



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

OFFICIAL
 MINUTES

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **19TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2003** AT 9:30 A.M.

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

Commissioner Leonard arrived at 9:34 a.m.

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

On a Y-5 roll call, the Consent Agenda was adopted.

COMMUNICATIONS	Disposition:
<p>136 Request of Jada Mae Langloss to address Council to give advice on cuts in services and resources (Previous Agenda 120)</p>	PLACED ON FILE
<p>137 Request of Francine Kaufman to address Council regarding Bureau of Parks and Recreation programming priorities in centers and schools (Previous Agenda 121)</p>	PLACED ON FILE
<p>138 Request of Martie Sucec to address Council regarding fate of the Southwest Community Plan (Communication)</p>	PLACED ON FILE
TIME CERTAINS	
<p>139 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Direct Bureau of Water Works to work with the U.S.D.A. Mt. Hood National Forest and community interests to conduct a comprehensive review of Bull Run Management Unit administration and develop recommendations to Council (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Saltzman)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	36122
<p>140 TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM – Accept the City Auditor’s Managing for Results Report and implement the system for the City (Resolution introduced by Auditor Blackmer)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	36123

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION		
*141	<p>Authorize the Portland Office of Transportation, Bureau of Water Works and Bureau of Environmental Services to participate with metropolitan regional transportation and public works agencies in the Portland Metropolitan Area Transportation Intergovernmental Agreement (Ordinance introduced by Commissioners Francesconi and Saltzman)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	177257
Mayor Vera Katz		
*142	<p>Give preliminary approval for the issuance of revenue bonds for the construction of the Broadway Project in an amount not to exceed \$50,000,000 (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	177258
*143	<p>Allow housing projects funded with Economic Development Bonds to be sold or rented to households, the heads of whom are 55 years of age or older, as allowed under federal law (Ordinance; amend Code Section 5.72.060)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	177259
*144	<p>Authorize acquisition of vehicles for use by City bureaus (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	177260
Commissioner Jim Francesconi		
*145	<p>Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Oregon Department of Transportation to provide an additional federal transportation funds to the North Lombard Overcrossing Project (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 50827)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	177261
*146	<p>Retain an easement for public water facilities within vacated SW Jefferson Street, SW Jefferson Road, SW Murray Street and SW Murray Lane, near SW Canyon Road (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 166797)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	177262
*147	<p>Authorize contract with Shiels Obletz Johnson, Inc. for project management services in connection with the Portland Transit Mall Project (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	177263
*148	<p>Authorize contract with PAVEMENT SERVICES, Inc. to acquire services for testing and analysis of city arterial streets and provide for payment (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	177264

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

<p>*149 Amend an Interagency Agreement for Portland Parks and Recreation with the Portland Development Commission for professional and technical services for park improvements for FY 2002-2003 (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 51843) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">177265</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p>	
<p>*150 Provide right of entry onto private properties with frontage on the Columbia Slough and its tributaries to perform a stream assessment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">177266</p>
<p>*151 Authorize grant application for environmental education program to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for not more than \$22,000 (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">177267</p>
<p>*152 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Bureau of Environmental Services Downspout Disconnection Program and the Northwest Service Academy Metro Center EnviroCorps to facilitate community participation and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">177268</p>
<p>*153 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Portland Development Commission to provide \$2,000 to support research into clean energy technologies (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">177269</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Erik Sten</p>	
<p>*154 Authorize agreement with Portland Housing Center for \$474,016 for the Homebuyer Assistance 2003 and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">177270</p>
<p>*155 Accept a Youthbuild implementation grant under the Office of Economic Development of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in the amount of \$642,840 (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">177271</p>
<p>*156 Authorize agreement with Housing Authority of Portland for \$100,000 for the HIV/AIDS Housing and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">177272</p>
<p>*157 Authorize agreement with Portland Impact for \$86,900 for the Transitions to Housing Pilot Project and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">177273</p>

REGULAR AGENDA

Mayor Vera Katz

***158** Amend agreement for Downtown Business District Management Services with Portland Downtown Services, Inc. (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 51730)

177274

(Y-5)

159 Establish a Portland Utility Review Board (Second Reading Agenda 131; repeal and replace Code Chapter 3.123)

177275

AS AMENDED

(Y-5)

Commissioner Randy Leonard

160 Grant a telecommunications franchise to Integrated Regional Network Enterprise for a period of ten years, and establish terms and conditions (Ordinance)

**PASSED TO
SECOND READING
MARCH 26, 2003
AT 9:30 AM**

Commissioner Dan Saltzman

161 Clarify and strengthen the utility, billing, collection and adjustment policies of the Bureau of Environmental Services (Ordinance; amend Code Chapter 17.36)

**PASSED TO
SECOND READING
FEBRUARY 26, 2003
AT 9:30 AM**

162 Amend agreement with Kennedy/Jenks Consultants to provide additional engineering and construction monitoring services for the Groundwater Treatment Improvements, increase compensation, and extend the agreement term (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 32548)

**PASSED TO
SECOND READING
FEBRUARY 26, 2003
AT 9:30 AM**

At 10:50 a.m., Council recessed.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **19TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2003** AT 6:00 P.M.

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

Commissioner Leonard arrived at 6:03 p.m.

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

163 TIME CERTAIN: 6:00 PM – Open Reservoir Replacement Project (Presentation introduced by Commissioner Saltzman)	Disposition: PLACED ON FILE
REGULAR AGENDA	
164 Tentatively approve the application by Metro and Bureau of Parks and Recreation for a conditional use master plan review to eliminate the temporary parking located on the west edge of the Oregon Zoo (Findings; Previous Agenda 135; LUR 97-00127 CU MS EN) Motion to adopt the Findings: Moved by Commissioner Sten and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman. (Y-5)	FINDINGS ADOPTED

At 9:05 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love
Clerk of the Council

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

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Closed Caption Transcript of Portland City Council Meeting

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

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

FEBRUARY 19, 2002 9:30 AM

Francesconi: Here. **Saltzman:** Here. **Saltzman:** Here.

Katz: Mayor is here. All right, we will take communications, 136.

Item 136.

Katz: Commissioner Sten just notified me that she called his office and jada is stuck in salem. So, we won't hear from her today. 137.

Item 137.

Katz: Francine are you here? You have three minutes.

Francine Kaufman: First, I would like to preface this by saying that the city of Portland has one of the best and most well-funded bureaus of parks and recreation in the country.

Katz: That's nice to hear because we constantly hear -- my good friend on my right wants more money. [laughter]

Katz: Let's start her time now.

Kaufman: Well, I am here today to make the council aware of some inequities in the provision of recreational opportunities to the people of, of the Portland metropolitan area by the bureau of parks and recreation.

Katz: Oh, I see.

Kaufman: And I was here -- I was born here in Portland and those inequities have been in existence ever since I can remember. I am talking specifically about organized recreational sports opportunities for women of all ages, fitness, and skill levels. I have provided to you some examples of promotional literature provided at the bureau centers that you have in front of you, I believe. And I believe these illustrate clear examples of inequity and discrimination by the lack of opportunities I just mentioned. An example at the Portland tennis center co-ed and men's mixers but no women's mixers are listed in the flyers. Community center and school gymnasiums used by the parks and recreation bureau for recreation. Offer adult basketball. But, in those flyers, or the one page out of the program guide that I xeroxed, there's no mention of gender and i've been to observe some open gyms at several of the community centers, and at best you will see, perhaps, three out of 20 people who are participating -- three women out of 20, 20 people total. That's on a good day. You will probably hear justification for this, for these, what I consider to be subtle examples of discrimination by bureau personnel, and some of these justifications might include, quote-unquote, there is no interest, therefore, we don't offer the programs. What I say, then, is I believe the interest is there and -- or -- but the interest is not there, rather, because these opportunities and programs aren't being provided. In conclusion, I would urge commissioner Francesconi to carefully review any bureau policies in existence that encourage this type of discrimination to occur and change those policies.

Katz: Thank you.

Francesconi: In response to that, lisa turpel was here last week when I saw this on the agenda. I have talked to her, so we are reviewing it, but there's another side to the story. We won't debate it right here.

Katz: Thank you. All right. 138.

Item 138.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Katz: Marty, three minutes. Thank you.

*******:** I know it's hard.

Katz: It is hard but you talk fast.

Martie Sucec: My name is martie susec, 7005 southwest 34th avenue, Portland, 97219. Nice to see you all again and nice to meet you officially. I've been here -- I haven't been here in a while --

Francesconi: You haven't met -- how did you get by this --

Sucec: I remember the guy that used to sit there. [laughter] Ok. Stick to the point.

Katz: Start all over.

Sucec: I submitted my testimony by e-mail to all of you yesterday and to your aid, mayor, last week, I think. We are very concerned about a design review issue in the heart of Multnomah. It looks like the design review commission is going to approve a four-story building with a 4th floor of 700 square feet. We are concerned about this for several reasons. We think it violates the southwest community plan, and as you know, we spent millions of dollars, all of us together, and a lot of time, and that was the resounding success at the end. Our concern is that -- and you also, as a council, agreed to put in height in the main street objectives in that plan as a design element. Our experience with this design review and our appeal of it is, it seems as if none of them heard of the southwest community plan and haven't been advised of the importance of it, or of any community plan, in particular, this one. The main -- the design review focused on the materials, one commissioner said that it looked like a badly layered birthday cake. The neighborhood does, does agree to a three-story building. We think that that's appropriate given our aims to preserve the urban growth boundary and to accommodate growth. Four stories in one and a two-story in a neighborhood retail area is just preposterous to us. This thing does look like it's a small -- it's a small footprint on the 4th floor, 700 square feet. He says it's more of an architectural feature. It looks like to me from the side like a pilot house on a tugboat. I don't think it's good design. I was particularly distressed by the land use review not taking this into account and the design commission not taking this into account. Height is a design element in small retail areas. It is -- it should be an element in the commercial zone, and certainly in the design overlay that you, yourselves, put on the village to try to give us some protection in design review. We believe that you can intervene under 33-420041-g. We think that it is very sad that we can't have a type 3 appeal on this kind of thing, unless these commissions and the land use staff -- I believe it's your bureau, commissioner --

Katz: Not yet.

*******:** Well, you have bureau of planning. Doesn't he have bureau of --

Katz: Not yet.

*******:** I'm sorry. I am not following things so carefully. But, your, then, your honor, to make sure that they know that this is -- this plan was a covenant with the city. It really was. For those of you who weren't here, it could have been -- well, you know what it could have been, what it is turning out to be, and people are paying attention to that. We were able to gather 200 signatures in two hours about the height of this building. We were able to gather the support of the Multnomah village business association and the historical association. Please help us out.

Katz: Thank you, martie. I know we are not supposed to discuss these, and I am really pretty strict about it, but I have asked the city attorney to respond to her letter to all of us. Ok. Thank you. All right. Let's do consent agenda. Any items to be removed off the consent agenda by either council members or anybody in the audience? Bye-bye. If not, roll call on consent agenda.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. All right. Time certain. 139.

Item 139.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Katz: Before we go ahead, phillis is out of the office. Usually she comes down and tells me who we have, what kind of guests we have from other parts of the world, and she is not here, so I don't know and I wanted to give you a chance to introduce them. Go ahead. [inaudible].

*****: I am here with a group of chinese leaders from northeastern china. There are 15 of them. They are presidents and vice presidents of their university.

Katz: How long are they going to be here?

*****: They are in their second week and they will go home on sunday.

Katz: All right, well, it's nice to see you and welcome and hope that you have a very nice stay here. Thank you. All right. Sorry.

Saltzman: Madam mayor, members of the council, bull run management unit and mt. Hood national forest is an important regional asset providing both natural recreational opportunities and the high quality drinking water that we currently serve about a quarter of the state's population. Over the last century the city has worked with the federal government to manage this area, and we currently enjoy one of the most cooperative relationships with our federal partnerships with the bull run. Much of that has to do with the efforts of the staff, but also the key leadership of our invited guest today, gary larson, the mt. Hood forest supervisor. The existing joint administrative agreement between the city and the forest service dates from the late 1970's, and it's well designed to address the issues of that time, but it is -- it isn't particularly applicable to our current situation, nor does it do a good job of looking at the needs of the management area and the bull run stakeholders. We have seen modification to say the federal bull run act which further protect the watershed and at the same time we have seen the availability of federal funding devoted to this forest. Significantly diminished to the bull run management unit. So these changes senate the timeliness and the appropriateness of the administrative structure. Beginning this process to redesign this joint agreement with our federal partners is what we have in front of us today. The water bureau and the forest service have completed the preliminary work necessary, updating the management structure. Now they are ready to kick off the process that will insure effective administration of the bull run management unit. Clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the city and the forest service in managing the watershed. As we begin this process, both agencies appreciate and are committed to gaining active community involvement to insure a final product that reflects the interests of the many stakeholders in the bull run management area. The water bureau and the forest service have done a good job of including citizens and community interests in the design and planning work to date. So, I would like to introduce rosemary menard, resource protection director from the water bureau and gary larson, mt. Hood forest supervisor, to walk us through the background and objectives of this process. We have dr. Ralph crawshaw here, as well.

Rosemary Menard, Portland Water Bureau: This is our other partner.

Saltzman: He will have something to say, I am sure, too. [laughter]

*****: Thank you, commissioner Saltzman --

Katz: And doctor, you don't have a three-minute on you this time. [laughter]

Katz: Go ahead.

Menard: Actually, the doctor and gary here have been partners with me in the process for at least two years, probably three years of, of figuring out how we are going to bring this issue forward in a manner that's most likely to involve the citizens because we all know of the history of contention around the bull run issues, and what we want to do is we want to make decisions about the future of the management unit in a fashion that involves the community so that they are bought in, and when it comes to you with the final solution out there a few years from now, that people will be engaged in it and they will know what the, the issues are and they will have given us their input along the way in how we want to make the, the watershed stewardship and protection that we need to provide for this valuable asset a part of our community for the future. So, I wanted to say a couple of things

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

about what we are really about here and what the outcomes are this process are intended to be. We want to restructure and improve our administrative relationships to accomplish more efficient and effective interactions. We have a lot of transaction costs between the city and the forest service. One of the examples that probably is -- seems kind of over-the-top, but is a typical example, is that it took us two years recently to negotiate a special use permit for a fairly small project. I mean, it was a big project for the water bureau, but it's a fairly small impact project on the forest service lands, and just because of the administrative requirements that both agencies have to meet it, takes a long time and a lot of transaction costs for both agencies in that, so we want to look for ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of those kinds of processes while respecting the needs of both of the organizations, the forest service and the city to get the jobs that they have the responsibility for. We want to use things like land ownership adjustments and long-term easements or broadly defined special use permits to help us do that kind of work. We want to develop and adopt a long-term memorandum of understanding between the city and the forest service that would help us to find the roles and responsibilities of the two agencies for the key kinds of activities that are going on in the watershed that we care about that influence water quality and the value of the resource for large supply and as a natural ecosystem. Those kinds of things are -- looking carefully at who's got what role and responsibility for road maintenance and the drainage systems and the watershed that are, that are really key to maintaining water quality, who is going to be responsible for the road decommissioning. We have about 143 miles of roads that need to be decommissioned. You authorized us in the earlier conversation that we had last month about the federal legislative agenda, to go after some funds to help the forest service to actually take care of putting those roads to bed. And so those are the kinds of issues that we want to be able to get clarity on for budget and financial planning that will help us to do the job that we need to do and to do it in a way that serves the interest of, of water rate-payers and maintaining the watershed. And finally, we want to engage the citizens in this process. One of our ideas is that to, to engage the citizens in helping us frame the issue by developing a set guiding principles before we start to develop the, the memorandum of understanding. Guiding principles might be things like, um, we want to look at the land exchanges but we don't want to exchange land outside the bull run management unit. The city owns some land inside the unit, the forest service owns some land under our projects. We might be able to exchange those lands and not sort of get into the bigger set of issues about, you know, are we exchanging timber harvest lands for some place else. There are a lot of issues that can grow there, so we want to engage the public in helping us understand, what are the sideboards and the parameters that they feel comfortable for us to negotiate this agreement, what are do they really care about and how can we make this agreement work? So that's what we are trying to accomplish, and we have laid out a work plan here in the attachment. I would like to let gary larson say a few words --

Katz: Go ahead.

Gary Larson, Mt. Hood National Forest Supervisor: Good morning, your honorable mayor and council. It gives me a lot of pleasure to be here this morning. If you might indulge me, I would like to welcome our guest menem and -- [speaking in chinese]

Katz: You are just showing off. [laughter]

Francesconi: How did he do?

Katz: Where did you learn chinese?

Larson: My ex-wife actually spoke chinese. She studied chinese area studies at san francisco state university. I picked it up by osmosis.

Katz: You picked it up by osmosis. Lawful. [laughter]

Larson: I have actually two items of business before you this morning. First is to make good on a promise that I made to the council on april 4th, 2001, and that's -- you may recall that that's when you took up the question of whether or not you should adopt a source water protection policy and

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

plan for the reservoir for bull run and the reservoir. You agreed to do that, and what I committed to do was to join you -- join the city in memorializing the forest service commitment to source water protection, and I have that letter today for you. Observe lets.

Larson: I won't go over this in detail but merely note that it's important to us to -- it's an honor for us to join you in the source water protection. On the first page I cite some important policy documents that talk about the forest service role in protecting watersheds and maintaining healthy, sustainable functioning conditions. I talk a bit about the northwest forest plan and then some specific policies that apply to the bull run watershed. On the second page, I give some concrete examples of our commitment and I list five things. I will only mention one in some detail. I talk about our management activities that there's been no, no timber harvest or road building in the watershed for almost a decade. I talk about road maintenance and storm-proofing, fire protection, watershed restoration, and I am most pleased to talk about item number two in the fiscal 2003. This fiscal year for us. We were able to get 297,000 worth of appropriations for road decommissioning and in 2004 we expect another \$276,000 for road decommissioning. So, this is -- I memorialized our commitment to source water protection and have made good on that promise I made a while ago. The second item of business is to talk about our administrative streamlining that's before us. We have, indeed, done a fair amount of work in thinking about how to organize it. I want to, at this point, honor and recognize the doctor's contribution. He had the intent and vision that this was the kind of endeavor that citizens would like to join the two agencies in. In fact, that's turned out that that's true. We have experienced a great deal of support from the doctor and other citizens. One thing that was kind of interesting to us, I think the people generally are aware that governments at every level of struggling with finances, and the message that we got when we did our sensing was people wanted us to not have a whole bunch of public meetings as we were doing the prework. They just wanted us to roll up our sleeves and figure out what we needed to do to make government work more efficiently. So that's what we have done and that's really what the proposal is before you. It's a way to administratively streamline our activities to let the city of Portland do what they do well in the bull run, which is be a utility, let us do what we do well, which is manage the ecosystem, and the environment of the larger watershed, and we believe that, that what we will be doing is really setting precedent for, for federal and local government working together in joint endeavors. And for closing in my comments, I would like to, to share with you a conversation that I had with doctor mary kay trowe, the provost at p.s.u., and I visited with her about two weeks ago about our joint endeavors here, and she said that the activities that we have, the vision that we have about having citizens engage with us, the vision that the doctor started, identically align with the, the universities -- the university's mission and objectives. To that end she made a commitment that p.s.u. Would be the third leg of our stool. As we look forward to working among ourselves and with the citizens on the issues, she made that commitment that they would be there with us. They would be the third leg of our stool, so as we meet with the public, it would be a joint endeavor of the city of Portland water bureau, forest service, mt. Hood national forest and Portland state university college of extended studies. So, I thought you would be interested.

Katz: Thank you, gary. Are.

Dr. Ralph Crawshaw: It is, indeed, a privilege to speak with you today. It's a privilege to work with both the forest service and the water bureau. My name is ralph crawshaw. I am a physician and professor emeritus of public health and professor emeritus of psychology. I became concerned about the water situation in the early 1990's and began on my own simply talking with people and learning more and more about the difficulties we were up against and we formed an organization called the "bull run heritage foundation." we learned first hand why a lot of fine people were frustrated in government in trying to carry out their responsibilities in talking with commissioner Sten and rosemary and the water bureau, I understood that they were trying their very best to do

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

something. Also, I took it upon myself to call up miss mollson, the head of the mt. Hood forest service, and I sat down with her, as I had with other people, and said wouldn't it be to our advantage if we kind of talked together? And in effect, I saw these people in silos where if they stepped outside of the boundaries of the silo, they were very vulnerable to public censor. By simply saying, look, why don't you and I have lunch together and we will have somebody else along, a lot was, was softened, and what happened was that the real good people had a chance to be good together, and I could step back out and here you have the result. It's pretty simple.

Katz: Thanks, ralph. All right. Questions by the council? Anybody want to testify? Anybody signed up? Karla, do we have -- no? All right. Roll call.

Francesconi: See if I have this quote right, so the real good people have a chance to be good together. That's terrific. We have to remember that.

Katz: I am writing it down.

Francesconi: So, anyway, I guess I want to start with thanking commissioner Sten for his efforts here. The bull run is one of our most precious resources. The citizens continue to remind us of that, so just the way it was passed down to us, it's important that we pass it down in even better condition, and to do that, it takes good people coming together to accomplish greater things, and so with Portland state, the forest service, and with the water bureau we have an opportunity to do this, so again, I want to thank commissioner Sten, and I also want to thank commissioner Saltzman for carrying this effort forward. Aye.

Saltzman: I just want to take time to just thank rosemary menard and the people on the water bureau, the doctor, and gary larson, the mt. Hood forest supervisor. It's a tremendous amount of cooperation and good will, and thank you for getting the right people in the right room and buying them lunch because it seems to be producing great results. [laughter]

Saltzman: And we have got many more roads to decommission and much to do to, to preserve that tremendous asset for our drinking water and recreation, and thank you all for your leadership. Aye.

Sten: Well, this is important work and you are all doing it in the right way. I am very thankful that the doctor turned his attention to the bull run a few years ago. We may need you to turn it back to the health plan now, which is has also been huge contributions to this community. Gary does not only speak chinese, I think he's one of the true, I don't know how many work for the forest service, but this is a person with a very developed view on how to do things, and I have learned a lot from him. We sometimes forget that, you know, in our zeal for the bull run, that the federal government does own the land, and I actually think that that's a good arrangement and has worked very, very well for this community over the years. It's, you know, the forest service has changed a lot and a lot of issues have come about, and I think that people sometimes have not kept track of what a terrific job that gary and his team with the bull run. Is really is a national treasure, and it has been protected by the federal government, and they have taken the right steps to do that and continue to invest in a time when it's almost impossible to get those kind of investments. So, thank you so much for your work, and I was just thinking we are going to start our day up on the hill and end it down in the reservoir this afternoon. [laughter]

Sten:, so it's a day to maybe think about how we protect and what the options are for the bull run, so it's a real honor to work with all of you, and rosemary, terrific. Aye.

Katz: I am really very pleased, rosemary and gary and ralph, that you have been able to put this together. Ralph, you need to go back to the health plan. It's suffering. This is wonderful, and it's wonderful because just last week we signed a memorandum of agreement very similar to this with the u.s. Fish and wildlife, with the corps of engineers and mins, and it's the same sense that we can all sit down, work together, and streamline permits and activities and get the work done more efficiently, so thank you. Aye. All right. 140.

Item 140.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Katz: Gary and dick and tim and mark.

Gary Blackmer, City Auditor: Good morning, madam mayor and members of council. I am gary blackmer, Portland city auditor. Before you is a resolution to move Portland and the vanguard of managed, well managed cities in this country and around the world. We produced this report managing for results, a proposal for Portland, in partnership with the office of management and finance. Our objective was to determine how Portland services were managed relative to the best practices of other governments and to propose a system that works here in Portland. In this report, you will see information from texas, missouri, indianapolis, phoenix, charlotte, new york city, san diego, milwaukie, and christ church, new zealand. I think we are very close to being among the best, and I think an effort to implement the recommendations of this report will benefit our community and make us among the best. We have been working regularly with the office of management and finance and with the bureau of planning to see what it would take to implement the recommendations of this report and to see how long. We see it as a multiyear effort to bring our systems together and to that extent, we are not asking for resources at this time, but instead, we are asking for you to set this as a direction for the city to go and for us to figure out how to get there. So, at this point, i'd like to turn it over first to dick tracy from our audit services division, and then also to tim grew, who has been a key partner in this effort.

Dick Tracey, Director, Audit Services: Good morning, council. My name is dick tracy, and I am the director of audit services for the city. The resolution before you today asked you to do really three things. Number one, to accept the report. Number two, to direct o.m.f. To develop an implementation plan, and number three, to direct o.m.f. To form an advisory group, of bureau managers working with the city auditor and working with the bureau of planning to develop and implement m.f.r. The overarching purpose for proceeding with this is to help us -- our city be more effective and more, be more efficient and be more accountable to the public. We think it has a number of benefits, both to, to a number of parties, to council, to help you identify your priorities and where you want to go, to managers, to help them plan and implement your priorities and goals, to city employees to help them recognize their, their role in achieving the city goals, and ultimately to the taxpayers so that they can see what we do and how we perform and how we spend our tax resources. So, how do we get there? The report, essentially, and what we found in our research is that it requires us as a city to be clear about what our priorities are, what our goals are and where we want to go, what our mission is. It also, then, requires us to fund and implement programs that address those priorities and address those goals. It asks us to track and to monitor, to see how well we are doing over time in the direction that we are doing, our progress towards those priorities, and finally, to report to you and to the public, both the good and the bad about how well we are doing. There are some specific tasks and activities and as gary indicated, we will come back in july with, with a more, a fully formed plan about how we will go about doing this. It will probably take a year or two, but I have to say that this is not a complicated system. It's not a fad. It, essentially, does a couple of things. It integrates some of our existing pieces together. It integrates our planning, our budgeting, and our reporting together in a more consistent coherent way, so that they are linked together and that, in fact, we use performance information for budget decisions, for policy decisions, and for accountability decisions in a more -- a specific and rigorous way than we are doing now. We have most of these pieces together. We have got some great starts in our quarterly meetings. We have got some new changes in the budget process that tim and mark are working on now. We are trying to work with our s.e.a. Report to integrate it better with the budget so there is a better link there between the two, so we have got some things in place. We think by july we will have a better full-formed plan about how we should proceed. We don't think that this is a radical change. We don't think that it will require immense or significant costs or time or effort, but it will require some time on our part as auditors, tim's part as the administrative director for the city, and

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

bureau's time. We're going to offer our -- as auditors, our training, our consulting, and our expertise in measuring performance to bureaus so we can move forward towards this effort. So, I would ask you and urge you to pass the resolution today and to get us to moved forward in managing for results.

*****: I will just be very brief. Having been with the city --

Katz: Identify yourself.

Tim Grewe, Chief Administrative Officer: Tim grew, chief administrative officer for the city. I've been with the city for 26 years now. As I sit and think about performance measurement, it is true that the city has been at the forefront in many ways in this area. I can recall many times as we tried to improve the budget, calling other cities and asking them for what they were doing. They would refer us back to Portland to get information, but things like the s.e.a. Report have a national reputation. The Portland, Oregon progress board, and the benchmark having a national reputation, and even the information in our budget document right now, we get frequent requests for that. Our participation in the icma process. But what we have been lacking is a system that integrates all of that together in a way that really provides you, the decision-makers of the city, with useful information both in terms of making decisions in the budget process, but also monitoring performance during the year. And beyond you, providing credible information to the public on the services we are providing and on how efficient we are in providing those services. So, I am real excited about the recommendations in this report because I believe it will create that system. We have had lots of collaboration with the bureau managers. I think we all share a healthy skepticism about whether or not we are going to achieve the results of this, but they all appear to be prepared to, to participate in this effort, and a big part of the implementation plan will be to continue the collaboration with the bureau managers and bring they will together to assist in not just developing the work plan, but moving this thing forward. So, i, too, would encourage you to give us your support today, and if so, I will be back to you before june with a more specific implementation plan to process.

Katz: Thank you. Questions by the council? Anybody else want to testify? Roll call.

