



November 3, 2021 Council Agenda

5633

Please note, City Hall is closed to the public due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

Under Portland City Code and state law, the City Council is holding this meeting electronically. All members of council are attending remotely by video and teleconference, and the City has made several avenues available for the public to listen to the audio broadcast of this meeting. The meeting is available to the public on the City's YouTube Channel, eGov PDX, www.portlandoregon.gov/video and Channel 30.

The public may provide written testimony to Council by emailing the Council Clerk at cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov.

The Council is taking these steps as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the need to limit in-person contact and promote social distancing. The pandemic is an emergency that threatens the public health, safety and welfare which requires us to meet remotely by electronic communications. Thank you all for your patience, flexibility and understanding as we manage through this difficult situation to do the City's business.

Email the Council Clerk at councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov with any questions.

Wednesday, November 3, 2021 9:30 am

Session Status: Recessed

Council in Attendance: Mayor Ted Wheeler

- Commissioner Carmen Rubio
- Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty
- Commissioner Mingus Mapps
- Commissioner Dan Ryan

Mayor Wheeler presided.

Mayor Wheeler left at 11:01 a.m. and Commissioner Ryan presided.

Officers in attendance: Karen Moynahan, Chief Deputy City Attorney; Keelan McClymont, Council Clerk

The Consent Agenda was adopted on a Y-5 roll call.

Council recessed at 11:19 a.m.

Communications

777

[Request of Joanne Rees to address Council regarding technical assistance for financial irregularities and elections tampering](#).(Communication)

Document number: 777-2021

Disposition: Placed on File

778

[Request of Char Pennie to address Council regarding technical assistance for financial irregularities and elections tampering](#) (Communication)

Document number: 778-2021

Disposition: Placed on File

779

[Request of David W. Potts to address Council regarding technical assistance for financial irregularities and elections tampering](#) (Communication)

Document number: 779-2021

Disposition: Placed on File

780

[Request of Magaly Martinez Gregorio to address Council regarding safety concerns about homeless campsite near her apartment](#) (Communication)

Document number: 780-2021

Disposition: Placed on File

781

[Request of Malcolm Johnson to address Council regarding initiatives to fight global and local poverty](#) (Communication)

Document number: 781-2021

Disposition: Placed on File

Time Certain

782

[Accept the Quarterly Technology Oversight Committee Report from the Chief Administrative Officer](#) (Report)

Document number: 782-2021

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance

Time certain: 9:45 am

Time requested: 30 minutes

Disposition: Accepted

Motion to accept the report: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Hardesty.

Votes: Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

783

[Appoint new members and extend the term of existing members to the Arts Education Access Fund Oversight Committee](#) (Report)

Document number: 783-2021

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler; Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Time certain: 10:15 am

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Confirmed

Motion to accept the report: Moved by Hardesty and seconded by Rubio.

Votes: Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

Consent Agenda

784

[*Pay property damage claim of Elizabeth McCormick in the sum of \\$8,184 resulting from a motor vehicle collision involving the Portland Police Bureau](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 190591

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Revenue and Financial Services; Risk Management

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

785

[*Amend contract with Corpac Construction Company in the amount of \\$328,786 for construction of the NW 20th Ave Local Improvement District project \(amend Contract No. 30006462; C-10049\)](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 190592

Introduced by: Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty

Bureau: Transportation

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

Regular Agenda

786

[Authorize revenue bonds in amount not to exceed \\$47 million to finance transportation projects](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 190596

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Debt Management; Management and Finance

Time requested: 15 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 10, 2021 at 9:30 a.m.

787

[*Authorize Bureau of Environmental Services to acquire certain temporary property rights necessary for construction of the Cedar Crossing Restoration Project No. E07158 through exercise of the City's eminent domain authority](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Referred to Commissioner of Public Safety

788

[Authorize competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest responsible bidder and provide payment for construction of the South Portland – Burlingame Phase 2 Sewer Rehabilitation Project No E11080 for an estimated cost of \\$5 million](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 190597

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 10, 2021 at 9:30 a.m.

789

[Add Accessibility of Candidate Debates and Forums Code and amend Open and Accountable Elections Program Code to make the program fairer, simpler, easier to navigate, and better optimized to achieve program goals \(add Code Chapter 2.09 and amend Chapter 2.16\)](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 190598

Introduced by: Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Bureau: Open and Accountable Elections

Time requested: 30 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 10, 2021 at 9:30 a.m.

790

[*Authorize new construction financing for an affordable housing project to be developed by an Innovative Housing Incorporated affiliate not to exceed \\$20,544,000](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 190593

Introduced by: Commissioner Dan Ryan

Bureau: Housing Bureau

Time requested: 15 minutes

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty Yea

Wednesday, November 3, 2021 2:00 pm

Session Status: Adjourned

Council in Attendance: Mayor Ted Wheeler
Commissioner Carmen Rubio
Commissioner Jo Ann Hardesty
Commissioner Mingus Mapps
Commissioner Dan Ryan

Mayor Wheeler presided.

Commissioner Hardesty left at 6:01 p.m.

Officers in attendance: Linly Rees, Chief Deputy City Attorney; Lauren King, Deputy City Attorney; Keelan McClymont, Council Clerk

Council recessed at 3:52 p.m. and reconvened at 4:02 p.m.

Council recessed at 6:21 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m.

Council adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Time Certain

791

[Amend Title 33 Planning and Zoning and Title 32 Signs and Related Regulations to revise and update regulations for historic resources \(amend Code Titles 32 and 33\)](#) (Ordinance)

Introduced by: Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Bureau: Planning and Sustainability

Time certain: 2:00 pm

Time requested: 3 hours

Disposition: Continued

Continued to December 15, 2021 at 2:00 p.m. Time Certain.

Oral record is closed. The written record will close November 5, 2021 at 5:00 p.m.

Thursday, November 4, 2021 2:00 pm

Session Status: No meeting due to lack of agenda

Closed caption file of Portland City Council meeting

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised city council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript. The official vote counts for council action are provided in the official minutes.

November 3rd, 2021 9:30 am

Wheeler: This is November 3rd, 2021 morning session of the Portland City Council. Good morning. Please call the roll.

Clerk: Good morning, mayor. Good morning, commissioners. Mapps?

Mapps: Yes.

Clerk: Rubio?

Rubio: Here.

Clerk: Ryan?

Ryan: Here.

Clerk: Hardesty.

Hardesty: Here.

Clerk: Wheeler.

Wheeler: Here. Under Portland city code, the city council for this meeting is being done electronically. All members of the council are attending remotely by video teleconference and the city made numerous avenues available for the public to listen to audio broadcast of this meeting. Meeting is available to the public on the city YouTube channel. Public may provide written testimony to council by e-mailing our amazing council clerk. Council is taking these steps as a result of the covid19 pandemic. And the need to limit in person contact and promote physical distancing. The pandemic is an emergency that threatens public health safety and welfare which requires us to meet remotely by electronic communications. Thank you all for your patience your flexibility and your understanding as we manage through these challenging circumstances to conduct this city's business. Now we will hear from legal counsel for rules of order and decorum -- Good morning.

Karen Moynahan: Good morning, mayor and Commissioners. To participate in the council meeting you may sign up in advance with council clerk's office to speak about any subject. You may also sign up for public testimony on resolutions or the first readings ordinance. The published council agenda contains information about how and who you may sign up for testimony while city council is holding electronic meetings. Your testimony should address the matter being considered at the time. When testifying please state your name for the record. Address is not necessary. Please disclose if you are lobbyist or if you are representing an organization please identify it. The presiding officer determines length of testimony. Individuals generally have three minutes to testify unless otherwise stated. When your time is up, the officer will ask you to conclude. Disruptive conduct such as shouting, or interrupting others testimony or council deliberation will not be allowed. If there are disruptions a warning will be given that further disruptions may result in the person being placed on hold or rejected from the remainder of the electronic meeting. Please be aware that all council meetings are recorded. Thank you. Thank you. [captionist changing settings.]

Wheeler: Colleagues as a note, I have a hard out at 11:30 am so if we're not concluded I will be turning this over to Council President Ryan. First Item Keelan

Interpreter: I'm sorry, I'm the interpreter. Tell me when you want me to start interpreting

Clerk: Okay. I'll read the communication now. Request of Joanne Rees to address council regarding technical assistance for financial irregularities and elections tampering.

Joanne Rees: My name is Joanne Rees. In Mya, two Lents NA members testified about misappropriation of city resources, such as insurance; failure to address issues; disenfranchisement possibly biased against whistleblowers. Promised meeting with Civic Life never materialized, we were sent on a wild goose chase. Department of Justice considers Civic Life the primary funder of NAs. Civic Life denies this besides recognizing NAs. In 2019, 1/5 of the LNA bank account funded single projects or business names of board members, appearing to be set for non LNA projects. Where did that money come from? LNA finance report corroborated the the board was in self service. They attempted to vote to dissolve it, during a pandemic summer; when this was thwarted, they removed voter forms, and the entire board resigned – retaining access to all LNA communications, financial, and operational platforms. Elections couldn't occur. Subsequent conversation with the DOJ found the LNA

was in dereliction of duty. We should not have had to second guess Civic Life and head to DOJ. Civic Life has a well funded neighborhood programming sector, if there isn't any help for whistleblowers on NAs that appear to be rogue, then defund that sector. There are more pressing issues, including a housing emergency and a surge in violent crime.

Clerk: Request of Char Pennie regarding technical assistance for financial irregularities and elections tampering.

Char Pennie: Good morning. My name is Char Pennie, I am the secretary treasures of Lents Livability Association. I'm here to talk about the former chair of LNA, who was the primary person responsible for the dissolution of our NA. This is the same person who Commissioner Hardesty is endorsing by showing up in photos with her child at neighborhood gatherings promoting Portland Street Response. This is the same person who willfully used our NA funds to start her own non-profit and was sitting chair when 8,000 dollars disappeared. This is the same person that has been having personal meetings with Comm. Hardesty, to remain as a cochair of -- meetings. This is the same person that made an open plea when Prosper Portland would not extend her free rental space for her Lents Collective, and was then given a position on their budget committee. Who then awarded her \$43,000 grant money. Through her guiles and lies she has managed to work her way up through the ranks with help of people like JR Lily and the Commissioner Hardesty while profiting herself from the nonprofit east Portland collective. It appears to the community that she awarded grant after grant with the community seeing very little return. It must be nice to be in such a position to get special attention while others cannot get a return a phone call. While you see her as community leader, the community sees her as a leech taking away from the community's voice and instead amplifying it. Thank you for your time this morning.

Wheeler: Next?

Clerk: Request of David Potts to address council

Wheeler: Good morning, David.

Wheeler: David, can you make sure you are not muted, please.

David Potts: Okay.

Wheeler: There you are. Yes. I can hear you now. Good.

Potts: Good morning, mayor. And city Commissioners. My name is David Potts, and I am the president of the Lents Livability association. I am here to give my perspective on how the city recognizes and funds the Lents neighborhood. Civic Life is supposed to support us, but I have found them unresponsive. E-mails are seldom answered. No one answers the phone. And after leaving numerous messages with staff we might eventually get a response - staff appears to be untrained in basic office etiquette. There are many excuses, but little has changed over the past five years but the staff. There are in a constant state of reorganization. And to the community, they seem to be rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. They appear to be aloof to connect with us. Things have gone awry with operation of our neighborhood association. And it no longer represents the neighborhood. We have had a self-elected board for the Lents neighborhood for the last two election. And no real accounting of where the funds have gone for more than five years. The entire board resigned just prior to the election that should have been held in September. It now appears that a member of the former board was going to be allowed to appoint her own interim board. Where was community involvement in the process? Once again, we await for actual engagement with the city through their neighborhood association. Thank you for your time.

Wheeler: Thank you. Next individual, please, it being looks like 780.

Clerk: Okay. Thank you, mayor, and Commissioners. I am going to read this title. And then we –

Wheeler: I am sorry. Commissioner Hardesty has her hand raised. I apologize Commissioner.

Hardesty: Thank you. I believe that was last person was from Lents neighborhood livability committee. Is that correct? Because I just wanted to respond to some of the allegations that were made. Especially as it relates to my office. There is no secret deal making taking place in my office. Between any community-based organizations. And each neighborhood association is independently operated. The city does not manage independent neighborhood associations. I am proud of the work that we have been able to do over this year. To try to re – re-right the ship at the office of neighborhood civic community engagement. And we are on a path to putting real standards in place. It sounds like there has been some – issues for 5 to 7 years based upon the testimony today. And I think you should put that your -- your information in writing and send it to Michael and a copy to my office. And we will be happy to

follow up with you. But it is inappropriate in a public forum to allege misconduct and unethical activities of elected leaders. I don't support that behavior. I never have and never will. And so I just wanted to not let that go unchallenged this morning. Thank you for being here. We really appreciate it.

Wheeler: Thank you Commissioner. Next individual. 780, please.

Clerk: Okay. Thank you. Mayor. Mayor, Commissioners we are joined today by a Spanish language interpreter so I am going to read title for 780 and then make sure everybody is connected. Request 780. I am going to Senora Magally ask you to unmute. Does she know if the interpreter is on line?

Clerk: Kendall will you ask to go ahead and present her communication to council?

Interpreter: Yes. Yes, ma'am. [speaking Spanish]

Magaly Martinez Gregorio and Interpreter: Okay. [Martinez Gregorio speaking Spanish] okay. First of all, good morning, and my name is Magaly Martinez Gregorio. Okay. I live at 9326 southeast Schuyler street in Portland. And the reason why I am here today to is to ask with all due respect, for you guys to get rid of the individuals who live around the condominiums where I live. Because they shoot up drugs in front of children. And they also as enter the condos and sometimes there are with guns and knives in their hands. And I am tired of contacting the police and the only response I get from them is that they cannot do anything about it. Due to coronavirus. I don't understand if more than half of the population is already vaccinated, then why do we continue to have the same problem? This is unheard of. And I feel that no one is listening to us. We need your help, please. I love the state of Oregon and I don't want the city to get even more messed up than what it already is. If you can't do anything about it, so, please, tell me where I can go for someone to listen to me. And for them to do something about it. Thank you very much. Have a good day and god bless you.

Wheeler: Thank you. Could I briefly respond, please?

Wheeler: Okay. Thank you for your testimony this morning. We appreciate having you here. I apologize for your not feeling that you have been heard by the city of Portland. this city council is -- sorry this city council is putting emphasis on the homelessness situation. Just this week the city and the county agreed to make tens of millions of dollars of additional investments in the homeless in resolving the homeless crisis. Part of the work is that we are

doing is to get as many people off of the streets as quickly and humanely as possible. That includes shelter, new villages, and other options. I want to thank you for your continued patience and understanding that we are doing everything that we can to resolve the homeless crisis. Enclosing -- in closing, this council is 100% in agreement that this is an urgent issue. Thank you for being here today. Commissioner Hardesty.

Hardesty: Thank you mayor and thank you to our speaker for being here today. What we are seeing on the street, is a -- combination of a multitude of failures. And what we know is we have thousands of people who have nowhere to go who are currently living on our streets. Is our interpreter still here?

Interpreter: Oh yes I am sorry. I didn't know that you wanted me to continue to interpret.

Wheeler: Yes, if you could for the Commissioners who are responding. So she is going to speak and then Commissioner Ryan. If you could interpret, please.

Interpreter: I am sorry about that. Could you repeat

Hardesty: That's okay. No problem. That's why I was pausing but I didn't know what happened. So, first just say I want to say thank you for being here today. And for your testimony.

Martinez Gregorio: Thank you.

Hardesty: And the next thing I want to say is that there are thousands of people on our streets desperately trying to survive on our streets because of a lack of so many supports.

Hardesty: Okay. Covid exposed the inequities that are built in our systems. Covid exposed the inequities that are built into all of our safety net systems. Whether that is housing, where there is not a zip code in the city of it Portland that the Black community is not cost-burdened in. There is no zip code that a young white family could afford to own a home in the city of Portland. Covid raised the level of domestic violence by over 400%. And I am saying all of this not to say that these are excuses for inaction. But that we need are a multitude of solutions to these very complex problems. I like you walk by camps every day in my neighborhood. I have conversations with people trying to survive on our streets. And most of the people that I meet would rather not be living on our streets surrounded by violence. I am however optimistic that together with government support, with community and mutual support and not demonizing people but for grace of god it could be us, is going to be how we are going to

rebuild a more equitable Portland. With grace we could what? We could build a more equitable fair, Portland. Thank you, again, for being here.

Wheeler: Okay. Thank you Commissioner Ryan. Sure.

Ryan: Thank you so much for your excellent testimony you did a wonderful job. I especially appreciated the pictures. It was very helpful if I wrote down your address right when I was listening, there will be one village built approximately four miles from that location and that will help relocate some of the houseless towards that village. Villages will be safe for those inside and also for those who live outside of the village. Keep testifying and testify for increased behavioral health services, for example treatment centers.

Interpreter: Can you please repeat that?

Ryan: Sure. Absolutely. I will break it up a little bit. Sorry about that. And keep testifying keep testifying for services and for treatment centers and, also, consider testifying at the county. We work with the county. They provide all of the services for houseless and their meetings are on Tuesdays and Thursday mornings. Your voice is powerful. Thank you, again for your testimony.

Martinez Gregorio: Thank you.

Wheeler: All right. Thank you. Our last testifier for communications this morning please. I am sorry, Commissioner Rubio go ahead. Thank you, mayor.

Rubio: [Speaking Spanish]

Martinez Gregorio: [speaking Spanish]

Interpreter: Do you guys want me to do that one? This is the interpreter.

Wheeler: I would. I would like to. My Spanish is a little rusty, so, yes, please.

Interpreter: Okay. All right. Well, I will just give you summary. The lady, who spoke who we just spoke to, was saying thank you for speaking, your voice counts. And the lady was saying oh thank you very much. You know, we need action to take because a lot of children and families are being affected by this. And no one is listening to us thank you.

Rubio: The first lady was Comm. Rubio

Interpreter: Thank you. Sorry about that.

Rubio: Thank you so much. I apologize I should have said it in english as well. I am sorry about that.

Wheeler: It is okay. Great. Commissioner Rubio does that complete your conversations there? Kendall, thank you very much for your great work. I know it is very hard and we really appreciate your stepping in here today. So thank you for that.

Interpreter: Thank you sir. I greatly appreciate that. You get have a great day.

Wheeler: Next individual item 785.

Clerk: Request of Malcolm Johnson to address council regarding initiatives to fight global and local poverty.

Malcolm Johnson: Good morning. Can you hear me okay?

Wheeler: Yes. Loud and clear.

Johnson: Well, hello, everybody. 'My name is Malcolm Johnson I am political affairs intern for the project. We are a nonprofit organization dedicated to fighting global poverty. Throughout the year, we advocate for a number of different bills and issues and things like that. And this week I am working on mobilizing people to support Afghan allies and refugees in wake of the Taliban taking control of the country. I know the council can't really specifically do much about that. But I wanted to reach out for the members of the Portland city council to -- to write some form of written communication that senators -- and representatives and in support of Afghan allies and refugees. Thank you for letting me speak and for hearing my thoughts.

Wheeler: Thank you. And you cut out a little bit but I think we got the gist of it. And your support for refugees from Afghanistan. Thank you for your comments and we will -- we do work closely with our federal delegation. Thank you. With regards to consents agenda. Have any items been pulled off of the agenda?

Clerk: We have received no requests. [Roll Call]

Wheeler: Consent agenda adopted. We will go to first time certain item, please item number 782. This a report by technology oversight committee. Which as we know is comprised five members of the public each selected by the Commissioner. The committee task with provided oversight of the city's technology-based projects. Ethan from the office of management finance, chief technology officer director of the bureau technology services Jeff Baer and the citizen members of the toc represents my office will ford penfold are here to present the report today. So welcome to you all.

Ethan Cirmo: Thank you very much mayor. Good morning, everybody. My name is Ethan and I work on the communications team for the office of management and finance. This is the quarterly report for the technology oversight committee of 2021. And as mayor Wheeler said, you will be hearing today from jeff the chief technology officer and director of BTS and then after you hear from jeff you will be hearing from Wilfred and he represents mayor Wheeler. Currently, we are overseeing just one project integrated tax system project. That is currently within budget schedule and scope. And in addition, we get regular updates from the Portland Oregon web site refresh. Project. As well as others on the project. That is it -- we typically get updates from them even though they are not actually being overseen by the toc. Starting next quarter, we are going to be overseeing the police bureau's office 365 migration project. And with that overview done, I will hand it over to jeff who will be talking to you about our quarterly report.

Jeff Baer: All right. Thank you Ethan and good morning mayor and members of city council. We are here to present quarterly report to council covering third quarter of 2021 and provide updates that may not necessarily reflected in the reporting period. And also some updates on some other projects. And as always we are very pleased to be here and happy to answer any questions you may have related to these different projects. First off I wanted to have a quick note about the integrated tax system. Or the better known as its. You will notice that all indicators are green and stable. As it moves into its third release which is slated to go live this coming January. Still a lot of work to be done over next few month to prepare for go live such as end to end testing. And staff training.

Ryan: Excuse me are we supposed to be seeing something on our screen?

Baer: I believe Ethan we are -- am I the only one that can't see it?

Ryan: I am not seeing it.

Cirno: So I am sharing my screen we have the presentation up and -- it is visible on my screen.

Wheeler: Yes. Good call. On Commissioner Ryan's part we are not seeing it. We are not seeing what you are talking about. Let me try to share again. Cool.

Hardesty: If you are sharing information that was in our packet -- in there it is.

Wheeler: Now it is up. It looks good now.

Baer: Thank you, Ethan. Thank you Commissioner Ryan for pointing that out. Just quick note related to its project revenue has done excellent job managing a very large complex project. And as thee Ethan not an although it is not necessarily end of the purview the toc they do receive periodic updates on the Portland Oregon web site replacement project. Also known as power, which is also provided in the report. And these past several months the project team has really been focused on the employee can internet site. Translation, and the contents migration and I think you will probably have been reached out by our project team to even of your offices to help with that contents migration. And then as noted under part 3 of 9 report, it is noted that it is police bureau office 365 migration planning is underway. And we become monthly report starting in December once we on board the external quality assurances consultants. And then also I want today to note too this week I received the toc intake assessments for the police bureau body worn project camera also fall underneath the toc oversight and also toc numbers will have an opportunities to review the rfp before it is published and then on final note before I turnover to.

Wheeler: Before you move off that. Do you want to ask a question on that item?

Hardesty: Thank you, mayor. Yes, I did. And, let me just say thank you, jeff, as always you are always wealth of information. Your team they do incredible work. And we always love to see all of the green spots all over the report when you come to council. You just talked about upcoming work with the police bureau and you mentioned body worn cameras. But I have not heard you mention the Regis data retrieval system that we pit in the currents budget. And for us to get a handle on because we know Portland police bureau not good at buying computer systems. And, so I just want to know -- your folks are all volunteers we are prioritizing things and we not just dumping stuff on you because there is a need for that information at this moment. So how are you going to do this all of the aspects police could possibly have. And do the ones that we as the council think are most important first?

Baer: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner. I appreciate that question. And what we are hearing from the police bureau and maybe a way to confirm this with that, we initially started work in finding for officer 365 migration which can help with the d.o.j. Settlement. That will be fairly quick turnaround. Quick being several months. Then it is going to be immediately followed by releasing rfp for the body worn camera project that will take a fair amount of time once we

each the solution for that. And on the heels of that is region replacements. So those three things are in cue.

Hardesty: That -- yes to me because, we are running out of time with the regents. And I am not quite sure what our plan is yet. For the body worn camera as you know, since we do have policy in place yet, I just want to make sure that we are not -- we don't -- that the police beer roe does not come back and want us to continue to extends this ridiculous contract. And that we are on track to actually replace Regis system as soon as possible. We have been talking cost benefit analysis. We need to get this system replaced.

Baer: Thank you. I will just move on to final note here and that's our last toc meeting I presented overview of other internal pts lab project they are aware of other technology initiatives that may not rise up to level of toc oversight but very important some of the things such as our cyber security improvement that we making related to fire wall replacement. And our hundred-degree upgrade throughout the city. 311 system. And also building access control service design and several others. So, although these are important projects they are just smaller and don't necessarily fall underneath the toc oversight. So with that I will pause and turn it over to will for comments on any of these different projects.

Wheeler: For some reason we are unable to hear you. Can you play with the sounds a bit see is you can fix that.

Wilfred Pinfold: Is that good?

Wheeler: Now we hear you.

Pinfold: Thank you. I apologize so tech guys and technology amazing. So, I -- what I said was I don't have a lot to report. I think we all Commissioner Hardesty, we would like to see green on chose charts it makes us feel good. I think it leaves a little space to talk about the good things. I would like to give a pull out to web refresh program, the -- I think it was bold move to take the approach that the city took. And I think it is paid off extremely well. I think -- without going into lot of technical details I will like to say that I think it is sets pathway that would allow the city to have a very good mechanism for communicating with citizens. And, I think there is a lot more capability there than we are currently using. And I -- you know I would like to point out that it is tool that the commission and city can use. I think it is more robust than we have had previously. So I think that's good point and worth mentioning just because we

have time and the thought and that there are communications that two be been artificial to get out. And also I would like to thank Commissioner Ryan and Commissioner Mapps for the work they have been doing on the permitting system. And the refresh there. And I have the privilege of being on some of those meetings and I think that's good work and much needed to address the myriad of problems with the cost of housing and the difficulty of biting in the city. And I think that's really good effort and I mentioned those two together because I think there some relationship I think we could use some of the technology that has been deployed in web site refresh to help with communications, and to help improve the quality of submission that I think is necessary to improve that overall process. So, so I am very happy way things are going I think I speak for the whole of the toc. And, thank you and as commission for work that you are doing.

Baer: Thank you. And concludes our report. If we have any questions we are glad to answer those.

Wheeler: Awesome. Thank you. Colleagues, are there further questions?

Mapps: First I wanted to thank everybody for this very concise report. Glad to hear that things are going well. I do have a question about some upcoming work. Do we know when the technology executive steering committee will be reconvened?

Baer: Yes. Thank you Commissioner maps. I have continue to have conversations with chief administrative officer Tom Rinehart, we are pulling together and doing some different -- just basically reconstituting that group very soon.

Mapps: Okay. Great. Well, and when you do reconvene, would it be possible for council office staff to attend those sessions?

Baer: I think they have in the past so I don't see why that's won't be possible.

Mapps: Okay. Great well. I just want to let you know our office is aggressive in both seeing that committee come back together and we would like to participate in those meetings when they get put on the calendar.

Baer: Great. Thank you.

Mapps: Sure.

Wheeler: Thank you. Colleague if there no further questions I will entertain a motion?

Commissioner Ryan moves to accept the report.

Hardesty: Second.

Wheeler: Second from Commissioner Hardesty. Any further conversation? Please call the roll.

[Roll Call]

Mapps: Just like to thank our staff for the important work they do for the city. And this is an excellent report that we heard today. It sounds like things are going well which one reasons with reasons I am glad to vote yes.

Clerk: Rubio?

Rubio: I want to say thank you jeff and team for this great work and this great report. And I vote yes.

Clerk: Ryan?

Ryan: Sorry. Hey. First of all thank you jeff for being here. And thank you all for testifying as well about the progress of your oversight committee. Will, I especially appreciated out connecting -- between the web up -- upgrades how it connects with what we are doing with leaning vastly improve our permitting processes that we do for our customers and partners throughout the city. I am definitely ready to accept this report. I vote yes.

Clerk: Hardesty?

Hardesty: Again, thank you so enough jeff and your team. We really appreciate you being here and adding value to this deliberation today. And what I love about the technology oversight committee is it these are really experts in their field. That agree to volunteer their expertise on behalf of the city of Portland. And even though I am always giddy to see the green, when you show up with charts that have red and yellow on it, I also know that means that we are paying special attention and we are monitoring to make sure that what we are investing in is going to work for us both short-term and long-term. So, trust me I don't mind red and yellow. But of course we all love the green. Because the green means everything is right on track. And we are doing what we should be doing. I cannot appreciate you enough. But I do want to make sure we were doing some of these systems issues, especially around placing, with regents center system. And, of course, getting best type of contract possible around body worn cameras. All that's really going to be important for us moving forward. So, my appreciation and I am very happy to vote aye.

Clerk: Wheeler?

Wheeler: Well, thank you Ethan and Jeff and all of you for joining us today and sharing these updates from the technology oversight committee. And as always, a huge thank you to entire committee and specifically Deanna and Victoria for the work you have done. This very technical work. It requires a lot of time and follow up. And we appreciate it and I look forward to receiving more updates in the future. I vote aye, and the report is accepted. Thank you for the great work. Next up going to be let's see, it is -- we can do that. We will do time certain 783, please.

Clerk: Appoint new members and extend the term of existing members to arts and education access fund oversight committee.

Wheeler: Commissioner Rubio?

Rubio: Thank you. In 2012, measure 26146 was passed by voters to create an arts education access fund. Which provides art teachers for all k-through five students and city and financial support to local arts organizations. The arts education access fund oversight committee is charged with reviewing the access fund expenditures, progress and outcomes and reporting on findings to city annually. Committee requires a minimum of ten and maximum of 20 members at a time serving up to two years of two and three terms. Two terms of two and three years. And today, I am excited to present several for appointment to this oversight committee over the last year, plus pandemic, the committee experienced combination of member transitions and conclusions of member transition services this resulted in an opportunity to recruit new cohort of members with varied experiences in connection to the arts. And these are the people whom we are appointing today. We also reappointing two active members currently serving. And I want to convey our deep appreciation to these individuals for stepping up to serve and for all of the great communities civic art contribution that they all make. And I am also proud it was thoughtful and intentional about equity and community representation. And I want to I appreciate any staff Schwartz for keeping this value front and center. And I also want to thank the soon -- committee members Laura and Michael who have served on this committee and are willing to reconnect to additional terms we appreciate this so much. These responsibilities that volunteers are charged with very important. And they are here to assure these investments are making the differences they are intended to make and to reach the communities they are intended to reach. And to ensure

arts and culture are presented live in our communities and schools. While not everybody was able to be here today, we are so appreciating to have number of these individuals who are here. So, I would like to welcome Laura of the arts education assess fund oversight committee to welcome the new members.

