I hope to see that emerge. I want to just commend commissioner Sten and the mayor for putting this before us. I'm pleased to support it. Aye.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Sten: I've mostly said enough, but a couple of quick points. I want to thank mayor Katz very much for helping with this, in getting this into place. Commissioner Saltzman for co-sponsoring and keeping the pressure on. I want to thank the advocates for pushing so hard earlier in the year. I think it was not a place where we could find an answer, and I think we're on track to an answer, and on the issue of accountability wayman and I will be back before this council and this community with the specific funding plan in January. That will happen. To the extent that we find, which I fully do not expect to happen, that we cannot reach these goals, then we'll confront that directly. It will be something for everybody to look at. And then once everybody looks at it we'll need everybody to help. I'm also going to work very, very hard, I am teasing a bit, and they've come forward to me to express a real interest to do what commissioner Francesconi said, which is to dig in. When smart people exist in the community, the housing advocate community, as you look into these numbers, can come up with strategies that transcend some of the fights we've having for the last ten years. I'm very sure of it. We just need to do it. One of the issues is mixed income buildings, so you're putting these different units into the same building. I think that will help financially. Looking at the real numbers. We passed a bond program idea that the mayor worked with me on last spring that we haven't used yet to do middle income project. There's a ton of things we can do, but as long as we're going after each other, and at this point I see the advocacy community, the app, all these folks coming together around this new partnership and I think we can move in a unified fashion. If we can't, we'll be back on those accountability issues. I'm convinced we can. From here on out the idea of being at war over the money is not what we're doing, what we're doing is executing both strategies, not at the cost of each other. I'm very hopeful, but there's a lot of work to be done. And we'll have the housing authority working with us as well. I'm looking at Steve. Aye.

Katz: Thank you, everybody. I knew we would be able to come up with some solution, but I think Susan hit it right on the nail when she said that you've got two bodies with policies that may be in conflict with one another, or at least not parallel with one another. And here's really the issue. We've made a decision as a city to create a Portland development commission, a commission of volunteers who have taken the responsibility, just as the commission -- the planning commission, a responsibility of making very important decisions in terms of how we invest probably the only money we really have to invest in the city between economic development, housing, and other projects in urban renewal areas. And my goal, since the day I became mayor, was to make sure that we weren't on a collision track, that those policies that the commission wanted to push forward were the same policies that we as a council wanted to push forward. Now, I have to admit to you that there's sometimes there were potential conflicts that were brewing. And I think it's very important for all of us to clearly understand that those can be worked out, but the last thing you want is to go on a collision course with the Portland development commission and the city council. Our role ought to be to try to minimize those tensions and work closely together, otherwise why have a commission and why ask citizens to do that kind of work? Commissioner Sten and Wayman came up and they said we'll get to the goal that you want to reach, Commissioner Sten, but give us, Portland development commission, the ability to get it done. And we'll come up with the plan and we hope that we can succeed. And Commissioner Sten was gracious enough to say yes, that that is fine, as opposed to locking numbers and locking dollars with the numbers and not giving Wayman the ability to be a little bit more flexible and use the expertise of a lot of partners. That was very critical to resolving this. So I want to thank everybody for making that happen. Aye. Come on up on ballot measure 56. Or did we do something --

*****: I have a comment on this one, if it's okay.

OCTOBER 18, 2001

Katz: It's too late. No, go ahead. [laughter]

*******:** Just the wording in the -- I just wanted to clarify the intent with commissioner Sten, that on the third be it resolved paragraph, that those regulatory tool items that were coming back with for council consideration we supplied a lot of ideas to bhcd, not all of them may be in the end workable. This doesn't direct us to actually come back with code language in the first instance to the council on these.

Sten: No, no. At this point i'm --

*******:** Is there an expectation? Okay.

Sten: Really, at this point, the idea is -- some are from the community, some from the planning bureau -- are really not specific enough for, you know, even I to take a position on them. So what i'm expecting in january is enough specificity so that we could then as a council decide whether we want to do any of them, or which ones we'd like to do, and then we'd ask for code language at that point.

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

Francesconi: Could we have a work session on this?

Sten: Sure.

Francesconi: I think this would be a good subject.

*******:** I assume you wouldn't object to us having a seat on the planning group. It's rare they don't bump up against policy stuff, but --

Sten: No, absolutely. Is martha still around, or did she leave? Planning bureau wants to make sure they're on the group that works on the regulatory strategies. I was saying we don't code language by january, we want detailed concepts.

Katz: And probably a work session, martha, after reading the report I think probably the discussion at a work session would be helpful. To flush them out and get a sense from the council where they want to go to.

Sten: So i'll schedule a work session for first part of next year, and then we'll take it at that -- that's a good suggestion. Maybe we'll come back to council with code language. Good idea.

Katz: Ballot measure 56, what do you want from us today?

*******:** There was one discussion item that came up, was discussed more if the last time we came before you, and that's whether or not to extend the telco restrictions to areas along the streetcar line. Some of them would be in the rx zone, some would be in the cx zone. If it's your intent to consider those on november 21st, we need to notice people in the broader district, because they'd apply. Again, both those --

Francesconi: -- anywhere in the country?

Katz: Not right now.

*******:** Not right now. They went to sort of reinforcing the active use requirements basically by the streetcar lines, so there were things other than --

Sten: They'll come back.

Katz: Yeah, they will come back. Yes on that.

*******:** I'm not sure property owners might understand. That might be an implication of your vote, so we should probably notify them for november 21st.

Katz: That's it. That's the one?

*******:** I think of all the possibilities that's the only one we've heard you talk about.

Sten: You're not notifying on inclusionary zoning?

*******:** What's that?

Sten: You're not doing any notice on --

OCTOBER 18, 2001

*****: No.

*****: That's why we felt we should be clear for you about this.

Francesconi: Tell them metro is considering that.

Katz: Wait a minute. We're not adjourned yet. Wait a minute. Just on the telco. On the restrictions of telco along the --

*****: Yes.

Katz: That's all you need.

*****: We're assuming that the undedicated parking switches can be done within the context of what's already been noticed. If for some reason we figure it's not, we'll add that.

Katz: We'll have to add that.

*****: On the ordinance south of salmon, mayor, you moved that the second reading be november 21st. From my perspective, october 25th would be okay.

Katz: You would rather have it then? Then fine. Let's move it to october 21st.

*****: Terrific. October 25th.

Katz: Thank you, everybody. We stand adjourned. Thank you. It's been a busy week.

At 4:25 p.m., Council adjourned.