Francesconi: There's a couple things I want to say here. First, we have a well-managed city. That's because of the talent that we have had in the city starting with tim, and tim follows a tradition there. , so compared to other cities, I really do believe that we are well managed, and as a result, we haven't experienced some of the turmoil at some other -- that some other jurisdictions have suffered here recently. And that's because we are well managed. But, these are especially trying times for all governments, including this government, and it's something that tim said at the end. The taxpayers are losing some credibility. We are losing some credibility with the taxpayers. Not only the city, county, schools, but at all levels, and so at a time of diminishing resources, increasing responsibilities, we have to do better than we have done so far. I think that the council needs to spend -- and we have a very good council who cares very much about the city and does a lot to manage the city well. But, I think that we need to spend some time as a council kind of reflecting on what we just heard here, on at least three levels. It was mentioned by dick. One is our own workforce, and have they bought in to -- bought into our priorities and what we are doing and the morale of the workers. That was brought up at our last retreat. I mean, at the last group session that we had. It's something that I think we need to address. The second issue is kind of teamwork with the bureau managers. I, frankly, think that we have too many bureau managers sitting around that table, and we have to work with the team of our bureau managers to kind of move forward to make sure that we implement some of these things. The third level is the council, ourselves. I think because we have a very energetic, good council, I think that sometimes we try to do too many things simultaneously. As a result, it sends mixed messages to the workforce and to the taxpayers. I don't think that we have clearly established a set of priorities, and it's understandable because so

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

much comes to us that we have to react to, but I think that we have to -- we are responsible for -- I think that there is kind of three levels. One, there is basic city services that we are responsible to -- for. Second, there is a set of city priorities by which we have to be responsible for, like schools at the top of the list. And then there's a series of things that we have to react to, but we have to be more intentional about how we operate at those three levels or else all the performance measurements in the world aren't going to matter. I think that you said that a little more tactfully than I just did in your report. But, it's incumbent upon us to do this. And I bare responsibility for this, as well. Let's take the park's bureau. I asked gary to do an audit of the park's bureau and dick performed this four years ago when I first came onboard, or after I had been there for a while. It was a very helpful audit in clarifying the lack of clear performance measurements, but I am aware that we haven't done an adequate joseph lieberman in terms of some follow-up on some of those recommendations, and, and we are doing that now. I am hoping that you will see the results. , so it's something that we have to kind of constantly watch and constantly monitor as part of our job. But, I am convinced that we have a team here from the workers to the managers to the council members that with some guidance with gary blackmer and his team of terrific auditors, with tim constantly reminding us, I think that we can do better and restore more credibility as we accomplish more in a more limited focus. Aye. **Leonard:** Well, this is exactly the kind of thing that I am very interested in working on. I am a person that's not real that you said about passing things or participating in processes that don't result in real live things changing and happening. I want you to know for me, I recognize what you are getting at and you know, although I am new here, I am also in my 26th year with the city and recognize a tremendous amount of things that we can do differently to provide better services, and I agree with commissioner Francesconi that I think that the city has done a poor job in utilizing its employees as a resource to manage better. I want to invite you to, to both dick and gary as you see things I can be doing different or better just in my portfolio, to let me know in managing and getting the kind of thing you are looking for because I don't -- I come at this from -- as the mayor probably remembers, being in the legislature, a completely different frame of mind on how you budget and how you, how you are as an elected official, as a legislator, certainly is different than, than an elected official here at the city where you mix the legislative and administrative functions. Poor john adams, turn in his grave to know the kind of government that we have here that lacks the natural tension that he fought for and the federal government. , so I recognize some of those problems here as i'm, i'm ramping up, doing my job. , so as you see things, I can do better to that end. I would appreciate it. Aye.

Saltzman: This looks like a good product. I am impressed with what I have seen here and look forward to what we can come up with in weaving all our threads together here. Aye.

Sten: I think you are doing good work and look forward to continuing to work with you. Aye.

Katz: I think I have three votes. Commissioner leonard, commissioner Saltzman, and myself. I do disagree with commissioner Francesconi's statement about we have too many bureau managers around the table. From my perspective, the larger the table gets, the better work we do in our disfunctional government because we then tap into the talent of everybody around that table, and what i've been able to see over the last ten years is how all of the bureaus weave in and out together depending on the issues. So that's something that I want to see the table get bigger, rather than smaller because if it gets smaller, it's less inclusive, and it's hard -- there's no question about it. It's hard. The city has been dealing with managing for results. We take gary and dick's work on, on s.e.a. Very seriously. Looking at the document and asking ourselves where can we do better, what can we do better, and proceed to move in that, in that direction. And because of their work and because of tim's work and our budget work, we are models for other cities in the country. But, we can always do better. There's no question about it. And we can set priorities, but we can also have a full course of activities that each member of this council is interested in because of our form of

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

government each one of the members on this council has their own full plate, and when you combine their own full plate, you have a huge, huge picnic, and that's ok as long as we are focused in what we want to accomplish, set a time line and have the ability to get it done. So, I am looking forward to working with you, Gary, on this and Tim and Dick. You can count on me. Aye. All right. Regular agenda. 158.

Item 158.

Katz: All right, come on up. Go ahead, Ruthy.

Ruth Roth, Office of Management and Finance: Ok. Ruth Roth, office of management and finance. What we are bringing to you today is an ordinance that amends the agreement for downtown business district management services between the city of Portland and PDSI. This is the latest chapter in the clean and safe district. As you know in July you voted on an amendment that increased the clean and safe district by 2 cents per square foot to provide for decorative lighting in a contribution to the proposed ice rink. Since that time, we have been working with PDSI and PBA to come up with an acceptable amendment to the management services agreement. And it was a lengthy process for several reasons. It was a lengthy process because originally we were trying to do a contract that would take us through a nine-year term, and come up with a nine-year budget. That would have been most efficient. But given the fact that, that certain difficulties emerged, financial difficulties emerged during the course of the first decorative light season, it became clear that it was not possible to do a nine-year budget because the funding source, as it was laid out, was not going to be sufficient to cover the costs over the long-term in the way that it was envisioned by, by the permit source of power. So, we backtracked, and instead what we are bringing to you today is an amendment that covers one and potentially two years of the decorative lighting system. The rink, as you know, is now part of a public process, and so the amendment does not speak to the rink. The amendment speaks only to the decorative lighting system. As I said originally, it was intended that the decorative lighting be, be fueled by a permanent source of power in the olden days, it had been pulled off of extension cords and trees from buildings, and to their credit, the downtown community wanted to do something more permanent and more efficient. But, because the permanent source of power was going to take some time and be quite costly, on an interim basis the city worked with PDSI to come up with a short-term solution, which was to draw the power off the city streetlights. There was a very good plan put together for the decorative lighting season that is still going on. The trees are still lit. It was always intended that this be a temporary solution. The streetlights are old. They are not adequate as a permanent source of power for the decorative lights. We had to turn off some streetlights this year to provide for power, and it caused some overloads in the system that long-term are not good for the health of the streetlights system. So, what we have today is an amendment that ratifies the use of the streetlights for the season that, that we are currently in, and provides for the possibility of an extension for one more year you are through -- the contract says March 1, but it should be a scrivener's error, it should be March 30, 2003, provided that PDSI and the city agree on a permanent source of power and this plan needs to be brought to the city by July 1st. If there is an acceptable plan brought to us, the streetlight manager has consented to continue to allow the streetlights for one more year. So, that is -- March 30, 2004.

Katz: That's the scrivener's error, and we will make that an amendment.

Roth: So we have been working very cooperatively and very strenuously with PDSI to try to bring this to you as quickly as possible because you can imagine they are running into some cash flow problems since the revenues from the increased clean and safety to support the lighting system have not been forthcoming because we did not have a contract. So we are all working in good faith at this point. They understand -- they understand that there is a problem, and they will be working toward a solution, and we will be working as their partners to make sure that to the greatest extent possible, there is a successful solution. I might point out that should a solution not be identified in

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

terms of, of a permanent source of power that can be funded within the existing rate structure or some other alternative, this agreement contemplates the possibility of the determination of the lighting district and the repeal of, of the increased fee. This is, this is merely a possibility. This is not necessarily a likelihood or a probability, but I just want to call it to your attention that potentially this could happen. In terms of the contribution for the ice rink at the point in time when a successful sighting has been made for that, we will be come to you with a further amendment that provides for the, the disposition of the funds to cover that portion of the agreement. Any questions?

Katz: Let's, let's clarify the ice rink because there's been a lot of misinformation and misunderstanding about the ice ring. Ruthy, would you repeat again who is responsible for the ice ring.

Roth: Ok. The ice rink is a project that is being supported and put forth by the Portland business alliance. At the time --

Francesconi: No, pioneer square board. I'm sorry --

Roth: Originally when will this proposal was brought to our attention, it was brought to our attention by the Portland business alliance working with the downtown community. At the time this proposal was brought to us, and at the time that we brought to you to council the amendment that supported the funding both for the ice rink contribution and the decorative lighting district. At that point, the proposal was decided in pioneer courthouse square. Given, given that recommendation, a public process was begun in terms of -- is this a good place to site it? Is this not a good place to site it, and what process will be set in place to give the public an opportunity to react. That is my understanding of, of the chain of events. Do you have any other -- is that -- does that clarify it, mayor?

Katz: The source of funding.

Roth: The source of funding -- I am talking -- I believe the overall budget, and I may be incorrect on this, is in the neighborhood of, of between \$9 and \$12. It's not on the tip of my tongue. This increased fee is going to pay for \$1 million contribution. This is not city dollars. This is --

Katz: That was the point.

Roth: This is not city dollars. These are dollars to be collected as part of the clean and safe downtown management license fee. It will be assessed to, to downtown property managers.

Leonard: The point the mayor is driving at is one I couldn't agree with more. We have to be real clear as we talk about these things in public, making sure that we are saying these are not general fund dollars. These are a whole lot of misconceptions that arise from things like this that cause undue angst among the public about our priorities when, in fact, they are not dollars that were, that were taken out of our --

Roth: These are not city general fund dollars. These are dollars to be raised by, by the, by the assessment of an increased downtown property management fee on, on building -- building managers within the clean and safe district

Leonard: They assess on themselves?

Roth: They assess on themselves, as they assess on themselves, the portion to cover the lighting costs.

Katz: I think that everybody here understands. Thank you. I just -- I want --

Roth: If you would ask me that directly, I could have answered you more correctly.

Katz: Yeah, you are right. [laughter]

Katz: You are right. I was wrong, but the point is that we get a lot of, of e-mails and letters that kind of combine a variety of issues together and talk about the credibility of the city when they combine all those issues together, and here we have an opportunity to talk about one of those issues that they throw in the mix about city using general fund dollars, and that is not the case.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Roth: Correct.

Katz: All right.

Francesconi: I just have one question back on this. Let me thank you for straightening this out and helping us clarify. I have the same question for Chris if he comes up and testifies in a minute, but how did we miss this in terms of a power source that's kind of important, especially when it was a 10-year contract.

Roth: I beg your pardon?

Francesconi: How did we miss this issue? In terms of a power source and what it would cost for the lighting.

Roth: This proposal was brought to the city very late in the game. It was brought to us in, I would say mid May. They had done due diligence. They had come up with the, the budget, and we were asked to, to very rapidly get it before council because it needed to be passed by council in a very short time frame to meet the window of going out in the fall billings. All I can say is we did not feel that it was our responsibility to, to second-guess their due diligence.

Francesconi: Thank you for catching it.

Katz: Chris, did you want to come up to us and talk to us a little bit?

*****: Only if you want me to. [laughter]

*****: Chris --

Katz: We haven't seen you in a long time.

Chris Thomas, Portland Business Alliance: Yes, I know. It's nice to be here again. Ruth actually gave a very good description, I think. The business alliance, the business alliance was actually caught a little earlier in the same situation that the city staff was when this came in response to the commissioner Francesconi's question. I think that we found relatively late that, that if the downtown holiday lighting was going to continue, it was going to have to be done through the business alliance putting together a fee increase and developing a program to do it because it was apparent to us that those who had done the bulk of the downtown lighting in the past were, were -- felt like they were not going to be able to continue it privately themselves, which is how it was done. I think we underestimated -- I mean, we did the best that we could, but within the time that we had, we underestimated what the difficulty was going to be in getting the whole system on a permanent underground independent power source. So, now we are, we are where we are and we are having to, to -- having to -- we are going to, to try and figure out how we can do this in a way that the streetlighting system is not, over the long-term, impaired by, by having the added power that we are drawing from the system. But I think that it was really the practical problem that we had in terms of, of just the timing of when we found this out and how fast we had to react to make sure that we had lighting continue from year-to-year because it really is critical to the downtown during the holiday season.

Francesconi: My last -- my second and last question, Chris, is -- speaking of performance measures, is there a way to evaluate during this last holiday season as to whether the, the added holiday lighting was successful in terms of stimulating, making it a more inviting commercial area?

Thomas: I think in the planning work that we're doing under the amendment, Ruth mentioned the July one date, which is sort of the deadline for completing that process, part of, part of that and what, what will be coming back to the city will actually be as best as can be done, an evaluation of at least what the, the sense of the community was about the lighting, was it successful, was it good, was it what people anticipated, and of how, how important or, or not important the lighting is in the, the period up from around December 1 to the end of March. So I think you will, you will -- we will give you the best that we can assemble on that, and that will be part of that.

Katz: Questions? Go ahead.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Saltzman: Did they achieve the full 19 blocks or 26 blocks that was originally supposed to be lit up?

Thomas: It's 45 blocks, and just, just about exactly that. There may be one or two off in either direction, but yes. There have been times when we have had to be creative about, about how to, to, to occasionally we lose strands from one thing or another. Somebody does something that cuts a strand, so we have had to be creative about getting the strands up. The program was virtually 100% accomplished this year. It took a lot of cooperation, by the way, from, from both our side and from bill graham, especially, at streetlighting to make that work and they had a very good working relationship. Really, really good. We really appreciated his help.

Saltzman: Is the goal to have a permanent power source determined asap or --

Thomas: That's, that's the --

Saltzman: Or before the next agreement runs out, next march of 2004?

Thomas: The plan that we are to come in with by this summer and that we are to, to work towards agreement on is a plan to provide a permanent solution, permanent power source, and it would include sort of how to get there, so -- so that's the time frame for this, and the agreement -- the amendment in front of you says if we can reach an agreement by this summer, then we will continue for another -- in other years, but we are on the road to implementation of, of whatever deteriorations need to be made.

Roth: There will probably need to be a transitional plan prior to the successful implementation of a permanent power source because a permanent power source is a timely process. So, there this will probably be some hybrid for some middle years once the streetlights are no longer the sole source of the power.

Katz: Further questions?

Sten: Who's the contractor that does the lighting now?

Thomas: I don't know. Let me get jody up here.

Katz: Identify yourself for the record.

Jody Jordan, Portland Business Alliance: My name is jody jordan. I work for the Portland business alliance, and I am the manager who's been working on this project. The contractor currently this year for the company is called "celebrate," and we sign a contract with them on an annual basis. They are based out of texas and they hire local labor, as well as three individuals who worked on the installation.

Sten: Ok. Thanks.

*******:** Sure.

Katz: Further questions? Ok. Anybody else want to testify? Roll call.

Francesconi: Well, thanks for your work on doing this. Just a couple of periphery comments. In terms of streetlighting, I will ask brandt williams to talk with you, as well, chris and ruth because the source of funding for the whole streetlighting program is a little unstable because it's general fund, and given the issues facing transportation, there's a whole issue there. The whole streetlighting issue. Now, we are fine for a year, but then given some issues in the Portland transportation budget, there's some issues, so maybe we can work together on this, so that's one, one statement. The second is just regarding the ice rink, by, by coincidence, just yesterday I went to buy near square board and heard a presentation about the summary of the public involvement process, frankly, I insisted upon, and the pioneer square board readily agreed to. And so it's being evaluated. The public reaction, and then we are going to distribute that all to the council. I could make a decision on my own, and I will make a recommendation to the council but then the council will have the final say on this. Now we are in the process of evaluating it. It did originate with pioneer square, and I am sympathetic to buy near square board because we don't give them much resource to say maintain the square and so they are trying to do things without a lot of help from us,

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

frankly. And I think that the business alliance endorsed the project, and then that became this fee that we are discussing today. I just wanted to give a little update. There is some public money in this ice rink proposal, just to be clear. There's about a million dollars of pdc dollars --
*****: Tax increment financing.

Francesconi: Tax increment financing, but there is no general fund, nor will there ever be any transportation money or anything else in this project. Ok. Thanks for your work, ruth and chris. Aye.

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

Katz: Well, I love the project, and i've been urging many years ago a.p.p. To think about creating a wonderful atmosphere for the heart of the city during all of the holidays. It isn't just the christmas holidays, and we celebrate them all here in the city. One of the ways of making a magical downtown is not only to light up the trees, but to make sure that all the retail windows are lit up and attract people to come into the downtown part of the city and celebrate the holidays, quanza, hanukkah, christmas, all the holidays with us in the heart of the city. That's what makes a city so special, so I want to thank all of you for taking a relatively small program that maybe was two streets up to 45 streets. Now, there is the issue of the power, and I hope that is resolved, but thank you for, for making this city look very beautiful during, during the season. Aye. 159.

Item 159.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: You almost got your moment here again. We want to know if your shirt is clean again. [laughter]

Francesconi: This is a good thing, and it was -- you can see from the testimony of people that are on both sides of the debate last time, they all supported this, so you know -- they all support this had proposal. The rising water, sewer rates to support very, very important goals of cleaning up the river is one of the most serious issues that we have facing our whole community. So, having enlightened, knowledgeable citizen input on this, it's really important and it's really the mayor who has been a defender of the perb from the very first day that I came on the job and has consistently been this. So, it's fitting that she should put this back together again. I do appreciate the amendment from the council. In order to have meaningful citizen involvement, we have to let citizens decide how they want to be involved on significant rate impact decisions, so by our amendment, we are entrusting some power to the citizens that they don't have to be bound just by us, and I think that that amendment improves this already-good product, so tommy, thank you, and mayor, thank you. Aye.

Leonard: Aye.

Saltzman: Well, speaking on behalf of the bureaus that will be bearing the brunt of the newly reconstituted perb, I want to say I still believe in it. It has been a useful and continues to be a useful mechanism. I think the changes made will only make it better, make it function better and have some better guidelines as to what the council expects the purb to be looking at, and we will be seeing -- I will be seeing -- I will be seeing hopefully a new purb board soon because we need them. The budget is just around the corner, and I hope that with a we can get a board up and running that quickly. I urge the council members to consider citizens for ease various positions that we will need to recruit quickly, unless the mayor has a slate up her sleeve. Aye.

Sten: Thanks to the mayor and tommy for reconstituting this. I think it's pretty much unarguable that we need citizens actively engaged in the issues. They can be a little -- styles they are exciting and sometimes dull and technical. From my point of view it's pretty unarguable that this board was not working well. I appointed numerous people who I think very, very highly of who unanimously quit the board because it wasn't functioning well. So i've been clear for some time that I have not -- this board has not been serving the purpose it needs to, and I am not trying to point fingers, but I

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

think, you know, rather than give up on the idea of citizen input through this process, reconstituting it and maybe starting it out with a fresh slate and a clearer mission is an optimistic in the right strategy, so I appreciate it. Aye.

Katz: Tommy, thank you for giving a lot of the legwork. I want to remind every council member you have a staff that has an ex officio seat at the perb so that we are kept informed about some of the issues and if they need some direction, then we will provide them with that kind of direction. I am pleased to, to start working on appointing members. I am asking all the council members to submit some names to me and all the organizations. I know that the business organizations that have two representatives are already onboard, identified some people that they want to serve, so I am asking all of you and the organizations that we want represented to also submit some names, so thank you. Aye. All right. 160. Why he thinks why he thinks why he thinks.

Item 160.

Nancy Jesuale, Communications & Networking: Nancy jesuale, communications. This is a telecommunications franchise that is very similar to a franchise that would be granted to any other carrier network in Portland. We all felt that it was important to have similar terms and conditions for our occupancy in the streets. So, this document was developed by the city attorney's office and the cable office.

Katz: Ok. Questions?

Saltzman: Is there a franchise fee?

Jesuale: Yes, 5%.

Saltzman: Ok. [laughter]

Francesconi: Can you give us a status report on how things are going?

Jesuale: Sure. Well, as you know we've -- we are now using the voice service to city offices everywhere that we could, and that includes all the major buildings, about 5,000 lines. We are providing high-speed data service to most city locations that we can, and we have about 50 active connections for our customers, and those are growing maybe 20 to 30 a month up to our preorder quantity of about 100 data circuits. So, we are wildly successful, i'd say.

Saltzman: I was going to say that I was preparing my office budget. We reviewed our interagency charges and telecommunications was the only interagency that actually declined from last year to this year. I am attributing that to irne.

Jesuale: Yep, yeah. Yeah.

Saltzman: Keep up that trend. It's good.

Jesuale: Thank you. And thank you for your support during this period. As you know with the, the arbitration, litigation with qwest, it has been stressful and the cutover period was, was extremely stressful I think on many city employees, but also especially on the comnet team, and I was so impressed with their dedication and their quality of work, and I know that you are really happy that they did such a fine job through basically the holidays.

Katz: Further questions? Anybody else want to testify? All right. It passes to second. Item 161. Thank you, nancy.

Item 161.

Saltzman: This ordinance will amend the code, chapter 17.36 to incorporate report recommendations of the customer information system assessment team. These were adopted by the council in december of 2001. The assessment team included the utility, financial experts from the private sector, as well as from several city bureaus. They are charge was to identify a set of reforms intended to increase the timely payment of sewer charges, discourage the delinquencies clarify the basis for adjusting customer accounts. Currently, the city has delinquent sewer use, service charges valued at more than \$18 million. These proposed code amendments will expand the range of collection options for the city to increase the probability that these delinquencies will be paid.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

These options are articulated in the ordinance and we have the b.e.s. Staff here to answer any questions. This discontinues the 20% discount on bills that are over six months due. This was something started in the mid county sewer project, and it was still on the books when we had our customer system information billing problems and resulted in the bureau of environmental services having to refund approximately \$6 million of its revenue. The committee looked at this discount and decided it was no longer a germane part of the code, so that's also being eliminated by the code changes.

Katz: Anybody want to testify? Any questions by the council?

Francesconi: Dan, one for you. I think it says it here but you may want to be explicit about it. That's that the 20% discount, the elimination of that does not disqualify rate payers who were impacted -- rate payers who were impacted by the failure of the utility billing system, is that right, or --

Saltzman: We have already, I believe that we have totally dealt with those people that were impacted by the customer information system in terms of getting their 20% credits to them. There are might be a handful that haven't been processed but I believe all of them have been processed. If there are any that would arise -- well, this is the effective date. This ordinance is a second -- will go to second reading and won't take effect for another 30 days after that. Anybody that has a problem in the intervening time will be ineligible for that, but after that, the 20% discount will no longer be in effect -- but up until then they will be eligible. We have processed, as I said, virtually all the discounts or the credits for the people that have been affected by the customer information system.

Francesconi: Are you -- this is my last question. We did some collection, intense collection efforts for the water bureau, and so you are doing this on the sewer only bills. Is it going to be a different collection system or the same collection system or --

Saltzman: I don't believe that we know that yet. We haven't really decided who we are going to use for collection, but I can have dan probably give a better answer than I can on that.

Dan Vizzini, Bureau of Environmental Services: Mayor Katz and members of the council, I am from the bureau of environmental services, dan vizzini. To answer the question specifically, we work hand in hand with the water bureau on collections. The days prior to 1992, I believe, was when the -- when the current code was created on this. The water bureau administered all of the collections activities, so -- and we expect that we would continue that relationship with the water bureau where, where they would identify delinquent accounts and pursue collection using the most effective tools available to them. The reason for this code language is that we do have instances where we have customers that don't receive water service and can't use water shut-off as a means of collecting a delinquency. So, this at least allows us to reinstate abilities that are instate law that we haven't used in the last 10, 12 years.

Francesconi: So, if it's not water shut-off, what is the stick?

Vizzini: The water bureau is looking at increasing the use of collection agencies, collection agency contract to pursue, and the, the final tool is, is returning to leaning property for the sewer component of the bill. The, the -- in discussions that we have had with the water bureau to date, what we have looked at is a series of steps that would take us from, from notices through the collection agency and then after a period of time with the collection agency, if it's still not collected, then looking at recording lanes on property.

Francesconi: Thank you.

Katz: Further questions? Anybody else want to testify? It goes to second. 162.

Item 162.

Katz: Anybody want to testify on this item? If not, it passes to second. We will come back together at 6:00 tonight. We will take 164 first, and let me just flag to those that are listening that

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

depending on the number of people that are going to be here to testify, we will probably go to two-minute testimony as opposed to three, and I will make that decision when I see how many people are going to testify. All right, everybody, we are adjourned until 6:00 p.m.

At 10:50 a.m., Council recessed.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

FEBRUARY 19, 2003 6:00 PM

Katz: Welcome to an evening session. Karla, please call the roll. [roll call]

Katz: Before we start we have an item we need to dispose of. Let's read item 164.

Item 164.

Katz: Katherine, you reviewed it?

Kathryn Beaumont, Sr. Deputy City Attorney: Yes. You have before you revised findings for adoption. We have reviewed them and we recommend you adopt them.

Katz: Ok. I need a motion.

Sten: So moved.

Saltzman: Second.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] all right. 163.

Item 163.

Katz: Let me turn it over to commissioner Saltzman.

Saltzman: Thank you, madam mayor and members of the council. Welcome to our public. I requested this hearing after hearing from the community and my council colleagues that it would be valuable to spend some time reviewing last year's council decision to secure Portland's open water reservoirs by replacing them with buried tanks. This hearing will focus on the decision made in late may of last year to approved a \$65 million security enhancement package. Tonight the water bureau will present a short power play presentation on the -- power point presentation. I will then ask our invited guests from the public health and safety fields to express their perspectives on the project, following that friends of the reservoir will have an opportunity to present their views, and then it will be open for public testimony. Currently we have an extensive public process under way. This process involves a 16-member public advisory committee that's developing recommendations for the city council on what could happen to the new I have -- newly available 22 park acres once the reservoirs are buried. To strengthen this process i've proposed adding \$10.9 million to the project budget this year, to ensure at a minimum the surface areas of the mt. Tabor reservoirs could be returned to their current appearance after the burial. Again, this is a decision that will ultimately come to us from the public advisory committee and will be up to the city council to make that final decision. Along these lines I have committed the city will not begin constructing the buried tanks at mt. Tabor until the public advisory committee process is completed this summer. The chair of the public advisory committee will speak for a couple minutes tonight regarding their work. In regards to Washington park, the plan is clear. We will be installing floating covers and microwave motion detection to temporarily protect and secure the drinking water reservoirs there. These temporary measures were chosen to offset the substantial rate impact that we would all feel if we were to bury all five reservoirs all at once. So we intend to do the tabor burials first, put temporary covers on Washington park, and then we'll also commit to having a public process to -- about what goes on top of the Washington park reservoirs, similar to what we're having right now for the mt. Tabor reservoirs. My perspective on this is ensuring that public health and safety is the council's most important responsibility to the residents of Portland. We have no choice but to act when we are made aware of vulnerabilities of our infrastructure. Particularly when that danger can affect thousands to tens of thousands of individuals. The open reservoir replacement project gets to the core of this responsibility. I remember having my own strong doubts about the security package when it first came before the council last year. People throughout our community are hurting economically and the rationale behind any increase in utility rates must be strong. I believe the rationale meets and exceeds this test. As other cities have moved to replace their open reservoirs, Portland's stand out more and more as a potential bulls eye. Portland now has 10% of the remaining

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

open reservoirs in the united states in our city. The risk to our water supply are real, and the city council made an expeditious and critical decision last year to address these risks rather than sit by and temp fate while options are debated. In regard to the many options you'll hear about tonight, and i've heard and read about, and the water bureau has heard about and responded to, they just don't give us the confidence and certainty that buried storage provides. You'll hear about the pittsburgh solution, basically keeping the reservoirs intact and filtering at the outlets. It doesn't provide security from intentional contamination, and it could end up being exceedingly expensive and take up valuable park land. We've -- we'll hear about moving the storage somewhere else. It doesn't work in our gravity fed system and could potentially place all of our reservoirs in one location, which is even probably a greater public health and safety risk. And you'll hear proposals probably about double domes, filters in everyone's water, permanent armed guards 24 hours a day, seven days a week, etc. You'll hear all these ideas, the water bureau has heard all these ideas and we've responded and provided information to people that want information why we've rejected these ideas, and you'll hear about it shortly in the power point. These are all input and ideas I value, but when rationally examined, these latter options are just not acceptable. Buried storage is the best option for our water system, it provides the city with the most protection, while potentially opening up additional park space. What we hope to continue to get from the community is its creativity and energy in developing a concept for this new above-ground space above the reservoirs. So I just finally want to say the water bureau and all of us here on the city council cherish the historic nature of the reservoir structures, and we have committed to preserve the historic character of the reservoirs. The historic integrity of the reservoirs as the work is done to bury the reservoirs. So I do not think that burying the reservoirs is at all inconsistent with maintaining the special aesthetic and historical amenities -- i'm just about through. I now want to turn it over to mort, our water bureau director, who will run us through the power point presentation.

Katz: Speak right into the mike. I think people are having trouble hearing up in the balcony. For those who have a -- a hearing problem or have difficulty hearing, we do have technical ear pieces that we can provide you, and they're up on the front table. But for everybody else, just speak up.