Laura Streib: Good morning. I am Laura Streib, access fund chair. And arts educational professional. I am an advocate for that. Thank you for Commissioners for having your continued support. Since I became chair of this committee in 2019, we have been busy standardizing our reporting calendar to streamline and be consistent in what is being asked for from the city revenue depth, and the six school districts that are getting funded with dollars. We also worked with this last year on a new student designed logo that represents arts education and access fund, and that's getting rolled out to all city non profit, and school districts that receive ae if funding so that we can continue to make this top mind for our citizens and our residents in Portland. We are very much looking forward to having this impressive new group of members to join us to ensure that tax dollars are being use the on what voters approved in 2012. Thank you.

Rubio: So, um, Laura were you going invite the appointees to introduce themselves?

Streib: If we have any that are able to be on the committee, they can just unmute and state their names.

James R. Dixon: Hello, I am James Dixon Portland based theatre maker with my primary focus on black and queer identities. I am also a local artist. Thank you for having me.

Joaquin Lopez: My name is Joaquin Lopez, I'm a performing artist.

Carlee Smith: Hello, this is Carlee smith. I am ab art worker and arts organizer based here in Portland Oregon. And I want to thank the committee and Commissioners mayor today for having us.

Jessica Lagunas: Hello, my name is Jessica . And I am a visual artist and also arts culture manager for latino network.

Margo Norton: Hello I am Margo. I am a Commissioner and I have been asked by commission to fill the seat on the committee that has reserved for tscc.

Jenn Falco: Hello, folks. My name is Jenn Falco and I have an undergraduate degree in theatre and mba and so, my hope here is to kind of span the arts focus and then also the financial side of this. I am super excited to be here and be part of this team.

Rubio: That may be all of the -- I am sorry. Keep going.

Hana Layson: Sorry. And I am head of art and education programs at Portland art museum and I am so grateful to be here and really excited to work on the committee. Thank you.

Rubio: Thank you. Okay. Is there anyone else? Okay. I think that's everybody. So I will just turn it back over to the mayor. And just, again, thank James, Carlee and the rest of you for joining us today. And for your willingness to serve. So mayor, back to you.

Wheeler: Thank you, Commissioner. I will entertain a motion to accept the report.

Hardesty: So moved, mayor.

Wheeler: Can I get a second?

Rubio: Second.

Wheeler: Commissioner Hardesty moves acceptance, report Commissioner Rubio seconds. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none. Please call the roll.

Clerk: [roll call]

Mapps: I want thank Laura and community members for being with us today, our I wanted thank everybody for the work that you are about to do for Portland on behalf of the arts I know this council wants to be good partner to you and we look forward to engaging in that work. And for these reasons, and more I vote aye.

Rubio: Again I want to thank all of the individuals that are stepping up to serve, we are appreciating that you took time out of your day to be here that shows your commitment and your engagement gives this work credibility that we need for this to be effective so thank you again and we look forward to your report. Next time. I vote aye

Ryan: Thank you Commissioner for leading this important effort further arts education will I also want to thank Laura for giving more of a context and for all of you amazing people -- seven of you that were here today to take time out of your day to say hello and thank you for in advance for your service. It is really a delight to meet all of you. And city arts education access funds is so important for us in it is great investments. Art saves lives. I am ready to say aye.

Hardesty: I want to thank Commissioner Rubio, what a stellar group of nominees you have placed in front of us today. I have to say whenever I see a with a queen I want to song. And, so, I feel like we have missed that opportunity today. But maybe next time. I am I have, very impressed with this stellar volunteers that you have been able to recruit. This is really heart warming this is work that leads spirit and sole. And I am happy say that I know about half of you but the other half I can't wait to get to know. Thank you for your service for the city of Portland. We need you now more than ever. And as we recover arts and music. That's what's going to help us regain our spirit. And regain our soul. And I am happy to vote aye.

Wheeler: I want to also express my thanks to Commissioner Rubio. First of all this is it a really great group of people. And I am kind of jealous anyway this looks like going to be fun. You are meetings are going to be fun and interesting as well providing super important community service. And so I just want to say thank you. Appreciate it. I vote aye. The report is accepted appointments are approved. Thank you, everybody. We will move to regular agenda. First item on regular agenda. Is it 786.

Clerk: Authorize revenue bonds in amount not to exceed \$47 million to finance transportation projects.

Wheeler: Speaking of fun - revenue bonds one of my favorite subjects but then again I was former state treasurer. Following ordinance authorities issued limited tax revenue bonds for various transportation projects of the Portland transportation. The issuance of these bonds will allow bot matching fund and, complete ongoing projects in its capital improvement plan. The bonds will be repaid from the ongoing financial resources that exist. However the bonds will be secured. As is often the case by the city's general fund. City debt managers matt, and patton are here to present the ordinance.

Hardesty: Excuse me.

Wheeler: I know. Before we hear the presentation. I know what I am doing here. I am going to hand things over to Commissioner Hardesty to I know would like to provide some opening remarks Commissioner, it is great to see you.

Hardesty: Pleasure to see you also. Thank you very much. I did not want to rush you but didn't want you to forget me either. I just wanted to add before we get into the presentation, that this ordinance will authorize \$47 million in bonds that will fund really critical capital

projects that are currently underweight and east Portland, north Portland, and land neighborhood example projects include safety improvement. Along the outer division. Stadium improvement unable hood connections, projects, and safety and access to transitioned to other projects. Debt will be repaid over a two years by system development charges, and the plan gas tax increase from house bill 2017. This bond issuance supports the decision to deliver near term and impact projects and communities that have been neglected by past infrastructure investments. I am now happy to turn it over to matt and he can take it away. Thank you.

Matt Gierach: Thank you. Mayor Wheeler and Commissioner Hardesty for the introduction. For the record I am matt. The debt manager in office of management finance. As stated in opening remarks this authorities days will allow city up to 47 million limited tack revenue bonds to finance various projects. The finance project were identified in transportation capital improvement plan prior to covid19 pandemic. And this financing will allow bureau complete project as planned. As reminder, limited tax revenue bonds secured by. City debt policy allows issuance limited tack revenue bonds that are paid for general fund for natural resource of the city. These are sell of sporting. Issuing self supporting benefit there lower freight relative security source. Proposed issuance will be considered self supporting be under debt policy I however, the bureau general france for station revenues and researches may be relied upon. If there are short followers payment resources. Prior to issuance, bureau will commit to previously for canting budgeting tower making debt service payment on these bonds to existing limited tax revenue bonds within debt portfolio. Given reduction and revenue due covid19 also -- it thought based upon the revenue levels but this borrowing future would fit within planning standard. With council authorities in the management division will have existing bonds if sale, and in January of 2022 by competitive. With that I am happy to answer any questions. And again, Jeremy Patton is on the line as well.

Wheeler: Very good. Colleagues, any questions on this item? I am not seeing right off the bat. Do we have anybody up for public testimony?

Clerk: No one signed up.

Wheeler: All right. Very good this is first reading of non-emergency and it moves to second reading. Thank you. Next item, 787.

Clerk: Certain temporary property right necessary for the construction of the cedar crossing restoration project, number e07158 through exercise of city's domain authority.

Wheeler: Commissioner Mapps good morning.

Mapps: Yes. Mr. Mayor colleague I am pull this item back to my office. We have been able to reach agreement with property owner in this situation. So, we do not need to bring this item for council.

Wheeler: All right that's good news. Thank you for that. Without objection. 788, please.

Clerk: Competitive structure and contract with the lowest responsible bidder and provide payment for construction of the south power of ten burlington phase two sewer rehabilitation project number e11080. For an estimated cost of \$5 million.

Wheeler: Commissioner Mapps?

Mapps: Yes. Thank you, mr. Mayor. Colleagues the item before us today is \$5 million sewage pipe replacements project in south Portland brought to us by the bureau environmental services, and as you know, environmental services manages city storm water and sewer infrastructure. Including 99 pump stations that rely upon about 2500 miles of pipe to support sewage to the Columbia boulevard water treatment plant. Ordinance before us today will allow the bureau the environmental services, to rehabilitate aging and severely deteriorating sanitation rarely combined sewer pipes and south Portland and Burlington game areas. This project will improve liability -- reliability, and reduce the risk of pipe breakage, and sewer releases. Which in turn will protect public health people's property and our environment. This \$5 million project is it scheduled to begin in July. And will become pleased within a year. Today we have free staff members from environmental services here to tell us more about this project. I am going to turn this presentation over to that team. Which includes joe, and a design engineer design manner Daniel, welcome and please tell us more.

Joe Dvorak: Great thank, you Commissioner. Good morning. Members of council for the record I am Joe. With bureau of environmental services. This project one of many in our large scale rehabilitation programming, and we are happy to present to you today we will turn it over to Daniel who prepared short presentation for you and I am available a for questions at the end. Thank you.

Mapps: All right Daniel-- I think we can't hear you. I think we still might be having soon audio issues.

Wheeler: Daniel we can see the presentation but we cannot hear you. Can you do something differently or can somebody else take up the presentation?

Daniel Boatman: Now we lost him. It you hear me?

Wheeler: We can hear you.

Boatman: All right.

Mapps: Loud and clear no presentation though we got.

Boatman: I will go back to sharing my screen. I had exit just to be able to find the controls to edit device it is using for my audio. Thank you. Okay. Sorry about delay. Okay. Well thank you for your time this morning. I everybody can see presentation now?

Mapps: Yes.

Boatman: Okay. Before moving on. So this project as Commissioners noted this project will increase system capacity and reliability and protect public health property, and reduce risk of sewage release and sewer back ups this project has, approximately, 6800 feet of pipe ranging from six inch to 30 inch. The average age of these sewers that are being are done is 100 years old. Which is right up at the end of the service life for these types of pipes, and so it is if long overdue, we have approximately 1,000 feet of sanitary services that will reconstruct or rehabilitate while we are doing mainline. Repairs. And we have an approximately, 370 feet of sanitary sewer extensions to address non conforming within the project area. The work will be done with variety of construction methods including open trench excavation and trenchless options. I will turn it over to Aaron for the public outreach.

Aaron Abrams: Hello, everybody. We have done outreach on this community this part of our large scale sewer rehab program we have been working throughout southwest on a number of projects in this area we sent out significant number of flyers e-mail updates, social media we have done multiple public presentations. We will have some extended work hours. And night work and we have gotten noises variances, for those from the noise office.

Boatman: That included that 30 days of outreach and what not so thank you, Aaron. And that picture there is joe and so for this project, our lead and we are also utilizing public informations outreach consultants that are assisting joe and outreach photograph this

project. Engineering estimate, Commissioner Mapps noted 5 million we have high confidence level on that. And we are hoping to advertise by February and begin construction around July or August depending upon the timing of things. And then our construction duration we are anticipating yearlong construction. And then, these pictures here John Landring kind of we are not working right next to the water tower but we are -- it is in general area and it is kind of iconic represent fashion of the area that we are working. And then that photo on right was one that I took just one of areas that we are working I thought it was beautiful for the photo I thought I would put it in slide show just to show you know beauty of areas that we do work in. Any questions?

Wheeler: Commissioner Ryan has a question.

Ryan: Yes. I have one. Because if anyone is tuning in I am sure some of them will want me to ask this question. It is wonderful big investment. For infrastructure. And when you say things like 100 years old, that allows us to tune in and listen a little harder. It is necessary if we don't make investments like this what's risk factor? Like what will happen if we don't do this investment?

Boatman: Joe do you want to that I can this one. I can take a stab at it but you may have more official response.

Dvorak: Yes. Great question. Basically, old infrastructure like that if we don't rehabilitate or replace will eventually collapse. And that can result in sink holes and cavities in street impacting traffic and safety and then from environmental services perspective, when pipes collapse, sewage can't get through and it will back up into neighboring homes businesses, as well as on the streets so both environmental transportation and safety impacts.

Ryan: I really appreciate that. I think because this dialogue is in the public domain both nationally and locally, it is important that we just dumb down for people like me and others that might be tuning so that we can really lean in on why these investments are really important. Our city not young any more. And so we really continuing to make these type of investments. But I just appreciate you taking the time to explain that. Thank you.

Wheeler: Thank you Commissioner. Keelan do we have any public testimony on this island?

Clerk: No one signed up.

Wheeler: Did you say one or no one.

Clerk: I am sorry no one signed up.

Wheeler: No one signed up. Very good so this is first reading of non emergency ordinance it moves to stick reading. Thank you. Next item 789 I just want to reminds people I may not be able to stay for the entirety of item but I will stay here as long as I can. Item 789, please.

Clerk: Add accessibility of candidate debates and forum code. And open and accountable elections program code to make the program fairer, simpler easier to navigate and better optimize to achieve program goals.

Wheeler: Great and just as reminder this is a first reading so we will not be voting on that any way today. We will take it up next week for the vote. Commissioner Rubio?

Rubio: Thank you mayor and before we begin the presentation, I want to announce that I have used the open accountable elections program in past. And although I am not currently running for reelection right know, out of the abundance of caution I am disclosing this. It is a potential conflict of interest. So today you have before you a package of amendments to the open and accountable election program. And will change to city elections law to improve accessibilities. Open accountable election was implemented for the first time for the 2021 election, open accountable elections commission is required to assess the program performance and recommend how to adjust the programs numbers and rules, to keep it up-to-date with the constantly changing campaign finance landscaped. The commission did that. And published findings in reported that can be found on the program's web site. At Portland.gov-elections. And in addition, because it was the program first cycle, the program worked with user experience researcher to do 3360 analysis. Of what went well and where there is room for improvement. All types of users participated from participating candidates non participating candidates. Campaign and different types of campaign donors. One piece of feedback was nearly universal. It is program needs to be simplified to make it easier for everybody to understand and use. And to make more inclusive. Moment of the amendments before you do that. These are one time program changes after the first election cycle. Other amendments are about keeping program aligned with the constantly changing commission. When we have filed these amendments earlier this fall, we learned that recent case law from Oregon government ethic commission complicated whether voting on these updates created -- creates conflict of interest. So, we pulled item from agenda to get clarity on this. It

was done to identify which changes in the ordinance might be interpreted a conflict of interest. As a result of that analysis, those items were changes the to delegations to open and accountable elections commission instead. This way, the program can be updated it regularly. As program like this must in order to continue to be successful do. Without asking the city council to regularly vote on things that potential conflict of interest when either 2 or 3 of us are in election cycle. One item can not be dell gated nor changed from being conflict of interest for those running for office right now. Which was a change to the program funding formula for the city's annual but. That item will be brought before you separately in the near future. In addition to the oea amount minute we are also considering, today, a change to the city's election law to clarify and code that candidate and debates and forums should be accessible and inclusive. So I will now turn it over to director Susan Mottet to discuss this further and answer your questions.

Susan Mottet: Thank you. So, I will just do few elaborations on what Commissioner's remarks. One is that when the law was passed in 2016, it was written with educated guesses based upon day from other areas and applied to Portland campaign finance data. To guess how it two change the campaign but no one new for sure. Until of course we could implement it. For at least one cycle and then have day to based upon that now we have actual data from implementation we can move beyond the guesses, and get the program just right. And, we had use very comprehensive use or experienced project to get they are lot of data. We looked at lot of campaign finance data from 2106 and 2020. To do very quality analysis. And, you know and as it mentioned we published both user experience report and the commission report on line. For those of you who don't plan to read it, it basically says that the first election cycle was success. The program navigated many challenging situations well. And met many goals but there were definitely lots of areas for improvement. And, the package amendments before you is -- with will goal of improving those areas. And the program is very happy to solicit all of the critical feedback as well as the feedback about things that are good and we should not change. And throw all of feedback up on our web site be transparent because we are very committed to making every improvement that the program needs so that can be functioning very well. And, that's important for public financing of elections programs because, they only work and meet goals when they are basically performing very well. They

are very well made for the existing election campaign finance climate. And needs 67 campaigns because they are only as soon as they have high participation rate. And there are many programs are 32 similar programs across country about half of them have not been updated over time and fallen into disuse. So we trying to avoid the same states for Portland programs. So, the opening commission, they looked at the quality data made series of recommendations, and they worked not just a with the users that were providing speed back but with stake holders and engaged many stake holders very deeply for moment substantive changes in the process of figuring out what specifically to recommend as whole Commissioner. To the city council. And then as Commissioner mentioned we had little hiccup and a couple recent changes in conflict of interest case law. Took the pieces of the recommended changes that have financial impact on campaigns, turned them into delegations to the commission. So is that hopefully in the future, the case law or even the statute will change so is that city councils can you know freely update public financing of election programs on their own. But until we are place where this city council can regularly update the program especially those numbers, that by definition have financial impact on campaigns, we do need a body to be able to make sure the program numbers stay up-to-date. And, are optimized for meet program meeting its goals successfully. The other changes is it to creates new piece of code about keeping public candidate debates and candidate forums, accessible and inclusive. And there is also delegation in the opening accountable election code to permit the opening accountable elections commission to allow up to ten noise dollar to be spent to defray the costs of interpreters and translators at candidate debates and forums and this came from a request from the late Commissioner fish who this asked nine program back in 23018 to help move city of Portland towards the goal of making sure that candidates and you know residents of Portland who want to engaged in our democracy don't have issues as relate to accessibilities. And I am here if any one has any questions about the changes before you.

Wheeler: Colleague any questions at this juncture? Commissioner Hardesty.

Hardesty: Yes. Thank you. For sake of full disclosure, I have filed to participate in public financing as a mechanism at the city of Portland for my reelection campaign. And I am not sure today whether I feel comfortable voting on anything having to do with that. So I do have

some questions today that not decided whether or not either with legal counsel recommendations it is appropriate for me to vote. But today my questions were original proposal that came forward had some financial mechanisms in place. Are we delegating the financial responsibility to the commission? Nervous city council?

Mottet: The one piece that was removed entirely, was that, recur code has funding cap how much money program can get. Of the general fund. The open accountable commission recommended replace that with a funding formula because the city vote he recalls had passed limit for candidates not participating in the program the court had stalled those middle of last election cycle. In court said that those can be enforced. Having contribution limit outside of the program and then you know newly would drive a lot more candidates into the program and increase the cost we estimate by about 50%. So funding cap would actually result program becoming continually insolvent. That's why they recommended funding formula. However, we wanted to make sure that the conflict the conflict of interest were removed from this. So we removed that piece entirely. That will only be able to be voted on separately by those you know feel comfortable are not running for reelection this year likely. And so, we plan to bring that before you again for vote that not all of you can easily participate in.

Hardesty: Thank you. I think that's really helpful. So, the -- what we are asking to do here is just to ensure that people with different abilities will be able to fully participate and this -- and the public finance elections system. Is that an accurate assessments of what we are being asked to do today?

Mottet: That's one thing. There are number of changes recommended to the program that don't have a fiscal impact on any campaign. And therefore aren't caught up with the conflict of interest law so it is all of those little changes that simplify the program and make it easier to use and understand. But with all of these items that create fiscal impact on campaigns, this would also delegate those decisions to open accountable election commission so those are three things that does increase the improvement accessibility. It is simplifies the program and then it delegates items that city council can't vote on very comfortably.

Hardesty: So, let me just say that I am uncomfortable with delegating my fiscal oversight to a committee. That will then come back with a recommendation that we will then have to vote

on. I think we have more conversations that we need to have you know. Maybe about timing when we bring these kind of changes to the council. I do think we need broader conversation and I am uncomfortable getting into the nitty gritty knowing that I am currently a candidate using that system. So this not a comfortable conversation to be having right now so that's where by caution lies.

Mottet: Okay. Thank you.

Hardesty: Thank you.

Wheeler: Commissioner Ryan.

Ryan: Yes. Thank you, mayor. Hello Susan it is good to see you and thank you for your service and I really appreciate what you said that when you do something bold, which I really I should have started off by saying something really important I want to second and say ditto to what Commissioner Rubio said earlier when commission Hardesty said. I don't haven't seen that wrote -- but I do want to say that I am somebody that ran with the first opening accountable system and I am running for reelection under the same program. So, then I go forward with some caution. And, I too will take some more advisement about whether I will vote next week. I still have the question and I am city council member and I would love to ask it. So here it goes. I really appreciate the 360 process. And so my question to you because it is about open and accountability, is you mentioned limit stake holders that you met with. And I think it would be good for us to see who in fact you talked to so. I know our office would love to see the limit of those who were consulted with in terms of being stake holders. I think that would be open and accountable and fair.

Mottet: Yes.

Ryan: That sounds good. Thank you so much Susan. Thank you for being here.

Wheeler: Thank you Commissioner Hardesty you had your hand up.

Hardesty: I thought of one other question. I mean the biggest unanswered question about open accountable elections is where it should be housed. And, we are in a position now where trans significance in auditor's office that I hope as city we are thinking thoughtfully about the charter commission. And, whether or not we should be putting that question in front of the commission. I still believe the place for open and accountable elections is auditor as I office. And it makes the most sense. Even though I am aware that an auditor in the future

may elect to use open and accountable system. And, I has commission had any conversations about that? And using this opportunity with the charter review commission to actually solidify where homes should be. Of the open and accountable elects.

Mottet: Yes. The open and the can be election code tasks open accountable commission making recommendation for a long-term home for the program. And, after careful conversation, recommended that the city consider a charter amendment minute to create an independent, Portland elections commission to house the program so it is independence of all of the electives that could run under it. Also one of the items user feedback we experienced that was also nearly universal was that it would be nice if at the present time contribution limits and disclosure enforcement was carried out by the same office. As runs open accountable elections. And, the commission has recommend the those changes to the charter review commission and we had conversations with then and so they are currently considering it.

Hardesty: Thank you, mayor.

Wheeler: Very good. Is there anybody signed up for public testimony on this item?

Clerk: No one signed up, mayor.

Wheeler: Very good. Colleagues then without further ado this is first reading of the non-emergency ordinance. And, it moved to second reading. And colleagues at this time I will turn the gavel over to the council president. Commissioner Ryan thank you for stepping in.

Ryan: You're welcome. Go ahead and read 790.

Clerk: Authorize new construction financing for an air for housing project to be developed by the innovative housing affiliate to not exceed 2,544,000.

Ryan: Okay. That's actually housing that's me, so colleagues I am excited to share update from PHB. I want to begin by think as well our partners at the joint office of homeless service for their heart work and leadership on the ann a man 7th by the voter approved Portland housing bond and weaves Portland housing bureau capital fund with much needed funding for supportive service for the county. To provide housing for our most vulnerable residents. This unique project will acquire and renovate existing historic building and develop it by adding two newly constructed buildings to create new affordable multi-family rental housing amenity rich high opportunity neighborhood. The project will help actualize critical housing

needs just three miles east of downtown also be close to public transportation. A large array of retail services multiple parks and within walk is distance of some of city's public schools. 128 affordable units will be developed in this project. These new units will contribute to the 1,490 permanently affordable homes fund through already open or in development. And man will ensure that the housing bureau exceeds goals. They originally promised to vote if approved by the city first, the affordable housing bonds. This project is it one of the many steps we are taking city increase affordable housing and session we amenity rich neighborhood. Where there is access to transit green spaces schools. And economic opportunity. It comes as a result of tremendous collaboration among our partner including joints office. The Oregon housing community services a key bank we especially want to thank the development team. I want to thank the housing bureau for efforts bring this to fruition. Director, please take it away.

Shannon Callahan: Thank you Commissioner Ryan. Good morning mayor and commissioners. Would you mind putting up power point presentation so we can show some images. And so as the Commissioner noted, we are here to ask for your approval for funding for the project. Next slide, please. The it is not where that red circle but actually number five. On the Portland on map in front of you. And as anything Commissioner noted it high opportunity neighborhood. Which is the laurel neighborhood. And it is our 11th project to either open or gib construction our final project bonds project will come to you actually later this month. The joyce hotel. Next slide, please. This slide here is a visual rendering of both the existing, historic landmarks and that will be retained on the campus. As well as two additional new buildings. The it is really a project that Portlanders should be proud of. It will bring preserve an old historic asset, brings new buildings, and as I said in laurel neighborhood to serve over 315 Portlanders with safe affordable housing and place to call home. Next slide, please. And specifically you can city here the historic building which will be repurposed. As Commissioner noted this is within walking distance of parks schools, retail, and excellent transportation access. Innovative housing has done great job to work with their contractors, and subjects, they are on track. To exceed the Portland equity contracting standards. That we set at 330 Bermuda of dmwesb. They are slight slated to start construction next month. So this project will welcome families home in the summer of 2023. Next slide, please. As we

mentioned the property is historic building. And we will be adding our will adding two new buildings on the three-acre site. And extremely careful to both preserve the historic nature of the building but to create new space for families to call home. As well as being very careful to preserve green space elements on the property and, what is wonderful tree canopy and landscape community. The property will serve family he is and very low-income households and include significant number of 23 and even four bedroom apartment. Next slide, please. Specifically you can see here renderings of one of new buildings and tech under parking. As I said there is 128 affordable units planned at the area 486 those are two bedrooms 133. And there even a four bedroom for families that may require that large of a unit. Rent support is paired with large number of the units on the property so, rents will be available for families with little to no income. And, the lowest rents that families would pay for a one bedroom would be about \$476 a month. They also partnering with IRCO and a new narrative to provide 12 units of permanent supportive housing all told, 42 unit at the area will serve very low-income families with incomes below 30% or below. Next slide, please. The joint office of homeless services will be providing operational support that operational support is being funded in part by the city's contribution to the supportive housing commitments they need. And as well, IHI will bring service partner as IHI junction provide comprehensive wrap around services to families. Next slide, please. Although, the city contribution to this project significant, we will be contributing over \$12.25 million in bond fund eight million on a federal community block grant. Project like this don't happen without private and public leverage. What we -- what our investments is leveraged is 2.8 times of resources, including, low-income housing tax credit from historic tax credits from key bank, as well as important contributions from our bureau by way of SDC exceptions. And finally before I turn it over to Sarah Stevenson executive director of innovative housing inc I just like to thank and acknowledge entire team who worked alongside IHI to make this project reality. It literally takes a village for this case about half of euro to work alongside the team to make sure that this project meets all of the requirements that we committed and a bit goes beyond that and really CEO agents sense of place a sense of permanent and senses of home for 315 Portlanders so with that I would like to turn it over and thank Sarah Stevenson for her and her team's partnership. Sarah?

Sarah Stevenson: Thank you. Good morning everybody. I am Sarah. With innovative housing. Very grateful to be here and for opportunities to talk to you about this critical funding step for the project. This development as Commissioner Ryan said preserves a valuable piece history and creates a new place for families to grow inside of here. And they really pleased to be part of team that will redevelop into 1228 new affordable homes. As you heard 61 of apartments will family sized 2 and 34 bedrooms. All of units will have air conditioning. We are designing natural playground utilizing pearls site one of very few mature trees that we have to remove to make way for new buildings. For most part we are working hard to retain trees and the green canopy. That will provide natural cooling to the site. Paired with great lawns that you saw in that rendering which one of the historic elements we are retaining. Our housing will be surrounded by green space. We look forward to working with both of them to welcome our new resident to this community. And Shannon mentioned addition to acting developer, staff will provide wrap around support services to all of the new residents. And as well as comprehensive housing stability services to individuals and families in our units. We will team up with new narratives offer behavior addiction services in. And we are partnering with immigrants refugee community to build and also to provide culture specific services, so that all of our new residents have support they need to succeed here. This property has long been used as retreat sanctuary in city. We look forward to repurposing into an affordable homes extending benefit of that safety and sanctuary to individuals and families who are struggling to make ends meet.

Callagan: Thank you. We appreciate this city's partnership in this work. And Commissioner Ryan that concludes our formal presentation of this matter and we would request council support to fund the project

Ryan: Thank you so much. And thank you, Sarah, it was great to have you here with us. Is there any public testimony on this item?

Clerk: No one signed up.

Ryan: Okay. Do you have anything that you like to add?

Hardesty: Commissioner Ryan?

Ryan: Absolutely.

Hardesty: Thank you. Council president, thank you Commissioner Ryan director Callahan and Sarah, for your presentation. Let me just say that I think this is it second time that innovative partners have been in front of us in last year. And each time I am just overwhelmed with gratitude for the thoughtfulness the approach that you take for the space and creating a beautiful space for new tenants that will be moving in. I just can't applaud this project enough. I know what it takes as a board member of human solutions for nonprofit to put tooth paste and glue and to bring these projects to the finish line. And I just want to thank all of the parties that were involved. These are the kinds of projects that I am proud of. It is rare that we have entire building. That will serve the most vulnerable people in our community. And I am just have no questions I am just thank you. Thank you. Great project. Happy to support it. And I believe this is an emergency ordinance so, I suspect we will be voting on it to later.

Callahan: Thank you.

Ryan: Thank you. Any other colleague have any questions or comments to make before we do the vote? All right. Seeing none. Since this is an emergency ordinance, if there is no more -- deliberation -- is there motion to --

Hardesty: So moved.

Ryan: Thank you, commission Hardesty. Is there a second?

Clerk: I am sorry. We actually don't a need a motion we can go ahead and call the vote.

Ryan: Okay when it's an emergency item? Sorry about that. This council president gets to learn something every time I get it handed to me. All right, with that. Then, if are there no further discussions can you please call the roll?

Clerk: Of course thank you. Mapps?

Mapps: I want jump want to thank Mr. Ryan for bringing this project forward it really is model for the city. And I also want to congratulate the bureau and iha for innovative and thoughtful work they are doing here it really is an example that I hope that we can replicate. Throughout the city. And, for these reasons and nor I vote aye.

Clerk: Rubio.

Rubio: I want to thank Commissioner Ryan, and the Portland housing bureau and innovative housing and all that have been dedicated to project for sometime now. This is it very exciting

project very beautiful project. And I am thrilled to be vote okay. On this today. I also just want to mention I love wrap around community support partnerships with providers and neighbors. And I love the green space that's for these families and individuals because they deserve to have that. So congratulations again on moving forward today and I am proud to vote aye.

Clerk: Ryan?

Ryan: Yes. Thank you. So thank you, director. And, it was really wonderful have you here Sarah. And, like my colleague said before me, the partnerships were really deep and vast. And especially so good

Hardesty: I want to highlight my appreciation. This is a good day. I vote aye.

Ryan: Okay. Its accepted. This item concludes the morning session of Portland city council today. We will be back for a really robust afternoon session. Bring your snacks. That begins at 2:00 pm. We are now adjourned.

Council recessed at 11:19 a.m.

Closed caption file of Portland City Council meeting

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised city council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript. The official vote counts for council action are provided in the official minutes.

November 3, 2021 2:00 p.m.