Mort Anoushiravani, Director, Water Bureau: I'm very pleased to be here, and I do have copies of my presentation outside for people who don't have it and they'd like to have it. What i'd like to do over the next few minutes, just go over the rationale of the decision that was made and the fact it was adopted by the council last may. Just to remind council and everybody again about, in may of 2002, the council adopted a plan to cover -- basically have a temporary cover at Washington park until a permanent solution in ten years, and also bury the storage and parking -- park improvements at mt. Tabor, and develop a plan for the park area at the Washington park, and then bury the storage at Washington park over the next ten years. That's just a summary of the recommendation from last year. To put this -- to put this reservoirs in a national context, many of the water systems across the country have had these facilities as part of their storage and distribution system. And in Portland, like them, we have actually had six and we actually abandoned one about 15, 16 years ago, now we have five. Over the last 30 years or so, over 90% of these reservoirs have either been covered or removed from service. And currently they're about 55 as of 2001, and actually the number is less now because a large number of the systems are either removing or covering the reservoirs, and because of the fact we have five, we roughly have 10% of the national number of the open reservoirs in service. The reason that they have been basically eliminated or covered were because of the threat of contamination, the fact that these are more vulnerable water storage facilities and they do not provide the best management practices, and also they have a very, very high maintenance cost when you compare it to the other type of storage facilities that are in the utilities, and also regulatory mandate either does not allow -- in many of the states across the country, actually they have mandated that the utilities have them actually cover them or take -- or

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

take them out of service. For example, in Washington, that's what they have done several years ago. And this was confirmed by a study that the water bureau took which was a very extensive and comprehensive study of looking at what to do with these facilities back in '96, and basically we reached the same conclusion and we concurs with the same reasons. And then after the tragic events of 9-11, obviously the water system security became another priority for us, and we looked at them through several different studies that basically confirms the findings that we are -- finding as a result of the latest independent study that we are doing that is going to -- that's going to get completed in march, which basically says open reservoirs are among one of our highest vulnerability facilities that we have in our system, which just basically reconfirms the prior study findings, and also burying these facilities are more preferred than having a treatment on site. From both the contamination as well as the security perspective. And then one other thing that we find out, the things that we have cherished and have used as advantages, if you would, over the years, when you look through a lens of vulnerability or risk reduction or security to actually -- because of the fact that we have a vast surface water source that is not filtered that does not provide additional barriers to remove contaminants if they are burying the water, and also because we just add minimal treatment for disinfection system and also the fact we have open reservoirs, it makes us, when you compare us nationally to some other water utilities, we're more of a target, if you will, from that aspect. As a result of this reevaluation work, we basically came up with two critical pieces of information, or basic knowledge, if you will. One is serious intentional contamination is a credible and realistic threat. And you're going to hear from some of the public safety people about that in a few minutes also. And also, the conventional wisdom before 9-11 was because of the dilution factor, it would take tremendous amount of material to contaminate a large body of water. And there are actually agents that emit a small quantities can cause a lot of damage. And this leads -- and then this -- bioagents or biotoxins, and unfortunately there is no real time detection of this toxin if they're basically to reduce into the water. The first time that you might find out about it is actually hearing from the public health people that there is actually sickness in the community. And then also as I mentioned a minute ago, they could be just in very small quantities that can cause serious problems, and these toxins are unstable in water, and unfortunately chlorine does not provide protection against them. And the consequences of this new piece of information, it could be a potential loss of life in the community if the water supply was contaminated, or it could cause serious sickness in our population, and also economic disruption that it would take -- if the system got contaminated, it could take up to weeks to decontaminate the system or flush the system. You can just imagine a large metropolitan area being without water service for several weeks. And what the consequences of that are. And then also general loss of confidence in the drinking water supply, which won't be good for the population or the -- for the city. Just pointing out the significance of this these facilities essentially 70% of the water that's served to the citizens of Portland goes through mt. Tabor reservoir. And the blue area is the service area for mt. Tabor, and the pinkish area is the Washington park area, but recognizing that actually Washington park water comes from mt. Tabor actually. So basically 350,000 residents of Portland, and businesses, use the water that goes through these two facilities. Therefore we came to the conclusion that we must do something in a status quo -- and status quo is not basically acceptable in terms of the water quality and the security protection for our water system. And also a status quo does not meet the regulatory requirements coming our way. So we have to do something. What that meant was as I mentioned a few minutes ago, we did conduct a large and comprehensive study of what to do with these reservoirs, because of the fact that they're 100 years old and they have maintenance needs and regulatory requirements and all that, and there was a plan to basically deal with them over the next 20 years or so. And as a result of the 9-11 and what we learned, we find out that we basically have to begin work immediately to deal with these issues, and remove the vulnerability from our system,

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

and then also make the completion much shorter and get it done in ten years, or sooner, if possible. And then we consider several range of options. One option was basically exclusionary zone and detection devices, one was to relocate the storage facilities or treatment at the facilities or bury them. And then in order to be able to evaluate these different scenarios, the water bureau established several criteria we would be judging these different scenarios to see which ones meet the criteria. Security was number 1, impact to the park character, we recognize the significance of these facilities to our communicated, and we want to make sure whatever we do is going to basically be in keeping with that tradition. And then also the cost of building it, and the long-term costs of the operation, and the water system operations and what that would mean for different scenarios. Scenario one is basically establishing a hundred-foot setback, have a high fence around this reservoirs, also clear vegetation and install microwave motion detection and also install additional cameras and then have on site guards and also for regulatory requirements we have to install barbed wires, have barriers for -- to keep the critters out of the reservoirs, if you will. Here's a depiction of if we were to establish the exclusionary zone at these two facilities. On the right you see the mt. Tabor complex, and on the left is the Washington park. Which means if we were to do that, basically we have to close the roads, we have to cut trees and eliminate access to most of the park, which I don't think would be acceptable to the city or to the community. But that's what it would take if we were to implement this alternative. Scenario two was to relocate this historic facility to a new location. The only viable site that potentially could work would be powell butte. And there is not actually enough room on the top there to replace this storage facility as well as allow for construction of the new facilities that we have to build for the future needs. And then also there is no site available on the west side. Basically having all of our storage in one place, it's not a good thing to do in terms of the vulnerability and the -- basically the threats of the disruption we would have to the water service. And it's also is a more expensive cost option. And I will share the cost numbers with you in a second. Scenario three was looking at providing treatment. What we looked at you have heard as the pittsburgh solution, which is basically membrane technology. We've looked at that, and the membrane technology in fact does not remove all the potential contaminants that could actually be introduced into the water. So it won't be 100% removal technology. Right now our system is designed so we can provide water through gravity, which means we don't have to -- we are not reliant -- there is a certain amount of system reliability as part of that. If we were to add treatment at this these facilities we have to do more pumping, and then it's also conflict with the city's sustainability policy in terms of the resource usage, and it's also a much more expensive alternative. Scenario four, it was to bury the storage facilities. Basically the advantages are it makes the contamination very difficult, and it's much easier to detect and respond to a security breach, and it also will open up -- it will also open up for additional park usage that is going to come as a result of the work that the p.a.c. Is doing, and that's going to happen sometimes this summer, and then also we're going to maintain a gravity system, and also it will deal with the regulatory requirements that's coming down the pike for us. In terms of the basic evaluation that we have done, these are just four different alternatives, and the criteria and the capital casts -- costs, and the net positive -- the value for these -- just the thing I want to point out, if you look at the cost of the treatment on the outlet and the buried options, there is a significant difference between the two. In terms of the treatment it's 118 million dollars just for capital costs and the buried is only \$61 million comparing the cost. There is a huge cost difference there. Then in terms of what we'll be doing based on what council has adopted and directed the water bureau to do, we can now install a floating -- we cannot in -- we can install a floating cover on Washington park and it would allow us to maintain the park as it is right now, we can maintain the roads right now, we don't have to cut any trees or vegetation per se, and we will not be -- we will not be doing any modification to these facilities or site, also it will meet the requirements for the regulations. This is just summarizing

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

what was basically adopted by the council last year in terms of burial of this storage at the mt. Tabor and the floating covers for the next ten years at Washington park until we can bury that over the next ten years also. Then the proposed budget for the project for mt. Tabor reservoir and the piping, it's about \$61 million, and just for the parking -- park improvements, it is \$10.4 million, and for the Washington park, to install the floating covers and some other security measures, it's about \$2.5 million. For a total of roughly \$77 million total. For the total project cost. Since the decision was made, there has been a tremendous amount of public involvement, public process. I won't be going through the list, but there has been quite a bit both the work that parks bureau has done, the water bureau has done, and the work that actually p.a.c. Is doing. And the p.a.c. Basically includes all the surrounding neighborhoods, and then it also has a broader city interest represented on it. In conclusion, security of the open reservoir is one of the top priorities, security measures we have to take to protect the water system. Bury the storage is the most secure solution. And buried storage is also the lowest cost option. That will also provide for potential additional park uses. And then floating covers is just going to be a temporary solution until we have a more permanent solution burying the reservoir at Washington park within ten years. And then the next steps, if the council wants us to move forward with this, it's basically construction of the floating covers starting this spring, and then the p.a.c. Recommendation coming up later this summer, and they're going to be a couple of council supporting contracts that's going to come to council march 5, and then we're going to begin design of the buried storage at mt. Tabor by the -- march, may time frame, and then also construction is scheduled for mt. Tabor sometime early in 2004. I'll be glad to answer any questions now.

Saltzman: We'll wait on questions for you, why don't we invite our public health and safety panel, have them go and then council can ask questions of you or that panel. Our public health and safety panel consists of charles matthews, the regional director of the f.b.i. Office, dave leland, with the state health division, maggie miller with the citizens crime commission, and karl simpson, who is one of the cochairs of the city's emergency preparedness council. And we thought we'd start with federal, state, and get down to local, so we'll start with charles matthews.

*****: Thank you, commissioner.

Katz: Talk right into the mike.

Charles Matthews, Special Agent, FBI: Thank you. Charles matthews use, special agent in charge of the f.b.i. In Oregon.

*****: Can't hear:

Katz: The mikes i'm going to ask everybody to speak right into the mikes. We're as high as we can go.

Matthews: I'm charles matthews, i'm a special agent in charge of the f.b.i. In Oregon. From a national counter terrorism perspective, public water supplies are considered part of the nation's critical infrastructure, and as such their safe operation emits an interest to the f.b.i. The systems, like few others, present a means to move certain weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical, to large segments of the population. Indeed, under certain circumstances, certain contaminants introduced into a water supply can result in substantial death and illness. Open and available water supplies such as exist in Portland, present an attractive nuisance, a soft target that could attract terrorists or others with criminal intent, these systems provide a means to convey toxins to large segments of the community. It's important that community leaders do what is appropriate and prudent to diminish the opportunity available to access these systems. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Go ahead. Right into the microphone.

Dave Leland, Manager Drinking Water Program, Oregon Department of Human Services: Good evening, mayor Katz, members of the council. My name is dave leland, and i'm the manager

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

of the drinking water program for the Oregon department of human services. Just at the outset I'd like to say I'm an engineer, not a physician. But I've been in public health for some 25 years, and even have water utility background in my past also. So I want to just address real briefly for you the public health issues that impact the Mt. Tabor reservoir improvement plan, and they are the security vulnerability concerns first, of course, and then there are some future federal regulations on drinking water quality that are secondary consideration here as well. Then there's some others, too, that I'll mention. For me, I've got to tell you the security issue is number 1 for me. And I think other people have covered that very well, and I won't reiterate that. Other than to say, we're learning, that, yes, it is possible to contaminate a city water system through reservoirs. It is possible. Is it likely? I don't know the likelihood of that, and I'll defer to law enforcement folks on that. But the consequences could be very, very high. Future e.p.a. Requirements for water quality are expected later on this year. This is sort of the secondary concern for me that I'll just share with you. And really, there are three choices for existing open reservoirs. Any of these are acceptable. The first would be a package of access controls, setback, other risk control measures to keep people and animals out, primarily, that we have to be approved. That's one option. Or installing the outlet treatment as most discussed earlier, or cover or replace the reservoirs. And I just want to say, there is not a do-nothing option within the preliminary regulation information that we've seen. And we'll know more as soon as those rules do come out later this year. Other considerations I just would offer, well, we all know the reservoirs are 100 years old. And uncovered reservoirs really have not been a modern standard practice since really the mid-1900's for obvious reasons. You want to keep things out of the drinking water. In fact, no new ones have been allowed for quite some time. I would also emphasize what most said earlier, you can do outlet treatment, but no one process removes everything, so you have some limitations there. And I would just close by saying, I certainly, as someone who's worked in Portland for a lot of years, recognize the scenic value and the image in the community, but I think health and safety should come first, and we're really here to advise the community process and you as you deliberate on this. But I know you're going to ask me what my advice is, so my public health engineer advice is cover the reservoirs. And we've been on record for at least since the early 1970's to that point. So thank you very much.

Saltzman: Thank you. Maggie?

Maggie Miller, Executive Director, Citizens Crime Commission: Mayor Katz, city commissioners, my name is Maggie Miller, I'm the executive director of the citizens crime commission. Founded in 1988, the citizens crime commission has provided leadership in the fight against crime by working with businesses, citizens, government officials, criminal justice representatives, and lawmakers do make Oregon state and local system more efficient, effective, and accountable. In April 2002, the crime commission formed a counter terrorism task force in response to the events of September 11th. The purpose of the task force was to study the optimal ways to prevent and prepare us and our -- in our region for catastrophic events. To this end, the task force published a counter terrorism report in August 2002. The report concludes that structures, facilities or services, which are essential to the function of a region, and without which there would be a great risk of loss of life or disruption of public services and the economy, are considered to be critical infrastructure. Much of this infrastructure was designed and built in a relatively threat-free environment. The counter terrorism report recommends assessing varying degrees of protection of our infrastructure with some elements being fully protected, such as our water supplies. The citizens crime commission strongly urges the city council to stand firm on their prudent decision to protect Portland's vulnerable water supply system. As ethereal as Portland reservoirs are to many, all residents of Portland have a right to wake up each day, turn on their tap, and expect a safe and secure water supply. There is no perfect defense against any act of terrorism. The likelihood of a terrorist attack against any given target is small. The impact of such an act, however, can be very

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

large. We must assess the threats to vulnerable infrastructures such as our water supply, and take appropriate steps to reduce having that which benefits us turned against us. The citizen crime commission once again urge you to safeguard our water supply. Thank you.

Saltzman: Thank you. Karl?

Carl Simpson, Director, Bureau of Emergency Communications: Good evening, mayor Katz, council members, my name is Karl Simpson, I'm the director of the bureau of emergency communications. I'm also the cochair of the emergency preparedness council. Thank you for the opportunity to address you this evening regarding a critical component of Portland's efforts to make this a more secure and safe community. The emergency preparedness council strongly supports securing the health and safety of our community's drinking water. Following the tragedy of September 11th, city council established the emergency preparedness council to focus and coordinate the community's preparedness for a crisis in emergency. As we met and we examined the city's critical infrastructures and vulnerabilities, it became clear that the region must have confidence that we can reliably deliver clean, safe water in the event of an emergency. This must be a priority for the city. The vulnerability of critical facilities is a key component of our work. How easy would it be for someone to damage our communications infrastructure? What would be the impact if the Portland building were destroyed? How would fire and police and 9-1-1 respond to a catastrophic emergency. These are some of the grim scenarios you directed us to examine. In that context we see the city's open reservoirs as open to intentional as well as natural disaster. Should there be intentional contamination, the consequence of panic and demand for a response would strain emergency resources, particularly if water contamination were part of a multitargeted event. Reducing the obvious vulnerabilities is a basic priority. The status quo is not acceptable. Speaking on behalf of the emergency preparedness council, we -- I strongly endorse the open reservoir replacement project and urge your continued vigilance over our city's critical infrastructure. Thank you.

Katz: Questions? All right. Questions by the council? Thank you, panel.

Saltzman: The next panel, before we go to public testimony, we allowed -- offered friends of the reservoir to put together a panel for about 15, 20 minutes.

Sten: I have a couple of questions for you. I guess I was hoping you could clarify on your time line that have you in mind now, I've talked with commissioner Saltzman and one of my expectations is that things go forward, the plan for what will happen in the park needs to come to this council for a hearing and discussion before we move forward on actually doing things. How does that fit into the time line that you laid out?

Anoushiravani: Well, that would actually fit, commissioner. The idea is that we are not going to do construction at Mt. Tabor until P.A.C. has completed their work. In terms of what we will know what's going to go on the top. So there is going to be coordination and agreement and consensus between those two. And P.A.C. Right now, we have actually extended the work schedule, if you will, sometime later in the summer. Basically what we're going to be doing, it's going to be some design work and that type of stuff, and no work will happen basically we're not going to turn over dirt, if you will, this we know what's going on the top.

Sten: I think -- what I'd like to see is that the work of that committee coming back to the council, get a hearing like this so we can actually -- I think there's two issues, and I think we'll hear about both of them tonight, they're both critical, but one is, are the reservoirs changing and two, depending on the answer to that question, what's going to go there? And I think so much concern is out there about the historical character, and I won't beat the drum now, because we'll hear it tonight, but it's important that the council actually have a direct discussion with the advisory committee and the citizens about what's going to go in the park after this is all done, before we move forward.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Anoushiravani: Right. We can do that, and that's not a problem, commissioner. I don't see that as a problem at all.

Sten: That's the right answer.

Anoushiravani: Thank you. I do get lucky.

Katz: Further questions by the council?

Leonard: I do. It's on the floating cover at Washington park. If -- assume for argument's sake that the security issues are legitimate issues in terms of burying the reservoirs. What effectiveness does the floating cover in fact provide at Washington park? Against terrorism acts of polluting the water supply?

Anoushiravani: Right. Ok, a couple of things, commissioner. There are going to be additional security measures yes going to be instituting at Washington park also. It's not just going to be the cover by themselves. There are going to be additional sensing devices, and there is going to be additional cameras, monitoring, guards, and all that too. And then also, just by the virtue of having a cover, it would make the response somewhat easier and quicker, if you will, because you basically have crossed the barrier, if you will. So --

Leonard: You've crossed the barrier whether there's a cover there or not. Somebody gets across the barrier and gets to the point where they're going to dump something in the reservoir, what does the cover do to prevent something from ending up in the reservoir?

Anoushiravani: It's not a panacea, that's why we call it basically interim solution. But just for this interim solution, if you have that barrier on the top, if it's breached, you would know it right away. Whereas if somebody were to pitch something in the water, if you will, that won't be detected, really. If that makes sense.

Leonard: It doesn't make sense, because I'm not understanding. I understand there would be a gap of some magnitude between the edge of the cover --

Anoushiravani: No. There won't be any gap. These are going to be tight.

Francesconi: I had the same question, because of that demonstration we saw, where they poured chemicals in. So if I could follow up.

Leonard: Please.

Francesconi: When you say temporary, what's temporary about it is the structure itself, but it's going to cover the whole reservoir?

Anoushiravani: Correct.

Francesconi: Describe it a little more for us. This cover.

Anoushiravani: Basically what this cover is, it is sort of like a membrane, if you will, reinforced membrane that would just basically -- it is basically stretched over the reservoir, and it's just held in place, if you will.

Francesconi: Can you cut it?

Anoushiravani: Oh, sure, you can cut it. [laughter]

Francesconi: Will then --

Anoushiravani: The point I'm making is there is going to be additional monitoring and surveillance going on, and this is just one more barrier, if you will, to make it safer than what it is right now.

Francesconi: That -- 2.3 million, whatever the number is, how much -- does that include the security?

Anoushiravani: Yes. In fact, what that includes, that includes not just the covers, it includes some of these additional securities and actually some of the piping and the valvings that we have to do there also.

Francesconi: Maybe you could send us a copy -- I'd like to see that breakdown at some point.

*******:** Sure.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Katz: I'm going to cut this off. No, that's all right, because we're here to listen to the people who've come to testify. And we can always -- [applause] rule number 1, this is not a demonstration. It's a thoughtful hearing process. So for those of you who haven't been here, if you like what you hear, you can do a wave or something and then we can see that. We don't need to hear it. If you don't like what you hear, you just need to bite your tongue, all right? All right. Thank you. Let's have the panel now from the friends of the reservoir. Partnership with.

*****: I want to thank you for having the hearing tonight.

Katz: Try the other mike.

Cascade Anderson Geller: That's better, I can tell. Thanks so much for having this hearing. We really appreciate the opportunity to get here with you all. And I appreciate all the people that are interested in the drinking water.

Katz: We need your name.

Geller: Cascade anderson-geller. I'm a member of the friends of the reservoirs. Why are we here tonight? Because we have to decide if these properties are of value. And so my piece tonight is to really try to make a case for why these properties are valuable. We can't just let you go ahead and do what seems like I know to all of you to be the right thing to do for public safety without raising a lot of issues. If we didn't do that, we would feel very guilty about these beautiful places that have existed in Portland for a very long time, as you know. So what happened when we were told finally, and we didn't feel the public process was adequate, by the way, and I know that's a disagreement that we have, when we finally found out about what was happening with the reservoirs? We felt it was absolutely necessary to cover the reservoirs. We totally felt that that was necessary. And so we came from that premise, and we jumped in, and we started researching, and we researched and we researched, and literally for seven months, some of us have spent hours and hours a week on this. And we can answer a lot of things. We need the opportunity more than just 20 minutes to do that, so I hope we can get that opportunity. And we'd like to provide with you documents. I -- we didn't get those turned in, we wanted to come to the hearing, but we want to provide you with some of those documents. We called people in other communities and said, what's happening? We went on the internet, we found communities that were fighting for their reservoirs, and this was even before september 11th. And we talked with them and learned that there were alternatives to burial. And people in california, people in pittsburgh, people in various communities as commissioner Saltzman mentioned have come up against this issue and have fought to keep the reservoirs open. Not because they were particularly lovely, like ours, either. That's an important point to us. As a matter of fact, the more we looked at reservoirs around the country the more we realized that these are incredibly special. I think everyone in the room, including all the water bureau and everyone who visits them knows the quality that's there. I don't think we'll ever, ever see the quality again that's shown in the workmanship there once we do away with them.

*****: Can you switch to the other mike?

*****: Ok. Well, how about both of them?

Katz: No, no.

*****: How's that?

Katz: Go ahead.

Geller: It's very frustrating not to be able to hear. All right. So we researched, we researched, we talked to communities, we found that there are alternatives that would address the perceived -- we'd like to emphasize perceived, and it's a hasty decision that was made under duress, and there are perceived mandate coming down. But these have been perceived for many years. I'd like to see us wait until we know what the federal government wants us to do before we move ahead. So some of Portland's most famous names, ladd, corbett, reed and failing, their pictures hang, many of them in your office, mayor Katz, because they were mayor here. They put theirs and their taxpayers money

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

on the line to bring the water we have today. No other public worrying in the state is as well documented as the reservoirs system and the bull run. And I think a lot of you know that. Our library archives are packed with documents. I've been reading those documents, doing the research for the history, and your names are already there, making history. And people that clip those little articles and stick them in there, they're there. So I'd like to see your names be up there with the champions that helped to do the best that's ever possible for these reservoirs. Some argue, and -- that it's enough to have documentation of the reservoirs, and that's what the historical process is about, is documentation. We don't believe that that's enough. To just document them. Some would say it's enough to leave a building here, a piece of fence there, a pair of -- a wall there, we don't feel that's enough. We feel we need to look carefully at whatever we do. During these stressful times, other mayors have had, and commissioners have had stressful times. The city leaders contemplated covering the reservoirs after pearl harbor was bombed. It was a very big deal, and they went through a lot of stress, and in the cold war, in the era of duck and cover, the commissioners sat like you and wondered what to do about the reservoirs. And then most recently, the vietnam war era, the flower children were up there and that's why we don't drive up to the top anymore of mt. Tabor park, because of all the flower children. People were worried there was going to be l.s.d. In the water, and there's lots of fun articles to read about during these times. But we're very fortunate right now that for the park centennial committee, for -- because the reservoirs are still there, in Washington and mt. Tabor parks, because the big machinery has not begun to roll. Our parks are not going to look good, mt. Tabor is going to be in a big mess for five years, and that's a big issue. So I just know that those people coming to that conference would love to buy postcards of mt. Tabor and Washington park if we had them available, because they are so special. So are the reservoirs worthy of special consideration or are they purely water storage vessels? We need to decide that. We all need to get on the same page about that, because that is the crucial issue here as far as we're concerned. I want to read you a quote from the draft of the section 106 document, I don't know how familiar you are with the document. This is something that has to be filed to the federal energy regulatory commission that the water bureau has to file in regards to some changes in licensing up there, because there's a generating plant between reservoir 5 and 6 that generates electricity, it's income producing, Washington park and mt. Tabor parks are income producing parks. They both have hydroelectric plants, they both have ways of making money, so we'd like to point that out as a way to help preserve the reservoirs. But anyway, let me read this quote to you. The open reservoirs have been an integral part of the mt. Tabor environment for over 100 years. The reservoirs, the reservoir gate houses, the walls, the wrought iron fencing and posts are all historically and aesthetically notable. They're significant as functional components of the water system as well as symbols of the importance of that system to the development of this city from a small town, to a large metropolis. With their picture effect structures, the reservoirs are also a vital landscape element within mt. Tabor park that. Was written in december 2002. I could bore you to death with lots of documentation, just like that. And I'm going to keep it to one, but I could go on the rest of the night there. Are so many documents. The ditto for the same thing would be Washington park. If they had to do the section 106 document. So anyway, there's -- I want to tell you there's the -- the reservoirs fallen to the top 52 properties eligible for city historical status. We have reservoir 2 that was demolished and sold, another income producer. We've sold out the whole corner of mt. Tabor park for housing. That's another income producer. We need to really take a close look at mt. Tabor park. It's being whittled away. Portland sustainability warrants careful scrutiny of demolishing such a well-built reserve. I know some people feel they were going to replace them in 20 years, but documents read these are strong and good until 2050. Is this sustainability, to destroy something that was so well built that my children will be in their 60's before the city council may have to look at this again? So I want to finish up, I can tell my time is

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

coming to a close, so I want to say that the reservoirs were built with the city beautiful movement. And this was a time when things were a mess in the city all around the country, people wanted beautiful things, and nothing could be built in a public work in the city beautiful movement that did not have beauty and utility built in. I pray that Portland can become a leader in the city beautiful movement again. I understand our city beautiful whatever it was called is going downhill, and I'd like to see us rise together and get that going again. They coined a term, beauty. There's no other public work in the whole country that meets this term the way our reservoirs do. So they fulfilled their mission with beauty and grace and they deserved to be honored in any process that will seek to change them. We must -- I quote, to be good stewards of Portland's infrastructure and mindful of the legacy we leave behind for future generations. We maintain and enhance the livability of Portland in the face of pressures and challenges. And that's from our creed here in Portland. So let me close with saying that there are many ways to -- I have to tell you, this building was built after -- in 1895, after the reservoirs were built. And this is one of the reasons why the city was put on the map, because of the great water system from the Bull Run. So something in -- another quote was from your quote here for taking care of the city hall, the heart of our city from 1998, take care of this wonderful building. Consider it a historic call artifact and treat it as though it were a priceless heirloom, passed down personally for our use, because it is. We're stewards of this building, charged with its preservation. End of quote. And I feel that is exactly like the reservoirs. So should -- how do we go about making decisions and interpreting information? That's what we need to decide. So thank you so much for your time.

Katz: Thank you.

Valerie Hunter: I'm next. I'm Valerie Hunter, I'm a physician and I'm a member of the Friends of the Reservoir, and I'm going to speak about safety issues. We are all aware that it is your concern for security and safety that has driven the rush to hurry and bury the reservoirs, and we do share that concern. Public safety is a value which cannot be compromised. However, we believe the risks should be put in perspective. We believe it should be possible to balance safety with other values which are held dear by the community. We also believe water and safety are a bigger issue than just the reservoirs, and in fact comprise all of the elements addressed in the system vulnerability assessment and the infrastructure master plan, and those issues are safety, water quality, and reliability. Let's of course look at safety. That's the one that's top on our minds. The public fear is mostly directed toward the threat of a terrorist poisoning the water. If the water is right there. However, this is probably the least important of the threats which face our water. Why is that? Water is a very inefficient way to deliver a biological warfare agent. There has never been a successful bioterrorist attack on a public water supply. The most efficient way to deliver every agent is an aerosol. Think anthrax powder in the rose garden. Most biological warfare agents are rendered ineffective by chlorination or would require enormous quantities to overcome the dilution effect. It would take about 5,000 pounds of cyanide to poison the smallest reservoirs, and 10,000 pounds after nerve gas agent. I will concede that there are biological toxins which are very potent, and would -- and could in small quantities poison a large body of water. These toxins, however, mostly can be produced only in a biological weapons laboratory. These toxins are inactivated by reverse osmosis, which is used by the army in its field units. Reverse osmosis is a form of filtration. Which can in fact eliminate most harmful biological agents from water. The issue that's scary to me is this one, the notion of a backflow attack, which was -- is a low-tech kind of attack which could be initiated from any tap or fire hydrant in the city. There can never be absolute security as long as this possibility exists. However, poisoning the water although scary, is just not a likely scenario. More likely is something low tech like this, blow up the infrastructure, and by the infrastructure, I mean bridges and trestles which bring the water, and if there were one single treatment plant that were to treat all of our water, then that also would be an attractive target, which

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

suggests that a distributed treatment such as treatment at the outlet, would be a safer solution and less of a target. Cyberattack. Water quality. Let's talk about water quality. That is, what about the duck poop? [laughter] you will be reassured to know that the federal government is intensely interested in water quality and has in fact promulgated many rules about this subject, and new ones are on the way. The impending federal regulation that's we've heard about are actually performance standards which I believe we could currently meet. And have to do with contaminants in the water, and viruses which are inactivated by chlorine. It certainly makes sense to wait and find out what the actual rule says before acting on it. The good news is Portland's water quality record can speak for itself. I'm quoting from the open reservoir study, water quality evaluation, which was one enormous volume of a five-volume study. Which looked at different water quality issues.

Sediment samples collected from the bottom of the reservoirs, no organic contaminants detected in the sediment. No giardia cysts detected in any sample. Viruses not thought to be a hazard because of chlorination, and the poor ability of animal viruses to be transmitted to humans. Aesthetic contaminants, that's the tennis balls. Not found to pose a human health risk. And here's the really good news, no waterborne disease outbreak or water quality incident of public health significance has ever been recorded in connection with Portland's open reservoirs. But that does bring us to the ducks. The ducks are at least an aesthetic problem if not a documented health concern. However, it doesn't take 64 million dollars to deal with ducks. Here is a low tech solution being used in Canada.

These are bird wires, which are very effective at keeping the birding away from water. Let's talk about other issues of safety. Notably, reliability. I believe risks should be put into context as there is not an infinite amount of money to spend on risk reduction, and the money should be targeted to where it will do the most good. The system vulnerability analysis states a major recurring hazard to our water supply is storms and landslides. These are real and immediate concerns, not theoretical ones. Let's look at our water supply. We have Bull Run, which brings by gravity the water through three big type pipes across six miles of landslide zone, across bridges and trestles. And then there's the backup system, the wellfield, which requires electricity and dikes. There have been some near misses. 1995 head works landslide took out a bridge which took with it conduits two and four, conduit three was using -- was bringing the water backed up by the wellfield, then a power outage shut down the wellfield. Not for long, our engineers are professionals and are on the job. This was not a long-standing outage, but it does seem to me to qualify at least as a near miss. In 1996, there was a rain on snowstorm which shut down the Bull Run with turbidity. We switched over to the well field, but then the same storm caused a flood on the Columbia River, which threatened the dikes.

The dikes were not breached, once again our engineers were on the job. But that also would seem to me to comprise a near miss. The vulnerability analysis list says its first seven concerns, and these are the five that were listed as high priority, all issues that deal with seismic stability, mechanical reliability of the well field, the Bull Run conduits, its bridges and river crossings. What is risk? The notion of risk and security are political issues not engineering ones. It is not possible for all the money in the world to eliminate all risks. It is therefore up to communities to understand what risks they face with the magnitude of each risk is, what the competing risks are, and what they want to spend to control these risks. I believe the real risk to our water supply is aging infrastructure and delayed maintenance. I am not trying to persuade you that we do not need to do anything at all to upgrade our water supply. I just believe that the issue is a bigger one than just the reservoirs, and I also believe that the issue is not so you are Jeff Kent that we must rush into action before all aspects of the problem have been concerned -- considered, and all the alternatives were examined. Speaking of alternatives, --

Chad Biasi: Good evening, my name is Chad, I am not in the Mt. Hood neighborhood area, I live in Southeast. I'm here to speak to you about your hasty decision to bury the reservoirs. The city council made its decision based on information provided to it by its consultant, a consultant with a

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

invested interest in the money. A review of the alternative analysis document shows that not all credible alternatives were actually presented to council. In fact, the document makes assumptions about the future shape of the water system, which are actually political decisions which is not yet been finalized. Decisions about the size of the system whether or where to do treatment and how much storage is needed is under which scenario. Here are some cities which have come to their own solutions to the problem of how to balance safety, quality, and the love of the people for their open water. This is pittsburgh, which underwent a decade of fines holding off building floating covers until technology caught up and provided a solution. They chose a treatment as -- at the outlet. This is a microfiltration plant nestled against 100-year-old high land park one reservoir. The reservoir, the water in the reservoir is considered unfinished water until it flows through the plant. The plant costs \$14 million. For the building and the treatment facility. An additional 14 million was spent on infrastructure upgrades to the reservoirs and the pipes. This is new york's hillview reservoir, which holds finished unfiltered water. As you can see, there's a walking path and highway next to this water. New york was considering building a cover, but is now favoring u.v. Treatment at the outlet. Here is a city that took its reservoirs offline and now uses it for fire and emergency storage. Boston and encino chose the same solution. This is the dam with the sidewalk at the hollywood reservoir. Here's another view of the pedestrians using the walkway. I think we all would think that pittsburgh, boston, encino and hollywood, california, are larger targets than Portland. [laughter] what other solutions exist? Is there some combination of all site -- off-site storage and treatment at the outlet that could be considered? What is the impact of the rapidly advancing technology of online monitoring? Here you have a new cover on a reservoir, I don't even know where this was at. This is the same type of reservoir cover four years after it was installed. Pretty nice. I could see that at Washington park. Here's worms, cockroaches, maggots, and decomposing plants and animal matter, they've all been found on this floating covered reservoir. Pretty nice. So what would you like? Would you like this? [laughter] or would you like this? [laughter] we believe that there's considerable unexplored alternatives. Treatment at the outlet, like they did at pittsburgh and new york, offline storage, like they did at hollywood, boston, and encino, alternatives or supplemental sites, bypass our reservoirs entirely? Our position is that we think the city should slow down. All options have not been presented. Alternatives -- alternative storage plans, treatment outlets, emerging technologies allow for a genuine public process to consider options. The p.a.c. Is not made up of the public, but hand-picked by the water bureau. When rationally examined, these actions make no sense at all. Thank you.

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

Moore: Please come up four at a time.

Katz: For those of how have not been here before, there's a little timer on the screen, and that will give you your three minutes, and then there will be a very low buzz, and I will try to interrupted you and allow to you finish your thought, but then we'll have to move on. Jeff, why don't you go ahead. start here

Jeff Boley: My name is jeff boley, i'm a chairman of the arlington heights open reservoir committee. This is not about public safety. Because public safety is a given. We all care about public safety. The real questions are these. First, what is the true magnitude of the risk to public safety? Second, what is the incremental increase in safety that the proposal will produce? Third, is that incremental benefit worth the cost in dollars? Fourth, what other nonmonetary costs will the proposal produce such as the impact on open space, surrounding residents, the environment, and historic and scenic resources? Fifth, how do we balance public safety with these nonmonetary costs? The answer to this fifth question is found in our well-established land use laws. No matter what you ultimately decide, it will be a land use decision under state law that can be appealed in court. For the reasons set forth in a february 14, 2003, already to you that I -- our request be placed

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

in the record of this hearing and which you have before you, I believe that the correct decision regarding the land use issues is that either covering or burying any of the reservoirs requires a conditional use permit. Before you make your decision, I believe there must first be a process that answers all of these five questions. I also believe these questions are of such importance, they will require significant time to answer and that we have no alternative but to take whatever time is necessary before you make the decision. Once the process is complete, what do we want? First, we want the reservoirs preserved and open. And a second priority, but the first is by far the most important, a second priority is that we want the reservoirs to remain a functional part of our water system if possible. We believe the reservoirs can remain open and be made safe for much less than the currently budgeted water rate increases. Our mantra is, open, safety, and savings.

Katz: Thanks, jeff. Katherine, can we get an e-mail on the issue jeff just raised with regard to a conditional use?

Kathryn Beaumont: I believe there are discussions ongoing internally, and I think when those have been resolved we can make the results of those known to you.

Katz: All right. Thanks.

*****: My name is katherine, and i'm the secretary treasurer --

Katz: You're going to have to talk right in the mike. Jeff, move the other mike closer to her. Ok.

Kathryn Notson, Secretary Treasurer, South Tabor Neighborhood Association: My name is katherine, i'm the secretary/treasurer for the south tabor neighborhood association. In my documentation I have a list of neighborhoods on that first page. I will not read that here, because i'm going to read what I have written on the other pages. The south tabor neighborhood association discussed the open reservoir replacement project on september 19, 2002, and january 16, 2003. There were 14 people, including board members -- there were 14 south tabor neighbors at these meetings. No one in attendance at either meeting objected to the mt. Tabor park open reservoir replacement project. The neighborhood association board received e-mails from three south tabor residents since january 16, 2003, objects to this project. Only one dissenting resident attended the september 19, 2002 meeting but did not raise objections at that time. On february 3, 2003, southeast uplift district coalition board voted on the friends of the reservoirs resolution this. Resolution contains objections to the process which determined the decision to bury the water in the reservoirs under -- in underground tanks as well as the process to determine what will go over the top of the tanks above ground. The south tabor delegate voted against the resolution. The delegate for the other neighborhood abstained from voting from this resolution. There were only nine out of 20 neighborhood association delegates who voted in favor of the resolution. Broke lynn, crestin and reed currently do not have reputation on the board. There were six neighborhood delegates who were absent. Center, eastmoreland, foster-powell, laurelhurst, richmond and sunnyside. Therefore the resolution was not approved unanimously, nor was it endorsed unanimously by the southeast uplift district coalition board. This was a presumptive statement typed on the resolution draft at the top of the page which was mailed to southeast uplift board members prior to the february 3, 2003, southeast uplift district coalition board meeting. Now, about the reservoirs in specific. Reservoir 1 was built in 1894. This reservoir is no longer to be used as part of the city drinking water system and will not be touched. It will remain as is. Reservoirs 5 and 6 were built in 1911. The volcanic cone was discovered in 1913. Two years after the construction of the reservoirs. The latter two reservoirs are 92 years old and damaged and deteriorating from natural aging and erosion. The fencing is dented and rusting and the walls are crumbling. While there has been no report to my knowledge of leakage, those who remember reservoir 2 near southeast division street and southeast 60th avenue recall it leaked. It was drained and sold to a developer who built courtyard plaza residential center and courtyard senior assisted living center.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Katz: Your time is up. Why don't you complete -- don't read it, but you've got certain points you can share with us.

Notson: Ok. My point is that the security is weak, and as the photograph that is even noted that the people standing around the reservoirs, any one of those 800 people standing there could have thrown something in the water. Although they had no intent to do so, that could have happened. That is a picture that portrays how close those people can get in spite of cameras and guards.

Katz: Thank you.

*******:** Yes. And --

Katz: We've got your testimony.

*******:** Ok.

Katz: I know you spent time trying to summarize the neighborhood association. I appreciate that. We'll read the testimony.

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

Pedro Ferdel-Azcarate: Mayor, commissioner, people of Portland, my name is Pedro, I live and work in southeast Portland, and I'm a member of my local neighborhood association, business association and several community organizations. I'm also on the board of southeast uplift, though I'm speaking as an individual tonight. And there was quorum at that meeting in the proposal -- and the proposal passed. But that's another issue. The water bureau has been circulating their formula to suggest that security risks exist that justify the burial of the Mt. Tabor reservoirs. This is the -- what they've been circulating. It's pretty simple. It goes like this -- viable agents, plus credible threats, plus significant consequences, equals a security risk. Unfortunately, not all the factors are accounted for in this very simple formula. They won't share with us or ask our opinion, we, the public who would be affected, what are those credible threats. Further, there are airborne biological agents that may be considered viable weapons of mass destruction. I just learned about this feedback system or flowback system. What about the Bull Run water shed? How are we going to protect the whole watershed? There are larger implications here. Using this formula, we're setting ourselves up to allow all of our public places to be defined as security risks. We the public must not lose our right to speak for our public spaces. Tonight we have the opportunity to demonstrate true leadership on this issue. Let's not let divisiveness and fear be our guide. I think everyone in this room agrees on some basic level that Portland, Oregon, is providing a clear vision and true leadership towards our American future. It's our common vision. Let's localize our real security threats and use our common sense in our neighborhoods. People are more likely to be killed in automobile fatalities than by some mysterious terror plot. People are without homes, the school year is being shortened, health care is being cut, etc. This multimillion dollar reservoir issue is not about security, it's about insecurity. The solution -- here in Portland, I believe we value community involvement, communication, a transparent public process, and the common sense leadership of our elected officials. Thank you. Gracias.

Katz: Thank you. [applause]

*******:** Good evening, Madam Mayor, members of the council. Thank you. I'm not here representing --

Katz: Identify yourself.

Chet Orloff, Chair, Public Advisory Committee: I am Chet Orloff, chair of the public advisory committee. I'm not here representing one side or another of the discussion that you're hosting this evening. But rather here to represent the public advisory committee, who is not handpicked by the water bureau, I should say. I'm on that committee representing the park board and other members are representing neighborhood associations and other parts of the city. Looking at this truly regional park. You should know that the decision that you have to make, which is a difficult one, will not necessarily affect the work of your committee, the public advisory committee. Either way,

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

you decide this decision, we will have our work cut out for us. Because whether or not the reservoirs are covered, there is substantial work that needs to be done to restore these, renovate these reservoirs, and the park to the omesteadian tradition and vision they were laid out in. I don't have written testimony for you because you're going to receive an awful lot of paper from the public advisory committee in the months ahead. We intend to give you regular briefings on our work. We have I think great ambition. As I say, either way, the decision comes out, I think we have the opportunity in this park to, as I say, reestablish that great tradition that we have in this city, a great tradition of open reservoirs, and maintaining most importantly I think the character of this park, which is not just distinct, but unique. And it's our objective as a public advisory committee to hold to that vision, to bring the best minds, the best visionaries we can to the city, and others within the city to the table to help the committee, to help the city, to help the neighborhood maintain that character, enhance it, restore it, to that vision that I think we all share. Thank you.

Francesconi: I just want to publicly thank you and the committee for doing this. I'm not sure you fully appreciated what was going to happen when you decided to do it. But the plan all along, and as commissioner Sten reinforced, you'll give us regular briefings, and this will be approved before any of the money --

Orloff: Thank you. I will take your appreciation back to the members of the committee.

Katz: Thanks.

Orloff : I actually intended to say just one thing to chet.

Leonard: I don't know that everybody realizes you're the former executive director of the Oregon historical society. So for me, I have been yearning to hear a balanced approach to this issue that you're bringing with your historical perspective of the city, balanced with your understanding of some of the other issues that we've been hearing about. So I am really happy you're involved, and really looking forward to hearing what you have to say as the process goes on, chet, thank you.

Orloff: Thank you. And I would say I believe the other members of the public advisory committee are also, they also share this perspective, this objectivity and this interest in I think everything that's been expressed this evening is -- as a matter of fact. Thank you.

Katz: Thanks, chet.

Caroline Whyte: My name is caroline, thank you for letting me talk. I was born in belfast, northern ireland, in 1971. I lived there until 1984. I've been back a lot of times since. Around the time I was born, there were a number of particularly savage terrorist attacks. The british government reacted to these attacks in an understandable but tragically flawed way. They interned a large number of people without trial, set up checkpoints and surrounded buildings in wire. I believe these buildings came to be considered a challenge by terrorist and they were targeted more as a result. For example, I remember a police station near where I lived which looked completely invulnerable but was badly bombed, with many people killed. Things have improved a lot in northern ireland now. There's a peace process. The soldiers have mostly gone, there's no more internment, the concrete is gone too. It's much more relaxed than it used to be, though it's still not perfect, of course. It seems clear a major reason for the improvements there is that there's much more economic and political justice than there used to be. There's much greater confidence in the political system. People are less willing to resort to violence. When the persons attacked it's natural to react by lashing out at anyone who appears to be a threat, while becoming overprotective of the things we love. Please remember this country is not actually isolated and alone. And 9-11 was not the first terrorist attack ever to occur. If we cover things in concrete, unfortunately that won't protect us from terrorism ultimately. However, history and the experiences of others who have had to deal with similar situations are a tremendous resource and in fact hold the only key to getting beyond the tragedy of 9-11. I feel very lucky to live in Portland. I moved here only four months ago and in large part I decided to come here because of its impressive legacy of planning. I

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

think this city is truly visionary in many ways. I've had a lot of luck in traveling, I've traveled a lot of places and lived in a lot of places, and I think Portland in its quiet unpretentious way is a real gem. The core of its strength is emphasis on public process. If a society is to be considered truly democratic its water needs to be controlled by its people or it would die very quickly if I couldn't get water. So we cannot have unaccountability making decisions about our water. Our water bureaus are our employees and should do what we ask them to do. If the public thinks the reservoirs need to be covered they should be covered. But it should be the public's choice. So I urge the city council to do the right thing and follow the proud legacy of the city's planners by having a truly public decision-making process. I should make clear in my opinion, covering the reservoir was simply draw more attention to them as a target. It's like forcing women to wear the veil to cover up. It makes you safer, but in fact it draws attention to any vulnerability you have and it also makes the world a duller place. We need to address the real causes of terrorism. Thank you for your attention.
[applause]

Jim Abrahamson: Good evening, Mayor Katz, and the members of the council. My name is Jim, and I'm a resident of southeast Portland. Also for the record, I am not currently employed by or a consultant to anybody or any organization. [laughter] I'm here to speak in support of the security package that includes the replacement of the exposed reservoirs on Mt. Tabor with secured underground storage. Replacing this infrastructure with secure underground storage should have been done 30 years ago when the matter was analyzed and discussed in detail by the Portland city council. A generation ago city council concern was contamination from animals, airborne matters and human pitches debris over the fence or occasionally taking a swim. The cause of concern today is far greater. The council has been briefed in secure sessions on the methods that enemies of our way of life could use those reservoirs as could be due to it's for mass sickness or death. I have been informed by credible professionals that the threat is real and should not be underestimated. Some contend Portland is an insignificant target for attack. I disagree. Portland's unprotected drinking water system offers an avenue of attack unique in the nation for its easy accesses and good odds that the perpetrators of poison can escape. As more communities harden their drinking water structure against attack, Portland moves higher on the target list. Terrorists are the ultimate opportunists. If the nation could be further unnerved by easy operation in a mid-sized city with high odds of success and possibly even escape, they'll do it. The consequence of contaminating the old reservoirs doesn't even have to end with one sickness to have significant impact. That could be the attack on a cherished symbol of our success, the generation of national headlines and the further erosion of confidence in government to protect citizens from our enemies. Please don't beat the council that has reviewed -- decision to improve the security of our drinking water in an age we now know to be increasingly dangerous and deadly. Replacing the exposed and aging reservoirs on Mt. Tabor with underground storage is the right thing to do. Most of the cost of the capital project is already in rates. And the wonderful new park space at the underground reservoirs will create could include appropriate reflexes of the legacy of the outdated open reservoirs. Thank you very much.

Katz: Karla?

Moore: Is there a Scott Bayla I missed?

Katz: Lloyd, why don't you start.

Lloyd Anderson: Mayor Katz, members of the council. It's a pleasure to be here.

Katz: Many of you may not know, Lloyd Anderson sat on this side of the table many, many years ago. For many, many years. And the water commissioner. As an engineer.

Anderson: That's right.

Katz: And I don't know what he's going to say. Why don't you move the mike closer to you.

Anderson: I'm Lloyd Anderson. My address is number 11 Oregon Yacht Club, Portland, Oregon. So I live on the water. I favor covered -- covering the reservoirs. I was on the Portland city council

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

during the vietnam war, and at least for part of the time had the responsibility for the water system. At the time, protests against the war and -- were mounting, and while most of the opposition was at a national level, some was local, including the blowing up of the very council chambers where we're sitting now. The threat of the water system seemed real. The council met, discussed it, and we considered covering the reservoirs at that time. And we proposed them -- covering them with a water feature so that in fact the appearance of the reservoirs was substantially what it is now. We dropped the project for several reasons, which I could develop if you want, but the point is it was dropped. In my opinion, the threat is greater now than it was then, and from a wider range of sources. With changing technology, the contamination could be more devastating. Open reservoirs are inherently more vulnerable than covered reservoirs, with or without immediate terrorist threat, I believe prudent public policy leads to covering reservoirs in urban areas where public access is as close -- is as close proximity as it is here in Portland. I think the major point i'd make is that the covering can be done with skill and sensitivity, so that it will have little or no negative impact on a very environmentally rich asset of our city.

Katz: Would you share with us why the issue was dropped during that time?

Anderson: The war, the vietnam war kind of came and then went, and so the public fear began to diminish as the feeling of terrorist activity diminished. The council had rate increases, which in fact they adopted, but shortly thereafter you had huge inflation occurring that wiped away really much of the resources to do anything. So you had a mixed bag of different reasons why they dropped, and the fact was that for my own stand point, I moved to port director, and so I didn't have a position where I could follow up.

Katz: Thank you.

*******:** Hi. My name is john beamer.

Katz: Into the mike.

Jon Biemer: Jon biemer, it's an honor to address the council. I'm a federal employee. I don't represent my agency, so I won't even give the name of it. But I think of myself as a bureaucrat. I think I am trained as an engineer, and I work as a program manager, and I like to think of myself as a public servant, and i've been doing that kind of work for over 20 years. So I have a sense of the planning and perseverance and time and dedication to -- it takes to get to this point in a public process. The analysis that went into the decision was extensive. I also have a sense that you're getting plenty of advice from your legal people about exposing yourselves, the city, and the people to risks from life and lawsuits. And so I think it's very appropriate for you to be paying attention to that. I also know how very, very frustrating it is when protests come along. Ok, that said, I have three points. When the public doesn't want something, it matters. And I think you're getting messages of that. I thought I was alone at first when I heard of this process to cover the reservoirs, and i'm seeing more and more protests, and it brought me out of the woodwork. I don't want it. The second point is that if we let this concern about terrorism overwhelm us into spending the great amount of money we're considering spending, they win. We have to consider that we have to have - - take control over our lives. And third, the lawyers and the engineers can be very helpful when you tell them what you want. [laughter] if the people are willing to take the risk, the lawyers and engineers will figure out a way to do it in a good way. There is a precedent in my experience, and that's in the city much phoenix. Years ago there was a freeway planned across the center of town. It would have split neighborhoods and all that sort of thing. Would it have been paid for 95% by federal money -- would it have been paid for by federal money. They put night a referendum just to see how the city felt about it. It got voted down and the city council decided to honor the referendum. I don't know how this city will go on that, but I do say that you are getting a protest. Thank you.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Francesconi: Just one thing, sir. I want to clarify, the issue of safety, which you're -- many people here are also concerned about, has been raised, the engineers have raised that, as others. As far as I know, the lawyers, maybe they should have, but we have not gotten any advice on the legal side of this.

Biemer: If you ask them, they'll tell you, cover the reservoir.

Francesconi: But the point is that's not happened. So I want you to be clear about that.

Biemer: I accept that.

Sten: Could I ask you a question too? Could I ask just about anybody, I want to get a sense, I know you don't speak for everyone, but if you take the premise, and just for this question, take it that these reservoirs need a major investment at some point. People are going to argue exactly when that is, but I think it's somewhat hard to escape that at some point it's like a roof, you might have five years, you might have 20 years, once it starts leaking you have to spend a fair amount of money. With your -- would your position be that we ought to revamp them and keep them like they are, or is it that we ought to honor the look of them? I'm not saying this as well as I'd like. We're going to have to invest a lot of money in these reservoirs at some point, and I'm struggling with the different positions to think, is the argument this is a great way to store water, it's kind of -- and we ought to keep doing it this way, or we ought to stretch this out for a while, or is it we ought to honor the park? Your testimony is heart felt and I want to try to get at what's the heart of it?

Biemer: I'd like to sit here and come up with an extremely wise answer. And I -- and I appreciate the question. I have to say that my personal opinion is my personal opinion. And things change. At one point I wasn't even going to bother with being involved in any of the protests, because it's not as high on my importance like the war in Iraq or social something or other else. This is basically something that's about the character of the city. And I think it's important. So I think that honoring the will of the people is my priority, and not my personal sense assist an engineer about how we ought to do it. As a matter of fact I'll go one step further. I'll say the real solutions have to come from the inside. They're the ones that know the details. Us, the people on the outside, can push, can set goals, can draw boundaries.

Sten: Thanks.

Katz: What agency do you work for? [laughter] tell us, because --

Biemer: I work for Bonneville Power Administration.

Katz: Thank you. Thank you for your public service for all these years. You're a good bureaucrat. [laughter]

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

Scott Vala: Members of the council, my name is Scott Vala, I'm a member of the board of Mt. Scott Arleta Association, and chairman of the board of Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Program. I'm not here to speak for or against the covering of the reservoir. We're just here for one issue, and that issue alone. As you probably know, Southeast Uplift is the largest of the neighborhood coalition representing 20 neighborhoods in Southeast Portland from inner to outer. Partly due to our size, we're constantly receiving requests for support in endorsements of all types of projects and issues. There's been times when we felt like we were almost overwhelmed with all the different issues and support people would like and help from us. We're very careful about what we support, and when we do it we try to do the best we can. We take that very seriously. As a result of our commitment, we've developed criteria that all proposals must meet before they're even considered. The proposal we have here met those requirements and was then discussed by our executive committee at their meeting. It was unanimously approved by the executive committee and passed on to the general board membership at our February meeting. At that meeting, it was also attended by a water bureau representative and a representative from Commissioner Saltzman's office. The resolution did pass by an overwhelming majority of the board. The board members present, and most of us have many

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

opinions about many aspects of this project, we tried to stay focus on the public involvement issue of this subject. Not on the covering of the reservoirs. We also feel it's very important to recognize the process of the p.a.c. And the process they are using to kind of finalize and look to see what ends up on top of the reservoir, whatever the outcome of this project. We think they're doing a very good job with this project, and southeast uplift has taken an active part in this process. We're only addressing what we feel is the expectation as well as the right of all citizens in this city to a timely, open, and meaningful discussion of any project that affects their lives as much as anything this size does. That is why we're presenting this resolution. The main points of which are -- i'll skip down, whereas the city of Portland has long held public participation as an integral part of policy making, this project significantly departing from that commitment, therefore be it resolved that the southeast uplift neighborhood program respectfully requests that the city council halt both the planning process and the implementation of the burial of Portland's open reservoirs, including the adoption of any additional contract agreements and that the city council initiate a well designed and open public process to allow for a full discussion and thorough evaluation of the technical policy and financial issues relevant to the proposal to bury the reservoirs. As well as the more comprehensive system -- comprehensive system issues that form the context for this project. I also brought with me a resolution that was passed by the buckman community association, which is very similar to ours. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you.

Saltzman: I want to clarify one point. You're mentioned it was adopted by an overwhelming majority of the board. Then you said present.

Vala: Our account --

Saltzman: It was not the majority --

Vala: It was a majority of the board.

Saltzman: Present.

Vala: As well as the board. There was 11 votes for the resolution. The way I have it.

Saltzman: I count ten, and you have a 20-member board.

Vala: I have 11.

Saltzman: It's not a majority of the board, but a majority of those present.

Vala: Yes, it was.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: Are you ready to go? Why don't you go ahead, then.

Chris Morance: My name is chris morance.

Katz: You're going to have to move up.

Morance: I've lived in the arlington heights neighborhood of Portland for 28 years. I feel deeply grateful for the beauty of our city and parks. The area of Washington park about reservoir -- around reservoir 3 has been a special place for me and my daughter, and it's a place that I treasure for walks in the evening when the reflection of the lights in the reservoir makes me feel astounded at the beauty of this feature, and its masterful incorporation into the natural setting of the hills. I'm going to depart from my written talk here because I want to not repeat things that you've heard many times here and concentrate on several things i'd like to reiterate; including talking about the covers, which is close to my heart, because of that particular reservoir being targeted for very quickly in this plan for floating covers. First, regarding the decision that was made to bury the mt. Tabor reservoir and put temporary covers, as we understand it, when council was presented with the menu of alternatives, they were not presented with at that point the -- what we consider very viable alternative of outlet treatment. You've heard that dismissed here, but it is I think a very important alternative to consider. It may not treat every possible toxin, but no system we have is going to be 100% safe. It does satisfy the requirements and the regulations, which are coming up, if that's a

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

question about legality. And it's very interesting to hear, which I just heard, that the hillview reservoir in new york, which is -- I would think be considered a greater target than the city of Portland, is opting for outlet filtration, they're not going to be able to have setbacks. They have a major highway that goes directly by that outlet. You've heard it's more expensive. I think that all those issues need to be looked at in detail. The first basis of comparison in saying it's an equally good option to bury the reservoirs has assumed that the aesthetic result is equivalent between burying the reservoirs and treatment at the outlet, burying the reservoirs because you can put several reflecting ponds on top of several of the reservoirs, and I think those of us who are close to the reservoirs can tell you that the experience of deep water, the aesthetic quality of the reservoir, and not going -- is not going to be replaced with a shallow reflecting pond. I suggest you all visit some if you have any question about that. Let alone ones the size of such a reservoir 3.