Wheeler: Good afternoon, everybody. This is the November 3rd, 2021, afternoon session of the Portland city council. It's good to see everybody back. Under Portland city code and state law the city council is holding this meeting electronically. All members of the council are attending remotely by video and teleconference, and the city made several avenues available to the public to listen to the audio broadcast of this meeting. The meeting is available to the public on the city's YouTube channel Portland eGOV PDX and www.PortlandOregon.gov/video, and of course channel 30. The council is taking -- sorry, I forgot something. The public may provide written testimony to the council by emailing the council clerk cctestimony@portlandoregon.gov. The council is taking the steps as a result of the covid-19 pandemic. And the need to limit in-person contact and to promote physical distancing. The pandemic is an emergency that threatens the public health, safety and welfare, which requires us to meet remotely by electronic communications. I want to thank you all for your continued flexibility, patience, and understanding as we manage through these challenging circumstances to conduct the city's business. And now we will hear from legal counsel on rules of order and decorum. Good afternoon.

City Attorney: Good afternoon, Mayor and Commissioners. Before I do, I would like to give the clerk an opportunity to call the roll please.

Clerk: Thank you. Mapps.

Mapps: Here.

Clerk: Rubio.

Rubio: Here.

Clerk: Ryan,.

Ryan: Here.

Clerk: Hardesty.

Hardesty: Here.

Clerk: Wheeler.

Wheeler: Here.

City Attorney: To participate in council meetings you may sign up in advance with the council clerk's office for communications to briefly speak about any subject. You may also sign up for public testimony on resolutions or the first readings of ordinances. The published council agenda at [Portland, Oregon.gov/auditor](http://Portland.Oregon.gov/auditor) contains information about how and when you may sign up for testimony while the council is holding electronic meetings. Your testimony today should address the matter being considered. When testifying please state your name for the record, your address is not necessary. Please disclose if you are a lobbyist, if you are representing an organization, please identify it. The presiding officer determines the length of the testimony. Individuals will have two minutes to testify today unless otherwise stated. When your time is up, the presiding officer will ask you to conclude. Disruptive conduct such as shouting, refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up or interrupting other's testimony or council deliberations will not be allowed. If there are disruptions, a warning will be given that further disruption may result in the person being placed on hold or ejected from the remainder of the electronic meeting.

Wheeler: And thank you very much. We have one item this afternoon. Item number 791. It is a first reading of a nonemergency ordinance. And I want to give people a heads up before we get into this. There are a very large number of people who would like to testify. We would like to get through the all testimony today. So we will be limited public testimony to two minutes each, which is the same amount the legislature gives. We often like to give three minutes if we can. Given the number of people signed up, it's going to have to be two months. I thank you for your understanding on that in advance. Item 791, Please, Keelan.

Clerk: Amend title 33 planning and zoning and title 32 signs and related regulations to revise and update regulations for historic resources.

Wheeler: Thank you. Colleagues, today we're holding a hearing on the historic resources code project. It is often known as the HRCP for short. There is nothing in the city of Portland

that doesn't have a acronym associated with it, this being no exception. Before we begin the presentations, I wanted to announce that I do not own property impacted by the project, and therefore do not have any conflict of interest to declare that. I would like to ask my fellow members of the council, do any of you wish to declare potential conflicts of interest, please raise your hand if you need me to call on you. I'm not seeing anyone. This project is being brought to us by the bureau of planning and sustainability. So at this time, I would like to invite Commissioner in charge, carmen Rubio, to give us opening remarks. Good afternoon, Commissioner.

Rubio: Good afternoon, Mayor and colleagues. I'm proud to introduce the historic resources code project to the city council today. Council had an opportunity to learn about the planning and sustainability historic resources program and the zoning code proposals at the October 19th work session. As we learn from project staff, historic resource identification, designation, protection, and the reuse are all important part of our land use framework. I'm eager to hear public testimony on the code proposals. But first, some well-deserved appreciations. I would like to thank staff from the bureaus of planning and sustainability and development services for an impressive amount of work and public outreach over the last few years. I would like to thank the planning and sustainability commission for holding hearings and make and making amendments to this proposal prior to making their unanimous recommendation to us. And also, thank you to the historic landmarks commission for providing advice at each stage of the project's development. And finally, thank you to everyone who reached out to all of our council offices, those who already submitted written testimony and those who will testify today. We are all very eager to hear from you and how you think the proposal might be strengthened. I will turn it over to Brandon Spencer-Hartle from the bureau of planning and sustainability to present the recommendation.

Brandon Spencer-Hartle: Thank you. Good afternoon, Mayor, Commissioners. Brandon Spencer-Hartle of the city of Portland historic resources program manager and the project manager for this project. Thank you for having us back. We were here, as Commissioner Rubio said, about two weeks ago to give council an opportunity to learn about the historic resource program and the code amendments specifically. I would like to provide a high-level overview for council offices, especially those in attendance today. If it would be okay to share my

screen, I would love to do that momentarily here. For the council clerk, would it be okay to share my screen?

Wheeler: Keelan? Are you working on that?

Clerk: Yeah, sorry, Brandon, you should have the necessary permission. Thanks.

Spencer-Hartle: Perfect, thank you, Keelan. We're here today for the first hearing of the recommended draft of the historic resources code project. A quick background for those in attendance today. There are several reasons why the code amendments are coming to council now. First, in January of 2017, the state land conservation and development commission amended the state administrative rules to govern local and county historic preservation programs. Those changes in state admin rules mandate we make amendments to the zoning code. The current zoning code automatically applies the highest level of design and demolition protections to properties and districts listed in the national register. We have seen in recent years considerable public interest in having a greater public conversation before strong protections are applied to large areas that are designated as districts. As staff and across the community and our communities that tell diverse stories about the city's history, the bureau of planning and sustainability recognizes that diverse histories are currently underrepresented and in some cases all but excluded from the city statewide historic resource inventory. Additionally, existing regulations, primarily those concerning design alterations and detached accessory structures have been found by staff, applicants and the public at large to be excessive in some cases related to minor changes. Last but not least, in this overall context of land use and zoning, we recognize that adaptive reuse flexibility providing historic resources the opportunity to adapt to new and creative uses is a necessary ingredient to support housing, seismic, public safety and energy improvement goals of the city. Just a quick refresh on the public engagement process. We're here with the recommended draft. This is the last public draft of the document after a three and a half year process that included a concept development period in 2018. During that period we held outreach in each quadrant of the city and online survey open for a number of months. In 2019, the bureau of planning and sustainability published an initial discussion draft of potential code amendments, held outreach events across the city. And, again, held an online survey for interested members of the public. And then in the fall of 2020, the proposed draft

was published and a hearing was held before the planning and sustainability commission. Chair of the planning and sustainability commission, Eli Spevak will join us to talk about the planning and sustainability commission consideration of that testimony and their recommendation to you today. And then in May 2021 after consideration of that earlier testimony, our planning and sustainability commission unanimously recommended adoption of the HRCP amendments to the city council. The recommended draft has been available for public review since June. The window for written testimony has been open since that time. I should say importantly that mailed notice has been sent to all historic resources that would be affected by the code amendments. As we discussed at the work session two weeks ago, there are five primary themes of these code amendments. Each of the five themes contains a number of proposals, those are backed by specific changes to the zoning code. The themes include the types of historic resources that we identify on the historic resources inventory, the local process to designate change or remove landmarks and districts. How historic resources are protected, primarily concerning design and demolition regulations, opportunities for adaptive reuse and the continued use of buildings and places. And then finally, how the code is administered for the benefit of applicants, city staff and the public. I did want to mention a few things in advance of today's hearing. There is a lot of testimony which will be great to hear. I did want to provide a few pieces of background based on the written testimony. For the benefit of council and those testifying, there is no proposal today to designate or remove any designations of landmarks or districts, no new districts and no districts proposed for removal. These code amendments do not change the federal criteria or process for listing in the national register of historic places but these code amendments do propose is changing the automatic regulation that comes with the national register listing. Reducing the automatic protection to demolition review and applying new criteria to be considered in the demolition reviews. The changes don't change the existing local designation process for landmarks and districts but make refinements that include a joint hearing between the planning and sustainability commission and the landmarks commission whenever a new local district is proposed for designation or removal. And one thing you will hear about maybe a lot today, is opportunities for future work. Bureau of planning and sustainability has not scoped of budgeted for the future work there will be a number of testifiers who will talk about

exciting opportunities, innovative ideas, and ways in which the code amendments can be used, not just for the benefit of reusing and adapting historic resources but specifically for those communities who have not been the beneficiaries of historic preservation in the past how the code amendments may inform and support future work. All written testimony has been added to the map app. Both for the benefit of council and testifiers today, if you are interested in the written testimony, that's available online through the map app. The last thing on the slide, you will hear today and see in the written testimony, a significant amount of research, concern and thought has gone into testimony today. And frankly, as someone who gets into the weeds of historic issues, I'm thrilled to see so much interest and so much thought that goes into these code amendments. Today is a public hearing. If testimony concludes today, the written record will also ask council to close the written record. On or around December 1st, any amendment requests that come from council office will be published to the bureau of planning and sustainability website, in advance of a potential December 15th hearing on amendments. Provided that schedule holds, we'll look to a January 19th first reading of a revised recommended draft. And January 26th second and final reading that paves the way for the march 1st code effective date. With that, I will stop my presentation and turn it over to the chair of the planning and sustainability commission, Eli Spevak, who will present the formal recommendation to the city council on this topic.

Eli Spevak: Thank you, Brandon. And thanks for the wonderful staff support on this project. Good afternoon, Mayor Wheeler and city council. I'm Eli Spevak, chair of the planning and sustainability commission. The city we now call Portland hosted enormous range of potent and grounding stories, arising from generations of people who called this place home. Historic preservation through zoning can help hold and illuminate the stories for the benefit of current and future residents. Technically of course, many of the rules for historic buildings found in this package can be achieved independent from zoning. There is nothing stopping a property owner or group of property owners from recording private agreements like covenants or easements to ensure the key features of historic importance are preserved over time. This is common practice with museums and period restorations. Applying the power of zoning to historic preservation as this code budget continues protects resources to an extent unlikely to happen through solely private agreements. Often times these protections are

balanced by incentives for adaptive reuse that improve the building's financial viability. And admittedly, some extend to properties where the private owner might not have signed up for them had they the choice. The historic resources code project does all these things. Wielding the power of zoning for historic preservation creates responsibility. We must ensure the stories elevated in resources protected reflect a wide range of histories found in our city, not just a few. The processes by which rules are adopted to protect resources should be local and democratic, with opportunities for public input like today, and guided by clear evaluation criteria informed by experts in architectural heritage, equity and racial diversity and city planning goals. This project does all these things too. Specifically, the HRCP establishes a clear hierarchy of resource types allowing the city to designate an appropriate level of protection for each landmark or district from a tiered menu of choices. It further increases flexibility for alterations in residential areas by exempting some solar energy installations, electric vehicle charging outlets, window replacements and new detached accessory structures from design protections. Together these changes balance the protection of historic resources with other community goals. It revises the rules for protecting landmarks and districts by eliminating and streamlining the review of some minor exterior alterations. And it requires a joint hearing between the PSC and HLC whenever a new historic or conservation district is proposed for designation or amendment. And prioritizes historically excluded communities in the approval criteria. The PSC would make a formal recommendation informed by the HLC to city council who would serve as the ultimate decision maker. And note as Brandon mentioned, federally protected resources will receive demolition review as required by state law. But additional protections will be established at the local level, through review by the HLC, PSC and city council. It maintains historic landmark commission flexibility and authority in review of projects that come before it, including reviewing additions and related new construction against adopted compatibility criteria. Collectively these changes will allow Portland's inventory of historic resources to tell more diverse stories, adapt a change in community needs and be protected for future generations. To arrive at the recommendations we hosted two virtual public hearings in fall of 2020. 70 individuals provided verbal testimony and we received 278 pieces of written testimony. Then the PSC held seven work sessions. Kristen minor, chair of the historic landmarks commission, joined all of them to help us understand historic issues

and workshop amendments. In addition, three members of each commission met four times with project staff support to go into greater detail on some of the amendments. We greatly appreciate chair minor and the HLC for the work on the project from beginning to end. We couldn't have done it without them. The recommended draft is markedly better thanks to their involvement and to the wealth of public testimony we received. Ultimately, the PSC voting unanimously to recommend the package to council. We hope things won't stop here. I'll leave you with a couple of suggestions to use the code for the benefit of Portlanders. First, conduct a citywide cultural resource plan prioritizing and empowering communities whose stories are absent from the existing inventory. And second, selectively refine the zoning map to ensure balances for heights of new buildings are neither too progressive nor too conservative in historic districts. Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to listening along with you to this afternoon's testimony.

Spencer-Hartle: Mayor, Commissioners, that will conclude the bureau of planning and sustainability and PSC recommendations.

Wheeler: All right. Very good. Commissioner Rubio, is there invited testimony before we get to public testimony?

Rubio: I am checking with staff. Brandon?

Spencer-Hartle: Mayor Wheeler, there is at least one. Kristen Minor, the chair of the historic landmarks commission. I believe we were offering her three minutes.

Wheeler: All right. Chair Minor, are you with us today? I'm sure you are. I would be shocked if you are not. There she is. And you are still muted, Kristen, if you could unmute. There you are.

Kristen Minor: Great. Okay. Good afternoon, Mayor Wheeler and city Commissioners. I'm Kristen minor speaking for the Portland landmarks commission. In my time allotted, I want to touch on three topics. First, why this package of code amendments should be adopted. What we ask of city council and why these next steps are so critical. The historic resources code represents so much work and time spent by bps, bds, members of the public and two commissions. The landmark commission supports the proposed code with technical amendments proposed by the bureau of planning and sustainability. We support it for all of the reasons we outlined in our letter, but especially because it creates an alternative to the national register standards. It's important for city council to understand that our support for

the code package overall doesn't mean that we are thrilled with every line of it. We reached compromises on more than a few provisions. But we also found more common ground than we thought possible between our two commissions. The planning commission and city council have already made huge strides in equity over the last five or so years by doing the work to allow more density and more uses across the city, especially in residential zones. These changes were supported by our commission in historic and conservation districts too. Now we need policies and programs that lead to better and more efficient uses for what we have already. Demolition and replacement often directly fuel gentrification and displacement, employment suffers as well. Instead we need policies and programs that push for energy retrofits and adaptive reuse. Increasingly, adaptive reuse applies to the neighborhood scale as well as to individual buildings, which is why we supported the flexibility to let go of some of the structures meant to only hold cars and to allow for solar panels in districts. Finally, we need policies and programs that will identify or designate places important to minority communities in Portland. This work can only happen if city council authorizes a cultural resources plan for Portland. Putting in place a process of outreach, with a yearly budget allotment. Comprehensive -- comprehensive plan policy 4.53 preservation equity says expand historic resources, inventories, regulations and programs to encourage historic preservation in areas and in communities that have not benefited from past historic preservation efforts. I'll conclude with a quick reminder that as a certified local government, the state assesses our city historic land use processes to make sure we don't fall below a certain minimum threshold of protections and public decision-making around historic resources. This code gets at many things the landmark's commission has been asking the city council for and we ask for your support. We also ask for your support of a cultural resources plan to tackle preservation equity. Thank you.

Wheeler: Thank you, Kristen. We appreciate it. Thanks for your leadership in the community. We will -- so that completes invited testimony, I believe. And somebody will correct me if that turns out to be wrong. With that, we will now move onto public testimony. Keelan, how many people do we have signed up currently?

Clerk: We have, it looks like 99 people on the call right now. But we have more signed up. We'll probably see others joining.

Wheeler: Good, because we can't just fall one short of a hundred. That doesn't seem right. We would have to recruit somebody to fill that last slot. We will move onto public testimony. Each person will have two minutes to testify. We have a lot of people, as you know, signed up to testify today and we're eager to hear everyone. I'll ask you heard your point already made by another testifier, please don't feel the need to necessarily repeat it word for word. You can just say, I support the idea around fill in the blank. Also, if you are a part of a group testifying together, we would appreciate you keeping your points as short as possible and possibly having somebody speak on behalf of the group. At the end of day, this is your microphone. This is your time and you can use your two minutes however you would like to use it. With that, Keelan, please takeover from here on public testimony.

Clerk: Thank you, Mayor. I'll call three at a time. First up, we have Mary Vogel, Mac Cunningham and Jennifer Shuch.

Mary Vogel: So I'm Mary Vogel. But I would like to ask if before you start the timer, I could explain how I happen to be first. Is that okay?

Wheeler: Mary, I actually wanted to know the answer to that question. So -- I would be happy to hear that.

Vogel: Okay. I remembered at city hall you used to always call for the people who were disabled or with small children to testify first. And I thought, you know, in the past, most of the people testifying did not use good, best practices for zoom. And the closed captioning was terrible. It's so much better today. But it was horrible. And so I couldn't get through a whole meeting because I was exhausted before they got to me. So anyway... That's why I asked to go toward the front of the line. I didn't want to be first but in any case, that's how I happen to be here.

Wheeler: Thank you, Mary, we appreciate you being here as always. And Keelan, as the clerk, I want to thank you for your thoughtfulness as well.

Vogel: Okay, so anyhow. All right, now timing. I'm Mary Vogel. And I'm here with my small business plan green in downtown Portland. We support the HRCF and the amendments that will be explained by Portland neighbors welcome and by housing Oregon. But we're not here to talk about that. Because there are people much better qualified for that. What instead I'm here to ask about that -- concerned about those concerned about historic resources might all

agree on. And that's adaptive reuse. The city and all interested parties will need to work with the state to assure common items in the Oregon state building code, such as fire, sprinklers, window openings, installation, sound transmission, elevators and gray water are changed, as Portland city code also makes it difficult to convert large, single-family homes for group living as well. Since I last addressed the -- this in the residential info project, I understand that only the change from commercial to residential has been made in the state code but it has not been put into Portland's code. After the HRCP with amendments passes, I hope that our preservation friends would join with Portland small developer alliance, Portland neighbors welcome, and housing Oregon and others to push the bureau of planning and sustainability to make it a first priority to work with the bureau of development services and the state on building code changes to make adaptive reuse more probable. Otherwise, you know, we lose in talking about this at all. So yes, I just hope that you will take into consideration adaptive reuse, because it is what will make the code implementable. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up, we have Mac Cunningham.

Mac Cunningham: Hello there. My name is Mac Cunningham. I'm an affordable housing developer at catholic charities of Oregon. Today, I am testifying on behalf housing Oregon's Portland metro policy council. Housing Oregon's policy council is made up of a diverse set of affordable housing organizations. We are largely supportive of the HRCP recommended draft, suggestions described and submitted testimony how HRCP can better support affordable housing. Specifically, we recommend an amendment to allow all affordable housing defined as 100% of units up to 60% ami to utilize a type two review process. And importantly, be entitled to full height and f.a.r. On the base zone. The affordable housing process is markedly different from and less flexible than that of market rate value. Decreases in review time and removing risks of high-impact changes which could derail a project late in the review process helps public dollars go further and opens doors -- opens the door for providing affordable housing where it previously had been too risky or infeasible. All the while providing thoughtfully designed provisions to historic areas and increasing opportunities for adaptive reuse of historic buildings. However, to ensure HRCP is as effective as possible to aid the development of affordable housing, we support funding future work to update design guidelines and historic districts. The less it occurs, unnecessary ambiguity and uncertainty will

remain. We support future funding for an update of the historic resource inventory, with additional consideration presented by Portland neighbors welcome, for a city to both protect places that reflect marginalized communities and removal of historic resources from overrepresented communities. Thank you to all staff and commission members who are involved, for thoughtfully recommending changes. Thank you, again, for the opportunity to testify before you all.

Clerk: Next up, we have Jennifer Shuch.

Jennifer Shuch: Hello. I'm Jennifer Such, a Concordia neighborhood resident and a volunteer with Portland neighbors welcome. I want to thank the bureau of planning and sustainability for all their hard work on the historic resources project. It's a much needed initiative that will give the city control over historic preservation in Portland. However, I believe more robust protections are needed to ensure that historic designation can no longer be used as an exclusionary tool by wealthy neighborhoods to bolster property values and hamper development. Portland welcome neighbors welcomes amendments and funding requests would first explicitly give council the ability to consider past racial exclusion as a criterion for resizing demoting or removing a district's historic or conservation status. Second, help developers, especially affordable housing developers, secure financing for new housing projects by limiting uncertainty in the approval process. Third, expand the idea of the city's built history to include sites important to a wide array of marginalized groups rather than just the craftsman bungalows of the wealthy. And finally, give the council more control over demolition in national register districts. You may hear today that historic districts currently makeup a small fraction of residential land in the city. In reality many districts are in the city's most high opportunity, transit rich, walkable neighborhoods. The east Moreland neighborhood association has explicitly stated that it is seeking national register designation in order to prevent new development. Other wealthy neighborhoods will surely follow the leads of Irvington, Laurelhurst, and east Moreland in using historic preservation as a form of redlining. What a city chooses to protect is a statement of its values. I believe we can protect the landmarks that are meaningful to the city's history without building a new legacy of exclusion. I urge the city to pass the HRCF with the amendments proposed by Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Luke Norman, Doug Klotz and Johann Hannesson.

Luke Norman: Hello, Mayor and Commissioners. My name is Luke Norman. I'm a volunteer with Portland neighbors welcome, I'm here today as an Irvington resident. Soon you'll hear from many of my neighbors who will tell you the most important thing for our neighborhood is preserving our buildings. I agree Irvington is a special place to live. Where students can walk to school, parents can bike to work and everyone can take the bus to the grocery store. What allows my wife and I to live in our neighborhood are the affordable rents in our two-story apartment building. While our building likely won't be featured on the neighborhood home tours, it does provide a home to my neighbors. Retirees and students, families, and workers, Asian and Black, Latinx and white. So I believe the most important thing you can do for our neighborhood is to help build more homes for people like my neighbors. Today, that means passing the historic resources code project with the housing Oregon and Portland neighbors welcome amendments. Together, these amendments ensure that the gentle density and apartment buildings that were legalized by council can be built in neighborhoods like mine. This means that Irvington's easy access to schools, jobs and shopping will continue to be affordable to my neighbors across the street who own century homes and my neighbors next door who rent two-bedroom apartments. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Doug Klotz.

Doug Klotz: Good afternoon. Mayor Wheeler and councilmembers, my name is Doug Klotz. I volunteer for Portland neighbors welcome and I support the historic resource code project with the amendments proposed by Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon. You may hear testimony from others today that historic landmarks commission must retain a primary role in district review and recommendations. In fact, the HLC as a major role. As Eli Spevak explained, a public hearing with the planning and sustainability commission and historic landmarks commission is required before the planning and sustainability commission recommends action on the designation or removal of historic districts. Assigning the PSC the final recommendation is consistent with the PSC's role in overseeing the 2035 comprehensive plan, the climate action and zoning code, and their charge to advise council on housing, climate change, equity and other policies. Historic and conservation districts have major equity, land use, transportation and climate change implications for our city. Historic district

can act to further inequity by preventing new affordable housing at 60 mfi or even less than 150 mfi. It can lock in place low-density, single-family land use patterns thwarting efforts to increase housing within a half mile of transit, efforts to reduce carbon emissions in efforts to build a walkable city. The HLC has a built-in bias by code, which says all members must have a demonstrated interest, competence or knowledge of historic preservation. These are not the folks to ask to balance the priorities. Therefore, it's appropriate the recommendation to council be made by the planning and sustainability commission, who has been charged with all citywide issues and will weigh all the factors and make a recommendation to council balancing the need for a district with all the comprehensive plan goals of our city, including historic preservation. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up is Johann Hannesson.

Johann Hannesson: Can I get a thumbs up if you can hear me? Excellent. Mayor Wheeler, Commissioners, my name is Johann Hannesson. I'm a volunteer and lobbyist for Portland neighbors welcome. I'm testifying today on its behalf. We are grassroots, pro-housing, pro-tenant organization dedicated to ensuring all Portlanders can find and keep safe, stable and affordable homes. The historic resources code project takes vital steps toward making our historic resources and districts more democratic, equitable and greater contributors to our housing goals. However, there are gaps in these changes that risk keeping some historic protections as a tool for economic exclusion and preventing some of our highest opportunity neighborhoods from contributing to the housing and equity goals. That is why we're asking you to pass the HRCP with four amendments and fully fund future work in two key areas. Those amendments are one, include a history of racial covenants, to resize, demote, or remove a district's historic or conservation status. Histories of segregation and exclusion need to be addressed. Amendment two, mandate the historic resource review can only reduce the buildings height or f.a.r. By 10%. This prevents informal zonings, preserves the ability to sculpt the building while preserving certainty of what size building can be built. This certainty is especially important for financing affordable house. Amendment three, change all historic resources from type three reviews to type two staff reviews. This is both faster, less expensive, while preserving the impression of the historic landmarks commission should a project be appealed. Number four. Expand approval criteria for demolition review and national

registered districts to the maximum allowed by state law. National register districts are fundamentally undemocratic and unaccountable to the city. To gain additional protections, a local process and standards should determine if the structure or the district warrants it. To compliment these amendments, we ask you to fully fund two studies. First, a study to reevaluate the appropriate size, protection and zoning of existing districts prioritizing reevaluation of districts built on history of racial and economic exclusion. Second, a study to both protect places that reflect b.i.p.o.c. And lgbtq plus and other underrepresented communities and remove resources from overrepresented communities. In combination, these changes will prevent past economic and racial exclusion from being rewarded with historic protections and help our historic resources represent the full spectrum of Portland's cultural past. We're excited to discuss how these amendments and those from our partners at housing Oregon can promote these goals and create more abundant housing for Portlanders of all incomes. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up, we have Sam Noble, Jared Morris, and M. Shawn Green.

Sam Noble: Can you hear me? Can I get some kind of reaction? Awesome. Good afternoon, Mayor and Commissioners. My name is Sam Noble. I'm a mt. Tabor resident, and sometimes volunteer with Portland neighbors welcome. I'm here to today to support the work of the historic resources code project. I hope you will approve it via amendment proposals from Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon. I submitted more detailed testimony in writing. When my daughter asked me for something, and I tell her, no, she's not allowed to go ask some other adult. When activists ask city council for special treatment around land use policy, you can grant or deny it by weighing competing objectives. But when you decline any activists who lives in an area with enough old building can go to the national register of historic preservation and get special treatment without consideration of local policy. Just as I get upset with my daughter for going behind my back, this should infuriate you as the body in charge. You have the ability to discourage the behavior and the ability to diminish its effectiveness. Amend the legislation before you to expand the demolition criteria in national register historic districts so this designation ceases to be useful for discouraging new neighbors and housing. In the proposal before you today, this means adding demolition approval criteria for sites likely to support more dwellings than currently exist. I would never

tell my daughter that no means go ask someone else. And city council shouldn't delegate its authority and responsibility. Please reclaim local control over historic designation in Portland. Please also confirm that historic designation can't be considered in a vacuum by maintaining the planning and sustainability commission's role as the body responsible for recommending historic and conservation districts to council. I have 15 seconds left if anyone would like to stretch, now is a great time or we can move on. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up, we have Jared Morris.

Jared Morris: Good afternoon, a quick sound check, can you hear me all right? Great. Those who literally said, burn it down, there are many inclusive ways we can add more affordable housing in Irvington and other historic districts without demolishing the oldest homes. For example, adaptive reuse. Portland added 6,000 housing units from the 1940s by allowing homes to be converted. We can do that again. Expanded adus. Irvington added 70 of them in 10 years and could add more and incentivize more via standalones and conversions. Expanded density. 71 of Irvington acres are occupied by noncontributing buildings, not subject to any demolition review. They can be redeveloped. An existing laws, the residential infill project means a fourplex already can be built or created on any single-family zoned lot in Irvington. And lastly, new incentives. HRCP removes all house unit limits throughout historic districts. It's helpful to see how it works before increasing demolitions. Those using words like racist, first know, Irvington for a time had covenants 105 years ago that didn't allow Chinese to live here. That was wrong. And it was part of the larger ugly story of state and federal exclusion. What you may not know is that 70% of Irvington as you know it today was built after that time or areas that never had such restrictions. And redlining by banks and insurance companies impacted people of all races and incomes where it applied to northeast Portland. Irvington residents worked hard to get it outlawed. To those adding amendments, the plant should make clear the financial subsidies that developers will need to build replacement housing that would meet any affordability criteria, otherwise the only housing added will be market rate which defeats the stated aims. Notice the lot in Fremont that added a duplex with each unit now listed for \$800,000. We can look to Laurelhurst for a shining example, adding to historic buildings more than a hundred units of affordable housing because the city is giving \$20 million in subsidies. And finally, to those who scheduled this hearing in the middle of the

week day afternoon when many are working first or second shifts, please make time to review the written testimony. Must of it from people who are offering inclusive solutions that don't involve demolition. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up, we have M. Shawn green.

M. Shawn Green: I'm Shawn green. I've lived in the same house in Irvington on the west side, adjoining Elliot neighborhood for 23 years. I moved into this neighborhood because it was dense, near the city center, economically and racially diverse, historic, and most important, affordable. This was an affordable place to live. I had been warned away from this neighborhood by well-meaning people who thought it was unsafe for someone to live here. But I've enjoyed greatly living in this neighborhood and I've enjoyed this diversity both economic and racial. This neighborhood has long had not only single-family homes but apartment complexes, townhomes, residential towers, public housing projects. It is not just a bunch of big wealthy homes. I've been saddened to see that over time there's been a considerable loss of this economic and racial diversity because of redevelopment with historic properties. The typical story is that historic property will be demolished and in its place will come a couple of townhomes, maybe three depending on the lot. Those townhomes are not affordable by any stretch of the imagination. I couldn't afford to buy one if I had to buy a new house now. That really tears apart the vital fabric of this neighborhood. I want to mention quickly adaptive reuse flexibility is a very nice phrase. I'm absolutely for that. I don't see how anybody could be against it. But it shouldn't be used as magic words to justify and enable inappropriate yet lucrative redevelopment. Preservation equity is more important than developer profits. That is the biggest concern I have with HRCP as proposed. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up, we have HeatherFlint Chatto, Rich Roberson, and Kay Mosby.

Heather Flint Chatto: May I share my screen?

Clerk: Yes, you should have the ability to do that.

Flint Chatto: Thank you very much. Please let me know when you can see my screen. Is there anything I need to do?

Clerk: We're not seeing it yet. There is a share screen button near the bottom. Heather, I think you are muted.

Hardesty: We see you but not your screen.

Flint Chatto: Okay. I share my screen now? Good?

Clerk: It's working now.