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

*****: Ok. Then i'll --

Katz: Do you have written testimony you want to leave with us?

Morance: I'll leave my testimony, yes.

Katz: Thank you.

Gary Kelly: I'm gary kelly, I am a vice-president of oracle, right across the street. An engineer. So the previous bureaucrat I can speaker took some of my thunder, but I work in an engineering organization. We constantly change what we do, and if you don't as leaders recognize the facts that bureaucracies will keep building whatever they're building, whether it's useful or not, whether it's wanted or not, then you're missing something. At oracle we have to regularly shoot bureaucracies or they keep building things people don't want. It's just a way of life. When I was attending some of the meetings discussing the process by which the decision to bury the reservoirs came out of, this was a narrowly focused engineering decision. Based on relative safety of putting water in a can versus leaving it open. None of the other elements of natural beauty, open space in our urban environment which is getting more pressure, none of those things were factored in. That was going to be later. A different organization would look at it. So I will just echo the concerns of the previous person from bonneville, that somebody has to tell that bureaucracy to get with the parks people, get with the people who value the spiritual values of open space in our urban environment and get them to work together. They won't work together unless you do that. Because it's not in their mind-set as engineers to do anything but put water in a can. [laughter] the other aspect is security. Security with a \$20 pump a terrorist can terrorize the city by pumping stuff into the water system. That was brought up earlier. A terrorist can take a milk canister and fill it with gasoline and go onto a bus and terrorize a city. There's a million ways a terrorist can terrorize a city, far more effectively than dumping something in the reservoir. More cheaply. The issue is about duck poop. The engineers care about duck poop. And they'll bury it in a can just because of duck poop. We've lived with duck poop for over 100 years, and it's fine. [laughter] the other issue is, will this reservoir structure last? I was in rome last year, I can tell you that concrete lasts over a thousand years. 3 aqua ducts there that have been operating for a long, long time. The -- so that's engineering, security -- and finally, it's the p.a.c.

Katz: Make your point quickly.

Kelly: Ok. The p.a.c. Leads you to believe that we can put a reflecting pond on top and it will be the same. I've been told that that will probably not happen for a number of reasons. The cost, the fact you'd have untreated water on top of treated water, the land grab that will happen for nonopen space values, because southeast Portland needs land for many, many uses. So there's pressure for soccer fields and dog runs, and skateboard park and other things. It's highly unlikely that people are going to produce something as aesthetically valuable to this community as that park ever again, and there's no park in the world like it.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Katz: Thank you. [applause] listen, don't fool around with me:

Eric Dickman: Good evening, my name is eric dickman and i've spent -- i'm -- my -- i'm going to depart from my notes because it would be duplicative --

Katz: Let me just in all fairness to you, are you ready to start with your -- ok. Go ahead then. Start his time, then.

Dickman: I've worked for over 25 years in a large bureaucracy, a public utility here in this town. And so I have some experience with the way public utility bureaucracies work. I think it's important that we question some of the positions and statements of the water bureau and make sure that they pass the laugh test. The first one I want to mention is one that has been mentioned before, and that's the hillview reservoir in new york. You can -- the water bureau's rationale for covering our reservoirs is they're such inviting targets. The written position is we're uniquely vulnerable because we're uniquely accessible. That's not true. You can see in the picture that this reservoir is open. 90% of new york city's water comes through that large reservoir. And the water bureau's response is that, well, new york's hillview reservoir is isolated and significantly less accessible. That's not isolated and inaccessible. Our water bureau says that the new york system has made substantial upgrades. You can see that's impossible. So I have to ask, if i'm a terrorist, and I want to place an open source of drinking water, am I going to choose a reservoir in Portland, where I can affect 50,000 people, or hillview, where I can affect millions of people? The bottom line is, Portland's a fabulous place. We have a wonderful asset here. Aren't we suffering from dilutions of grandeur? Thank you.

Floy Jones: Good evening, and forgive me, via cold, so this is going to be tough. My name is floyd jones. I'm going to talk to you about consultant and contracting concerns. There are many in the community that have concerns regarding the appearance of a less objective relationship between the water bureau and the selected consultants on this project. We also have concerns regarding the objectivity of the consultants when providing information about alternatives and costs we -- de -- specifically for our reservoirs. Decisions were made without any public involvement and the consultants rather than the water bureau respond to many of the inquiries made now. We believe that the best decisions for main tagging a safe water supply can be made by our working together to evaluate all of the options. In this paper you've outlined the contract history and although this contracting process may be considered business as usual by the city, citizens who rarely see the inner workings of large projects such as this see biases. I ask that you review this information and consider any appropriate changes. Thank you.

Katz: This is your testimony?

*******:** It is.

Katz: Thank you.

Laura Gordon: Good evening, my name is laura gordon, and I am the water bureau liaison for mt. Tabor neighborhood association. I'm also a member of the p.a.c.

Paul Leistner: And i'm paul, president of the mt. Tabor neighborhood association. And you've heard a lot of people talking about a desire for process. We wanted to do something constructive and give you a process proposal that you can put on the table to consider. One of the things I think you're hearing is that the water bureau and montgomery watson have been working for a number of years on this issue. And they have done what they feel I think is in the public interest, and I think the picture for us is sort of like they have now climbed into the truck, they threw shovels in the back and they're heading off down the road, now you've got a bunch of citizens running along the side of the truck there a they're going down the road shouting out questions to them and asking questions, and they're shouting out information, and people are getting more and more frantic about it. And we think really what needs to happen is they need to stop the truck and they need to get out and we need to sit down and have a discussion about this. And I think what you're finding there are a lot of

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

people who think that maybe there is a good case to be made for burying the reservoirs, but they don't feel there's been a full discussion of it. They don't feel comfortable with that decision right now. And they would like to see a little more process. I think valley -- valerie's presentation with the friends of the reservoirs brought up a bunch of issues that a lot of people would like addressed and possibly settled. So the mt. Tabor neighborhood association is focused on process. We have not taken a position on whether or not to bury the reservoirs, and -- or on what goes on top. We're looking at the process. So we've tried to come up with a proposal for a constructive process to move forward. We feel it's very important to start to rebuild the trust and credibility in the process and to allow the city council to move forward on a course of action that's more broadly understood and supported by the community. And in essence what we're proposing is a limited time process. It's going to be four months, six months, whatever is deemed appropriate, designed and managed by an independent public involvement consultant, supported by an independent engineering consultant, that would bring together the key stakeholders to clarify first, clarify and articulate the public values that are at play. They don't need to agree, but they're important values like high quality drinking water system, system that's protected from malicious contamination, the need to upgrade facilities protect the historical features, get it all out on the table and then under -- in that process, then let's talk about the rest. Let's try to understand what the risk is, and then have the group look at alternatives and rate them on the strengths and weaknesses. And then come back to you guys with that information. It will inform the stakeholders, and then they'll be able to come back and inform you, and you guys may make the decision that, yes, we still want to bury the reservoirs, but I think it will be a much more credible decision at that time, or you may get information that convinces you that maybe a different approach is something you want to try. And we really encourage you to take this into consideration. And we've been working with elaine cogan on this. She facilitated the mt. Tabor park master plan. We know dan knows her, jim knows her. We feel that's important that parks and water know her. And she's on the short list for the master list. You can hire her immediately, get the consultant, and she could do the job. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you, paul.

*****: Thank you. [applause] [gavel pounded] come on, folks.

Katz: Did you want to say anything, laura?

Gordon: I was here mostly to answer questions. Do you have any questions?

Katz: No. We know paul, so --

Gordon: That's fine. Paul and I have worked on this for quite a while. Would I briefly say I have been involved with the water bureau, working with them way before this came up. For over three years. And all along throughout this whole process we've been encouraging them to have good public process. And we have come forward with this proposal at this time because we really feel like it is an issue of trust. And it is an issue of public interest. You know, this issue is going to dog this process from now until it's finished and beyond. If it's not addressed properly. So we tried to put forth a positive solution to how you can move from now and go forward in a good way.

Katz: Thank you. Ok.

Katz: After these three we'll shift, because there are 36 people left to testify, and we'll shift to two minutes.

Peter Wilmarth: My name is peter wilmarth. I'm not a resident of mt. Tabor. I don't belong to any of the organizations. I'm just a citizen who appreciates the parks and the reservoirs. I also want to speak about priorities here. Those of us in the chamber don't realize how much pain is out there. This state is in the worst financial crisis in a generation. Dozens of vital programs, all over the state are being cut and cancelled. My daughter's school is being closed, the school year is being cut, I think the priorities are wrong here. It's irresponsible and the appearance is wrong to dedicate \$75 million and trust me, it will be \$150 million before they're finished, to an infrastructure project

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

at the same time the school system is being ravaged. It's wrong, and it looks wrong. The fact that the cost will be rolled into a water bills suggests that soon Oregon will have both the shortest school year and the highest water rates in the country. And that is just bad policy. I understand that the mt. Tabor plan was sort of a back burner project prior to the september 11th attack. It should remain in that category. We simply can't throw \$65 million at every conceivable terror threat. Reservoir poisoning is a difficult unlikely avenue of attack. If a terrorist is dedicated to poisoning our water, they probably can succeed by finding another inlet to the system. I personally regard that scenario as less likely than a truck bomb or a sniper, and I don't think it's cost effective securitiwise. I'm also not persuaded that poor water quality is a high enough priority to move this project ahead of so many other pressing problems. Nor am I convinced the reservoir replacement is as good an investment as improving maintenance on our aging system of types and other distribution infrastructure. I've heard that the water bureau has a number of other massively expensive projects that they're promoting. The water bureau has been good stewards of the utility, but I think the public needs a more decisive say in these major policy issues. And the city council needs to provide responsible leadership on issues like the mt. Tabor project. Decisions of this magnitude can't be left to the engineers alone. Above all, the city council needs to seek public input and trust on controversial expensive planning issues so they can be decided on their merits. And I am not persuaded by the merits of this project, and I doubt that a majority of voters would approve it if they were given a chance so I think the immediate construction plans should be halted, and there should be a public hearing, and the one option must be preservation of the reservoirs or the city's citizens will feel cheated. And the last point i'll make is, on the security issue, one time a country that felt threatened built an enormous fortunate if I indication. It turned out to be simply something you could go around. I won't say more. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Lois heyng: My name is lois heyng. I have been participating since september in actions to save the reservoirs. I want to share with you the following words from herbert dryside, a water visionary, an urban landscaper. The way water is handled in towns shows more than the mere tech come ingenuity of its citizens. It reflects myth and religion, and shows spiritual constitution of its people. As you know, dryside has been selected by the city of Portland to design a new park in the pearl district. I commend the city for choosing him, because his design will resurrect the water footprints that have so long been buried there. Ironically, while you are encouraging reconnection of citizens to the tanner creek watershed in the pearl district, you are about to abandon the vision of form and function embodied in the open reservoirs. For many citizens, the reservoirs of Portland not only represent, but they are the structures that directly connect us to the bull run watershed. And are integral to a sense of place in Portland. Dryside also laments that technology and aesthetics are usually kept neatly apart as contradictions that cannot be bridged. His body of work refutes this artificial division, as did the olmstead design for the reservoirs. But since september, your message has been loud and clear to we citizens, to us citizens. By saying that citizens can only talk about what goes on top, you are reinforcing that artificial distinction between engineering and design. You have also denied the citizen involvement and integrated planning that dryside so strongly argues for in water projects. I believe we must examine closely what we are about when we choose to destroy our sense of place. Please remember, the public memory is deep for beloved places. We should not be seduced into decisions out of fear in bureaucratic decisions dictates. Our decision should spring forth from the creative and visionary energies that citizens can provide.

Katz: Thank you.

Charles Heyng: My name is charles hine. In the process of working on this as a friend of the reservoir, I came into contact with a person named jeanette newquist. She's elderly and somewhat ill, and she was not able to make it tonight. And she asked me to read this letter to you from her.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Dear mayor and commissioners. First my apologies for not being able to attend tonight as planned. My name is Jeanette Newquist, my address is 6125 Southeast Division Street, Portland. I was born August 23, 1918, at my parents' home on North Simpson Street in Portland. My great grandfather, migrated from Iowa to Portland via covered wagon in 1862. I have a day-to-day diary of his journey from in 1862. He was elected to the first legislature in the new capital building. My father was born in North Portland. He attended Portland schools and graduated from Hill Military Academy. Although he was offered an appointment to Annapolis, he chose to follow a career in Portland as a surveyor. As such, he was part of the team of surveyors who had the opportunity to work on the development of the reservoirs in question. My father was proud of his work and so am I. I am 84 years old, and I have seen so, so many of the interesting old buildings in Portland be torn down for run-of-the-mill replacements. I'm afraid my generation and later generations have not done an adequate job of preserving historic places such as the Old Portland Hotel. Other cities such as Spokane are doing this. Please seriously consider saving this unique piece of architecture for our younger generations to admire and enjoy. I now live in and pass through the area and I know that as heavily used and enjoyed by many on a regular basis. While I recognize fully the threat of terrorism, our country has gone through two world wars without harm to this area. I feel a temporary cover could be used until the threat passes. Please don't destroy the only really interesting and unique thing we have left on the east side of Portland. I feel strongly the money destined for this proposed project could be much better used to cover some of the school budget shortfall. Thank you for your consideration.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: We're going to do -- I know it's somewhat unfair, but we're losing everybody. We're going to do two minutes each. So look at the time and try to time yourself. I apologize. Go ahead. I'm sorry, we have a young man here and we'll let him go first. Are you going to testify?

*******:** Sure.

Katz: We need your name.

Kori Mai: My name is Kori. I'm friends of the reservoir. I was born in my house, and probably one of the first things I ever saw was Mt. Tabor, and I don't want to see that change. I mean, it's going to be perfectly flat, and it's going to be like -- I don't want, like, 300 million dollars to be wasted on making a park ugly. You know what I'm saying? They could use -- [laughter] they could use that money for my school, it barely even has heating, and they could open my old school that shut down, 185 times with that money. Ok? And, yeah, and today's my birthday. [applause]

Katz: You can -- we can all clap and wish you a happy birthday. [applause]

Mai: I was born two hours ago, ok? Right now nine years ago, I would be glancing at Mt. Tabor, probably.

Katz: You're something else. Thank you very much. We're going to try to help the schools as well, but we can't use the same money for this that we can use for the schools. But we will try to help the schools.

Mori: Why are they talking about spending money when there's a bunch of other things that can do it?

Katz: That's an issue. But -- thank you. Thank you for making that point. Who does he belong to?

*******:** They're not here right now.

Katz: You came by yourself? He's a neighbor?

*******:** A good neighbor, too.

Katz: Thank you very much for caring for all of us.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Robin Denburg: My name is robin, i'm -- I live in the mt. Tabor area and I live four houses from where the staging area is going to be. I can't be as cute as he has been, but i'll try to provide some facts to back up my story. I also want to start by thanking you for having this forum. It's really important to have evening for ulc, and I think we need to do this more often. Thank you for having us. I want to start by -- i'm representing the southeast uplift land use and transportation committee. We met on monday and I was asked to give a brief statement on behalf of that committee. We added our voices in support of the statement that was issued by the southeast uplift board of directors. We want to create a true public process on this issue and are seriously concerned with the public process that's occurred so far. And the plan process that is to be. As an individual I want to express concerns about the process on this issue. My fear is that we're going to have this public meeting tonight and then we're going to go back to the current process, which is extremely flawed. You need to explain to me \$72 million is being spent well and consider alternatives to catching that meet the security needs and this hasn't been done. And I need to be able to see that. When I look at an environmental impact statement you have several choices. And that process hasn't occurred. As far as the continuing problems with the current process, one is, your public information officer tries to discredit and deny opposition to this project. Dan sam even tried to do that tonight by discounting the board of directors vote. So maybe that's -- maybe that's where the public information officers are taking direction. P.a.c. Meetings have not been announced, especially to the city's reservoir list serve. I repeatedly requested and this has not occurred. There's a group being created to discuss the construction access route. I as a neighbor who lives four blocks from the proposed staging area have not been contacted with regards to this group. I would be interested in knowing why. I don't feel the p.a.c. Is representative enough. And there's been no discussion about the negative impact of property values with three to five years of construction.

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

Denburg: Paul and laura's ideas as far as the public process is a much better one than what we have currently planned. I want to applaud them for their leadership.

Katz: Thank you.

Gilman Vital: Yes, my name is gil, and i'm not a native Portlander, i'm originally from chicago. I came here in '85 looking for a job in the electronics industry. Right when there was the first wave of mass layoffs. And between looking for work and because I didn't know anyone in Portland, I would spend many hours in the park by the reservoirs. Most of that time I would spend writing letters to various people as I didn't know anyone in Portland. People who received those letters told me later about how incredibly beautiful it sounded by my description, and how unique it was. And indeed, just being -- being a person who's been to many cities and lived many places, i've never been able to find anything quite as unique that has such a contemplative and serene quality as the reservoirs at mt. Tabor. I can understand the need for protecting the water supply. As a technical professional, it seems to me I can envision many possible uses of technology to detect objects thrown in the reservoir. Use of laser systems or a network of motion detectors and infrared imaging systems. You could easily detect harmful objects, or even constant water monitoring. I think that also burying the tanks deeper and augmenting the gravity flow could alleviate the need for changing the appearance, you know, like the reservoirs, and the surface could be left intact and still accomplish the protecting of the water. I feel the existing plan would permanently eliminate the unique and priceless quality of the reservoirs. And deprive future generations of that.

Katz: Thank you.

Mike Royce: My name is mike royce, i'm a lifetime resident of Portland, Oregon. I'm a vietnam veteran and i'm also a teamster for 34 years here in Portland. The reservoirs at mt. Tabor have been an enjoyable part of people's lives for 100 years. Always respected and protected by the community around the area. In my opinion, that's why we haven't had any devastating events

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

concerning the reservoirs in the past. They've been in existence through world war ii, the korean conflict, vietnam war and desert storm. After the events of 9-11, city council and the Portland water bureau are pushing to have the reservoirs destroyed and want to replace them with buried storage tanks. What happened to our government's advice to our communities to the to change but to be aware of the possibility of terrorism? We can't allow such a small percentage of insane people to dictate changes in our living conditions. In my opinion, covering or burying tanks where the reservoirs are now would eliminate the collection of large amounts of water which represent the same exact thing that comes naturally from melting snow and water runoff into the bull run river. In the future we'll probably wish we had more of these water collecting devices. We'll probably be looking to design more high-tech water collectors similar to the ones you plan to destroy. The spending of this money to make changes that aren't really necessary in my opinion sends the wrong message to our citizen who's are struggling to survive in any way they can during the worst economic situation in the state of Oregon in the long time. Imagine yourself on a fixed income barely making it. Or without a job. Or maybe sick. And a program you depend on was just discontinued because of cutbacks. Or how about your school kid -- or you're a school kid and your school was closed because there was no money and you're being bused to another neighborhood to attend class at a different school? How do you think these people feel about the millions of dollars being spent now with the plan to increase water rates to pay the debt you've created. Regular people know water rates aren't taxes, but just another expense for the already burdened taxpayer. They also know the future of water is important, but wonder why their financial being isn't as important to you. You say it's about terrorism, and the protection of water, but isn't it really about the regular salvation of our bull run water? How come you've talked about the expense of mt. Tabor, but have avoided talking about the future remodel of powell butte and the new plant you plan to build there?

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

Dee White: My name is dee white, I live and work in southeast Portland. Times are tough for me, and for almost all of us. My local government is being forced to close schools, cut off aid and resources for our mentally and physically disabled citizens, and cut back on our infrastructure. And yet my local government is getting ready to force me to pay for something that I cannot afford, and more importantly, cannot justify. In fact, i'm totally opposed to this project that was born in a budget meeting and will end up raising my water rates by at least 20% over the next ten years or less. I've been to every public meeting and every public advisory committee meeting since the beginning. I have listened to presentations by the water bureau, and its consultants. I have not found any -- one compelling reason for accepting this project. This project will force me to pay for more for an already expensive necessity, and it will not stop all of the ways our water can be contaminated. One example, and this is a big one, is backflow. I know we've been talking about it all night, but this is a big one for me. If I were a terrorist organization, it would be the first avenue I would take. It would be fast and easy, it can be done in the middle of the day and no one would know it and it would be more effective than attempting to contaminate a large open body of water. Our water, buried or not, is vulnerable to backflow and I have yet to see or hear any viable argument on this from the water bureau. At the very least this project should be tabled until we can be convinced that -- back flow is not possible. It is possible? Absolutely. Are my rates going up if the contracts are signed? Absolutely. Was the decision fast tracked after 9-11? Absolutely. Is this decision like so many other decisions being made in the wake of 9-11 based largely on fear and not fact and requirements? Absolutely. I beg you all to please table this project until all of the options are explored. The risks objectively analyzed. Our economic outlook improves and common sense prevails.

Katz: Thank you.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Herschel Soles: Herschel Soles, resident of northeast Portland. I became a friend of the reservoir because I look upon this project as a little bit of a scam. I really would like to see a lot more public input. I saw a movie last week, it said if you want to reduce terrorism, stop participating in terrorist acts. Of course he's referring to our federal government. Participating. I know this council doesn't like to get involved in foreign policy, because I was here when the war thing was being discussed. It's perfect. They had a sign in the paper talking about terrorism, and the sign said, terrorism -- war is terrorism with a bigger budget. I think we -- this council has to get concerned with our foreign policy. We have to make some voice, because that's the way you reduce terrorism. Close down the school of Americas. Stop this aid to Israel. It's causing a genocide against the Palestinians. I want to second everything that was said just ahead of me about the public input. I think that's what this plan needs. It looks too much like inside political payoffs. We want to see more public input, more discussion, we don't want to be separated from something we consider to be very artistic, very serene, very pleasant place to go. It was a couple years ago that Taliban destroyed some 2,000-year-old temples there. I mean, we're all appalled at this kind of artistic destruction would take place. I'm hoping you people don't follow a similar route there. Let's get some public input and maybe we can have our reservoirs for another 100 years. We think it can go for another hundred. So I'm all in favor of postponing the -- any decision about this thing, getting more public input, and don't destroy anything unless you hear from us and it says that what we really want to do.

Katz: Thank you.

Lenore Bijan: My name is Lenore, and I have some concerns with this. I have seen over the course of the last few years, so many changes in technology, where things are presented as the last word in something, and they're going to cost so many millions of dollars, and then the bill comes in, and they cost double that amount, or another third, and they're not the last word. They're very faulty. And have to be revamped at public expense. As far as the water bureau is concerned, the sewer system negotiations I was in on that, I live in northeast Portland, I'm a low-income person, I'm older, and water is extremely important to me because I raise everything I eat. I grow it in my garden. And the sewer rates went sky high. A lot of things we were promised didn't come to pass. A lot of things that had been -- that absolutely on the board, just disappeared. And I'm very concerned about this sort of thing. What I'm most concerned about is the climate of fear, where Roosevelt said the thing to fear is fear itself. And it seems to me that right now this country is in the grips of a horrible fear, where we're doing a lot of counterproductive things, like the duct tape fiasco, that our -- we're not considering the other possibilities. If we, for instance, covered a reservoir and sunlight couldn't get in there, and things can get under the membrane, or under the cover, we don't know what the long-range potential for disaster to the water supply by purely natural means might be. Or how technology might be able to improve. We don't know what the federal government is going to require of our water system.

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

John Larsen: My name is John Larsen, and I'm here to beseech you to not to -- I'm not asking you to not cover the reservoirs or to cover the reservoirs, but to give this matter a full ventilation and a full public hearing. I'm distressed sitting here listening to my fellow citizens having to race through their testimony on this matter, because they believe that this three minutes or this two minutes is the only chance they're going to have to tell you about how they feel about it. Because although your decision was made nine months ago, this is the first and as far as they know, the only opportunity that they're going to have to address this matter and be heard. I live in Mt. Tabor, and I own commercial property in Mt. Tabor, and I work in Mt. Tabor, and I have been there for over 20 years. And although I don't represent Mt. Tabor, I believe that I'm representative of it. We're good citizens, we pay our taxes, we vote, if my fellow -- my neighbors are anything like me, they voted for each of you, as a matter of fact. And we participate in public processes, I chaired the --

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

cochaired the hawthorne boulevard process a few years ago. I go to neighborhood meetings where civic participants and what I see happening in my neighborhood is the erosion of confidence in government. I -- when I go to neighborhood meetings I don't hear bashing of government, I don't hear -- people were all in favor of voting for measure 28, they're in favor of what city government does. But right now it -- there's a tremendous citizen -- cynicism that's being bred because of the way this process has unfolded, or rather this lack of process. There may have been a water bureau process, but there hasn't been a citizens process. Hi nothing to do with the proposal that paul and laura, my neighbors, brought to you tonight. But i'd really urge you to give that some serious considering. If this project is that important, then so is the participation of your constituents. And our fellow citizens. Thank you.

John Wish: Mayor Katz and councilmen, thank you for allowing us to talk. Since 2001, as a member of the mt. Tabor neighborhood association and the mt. Tabor neighborhood association board, has been asking the water bureau for full citizen participation. We were stone walled and we were not given any information until late 2002, supper of 2002, and then we were told you may talk about only what goes on top. I would also like to call attention to mort's presentation e. Scenarios two, three, and four. I have reviewed that -- the financial information with joe glicker, the water bureau consultant and with dennis kessler, and I find problems with those numbers. I think there are alternatives, which are cheaper, which will meet the safety needs and they need full public discussion. Final, my final point, I support paul and laura's comments and would hope that there is full public discussion, because the water bureau and best are going to be talking about -- b.e.s. Are going to be talking about hundreds of millions of dollars of needed capital investment in the next ten years, which could triple our rates for water and sewer. We need full public support to do that. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Bruce Hollen: Yes, hello, i'm bruce hollin, I live in southeast Portland. What I -- my comment is, I think it should properly go to a vote of the people on this issue. This is something that the people should vote on. That is my opinion on this issue. And as far as this -- there will still be risks, even if this thing is put into place. It's not going to eliminate all the risks, because you're dealing also with the source of the -- which is up there in bull run. I mean, and like the other person said, backflow. So it's not going to eliminate all the risks, the very thing that's been said to sell the program. That's all I have.

Katz: Thank you.

Kerry Brown: Mayor Katz and city council. Why does the city council think they are smarter than the citizens of Portland when it comes to making a decision about the mt. Tabor reservoirs? The citizens of Portland are telling you no to this. We cannot trust you to make a decision with this one. It appears that this is just one more incidence where you forget that you work for us. The real issue is the financing. In defense of our country and impending war, our city and nation does not have the extra money to fund this project. Citizens are concerned about terrorism, but we're not so frightened that millions of dollars must be taken from us and directed toward the burial of these two reservoirs. The Washington park reservoirs, and the water filtration system for the bull run. We're comfortable with the current safeguards. Why impose a permanent seven-plus increase on our water rates when you can just leave these reservoirs alone? It is documented that the bull run is one of the most protected watersheds in the nation. There's no federal or state law requiring you cover these sites. The number of projects in the works within the city of Portland is out of control and budgets are inflated. The implications to the mt. Tabor neighborhood and damage to the butte are serious considerations that jeopardize the livability. The construction, erosion, redirection of traffic, the noise, the length of time to complete this, the list goes on and on. I ask you to stop now, while you're ahead. It is time each of you realizes that this continued need for personal recognition,

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

future remembrance, and the building of monuments for yourselves has to end. Does commissioner dan Saltzman wish to be compared and remembered as commissioner erik Sten was with his mismanagement and incompetence? Thank you.

Katz: Go ahead.

Roger Cathey: My name is roger cathy, i'm an independent systems analyst and research engineer.

Francesconi: Personal stuff doesn't help. It really doesn't.

*******:** Ok.

Katz: Go ahead.

Cathey: I guess the first thing i'd mention is a technical issue such as those that were pertaining to the types of systems that we have in -- that are similar to those in new york. They have a budget many times greater than Portland does, and their experts decided not to cover the reservoirs. What's good enough for them should be good enough for us. And the technical issues of burying a reservoir, I did a great deal of study on the subject of biotoxins. Since 1974 I got into biochemistry and i've studied the issue of biological toxins. And the kinds of things that terrorists have access to don't in my mind represent a serious risk. Probably the most dangerous toxin that we could find at any form after system would be prions. They're not affected by anything except for filtration. Filtration is the best way to go. And filtration can include a subsidiary or auxiliary system of treatment that includes ozone and electroradio therapy. Those are things that could be put into a little slope between the top reservoir and the bottom reservoir of mt. Tabor very efficiently and be part and parcel of the upgrades. Finally if you bury water, it's not exposed to natural ozone of the atmosphere, it's not exposed to sunlight and you could return to the issue of spraying water to increase that exposure, because fungus cannot grow in systems like that. And buried tanks are a perfect way to culture fungus. And that's a huge issue. Finally i'll just say that if this is a system that's to protect people, it has to be truly representative and not just an appeasement process. And so I know that you're going to do that and carry this forward to a more serious consideration, because believe me, you don't want to get fungus in your system. One thing about the ducks.

Katz: Let's not go there.

Cathey: Duck poop has enzymes that prevents fungus. If you have toenail fungus, put duck poop on it to get rid of it. You bury the water, you're going to regret it. None of those things are a problem when exposed to the air or sun. But you're going to regret it in 50 years. You're going to think, why did we do that?

*******:** Thank you for having me here. For a lot of really good --

Katz: Identify yourself.

Greg Davis: Greg davis. I've heard really good heart felt speeches, but I think what's important is to have a dialogue. I'd like to ask a couple of quick questions to help me understand this project.

Katz: Let me just interrupt you. We're not going to have a dialogue in this kind of a forum. So why don't you go ahead and ask your questions, I don't think they're going to be any responses. Let us hear how you feel about it.

Davis: I was just curious if this is strictly a Portland and Portland-funded project. And whether or not you're getting any pressure from the federal government to do this. And if there are any plans to protect the bull run watershed and dam from an aerial attack.

Katz: Thank you. Did you want to answer any -- there may be an answer later. Ok.

Davis: We can't have a dialogue?

Saltzman: A lot of those answers are in the presentation. Yes, there is a federal rule, yes, it will be Portland fund and I don't feel comfortable commenting on security protects of bull run.

*******:** Oh.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Randall Smith: I'm Randy Smith, native of Portland. Resident of South Tabor. I am also trained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Coast Guard and oil and hazardous materials bills response, damage assessment, safety and contingency planning. And I'm a past senior scientist with the Water Policy Workshop at Portland State University. And a trained aquatic biologist. I have a statement which I will send, but I -- as I've listened to everyone tonight, I think maybe there are two things I could just say which would be helpful. I disagree with the Water Bureau in that there aren't adequate safety concerns. I think there's modern methods of flow cytometry, which could be incorporated. But safety isn't the major issue. The open reservoir system is just an absolute treasure. I had the opportunity to go to southern France a couple years ago, and maybe you've seen the Volkswagen ad with the Roman aqueduct in the background. That's the -- aqueduct and it's a French national treasure. Kids go there every spring to see the aqueduct and visit. What would happen if someone said, someone's going to fall off that treasure, we'll just tear it down. And it would be gone. We don't think of our reservoir system as that kind of treasure, but truly our open reservoir system is a national treasure. There are alternatives to underground reservoir systems that could be placed elsewhere in the system, there could be diversions that go around Mt. Tabor that could address safety issues, earthquake issues, things like that. But truly, you know, as a biologist, water is always more dangerous in a can than an open water system anyway, as someone else has said. And truly, I want to affirm what the woman said from Ireland, that highlighting something with barbed wire is always a greater target than the thing you have.

Katz: Thank you.

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

Geoff Oneil: My name is Geoff Oneil, I'm from the Mt. Tabor neighborhood. On the west side we have Washington Park, we have the zoo, the rose garden. And on the east side, Mt. Tabor Park is the crown of the east side. And those reservoirs are the jewels on that crown. We move to Mt. Tabor to enjoy the park, and I would want you to think of the east side of Portland without the reservoirs. It would be like Boston without the gardens with the swan rides across the commons. It would be like New York City without Central Park. It would be like San Francisco without Golden Gate Park. And why cover it? I just want to urge you to explore the alternatives of offline storage, or outlet treatment. I think that the reservoirs is an engineering marvel that has sustained us over the last hundred years, and I think we -- together we can find an elegant solution that will retain that functionality. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: You look familiar.

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

Katz: Anybody else? Let's find out. Keep reading.

Katz: Go ahead.

Lew Humble: Ok. My name is Lew Humble. I live in the Sellwood district. I've been around here as long as Dorothy McCulloch Lee was mayor or the Vanport flood. I've run against, well, two of you at least. The other one disappeared.

Francesconi: It's going to be the rest of us now too.

Humble: Well, I'm declared candidate for the mayor of Portland. So you must all know what I'm about. It's water, water, water. The river, Bull Run, the reservoirs. I don't know exactly how to put it, other than, at this forum, the thing is about the reservoirs. They are a treasure, just like Memorial Coliseum, and they should be left alone. What I do think we should move the reservoir system to somewhere else. Those things -- Mt. Tabor is an active volcano. I keep hearing not if, but plan we're going to have a major earthquake. And when all these buildings are getting retrofit and the bridges are getting retrofit, those reservoirs are going to be the first thing that goes when. Thank you.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Katz: Thank you.

Steve Reinemer: Steve reinemer. I'll be giving I more postcards that have gotten signed. There are awesome of them there to add to the previous thousand or so presented in mid-january. I think about 1500 people now have formally signed postcards or staples questioning this decision. I have no doubt that thousands more would do so at the slightest concentrated every. In my experience, eight or nine people out of ten on mt. Tabor on any given day do sign these cards. I'd also like to say I think each rationale in opposition to the burial decision stand independently in its merits. But and -- and i've crossed quite a few to address because my list is dwindling as people speak. I can just on some of them I can understand why someone might not be concerned with the compromises of burial, if, for example, you weren't concerned with the rate increases or if you didn't think citizens have other pressing priorities for their pocketbooks at a time when people don't feel at liberty to spend as little as measure 28 asks for on a temporary bases for fundamental education and social services. That amount was similar to the amount that all of us will pay permanently through our rate increases for a questionable value if not outright devaluation in the minds of most. Or if you feel such an event is more likely an important as he just referred to, the things like earthquakes, which were rated much higher as other people have said. Including the pipelines across under the willamette that are right along the major fault line. Or if you thought our reservoirs were going to look more or less the same upon completion of the project, in spite of an uneasing feeling I have that the agenda is to capitalize on new park space for active recreation like soccer and ball fields, and in any case not the current unique vast water. That's a design that the city commissioners and public representatives of the on top design p.a.c. Have referred to at times as something really special. Well, I personally know something really special, and that is know something -- no something really special.

Katz: Thank you.

Diane Tweten: My name is diane tweten. Carding to a recent mailer, the reservoirs are relics of the past. There isn't any federal mandate or health situation driving this. Other cities have considered doing it decided against it. Even though as unfiltered, I have never had a duck feather or frisbee come through my tap. Our water comes from many open source and is vulnerable to many catastrophies. It's just hard to poison a large body of water. Does the city council sincerely believe that this threat is so great that this is -- this enormous expenditure is justified? Perhaps I would be more likely to believe that you do. If there's been a full discussion, including a response to issues of vulnerability to backflow. In many cases the modern cure is worse than the problem it seeks to solve. Chlorine is a carcinogen that the e.p.a. Consider recommending be discontinued. Having worked for a did owned by a large manufacturer of chlorine which wouldn't let me post information on an earth day presentation about chlorine-free paper, I have my suspicions. Using the wisdom of mother nature, which is occasionally greater than our own modern wisdom, keepers of the water builds flow forms which are not only beautiful but purify the water through aeration. Being exposed to oxygen helps dissipate the excess chlorine. So far I haven't heard a convincing case that would justify the enormous cost. The Portland city council feels that most Portlanders knew about this. I heard the same thing said about the proposed regional drinking water agency and was having a great deal of difficulty finding anyone who knew anything about it. The statement might be more believable if hit been mentioned as part of the mt. Tabor master plan in 1998. Montgomery water son studied the issues since 1996. No serious discussion occurred until after the may decision. I think the city knows how to truly inform the public.

Larry Beck: Good evening, mayor Katz and commissioners. I have three points, larry beck, southwest corbett and gibbs. I have three points I want to make. I don't live in mt. Tabor and I don't live in Washington park, so I would support what the neighbors have to say. I'm sorry I just got in about 8:30 tonight. I would listen very carefully to what those neighbors have to say. Even

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

though i'm not a neighbor in those neighbors neighborhoods, this is my city as well. The other two points are about process. I am pleased to see the council decided to hold an additional hearing here tonight so people could speak. I don't know what level of notice and process were given to the neighbors before, but I think it's helpful when obvious 30 -- obvious 30 was an uproar about people being aware, that you hold the forum. I know commissioner leonard and I spoke about process and making sure that these forums are truly an open maybe not an exchange of ideas or debate with the council and people presenting, but it's a true opportunity for you to listen to the citizens and to make a decision after and not have decisions made before. I they've we've had a problem with that in the past. I certainly hope this will be an open forum and a decision is not made until later. Last point is about money. I'm very concerned about money that this city is proposing to spend on certain projects. I've been before you 0 a number of other projects where we're talking about a quarter of a million dollars, or we're going to be talking about 18 million, and now we're looking at 66 to 68 million. It concerns me when we can't keep schools open, we can't fund social services in Multnomah county, when we've got a 23 to \$50 million deficit for next year and they're talking about closing schools and shortening school year, we're devoting resources towards this project that could be devoted towards schools. I understand it's not the city's bailiwick, but the city in the past has given moan to the schools, and i'd like to see our resources to go to projects like that for the benefit of the public rather than for projects like this. So I would certainly hope you take that into consideration. Thank you.

Katz: We'll have a conversation about that later on.

Beck: I'd be happy to, thank you, mayor.

Brian Pendergast: Good evening, my name is brian pendergast, I lived and worked in this area for 40 years. I had many thoughts and points in opposition tonight to convey, but during the session i've heard nearly all mentioned in a very thoughtful insightful and knowledgeable way. So i'll not repeat them. One of the things that I think is devastatingly important is that we all need to consider how on earth we're going to continue to pay for these kinds of things. It sounds very expensive, and as well it sounds like a hastily drawn-up plan. Another thing I might add is that as i've grown up i've seen a lot of places that I used to be able to go made off limits, and a lot of things that I used to be able to do without any thought is no longer allowed. So what brings that up is the idea of making the reservoir disappear or less accessible, and then lots of surveillance there at our expense to monitor everybody, really. And I guess I close in saying that at what point will the government, whose existence we all pay for, stop restricting and placing under surveillance all of us under the guise of terrorism and homeland security? And also it's beyond me why all of us have to come forward tonight and plead for a chance to -- for the rest of the thousand of us that don't come tonight to have a chance to vote on this. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Richard Carpenter: I'm richard carpenter, and thank you for being here tonight. If I had a question, it would be, has there been a final decision made on this? But you without a dialogue, i'll move ahead. No one has enjoyed that part more than my family and i. It's nothing like starting at the bottom.

> walking all the way up to the top, looking out over the west side, and the reservoirs. Down below. Used to be in the early 1980's, there was a guard or someone to do -- they were always there, there was always someone there. And after that, I think the mid-1980's, there stopped being anyone there. I always thought, there ought to at least be someone here. Finally after 9-11, there was. Then I wanted to talk about money priorities. People have talked about schools, and I have to say taxes are still taxes. Schools need to be taken care of first, then the water bureau billing problems need to be dealt with, and then this big pipe going under the willamette river. All these are going to be big expenses that are going to come on our water bills and need to be dealt with.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Then I wanted to move on to poisoning the water, or whatever it is, that someone's going to do. And if it gets poisoned or if someone jumps in like they did, the way you deal with it is you just drain it all out. Unfortunately, that has to be done. And those reservoirs are just like big concrete buckets. If a terrorist wants to get in, and they're covered, then they're going to figure out how to get in some way and do what they're going to do.

Katz: Thank you.

Carpenter: But the solution to spending money is to spend it up at bull run.

Katz: Thank you.

Moore: He still has time.

Katz: I'm sorry. Sorry, sir, you have 15 seconds. [laughter] somebody's watch went off.

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

Katz: Rosemary, why don't we start with you. It's been a while. I know you're going to give us heck, but it's been a while since we've seen you.

*******:** It has been a while. This brought me out again.

Katz: Why don't you identify yourself.

Rose Marie Opp: My name is rose marie opp. I don't live in the area either, but I do appreciate the beauty of both of those lovely places. Mayor, I was in here about a year ago, I told you, someone came up to me in a grocery store and asked, they're getting the character out of Portland, aren't they? And my eyes went down, yeah, well, if you move forward with this, I believe you'll be gutting the character right out of our city on both sides of the river. After everything i've witnessed the past eight years, I sometimes think, what more could happen? After seeing the destruction and change that i've seen in this city, and particularly in our outer southeast, I don't think I need to remind you that we lost nearly six acres of our eight-acre neighborhood parks, so to get away, it's been a refuge for me to go up to that mt. Tabor area. And I would love for you to go up and fall in love with the place and have a heart connection. Feel the warmth of the sun, see the sun set and the glow on that reservoir. It isn't comforting at all to know that you might have a new plan here. I don't think people want a different plan. We need the comfort of keeping what we dearly love, and people who have Portland values need to be respected instead of getting your treatment, if you pardon the pun. And I hate to say this, but I do feel like i've -- i'm being backed up against the wall, and I really feel if you don't love the Portland things in this city as much as the people of this city do, then maybe it's time for you to stay in new york.

Katz: That wasn't nice.

Opp: I know it wasn't nice. But i've seen so much destruction in this city.

Katz: Thank you.

Opp: I and would like to invite you to come up one evening.

Katz: Thank you.

Opp: To the reservoir.

Katz: Rosemary, thank you.

Joe Angel: I'm joe angel, mayor and council, thank you for letting me speak tonight. I live up near Washington park, and I would like to give you a perspective from up there. We need a process that values the open space resource that we now have up there. The temporary covers as I have said to you before, are not a security measure. They simply don't pass the test on being secure. To waste that money for a measure that is represented as security is not what we should be doing. I would like to ask you to value what you have seen tonight, and to draw on the citizens who love this city. You've seen a lot of smart people come up here and raise issues that are legitimate, real issues about the decision that was made. We need to bring forth a process that encourage those kinds of debates and gets to a real solution that is not put forth by a consultant. On the west side we especially need a planning process. We have a regional park there that draws from way far away, draws from

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

british columbia. Tons of people come in buses. We have the rose garden, we have the japanese gardens. There's a lot of stakeholders. We need to plan now, because it will take some time with that many stakeholders. We need to start the process. Lastly, please remove any conflict of interest. I think this is a baseline requirement. It seems common sense to me. The people you seek advice from should be very broad in their perspective and you should start narrowing it down. But they shouldn't be the same people who are going to build whatever it needs to be built.

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

Angel: I don't believe there's an access -- axis of evil between the council and the bureau, and the consultant. But I do believe there needs to be separation.

Katz: Thank you.

Francesconi: That would have made tv if they hadn't left. That was a good line.

Katz: Are you the last person?

Autumn Chamberlin: I am the last person. Missed my call earlier, evidently. Mayor Katz -- my name is autumn chamberlain. I've been a southeast Portland resident for 25 years. Generally I think we all need nature. We need to revitalize our troubled, stressed-out souls with mother nature and we need this more now perhaps more than ever. I rejuvenated my spirit frequently on mt. Tabor as i'm sure many if not all of you have as well at one time or another. The water-filled reservoirs have been particularly peaceful places for me. Disruption and destruction of the existing beauty of mt. Tabor would deeply sadden me. I am greatly troubled by all the rushed and closed process. I'm troubled by the general capitalization of fear. I am amazed at the proposal of a construction of a super filtration station so we Portlanders can enjoy I canny willamette river for all our needs. Yum. I strongly agree with the points presented by the physician who spoke earlier, open water contamination is not a big concern of mine. To me, backflow access is the greatest threat. This possibility scares and concerns me far more than possible terrorist or any idiot contaminating any open reservoir. I'll not looking forward to more increases in water bills. So this is not something to be rushed into. Because of this, and much more, I beseech to you completely open this process to us, the citizens. We want neutral facilitators. We want independent fact finders. Please take time to consider all the facts. Please listen to all the citizens. Together, we can preserve the wonderful structures for history, for generations of continued enjoyment. Together we can preserve the beauty of soul-inspiring nature. Together we can. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. [applause] thank you, everybody. Thank you for coming out. I'm sure among our council members we will have discussion as to where we go next on this. But I appreciate everybody out here and thank you for your comments and your recommendations. We stand adjourned. [gavel pounded]

At 9:05 p.m., Council Adjourned.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Closed Caption Transcript of Portland City Council Meeting

February 19, 2003

6:00 PM Session, Item 163

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

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

WEDNESDAY, 6:00 PM, FEBRUARY 19, 2003

163 TIME CERTAIN: 6:00 PM – Open Reservoir Replacement Project
(Presentation introduced by Commissioner Saltzman)

PLACED ON FILE

Item 163.

Katz: Let me turn it over to commissioner Saltzman.

Saltzman: Thank you, madam mayor and members of the council. Welcome to our public. I requested this hearing after hearing from the community and my council colleagues that it would be valuable to spend some time reviewing last year's council decision to secure Portland's open water reservoirs by replacing them with buried tanks. This hearing will focus on the decision made in late May of last year to approved a \$65 million security enhancement package. Tonight the water bureau will present a short power play presentation on the -- power point presentation. I will then ask our invited guests from the public health and safety fields to express their perspectives on the project, following that friends of the reservoir will have an opportunity to present their views, and then it will be open for public testimony. Currently we have an extensive public process under way. This process involves a 16-member public advisory committee that's developing recommendations for the city council on what could happen to the new I have -- newly available 22 park acres once the reservoirs are buried. To strengthen this process i've proposed adding \$10.9 million to the project budget this year, to ensure at a minimum the surface areas of the mt. Tabor reservoirs could be returned to their current appearance after the burial. Again, this is a decision that will ultimately come to us from the public advisory committee and will be up to the city council to make that final decision. Along these lines I have committed the city will not begin constructing the buried tanks at mt. Tabor until the public advisory committee process is completed this summer. The chair of the public advisory committee will speak for a couple minutes tonight regarding their work. In regards to Washington park, the plan is clear. We will be installing floating covers and microwave motion detection to temporarily protect and secure the drinking water reservoirs there. These temporary measures were chosen to offset the substantial rate impact that we would all feel if we were to bury all five reservoirs all at once. So we intend to do the tabor burials first, put temporary covers on Washington park, and then we'll also commit to having a public process to -- about what goes on top of the Washington park reservoirs, similar to what we're having right now for the mt. Tabor reservoirs. My perspective on this is ensuring that public health and safety is the council's most important responsibility to the residents of Portland. We have no choice but to act when we are made aware of vulnerabilities of our infrastructure. Particularly when that danger can affect thousands to tens of thousands of individuals. The open reservoir replacement project gets to the core of this responsibility. I remember having my own strong doubts about the security package when it first came before the council last year. People throughout our community are hurting economically and the rationale behind any increase in utility rates must be strong. I believe the

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

rationale meets and exceeds this test. As other cities have moved to replace their open reservoirs, Portland's stand out more and more as a potential bulls eye. Portland now has 10% of the remaining open reservoirs in the united states in our city. The risk to our water supply are real, and the city council made an expeditious and critical decision last year to address these risks rather than sit by and temp fate while options are debated. In regard to the many options you'll hear about tonight, and i've heard and read about, and the water bureau has heard about and responded to, they just don't give us the confidence and certainty that buried storage provides. You'll hear about the pittsburgh solution, basically keeping the reservoirs intact and filtering at the outlets. It doesn't provide security from intentional contamination, and it could end up being exceedingly expensive and take up valuable park land. We've -- we'll hear about moving the storage somewhere else. It doesn't work in our gravity fed system and could potentially place all of our reservoirs in one location, which is even probably a greater public health and safety risk. And you'll hear proposals probably about double domes, filters in everyone's water, permanent armed guards 24 hours a day, seven days a week, etc. You'll hear all these ideas, the water bureau has heard all these ideas and we've responded and provided information to people that want information why we've rejected these ideas, and you'll hear about it shortly in the power point. These are all input and ideas I value, but when rationally examined, these latter options are just not acceptable. Buried storage is the best option for our water system, it provides the city with the most protection, while potentially opening up additional park space. What we hope to continue to get from the community is its creativity and energy in developing a concept for this new above-ground space above the reservoirs. So I just finally want to say the water bureau and all of us here on the city council cherish the historic nature of the reservoir structures, and we have committed to preserve the historic character of the reservoirs. The historic integrity of the reservoirs as the work is done to bury the reservoirs. So I do not think that burying the reservoirs is at all inconsistent with maintaining the special aesthetic and historical amenities -- i'm just about through. I now want to turn it over to mort, our water bureau director, who will run us through the power point presentation.

Katz: Speak right into the mike. I think people are having trouble hearing up in the balcony. For those who have a -- a hearing problem or have difficulty hearing, we do have technical ear pieces that we can provide you, and they're up on the front table. But for everybody else, just speak up.

Mort Anoushiravani, Director, Water Bureau: I'm very pleased to be here, and I do have copies of my presentation outside for people who don't have it and they'd like to have it. What i'd like to do over the next few minutes, just go over the rationale of the decision that was made and the fact it was adopted by the council last may. Just to remind council and everybody again about, in may of 2002, the council adopted a plan to cover -- basically have a temporary cover at Washington park until a permanent solution in ten years, and also bury the storage and parking -- park improvements at mt. Tabor, and develop a plan for the park area at the Washington park, and then bury the storage at Washington park over the next ten years. That's just a summary of the recommendation from last year. To put this -- to put this reservoirs in a national context, many of the water systems across the country have had these facilities as part of their storage and distribution system. And in Portland, like them, we have actually had six and we actually abandoned one about 15, 16 years ago, now we have five. Over the last 30 years or so, over 90% of these reservoirs have either been covered or removed from service. And currently they're about 55 as of 2001, and actually the number is less now because a large number of the systems are either removing or covering the reservoirs, and because of the fact we have five, we roughly have 10% of the national number of the open reservoirs in service. The reason that they have been basically eliminated or covered were because of the threat of contamination, the fact that these are more vulnerable water storage facilities and they do not provide the best management practices, and also they have a very, very high maintenance cost when you compare it to the other type of storage facilities that are in the

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

utilities, and also regulatory mandate either does not allow -- in many of the states across the country, actually they have mandated that the utilities have them actually cover them or take -- or take them out of service. For example, in Washington, that's what they have done several years ago. And this was confirmed by a study that the water bureau took which was a very extensive and comprehensive study of looking at what to do with these facilities back in '96, and basically we reached the same conclusion and we concurs with the same reasons. And then after the tragic events of 9-11, obviously the water system security became another priority for us, and we looked at them through several different studies that basically confirms the findings that we are -- finding as a result of the latest independent study that we are doing that is going to -- that's going to get completed in march, which basically says open reservoirs are among one of our highest vulnerability facilities that we have in our system, which just basically reconfirms the prior study findings, and also burying these facilities are more preferred than having a treatment on site. From both the contamination as well as the security perspective. And then one other thing that we find out, the things that we have cherished and have used as advantages, if you would, over the years, when you look through a lens of vulnerability or risk reduction or security to actually -- because of the fact that we have a vast surface water source that is not filtered that does not provide additional barriers to remove contaminants if they are burying the water, and also because we just add minimal treatment for disinfection system and also the fact we have open reservoirs, it makes us, when you compare us nationally to some other water utilities, we're more of a target, if you will, from that aspect. As a result of this reevaluation work, we basically came up with two critical pieces of information, or basic knowledge, if you will. One is serious intentional contamination is a credible and realistic threat. And you're going to hear from some of the public safety people about that in a few minutes also. And also, the conventional wisdom before 9-11 was because of the dilution factor, it would take tremendous amount of material to contaminate a large body of water. And there are actually agents that emit a small quantities can cause a lot of damage. And this leads -- and then this -- bioagents or biotoxins, and unfortunately there is no real time detection of this toxin if they're basically to reduce into the water. The first time that you might find out about it is actually hearing from the public health people that there is actually sickness in the community. And then also as I mentioned a minute ago, they could be just in very small quantities that can cause serious problems, and these toxins are unstable in water, and unfortunately chlorine does not provide protection against them. And the consequences of this new piece of information, it could be a potential loss of life in the community if the water supply was contaminated, or it could cause serious sickness in our population, and also economic disruption that it would take -- if the system got contaminated, it could take up to weeks to decontaminate the system or flush the system. You can just imagine a large metropolitan area being without water service for several weeks. And what the consequences of that are. And then also general loss of confidence in the drinking water supply, which won't be good for the population or the -- for the city. Just pointing out the significance of this these facilities essentially 70% of the water that's served to the citizens of Portland goes through mt. Tabor reservoir. And the blue area is the service area for mt. Tabor, and the pinkish area is the Washington park area, but recognizing that actually Washington park water comes from mt. Tabor actually. So basically 350,000 residents of Portland, and businesses, use the water that goes through these two facilities. Therefore we came to the conclusion that we must do something in a status quo -- and status quo is not basically acceptable in terms of the water quality and the security protection for our water system. And also a status quo does not meet the regulatory requirements coming our way. So we have to do something. What that meant was as I mentioned a few minutes ago, we did conduct a large and comprehensive study of what to do with these reservoirs, because of the fact that they're 100 years old and they have maintenance needs and regulatory requirements and all that, and there was a plan to basically deal with them over the next

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

20 years or so. And as a result of the 9-11 and what we learned, we find out that we basically have to begin work immediately to deal with these issues, and remove the vulnerability from our system, and then also make the completion much shorter and get it done in ten years, or sooner, if possible. And then we consider several range of options. One option was basically exclusionary zone and detection devices, one was to relocate the storage facilities or treatment at the facilities or bury them. And then in order to be able to evaluate these different scenarios, the water bureau established several criteria we would be judging these different scenarios to see which ones meet the criteria. Security was number 1, impact to the park character, we recognize the significance of these facilities to our communicated, and we want to make sure whatever we do is going to basically be in keeping with that tradition. And then also the cost of building it, and the long-term costs of the operation, and the water system operations and what that would mean for different scenarios. Scenario one is basically establishing a hundred-foot setback, have a high fence around this reservoirs, also clear vegetation and install microwave motion detection and also install additional cameras and then have on site guards and also for regulatory requirements we have to install barbed wires, have barriers for -- to keep the critters out of the reservoirs, if you will. Here's a depiction of if we were to establish the exclusionary zone at these two facilities. On the right you see the mt. Tabor complex, and on the left is the Washington park. Which means if we were to do that, basically we have to close the roads, we have to cut trees and eliminate access to most of the park, which I don't think would be acceptable to the city or to the community. But that's what it would take if we were to implement this alternative. Scenario two was to relocate this historic facility to a new location. The only viable site that potentially could work would be powell butte. And there is not actually enough room on the top there to replace this storage facility as well as allow for construction of the new facilities that we have to build for the future needs. And then also there is no site available on the west side. Basically having all of our storage in one place, it's not a good thing to do in terms of the vulnerability and the -- basically the threats of the disruption we would have to the water service. And it's also is a more expensive cost option. And I will share the cost numbers with you in a second. Scenario three was looking at providing treatment. What we looked at you have heard as the pittsburgh solution, which is basically membrane technology. We've looked at that, and the membrane technology in fact does not remove all the potential contaminants that could actually be introduced into the water. So it won't be 100% removal technology. Right now our system is designed so we can provide water through gravity, which means we don't have to -- we are not reliant -- there is a certain amount of system reliability as part of that. If we were to add treatment at this these facilities we have to do more pumping, and then it's also conflict with the city's sustainability policy in terms of the resource usage, and it's also a much more expensive alternative. Scenario four, it was to bury the storage facilities. Basically the advantages are it makes the contamination very difficult, and it's much easier to detect and respond to a security breach, and it also will open up -- it will also open up for additional park usage that is going to come as a result of the work that the p.a.c. Is doing, and that's going to happen sometimes this summer, and then also we're going to maintain a gravity system, and also it will deal with the regulatory requirements that's coming down the pike for us. In terms of the basic evaluation that we have done, these are just four different alternatives, and the criteria and the capital casts -- costs, and the net positive -- the value for these -- just the thing I want to point out, if you look at the cost of the treatment on the outlet and the buried options, there is a significant difference between the two. In terms of the treatment it's 118 million dollars just for capital costs and the buried is only \$61 million comparing the cost. There is a huge cost difference there. Then in terms of what we'll be doing based on what council has adopted and directed the water bureau to do, we can now install a floating -- we cannot in -- we can install a floating cover on Washington park and it would allow us to maintain the park as it is right now, we can maintain the roads right now, we don't have to cut

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

any trees or vegetation per se, and we will not be -- we will not be doing any modification to these facilities or site, also it will meet the requirements for the regulations. This is just summarizing what was basically adopted by the council last year in terms of burial of this storage at the mt. Tabor and the floating covers for the next ten years at Washington park until we can bury that over the next ten years also. Then the proposed budget for the project for mt. Tabor reservoir and the piping, it's about \$61 million, and just for the parking -- park improvements, it is \$10.4 million, and for the Washington park, to install the floating covers and some other security measures, it's about \$2.5 million. For a total of roughly \$77 million total. For the total project cost. Since the decision was made, there has been a tremendous amount of public involvement, public process. I won't be going through the list, but there has been quite a bit both the work that parks bureau has done, the water bureau has done, and the work that actually p.a.c. Is doing. And the p.a.c. Basically includes all the surrounding neighborhoods, and then it also has a broader city interest represented on it. In conclusion, security of the open reservoir is one of the top priorities, security measures we have to take to protect the water system. Bury the storage is the most secure solution. And buried storage is also the lowest cost option. That will also provide for potential additional park uses. And then floating covers is just going to be a temporary solution until we have a more permanent solution burying the reservoir at Washington park within ten years. And then the next steps, if the council wants us to move forward with this, it's basically construction of the floating covers starting this spring, and then the p.a.c. Recommendation coming up later this summer, and they're going to be a couple of council supporting contracts that's going to come to council march 5, and then we're going to begin design of the buried storage at mt. Tabor by the -- march, may time frame, and then also construction is scheduled for mt. Tabor sometime early in 2004. I'll be glad to answer any questions now.