Flint Chatto: Great. Okay. Thank you very much, Commissioners and Mayor, for having this attention on the historic resources code project. I really appreciate all of your work and also want to compliment Brandon Spencer-Hartle for his hard work and all the participants in this process. I'm a 20-year urban planner and environmental designer. And I work on major revitalization projects and support communities with local grassroots public engagement to develop tools and resources. One of the reasons I do this work is because I'm deeply concerned about our climate impacts. And buildings use nearly 40% of our energy as the chart on the left shows. When we tear them down, we are really having a significant impact to the already extracted embodied energy to gather the resources, refine the resources, transport them and do it all over again. It's a critical part of our strategy to be able to use the resources we have and then build above and fill in. Because buildings represent 90% of our first cost. When you look at the chart on the right and you see how long it will take us to overcome the impact of those first costs that yellow bar on the left with our embodied carbon of our operations, it's going to take us a lot longer. Even if you have a building that is new that is 30% more energy efficient it takes between 10 and 80 years to offset the carbon impact. What we do right now in the next 10 years is going to be critical. And how we reuse our buildings and provide the funding for adaptive reuse strategies is critical. I want to point out the economic impacts that much of our heritage tourism impacts our economic survival of the streets, which are very much suffering right now. We have a large number of areas that are special in our city and do not have any kind of protections. I'm going to flash these on the screen to show the items we would like to support in terms of landmarks commission and retaining their role. We do not support the extended criteria for demolition not consist with goal five. It needs something that reflects the carbon impact. I would like to support a cultural resources master plan that also includes the low-rise vintage building study. Because these are important areas that have been mapped by the city that are not having any kind of protections and there are already existing resources and maps and we have supported these with many other special buildings and inventories as volunteers. I want to close with an example of a building that is about to be demolished, the Portland hostile on hawthorn is one

of those special places in our community that has been an important gathering place. And we don't have many tools to be able to move that building, transform it or turn it into some kind of other community center use right now. So these are losses we feel that, places we all share. I hope we will use tools and funding you have to really support more underserved communities to conduct the inventories and provide the adaptive reuse tools and technical assistance, low-interest loans, et cetera. Thank you very much. I appreciate your time.

Clerk: Next up, we have Rich Roberson.

Rich Roberson: Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Rich Roberson. I'm a homeowner and a parent in the formerly redlined section of Irvington. And I'm generally supportive of the many proposed changes. However, I have concern of some of the changes that might weaken protections and increase demolitions without requirements the new construction meet the goals and increased density and affordability. I have witnessed countless demolitions in the adjacent unprotected neighborhood of Sabin. In nearly every case, the new home that was built was sold for more than doubled the demolished home. This phenomenon was recently studied in Chicago by M.I.T. And they found similar measures to increase redevelopment had actually decreased affordability, while having minimal impact on housing supply. Demolitions are an outright attack on affordability and target minority-owned properties. We don't knock down the expensive houses. One of the other things I observed with the lack of protection and support, there has been rapid gentrification at the historically black north and northeast community. The albino neighborhood was 50% black in the 1980s, it's less than 20% today. Comparing the schools. The schools where my children went. We see that in 2009 Sabin elementary school was 30% white, 45% white and 61% of students receive free or reduced price meals. In 10 years, it has become 66% white, 15% black and less than 25% of students require financial assistance for meals. Over the same time, Irvington minority population is unchanged at 47%. Historic neighborhoods foster strong, empowered and diverse communities. I urge council to protect existing historic structures, expand historic protections for overlooked minority communities and raise big restorative justice opportunities and the relocation of the redevelopment of the albino rail yard. Thank you so much for your time.

Clerk: Next up, we have Kay Mosby. Okay. You are muted. Down in the left corner there should be a picture of a microphone. We can hear you now.

Kay Mosby: Hi, my name is Kay Mosby. And shortly after my husband Woody and I moved to Irvington, the neighborhood received a historic designation. We were pleased to know our newly adopted city, like the east coast we had just left, had an appreciation for preserving and protecting history and celebrating its craftsman and artisans. Irvington had a strong history of providing affordable housing, which is the apparent in the 2200 multi-family units in the historic district. We have many examples of adaptive reuse, such as duplexes and triplexes carved out of original single-family houses. Recently, the addition of approximately 70 accessory dwelling units prove that Irvington used to increase housings capacity. I'm sorry. We urge the city council to consider incentivizing provisions for adaptive reuse of existing structures rather than demolition. About 40 years ago, the city was considering demolishing a part of our region to make way for industrial development. The residents responded by creating a home tour to bring attention and people to see the cohesive historic nature of the neighborhood. It worked up until the pandemic. The -- I mean, it worked the home tour. The Irvington historic home tour has been an annual event attracting hundreds of volunteers and over one thousand attendees from across the city, state and even from Canada. The real draw to the home tour, however, is that the neighborhood is still intact. Which today speaks to the importance of historic designation protections. It is this existing diversity of buildings and homes side by side on century tree lined streets that give the neighborhood cohesive character that would not be possible with scattered historic sites not intact. If you have not driven through Irvington, please visit. And see what would be lost if developers are allowed to demolish structures. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Elizabeth Deal, Daniel Hernandez and Heidi Hart.

Elizabeth Deal: Hi, Commissioners. Thank you for your time. I want to say thank you to the people I just cut in line because I didn't know I could contact the clerk. I have two small children sleeping so I'm going to keep it brief. I'm a third generation Portlander. I come from a Chinese family who was redlined out of many neighborhoods in Portland. And I want to say I support HRCP and I think that the majority of this work is great and much needed to increase equity in Portland. However, there's one thing I really want to urge council to not change. And that is that the historic resources commission they should be the leader or at least given equal foot as the pcs when it comes to determining what is historic and deserves protections. I

don't live in a historic district. I live outside the edge of the piedmont conservation district. And my neighborhood wanted to pursue a historic district designation but most of us are working-class families who are too busy raising kids and the process was too arduous and too expensive. And I think when determining what's worthy of protection, we need to consultant experts that understand history and understand the importance or why something that's historic is important to the community. If we want to talk about inherent bias we should consider all the industry reps sitting on the PSC. So I don't think that's a fair thing to do. All I got to say is I think this is a really great package of code changes. However, please listen to experts when it comes to our history. And let's not give the majority of the say to the powerful industry lobbyist who currently drive a lot of our city planning. So that's all I got to say. I thank you for your time. And I appreciate you letting me go early in testimony. And I also want to say I am a volunteer on the bds draft and on my neighborhood association. Mostly I'm here personally as a mom and someone who cared about the city for a very long time. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up, we have Daniel Hernandez.

Daniel Hernandez: Hello, Mr. Mayor and Commissioners. Thank you, for giving us all the opportunity to speak. I recognize this is a thorny issue and people are probably unloading on you about all things to do with Portland that might not be specifically about the historic discussion that we're having. As a homeowner, as a layman, I wanted to testify I support the work of the city and trying to increase housing opportunities for everybody. But I just invite everyone to consider what happens to a city when you start to remove its residential areas and make it all just a series of buildings. Like great, people can move in closer. We all want that. We want affordable housing. But at the expense of people who work very hard like a few homeowners who have spoken before me said to get to the pinnacle of a beautiful city and beautiful home, work hard, this is where your kids go to school. And then for that to suddenly be endangered by a few houses around us that could be raised and turned into condos, with the attended parking issues and really just a loss of character. So I know it's a soft issue compared to some of the hard issues you are talking about. I wanted to invite you all to consider the historic designation gives Portland part of its soul and there is care taken in how the new buildings impact the beautiful historic districts. I live in a house on -- that was built as a craftsman bungalow, it's very unusual. It's the Irvington historic tour stops here. I wanted a

modern house and my wife wanted the historic house. I've grown to love it and the neighborhood. I invite you to please consider how great the historic homes are to the entire city of Portland. Thank you for your time.

Clerk: Next up, we have Heidi Hart.

Heidi Hart: Hello, Mayor and city Commissioners. Can everyone see my presentation right here? Okay. Perfect. All right. As I thank you for your time. I'm Heidi Hart, a renter who lives in Buckman. I'm presenting the first of three amendments proposed by Portland neighbors welcome. Some of Portland's most affluent neighborhoods have a history of racial covenants. Portland needs to face and atone for our racist history, not protect it. Revisiting the special privileges given to these neighborhoods is a small and necessary step to face our problematic history. The first example of this is Irvington. Irvington deeds in Irvington restricted Chinese residents from living in these houses except as house servants. And this item was actually listed in Irvington's 2010 national register of historic places registration form. In my opinion, a history racial exclusion is not a good point when it comes to historical landmarking. Next example is lands additional, which had in its deed restrictions that Chinese or Japanese residents could not live in the houses except as servants. The third example is Laurelhurst, which restricted by deed Chinese, Japanese, Black people wouldn't be able to live in these neighborhoods except as servants. The effects of the covenants continue to this day but have taken new forms. The racial zoning restrictive covenants were outlawed. After they were outlawed, many cities including Portland turned to exclusionary zoning. After Portland's adoption of the residential infill project, historic districts are able to use the historic districts restrictions in order to perpetuate exclusionary zoning. Irvington, Laurelhurst and lands addition of land in high-opportunity areas and cover a huge amount of land highlighted in aqua. These neighborhoods are close to jobs, transit and amenities and have complete streets and sidewalks. But historic district rules make it difficult to build affordability or multi-family housing. According to the anti-displacement action plan report, these areas should encourage infill development and higher density housing opportunities especially affordable housing. And this is a large amount of area in Portland to be almost entirely -- to make it very difficult to build any new higher density housing or affordable housing. So this is our first amendment. Which is to include a history of racial covenants as a reason -

Hardesty: Excuse me. Can I get a time check. You are about a minute over. What's the pleasure of the Mayor?

Wheeler: Keelan, can you please manage the time? Because we have so many. It's a great presentation and I would like an email copy of it, Commissioner Hardesty is right. We have a lot of people signed up. I want to make sure we give everybody the opportunity to be heard. I know it's hard to keep comments within two minutes. Let's try so everybody can be heard today.

Hart: Absolutely. This is on map app. Thank you for the time check, Commissioner Hardesty. My apologies. I'll end the presentation. Thank you for your time.

Hardesty: I agree. Great information but we have a lot of people.

Clerk: Next up, we have Adam Starr, Matt Kelly and Gregg Baker.

Adam Starr: Hi, my name is Adam Starr. And I'm here because I support the change to the historic district code. I live in Irvington. I've lived in Irvington for about 10 years with my son who is now 11 years old. I have a dilapidated garage on my property. My mother recently retired. I want to take my garage and convert it to a modest ADU, so my mother can live with us. This will enable me to have my mom around to help take care of my son and allow them to spend more time together. And also as she gets older it will allow me to take care of her and for her to age in place. I met with a contractor who met with the city who explained a small ADU consistent with the aesthetics of the neighborhood, it won't be approved by the city under the current code. But under the proposed amendment, it would allow me a path forward to build this ADU. So in addition to that, there are some economic issues at play. I personally cannot afford to buy my mother another place in the neighborhood. And even finding an affordable rental unit is difficult. Being able to convert my garage to a small ADU is the most economically efficient solution. Not only would it be nice to have her close by, it's the only viable economic path forward for me. That's why I'm here to support the change to the historic district so that I can have a small ADU on my property and allow my mother to live with me and help take care of my son. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up, we have Matt Kelly.

Matt Kelly: Good afternoon, my name is Matt Kelly. I'm a city of Portland employee but I am taking personal time to testify today. And my comments are my own. I support the historic

resources code project and I support the amendments endorsed by Portland neighbors welcome. This is why. I appreciate historic resources. And I happen to live across from a site on the national register of historic places. Which is lone fir cemetery in southeast Portland. It's a lovely cemetery and it provides wonderful green space and people enjoy it every day. I see people going on walks, parents teach kids to ride bikes. There is a person who feeds squirrels every single morning. It's a historic site that provides a lot of public services. I know there is always a tension between trying to keep our city sort of the same and allowing for the to change. I'll be frank, my concern is that mostly white, mostly wealthy people will take advantage of historic preservation rules to keep their neighborhoods mostly white and mostly wealthy. I'm especially worried about this as we finally started allowing more types of housing across the city, including neighborhoods that may be considered historic. Excluding people of races or classes may not be people's intentions but outcomes are important. Historic protections can exclude people by limiting housing options. There is plenty of precedent in Portland and elsewhere for using arcane rules to exclude people with racist and classist intentions. Many of the older neighborhoods don't just have historic qualities, they have some of the best access to high-quality public services, some of our best transit services, parks and schools, our safest streets, lots of trees. These public resources aren't truly public if they are mostly accessible to white, wealthy people, codified through rules that limit housing options. Getting to take a home tour once in a while isn't a substitute. The amendments endorsed by Portland neighbors welcome help safeguard our shared public interest in a city that is accessible and welcoming to people of all races, classes and backgrounds while allowing for historic protections. That's the kind of city I want to live in and I hope most of us would agree on that. Thanks for your time.

Clerk: Next up, we have Gregg Baker. Gregg, you are muted.

Gregg Baker: Okay. I'm on now?

Clerk: Yes, we can hear you.

Baker: Okay. I'm Gregg Baker, I lived in Irvington for 10-15 years now. And I lived in Oregon for 50 years. And nobody has really addressed the safety issues of how this -- these proposed changes affect us. I and my family have been affected by two safety concerns recently. We went, we took a trip and a couple of day trip and came back. And someone had moved into

our yard and camped out and was there. And fortunately, as we drove up, the police came. And apparently there was an outstanding arrest for this individual. And they took him to court. But anyway, that's an incident number one. And when this happens to you, you have a loss of safety, you know, you have, you almost get depressed about how your personal safety has been invaded. About four weeks ago, our car was stolen from the front of our house. And we recently, it was found about two weeks later. And it had been demolished. The battery was taken. The catalytic converter was taken. The tire had been involved in an accident. And smashed and it was totaled out. So we've had these two safety concerns just recently. And I'm not saying that changing the designation of the neighborhood is going to change it. But it really -- and I notice I've read in the paper that some of the councilmembers that had sort of invasions in their yards and so forth, I think I'm in favor of retaining the historical designation. And I think that at the beginning of the presentation here, they were talking about safety. And I really haven't heard anyone talk about how changing the historical designation affects the safety of the district. And I personally have had just recently these two incidents affecting that. I think you have to look at that consideration as well. I --

Hardesty: Excuse me. I'm going to do a time check again. We've got a lot of folks. Thank you, sir, thank you for being here.

Baker: Thank you.

Clerk: Next up, we have Aaron Brown, Michael Andersen, and Woody Mosby.

Aaron Brown: Good afternoon, can you folks hear me? My name is Aaron Brown. I'm the board president of Portland neighbors welcome. Here to testify in support of the recommendation that Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon put together. Just to be clear, I'm not an industry lobbyist, I'm a millennial lucky enough to buy a house that wants to make it easy for my friends. As many of the other testifiers were able to do 30 years ago. Other folks from Portland neighbors welcome are more knowledgeable about the specific policy details for a recommendations as to why it preserves affordability. I heard a point about sustainability that is simply not true. It feels like a good use of my two minutes to address. You will hear the most eco friendly thing to do with buildings is to keep them forever. The greenest building analysis focused on replacing a single detached house with a similar one. Which Portland's residential infill project made all but impossible. When it comes to the gentle

density now legal in Portland, the same report states, quote, additional density may be environmentally advantageous if buildings are located in areas that are walkable and transit accessible. How wild that those are the neighborhoods targeted by the proposal. Separate analysis from the Portland department of environmental quality finds smaller attached homes are dramatically more energy efficient than larger because 80% or more of a home's lifecycle energy costs occur via heating and cooling. What history are we preserving? 20th century is architecture that many of these folks are speaking about is the built environment that codified racism. It's codified neighborhoods that are substantially energy intensive. It's codified segregation. Codifying this neighborhood character is codified elimination of Portland's neighborhood characters. I don't think this is a history I want to preserve. I don't think any of you want it to be your legacy to be carried to the 21st century. We can preserve architecture and the feel of our neighborhoods while still shaping Portland to fit our growing city needs. And our city needs more housing. This decade has to be focused as much on what we retire as build. To preserve the feel of the neighborhood while welcoming new residents. I encourage you to look at Portland neighbors welcome testimony for further information on how to address the historic resource code project inline with our stated goals. Thank you for your time.

Clerk: Next up is Michael Andersen.

Michael Andersen: Hi. This is Michael Andersen. Can you see my screen share? All right. Good afternoon, Mayor and members of council. I'm the senior researcher with site line institute. Speaking on support of the amendments from Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon. I'll speak to the amendment about one particular type of historic district, national registry districts are uniquely undemocratic. And this makes them dangerous. To show why, here's a short example one of my favorite neighborhoods, it's also one of Commissioner Mapps', Buckman. It's a great neighborhood across the river from downtown Portland, one of Portland's most income diverse neighborhoods. Not because it doesn't have lots of nice old homes, it does, and that's great. It has nice old homes and scattered through them are apartment buildings of ages, sizes and prices that vary. Some are affordable, some are market rate. There are lots of options. There are also lots of great transportation options there. That's probably the way Buckman residents get around, like our goals for the future of

Portland. In 2007, someone proposed making it possible for more people to live in Buckman by replacing these three lots with about 50 apartments. A few dozen mostly homeowners who live nearby, organized to turn 94 acres of Buckman into a national register district. Was this a good idea for the city as a whole or region or planet? No one ever asks the question because national register districts can be created with almost no democratic oversight. And give home owners veto power over city council's zoning. But fortunately, my view, Buckman's district wasn't created. This is what the site looks like today. It's one of a handful of sites that added hundreds of new home to Buckman helping preserve that income diversity despite its premium location. So why wasn't this blocked by a new national registry district? Not because any democratic process intervened. National registry district offer none. Because a majority of homeowners thought it would be annoying to live in a national registry district because of all the fees and rules. The project before you today will remove a lot of those fees and rules. I'm not here so say you should keep the fees and rules to prevent the abuse of national registry districts. As you remove those you should consider protecting your own power and democratic oversight by steering people away from undemocratic national registry districts and toward local district instead. The proposed amendments would do this. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up, we have Woody Mosby.

Woody Mosby: Hi. [audio echoing] hi, my name is Woody Mosby. I'm a resident of Irvington. And I submitted testimony in writing that I encourage anybody who is interested to read. But I want to divert from that a little bit. I would like to speak from a homeowner in a historic district who lived in historic districts in the past in other cities. And one of the reasons we bought and we moved to Portland was because it had beautiful historic districts that were still affordable. We moved here 12 years ago, it was an affordable district. As was most of the rest of Portland at that time. I almost feel like -- we've been targeted as the enemy by some of the groups like Portland neighbors welcome. They make me feel not welcome at all. And I regret that because we love Portland. We have contributed to it. We have been volunteers. We are not wealthy, even though we live in a historic district. Most of our neighbors aren't wealthy. Yes, there are wealthy people here but that's what's called diversity. You've got all levels of people, black neighbors, white neighbors. It's a formed community that is strong, progressive and supportive of Portland. And things like increased housing for affordable

people. I really, my background is architecture. I have been in architecture a long time. I encourage you to think very, very seriously before you ease the demolition restrictions. Because once you lose this kind of quality of housing and craftsmanship, you are not going to get it back. It will never happen again. And cities that are really the most wonderful cities to visit have historic architecture and districts. And a quality you cannot replicate today. I thank you very much for your time. I know I've run over. I apologize for that.

Clerk: Next up we have Tony Greiner, Daniel Vidas, and James Heuer.

Tony Greiner: Hi, can you all hear and see me? Okay, thank you. My name is Tony Greiner. I'm a member of the board of the Irvington community association. And where I live in an 1892 house my wife and I did the paperwork on to place on the national register of historic places. That process took about the year. The process of putting Irvington in a national historic district took about three years. Don't get the impression these are quick jobs. I'm also a member of the committee involvement, committee of the bureau of planning and sustainability. And in both cases I'm speaking for myself not for those organizations. Historic resources are irreplaceable, acting hastily or from self-interest can do permit damage to the structure of the city. You only have to look at the vacant lots next to the Emanuel hospital to see the long range results of somebody thinking this is a great idea without thinking it through in advance. So that's first the thing. Secondly, I want you to be aware of this. That while there's been a lot of talk about how this plan was developed with input from a lot of people. In practice that has been the case. One of the members of the planning and sustainability commission, which is behind the code projects in two different meetings and two different times expressed desire to block the participation of neighborhood agreements, neighborhood associations and historical associations from this process. The chair of the committee and no committee members spoke up saying that's not right. We have a tainted process right from the start. Where somebody with power in this situation was able to come in and effectively try to block the participation of people. It is my belief that they listened and then ignored us. You should be aware of that. There is a stream catcher with all the language that was being used available on the written testimony. Thank you.

Wheeler: Commissioner Rubio has a question.

Rubio: Thank you. I would like to quickly respond to Mr. Greiner. First, thank you for your testimony and your service on the council. I want to make you aware and also for the public record that the PSC leadership read your testimony to city council and they have since submitted a piece of testimony regarding this issue. And they just wanted to make it clear that felt the colleagues statement were taken out of context and the aim of community engagement for the project and the commission generally is to include more voices and decision-making. And the issue specifically they were talking about the Commissioner was talking about you referenced was talking about communities in east Portland that have been under served by the city's historic resources program. I'm wanting to raise that up to hope you will have access to the letter so you can read it. And hopefully be assured that the process was inclusive. It should be available on map app for everyone to access. And thanks again for your testimony.

Clerk: Next up we have Daniel Vidas. Daniel, you are muted.

Daniel Vidas: Does that work?

Clerk: I can hear you now.

Vidas: I've lived in the Irvington area for over 40 years. And here to argue against the economic incentive provisions of the draft code, which would eliminate existing residential zoning restrictions against commercial office, sales and service uses. Zoning restrictions exist for a reason and are important to protecting neighborhoods and homeowners from encroaching commercial operations. They shouldn't be waived lightly. Reportedly the draft zoning incentives are to create economic viability for the rehabilitation, reuse and preservation of historic sites. Terms rehab and reuse beget images of abandoned decrepit buildings to be suitable for reuse. For those uses, neighbors would likely voluntarily waive their zoning restrictions. The draft does not require any addition of need distance of only existence of historic significance and prior nonresidential use. Those standards will necessarily benefit many sites that are not needy and to which neighbors might object if given the opportunity. Particularly, within those definition of residential, nonresidential use are churches. But no one seems to mention that there are over 500 churches in Portland. And even brandon's quoted today, the Oregonian, old buildings such as schools might be used for commercial space. Of the 500 churches in Portland, most are in residential areas and many are well-maintained and fully functioning. And many of them will no doubt succumb to the lure

of easy money and lease space to commercial operations, to the detriment of the neighborhood and also commercial competing landlords. We're not talking about churches running a daycare center or gift shop.

Hardesty: Excuse me, sir, it looks like I'm the cop today. Your time is up. We appreciate your testimony.

Vidas: I'm sorry for that. I hope you review my written testimony.

Hardesty: We will. Thank you.

Vidas: Well, I hope you do. We don't need these provisions. We have these --

Wheeler: Keelan, is there a way you can -- [multiple speakers]

Wheeler: Thanks, Daniel. Appreciate your testimony. Keelan, is there a way you can help with the timing here when people have reached their two minutes, can you please say time and I'll take it from there if they don't stop.

Clerk: Sure. We have our timer running as well, which I think is hopefully visible to everyone. And I'll also indicate when the time is up. Next up, we have James Heuer.

James Heuer: Mayor and city Commissioners my name is Jim Heuer. I'm speaking as a member of the pokeman coalition for historic resources. HRCP was Portland's response to changes in the Oregon land use goal five rules for historic preservation. I was privileged to serve on the regulatory advisory committee that recommended those new rules, which were adopted in January 2017. The new rules deliberately usher in a new era where city council have increased role in identifying, designating and protecting historic resources. Specifically, cities were freed from... From constraints in developing inventories of historic resources. A major change. Cities were given protections to historic resources, another major change. Cities were prohibited there automatically applying a suite of regulatory protections to newly-listed resources on the national register. In the process also a baseline protection was established for demolition review of natural register resources, but that provides the city council with generous latitude to consider many factors including affordability of replacement development rather than a single narrowly-defined criteria. A latitude that allows and challenges the city council to do its job this weighing conflicting and evolving goals to arrive at the best decision for the community. In the context of these revised rules, we are deeply concerned about provisions in HRCP covering designation, de-designation,

demolition definition and demolition criteria which do not comply with these rule currently. Also provisions fail to follow the guidance of the secretary of the interior and the state of Oregon in how resources are to be evaluated for protections. In this regard, it should be noted that the five rules are prescriptive and not advisory. Thank you very much for your time.

Clerk: Next up we have Katherine Widdows, Darrin Amico and Sean Aaron Cruz.

Katherine Widdows: Hey, everybody. My name's Kate widows, and I'm a contributing member of PDX neon. And our goal is to -- we're a bunch of volunteers who love neon and consider neon signs works of folk art. And our goal is to get some protection for these irreplaceable cultural icons. So as far as HRCP documents, we're pretty happy with the new demolition protections and a lot of the amendments that are, that are being proposed. So what we're going to do today instead is talk about future work opportunities. And is one of the things that I think is a great next step for protecting historic neon signs would be to complete a comprehensive, city-funded survey of significant neon signs. This would allow the signs to be reviewed for landmark status and would be an important step in protecting these public works of art. Another idea would be to follow San Francisco's lead and create a legacy business program which could bridge the gap, you know, say a business was selected for landmark status because of their sign and they didn't have the money to have their sign restored or rebuilt, this legacy business program could potentially bridge the gap with funding for those businesses to keep these beautiful signs lit. And I'm just going to mention a few signs today and talk about how important they are. Well, one of the signs we'd love to see restored right away is dean's barbershop which is Oregon's oldest African American salon. There's a few other signs that have no protections right now. It looks like I'm out of time, so thanks so much for your time, and I hope you read my written testimony.

Wheeler: Thank you, Kate.

Widdows: Thanks so much, everybody.

Wheeler: Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Darrin Amico.

Darrin Amico: Thank you. Honorable members of the council, thank you for your attention.

First off, I would like to ditto heather chattel. I believe preservation is the ultimate form of recycling, so allowing for some efficient updating would be ideal. I realize that this may be a

repeat of many points of interest, though I'm interested to speak about solar in historic districts, I'd like to make two points today. We're living anything a climate emergency. First, our priorities as a community and as individuals should be to do everything in our power to allow for positive change for those who want and can install solar to the benefit of the environment and to the reduction and dependence on fossil fuels. This council is to decide for allowable placement of solar panels in historic districts. It should come as no surprise, and it's been said earlier that according to the EPA residential homes and transportation the make up almost 50% of the global warming emissions through the use of fossil fuels and energy that is used to build and run these systems. As responsible citizens, we should be allowed to outfit our homes to take advantage of these renewable resources that we have, and the best and most affordable right now is solar. This would reduce the load of the grid and the need for fossil fuel-generated energy. If I was allowed to use a current code to allow solar, I would not be able to use 20% of my roof surface due to orientation and efficient use of solar. I would like to see that solar panels, not just tesla solar, are allowed on all surfaces of the roof including the street-side areas. Second, the simplicity of installation could be further enhanced by the use of metal roofs, having the benefit of extended duration of roof life, reducing waste and landfill burden on top of improving the quality of the runoff into the ground water, eliminating hydrocarbons, zinc and other toxic ingredients. Side issues that affect livability --

Clerk: Time is up.

Amico: -- reflective surfaces would help in this process. Thank you for your time. Today. Good-bye.

Clerk: Next up we have Sean Aaron Cruz.

Sean Aaron Cruz: Good afternoon, Mr. Mayor, members of the city council. I'm Sean Aaron Cruz, I'm a resident, and when I bought my home this 2002 from a developer, I didn't know anything about the history of the house or the cultural significance that it had. And it was the family home of Gilbert and Floyd Pepper who were the head of three generations of Indian educators. And the cultural significance here is very large. Floyd Pepper was the writer of Indians and Oregon today for the department of education, middle and high school curriculum for the state. And her son Jim is the only Oregon musician whose instrument is in a

glass case in the Smithsonian museum, the only Oregon musician who, as far as I know, attracted the attention -- his body of work attracted the attention of a winner of the Pulitzer prize. And this is his first lp under his own name right here, 1971, Jim pepper's powwow. And I am executive director of the Jim pepper native arts council, and we're headquartered here. And it's my plan that after I pass along that this house will go to the council. And we ask that you designate this as a landmark. And that we preserve the property forever. Thank you very much. I still have time. [laughter]

Clerk: Next up we have Nicole Possert, Maya Foty and Patricia Spencer. Nicole, are you able to unmute?

Nicole Possert: Yes, thank you. My name is Nicole Possert, and I'm the executive director of restore Oregon. We help reserve, reuse and as forward meaningful places and spaces in communities across the state. As a nonprofit educational and advocacy organization, we believe that historic resources are a vibrant part of the solution to our most pressing challenges. The HRCP provides important means to utilize preservation inclusively and to have us all work together to advance equity, cultural heritage, climate action, housing affordability and anti-displacement. The thing that I would like to speak most about today besides the testimony that we submitted is around the demolition criteria. Demolition is a forever loss, so we feel that demolition review must be done right. We believe it must comply with the Oregon land use school of five rules taking a balanced approach that considers the economic and non-economic value of a historic resource and its impact on the community relative to proposed replacement projects. Specifically criteria d1 in the recommended draft is a concern to us, and we stand committed to partner with the city council to revisit this demolition criterion. We also would add that we would like the council to adopt HRCP with this amendment in terms of the demolition criteria ask mainly focus on what comes next. How do we fund historic preservation going forward? How can the city come up and support a cultural resources plan, a citywide historic resource inventory that needs to be done, all of the things that come next? So thank you for your time. Appreciate your listening today.

Clerk: Next up we have Maya Foty.

Maya Foty: Hi. Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners, my name is Maya, and I'm the vice chair of the HLC testifying today the as a private citizen. Historic resources code project is a result of

countless hours of hard work by city staff, and I strongly urge you to adopt these provisions. I've represented HLC several times, I thought this might be a nice opportunity to share from a personal side what preservation means to me. I was born and raised in the Hungarian American family in a small town in southern California. My parents had fled Hungary during the communist occupation of the second world war and arrived to southern California via Germany. We were raised in a group of other Hungarian immigrants, and I always felt like I didn't quite belong in suburban California, but then I didn't quite belong in Hungary either. I was always left longing for a connection to a place. I think this longing for connection drew me to the field of historic preservation which is exactly identifying, nurturing and celebrating place. I've lived in and worked in five countries and countless cities now in pursuit of this elusive connection to place. My husband's family is from Portland which is why I ended up here. The greatest cities in the U.S.. And abroad are managed with strong and well-funded preservation policies, New York, Boston, D.C.. Take a look at the cultural resources mapping the New York city landmarks commission is doing, it's on their web site. Policy encourages retaining existing building stock. The policy encourages the reservations of buildings whose value lies not just in the bricks and mortar, but the people who inhabit them. Like the oldest African American salon this Oregon, the first business nominated in Oregon specifically for its place this LGBTQ history. HRC policy encourages reusing existing terms versus replacing and encourages the growth of the burgeoning contracting industry specializing in the rehabilitation of existing fabric. You will hear there them today, the crafts people ask is even a student from the community college who has a program dedicated to teaching --

Clerk: Time is up.

Foty: Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Patricia Spencer.

Patricia Spencer: Hello, and thank you for having me here today, city council. I am the founder and owner of fresh air sash quarter repair inc.. I launched my business in 1999, we restore the operating function of original double-hung windows in pre-1950s homes. After 18 years it was time for me to start training next generation to do this very important work. My crew of two young people are restoring 17 windows in a home in the Irvington historic district as we speak. One of my crew is a graduate of the historic reservation restoration

program. Portland's original windows were constructed out of native, old growth doug fir or cedar. Homeowners simply don't know that their windows can be made more energy -- can rival the efficiency of a new window. Check out the window preservation alliance web site for more information about this. There's a whole cottage industry of small businesses here in Portland that I and my colleagues rely on; wood crafters, winks hardware, dale who makes wooden storm windows, stained glass artist jacob, mark, the welder who makes the custom window weights, lisa who painstakingly removed ask and saved panes of wavy glass, ella rose and her crew at the rebuilding center. Best place for an original window is in the home that it came from, not in a landfill. Let's get the word out. Thank you so much.

Clerk: Next up we have Jonathan Cohen, Nick Forrest and David Sweet.

Johnathan Cohen: Hi there. My name is Jonathan Cohen, and I'm the current treasurer and land use committee chair of the oldtown community association. I also own the society hotel with my wife, jessie burke. I am a former aeronautical engineer and general contractor in the city of Portland for over 17 years. And in 2013 I redeveloped our historic building that houses the society hotel this oldtown, and it was my very first development project. And I discovered just how arduous the process can be even for an experienced contractor like myself. I'm testifying today to bring awareness to the city council of the needed amendments to the historic resource code project for small historic properties like we have in oldtown and how our current historic review processes have hindered our neighborhood's ability to grow into a vibrant community and ecosystem. Even more alarming is discovering how this process has created unreasonable barriers to historically disadvantaged property owners and created a form of modern day redlining, effectively eliminating marginalized communities' ability to build generational wealth. The designation of oldtown as a historic district added a level of complexity to development that most small property owners find very daunting to navigate. This process includes a review by the commission which has the power to arbitrarily limit the building rentable floor area below the limits determined in the zoning code. So buildings continue to decay while development happens all around and throughout the rest of the city. Many people believe that having the historic land marks commission review building renovation designs is what is preserving our historic building stock, but most people don't realize we already have very detailed building design guidelines for if each historic district,

and the staff of bureau of development services are very skilled at using this tool in this process. As such, our primary amendment is to, to the current historic resource code project draft --

Clerk: Time's up.

Cohen: -- stay with the staff at development services which allows small property owners to navigate the city policies that are already in writing and have more predictability than those without deep pockets to bring their properties back to life.

Wheeler: Thank you.

Cohen: -- more information brought to each councilor --

Hardesty: It's really disrespectful to keep talking when your time is up. We have a hundred people behind you. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Nick Forrest.

Nick Forrest: Can you hear me?

Wheeler: We hear you loud and clear.

Forrest: Thanks. I've been working at a small family business that restores vintage windows and doors. Our company has been doing rehab for 20 years. Removing protections on buildings would impact our business and buzzes like ours. Our business depends on protection to keep architectural integrity in historic neighborhoods. Low cost replacement companies would otherwise come in and replace original building materials. It's not just about saving our jobs, but the value of the service we provide. Our experience is that some homes and buildings that surround significant historic structures are the same building material and the same style. We believe that the surrounding buildings, architectural characteristics and consistency add to the overall significance and reverence of the -- [inaudible] the materials craftsmanship that are found in buildings like these, the components that can be refurbished and upgraded to rival the highest quality products in today's current market. So I wanted to bring attention that there are many local companies that do this type of work. When we do public bids, they're often very competitive. Window retrofits and upgrades to existing windows and doors should be -- the value in restoration are -- [inaudible] often cost less than replacement. There's a whole industry that depends on keeping these

materials, and new window companies push replacement windows just because they have such big budgets. Yeah. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have David Sweet.

David Sweet: Good afternoon, Mayor, Commissioners. My name is David Sweet, and I live in the Cully neighborhood. But in the 1990s, I built a new craftsman-style house on a vacant lot in Irvington. Three blocks away my future wife was converting a house to a duplex. We met as neighbors, fell in love and have had a wonderful marriage. I attribute our happiness to the fact that Irvington had not yet become a national historic district. If it had been, neither of our projects would have been affordable to us, and we would never have met. National registered districts headache development, conversions and redevelopment more expensive. Some recently proposed historic districts have had the express purpose of raising property values and making housing in the district more expensive. Portland has been changing the codes for low density zones to make them less exclusionary. National register listing seems to be the new form of exclusionary zoning. In 2010 I was project manager for solarize northeast, a community bulk purchase solar project that resulted in the installation of more than 200 residential photovoltaic systems in northeast Portland. These systems have kept many thousands of tons of carbon out of the atmosphere and have more than paid for themselves. We could have installed many more of these systems, but at the time the need for historic design review prevented their installation in any historic district. Subsequent reforms and the current proposal address this issue. I support passage of the historic resources code project, its reforms are badly needed. I also support the amendments proposed by Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon to make the code more equitable ask less likely to contribute to the rising cost of housing and provide greater certainty and affordability for housing developers. I urge you to vote for affordability and the possibility of love. Thank you.

Wheeler: Keelan, are we at the end of those three?

Clerk: Yes, Mayor.

Wheeler: All right. Why don't we, colleagues, take a 10-minute break here. We will be -- it's now 3:52. We will take a recess until 2 minutes after the hour.

At 3.52 pm, Council recessed.

At 4:02 pm, Council reconvened.

Wheeler: All right. Thank you, everybody. We're back from recess. We are now in session. Go ahead, Keelan.

Zoom: Recording in progress.

Clerk: Next up we have Jane Morse, Jolynn Mitchell and Brian Pietrowski.

Jane Morse: Okay. All right. Can -- I can't see anyone, can --

Wheeler: We can hear you.

Morse: All right. My name is Jane Morse, and I'm a recent purchaser of a property this Irvington -- purchaser. And when I purchased the property, neither the seller nor my real estate agent informed me that, in fact, the property was within the historical limits. And I found out later, after I had started to make some renovations, that I could not do that without the appropriate permits. My original contractor -- excuse me, my dog's here. My original contractor, in fact, quit when he learned that the permits would be required, and then the subsequent contractor actually has been applying for the permits since June, and they still are not done. So I'm just here to encourage the changes that have been applied for minor residential changes be authorized in a much more, much more simple process and one that can easily be tolled. And that's all I have to request. And thank you for the recommendations that are being up for approval. Thanks.

Clerk: Next up we have Jolynn Mitchell.

Jolynn Mitchell: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Jolynn Mitchell. Mayor Wheeler and city Commissioners, thank you for your time today. Our family has lived in Irvington for 23 years. Our home is, indeed, historic, and I believe it contributes to historic Irvington. Our garage, however, is three cement walls with a flat roof that the walls are actually crumbling and are a hazard to are enter. By the current city coding, our building -- garage cannot be torn down. It needs to be left as is. So we feel that this is a hindrance to us being able to actually use our garage as a usable building. We support the proposed changes to the HRCF demolition code rules for removing emptying of detached the structures. We see this current rule as time consuming and costly for the city to review and approve demolition of detach the structures. Thank you for your time today.

Clerk: Next up we have Brian Pietrowski.

Brian Pietrowski: Hi. My name's Brian, I'm an alumni of the Oregon college of art and crafts. I'm also a licensed contractor and is work in the field of window restoration and reproduction. There seems to be a lot of controversy around the value of replacing windows as opposed to restoring wooden windows. One of the main concerns seems to be efficiency. Of the total heat loss in the house, only about 12% is lost through the window openings while most occurs at the walls and roof. At the community college we've done studies with thermal imaging that have proven this. Restoration can often compete with replacement and will usually outlast. Contemporary window inserts -- I'm sorry. New windows are made from toxic materials that are harmful to the environment, and a lot of the replacement windows in the market have very limited warranties. When a component fails, replacement is usually the only option whereas a traditional wooden window can be restored a number of times over. Wood windows have been disassembled and rebuilt with new components in the same way that they were originally built. Unfortunately, the window restoration industry is much smaller with lesser means to advertise and lobby local governments than the new window companies. So quite often homeowners do not get the chance to weigh their options and are misled into degrading the integrity of their homes. Thanks for your time.

Clerk: Next up we have Susan Sater, Zoe Lynn Powers, and is Bert Sperling. Susan, you're muted. Are you able to unmute? Susan, are you there?

Susan Sater: Yes, hello. I wasn't sure what was going on.

Clerk: Go ahead.

Sater: So am I beginning my testimony.

Clerk: Yes, please.

Sater: Okay, sorry. [laughter] so sorry for the could be fusion. I guess you know I'm Susan Sater. Protecting history and architectural heritage is compatible with increasing residential density and affordability. There's no need to make it easier to demolish authentic structures to intrude incompatible new construction or to convert residential use to commercial use. You've heard from previous speakers how here in Irvington under existing protections and processes demolition of neighborhood housing has decreased and an increasing number of large historic single-family homes have been reworked into multiple housing units. Many

apartments have been created within original houses and increasing number of -- are being constructed that match adjacent homes in style and scale, new and multiple use construction forges ahead here under existing protections consistent with historic protection as you've heard examples from other speakers. Really every or the island neighborhood makes -- Portland neighborhood makes a unique contribution that's worth protecting. As we seek ways to increase housing densities and reduce cost through our protests, the homelessness, the covid pandemic, there's been a gratifying renewal of everyday life all over the city's neighborhoods. Many ways our neighborhoods have served as an anchor in these challenging times. These last few years may have shown us that we take too many things for granted including the value all around us in our diverse and wonderful neighborhoods. Let's be good stewards of these places for us today and for people who come to Portland in the future. Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.

Clerk: Next up is Zoe Lynn Powers.

Zoe Lynn Powers: Good afternoon. On behalf of a number of property owners of large HRI buildings. Currently, HRI properties are not historically designated, merely part of an inventory the city conducted in 1984 as a planning tool. Under state law, quote, a local government shall allow a property owner to refuse to consent to any form of historic property designation. The new significant resources designation clearly falls within the broad category of, quote, any form of historic property designation, and it violates state law for city council to designate without owner consent. You could remove HRI buildings the regulation in the zoning code much in the way unranked HRI buildings are proposed to be treated. The properties could remain on the inventory for informational purposes, and the most significant should be considered for landmark status. Second, you could ask now for owner consent to designate the properties. Third, you could direct bds to improve the existing code process to remove an HRI listing. Currently, removal requires a 120 of day permitting blackout period during which bds is prevented from issuance of all permits even completely unrelated to any historic value of the property such as plumbing permits and tenant improvements. For large buildings there's never a 4-month gap in permitting issuance which has made this HRI removal right illusory. And we want them to be pulling permits. The purpose of the permitting blackout is to allow, quote, time for consideration of alternatives to demolition

such as restoration are. Owners seeking permits are making an investment in the building. That's the opposite of demolition. Particularly at a time when investment in downtown is tenuous, it belies reason that the city would interpret the code this a stricter fashion than the terms allow and this a manner that discourages investment in HRI-ranked buildings downtown. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up is Bert Sperling. You're muted, Bert.

Bert Sperling: There we go. How's that?

Clerk: We hear you.

Sperling: Thank you. Hi, longtime resident of the east Moreland neighborhood and it's if board member of our neighborhood association. And as you consider the details of the historic code at the city, state and national levels, I'd like you to keep in mind about what's been happening here and how the historic designation process can be distorted and misused. Ten years ago the board of the Ena, the Mideast Moreland neighborhood association, started to -- to increase density and affordability. Now, east Moreland's a lovely corner of Portland with its curving streets and large street trees and charming homes, but it's the not historic. It doesn't represent homes of any particular style, genre or era. And even in the proposed district they range from 1912 to 1961. But the Ena has been effectively using the bizarre federal law that allows anyone to nominate and implement a national historic district without the permission of any property owners. For the last 06 years, the d60 years, it's been against the wishes of its own neighborhood homeowners. They conducted a referendum on the historic district overseen by southeast uplift and the majority of east more lander's voted against it, but the board ignored the results. Over a thousand notarized objections have been filed with the9 state, and only 300 letters of support not even notarized have been reported. And the Ena refuses to hold open meetings and to inform and educate the neighborhood and to allow neighborhood input. They've declared all committee meetings can planning sessions to be private ask prohibited to neighbors. There's only one public hearing per month. -- meeting per month. And the membership on the board is restricted to those in favor of the proposed historic district. And anyway, it's been a very bad process. Don't reward east Moreland for their misbehavior, and don't let it with a template for others.

Clerk: Time is up.

Sperling: So thanks very much for your time.

Clerk: Next up we have Henry Honorof, Taylor Smiley Wolfe and Eric Lindsay.

Henry Honorof: Hey there. Can you hear me and see the screen?

Ryan: Yes.

Honorof: Perfect, wonderful. Hi name is Henry, I'm a homeowner in the Elliott neighborhood. To you know me, you know me as Henry Kramer, my name was changed recently. It's not worth going into here. I'm sharing slides prepared by a number of volunteer this from Portland neighbors. The amendments two and three to increase certainty ask decrease time and costs in historic resource review. Amendment two would mandate the historic resource review could only reduce a building's height, floor or area ratio, and amendment three would change all historic resource type 3 reviews to type 2. I'm going to go through a couple examples of why. Historic resource review needs to provide certainty to encourage the creation of more housing. The HLC routinely shrinks housing projects by implying they wouldn't be approved, and this informal down zoning that increases a lot of risk to building housing, it increases costly redesigns, makes financing less certain, projects fall through and fewer homes get built at all. An example here is the grand Belmont housing proposal. The council approved was 200 feet, the proposed height was 158 feet for reference. Weatherly building was 175. This was a parking lot. The proposed housing was 193, and after historic review it was reduced to 121 units. That's 72 homes lost. The omni tower housing proposal, proposed height 170, similar to a lot of other houses in the neighborhood, 135 proposed homes, and it was mothballed, 135 homes lost. Susan Edmunds was reduced from 165 homes to 149, that's 16 homes lost. That's 223 homes lost, that's 223 individuals and families who have to compete with other Portlanders now, and most of those would have replaced surface parking lots. So amendment two, again, is mandating historic resource review can only reduce the building's height and amendment three would change all type 2 --

Clerk: Time is up.

Honorof: -- to staff reviews. And I will stop there. Thank you so much for your time.

Clerk: Next up we have Taylor Smiley Wolfe.

Taylor Smiley Wolfe: Thank you. Can you hear me okay? Can you hear me?

Clerk: Yes.

Smiley Wolfe: Mayor Wheeler, members of the Portland city council, good afternoon. For the record, my name is Taylor Smiley Wolfe, and I am here as a Portland resident today, not as a representative of my employer. And, boy, is writing testimony exciting and different when I'm here for myself. When I think of redlining in the city of Portland, I think of exclusionary zoning or what I think of as gold mining certain neighborhoods, the self-segregation over resourcing of wealthy white communities. It's a tool that dominant communities in Portland use to reserve their historic privileges in amber. The use is not innocent, it is explicitly linked to gentrification and displacement pressure spilling out into nearby neighborhoods. As a city, I don't think the presence of a Dutch colonial house built in the early 1900s warrants the ability for any neighborhood to partially exempt themselves from pro-housing reforms that the city has determined are necessary to create housing opportunities for all Portlanders. In fact, it directly undermines the intent of other zoning reforms the council has recently enacted. We are not Dutch, and although we are a colonial settler nation, there are ways of acknowledging that history that dismantle as opposed to reinforcing it. I have heard a number of folks testifying about the costs of new development. In their high opportunity neighborhoods as a justification for protecting their communities from change by touting the power and tools at their disposal. As a resident of Portland, I want to remind residents of these neighborhoods that their median home values are about \$300,000 above the citywide median as a result of the exclusionary history of their neighborhoods. Increasing land values, not their own labor. Those of us who live in neighborhoods that allow more development, welcome to the city you live in. I encourage you to welcome new neighbors to your community. As an affordable housing policy professional, I know the only way to build housing that is truly affordable in a major U.S. city like Portland is to publicly subsidize it. Preserving exclusionary communities in a way that subsidizes development will increase median rents. I want to support the -- [inaudible] thank you so much for your time.

Clerk: Next up we have Eric Lindsay.

Eric Lindsay: All right. Can you guys hear me?

Clerk: Yes, we can hear you.

Lindsay: Good afternoon, council. My name is Eric Lindsay, and I have the good luck to live in the Overlook neighborhood, and I just want to simply say that I support the goals of the historic resource code project, but I would ask that you, this project be further improved to insure the historic preservation cannot with used as an exclusionary tool which I think is too often the case. Specifically, I urge you to adopt the amendments and studies proposed by Portland neighbors welcome, and as so many people have said those things better than i, I will leave it at that. Thank you so much for the time this afternoon.

Clerk: Next up we have Colin Folawn, Iain MacKenzie and Angela Uherbelau

Colin Folawn: Thank you. Can you hear me okay? All right. Good afternoon, my name is colin, I live in the east moreland neighborhood. The recommendations from bps are a step in the right direction to evolve and adapt over time. In line with the progress that Portland desperately needs. It is far too easy for neighborhood associations, especially in wealthy neighborhoods like mine, to attempt to cordon off large portions of our city under the guise of being historic districts. So restriction should be minimal. The Portland coalition for historic resources is pushing for a broad definition of demolition and several draconian amendments under the premise that the historic resource code project does not meet goal five. That's just wrong. Goal five talks about the integrity of the resources being lost and the CFR reminds us t gown to be irretrievably lost, so to go further would become design review, and that's not what goal five requires. It's correct that demolition means any act that removes or relocates historic significant resource. But that's not the end of the story. In order for a resource to move from contributing to noncontributing status, we must be able to say that the location, design is, settings, workmanship and association have been so altered or deteriorated that the overall integrity of the building has been irretrievably lost. As applied to goal five, all seven elements must be irretrievably lost in order to require demolition review. So it is not even necessary or appropriate for the landmarks commission and bds to renew view every single proposal, replace windows or replace a garage with accessory dwelling unit. So I urge you to reconsider the proposals -- reject the proposals and instead adopt the draft recommended by bps. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Iain MacKenzie.

Iain MacKenzie: Good afternoon. My name is Iain MacKenzie, and I'm here mostly in support. I'd like to start by thanking bps staff for their incredibly hard work on this project. I'd also like to thank the members of the historic landmarks commission who give up an enormous amount of their time because they have a deep love for our city. The HRCP makes it possible to find new uses for historic buildings. The project makes it easier to add historic districts such as Irvington or Laurelhurst. As a gay man, I appreciate that the city is starting to look at underrepresented -- [inaudible] the showplace that was recently added to the national register of historic places. I also appreciate the work on advancing a number of nominations important to black history in Portland. I hope we see more work like this in the future. However, I think you should consider one amendment to the proposal. The recently approved project clarified the commission cannot reduce the height or if far of a development. The landmarks commission placed the same rules the design commission does this a historic district, and yet this package has no parallel language. In my professional work, I've worked with developers of both market rate and affordable housing, and one thing that they have in common is that in order to move forward, they need certainty. If there is a new building being composed that replaces a surface parking lot or a noncontributing, nonhistorical building, we would expect that proposal should take full advantage of the zoning approved by city council only a few years ago with a comprehensive plan. You've received testimony from the Oldtown, Chinatown community association, Housing Oregon and Portland neighbors welcome. I urge you consider it. Thank you very much. Finish.

Clerk: Next up we have Angela Uherbelau

Angela Uherbelau: Thank you very much. Hi, I'm Angela, I live here in Irvington. My two daughters go to Irvington school. And I am here to enthusiastically support the amendments that have been proposed by Portland neighbors welcome. Increasing racial and socioeconomic diversity in our neighborhood will make it even more beautiful, not less. I want to express how, what it's felt to live in this neighborhood and go to a local public school that does have some diversity, racial and socioeconomic diversity, and at the same time we have seen a decline at Irvington school. We have lost 6% of our black enrollment since 2019, and those aren't numbers, those are families, those are friends, those are neighbors. And they have been priced out of the neighborhood along with other families of all other races. And I

think that as we talk about preservation and we talk about this loss of character or loss of architecture, I think we also need to emphasize what we lose by having a socioeconomically segregated neighborhood. I also would just like to have a gentle remind or about impact and is intention and in the latest newsletter of our community association, on one side, on the right-hand side there was a call to come and testify today in support of preserving our historic designation. And is on the other side, the board was talking about how it's not racially diverse, it doesn't have many renters, and it doesn't have young people. So in order to diversify our neighborhood, we need to have more affordable housing here, and I really appreciate you considering doing that here in Portland and specifically in these historic fake -- neighborhoods. Thank you so much.

Clerk: Next up, Tom Clark, David Binnig and Greg Raisman.

Tom Clark: Hello. My name is Tom Clark, I am a co-owner of a quarter-block building at 333 northwest 5th avenue in oldtown. Although the building is across the street from and not within the Chinatown/Japan town historic district, I want to advocate for amendments which could bring life and economic development to all of oldtown. Oldtown the needs help to support appropriate development in our beautiful but troubled historic district. Many small property owners are discouraged from pursuing development due to the cumbersome and expensive review process that's in place today. We in the neighborhood see an opportunity for the HCRP process to help incentivize development in oldtown rather than discourage it. Our historic district designation can deter development. In particular, the review process includes the historic landmark -- with the power to limit height and floor area ratio below the limits allowed in the zoning code. The intention of the landmarks, including landmarks is to insure compatibility with the historic fabric. We in oldtown want this too. However, the district has the excellent historic district design guidelines in place with very detailed guidance to create this compatibility. Bds or staff used these guidelines to review and judge projects to insure this compatibility. I recommend amening the current historic resource code in one of two ways, either have all historic district projects review be limited to bds and bps staff as a type 2 review, eliminating landmarks commission review, or if that's not possible, simply remove the power of landmarks commission to consider height or floor area ratio as

part of their review. This will allow small property owners to more predictably and affordably develop their properties, benefiting all of oldtown's reactivation. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have David Bennig.

David Bennig: Thank you. My name's David Bennig, I live in southeast Portland, and I love Portland's old homes and neighborhoods. My house was built in 1916. I live near Laurelhurst and enjoy biking through there. We've seen the deeds restrictions attached to those neighborhoods; no apartments, no homes below a certain price, no asian or black people unless they were employed as servants of the white residents. In the '20s, Portland enacted a zoning code to ban multi-family homes not for the full city, but for those same dozen or so neighborhoods. Now we have the conversation about historic districts and the history of those districts is a history of deliberate and successful exclusion. I don't think, to be fair, that current residents of those neighborhoods intend to exclude people in that sense, but I know last week I joined a presentation by Mr. Spencer -- in one of my neighborhoods, brought up a house on Hawthorne that has about 30 homes. He said it's a monstrosity that should have stayed a single-family home. In his view, it would have been better to shut out those 30 households than to lose one but fairly unremarkable home, looked a lot like mine. So I will say there is a real and visible temptation to value buildings over people, and the hazard of maintaining historic in districts as these broad tools of exclusion is that it makes it easy for landowner to execute that impulse to shut people out. I think we need balance to preserve important buildings without having one-size-fits-all districts that preserve whole neighborhoods this carbonite, and for that reason I support these reforms and the proposed amendments from Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon. Thank you very much for your time.

Clerk: Next up with Greg Raisman.

Greg Raisman: Hi, my name is Greg, I am a resident of southeast Portland and am here as a representative of my employer. For some housekeeping, there's been some testimony that the planning and sustaining commission should not be part of to process. Instead, I support having both commissions involved in the process with the PSC as the final if recommending body. I support the amendments brought forth by or the land neighbors welcome and housing Oregon. I know that the intentionality of historic preservation is not to maintain our

system at least that leads to racial and economic segregation, but intentions and outcomes are two very different things. We should be cautious was preserving our historic shames. The book the color of law lays out in detail how American governments have used development to create the economically and racially-segregated cities that we live in. It lays out our entire ugly history of these methods. One person discussed in our history is Frederick Olmsted, important parks, great landscaping. However, not all the gold is glitter. During world war i, he directed the town planning division of the federal government's housing agency that managed or built more than 100,000 units of segregated housing for workers in defense plants. In 1918 he told the city planning that good zoning policy had to be distinguished from racial segregation which the supreme court had found unconstitutional with which he wasn't concerned. So far as policy went, Olmsted stated, quote: In any housing developments which are to succeed, racial divisions have to be taken into account. The you try to force the mingling of people who are not yet ready to mingle and don't want to mingle, a development not succeed economically. This is our history. Let's not let it be commemorated in our future. With the pro-housing amendments, this project would save us, would save the best parts of our history while moving beyond the worst parts. Thank you very much.

Clerk: Next up we have Daniel Chandler-Klein, Anna Kemper and Brandon Narramore.

Daniel Chandler-Klein: Hello. My name is Dan Chandler Kline. I strongly support the HRCP while urging you to go forward by adopting the amendments proposed that many others have already mentioned today. Without further action from city council, the historic preservation process continue to be a tool to further entrench histories of racial and economic exclusion and allow affluent neighborhoods to avoid playing by the same housing rules as the rest of the city. Wealthy neighborhoods have already stated their intent to use the historic preservation process to exempt themselves from the residential project the city council adopted just last year. Portland's housing crisis affects each and every one of us, and it is the responsibility of every neighborhood to do its part in solving this. No neighborhood should be allowed to say not our problem and pass the buck to the rest of the city. We all must do our part. The HRCP shifts the review process towards or a democratic system with accountability so I'm strongly urging the council to pass the proposal to prevent this process from being used for nefarious purposes. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Anna Kemper.

Anna Kemper: Okay. Good afternoon, council members. Hi name is Anna Kemper, and I live and work this northeast Portland, and I'm here today as the vice president of the Portland neighbors welcome board. And I'm here today as another voice of reason to urge you to pass the historic resources code project with the recommendations of Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon. Many folks have already made excellent points before me on why the updates and recommendations are essential to creating a just, equitable and sustainable future we want to see in Portland. I'd like to use my time to refute the argument that we -- housing needs simply by reuse of existing buildings like they did back in world war ii. It might sound reasonable to create duplexes or triplexes, but this argument is simply if not based in reality. Our building codes are much more complex than those in world war ii Portland and most internal divisions where you'd have to have multiple kitchens and bathrooms are completely economically infeasible. Claiming this is a reason to keep the historic resources code as is wishful thinking or disingenuous and relying homeowners to turn their property into multiple would insure no new housing is created. In the midst of both urgent housing and climate crises, we need more housing, denser housing quickly. We have the tools for this, and updating the historic resources code along with the proposed recommendations would allow for this across all neighborhoods in our city. Finally, I worked in the solar industry for the it's three years. It's an incredibly drawn-out process, but the code creates significant barriers due to cost and time, and many homes and building owners end up giving up on putting solar on their property because of it. We need solar in order to meet the city's climate goals, so this is another reason to streamline the code process. I appreciate you taking time to hear everyone's comment today. Thank you all.

Clerk: Next up we have Brandon Narramore.

Brandon Narramore: Good evening, Mayor and city council. I am testifying in support of the housing Oregon and Portland neighbors welcome amendments. I am all for history and preservation. I'm currently on vacation in Paris, France, and love walking with my partner down the car-free streets. In Portland I believe it is important that we identify which buildings hold significant historic value including those that include -- that have far too long been overlooked. That said, while I support the inclusion of landmarks as historic resources, it is a

mistake to extend this to an entire neighborhood. For a neighborhood to be one that is livable for all kinds of neighbors, it must be allowed to change. It is injustice for the many more folks seeking a home. We must not let historic preservation become a tool used by wealthy committees to undemocratically exempt themselves from Portland zoning codes. My vision is one that anyone can afford to live in a neighborhood that gives them joy. Please do not let -- I urge you to support the amendments. It's well past midnight, can I'm going to bed so I can be awake for the louvre tomorrow. Thank you for your time.

Clerk: Next up we have Stephen Judkins, Rob Hemphill and Tim DuBois.

Stephen Judkins: Hi. My name's Stephen Judkins, I live in north Portland born and raised in Portland. And I'm here to mostly say I'd like to support the amendments from Portland neighbors welcome. Been asked to bring up, as other people have said more eloquently than me, that there's no way to meet our housing needs through simply subdivisions of existing historic buildings. That's not a realistic choice. I appreciate greatly that city council passed the residential in-fill project last term. I thought it was a great demonstration of our values as a city that we say every neighborhood has to take some development, has to see some change in order for us to meet the desperate need for new housing in the city. We need affordable housing, market rate housing, and it has to be in the rich neighborhoods, the poor ones and everything in between. What I'm concerned about is that if we don't change our historic codes, it could be used as a hoop hole by the most privileged neighborhoods in the city to circumvent this annual policy that council passed last term. And if it's true that your values are what you stated then, gotta make sure that it's consistently applied and there aren't these tools available for, you know, the historically rich and historically exclusionary or neighborhoods to bow out of their responsibility. In conclusion, I think the amendments by Portland's neighbors welcome will strike a good balance here, make sure we can historically preserve some things, make sure that the burden of new development if you can even call it that is fairly distributed across the city. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Rob Hemphill.