Saltzman: We'll wait on questions for you, why don't we invite our public health and safety panel, have them go and then council can ask questions of you or that panel. Our public health and safety panel consists of charles matthews, the regional director of the f.b.i. Office, dave leland, with the state health division, maggie miller with the citizens crime commission, and karl simpson, who is one of the cochairs of the city's emergency preparedness council. And we thought we'd start with federal, state, and get down to local, so we'll start with charles matthews.

*****: Thank you, commissioner.

Katz: Talk right into the mike.

Charles Matthews, Special Agent, FBI: Thank you. Charles matthews use, special agent in charge of the f.b.i. In Oregon.

*****: Can't hear:

Katz: The mikes i'm going to ask everybody to speak right into the mikes. We're as high as we can go.

Matthews: I'm charles matthews, i'm a special agent in charge of the f.b.i. In Oregon. From a national counter terrorism perspective, public water supplies are considered part of the nation's critical infrastructure, and as such their safe operation emits an interest to the f.b.i. The systems, like few others, present a means to move certain weapons of mass destruction, biological and chemical, to large segments of the population. Indeed, under certain circumstances, certain contaminants introduced into a water supply can result in substantial death and illness. Open and available water supplies such as exist in Portland, present an attractive nuisance, a soft target that could attract terrorists or others with criminal intent, these systems provide a means to convey toxins to large segments of the community. It's important that community leaders do what is appropriate and prudent to diminish the opportunity available to access these systems. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Go ahead. Right into the microphone.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Dave Leland, Manager Drinking Water Program, Oregon Department of Human Services:

Good evening, mayor Katz, members of the council. My name is Dave Leland, and I'm the manager of the drinking water program for the Oregon Department of Human Services. Just at the outset I'd like to say I'm an engineer, not a physician. But I've been in public health for some 25 years, and even have water utility background in my past also. So I want to just address real briefly for you the public health issues that impact the Mt. Tabor reservoir improvement plan, and they are the security vulnerability concerns first, of course, and then there are some future federal regulations on drinking water quality that are secondary consideration here as well. Then there's some others, too, that I'll mention. For me, I've got to tell you the security issue is number 1 for me. And I think other people have covered that very well, and I won't reiterate that. Other than to say, we're learning, that, yes, it is possible to contaminate a city water system through reservoirs. It is possible. Is it likely? I don't know the likelihood of that, and I'll defer to law enforcement folks on that. But the consequences could be very, very high. Future EPA requirements for water quality are expected later on this year. This is sort of the secondary concern for me that I'll just share with you. And really, there are three choices for existing open reservoirs. Any of these are acceptable. The first would be a package of access controls, setback, other risk control measures to keep people and animals out, primarily, that we have to be approved. That's one option. Or installing the outlet treatment as most discussed earlier, or cover or replace the reservoirs. And I just want to say, there is not a do-nothing option within the preliminary regulation information that we've seen. And we'll know more as soon as those rules do come out later this year. Other considerations I just would offer, well, we all know the reservoirs are 100 years old. And uncovered reservoirs really have not been a modern standard practice since really the mid-1900's for obvious reasons. You want to keep things out of the drinking water. In fact, no new ones have been allowed for quite some time. I would also emphasize what most said earlier, you can do outlet treatment, but no one process removes everything, so you have some limitations there. And I would just close by saying, I certainly, as someone who's worked in Portland for a lot of years, recognize the scenic value and the image in the community, but I think health and safety should come first, and we're really here to advise the community process and you as you deliberate on this. But I know you're going to ask me what my advice is, so my public health engineer advice is cover the reservoirs. And we've been on record for at least since the early 1970's to that point. So thank you very much.

Saltzman: Thank you. Maggie?

Maggie Miller, Executive Director, Citizens Crime Commission: Mayor Katz, city commissioners, my name is Maggie Miller, I'm the executive director of the Citizens Crime Commission. Founded in 1988, the Citizens Crime Commission has provided leadership in the fight against crime by working with businesses, citizens, government officials, criminal justice representatives, and lawmakers do make Oregon state and local system more efficient, effective, and accountable. In April 2002, the crime commission formed a counter terrorism task force in response to the events of September 11th. The purpose of the task force was to study the optimal ways to prevent and prepare us and our -- in our region for catastrophic events. To this end, the task force published a counter terrorism report in August 2002. The report concludes that structures, facilities or services, which are essential to the function of a region, and without which there would be a great risk of loss of life or disruption of public services and the economy, are considered to be critical infrastructure. Much of this infrastructure was designed and built in a relatively threat-free environment. The counter terrorism report recommends assessing varying degrees of protection of our infrastructure with some elements being fully protected, such as our water supplies. The Citizens Crime Commission strongly urges the city council to stand firm on their prudent decision to protect Portland's vulnerable water supply system. As ethereal as Portland reservoirs are to many, all residents of Portland have a right to wake up each day, turn on their tap, and expect a safe and

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

secure water supply. There is no perfect defense against any act of terrorism. The likelihood of a terrorist attack against any given target is small. The impact of such an act, however, can be very large. We must assess the threats to vulnerable infrastructures such as our water supply, and take appropriate steps to reduce having that which benefits us turned against us. The citizen crime commission once again urge you to safeguard our water supply. Thank you.

Saltzman: Thank you. Karl?

Carl Simpson, Director, Bureau of Emergency Communications: Good evening, mayor Katz, council members, my name is Karl Simpson, I'm the director of the bureau of emergency communications. I'm also the cochair of the emergency preparedness council. Thank you for the opportunity to address you this evening regarding a critical component of Portland's efforts to make this a more secure and safe community. The emergency preparedness council strongly supports securing the health and safety of our community's drinking water. Following the tragedy of September 11th, city council established the emergency preparedness council to focus and coordinate the community's preparedness for a crisis in emergency. As we met and we examined the city's critical infrastructures and vulnerabilities, it became clear that the region must have confidence that we can reliably deliver clean, safe water in the event of an emergency. This must be a priority for the city. The vulnerability of critical facilities is a key component of our work. How easy it would -- easy would it be for someone to damage our communications infrastructure? What would be the impact if the Portland building were destroyed? How would fire and police and 9-1-1 respond to a catastrophic emergency. These are some of the grim scenarios you directed us to examine. In that context we see the city's open reservoirs as open to intentional as well as natural disaster. Should there be intentional contamination, the consequence of panic and demand for a response would strain emergency resources, particularly if water contamination were part after a multitargeted event. Reducing the obvious vulnerabilities is a basic priority. The status quo is not acceptable. Speaking on behalf of the emergency preparedness council, we -- I strongly endorse the open reservoir replacement project and urge your continued vigilance over our city's critical infrastructure. Thank you.

Katz: Questions? All right. Questions by the council? Thank you, panel.

Saltzman: The next panel, before we go to public testimony, we allowed -- offered friends of the reservoir to put together a panel for about 15, 20 minutes.

Sten: I have a couple of questions for Mort. I guess I was hoping you could clarify on your time line that have you in mind now, I've talked with Commissioner Saltzman and one of my expectations is that things go forward, the plan for what will happen in the park needs to come to this council for a hearing and discussion before we move forward on actually doing things. How does that fit into the time line that you laid out?

Anoushiravani: Well, that would actually fit, commissioner. The idea is that we are not going to do construction at Mt. Tabor until P.A.C. has completed their work. In terms of we will know what's going to go on the top. So there is going to be coordination and agreement and consensus between those two. And P.A.C. Right now, we have actually extended the work schedule, if you will, sometime later in the summer. Basically what we're going to be doing, it's going to be some design work and that type of stuff, and no work will happen basically we're not going to turn over dirt, if you will, this we know what's going on the top.

Sten: I think -- what I'd like to see is that the work of that committee coming back to the council, get a hearing like this so we can actually -- I think there's two issues, and I think we'll hear about both of them tonight, they're both critical, but one is, are the reservoirs changing and two, depending on the answer to that question, what's going to go there? And I think so much concern is out there about the historical character, and I won't beat the drum now, because we'll hear it tonight,

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

but it's important that the council actually have a direct discussion with the advisory committee and the citizens about what's going to go in the park after this is all done, before we move forward.

Anoushiravani: Right. We can do that, and that's not a problem, commissioner. I don't see that as a problem at all.

Sten: That's the right answer.

Anoushiravani: Thank you. I do get lucky.

Katz: Further questions by the council?

Leonard: I do. It's on the floating cover at Washington park. If -- assume for argument's sake that the security issues are legitimate issues in terms of burying the reservoirs. What effectiveness does the floating cover in fact provide at Washington park? Against terrorism acts of polluting the water supply?

Anoushiravani: Right. Ok, a couple of things, commissioner. There are going to be additional security measures yes going to be instituting at Washington park also. It's not just going to be the cover by themselves. There are going to be additional sensing devices, and there is going to be additional cameras, monitoring, guards, and all that too. And then also, just by the virtue of having a cover, it would make the response somewhat easier and quicker, if you will, because you basically have crossed the barrier, if you will. So --

Leonard: You've crossed the barrier whether there's a cover there or not. Somebody gets across the barrier and gets to the point where they're going to dump something in the reservoir, what does the cover do to prevent something from ending up in the reservoir?

Anoushiravani: It's not a panacea, that's why we call it basically interim solution. But just for this interim solution, if you have that barrier on the top, if it's breached, you would know it right away. Whereas if somebody were to pitch something in the water, if you will, that won't be detected, really. If that makes sense.

Leonard: It doesn't make sense, because i'm not understanding. I understand there would be a gap of some magnitude between the edge of the cover --

Anoushiravani: No. There won't be any gap. These are going to be tight.

Francesconi: I had the same question, because of that demonstration we saw, where they poured chemicals in. So if I could follow up.

Leonard: Please.

Francesconi: When you say temporary, what's temporary about it is the structure itself, but it's going to cover the whole reservoir?

Anoushiravani: Correct.

Francesconi: Describe it a little more for us. This cover.

Anoushiravani: Basically what this cover is, it is sort of like a membrane, if you will, reinforced membrane that would just basically -- it is basically stretched over the reservoir, and it's just held in place, if you will.

Francesconi: Can you cut it?

Anoushiravani: Oh, sure, you can cut it. [laughter]

Francesconi: Will then --

Anoushiravani: The point i'm making is there is going to be additional monitoring and surveillance going on, and this is just one more barrier, if you will, to make it safer than what it is right now.

Francesconi: That -- 2.3 million, whatever the number is, how much -- does that include the security?

Anoushiravani: Yes. In fact, what that includes, that includes not just the covers, it includes some of these additional securities and actually some of the piping and the valvings that we have to do there also.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Francesconi: Maybe you could send us a copy -- i'd like to see that breakdown at some point.
*****: Sure.

Katz: I'm going to cut this off. No, that's all right, because we're here to listen to the people who've come to testify. And we can always -- [applause] rule number 1, this is not a demonstration. It's a thoughtful hearing process. So for those of you who haven't been here, if you like what you hear, you can do a wave or something and then we can see that. We don't need to hear it. If you don't like what you hear, you just need to bite your tongue, all right? All right. Thank you. Let's have the panel now from the friends of the reservoir. Partnership with.

*****: I want to thank you for having the hearing tonight.

Katz: Try the other mike.

Cascade Anderson Geller: That's better, I can tell. Thanks so much for having this hearing. We really appreciate the opportunity to get here with you all. And I appreciate all the people that are interested in the drinking water.

Katz: We need your name.

Geller: Cascade anderson-geller. I'm a member of the friends of the reservoirs. Why are we here tonight? Because we have to decide if these properties are of value. And so my piece tonight is to really try to make a case for why these properties are valuable. We can't just let you go ahead and do what seems like I know to all of you to be the right thing to do for public safety without raising a lot of issues. If we didn't do that, we would feel very guilty about these beautiful places that have existed in Portland for a very long time, as you know. So what happened when we were told finally, and we didn't feel the public process was adequate, by the way, and I know that's a disagreement that we have, when we finally found out about what was happening with the reservoirs? We felt it was absolutely necessary to cover the reservoirs. We totally felt that that was necessary. And so we came from that premise, and we jumped in, and we started researching, and we researched and we researched, and literally for seven months, some of us have spent hours and hours a week on this. And we can answer a lot of things. We need the opportunity more than just 20 minutes to do that, so I hope we can get that opportunity. And we'd like to provide with you documents. I -- we didn't get those turned in, we wanted to come to the hearing, but we want to provide you with some of those documents. We called people in other communities and said, what's happening? We went on the internet, we found communities that were fighting for their reservoirs, and this was even before september 11th. And we talked with them and learned that there were alternatives to burial. And people in california, people in pittsburgh, people in various communities as commissioner Saltzman mentioned have come up against this issue and have fought to keep the reservoirs open. Not because they were particularly lovely, like ours, either. That's an important point to us. As a matter of fact, the more we looked at reservoirs around the country the more we realized that these are incredibly special. I think everyone in the room, including all the water bureau and everyone who visits them knows the quality that's there. I don't think we'll ever, ever see the quality again that's shown in the workmanship there once we do away with them.

*****: Can you switch to the other mike?

*****: Ok. Well, how about both of them?

Katz: No, no.

*****: How's that?

Katz: Go ahead.

Geller: It's very frustrating not to be able to hear. All right. So we researched, we researched, we talked to communities, we found that there are alternatives that would address the perceived -- we'd like to emphasize perceived, and it's a hasty decision that was made under duress, and there are perceived mandate coming down. But these have been perceived for many years. I'd like to see us wait until we know what the federal government wants us to do before we move ahead. So some of

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Portland's most famous names, ladd, corbett, reed and failing, their pictures hang, many of them in your office, mayor Katz, because they were mayor here. They put theirs and their taxpayers money on the line to bring the water we have today. No other public worrying in the state is as well documented as the reservoirs system and the bull run. And I think a lot of you know that. Our library archives are packed with documents. I've been reading those documents, doing the research for the history, and your names are already there, making history. And people that clip those little articles and stick them in there, they're there. So i'd like to see your names be up there with the champions that helped to do the best that's ever possible for these reservoirs. Some argue, and -- that it's enough to have documentation of the reservoirs, and that's what the historical process is about, is documentation. We don't believe that that's enough. To just document them. Some would say it's enough to leave a building here, a piece of fence there, a pair of -- a wall there, we don't feel that's enough. We feel we need to look carefully at whatever we do. During these stressful times, other mayors have had, and commissioners have had stressful times. The city leaders contemplated covering the reservoirs after pearl harbor was bombed. It was a very big deal, and they went through a lot of stress, and in the cold war, in the era of duck and cover, the commissioners sat like you and wondered what to do about the reservoirs. And then most recently, the vietnam war era, the flower children were up there and that's why we don't drive up to the top anymore of mt. Tabor park, because of all the flower children. People were worried there was going to be l.s.d. In the water, and there's lots of fun articles to read about during these times. But we're very fortunate right now that for the park centennial committee, for -- because the reservoirs are still there, in Washington and mt. Tabor parks, because the big machinery has not begun to roll. Our parks are not going to look good, mt. Tabor is going to be in a big mess for five years, and that's a big issue. So I just know that those people coming to that conference would love to buy postcards of mt. Tabor and Washington park if we had them available, because they are so special. So are the reservoirs worthy of special consideration or are they purely water storage vessels? We need to decide that. We all need to get on the same page about that, because that is the crucial issue here as far as we're concerned. I want to read you a quote from the draft of the section 106 document, I don't know how familiar you are with the document. This is something that has to be filed to the federal energy regulatory commission that the water bureau has to file in regards to some changes in licensing up there, because there's a generating plant between reservoir 5 and 6 that generates electricity, it's income producing, Washington park and mt. Tabor parks are income producing parks. They both have hydroelectric plants, they both have ways of making money, so we'd like to point that out as a way to help preserve the reservoirs. But anyway, let me read this quote to you. The open reservoirs have been an integral part of the mt. Tabor environment for over 100 years. The reservoirs, the reservoir gate houses, the walls, the wrought iron fencing and posts are all historically and aesthetically notable. They're significant as functional components of the water system as well as symbols of the importance of that system to the development of this city from a small town, to a large metropolis. With their picture effect structures, the reservoirs are also a vital landscape element within mt. Tabor park that. Was written in december 2002. I could bore you to death with lots of documentation, just like that. And i'm going to keep it to one, but I could go on the rest of the night there. Are so many documents. The ditto for the same thing would be Washington park. If they had to do the section 106 document. So anyway, there's -- I want to tell you there's the -- the reservoirs fallen to the top 52 properties eligible for city historical status. We have reservoir 2 that was demolished and sold, another income producer. We've sold out the whole corner of mt. Tabor park for housing. That's another income producer. We need to really take a close look at mt. Tabor park. It's being whittled away. Portland sustainability warrants careful scrutiny of demolishing such a well-built reserve. I know some people feel they were going to replace them in 20 years, but documents read these are strong and good until 2050. Is this

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

sustainability, to destroy something that was so well built that my children will be in their 60's before the city council may have to look at this again? So I want to finish up, I can tell my time is coming to a close, so I want to say that the reservoirs were built with the city beautiful movement. And this was a time when things were a mess in the city all around the country, people wanted beautiful things, and nothing could be built in a public work in the city beautiful movement that did not have beauty and utility built in. I pray that Portland can become a leader in the city beautiful movement again. I understand our city beautiful whatever it was called is going downhill, and I'd like to see us rise together and get that going again. They coined a term, beauty. There's no other public work in the whole country that meets this term the way our reservoirs do. So they fulfilled their mission with beauty and grace and they deserved to be honored in any process that will seek to change them. We must -- I quote, to be good stewards of Portland's infrastructure and mindful of the legacy we leave behind for future generations. We maintain and enhance the livability of Portland in the face of pressures and challenges. And that's from our creed here in Portland. So let me close with saying that there are many ways to -- I have to tell you, this building was built after -- in 1895, after the reservoirs were built. And this is one of the reasons why the city was put on the map, because of the great water system from the Bull Run. So something in -- another quote was from your quote here for taking care of the city hall, the heart of our city from 1998, take care of this wonderful building. Consider it a historic call artifact and treat it as though it were a priceless heirloom, passed down personally for our use, because it is. We're stewards of this building, charged with its preservation. End of quote. And I feel that is exactly like the reservoirs. So should -- how do we go about making decisions and interpreting information? That's what we need to decide. So thank you so much for your time.

Katz: Thank you.

Valerie Hunter: I'm next. I'm Valerie Hunter, I'm a physician and I'm a member of the Friends of the Reservoir, and I'm going to speak about safety issues. We are all aware that it is your concern for security and safety that has driven the rush to hurry and bury the reservoirs, and we do share that concern. Public safety is a value which cannot be compromised. However, we believe the risks should be put in perspective. We believe it should be possible to balance safety with other values which are held dear by the community. We also believe water and safety are a bigger issue than just the reservoirs, and in fact comprise all of the elements addressed in the system vulnerability assessment and the infrastructure master plan, and those issues are safety, water quality, and reliability. Let's of course look at safety. That's the one that's top on our minds. The public fear is mostly directed toward the threat of a terrorist poisoning the water. If the water is right there. However, this is probably the least important of the threats which face our water. Why is that? Water is a very inefficient way to deliver a biological warfare agent. There has never been a successful bioterrorist attack on a public water supply. The most efficient way to deliver every agent is an aerosol. Think anthrax powder in the rose garden. Most biological warfare agents are rendered ineffective by chlorination or would require enormous quantities to overcome the dilution effect. It would take about 5,000 pounds of cyanide to poison the smallest reservoirs, and 10,000 pounds after nerve gas agent. I will concede that there are biological toxins which are very potent, and would -- and could in small quantities poison a large body of water. These toxins, however, mostly can be produced only in a biological weapons laboratory. These toxins are inactivated by reverse osmosis, which is used by the army in its field units. Reverse osmosis is a form of filtration. Which can in fact eliminate most harmful biological agents from water. The issue that's scary to me is this one, the notion of a backflow attack, which was -- is a low-tech kind of attack which could be initiated from any tap or fire hydrant in the city. There can never be absolute security as long as this possibility exists. However, poisoning the water although scary, is just not a likely scenario. More likely is something low tech like this, blow up the infrastructure, and by the

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

infrastructure, I mean bridges and trestles which bring the water, and if there were one single treatment plant that were to treat all of our water, then that also would be an attractive target, which suggests that a distributed treatment such as treatment at the outlet, would be a safer solution and less of a target. Cyberattack. Water quality. Let's talk about water quality. That is, what about the duck poop? [laughter] you will be reassured to know that the federal government is intensely interested in water quality and has in fact promulgated many rules about this subject, and new ones are on the way. The impending federal regulation that's we've heard about are actually performance standards which I believe we could currently meet. And have to do with contaminants in the water, and viruses which are inactivated by chlorine. It certainly makes sense to wait and find out what the actual rule says before acting on it. The good news is Portland's water quality record can speak for itself. I'm quoting from the open reservoir study, water quality evaluation, which was one enormous volume of a five-volume study. Which looked at different water quality issues. Sediment samples collected from the bottom of the reservoirs, no organic contaminants detected in the sediment. No giardia cysts detected in any sample. Viruses not thought to be a hazard because of chlorination, and the poor ability of animal viruses to be transmitted to humans. Aesthetic contaminants, that's the tennis balls. Not found to pose a human health risk. And here's the really good news, no waterborne disease outbreak or water quality incident of public health significance has ever been recorded in connection with Portland's open reservoirs. But that does bring us to the ducks. The ducks are at least an aesthetic problem if not a documented health concern. However, it doesn't take 64 million dollars to deal with ducks. Here is a low tech solution being used in Canada. These are bird wires, which are very effective at keeping the birding away from water. Let's talk about other issues of safety. Notably, reliability. I believe risks should be put into context as there is not an infinite amount of money to spend on risk reduction, and the money should be targeted to where it will do the most good. The system vulnerability analysis states a major recurring hazard to our water supply is storms and landslides. These are real and immediate concerns, not theoretical ones. Let's look at our water supply. We have bull run, which brings by gravity the water through three big type pipes across six miles of landslide zone, across bridges and trestles. And then there's the backup system, the wellfield, which requires electricity and dikes. There have been some near misses. 1995 head works landslide took out a bridge which took with it conduits two and four, conduit three was using -- was bringing the water backed up by the wellfield, then a power outage shut down the wellfield. Not for long, our engineers are professionals and are on the job. This was not a long-standing outage, but it does seem to me to qualify at least as a near miss. In 1996, there was a rain on snowstorm which shut down the bull run with turbidity. We switched over to the well field, but then the same storm caused a flood on the Columbia river, which threatened the dikes. The dikes were not breached, once again our engineers were on the job. But that also would seem to me to comprise a near miss. The vulnerability analysis list says its first seven concerns, and these are the five that were listed as high priority, all issues that deal with seismic stability, mechanical reliability of the well field, the bull run conduits, its bridges and river crossings. What is risk? The notion of risk and security are political issues not engineering ones. It is not possible for all the money in the world to eliminate all risks. It is therefore up to communities to understand what risks they face with the magnitude of each risk is, what the competing risks are, and what they want to spend to control these risks. I believe the real risk to our water supply is aging infrastructure and delayed maintenance. I am not trying to persuade you that we do not need to do anything at all to upgrade our water supply. I just believe that the issue is a bigger one than just the reservoirs, and I also believe that the issue is not so you are Jeff Kent that we must rush into action before all aspects of the problem have been concerned -- considered, and all the alternatives were examined. Speaking of alternatives, --

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Chade Biasi: Good evening, my name is chad, I am not in the mt. Hood neighborhood area, I live in southeast. I'm here to speak to you about your hasty decision to bury the reservoirs. The city council made its decision based on information provided to it by its consultant, a consultant with a invested interest in the money. A review of the alternative analysis document shows that not all credible alternatives were actually presented to council. In fact, the document makes assumptions about the future shape of the water system, which are actually political decisions which is not yet been finalized. Decisions about the size of the system whether or where to do treatment and how much storage is needed is under which scenario. Here are some cities which have come to their own solutions to the problem of how to balance safety, quality, and the love of the people for their open water. This is pittsburgh, which underwent a decade of fines holding off building floating covers until technology caught up and provided a solution. They chose a treatment as -- at the outlet. This is a microfiltration plant nestled against 100-year-old high land park one reservoir. The reservoir, the water in the reservoir is considered unfinished water until it flows through the plant. The plant costs \$14 million. For the building and the treatment facility. An additional 14 million was spent on infrastructure upgrades to the reservoirs and the pipes. This is new york's hillview reservoir, which holds finished unfiltered water. As you can see, there's a walking path and highway next to this water. New york was considering building a cover, but is now favoring u.v. Treatment at the outlet. Here is a city that took its reservoirs offline and now uses it for fire and emergency storage. Boston and encino chose the same solution. This is the dam with the sidewalk at the hollywood reservoir. Here's another view of the pedestrians using the walkway. I think we all would think that pittsburgh, boston, encino and hollywood, california, are larger targets than Portland. [laughter] what other solutions exist? Is there some combination of all site -- off-site storage and treatment at the outlet that could be considered? What is the impact of the rapidly advancing technology of online monitoring? Here you have a new cover on a reservoir, I don't even know where this was at. This is the same type of reservoir cover four years after it was installed. Pretty nice. I could see that at Washington park. Here's worms, cockroaches, maggots, and decomposing plants and animal matter, they've all been found on this floating covered reservoir. Pretty nice. So what would you like? Would you like this? [laughter] or would you like this? [laughter] we believe that there's considerable unexplored alternatives. Treatment at the outlet, like they did at pittsburgh and new york, offline storage, like they did at hollywood, boston, and encino, alternatives or supplemental sites, bypass our reservoirs entirely? Our position is that we think the city should slow down. All options have not been presented. Alternatives -- alternative storage plans, treatment outlets, emerging technologies allow for a genuine public process to consider options. The p.a.c. Is not made up of the public, but hand-picked by the water bureau. When rationally examined, these actions make no sense at all. Thank you.

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

Moore: Please come up four at a time.

Katz: For those of how have not been here before, there's a little timer on the screen, and that will give you your three minutes, and then there will be a very low buzz, and I will try to interrupted you and allow to you finish your thought, but then we'll have to move on. Jeff, why don't you go ahead. start here

Jeff Boley: My name is jeff boley, i'm a chairman of the arlington heights open reservoir committee. This is not about public safety. Because public safety is a given. We all care about public safety. The real questions are these. First, what is the true magnitude of the risk to public safety? Second, what is the incremental increase in safety that the proposal will produce? Third, is that incremental benefit worth the cost in dollars? Fourth, what other nonmonetary costs will the proposal produce such as the impact on open space, surrounding residents, the environment, and historic and scenic resources? Fifth, how do we balance public safety with these nonmonetary

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

costs? The answer to this fifth question is found in our well-established land use laws. No matter what you ultimately decide, it will be a land use decision under state law that can be appealed in court. For the reasons set forth in a february 14, 2003, already to you that I -- our request be placed in the record of this hearing and which you have before you, I believe that the correct decision regarding the land use issues is that either covering or burying any of the reservoirs requires a conditional use permit. Before you make your decision, I believe there must first be a process that answers all of these five questions. I also believe these questions are of such importance, they will require significant time to answer and that we have no alternative but to take whatever time is necessary before you make the decision. Once the process is complete, what do we want? First, we want the reservoirs preserved and open. And a second priority, but the first is by far the most important, a second priority is that we want the reservoirs to remain a functional part of our water system if possible. We believe the reservoirs can remain open and be made safe for much less than the currently budgeted water rate increases. Our mantra is, open, safety, and savings.

Katz: Thanks, jeff. Katherine, can we get an e-mail on the issue jeff just raised with regard to a conditional use?

Kathryn Beaumont: I believe there are discussions ongoing internally, and I think when those have been resolved we can make the results of those known to you.

Katz: All right. Thanks.

*****: My name is katherine, and i'm the secretary treasurer --

Katz: You're going to have to talk right in the mike. Jeff, move the other mike closer to her. Ok.