Rob Hemphill: Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Rob Hemphill, I'm testifying in support of the HRCP and the amendments that you've heard about today. I'm also going to give a brief presentation on amendment four that's been

proposed, and I'll try to be quick about this. So we want you to, we want to empower council by expanding the approval requirements for the national registered districts to the maximum allow by state law. National register districts are inherently undemocratic, approved by a small group of property owners, and homeowners outside the district have no say at all, renters have no say at all. I live in Kerns where 77% of the neighborhood is renters who would have no say in whether they can become national registered districts, but council doesn't get to sign off on this. This is what's really important is that council needs to be the democratic body that really considers -- and right now the current rules really limit what council can consider. So moving on, why does this matter? Because these historic click revolutionary neighborhoods intend to block -- housing and the demolition review all but guarantees no one's going to risk proposing a significant project that might be unpopular. And just so we're clear, these national registered districts have openly served their intent. We saw this. Look at those home values. Look at what have said. They want to make it harder to build quadplexes. In east Moreland, the same. And those home values, my goodness, I wish I could live there. I'm going to skip through this. So what does this matter? If you can expand the approval criteria from the council to the maximum, you can really consider all of the criteria that we want to think about when we're looking at a demolition review, a comp plan, residential in-fill project, other things like that. And so we can consider things like whether we're going to be having more people work on the -- living on the site. We can still keep an exception for uniquely significant, historical structures.

Clerk: Time's up.

Hemphill: But council should not limit themselves based on just, council should be able to take everything into mind and not just limit themselves from the beginning. Thank you, I'm out of time.

Clerk: Next up we have Tim DuBois.

Tim DuBois: Hello. Am I up?

Clerk: Yes. Go ahead, Tim.

DuBois: Okay, sorry. Here we are trying to claw back the policy overreach of historic preservation. The amount of public if resources, taxpayer money and time around his oric preservation policies should be or asked a violation of city council's fiduciary obligation to the

taxpayers of Portland. In a free society with private ownership, historic preservation is already baked into the system. If you like historic preservation and you own property, then preserve it. If you sell your property, that is an open acknowledgment that the next person may not feel the same way towards an inert object such as a home. Instead, we have people creating a problem where none exists, and you as government officials are being asked to take sides on a purely objective, emotional -- subjective, emotional topic. It will generate cash flow that will make the need for government intervention or generate charity through a nonprofit for its preservation is. No need to waste taxpayer dollars. Cities are by design the most dynamic and exciting of places, but that dynamism is threatened with preservation laws. It reminds me of our forests. In a healthy forest, forest fires are an essential part of the long-term health of the ecosystem. It is essential to maintain adaptations in nature that will allow for the long-term health in a changing environment. Humans were wrong in stopping natural forest fires as a public policy. We are now living through the obvious consequences of that mistake. The same is true in our housing policy with preservation laws. I know it's too late to reverse the moving train of historic preservation and something with this policy will pass and amendments will be made trying to do so, but it will be insufficient. So what I'm asking you is two things. First, you ask yourself before voting for anything, does this make housing more or less expensive to provide and maintain? Finally, years or decades from now are you granting powers to a special interest group that a future city council will wish you never granted when they finally have to have an adult conversation about housing policy. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Adam Zucker, Peggy Moretti.

Adam Zucker: Thank you, my name is Adam Zucker. I support the HRCP along with the amendments proposed by the housing Oregon and Portland neighbors welcome and wanted to use my time to share insights I've gleaned from -- I've gleaned. By my account, one of the main drivers that led to nominating the Buckman neighborhood as a national historic neighborhood was to limit housing density. This is exactly what one of the organizers told me after their appeal for a new development failed. They told me that the national historic district designation is the only tool we can use to prevent new apartment buildings from replacing single-family residents. Ultimately, it was denied by a majority of the property owners, but this was no trivial feat given how democratic the historic nomination process is. In my mind,

this outcome was only achieved because of the well-organized campaign spearheaded by the late and great -- [inaudible] and because Buckman neighborhood maintained a neutral position as well as opportunities for neighbors to learn and discuss what it would need to become a historic district. Fast forward five years and now I'm an owner in the Laurelhurst neighborhood, and once again I find myself being subjected to another proposed national historic district. This time around I felt like the neighborhood association had its thumb on the scale of an already-unfair nomination process. There were multiple one-sided articles shared in the neighborhood newsletter, and when I -- it was posed as an information -- advertised an information meeting. I found myself facing a smug building contractor who essentially asked for a five-figure handout to buy and pick up a property in order to prevent it from becoming two new homes and potentially preventing another family from moving into the neighborhood. This time around the vote passed. In conclusion, what really irks me most about especially someone who appreciates historic resources is that the well to do folks commandeering the process as a means to thwart new development and local land use rules under guise of historic preservation. This is why I support the HRCP and the proposed amendments that expand approval criteria --

Clerk: Time is up.

Zucker: Thank you very much.

Clerk: Next up is Peggy Moretti.

Peggy Moretti: Hi. Are you able to see me? I'll just start. I'm Peggy, I am the former executive director of Restart Oregon testifying as a private citizen now and in support of the HRCP. You've been asked to -- and tasked with the stewardship of the places that embody our diverse cultural heritage, that provide housing, incubate businesses and encapsulate untold volumes of old growth timber, old world craftsmanship and thousands of tons of CO₂. The recommended draft of the HRCP takes big steps in the right direction providing much-needed flexibility, greater accessibility and a focus on diversity in underserved communities. And it does address some of the challenges of these processes in the past. I endorse the comments submitted by the Landmarks Commission, Restore Oregon, the Portland Coalition for Historic Resources and the need for some small but essential amendments that will ensure city council is fully empowered and equipped to address future decisions about what and

how historic resources are passed forward to future generations. Amendments are needed to ensure that proper expertise is brought to decisions on future historic designations. I feel strongly the landmark's commission should be part of any recommendation that goes to city council for new designations along with the PFC or who has displayed such antagonism. Number two, that the city policy does align with Oregon's goal five rules especially regarding demolition review. Of course, some demolition happens, but it should all of the factors outlined in the goal five rules must be considered. So that a balanced decision can be made. You've heard a lot of unfounded and painful to hear the unfounded accusations about preservation and the testimony from some folks who I'm sure mean well, but they think that removing protection from that tiny fraction of about 3% of the housing stock of Portland is going to move the needle on awe affordability. There is absolutely zero data to support that position. You know, frankly, many in the preservation community would like to see stronger provisions, and you've got those that want to see weaker provisions. That might mean you've got a good balance here that's been established. I also want to point out that demolition is a major co2 emitter. A 1500-square-foot house being demolished and replaced by a larger structure is the equivalent of 93 cars on the road for a year. So there's much to peel back here, and I appreciate your attention and all the work that's gone into this effort so far. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up is Nancy Crane. Nancy, are you able to unmute? Nancy, are you -- you're muted. Maybe we should go on to the next three, and then we can circle back to Nancy. Next up we have Susan Hathaway-Marxer, Josh Wendroff, and Esther Westbrook. Go ahead, Susan. You're muted. Susan, you're muted.

Susan Hathaway-Marxer: Hello. I live on northeast 22nd street, I have lived there for over 50 years. I have been on the board for a long time of the Irvington neighborhood association. I can tell you that living here on this street in Irvington has hugely, positively helped and head my family's life stable and happy. Long before Irvington was a historic district, it had a historic home tour. And about the same time it started its charitable giving committee because we charged money to go look at the historic homes. People want to see these old, beautiful homes with the great woodwork inside and the big buffets and the big rooms and all the rest of it. And we took that money. We have now and started a charitable giving committee. We've developed policies and procedures and have a very tightly structured giving arrangement.

We give the money away. We have given over \$400,000 away to groups that help seniors and kids in our neighborhood. We have given money to Irvington school to buy library books. We have given money to -- school and Jefferson high school for their senior all-night parties. We have given money to meals on wheels and project linkage. And we have started a foot care clinic for the many people who live in those two buildings there who are diabetic or pre-diabetic. So all I can tell you is that people, a lot of people value these houses. They want to see them, and we have tried our very best to mingle the money and the good intentions.

Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Josh Wendroff

Hillary Wendroff: Hi there. Actually, I'm Hillary, he had to go take my daughter, and I actually slated to speak as well. I have his statement, so I can either read his statement or my statement, I don't know how you guys want to do it. I guess I could read his and then do mine when it's my turn?

Wheeler: Why don't you, since you're here --

Wendroff: Yeah.

Wheeler: Why don't you go ahead, unless any of my colleagues object, give you four minutes to read both.

Wendroff: Oh, that's a good idea.

Wheeler: Then you don't have to stick around.

Wendroff: Thank you. I appreciate that. I will read mine first. My name is Hillary, I'm an Irvington resident. Removing or down rooting the historic designation, in my opinion, is a bad solution to the city's housing issues. Recent experiences in allowing subdivisions and apartment buildings have not lowered housing prices as the resulting properties just created more high-rent town homes and apartments. Let's take the two new town Oklahoma's built on the corner of northeast Fremont avenue and northeast 15th. They were touted as a solution to the affordable housing crisis putting two structures where there was previously one single-family home. Those two townhomes just went on the market. In no way could these townhomes be considered affordable. The idea that allowing developers to take down irreplaceable historic homes and put up new multi-unit properties or subdivide existing properties will alleviate the housing issues in Portland is just incorrect. Not only will it not

make housing more affordable, it will harm the fabric of the city. Once destroyed, it cannot be replaced. If Portland is serious about solving the housing crisis, rezoning is not the way to go about it. The time it will take for there to be a meaningful change by way of rezoning Irvington is many years out and will make an insignificant difference overall. You will be damaging the character of the city by changing these old neighborhoods for little to no gain. Instead, if you actually want to impact housing stock in Portland, the city needs to alter the growth boundary of. That is the way to make a quick and meaningful change, not just a statement that does little to address the actual problem. That was my statement. My husband Josh's statement is this. He wanted to thank everybody for giving himself a chance to speak, and he wanted to point back to the testimonies of Jarred Morris and Rich Roberson and particularly Heather Chateau who head the case much better than we could just being lay residents. My husband and I moved to Portland five years ago in large part because of the character of the city and its many unique neighborhoods. Before Portland we lived for a long time in a part of Los Angeles that had historic homes but no protections around demolition and redevelopment. We can tell you that it did not result in more or better access to affordable housing, but it did make a lot of developers a lot of money as they took down old, modest homes and replaced them with very expensive new development. -- expensive new development. It did dramatically and thing impact the character of our neighborhood. And once that is gone, it's gone forever. There are plenty of opportunities for reuse of existing structures, but it's shortsighted to allow these historic houses destroyed and -- to be destroyed and redeveloped. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Esther Westbrook.

Esther Westbrook: Thank you. Good afternoon, Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners. My name is Esther Westbrook, and I live in Irvington in the southwest corner of the neighborhood that was redlined decades ago. My home was built in the early 1900s. Most of the buildings on my block and my street are multi-family homes and small apartment buildings. The missing middle is already here in Irvington. It's a racially and economically diverse area, and I love living here. I am testifying against any changes to the HRC that would weaken existing demolition protections. First, the proposal goes against the stated goal of sustainability. The most sustainable building is the one that are already built. Also, and this hasn't been

mentioned yet, demolitions typically involve the destruction of mature trees. The inner east side is already overburdened by air pollution and suffers the heat island effect. Further reducing the tree canopy will worsen climate impacts on our communities. Second and more importantly, it will not accomplish the goal of increasing affordable housing. There are no provisions that require any new housing to be built that is more affordable than the housing it is replacing. All over the city the, particularly the east side, I see existing affordable housing being torn down, renters evicted and new luxury homes being built. I haven't seen any convincing data that r.i.p. Has improved the affordable housing situation in Portland. On the contrary, housing costs have continued to rise unabated. This proposal is not the way to make that happen, and it doesn't reflect the economic reality. This proposal would not benefit existing Portland residents. It will mainly benefit home builders, developers and real estate agents. It will actually harm Portland residents, especially the renters that will lose their homes. I suspect these are the entities bankrolling Portland neighbors welcome and who drafted the talking points accusing people who want to reserve historic -- preserve historic buildings as being racist. This proposal goes against goal number five which is meant to preserve historic places. The council should not destroy something valuable and the maximizing of develop earn profits. Instead, we should be expanding historic protections to other neighborhoods including --

Clerk: Time's up.

Westbrook: -- lower -- thank you.

Clerk: Let's try to see if Nancy crane was able to get connected. Nancy, can you unmute? Okay. Let's go on to the next group.

Wheeler: Keelan, maybe -- is there a way we could reach out to Nancy via e-mail or maybe just have her call in? Is that a possibility?

Clerk: Yeah, sure. We'll reach out to Nancy.

Wheeler: She's been with us for all these hours, it must be frustrating for her not to be able to get in, so if we can help her, thanks.

Clerk: Yeah, absolutely. Okay. Next up we have Brooke Best, Paul Falsetto and Jonathan Greenwood.

Brooke Best: Okay. I'm speaking as a member of the architectural heritage center's advocacy committee and PCHR. Ambitious effort is an important step by the city to come into alignment with Oregon's land use goal five rules. Previous PCHR testimony has expressed concerns about the provisions addressing December egg nation, delisting -- designation, delisting, the definition of demolition as well as demolition criteria which are at odds with goal five. We're also concerned about the composition and the role of the historic landmarks commission. PHLC should have a coequal role with PSC in making recommendations to city council. They're the ones with the expertise, not PSC. We fully support PCRH updates that advance four main areas including racial equity that encompasses updates to the citywide inventory and creating a cultural resources plan to recognize places and spaces that reflect Portland's diverse communities. There's a huge disconnect between historic preservation and pro-density advocates. Unfortunately, we cannot build our way to sustainability. Our historic buildings, particularly adaptive uses are part of the solution preservation plays a major factor in Portland's economic vitality. Lastly, cultural heritage. Increases in protection to conservation districts works to create better preservation equity and correct a longstanding disparity between protections for historic neighborhoods to tell the story of underrepresented communities. Thank you.

Paul Falsetto: Good afternoon. My name is Paul Falsetto, and I'm an architect who lives and works in Portland, and I have a specialization in historic preservation. I support the HRCP package as developed by bps in that it better aligns preservation efforts with the goals laid out in the 2035 comp plan which in part was its charge. The fact that you have folks on different sides of the equation offering their own amendments might show that bps city's preservation. The story the city told in large part through its physical environment and maintaining the story line is based on the retention of the integrity of the historic landmarks and districts. The principal responsibility is a well-trained media staff and a well-qualified landmarks commission. And we're lucky enough to have both of those. There is a proposal to reduce the level of responsibility by the landmarks commission, for instance, changing the type three view to be a staff only review. I find this to be extremely troubling as it removes the commission's expertise from the adjudication process and it also removes the fact that they do it in a public setting with the opportunity to hear public testimony. Why I ask would we go

to a less public and less daylight procedure than now. The ability for the landmarks commission to have a say in the height and mass of the buildings is critical in maintaining the integrity of the historic district. The challenge we have is that we have two potentially conflicting viewpoints and goals. The maximum heights and f.a.r. Set by the zoning code don't necessarily correspond with the physical reality and story line of a historic district. It has always been understood these two would be in conflict. And the use of a knowledgeable entity would review and make a proper call. It was rightfully decided this would be the landmarks commission, and they have been doing it now for decades successfully and protecting the integrity of our historic districts. I believe that this process should continue. End of testimony. If you have questions, I would be happy to answer them. Otherwise, thank you very much.

Clerk: Next up we have Jonathan Greenwood.

Jonathan Greenwood: Hello. Can anyone hear me?

Wheeler: Yeah, we hear you.

Greenwood: Okay. Hello I'm Jonathan Greenwood. I support both the Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon amendments. First, include a history of racial covenants as a reason for the council to resize, demote, or remove a district's historic or conservation status. Do not allow communities to exclude building of more affordable housing if they have a history of segregation or exclusion. Second, allow historic resource to reduce the building fight f.a.r. By no more than 10%. We should not allow too much downsizing of new housing so we don't create uncertainty and delays for such development when relying on historic resource reviews. This make building cheaper and facilitating building of housing. Third, change all historic resource type three reviews to type two staff reviews. Staff reviews allow for more affordable housing to be financed in areas that would be curbing for dense housing along corridors and transit routes. Fourth, expend approval criteria for demolition review in national registered districts to the maximum allowed by state law. Protect genuine historic assets while following a review process that will allow for -- [audio cutting in and out] and affordable housing density if a building is to be demolished. Strong demolition protections codes in neighborhood settings adhere to local districts that are democratically overseen by council. Not federal districts that exclude outside commentary. Finally, council should fund

two studies to ensure historic preservation values the full diversity of our city rather than or most exclusionary enclaves. A study to prioritize reevaluation of district size and protection level if built on a history of racial and economic exclusion, a study to protect places that reflect BIPOC, LGBTQ plus and other underrepresented communities and remove resources from overrepresented communities. Thank you so much.

Clerk: Next up we have Richard Mills, Wendy Rahm, and Walter Weyler. Richard, are you able to unmute?

Richard Mills: Yes. Did I -- that was successful.

Clerk: Yes, we hear you.

Mills: I would like to address three sections of the proposed historic resources code project. Section 3344540c6, expand the commercial use of residential buildings by allowing retail uses in quote buildings located 1,500 feet or less from the transit station or five hundred feet or less from a transit street with 20 minute peak hour service, end quote. This incentive would allow retail operations in almost every house in Irvington. One reason I live in Irvington is retail operations are located mostly on the outer boundaries of the district. Under this incentive, any Irvington resident can open a café or have ticketed events on the residential property. This proposed extension of retail operations throughout the entire district would negatively impact the residents of Irvington and should not be allowed. Section 33710060b removes a requirement for the historic landmarks commission to include a historian or an architectural historian instead, quote, at least five members must have professional experience, end quote, in one or more categories including real estate, construction, community development and finance. No historians would have to be included in the commission. Instead all members could be real estate and construction professionals with obvious finance interest toward demolition and construction rather than historic preservation. This requirement should not be removed. Section 33846040c2 allows historic district designation to be removed or reduced, quote, if the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan are equally or better met by changing the level of protection, end quote. Type three review could be initiated by the planning and sustainability commission or any concerned party. This proposed change is much more lax than the existing code and does not comply with the Oregon goal 5 rule and should not be included in the HRCP. Thank you.

Wheeler: Keelan, before you --

Clerk: Next up --

Wheeler: Before you call the next person, do we still have our closed captioner, correct?

Clerk: I'm trying to find out how long they will be available.

Wheeler: How many more people do we have?

Clerk: We have 47 more on the call.

Wheeler: Okay, that's a lot. But I would like to go, well -- first of all, we need closed captioning. So they maybe a limiting factor. Do we have -- what do we know from our closed captioner?

Clerk: I heard they could stay on for a little bit longer. But --

Wheeler: Define a little bit please?

Clerk: They didn't say. My guess is probably 15-20 minutes.

Wheeler: Okay. Lindsay, or hang on.

City Attorney: It's Lauren. I'm on the call.

Wheeler: Lauren. Thank you, I'm having one of many moments today. Lauren, we are required to have a closed captioner or not?

City Attorney: Yes. We need to have closed captioning.

Wheeler: Okay. So obviously, what we're going to have to do, colleagues, when we lose our closed captioner at say 5:25 we will have to continue this session to another day. We'll leave public testimony open therefore, written testimony will -- we'll leave the record open unless I'm told otherwise. Let's start working towards that. We really need to be able to when we have issues like this where we know we're going to have dozens and dozens of people sign up, we need to be able -- I've got no plans tonight. So my preference would be to continue pushing forward but we obviously can't do that if we don't have our closed captioner. So if we're truly losing the closed captioner, let's assume we're going to adjourn at 5: 25.

Clerk: Okay. Thank you. I'll continue calling testifiers. Next up, we have Wendy Rahm.

Wendy Rahm: I'm Wendy Rahm, speaking on behalf of the downtown neighborhood association or dna. The next six speakers represent dna approved positions on the historic resource code project. Why is it important to keep a strong separate program for historic resources? Older buildings and sites are guardians of our stories and history. National

registered buildings are designated after a rigorous process with national standards. Local landmark buildings and sites deserve equal recognition and protection. Both designations cast a broad net to capture who we are and how we got here. They call our attention to places we may not know about. Many stories remain uncovered and recognized. Once a building or site is gone, the stories disappear. Some recent nominees for national registry, show there breadth of diversity. Darcell's home was designated. And three recently nominated african american sites for golden west hotel, the baptist church and a beauty salon and barbershop. Place matters. If destroyed, we lose, we forget. Historic designations with strong protections ensure that we guard places that teach us about all groups histories. By learning about each other, we build bridges. We must protect against pressures of demolition for profit. Older buildings stock is also a rich source of affordable housing. Rehabbed and seismically retrofitted they provide less expensive housing than newly built housing, repurposing older buildings is a key source of affordable and missing middle housing. Adapting them allows for increasing density without demolition and importantly, without displacement of people. Keeping them reduce carbon footprint, minimize land waste fill-landfill, conserve our natural resources, that's sustainable. Finally, they create Portland's unique sense of place. That brings new residents, businesses and visitors, protection is integral to economic vitality. Please amend this proposal.

Clerk: Next up, we have Walter Weyler.

Walter Weyler: Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen, I am Walter Weyler, board chair and speaking on behalf of the downtown neighborhood association, the DNA. The DNA urges you not to change the role of the historic landmark commission, the HLC, as the government decision make body. Leave the decision-making to the historic commission, which has the expertise on historic preservation, rather passing it or sharing it with planning and sustainability commission. Whose mission is not in historic preservation. The makeup of the planning commission reflects its goals by drawing primarily from real estate and developer fields. The proposal gives this authority to planning. Which is also tasked with creating the policy and writing the code. Well, no commission should be given the authority to both write and enforce policy. Yet, this is what the proposal does. As written, this proposal includes an unwarranted transfer of power from historic to planning. By reducing the role of historic,

there may be a risk of loss of accreditation by the national park service as a certified local government. That could impair much of Portland's history, including the recently acknowledged African American sites, HLC must be the government decision-making body to administer the historic resource code. Thanks for your time. A big pleasure.

Clerk: Next up, we have LaJune Thorson, Dean Barnett, and Marian Debardeleben.

LaJune Thorson: Hi. I'm LaJune Thorson, representing the DNA. Do not change the makeup of the historic landmark commission. Dilution of the requirements for serving on this will only empower moneyed interest over the protection of diverse Portland histories and sites. The code change proposal permits a future HLC with no professional experience or expertise in historic preservation, to make decisions on our behalf. Instead, we will have real estate developers, two other members with no specific experience or knowledge and the remainder from fields search as finance, law and urban planning. Those fields are already included on both the planning and sustainability commission. And the design commission. Making the HLC more like them is both perplexing and likely bad government. The membership and expertise of the historic landmark commission must not be diminished by having professionals unfamiliar with historic preservation. Whatever planning and sustainability commissions is staff purposes were for excluded the HLC from the most important decision-making processes while diluting it, one can only guess. We need an advisory group with expertise in historic significance and preservation issues. After all, it was the HLC that recognized the multiple property listing for African American building ignored until recently. Many under threat of demolition for larger and more expensive buildings. Having a process with historic emphasis and expertise of these professionals is critical. The DNA urges you to consider an amendment requiring at least five of seven members possess recognized and extensive professional experience and knowledge of local history, architectural history, historic preservation, and cultural anthropology. This is consistent with current code and best practices that value all histories including those of minority and underserved populations. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up, we have Dean Barnett.

Dean Barnett: Hi. Excuse me. I'm Dean Barnett. A downtown resident. And I'm speaking on behalf of the DNA. The DNA supports the undertaking of updating and creating a new historic

resource inventory called the HRI. The principle question is funding. In city council must commit to finding that's important to funding this important update. There are specific areas called out in central city 2035 and they should be prioritized. More public input is needed on what standards for evaluation should be. The DNA also supports the inclusion of eligible properties in the HRI, with or without owner consent. Underrepresented areas should also be prioritized in addition to those called out in cc2035. That these underrepresented areas and populations have not been prioritized before has not been the fault of the zoning code but an apparent failure of economic and political pressure in all areas of the city. Demolition of properties listed on the HRI have had no real protection with the result that profit was prioritized over saving historic stories and buildings. Any property listed, even those not ranked in the 1984 HRI should be included in the new one. This update should be additive, not subtractive. This requires an amendment initiating and funding the HRI requires your action. Thanks.

Clerk: Next up we have Marian Debardelaben.

Marian Debardelaben: Good afternoon, all. My name is Marian Debardelaben. And I'm here as a member of the DNA, downtown neighborhood association. I speak to the important support of the maintenance and protection of the national register resources. The DNA supports the adaptive reuse as long as it does not compromise the qualifying characteristics of a property. Added disincentives for leaving a building unoccupied or not maintaining a property must be clearly stated in the code. Failure to enforce demolition by neglect encourages loss of important properties, especially those in underrepresented areas that developers look upon for profits. Regulations should be added that mandate repair and mitigation of hazardous conditions prior to demolition, including major fines for failure to abate. Enforcement of these code provisions must be observed, however, accompanying the priority needs to be a funding mechanism to incentivize preservation over demolition. It is too easy to create an analysis that appears to support a category of reasonable economic use. Yet, this is a threat to minority properties. The poster child of this is the Blanchet house which falls in this criteria to allow the demolition of a property considered foundational to the Japanese American experience in Portland. A building doesn't have to be beautiful to be preserved, to tell a significant story. It is the building that reminds us of the history. When the

building disappears, it is nearly impossible not to lose the story. Minority stories need to be honored and this category is too easy for side use. Thank you.

Clerk: The next three are Thomas Ray, Paul Weir and --

Wheeler: Before we hear them, I need to have a brief conversation with my colleagues. Keelan, for one moment. So colleagues, here's what we can do. I've been advised by legal counsel that we do not need to have the closed captioner available for the remainder of the evening. Keelan is trying to find another closed captioner on the fly. But that may not be possible. What is possible is we would continue -- keep hearing testimony for as long as we can. And those who need closed captioning in order to be able to do their testimony, what we would do for them is we would make a separate accommodation to allow them to come back on a different time, when we have a closed captioner so they would still have the opportunity to testify. And the remainder of this hearing would be closed captioned prior to that. So that people who are relying on closed captioning, would have the opportunity to be able to read the rest of the testimony if they so choose. So I guess the question to you, colleagues, is if we do that, number one, is that an acceptable resolution, and are you able to stick around for the conclusion of the testimony tonight? I'm seeing a head nod from Commissioner Ryan, Mapps, Rubio. Commissioner Hardesty, how long do we have you?

Hardesty: I originally said I could stay until 6:00 and that still stands.

Wheeler: Okay, would it be acceptable given the record will be recorded to continue and get as many people who have shown up out of the way and you will have access to that record? I appreciate that.

Hardesty: I'm happy to review the record before our next conversation on this matter.

Wheeler: Awesome. I figured you would. But I have to ask. Keelan, are you able to stay and we have Lauren, are you able to stay, our legal counsel?

Clerk: Yes, Mayor, I'm available.

Wheeler: Okay. It's not ideal but it's a work-around as they say. We'll continue testimony. Again, those of you who would rely on closed captioning, we'll be losing our closed captioner about now. We will make that accommodation and we'll discuss that at the end of the hearing. And we will of course publicly post that resolution.

City Attorney: Can I, Mayor, because I imagine those that require closed captioning and want to take advantage of that accommodation are planning on potentially signing off, is it possible, Keelan, for them to direct message you that they require the closed captioning and we can go ahead and create that list?

Clerk: Yeah, let me clarify. The closed captioning will continue in the meeting itself. So what you are seeing at the bottom of your screen will continue. We're just going to lose the closed captioning that gets broadcast to youtube and channel 30.

City Attorney King: Got it. The open signal will be able to add closed captioning after the recording and anyone who is interested can view it online afterwards, is that correct?

Clerk: Yes, we'll work with the captioner to get that done post production.

City Attorney King: Okay, Linly, correct me if I'm wrong, given the closed captioning will continue in the zoom and everyone testifying will have the access, I don't think we need to provide that accommodation at a future hearing. Instead, everyone can continue to testify tonight.

City Attorney Rees: I agree.

Wheeler: Okay. So it sounds like we resolved it. Good, colleagues, any questions before we move onto continue testimony? Not seeing any. Okay. Good. Thank you, for --

Ryan: Thank you, Mayor. I was thanking you for coming through since we have people to testify.

Wheeler: It's not like any of us have a great social life anyway. [chuckling] I would rather hear this. Let's continue without further ado. Thank you, all.

Clerk: Next up, Thomas Ray, Paul weir and John Liu.

Thomas Ray: I'm Thomas Ray. And I continue the testimony for the downtown neighborhood association. It is essential the historic resource code recognize, maintain, and protect all existing national register resources at the highest level of protection review. This proposal demotes properties on the national register, leaving them with greatly reduced protection to almost none. These properties passed a high bar to achieve their recognition. Equally high protection should apply to all national register resources, including those named after 2017. Their protection should be no less than for local historic resources. In fact, many current, national historic register resources are also designated as local historic resources. It is

unnecessary and counterproductive to reduce the role and significance of national register properties, equal protection for local landmark and national register resources should be the goal. No benefit is gained by reducing protection. Doing so could result in the loss of significant historic resources, including some soon to be added to the national register, including those mentioned, African American properties. Greater protection of local historic resources can be provided without reducing protection of national register resources. The DNA would endorse such an amendment. Demoting, reducing protection of national registry properties along with proposed revisions like reducing the role of the HLC risk the loss of our accreditation by the national park services as a certified local government. An extensive amendment or rewrite of the designation section will be necessary and essential to achieve the equality of protection for our most important treasures. Thank you for your time.

Clerk: Next up we have Paul Weir.

Paul Weir: Good afternoon. I'm Paul Weir. I'm a member of the DNA and speaking on their behalf this afternoon. One of the stated purposes of the HRCP is to provide protection for Portland's historic resources, irreplaceable assets. Yet the proposed amendments actually reduce protection, ease the process for demolition, and the allowed destructions of resources significant qualifying properties. The demolition review exemptions have been significantly expanded to include alterations to historic resources that remove 50% of a wall street facade. 50% or more of the exterior walls and 50% or more of roof areas. The extent of these alterations constitutes demolition as defined by state law, including any act that destroys in whole or part a significant historic resource, such that its historic significance is lost. The extent of these alterations constitutes demolition as defined by state law, including the proposed allowed alterations are excessive. Removal of far less than 50% of these elements from a historic resource will result in the loss of its historical significance and constitutes demolition. The proposed amendments are in violation of state law and Oregon administrative rules. The proposed amendments compromise required protection and will result in the loss of Portland's historic resources. The proposed amendments are not necessary nor justified. The DNA recommended the proposed amendments to expand the amendments from demolition review should not be included in the HRCP. Thank you.

Clerk: Times up. Next up we have John Liu.

John Liu: I would like to share my screen, please. Okay, can you hear me?

Clerk: Yes, we can hear you.

Liu: All right, thank you. My name is John Liu. I'm testifying for the Portland coalition for historic resources. Referring you to my written testimony dated October 27th, I'm going to focus on one thing. It's been mentioned before but I'm going to put it in front of you. Under the HRCP you will not in the future have the ability to hear from your own historic landmarks commission in a historic district decision. This is the relevant code section I have on the screen. And you can see what is being changed right here. Currently the code says the commission gets to recommend to city council on historic district decisions. You are asked to change, to take out those words so in the future your own commission, the only city body that is expert on historic matters will only be able to give advice to another body which may or may not pass to you. This is really important because you are going to be asked to designate diverse range of districts in the future. For example, African American historic districts in north Portland, often those buildings are kind of plain. Their history is from the people who lived, loved, and worked and organized there. You are going to need expert advice on which areas should be preserved and which should be gentrified through demolition. It's important you have the most and best advice you can as a city council. And yes, the historic landmarks commission has both representation from and deep expertise in the history of Portland's communities of color. Please do not silence the HLC. Please leave the highlighted paragraph as it is. And that will give you the information to make the very best decision for the city of Portland and all its communities in the future. Thank you so much.

Clerk: The next three are Constance Beaumont, Eric von Hulha, and Patricia Patterson.

Constance. Are you able to unmute?

[Feedback]: And that will give you the information to make the very best --

Clerk: Constance?

Constance Beaumont: Can you hear me?

Clerk: Yes.

Constance Beaumont: I'm hearing another voice, can you hear me now?

Clerk: We can hear you. [audio echoing]

Wheeler: Somebody has the YouTube on. So please turn off, if you are listening to this through another means, turn it off while you are testifying. Otherwise, it's going to drive you nuts.

Clerk: Constance are you playing the meeting in the background?

Beaumont: I don't know what's going on here. I do hear a voice in the background but I don't know how to stop it.

Clerk: Why don't we go onto the next person and come back to you.

Beaumont: Okay.

Clerk: Let's go to Eric von Hulha.

Eric von Hulha: Hello. Long time listener, first time caller. My name is Eric von Hulha. I'm an Irvington resident. I've been here four years. I lived in Portland for a total of nine. As a renter here in Irvington, I'm able to live in this neighborhood because of multifamily housing that would be considered noncontributing structures to the district. I'm testifying in support of the HRCP. But I urge you to make sure historic preservation is not allowed to preserve the exclusionary history of these communities like Irvington. Outcomes and not just the seemingly benign intentions here do matter. As others have said, the history of neighborhoods like Irvington have included racial and economic exclusion and even sadder some homeowners have made it clear they want to use the historic preservation process to ensure city's histories are locked in by trying to make themselves exempt from democratic oversight. That is how it is with the register process. A small group of homeowners would get to override city council and ignore the less affluent neighbors. Renters don't have a say there. This would be an abuse of the historic preservation process and should not be allowed. Focusing on preserving historic houses does in fact preserve economic segregation in many cases. The architecture of a neighborhood should not be excuse to exempt itself from the recent reforms made in support of housing and tenants. In closing, I support the amendments from Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon. Thank you.

Clerk: Let's try Constance again. Are you able to unmute? All right. We'll go to Trisha Patterson.

Trisha Patterson: Hi there. Sorry about that. Hi Commissioners and Mayor. My name is Trisha Patterson. I'm a board member at Portland neighbors welcome. I fully support the

amendments proposed by Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon. We've heard some really great testimony today, it's been a very long day, on the HRCP, and wanted to add a comment on historic covenants, racial covenants and the mapping of this prejudice. So many of you will recall the 2018 archive project by Gretta Smith, who was a PSU student, and the map that she made of a few racial covenants in and around Portland that she created from deed research. This project and many efforts across the country created a pathway for others to see just how prevalent this practice was. That we can more fully understand the ramifications today. And I have this interest because when we talk about historic resources we can get into the weeds of designation, recommending body's review codes but it's so critical we remember the overarching reason we're visiting this section of the code in the first place and we're talking about historic districts. That is the wholesale endorsement of racial covenants as a segregation strategy and the financial and legal backing of this racist practice by banks and insurance companies and government. Even though racial covenants were outlawed in the 1968 fair housing act, the ramifications of the decades this practice was in place are still felt today. The relatively tiny amount of information we concretely have and how much more there is to sift through is illustrative of just widespread, accepted and endorsed the practice of racial covenants were. And this is especially assailable today where we've heard so many people complain that adding gentle density to the existing housing stock in housing in the historic registry won't make much of a difference, that they say these neighborhoods are only 3% of the city's residential area. Honestly, these are the neighborhoods that we should be targeting because that 3% of the city is a much higher percentage and high opportunity neighborhoods and low displacement risk neighborhoods. Those are the neighborhoods we should target. I'll leave you with a quote. I want this to be quick. I'll leave you with a quote from Kimberly Crenshaw that I've been thinking on the last few days. It goes like this. 'You have to dig a little on the ground you think you stand on so you can actually see how much that you take for granted in society is actually layers upon layers of inequality.' Thank you.

Clerk: It looks like Constance may have dropped off. Let's move to Joan Petit, Micha Sinclair and Nora Lehmann.

Joan Petit: Hello, my name is Joan Petit and I own and live in a beautiful historic home built around 1905 in the Elliott neighborhood, part of historic Albina. I support the HRCP and the amendments proposed by housing Oregon and Portland neighbors welcome. I live just a few blocks away from Irvington so I know that Irvington and Elliott aren't that different.

Joan Petit: Hello, my name is Joan Petit and I own and live in a beautiful historic home built around 1905 in the Elliott neighborhood, part of historic Albina. I support the HRCP and the amendments proposed by housing Oregon and Portland neighbors welcome. I live just a few blocks away from Irvington so I know that Irvington and Elliott aren't that different. I support the HRCP the houses in Irvington is much like my house. It's not because of the ages of the homes but because of when who lived in those homes. My family. My multi-racial family wouldn't have been allowed to live in Irvington a few decades ago because of red lining and legal structures. I know people are tired of hearing about the history of racism and I know my neighbors in Irvington are welcoming people because I see nice yard signs on black lives matter and no human is illegal. We need to look at outcomes. A scholar says that racism is baked into policy and we need to look at the outcomes of policies. If a policy makes it harder for people to change old houses or fix their garage or build more houses in white neighborhoods, the outcome is that fewer black or brown people live in those neighborhoods, then that's a racist policy. Historic districts making it harder for brown or black people to live in our city's loveliest neighborhoods and we all want to live in lovely neighborhoods with trees and sidewalks. We have a housing crisis. I don't think we should be giving more protection or time and energy of protecting the most exclusive neighborhoods. The houses will be fine. What we need for them is to get better at sharing what they have so more Portlanders can benefit. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Nora Lehmann.

Nora Lehmann: Can you hear me?

Clerk: Yes, we hear you.

Lehmann: Good afternoon Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners my name is Nora Lehmann and I live in Humboldt neighborhood. Alike many others at the hearing, I support the goals and reforms of the historic research goals project and I ask you to support Portland neighbors welcome. Neighborhoods should not be preserved in amber as many believe. All places

become historic after time passes but those that get officially designated historic are ones where wealth and privilege with concentrated over the decades through exclusionary practices, Humboldt has houses of similar vintage of trigger but no one is trying to designate it as a historical district. Allowing those to live in affluent neighborhoods to exempt themselves from the residential in-fill project documented last year is unjust. These questions must be seen in the context of the ever-worsening climate crisis. We cannot forget that global heating is coming to all of us with the tsunami of change. We need our cities to be dense consider and greener and have many fewer cars and be much more walkable and bike-able and we need them faster than they are currently happening. Many of the older voices I heard testify this afternoon do not seem to understand this. Without further action from city council, the historic preservation process will continue to be a tool further to entrench histories of racial exclusion and allow rich neighborhoods to avoid playing by the same rules and make it more difficult for Portland to meet climate targets. Please adopt the measures to speed our city on its path to be more equitable and adaptable to our harsh climate future. Thank you so much.

Clerk: Next up is Micha Sinclair.

Micha Sinclair: I'm Micha Sinclair, can you hear me all right? Excellent. I live in a historic house I bought several months ago. A large part of my retirement plan is in this house and keeping the level of affluence. I'm here to say please do not worry about that when there are people who do not have homes and families struggling to have many people in an apartment. We need to prioritize the crisis both environment and social. The -- I'm going to speak more anecdotally than other people. We have the HLC guidelines and expert guidelines are not experts in everything, and they're still to this day demanding that invasive species of trees be planted on the city's right-of-way. Trees that are specifically -- by city forestry. These are being used by neighborhood associations like hands and the landmark commission, HLC which there is a lot of cross pollination to brow beat people to do things that are environmentally unsound. I want to speak to the idea that not all of the inequity is intentional. I can tell you that my wife was a woman of color within the first month and somebody walked up to her and said you should have kept the house white. That was upsetting. And, yes, we're painting the house but she felt the double entendre was clear and

so do I. There is still inequity. There is still an outlook that poor people bring crime as we heard in earlier testimony that his big fear in adding housing for the poor would be an increase in safety. These things need to be called out. Thank you very much.

Clerk: I will I'll call on Constance one more time. Constance, are you able to unmute?

Constance Beaumont: Yes, can you hear me now?

Clerk: We can hear you.

Beaumont: I won't repeat some of the arguments or points made earlier by members of the downtown neighborhood association or by John, but in general, I agreed with the points they made. I think the HRCF proposal would dilute requirements for relevant on the part of the landmark commission members. The current environments should be retained. And in similar vein, a few of the landmark commissions should play a primary role in decisions regarding historic resources. I would like to mention several key benefits of Portland's historic resources that the council should consider. One, they are important to Portland's economy especially if it relates to tourism. Secondly, this view is based on my 18 year tenure for the trust with historic preservation in Washington DC I visited well over 100 cities and I concluded that a defining feature of most historic neighborhoods is their pedestrian friendliness, due to the design and architecture and trees. That's a feature that motivates people to walk more and drive less. We need to be concerned about getting people out of their carbon-emitting cars and encourage them to walk more and preserving existing pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods and insisting that new development be more pedestrian friendly are two things that the city should do. Finally, although we need more and more affordable housing, it's not necessary to trash one community asset to create another. I'll cite one example and that's the historic man house in Laurelhurst which is being renovated and converted into 129 units of affordable housing. Thank you for your time and consideration of these views.

Clerk: Next up we have Carrie Richter, Sam Stuckey and Sarah. Carrie, are you able to unmute?

Carrie Richter: Yes, I can, thank you. Mayor and Commissioner I'm Carrie Richter and I fully support adoption of the HRCF. I would like to offer three points in response to some amendments advocated for today. Entitling height this as a matter of right for affordable housing is a bad idea because the landmark's commission must provide setbacks or step

backs on buildings. In fact, this is could common practice in Chinatown, east Portland, Kenton, south side of Irvington in alphabet. The seven corner's project on 20th and southeast division was a huge suck because it maximized height and used sculpting to make it compatible. Next I ask you that you object amendments that will provide blanket [indiscernible] zoning provides for a balancing ever public policies including economic consequences of demolition as well as the merits of new development when making these determinations. With all due respect to the middle housing advocates, a historic single-family house will always be able to be converted to a duplex. If the house is large, it could be internally converted. If the existing house is small, an addition either attached or detached could be added. With all due respect to those concerned with red lining and racism, where were you when I and my fellow preservations were in the trenches this summer fight be tooth and nail to save the Yamaguchi hotel only perpetuating further erasure. Thank you very much for further consideration of these comments.

Clerk: Next up we have Sam Stuckey.

Sam Stuckey: I'm both a member of Portland neighbors welcome and the old town community association and a board member or committee member with the old town Chinatown trance land use and transportation committee although I speak on my own today. I would like to point out there has been a lot of consideration so far on whether or not historic preservation does or does not promote development, the creation of new housing and economic opportunity both for privileged communities and those that have been historically disadvantaged in our city. I would like to point to old town and Chinatown. In the current condition of under development and blight, that we experience daily there, I worked there many years and this conversation is the conversation among account committee association and land use committee. Historic preservation is not the only reason that old town continues to slip further and further into disrepair. But it is a main one, it's a major barrier to economic development. We hear it time and time again from people that would like to build housing. Would like to build new businesses in old town and Chinatown and run up against ambiguous rulings from the historic landmarks commission or dissuaded from investing in the neighborhood due to uncertainty. So I would like you to carefully read the testimony from our organization from the old town community association. And I don't think what we're

asking for is going to hurt preservation of our history, but enhance it through enhancing the economic viability of our district. There are a number of members of our community that are going to speak towards the end of the testimony today. They're way at the back of the line. I hope that you guys can stay on and listen diligently to the story they tell because they're telling. I won't take any more time. I appreciate you. Have a great night.

Clerk: Next up is Sarah Iannarone.

Sarah Iannarone: Hi. When you lose an election no one knows how to say your name. I'm here as I dues payer on Portland welcome. There was assertion earlier on that that was an astroturf effort with a lot of deep pockets and I can assure you these folks are a civic gem and have been showing up for years to pass pro housing policy working at the grassroots making sure that a different sets of voices are included. I support the amendments that they put forward on this HRCP and in tandem with housing Oregon. We have a lot of people who care about the future and that's clear. I think it's important for us to remember that it's these people that are the treasure here. The buildings are a part of what this at this is about. I work in old town in an old building and it ringed on every side of the block by tents and this is the problem we face today. Other things we have to acknowledge. We've heard from people like Trisha Patterson who talked about exclusionary zoning being racist. There are a lot of people arguing about how we should think about this or that and they're not reasonable arguments when you look at the history of racism in Portland. It's that simple. We need to be thinking about these things through different lenses and frames. No one here is advocating that we destroy priceless historic treasures in the city. We're trying to access opportunity and transportation. We know 40% of our greenhouse gas emissions come if transportation. Think of how many people would live in these affluent neighborhoods if they were zoned probably and access the orange line that runs right through East Moreland. It's important to not weigh these as two he very equal sides of an equation, but there are folks fighting for equitable climate start future and folks fighting for an equitable status quo. Thanks and keep up the good work.

Clerk: Next up we have Athul, Susan and Dean.

Athul Acharya: Mayor, I'm Athul and I'm in the Kerns neighborhood. I'm speak in my personal capacity only. I support the HRCP reforms, but I urge the council to go further. In

passing Mendoza, this made strides to house everyone that wants to live here. These are pro housing and pro tenant. They were a model for cities around the country. But of course, not everyone likes them, exclusionary committees vigorously oppose their passage and they continue to oppose them now. And having lost the battle in zoning reform, they turning to historic preservation as a tool for exclusion. Historic preservation abused is a theft from the unhoused. To ensure that exclusive neighborhoods cannot use the historic preservation process to opt out of reforms, the council must act to strengthen the proposal specifically if the district has a history of racial covenants, that should be a reason to demote, resize or remove the historic or conservation status. If we permit communities with a history of segregation [indiscernible] to continue to enforce segregation, we might as well build a statue to robert e. Lee and rename i-84 the Jefferson Davis expressway. The council should limit how much historic review should be allowed to spot down zone a project. No more than a 10% height reduction should be allowed. Historic preservation is not a veto by housed against those seeking housing. There should expand approval criteria for demolition review to state law limits. Exclusionary communities are looking at the national register as a way to circumvent democratic oversight over local or historic districts. Council should not reward them for seeking to bypass local democratic control. The supposed purpose of historic preservation is to honor and protect history.

Clerk: Next up is Susan.

Susan Gisvold: Oregon and Portland have a shameful history of pollutionary practices from our constitution to property deeds. I urge the council to pass HRCP.

Clerk: Susan, you are muted.

Gisvold: Can you hear me? My name is Susan. Can you hear me?

Clerk: Yes.

Gisvold: Okay. I speak to you from Irvington in my home from the past 54 years. I will take you back to our house-hunting days in Portland. In 1967, we had arrived the year before from Minneapolis, had a baby, settled into our rental duplex. Starting in the spring of 1967, our weekends were spent house hunting. At the same time we read in the Oregonian that there were of 60 children of color under the age of 2 available for adoption. Since we were interested in an interracial family, we applied to Multnomah county to adopt one of those

children. I vividly remember my discussions with my husband that we should be looking primarily in the Irvington neighborhood because it was integrated. The neighborhood was one-third black, and the local school was racially diverse. Two-thirds of the students were black. In May 1967, we attended the first Irvington home tour showcasing six homes. Which confirmed our Irvington decision? We bought a house and moved in in November, 1967. We eventually adopted four children of color and had two home products. All six children attended Irvington elementary school. Our lives centered on the school and allowed us to build community. And make a good school even better. Over the years so many Irvington residents worked so hard to make it a place that championed diversity architecture and trees for everyone. For these reasons, I join those who are dismayed and disappointed by the amount of misinformation and demonization being displayed about how Irvington came to be. To those who suggest that my neighborhood is exclusionary, I say this: Let's get real. Stop the name calling. Let's base decisions on fact and the truth. I've we observed this history and lived it. For more than half a century we've given our heart, time, and energy to make this a better place for everyone.

Clerk: Okay. Next up is Dean Gisvold.

Dean Gisvold: I'm Dean and I've lived in Irvington for 54 years and I am the ICA land use chair. Over 700 historic review applications have been filed by Irvington residents and businesses and have been processed by bds and the Irvington land use committee. We've responded to 99% of the applications and only 7 of them have been appealed. Let me give you some real facts about Irvington. This information comes from Brandon and city records. The Irvington neighborhood has over 2,000 multi-family units plus the 200 units at our public housing projects in dokey manor and grace peck terrace. Those are 2,250 units of multi-family housing and single family has less, 2,150. That's what is on the ground now. And those multi-family units are made up of 66 ADUs, 119 apartment buildings with 1300 units, 33 condominium buildings with 250 units. 162 complexes, 24 triplexes. Exclusionary, we are not. In addition, the official Irvington school records from 2018 and 2019 show that 47% of the students are students of color. That continues what my wife just said about what we found in 1967. Irvington supports the exemptions but we request if you do a detached volume of more than 200 square feet it be used as an ADU and we support repair of windows and you've

heard a couple of people testify from that industry that it would be what like the deconstruction industry. It can be expanded and put more people to work because it's cheaper by 50%. Thank you for putting up with my overtime-ness.

Clerk: Next up is John, Sarah and Emily. John, you are muted. Are you able to unmute, john? Let's go to Sarah Gilbert.

Sarah Gilbert: Hi there, sorry.

Clerk: We can hear you, go ahead. You're muted now. Will you try to unmute.

Gilbert: I've been a resident of Portland for almost a decade now and in the process, I have had a chance to really learn a lot about the history of all of the decisions that we've made as a city. And the damage that has been brought on communities like the black communities and some of which were inner southeast and northeast neighborhoods that have been historically damaged and dispersed. When we talk about preserving history, we often ignore the history that has been erased. I don't think that history stays in buildings. It stays in the stories we can tell and we can tell them with or without the buildings preserved. I support the council's plan with the amendments by Portland neighbors welcome. I urge us all to think about when we talk about racist decisions and account ones that have been made in the past, remembering that we've all benefited from decades, if not a century and a half of extraordinary racist decisions and it's time to start rectifying those and prioritize housing that is available to everyone. Thank you.

Clerk: Emily.

Emily Guise: Hello. Thank you for the opportunity to testify, Commissioners and Mayors. I'm Emily, and I strongly support the amendments from Portland and neighbors welcome and housing or and urge you to pass them. I live for three years in a rented apartment. My apartment is gentle density housing created 10 years ago when my landlord built on to the six-plex that already existed. Luckily Foster-Powell is not designated a historic district so our landlord could build two other units without spending more money to conform to historic code. Thanks for that ability to build gentle density, my partner and myself and cat live in an affordable, walkable and bike-able, transit friendly neighborhood. A rare thing in Portland. With the current affordable housing crisis in Portland, I wholeheartedly support the amendments. They would allow thoughtful historic preservation while making it harder for

historic districts to become obstacles to lower cost and affordable housing. Thank you for your time.

Clerk: Next up is John. John, are you able to unmute? Let's go on to the next. We have Fred, Louis and Carter.

Fred Leeson: My name is Fred. I want to make two quick comments. First I encourage you to look at the memos from the Portland coalition for historic resources and from the architectural historical center. Both raise four questions or issues that I think are easy to resolve. And can be fixed without damaging any of the benefits in the rest of the HRCP. By ignoring them, I'm afraid you're inviting some unfortunate legal disputes down the road that will be costly for everyone involved. Second, I assume as a tenant of modern public administration, you want to get the best advice and expertise you can. If you're building roads or public works or worried about the city budget or you're doing bond issues, you want to get the best expertise you can get to advise you. In that regard, what you're proposing in front of you does is, you're taking away people with expertise with on the ground experience in the vital parts of historic preservation. I know frankly I don't understand why you're willing to accept less than the best in the biggest city in Portland that has more people with ability to provide information that's useful. I really think this is a step backward in public administration and I for the life of me, I don't understand why you're willing to do that. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up is Louis.

Louis McLemore: Yes, good evening Mayor and Commissioners. I represent the Billy Webs Elks Lodge. It's a cultural situation in the Albina neighborhood because of the city's efforts, we were recently honored by being listed in national register of historic places an important first step in preserving and recognizing black history. There is much more work to be -- to do and one property listed simply not enough. The historic resources code project needs to be a tool for all communities to learn, share, and protect the history and cultural heritage. In every part of Portland. Here is an opportunity to safeguard these special places like ours from irreversible loss. We support work city staff has put into this draft. We support the much-needed improvements to the inventory process and additional incentives for recognizing a diverse and wide array of historic places in all parts of Portland. The Elks Lodge and that the council adopt HRCP. We would ask that council revisit the demolition criteria specifically d-1 and this

draft. So cultural heritage is not further erased in Portland. But we mostly ask that this council also put forth significant support and funding to update the historic inventory and offer more incentives for historic places. All communities, but especially communities of color, need to be invested in as well as protected and celebrated for their unique histories and contributions to Portland. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up is Carter.

Carter Ause: Hello city council members. Thank you for hosting this important meeting and for staying awake today. I'm Carter and I'm a current master student with the historic preservation program at the university of oregon. I myself am interested in a preservation career because I believe this field has enormous potential for community members, architects, and city planners to foster urban environments to foster equity, esthetic beauty and sustainable design. The proposed historic resources project would allow the Portland inventory to be updated for the first time since 1984. What I am proposing today that is that the city provide additional funding for survey work in the future. This past spring I had the pleasure of engaging in research. My research focused on African American resources connected with the history of civil rights outlined in cornerstones of the community as well as the documentation form filed for the architectural heritage center. Through my research, I found 28 historical significant civil rights resources in northeast Portland. And I found four historically civil rights resources that have been demolished since 1977 and replaced with new construction. Community stories from the civil rights era through the buildings that help tell the story need to be given a voice within the future planning decisions. The city needs to take more intentional steps to further research and do significant resources which could be erased from the urban fabric if we are not careful. Thank you for your time.

Clerk: Next up we have Tamara, Rick, and Patrick.

Wheeler: Could we get the current count of people remaining, please?

Clerk: Sure. May I provide that after this group?

Wheeler: Let's let these three testify so we have a sense of where we are. Maybe after these three, take a brief break just to give people an opportunity. Nick Fish used to call it a compassion break.

Clerk: Thank you. We have Tamara.

Wheeler: Hi, Tamara.

Rick Michaelson: Are you ready for me?

Clerk: Go ahead, Rick.

Michaelson: Sure. I'm Rick Michaelson and I'm here to support the staff work done on this important project. While not perfect, I'm pleased that it provides local control for historic districts and resources and we no longer have to do the odd work-around to get city regulations. But I am frustrated by the rhetoric and lack of acts in it. This is a very complicated issue and it's been complicated for years. But I think historic districts are important to us and we need to recognize that. Historic districts are about memory, cultural history and diversity. They help to avoid the modern one size fix all. Land is available to all the residents of Portland who walk and drive through there. The downtown historic district provides great economic opportunities for both locals and tourists in the area. The Albina district provides diverse housing for its population. And its population is below Portland's median income and has a higher poverty rate for the city as a whole. Most are housed in historic buildings. Historic districts are only about 3% of the area of the city. Not every site needs to be same. Affordable housing needs to be a priority for lower cost housing. In northwest we chose to protect the smaller buildings in the Albina district by providing up-zones north of the district. Portland's character is what it is because we encourage a variety of neighborhoods with a variety of characters. Historic districts are part of that variety. I provided you detail recommendations on minor changes to the proposal in writing and I hope you take that under consideration. Thank you very much. Is a good evening.

Clerk: Next we have Patrick.

Patrick Hilton: I'm done.

Clerk: Patrick, you're muted.

Patrick Hilton: Okay. [indiscernible] should be the norm not the exception. Not just have this as an option but codify this please. This would allow for history to teach architecture like the Yamaguchi and the Hawthorne hostel. Yes to incentive and helping to finance ADUs especially in the historic areas. Landmarks commission and other historic advocacy groups should be able to inform city council on these issues. How about all Portlanders have a say not just bureaucrats or people that own buildings. Places like sunny side are important to me

and enjoyed by people that don't live there. These are shared non-renewable resources for everyone. That's what historic vintage neighborhoods are. These are important for the well-being of Portlands. For those of us not privileged enough to go to Paris or Disneyland for a grand architectural experience, these buildings are our Paris. People should be able to come here and enjoy the vintage and historic neighborhoods. Our city is as beautiful as Paris. Old buildings are better than urban suburbia. If you think architecture should be destroyed. I suggest you destroy your car because Henry Ford was an anti-Semite. The bicycle was developed by a German and a man. You should be innovating for bringing people together by sharing the architect in the city not by dividing us by class and race. Please be pragmatic and practical with this non-renewable resource. Thank you.

Clerk: That completes that group. We have 23 remaining.

Wheeler: Let's take a brief compassion break. It's 6:21, let's come back at 6:30. Does that sound good? We'll see everything at 6:30. We're in short recess.

At 6:21 pm, Council recessed.

At 6:30 pm, Council reconvened.

Clerk: Thank you, Mayor. Next up we have Greg, Steven Cole, and Scott Jones.

Greg Buss: Hi, thank you so much Mayor and Commissioner. I'm a Laurelhurst homeowner and I wanted to speak in favor of the amendments by Portland neighbors welcome. And the overall effort to build more housing in every part of our city. There are maybe more of us than you think in some of the neighborhoods. I grew up here in Laurelhurst. I went to Fernwood middle school and Grant high school. I can relate to some of the old consider commenters from Irvington who are speaking to the neighborhoods relative diversity and community spirit there. I do not think they're ill-intentioned but I see a generational divide that is obvious in the comments we've heard tonight. Those of us who have struggled to find and afford homes in inclusive neighborhoods in recent years and starting families compared to the perspective of those who bought their homes many decades ago, we simply need more housing. We need more affordable housing and more middle-income housing, we need more housing. Period. Because while Portland has changed and grown dramatically, you know,

Laurelhurst has not changed and every neighborhood needs do its part to create the new Portland and you know, where my children can grow up and afford to live. I see the homeless encampment circling the playground park as connected to this question. Instead of adapting to a growing population, too many people are looking for ways to pull out. The critics, I don't think see what they're proposing as a solution. Let's make it easier to build more housing and get people housed in Portland. Thank you very much.

Clerk: Next up we have Steven.

Steven Cole: I'm Steven and I'm the president of the Irvington community association. First as previously stated Irvington is surprisingly dense in population. Contrary to the demonization of the residents of proponents of making it easier by destroying homes makes it economically diverse. We are not trying to keep people of lesser means out of the neighborhood. When my wife and I moved to Irvington no one would have mistaken us for anything but middle class. We came here to opportunist developers from destroying homes. As state, we approved of many of the proposed changes. Solar panel changes should be enacted immediately as climate [indiscernible] for discussions tonight. We welcome even more density through the RFP changes which contrary to testimony we're not trying to avoid. However, making it easier to demolish homes will not result in affordable additional housing but result in cheaply-built and expensive replacements. Contrary to some testimony we welcome increased density. Economic diversity won't happen with modern multimillion dollar homes incentivized. I would also like to note we have apartments and multi-story buildings. Many located in areas allowing up to eight stories. Irvington can make it more density without making it easier for strollers demolish historic homes. What makes Portland a great place to live is the tapestry of different neighborhoods. Irvington adds to the tapestry. We should not work towards a homogenized Portland. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Scott Jones.

Scott Jones: Hi, I'm Scott Jones and I lived in Portland for 35 years. And in the Humboldt neighborhood for 20 years. As steward for the last two decades of a 1907 house that I restore, I witnessed numerous houses like mine can be demolished on my block and around. Not one of the new giant multiplex whose took their places housed low income renters or owners and encouraged diversity like the houses they replaced. Instead, they've been selling for \$800,000

to \$1.2 million each and gone to seclusion. Exclusively white people and made with toxic materials and have no solar panels. A new construction company is not going to buy a \$500,000 property with the intent to tear it down if they're not going to profit multiple times from it. I experienced firsthand each one of our historic properties is important to our entire local economy. While my guests see ugly properties cropping up near me and my neighborhoods and beyond in replace of the historic treasures, that hurts most. We keep being told that Portlands has a housing crisis but our people who can afford housing sleeping in tents? No we have a income and cost of living cries. While the issue is complex, there is no way that tearing down good houses and replacing them with super expensive non-ecofriendly multiplexes is anything less than a huge contributor do this crisis. As our city's current stewards of historic treasures, please make sure that the HRCP protects our neighborhoods from the huge amount of demolitions that the city has allowed. Thank you very much.

Clerk: Next up is Rod, Andrew and Don.

Rod Merrick: Can you hear me? Good. Good to see you all and thank you for conducting this hearing. I'd like to first ask you to carefully considerate thoughtful concerns highlighted in the 4 point testimony committed by PCHR. It draws from those of experience in the field of preservation as well as those young old with civic engagement about Portland's future. Today I would like to focus on the importance of approving the code process but with needed amendments. As it stands the HRCP with thousand friends welcome Portland neighbors is already weakened our regulations compared to other cities and do nothing for affordability. There are those whose intentions are to do that. My concern is grounded in 10 reasons why it's to important to have a strong local preservation program. One, preservation guides change to protect historic resource. Our architectural landscapes and culture. Preservation is the most sustainable form of development. Preservation promotes local craft skills and local businesses that supply products for those crafts. Preservation of existing structures limit demolitions that are the largest volume of material trucked to landfills. Preservation protects treasures of the city for the education and enjoyment of visitors and fellow residents and promotes community and civic pride. Preservation drives tourism worldwide. Portland is in need of preserving its appeal beyond providing a landing place for exploration of beautiful

landscapes. Eight, preservation attracts investment in unstable and declining neighborhoods. Preservation is an expression of appreciation and provides soul to every place where it's practiced. And finally, all historical preservation districts comprise less than 3% of Portland's buildable land area and contribute to housing affordability by preserving existing housing stock which is often the most affordable housing, curbing upscale redevelopment and discouraging demolition and displacement. We need more, not less, thanks for your thoughtful consideration.

Clerk: Next up we have Andrew.

Andrew Damitio: Thank you so much. And thank you Mayor Wheeler and Commissioner. My name is Andrew and I currently live in the Lloyd district. I'm a recent arrival to Portland having moved here in August. Historic preservation is a value I hold dear in my heart. I grew up in the Corvallis area and I served on the natural areas and parks board. We worked to preserve historic structures from the Palestine church to the commander's house. Preservation has educated and enriched the surrounding communities. The purpose of historic preservation should be to educate and inspire the public. I worry that without the inclusion of amendments to ensure the historic district designations do not operate as a barrier to avoiding apartment construction, they will become expensive enclaves that are walled off for everyone but the wealthy instead of being a historic resource. Portland has ensured that the city has ample supply of studio one-bedroom apartments which allowed me to move to Portland in the first place. Allowing my partner and I to rent cheaply in the city center. We both fear we'll be priced out and forced to leave Portland should we desire kids or require more space than a college dorm in the future if we don't have more space than now. Existing homes which have best access to opportunity as well as bike and pedestrian-friendly infrastructure have daunting price tags that we'll never be able to afford. The average home price in Laurelhurst is \$858,000. In Irvington, \$860,000. My partner and I are both 24 years old and new to the city but want to stay for a long time. I urge the commission to consider the needs of the next generation of Portlanders when you're voting on amendments to the historic resource code. While I am lucky to be plugged into politics, the vast majority of newcomers are not. Thank you for letting me speak.

Clerk: Next up we have Sean.

Sean Sweat: Thank you, first I support the amendments housing oregon and Portland neighbors welcome. Second I love historic landmark buildings but do not support historic districts. I don't want a few homeowners to trigger a loophole that will circumvent the decisions. Please pass this with those amendments and to take that -- take those decisions back from the feds and restore local control. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Linda N. and Bill and Linda M. Linda, you're muted. Linda, are you able to unmute?

Linda Nettekoven: Good evening Mayor and city council members. Thank you for your ongoing interest in this important work and outstanding endurance this evening. I live in the [indiscernible] neighborhood. I speak as an individual this evening. I'm here to support the HRCP to commend bds staff for their hard work couldn't complex issues and reinforce several concerns voiced by others in an attempt to strengthen the proposal. First, the primary role for the historic districts and a broader set of criteria including those mandated by goal five to allow council to better balance conflicting goals involved in demolition decisions.

Furthermore, let's get going on a developing the cultural resources plan and updating the building codes to facilitate for adaptive use. We've been discussing our cities history of exclusionary practices and how wealth and privileged are concentrated for decades in certain neighborhoods. I hadn't planned to talk about this and time doesn't allow me to share the story of economic mood wings but I will show you how the real estate industry managed to lure African neighborhoods from downtown a perhaps unintended win-win. As a multi-year veteran on the committee I want to close by saying please don't let us down when it comes to funding for historic resources. This is an excellent time to be increasing our understanding of the facts, developing a common understanding of our history, how we got here and how we can move ahead. Thank you very much.

Clerk: Next up we have Bill.

Bill Levesque: I'm Bill the president of the Hawthorne boulevard business association. We've submitted our written testimony and I encourage you to take a look at that. I'm concerned about the logic of false choices inherent in the discussion. Historic preservation versus high density housing. We want both. In fact, I think that a lot. People on this call have the same values and goals. We have different ways of looking at the same set of problems that we all

have -- but we all have good intentions. Esthetic is important. It's nothing to apologize for. We should be able to state clearly that beauty is good. Is it subjective? Yes. It doesn't mean it's unimportant. In fact, we all want beauty and should strive to make it available to everyone everywhere. It's important to clearly state what our long-term goals. If we have a goal of affordable housing closer to the city center, that's good but how much and where? Let's get those goals clearly articulate. We've seen white people complain about gentrification while sitting in their \$700,000 townhome in a neighborhood that has a history of red lining and displacing people of color. I saw it firsthand in San Francisco. If the goals are not clearly understood, any process we have in place and any argument we have is just an enabler for developer profits. Developers are good. But government holds the responsibility to manage the development toward the goals of the citizens. Finally it is important that we know where we're going. What will Portland look like in 50 years? That's really important question for us to get our arms around. What will it look like 50 years from now? Will it be five-story buildings covering our commercial streets end to end? If not, how much will be replaced? And seems extreme, but given some of the things that we've seen on the corridors already, what is to stop that from happening or for it to be overwhelmed by five-story bullet family units? If that's the vision, let's state that and have a discussion on that at a political level. Any changes here should include our course to our vision. We have our recommendations for the updates. But it is our responsibility to make sure that any process or changes align clearly to the defined set of goals. I appreciate all the work you're doing and staying late and listening to us. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up is Linda. Linda, you are muted.

Linda McDowell: Okay.

Clerk: We heard you. Try to unmute again.

McDowell: Okay. I would -- I'm going to just say that I agree with the last person who spoke. I grew up in the Irvington area and I now live in what is called Sullivan's gulch neighborhood in an apartment and I feel lucky to still live in this beautiful area. And I have -- I firmly believe that we should keep our landmark commission populated with people who understand historic preservation. I mean, we've seen what happened to our government in the last four years when there is an attempt to put people in positions that don't have experience. And so,

I feel that we need to make sure that we leave people until experience on those commissions to make decisions about buildings being demolished. I live in Sullivan's gulch and in the last few years, the we loosened the regulations. I was a realtor for 20 years and made this area all r-2 zoning. As a result of that, several beautiful houses have been demolished. They haven't been replaced by low-income housing. But high-income housing. Especially there is one corner on 21st that a mega building that I believe seven stories tall was built and they tried to sell as condominiums. It wouldn't sell. Now I have a friend living there. She said at one time there was about within third of it finally rented. But there was no attempt to make low-income housing there. Plus.

Clerk: Time is up.

McDowell: Thank you anyway. I hope that we continue. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Meg, Julia and Connie.

Meg Langford: Hello Mayor and Commissioners. I appreciate having the opportunity to speak at this late hour. I am a proud Portlander since 2005 and I am an archives professional so share history with the community. Preservation is cultural memory work are not about preserving every item or building. It's about memory keeping for the public good. Part of the public value historical resources is to reckon with the past. Preservation should not be weaponized to trap us in an endless time loop of bad decisions or to bring back the exclusionary zoning lobby in a new set of clothes. I support the amendments. Portland is not a museum. It's a city and rapidly-growing city. I urge city council to ensure the decisions made on the HRCF are guided by the facts and what is in the public interest. Many prior testimonies provided ample evidence how important it is that that's decisions are made under democratically elected control. I noticed some of my Portlanders expressing fear over the change, I think that is unfortunate. I'll draw your attention to my neighborhood. Hundreds of additional homes have been added since the register attempt failed while remaining a vibrant neighborhood. We need to support them citywide. You can't stop a city from changing or stop the clock, but you can help our growing city towards a more resilient and equitable future. That's why I'm a dues-paying member of Portland neighbors welcome and that's why I'm here today. Please accept the amendments made by Portland neighbors welcome.

Clerk: Next we have Julia.

Julia Metz: Thank you for sticking it out tonight. I'm Julia a non-profit housing developer. As a member of housing oregon and the council, catholic charities want to we iterate their supported testimony. I want to thank you my colleagues who collaborated on these requests. Among other things, the emphasized need for process is forward to reduce unnecessary risk to developments and increase the provision of affordable homes. Currently affordable housing developers often preemptively reduce the number of homes to minimize risk while many others don't consider developments in the areas due to the certainty of the current process. With that in mind, we echo the request for a type-two review process. I want to emphasize the high importance of near term future funding to update the historic guidelines. We want to provide affordable homes that are responsive and respectful of the surrounding context. Help us to do that by refining the guidelines. As we look to the future of historic designations, we want to emphasize not only will the recommendations note provide affordable housing but it helps ensure affordable housing can be threaded in future resources to help can prevent future displacement for vulnerable residents. Taking this in a direction that is more responsive to the needs of Portlanders. I want to touch on the comments that repurposing old buildings is costly. An our product we're currently seeing the typical cost per square foot compared to new construction is the same. However the changes can make this more feasible by minimizing unnecessary barriers and costly processes. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Connie.

Connie Masuoka: Thank you very much. Thank you councilmembers and Mayor for letting me speak. I'm Connie and currently the board president of the Japanese American museum of oregon located in the old town Japan-town neighborhood historic district. I have a testimony that has written and submitted. Right now I would like to speak because of the lateness of the time for -- out of my testimony. To say that I really want you to think about -- I support the HRCF and I would like you to follow it. The thing is that old town area was developed in 1972 when Bill Natocame through and bought up the buildings here in the idea of preservation and developing this into an affordable retail space and living space for people. It's been progressing through into the 2035 plan and the development people have looked at it. I would like you to look at it and go equitably with it. And go by the rules they set forth. You've

already effectively damaged the area by taking down contributing buildings along Glisan where you're also set to demolish the Yamaguchi hotel. These are things that were set aside as contributing buildings and set for demolition and allowed to go to waste and go to demolition. I think that is unfair. It raises the cultural history of our Asian American community. I know that you're trying to go forth and develop more landmark spaces, but please remember that there are spaces that are designated and please don't let those go to waste and be demolished. I would like that on record. Thank you so much.

Clerk: Next up we have Tony.

Tony Jordan: Hello Mayor and Commissioner. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I'm Tony and I support the proposed amendments by Housing Oregon and Portland Neighbors Welcome particularly demolition review in National Registered Districts. I'm here testifying on the 20th year of my historic marriage. It's a great time. I served for six years on the Sunny Side Neighborhood Association. Four as chair. While I'm proud of the work my board and I did during the terms which is giving a lot of input in the Comprehensive Plan project, I came away with the belief that our neighborhood associations do not and cannot operate as truly representative bodies and the legitimacy can be wielded by a few people to subvert our city's planning process. Without amendments to expand approval criteria and predictability for demolition, this project will create National Registered Districts to maintain exclusionary zoning practices. These districts will be more attractive under HRCF because they will not bring restrictions for window replacement, solar replacements and garage demolitions, which is good. But the process will remain undemocratic and unchecked. It will be easier to implement a National Registered District than a public parking permit zone. You as City Council will not have a say in it. We can preserve history without excluding Portlanders from desirable neighborhoods. Please support the amendments by Portland Neighbors Welcome and Housing Oregon particularly amendment four.

Clerk: Next up we have Regina, Michelle and Lincoln. Regina, are you able to unmute?

Regina Winkler: Hello.

Clerk: We hear you.

Winkler: Great. I'm a long-time Portland resident. And my comments are, we have a point to be stewards over Portland's great place which are vital for the city's future success. Portland'

historic neighborhoods are integral to the attractiveness and viability of Portland rather than rows of cookie cutter houses. Historic neighborhoods are diverse and preserve Portland's character and livability. When we reserve and rehabilitate existing buildings, we are utilizing environmentally ecological way the most sustainable form of development. Local craft skills are promoted and local businesses supply products for crafts thus limiting the volume of material trucked to landfills compared to development by demolition. The treasures of the city are protected for the enjoyment of business and fellow residents. Thriving tourism and diverse populations restoring Portland's place as the number one community in the US. Rather than shabby reputation which is currently marring Portland's recovery from the pandemic. The walkability of these neighborhoods cuts down on pollution and congestion in our city as residents are not dependent on vehicles to get to business communities. Sense of community is promoted and builds a share of history. I'm in favor of the project and urge you to vote in favor with the following caveats. These issues need to be addressed in amendments before final -- someone, these include evaluating compliance with --

Clerk: Your time is up.

Winkler: Sorry. Thank you for the opportunity. Appreciate it.

Clerk: Next up we have Michelle.

Michelle Plambeck: Good evening Mayor and city council. Thank you for the opportunity to testify in these historic resources code project this meaning. I'm here today representing oregon smart growth. Although we appreciate the changes in the proposals said which may historic preservation more financially viable including allowing for limited commercial uses in residential zones, smart growth has significant concerns regarding the discretionary authority on high f.a.r. And owner consent. The proposal today it is to put f.a.r. May result in inappropriate and unfair designations. Limit the ability to make improvements and underline the purpose for which it was purchased. Owners should have a say in the designation. Alternatively Portland code could provide that a notice must be given to the property owner and the property owner has some creative time to object to the decision nation. We've submitted written testimony via the map that details these concerns and solutions. A balance must be achieved to protect historic resources and limiting growth and in-fill and give the

owners a say in whether the restrictions are applied to their property. We look forward to working with the city in the amendment process.

Clerk: Next up we have Lincoln.

Lincoln Tuchow: Hi there folks. I'm Lincoln and I'm a realtor in Portland as well as the member of the board of the historical preservation. I know we're getting tired. I would like to say I think everybody at this meeting is passionate about creating more affordable housing and as a residential real estate agent in Portland, a lot of affordable housing stock in Portland does reside in the older buildings and not new apartment complexes. A brief comparison of rent reveals that a lot of the new apartment buildings are more expensive than the older homes and apartments. A lot of the new luxury buildings and market-rate building that are built are not filling the gap for affordable housing. So, and a lot of the demolitions that building these new buildings has created a lot of displacement and contribute to the homeless situation in the city. Really there is that and also the HRCP is a wonderful document in terms of if we can reuse the buildings and have adaptive reuse and need to do that and add ADUs, the greenhouse gas creation, the carbon footprint will be less and the waste will be less. It's a green solution. The one thing I want to touch on here is, you know, people have been talking about historic preservation is racist and exclusionary, and it's not. The conservation districts are in the part of north and northeast Portland which tell the story of the African American experience in our city. You know, how tragic would it be if those neighborhoods were bulldozed and replaced with sterile complexes. Let's stop the name calling and race baiting because it's counterproductive. Thank you Brandon, Spencer and everybody who worked so hard on this I hope you will approve it as-is without the amendments proposed by Portland neighbors welcome. Thank you very much.

Clerk: Next up we have Rebecca and Tim and Chris.

Rebecca Small: Good evening Mayor and councilor. I'm Rebecca and I live in Kenton. There is no reason for the city to give a small group of homeowners to forever exempt their neighborhood from participating in the difficult work of growth and change. I don't support empowering a small group of people from shifting the burden to the rest of us. Therefore, I urge you to adopt the Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon amendments. Thank you so much for your time.

Clerk: Next up we have Tim. Tim, are you there? We can't hear you, Tim Let's go -- wait, are you there, Tim?

Tim Davis: I'm disconnecting my -- here we go. Do you hear me now?

Clerk: Yes, we hear you.

Davis: It doesn't work when I attach my monitoring for a weird reason. Hello, Mayor and Commissioner. I'm Tim And I support HRCP with the caveat that -- I can't see. That we add the critically important amendments put forth by Portland neighbors welcome and housing oregon which will make HRCP more equitable and make housing more affordable. I'm part of the low 2% of Portland resident who live downtown. I live in a tall tower and I support more tall towers and any other way we can multiply our density and shrink our eco footprint. We need to promote people and active transportation over cars and need more neighborhoods like the alphabet district. Nearly all the buildings along with their random uses would be totally illegal today. I urge you to listen to Joan Petit who testified, Joan's powerful testimony said it all. Also Sam Stucky, and they are so right about the problems that historic designation has caused old town for decades and we're not going to driveway our most treasures homes and buildings. Portland will not lose its historic character. The historic co-projects is a small part to what is needed to ensure that historic preservation status cannot be used to make neighborhoods become more exclusive. They've had every advantage from the moment these neighborhoods were created. The last thing we need is for these communities to exempt themselves from our most recent tenant reforms and pro housing measures and it looks like time is up. Thank you so much.

Clerk: Next up we have Chris. Chris, you are muted.

Chris Marraccini: Can you hear me now?

Clerk: Yes.

Marraccini: It is upsetting to read about the historic resources code project which highlights the city council's continued efforts to demolish single-family residences in Portland. This time the city attempts more demolitions by reclassifying historic properties. Portland has a low inventory of single-family homes are Portlanders looking for a "home with charm and historical elements, wood floors and a backyard" as stated in the Oregonian. Unfortunately this the kind of home the HRCP could demolish. As the inventory of homes decreases, the

houses left are artificially inflated and putting home ownership out of reach for many Portlanders. Because of this, the HRCP does not integrate greater equity and inclusion as it states. It does the opposite. It's gentrification and causes the rich to get richer and the poor to get poorer. It denies many vulnerable Portlanders many in the minority area and under-served populations the opportunity to purchase a home. Not everyone wants or should rent. I disagree with changing the composition of the historic landmarks commission. It could easily result in a conflict of interest allowing political and financial gains to flourish over the needs of the community. Is there any oversight or form of accountability in the proposal? It is hoped that the city leaders will understand the significance of historic preservation and a vision of Portland that extends beyond speculation. To me, like the RIP, this proposal is a short-term money grab by developers. I hope you'll take this into consideration. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Kiel, Simon and then Roger.

Kiel Johnson: Hello I'm Kiel Johnson and I'm here with my 3-year-old eating eggs. I'm here to voice support for the amendments for the Portland neighbors welcome and housing oregon. I'm a small business owner and I run the bicycle valet. One of the important things to get people riding bikes is to create opportunities for more density. I live in the cully neighborhood and older buildings here don't have the same history as in others but it's as meaningful. I that I we should commemorate the histories of all our neighborhoods by continuing some structures and let them evolve to build a greener and fairer city. S that a future that is worth commemorating to. I support the project with amendments from the Portland neighbors welcome and housing oregon and thank you very much for listening this whole evening.

Clerk: Next up is Simon.

Simon Apostol: Hello. Good evening and thanks for staying later. I'd like to express my support for the HRCP proposal and the amendments proposed by Portland neighbors welcome and housing oregon. I'm a former resident of Irvington although I was priced out. I do understand the importance of historic resources. In fact, my mom is a former employee of the state historic preservation office so I grew up with a deep appreciation of old buildings but I've seen other have used the preservation process to fight housing. I urge you to reject

these attempts by the wealthy, if you live in a neighborhood with million dollar homes, if you own one, you're wealthy. To reject these attempts to subvert this and take a step toward a more equitable and affordable city. We're in a housing affordability housing crisis. This is critical to addressing both of these. Thank you for your time.

Clerk: Next up is Roger.

Roger Jones: Good evening my friends. All of my friends. You guys are just really still hanging in there at this late hour, that is great. I'm Roger Jones. I'm with the Hawthorne boulevard business association. For the last 35-40 years I tried to get either a historic district or a designation of some conservatory of our geographically-challenged area which fortunately we've been able to hold the ground a little bit on. Anyone who has been in the neighborhood recently knows that we're under significant pressure. Funding is the -- follow the money. I'm going to say with 2021 fall budget monitoring process in process and having identified significant one-time resources are available, I hope that you will help fund the cultural resources master plan. The updates to the historic resources inventory. And help Spencer out with some more staff to help work with volunteers and under-served communities do the work to supply the city. We really need to work together to make everything work and that's the big message. I could go on to other things that have been artfully covered, but the most important thing I think is to give resources to the professionals at landmarks and the professionals like Spencer and Brandon who is doing so much work. It's late. Thanks for hanging in there, guys. I'll give it back.

Wheeler: I want to thank everybody who has testified who have also hung in there. Thank you to all of you. Could you give me an indication of how many folks are left?

Clerk: We have about six.

Wheeler: We're going to get through this in no time at all. Thank you everybody especially those at the end of the list, we appreciate it.

Clerk: Next up we have Maureen Andersen and Matthew and Josette.

Maureen Andersen: Hello. My name is Maureen, I live in the cully neighborhood. I'm a mom, a nurse and a homeowner and I support the Portland neighbors welcome and housing Oregon amendments. Housing shouldn't be used to keep people out of nice neighborhoods. These amendments would do that. I want my 5-year-old child to be able to grow up with

people that aren't exactly like him and our neighborhood schools are not going to reflect that if places are protected which is another way of keeping people out that are not like you.

Thank you so much.

Clerk: Next up we have Matthew.

Matthew Tucker: Good evening everyone. Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners, I'm a homeowner in the Richmond neighborhood in southeast Portland. Speaking as an individual and not as a representative of my employer or other organization. I've been impressed with the housing reforms you have supported and enacted in the last years that will extend the legacy of diverse housing styles throughout Portland to meet the needs of all Portlanders. I'm here to express the goals of HRCP and to urge you to go further to ensure that historic preservation cannot be used to exempt certain neighborhoods from those recent pro housing/pro tenant reforms by adopting the amendments endorsed by Portland neighbors welcome and endorse the testimony of Portland neighbors welcome. From housing affordability and homelessness to climate change to mass transit adding density in neighborhoods will go a long way towards helping us meet the challenges our city faces today. If small groups of anti-housing home owners in a given area are able to prevent any new building neighborhood by neighborhood, all of these problems will get worse. That is something we cannot afford. The marginal loss of a character of a few neighborhoods pales in comparison to the losses we in future generations also face if we don't meet the challenges later on. I want to address the concerns for many well-intentioned Irvington residents that testified today. In my line of work in risk management, I constantly thinking of actions would yield. When there is a situation that will be easily abused, it will be. I have no doubt that all the people who testified today are being earnest and say they welcome the he will evolution of Irvington, it's likely without the amendments of Portland neighbors welcome account process will be wielded by a few to prevent any neighborhood change. Thank you for the time.

Clerk: Next up we have Josette Katcha

Josette Katcha: I'm Josette and a preservation specialist in support of the HRCP. I've been in the field for 15 years in various parts of the country. When I moved to Oregon in 2013, I was shocked at the lack of building protection in the city of Portland relative to comparable cities across the nation. As a university of Portland star preservation graduate, our curriculum was

rife with many of the case studies which were outdated and they failed to save the community and protect our historic resources. I echo support in strengthening demolition view. The character-rich character fabric of Portland is germane to the area. As a renter for six years, I can attest that the housing is tough and demand is high. Particularly in desirable neighborhoods. In contrast many new housing developments are isolated both literally and figuratively. As they struggle with high vacancy rates in spite of incentives. The only solution, the HRCF is a step forward in strengthening Portland's appeal by better integrating housing needs within the historic fabric and needs to be done through flexibility. As a self-described non-purist preservationist, I distress that historic preservation does not equate to limiting the use. Historic cost museum model is not sustainable for every day building. Most of what we preserve considers previous alterations to a building that is historic in themselves. This key for success is to allow a build examining environment to evolve together. Change is a part of the story. We can make history today by ushering in the HRCF while pouring building interventions being innovative and representative of who we are now and our sustainable building for the future. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up is Robert, Neil and Hongcheng.

Robert Ball: Good evening Mayor and Commissioners. I'm Robert. Currently if inclusionary housing is triggered in historic districts who do not have a design overlay zone designation. No heights granted to offset the requirement makes the increased f.a.r. Unusual and stops the development of affordable housing on historic and non-historic sites in historic districts. Historic districts that happen to have a design overlay zone are getting height and f.a.r., but those without an overlay do not even though both receive design review from the commission. Therefore, I'm requesting an amendment in the mixed-use zones chapter that will allow the 10-foot bonus height in historic districts if there is no contributing building on the site. This 10-foot bonus height already exists in the design overlay zones an overlay that exists within several but not all of our historic districts. This would bring parity to historic zones throughout the city. Any sites affected by this amendment will have review conducted by the historic landmarks commission including the criteria now used. Only sites with non-contributing structures would need to be eligible for height bonuses therefore promoting the preservation of historic resources. To ensure the historic resource review

approval criteria are best met, the additional height will support the historical landmarks commission in having the ability to support taller floor heights and other design features. Bonus f.a.r. Granted without extra height are unusable because they go hand in hand. I've submitted this request in written testimony with more in-depth points and I thank you for your consideration.

Clerk: Next up is Neil.

Neil Lee: Good evening Mayor and Commissioner, I'm Neil Lee and I'm the president of the Chinese Consolidated benevolent association. The CCBA owns a four-story building in the center of old town Chinatown built in 1911 and listed as a contributing historical building in the neighborhood and also on the national register of historic places. This building and organization got contributed significantly and notable history and contributions to the city. Since 2019, the CCBA has been working on a project to conduct badly needed repair work. The project scope is to repair a gaping hole in the rain gutter at the top of the building. In this most cases this would be considered a simple repair project. Since the building is in a historical neighborhood with historical status, the project required to go through a landmark review process and building review. The historical review process began on November 17th, 2020, through final approval on September 29th of 2021. That's 316 days or 10 months to complete the process. Even when you take the pandemic delay into account, it's still a long time to get approval to fix the hole in the gutter not to mention permit fees adding up to \$5,052. As an architect by profession, I do understand the need for these kinds of reviews, but there needs to be a better way to understand the unique scopes of these building projects to provide a more equitable and streamline way to encourage development in old town Chinatown particularly to those building owners that are historically disadvantaged. Thank you for allowing me to provide testimony on this important issue and please read my expanded written testimony for additional details. Thank you.

Clerk: Next up we have Hongcheng

Hongcheng Zhao: Can you hear me?

Clerk: Yes.

Zhao: Great. I'm happy to be the last one and my earbuds are running out of batteries. I'm the president of oregon Chinese coalition and one of the shareholders in Chinatown. We came up

with [indiscernible] forming a group which consisted of a dozen of Chinese community members. We put our money together to purchase a from China owners [indiscernible] the building had been owned for decades but vacant since 1975. A [indiscernible] when we started to draw our blueprints for the new phase, we suffered setbacks because of lack of transparency and we were guilty of breaking the rules in the process. We filed application for renovation before we got anything back from the committee. The word came back from the previous owner on why are you going to demolish the building. We found out people saw the proposal mentioning removing the roof for renovation. [indiscernible] it was equivalent to demolition. This [indiscernible] as to how we moved forward. What we hope for from the commission had you been adequate for the problem instead of being [indiscernible] for the city, they choose to sport property owners to improve historical [indiscernible] resources which can be tangible and have a long-lasting impact for the neighborhood. Thank you for hearing me today.

Clerk: I'm going to call one more person who had trouble connecting before. John.

Wheeler: Very good.

Clerk: John, are you able to unmute?

John Czarnecki: Yes. Hello Mayor Wheeler and city Commissioner. Thanks for this opportunity to testify this evening. Although a member confident downtown neighborhood association board. I speak as an individual, a Portland architect, and past chair of the landmark's commission. I support the HRCP and align myself with comments made by the PCHR and others who have supported in qualified support for the project. Three salient points come to mind. The landmarks responsibilities is to reduce the inventory and demolition by neglect. The Commissioner responsibilities: Landmarks commission responsibilities are being shifted. The proposed changes would charge the landmark's commission with providing advice to the planning and sustainability commission would then address the city council. Unlike landmarks Commissioners, planning and sustainability members may have little knowledge or appreciation for historic preservation and the role in genuine culturally diverse sustainability. The landmark's commission should be responsible for addressing the council directly on creation, modification or removal of historic districts and legislative action. Update of the historic inventory. The HRI was last conducted in 1984. Update would bring currently

ineligible resources as well as those previously dismissed but may have recognition of their under-represented cultural significance. While supporting the HRI in principle, the currently proposed language makes no provision for its accomplished funding or any reference to require standards methodology. Professing a desire to do the work is not enough. These provisions have little meaning without a defined resources and funding for the resources required to implement the survey. The last one addresses demolition by neglect. Please expand the existing notice of building and housing code violations 33.4.5.060 to minimize intentional failure to maintain a historic resource resulting in demolition. Expanded protection particularly for the contributing resource in a historic district would require a bds to we issue a citation to the owner for failure to properly maintain the property according to specific criteria including structural integrity. And [indiscernible] to unregulated entry. The historic landmarks commission would inform the opener for penalties for public or private acquisition. Congratulations and thanks to Brandon and Spencer and pbs staff for their work, and thank you for commission, for your forward thinking on behalf of us all. Good night.

Wheeler: Keelan, does that complete public testimony on this item?

Clerk: Yes it does.

Wheeler: Very good and if we could get our legal counsel here as well, let's talk next steps. We have finished public testimony. So my presumption is that we'll close the public record at this point both for oral and written testimony. And that we'll continue the hearing to a later date. But I want to make sure I got that right with legal counsel.

DelCotto: So, Brandon, can you join me on this. It's my understanding that some folks at the hearing today had integrated an intend to submit additional information. At council's discretion whether you want to leave the record open for a day or two to allow that to happen then close it. It's my understanding at that point the record would be closed, staff would work on comments and once the amendments are proposed and posted, the record will open for people to provide testimony on the amendments. Brandon, do you want to speak to that?

Spencer-Hartle: Mayor, I think what we would prefer given what I heard tonight about interest in submitting additional pieces of testimony if we could keep the record open until

Friday at 5: 00 p.m., that would provide that opportunity and gives the weekend to sort through everything.

Wheeler: Good. Does anybody have any objection to that? Anybody on the city council have objections to that? It makes good sense to me.

Spencer-Hartle: We'll close the record -- written record at a Friday at 5: 00 and oral record would close now and we'd open it for on or around December 1st and continue on December 15th.

Wheeler: That a time certain?

Spencer-Hartle: I believe it's at 2: 00 p.m., Mayor.

Wheeler: 2: 00 p.m. So to review, we'll keep the written -- the oral record is closed at this point. We'll keep the written record open until 5: 00 p.m. This Friday so that's November 5th, 5: 00 p.m. This Friday. We'll continue this hearing to December 15th, 2: 00 p.m. Time certain. Be there. Anything else we need to cuss before we adjourn for the evening? Any last words from colleagues? I want to thank my colleagues for being here. This was a long day but we did great work and heard fantastic testimony. Thank you to you and everybody that provided testimony tonight. We have a lot to work with. With that, we are adjourned.

Council adjourned at 7:38 p.m.