Kathryn Notson, Secretary Treasurer, South Tabor Neighborhood Association: My name is katherine, i'm the secretary/treasurer for the south tabor neighborhood association. In my documentation I have a list of neighborhoods on that first page. I will not read that here, because i'm going to read what I have written on the other pages. The south tabor neighborhood association discussed the open reservoir replacement project on september 19, 2002, and january 16, 2003. There were 14 people, including board members -- there were 14 south tabor neighbors at these meetings. No one in attendance at either meeting objected to the mt. Tabor park open reservoir replacement project. The neighborhood association board received e-mails from three south tabor residents since january 16, 2003, objects to this project. Only one dissenting resident attended the september 19, 2002 meeting but did not raise objections at that time. On february 3, 2003, southeast uplift district coalition board voted on the friends of the reservoirs resolution this. Resolution contains objections to the process which determined the decision to bury the water in the reservoirs under -- in underground tanks as well as the process to determine what will go over the top of the tanks above ground. The south tabor delegate voted against the resolution. The delegate for the other neighborhood abstained from voting from this resolution. There were only nine out of 20 neighborhood association delegates who voted in favor of the resolution. Broke lynn, crestin and reed currently do not have reputation on the board. There were six neighborhood delegates who were absent. Center, eastmoreland, foster-powell, laurelhurst, richmond and sunnyside. Therefore the resolution was not approved unanimously, nor was it endorsed unanimously by the southeast uplift district coalition board. This was a presumptive statement typed on the resolution draft at the top of the page which was mailed to southeast uplift board members prior to the february 3, 2003, southeast uplift district coalition board meeting. Now, about the reservoirs in specific. Reservoir 1 was built in 1894. This reservoir is no longer to be used as part of the city drinking water system and will not be touched. It will remain as is. Reservoirs 5 and 6 were built in 1911. The volcanic cone was discovered in 1913. Two years after the construction of the reservoirs. The latter two reservoirs are 92 years old and damaged and deteriorating from natural aging and erosion. The fencing is dented and rusting and the walls are crumbling. While there has been no report to my knowledge of leakage, those who remember reservoir 2 near southeast

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

division street and southeast 60th avenue recall it leaked. It was drained and sold to a developer who built courtyard plaza residential center and courtyard senior assisted living center.

Katz: Your time is up. Why don't you complete -- don't read it, but you've got certain points you can share with us.

Notson: Ok. My point is that the security is weak, and as the photograph that is even noted that the people standing around the reservoirs, any one of those 800 people standing there could have thrown something in the water. Although they had no intent to do so, that could have happened. That is a picture that portrays how close those people can get in spite of cameras and guards.

Katz: Thank you.

*******:** Yes. And --

Katz: We've got your testimony.

*******:** Ok.

Katz: I know you spent time trying to summarize the neighborhood association. I appreciate that. We'll read the testimony.

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

Pedro Ferdel-Azcarate: Mayor, commissioner, people of Portland, my name is pedro, I live and work in southeast Portland, and i'm a member of my local neighborhood association, business association and several community organizations. I'm also on the board of southeast uplift, though i'm speaking as an individual tonight. And there was quorum at that meeting in the proposal -- and the proposal passed. But that's another issue. The water bureau has been circulating their formula to suggest that security risks exist that justify the burial of the mt. Tabor reservoirs. This is the -- what they've been circulating. It's pretty simple. It goes like this -- viable agents, plus credible threats, plus significant consequences, equals a security risk. Unfortunately, not all the factors are accounted for in this very simple formula. They won't share with us or ask our opinion, we, the public who would be affected, what are those credible threats. Further, there are airborne biological agents that may be considered viable weapons of mass destruction. I just learned about this feedback system or flowback system. What about the bull run water shed? How are we going to protect the whole watershed? There are larger implications here. Using this formula, we're setting ourselves up to allow all of our public places to be defined as security risks. We the public must not lose our right to speak for our public spaces. Tonight we have the opportunity to demonstrate true leadership on this issue. Let's not let divisiveness and fear be our guide. I think everyone in this room agrees on some basic level that Portland, Oregon, is providing a clear vision and true leadership towards our american future. It's our common vision. Let's localize our real security threats and use our common sense in our neighborhoods people are more likely to be killed in automobile fatalities than by some mysterious terror plot. People are without homes, the school year is being shortened, health care is being cut, it etc. This multimillion dollar reservoir issue is not about security, it's about insecurity. The solution -- here in Portland, I believe we value community involvement, communication, a transparent public process, and the common sense leadership of our elected officials. Thank you. Gracias.

Katz: Thank you. [applause]

*******:** Good evening, madam mayor, members of the council. Thank you. I'm not here representing --

Katz: Identify yourself.

Chet Orloff, Chair, Public Advisory Committee: I am chet orloff, chair of the public advisory committee. I'm not here representing one side or another of the discussion that you're hosting this evening. But rather here to represent the public advisory committee, who is not handpicked by the water bureau, I should say. I'm on that committee representing the park board and other members are representing neighborhood associations and other parts of the city. Looking at this truly

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

regional park. You should know that the decision that you have to make, which is a difficult one, will not necessarily affect the work of your committee, the public advisory committee. Either way, you decide this decision, we will have our work cut out for us. Because whether or not the reservoirs are covered, there is substantial work that needs to be done to restore these, renovate these reservoirs, and the park to the omesteadian tradition and vision they were laid out in. I don't have written testimony for you because you're going to receive an awful lot of paper from the public advisory committee in the months ahead. We intend to give you regular briefings on our work. We have I think great ambition. As I say, either way, the decision comes out, I think we have the opportunity in this park to, as I say, reestablish that great tradition that we have in this city, a great tradition of open reservoirs, and maintaining most importantly I think the character of this park, which is not just distinct, but unique. And it's our objective as a public advisory committee to hold to that vision, to bring the best minds, the best visionaries we can to the city, and others within the city to the table to help the committee, to help the city, to help the neighborhood maintain that character, enhance it, restore it, to that vision that I think we all share. Thank you.

Francesconi: I just want to publicly thank you and the committee for doing this. I'm not sure you fully appreciated what was going to happen when you decided to do it. But the plan all along, and as commissioner Sten reinforced, you'll give us regular briefings, and this will be approved before any of the money --

Orloff: Thank you. I will take your appreciation back to the members of the committee.

Katz: Thanks.

Orloff : I actually intended to say just one thing to chet.

Leonard: I don't know that everybody realizes you're the former executive director of the Oregon historical society. So for me, I have been yearning to hear a balanced approach to this issue that you're bringing with your historical perspective of the city, balanced with your understanding of some of the other issues that we've been hearing about. So I am really happy you're involved, and really looking forward to hearing what you have no say as the process goes on, chet, thank you.

Orloff: Thank you. And I would say I believe the other members of the public advisory committee are also, they also share this perspective, this objectivity and this interest in I think everything that's been expressed this evening is -- as a matter of fact. Thank you.

Katz: Thanks, chet.

Caroline Whyte: My name is caroline, thank you for letting me talk. I was born in belfast, northern ireland, in 1971. I lived there until 1984. I've been back a lot of times since. Around the time I was born, there were a number of particularly savage terrorist attacks. The british government reacted to these attacks in an understandable but tragically flawed way. They interned a large number of people without trial, set up checkpoints and surrounded buildings in wire. I believe these buildings came to be considered a challenge by terrorist and they were targeted more as a result. For example, I remember a police station near where I lived which looked completely invulnerable but was badly bombed, with many people killed. Things have improved a lot in northern ireland now. There's a peace process. The soldiers have mostly gone, there's no more internment, the concrete is gone too. It's much more relaxed than it used to be, though it's still not perfect, of course. It seems clear a major reason for the improvements there is that there's much more economic and political justice than there used to be. There's much greater confidence in the political system. People are less willing to resort to violence. When the persons attacked it's natural to react by lashing out at anyone who appears to be a threat, while becoming overprotective of the things we love. Please remember this country is not actually isolated and alone. And 9-11 was not the first terrorist attack ever to occur. If we cover things in concrete, unfortunately that won't protect us from terrorism ultimately. However, history and the experiences of others who have had to deal with similar situations are a tremendous resource and in fact hold the only key to

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

getting beyond the tragedy of 9-11. I feel very lucky to live in Portland. I moved here only four months ago and in large part I decided to come here because of its impressive legacy of planning. I think this city is truly visionary in many ways. I've had a lot of luck in traveling, I've traveled a lot of places and lived in a lot of places, and I think Portland in its quiet unpretentious way is a real gem. The core of its strength is emphasis on public process. If a society is to be considered truly democratic its water needs to be controlled by its people. It would die very quickly if I couldn't get water. So we cannot have unaccountability making decisions about our water. Our water bureaus are our employees and should do what we ask them to do. If the public thinks the reservoirs need to be covered they should be covered. But it should be the public's choice. So I urge the city council to do the right thing and follow the proud legacy of the city's planners by having a truly public decision-making process. I should make clear in my opinion, covering the reservoir was simply draw more attention to them as a target. It's like forcing women to wear the veil to cover up. It makes you safer, but in fact it draws attention to any vulnerability you have and it also makes the world a duller place. We need to address the real causes of terrorism. Thank you for your attention.
[applause]

Jim Abrahamson: Good evening, Mayor Katz, and the members of the council. My name is Jim, and I'm a resident of southeast Portland. Also for the record, I am not currently employed by or a consultant to anybody or any organization. [laughter] I'm here to speak in support of the security package that includes the replacement of the exposed reservoirs on Mt. Tabor with secured underground storage. Replacing this infrastructure with secure underground storage should have been done 30 years ago when the matter was analyzed and discussed in detail by the Portland city council. A generation ago city council concern was contamination from animals, airborne matters and human pitches debris over the fence or occasionally taking a swim. The cause of concern today is far greater. The council has been briefed in secure sessions on the methods that enemies of our way of life could use those reservoirs as could be due to mass sickness or death. I have been informed by credible professionals that the threat is real and should not be underestimated. Some contend Portland is an insignificant target for attack. I disagree. Portland's unprotected drinking water system offers an avenue of attack unique in the nation for its easy accesses and good odds that the perpetrators of poison can escape. As more communities harden their drinking water structure against attack, Portland moves higher on the target list. Terrorists are the ultimate opportunists. If the nation could be further unnerved by easy operation in a mid-sized city with high odds of success and possibly even escape, they'll do it. The consequence of contaminating the old reservoirs doesn't even have to end with one sickness to have significant impact. That could be the attack on a cherished symbol of our success, the generation of national headlines and the further erosion of confidence in government to protect citizens from our enemies. Please don't beat the council that has reviewed -- decision to improve the security of our drinking water in an age we now know to be increasingly dangerous and deadly. Replacing the exposed and aging reservoirs on Mt. Tabor with underground storage is the right thing to do. Most of the cost of the capital project is already in rates. And the wonderful new park space at the underground reservoirs will create could include appropriate reflexes of the legacy of the outdated open reservoirs. Thank you very much.

Katz: Karla?

Moore: Is there a Scott Bayla I missed?

Katz: Lloyd, why don't you start.

Lloyd Anderson: Mayor Katz, members of the council. It's a pleasure to be here.

Katz: Many of you may not know, Lloyd Anderson sat on this side of the table many, many years ago. For many, many years. And the water commissioner. As an engineer.

Anderson: That's right.

Katz: And I don't know what he's going to say. Why don't you move the mike closer to you.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Anderson: I'm lloyd anderson. My address is number 11 Oregon yacht club, Portland, Oregon. So I live on the water. I favor covered -- covering the reservoirs. I was on the Portland city council during the vietnam war, and at least for part of the time had the responsibility for the water system. At the time, protests against the war and -- were mounting, and while most of the opposition was at a national level, some was local, including the blowing up of the very council chambers where we're sitting now. The threat of the water system seemed real. The council met, discussed it, and we considered covering the reservoirs at that time. And we proposed them -- covering them with a water feature so that in fact the 8 appearance of the reservoirs was substantially what it is now. We dropped the project for several reasons, which I could develop if you want, but the point is it was dropped. In my opinion, the threat is greater now than it was then, and from a wider range of sources. With changing technology, the contamination could be more devastating. Open reservoirs are inherently more vulnerable than covered reservoirs, with or without immediate terrorist threat, I believe prudent public policy leads to covering reservoirs in urban areas where public access is as close -- is as close proximity as it is here in Portland. I think the major point i'd make is that the covering can be done with skill and sensitivity, so that it will have little or no negative impact on a very environmentally rich asset of our city.

Katz: Would you share with us why the issue was dropped during that time?

Anderson: The war, the vietnam war kind of came and then went, and so the public fear began to diminish as the feeling of terrorist activity diminished. The council had rate increases, which in fact they adopted, but shortly thereafter you had huge inflation occurring that wiped away really much of the resources to do anything. So you had a mixed bag of different reasons why they dropped, and the fact was that for my own stand point, I moved to port director, and so I didn't have a position where I could follow up.

Katz: Thank you.

*******:** Hi. My name is john beamer.

Katz: Into the mike.

Jon Biemer: Jon biemer, it's an honor to address the council. I'm a federal employee. I don't represent my agency, so I won't even give the name of it. But I think of myself as a bureaucrat. I think I am trained as an engineer, and I work as a program manager, and I like to think of myself as a public servant, and i've been doing that kind of work for over 20 years. So I have a sense of the planning and perseverance and time and dedication to -- it takes to get to this point in a public process. The analysis that went into the decision was extensive. I also have a sense that you're getting plenty of advice from your legal people about exposing yourselves, the city, and the people to risks from life and lawsuits. And so I think it's very appropriate for you to be paying attention to that. I also know how very, very frustrating it is when protests come along. Ok, that said, I have three points. When the public doesn't want something, it matters. And I think you're getting messages of that. I thought I was alone at first when I heard of this process to cover the reservoirs, and i'm seeing more and more protests, and it brought me out of the woodwork. I don't want it. The second point is that if we let this concern about terrorism overwhelm us into spending the great amount of money we're considering spending, they win. We have to consider that we have to have - - take control over our lives. And third, the lawyers and the engineers can be very helpful when you tell them what you want. [laughter] if the people are willing to take the risk, the lawyers and engineers will figure out a way to do it in a good way. There is a precedent in my experience, and that's in the city much phoenix. Years ago there was a freeway planned across the center of town. It would have split neighborhoods and all that sort of thing. Would it have been paid for 95% by federal money -- would it have been paid for by federal money. They put night a referendum just to see how the city felt about it. It got voted down and the city council decided to honor the

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

referendum. I don't know how this city will go on that, but I do say that you are getting a protest. Thank you.

Francesconi: Just one thing, sir. I want to clarify, the issue of safety, which you're -- many people here are also concerned about, has been raised, the engineers have raised that, as others. As far as I know, the lawyers, maybe they should have, but we have not gotten any advice on the legal side of this.

Biemer: If you ask them, they'll tell you, cover the reservoir.

Francesconi: But the point is that's not happened. So I want you to be clear about that.

Biemer: I accept that.

Sten: Could I ask you a question too? Could I ask just about anybody, I want to get a sense, I know you don't speak for everyone, but if you take the premise, and just for this question, take it that these reservoirs need a major investment at some point. People are going to argue exactly when that is, but I think it's somewhat hard to escape that at some point it's like a roof, you might have five years, you might have 20 years, once it starts leaking you have to spend a fair amount of money. With your -- would your position be that we ought to revamp them and keep them like they are, or is it that we ought to honor the look of them? I'm not saying this as well as I'd like. We're going to have to invest a lot of money in these reservoirs at some point, and I'm struggling with the different positions to think, is the argument this is a great way to store water, it's kind of -- and we ought to keep doing it this way, or we ought to stretch this out for a while, or is it we ought to honor the park? Your testimony is heart felt and I want to try to get at what's the heart of it?

Biemer: I'd like to sit here and come up with an extremely wise answer. And I -- and I appreciate the question. I have to say that my personal opinion is my personal opinion. And things change. At one point I wasn't even going to bother with being involved in any of the protests, because it's not as high on my importance like the war in Iraq or social something or other else. This is basically something that's about the character of the city. And I think it's important. So I think that honoring the will of the people is my priority, and not my personal sense assist an engineer about how we ought to do it. As a matter of fact I'll go one step further. I'll say the real solutions have to come from the inside. They're the ones that know the details. Us, the people on the outside, can push, can set goals, can draw boundaries.

Sten: Thanks.

Katz: What agency do you work for? [laughter] tell us, because --

Biemer: I work for Bonneville power administration.

Katz: Thank you. Thank you for your public service for all these years. You're a good bureaucrat. [laughter]

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

Scott Vala: Members of the council, my name is Scott Vala, I'm a member of the board of Mt. Scott Arleta Association, and chairman of the board of Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Program. I'm not here to speak for or against the covering of the reservoir. We're just here for one issue, and that issue alone. As you probably know, Southeast Uplift is the largest of the neighborhood coalition representing 20 neighborhoods in Southeast Portland from inner to outer. Partly due to our size, we're constantly receiving requests for support in endorsements of all types of projects and issues. There's been times when we felt like we were almost overwhelmed with all the different issues and support people would like and help from us. We're very careful about what we support, and when we do it we try to do the best we can. We take that very seriously. As a result of our commitment, we've developed criteria that all proposals must meet before they're even considered. The proposal we have here met those requirements and was then discussed by our executive committee at their meeting. It was unanimously approved by the executive committee and passed on to the general board membership at our February meeting. At that meeting, it was also attended by a water bureau

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

representative and a representative from commissioner Saltzman's office. The resolution did pass by an overwhelming majority of the board. The board members present, and most of us have many opinions about many aspects of this project, we tried to stay focus on the public involvement issue of this subject. Not on the covering of the reservoirs. We also feel it's very important to recognize the process of the p.a.c. And the process they are using to kind of finalize and look to see what ends up on top of the reservoir, whatever the outcome of this project. We think they're doing a very good job with this project, and southeast uplift has taken an active part in this process. We're only addressing what we feel is the expectation as well as the right of all citizens in this city to a timely, open, and meaningful discussion of any project that affects their lives as much as anything this size does. That is why we're presenting this resolution. The main points of which are -- i'll skip down, whereas the city of Portland has long held public participation as an integral part of policy making, this project significantly departing from that commitment, therefore be it resolved that the southeast uplift neighborhood program respectfully requests that the city council halt both the planning process and the implementation of the burial of Portland's open reservoirs, including the adoption of any additional contract agreements and that the city council initiate a well designed and open public process to allow for a full discussion and thorough evaluation of the technical policy and financial issues relevant to the proposal to bury the reservoirs. As well as the more comprehensive system -- comprehensive system issues that form the context for this project. I also brought with me a resolution that was passed by the buckman community association, which is very similar to ours. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you.

Saltzman: I want to clarify one point. You're mentioned it was adopted by an overwhelming majority of the board. Then you said present.

Vala: Our account --

Saltzman: It was not the majority --

Vala: It was a majority of the board.

Saltzman: Present.

Vala: As well as the board. There was 11 votes for the resolution. The way I have it.

Saltzman: I count ten, and you have a 20-member board.

Vala: I have 11.

Saltzman: It's not a majority of the board, but a majority of those present.

Vala: Yes, it was.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: Are you ready to go? Why don't you go ahead, then.

Chris Morance: My name is chris morance.

Katz: You're going to have to move up.

Morance: I've lived in the arlington heights neighborhood of Portland for 28 years. I feel deeply grateful for the beauty of our city and parks. The area of Washington park about reservoir -- around reservoir 3 has been a special place for me and my daughter, and it's a place that I treasure for walks in the evening when the reflection of the lights in the reservoir makes me feel astounded at the beauty of this feature, and its masterful incorporation into the natural setting of the hills. I'm going to depart from my written talk here because I want to not repeat things that you've heard many times here and concentrate on several things i'd like to reiterate; including talking about the covers, which is close to my heart, because of that particular reservoir being targeted for very quickly in this plan for floating covers. First, regarding the decision that was made to bury the mt. Tabor reservoir and put temporary covers, as we understand it, when council was presented with the menu of alternatives, they were not presented with at that point the -- what we consider very viable alternative of outlet treatment. You've heard that dismissed here, but it is I think a very important

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

alternative to consider. It may not treat every possible toxin, but no system we have is going to be 100% safe. It does satisfy the requirements and the regulations, which are coming up, if that's a question about legality. And it's very interesting to hear, which I just heard, that the hillview reservoir in new york, which is -- I would think be considered a greater target than the city of Portland, is opting for outlet filtration, they're not going to be able to have setbacks. They have a major highway that goes directly by that outlet. You've heard it's more expensive. I think that all those issues need to be looked at in detail. The first basis of comparison in saying it's an equally good option to bury the reservoirs has assumed that the aesthetic result is equivalent between burying the reservoirs and treatment at the outlet, burying the reservoirs because you can put several reflecting ponds on top of several of the reservoirs, and I think those of us who are close to the reservoirs can tell you that the experience of deep water, the aesthetic quality of the reservoir, and not going -- is not going to be replaced with a shallow reflecting pond. I suggest you all visit some if you have any question about that. Let alone ones the size of such a reservoir 3.

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

*******:** Ok. Then i'll --

Katz: Do you have written testimony you want to leave with us?

Morance: I'll leave my testimony, yes.

Katz: Thank you.

Gary Kelly: I'm gary kelly, I am a vice-president of oracle, right across the street. An engineer. So the previous bureaucrat I can speaker took some of my thunder, but I work in an engineering organization. We constantly change what we do, and if you don't as leaders recognize the facts that bureaucracies will keep building whatever they're building, whether it's useful or not, whether it's wanted or not, then you're missing something. At oracle we have to regularly shoot bureaucracies or they keep building things people don't want. It's just a way of life. When I was attending some of the meetings discussing the process by which the decision to bury the reservoirs came out of, this was a narrowly focused engineering decision. Based on relative safety of putting water in a can versus leaving it open. None of the other elements of natural beauty, open space in our urban environment which is getting more pressure, none of those things were factored in. That was going to be later. A different organization would look at it. So I will just echo the concerns of the previous person from bonneville, that somebody has to tell that bureaucracy to get with the parks people, get with the people who value the spiritual values of open space in our urban environment and get them to work together. They won't work together unless you do that. Because it's not in their mind-set as engineers to do anything but put water in a can. [laughter] the other aspect is security. Security with a \$20 pump a terrorist can terrorize the city by pumping stuff into the water system. That was brought up earlier. A terrorist can take a milk canister and fill it with gasoline and go onto a bus and terrorize a city. There's a million ways a terrorist can terrorize a city, far more effectively than dumping something in the reservoir. More cheaply. The issue is about duck poop. The engineers care about duck poop. And they'll bury it in a can just because of duck poop. We've lived with duck poop for over 100 years, and it's fine. [laughter] the other issue is, will this reservoir structure last? I was in rome last year, I can tell you that concrete lasts over a thousand years. 3 aqua ducts there that have been operating for a long, long time. The -- so that's engineering, security -- and finally, it's the p.a.c.

Katz: Make your point quickly.

Kelly: Ok. The p.a.c. Leads you to believe that we can put a reflecting pond on top and it will be the same. I've been told that that will probably not happen for a number of reasons. The cost, the fact you'd have untreated water on top of treated water, the land grab that will happen for nonopen space values, because southeast Portland needs land for many, many uses. So there's pressure for soccer fields and dog runs, and skateboard park and other things. It's highly unlikely that people are

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

going to produce something as aesthetically valuable to this community as that park ever again, and there's no park in the world like it.

Katz: Thank you. [applause] listen, don't fool around with me:

Eric Dickman: Good evening, my name is eric dickman and i've spent -- i'm -- my -- i'm going to depart from my notes because it would be duplicative --

Katz: Let me just in all fairness to you, are you ready to start with your -- ok. Go ahead then. Start his time, then.

Dickman: I've worked for over 25 years in a large bureaucracy, a public utility here in this town. And so I have some experience with the way public utility bureaucracies work. I think it's important that we question some of the positions and statements of the water bureau and make sure that they pass the laugh test. The first one I want to mention is one that has been mentioned before, and that's the hillview reservoir in new york. You can -- the water bureau's rationale for covering our reservoirs is they're such inviting targets. The written position is we're uniquely vulnerable because we're uniquely accessible. That's not true. You can see in the picture that this reservoir is open. 90% of new york city's water comes through that large reservoir. And the water bureau's response is that, well, new york's hillview reservoir is isolated and significantly less accessible. That's not isolated and inaccessible. Our water bureau says that the new york system has made substantial upgrades. You can see that's impossible. So I have to ask, if i'm a terrorist, and I want to place an open source of drinking water, am I going to choose a reservoir in Portland, where I can affect 50,000 people, or hillview, where I can affect millions of people? The bottom line is, Portland's a fabulous place. We have a wonderful asset here. Aren't we suffering from dilutions of grandeur? Thank you.

Floy Jones: Good evening, and forgive me, via cold, so this is going to be tough. My name is floyd jones. I'm going to talk to you about consultant and contracting concerns. There are many in the community that have concerns regarding the appearance of a less objective relationship between the water bureau and the selected consultants on this project. We also have concerns regarding the objectivity of the consultants when providing information about alternatives and costs we -- de -- specifically for our reservoirs. Decisions were made without any public involvement and the consultants rather than the water bureau respond to many of the inquiries made now. We believe that the best decisions for main tagging a safe water supply can be made by our working together to evaluate all of the options. In this paper you've outlined the contract history and although this contracting process may be considered business as usual by the city, citizens who rarely see the inner workings of large projects such as this see biases. I ask that you review this information and consider any appropriate changes. Thank you.

Katz: This is your testimony?

*******:** It is.

Katz: Thank you.

Laura Gordon: Good evening, my name is laura gordon, and I am the water bureau liaison for mt. Tabor neighborhood association. I'm also a member of the p.a.c.

Paul Leistner: And i'm paul, president of the mt. Tabor neighborhood association. And you've heard a lot of people talking about a desire for process. We wanted to do something constructive and give you a process proposal that you can put on the table to consider. One of the things I think you're hearing is that the water bureau and montgomery watson have been working for a number of years on this issue. And they have done what they feel I think is in the public interest, and I think the picture for us is sort of like they have now climbed into the truck, they threw shovels in the back and they're heading off down the road, now you've got a bunch of citizens running along the side of the truck there a they're going down the road shouting out questions to them and asking questions, and they're shouting out information, and people are getting more and more frantic about it. And

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

we think really what needs to happen is they need to stop the truck and they need to get out and we need to sit down and have a discussion about this. And I think what you're finding there are a lot of people who think that maybe there is a good case to be made for burying the reservoirs, but they don't feel there's been a full discussion of it. They don't feel comfortable with that decision right now. And they would like to see a little more process. I think valley -- valerie's presentation with the friends of the reservoirs brought up a bunch of issues that a lot of people would like addressed and possibly settled. So the mt. Tabor neighborhood association is focused on process. We have not taken a position on whether or not to bury the reservoirs, and -- or on what goes on top. We're looking at the process. So we've tried to come up with a proposal for a constructive process to move forward. We feel it's very important to start to rebuild the trust and credibility in the process and to allow the city council to move forward on a course of action that's more broadly understood and supported by the community. And in essence what we're proposing is a limited time process. It's going to be four months, six months, whatever is deemed appropriate, designed and managed by an independent public involvement consultant, supported by an independent engineering consultant, that would bring together the key stakeholders to clarify first, clarify and articulate the public values that are at play. They don't need to agree, but they're important values like high quality drinking water system, system that's protected from malicious contamination, the need to upgrade facilities protect the historical features, get it all out on the table and then under -- in that process, then let's talk about the rest. Let's try to understand what the risk is, and then have the group look at alternatives and rate them on the strengths and weaknesses. And then come back to you guys with that information. It will inform the stakeholders, and then they'll be able to come back and inform you, and you guys may make the decision that, yes, we still want to bury the reservoirs, but I think it will be a much more credible decision at that time, or you may get information that convinces you that maybe a different approach is something you want to try. And we really encourage you to take this into consideration. And we've been working with elaine cogan on this. She facilitated the mt. Tabor park master plan. We know dan knows her, jim knows her. We feel that's important that parks and water know her. And she's on the short list for the master list. You can hire her immediately, get the consultant, and she could do the job. Thank you very much.

Katz: Thank you, paul.

*****: Thank you. [applause] [gavel pounded] come on, folks.

Katz: Did you want to say anything, laura?

Gordon: I was here mostly to answer questions. Do you have any questions?

Katz: No. We know paul, so --

Gordon: That's fine. Paul and I have worked on this for quite a while. Would I briefly say I have been involved with the water bureau, working with them way before this came up. For over three years. And all along throughout this whole process we've been encouraging them to have good public process. And we have come forward with this proposal at this time because we really feel like it is an issue of trust. And it is an issue of public interest. You know, this issue is going to dog this process from now until it's finished and beyond. If it's not addressed properly. So we tried to put forth a positive solution to how you can move from now and go forward in a good way.

Katz: Thank you. Ok.

Katz: After these three we'll shift, because there are 36 people left to testify, and we'll shift to two minutes.

Peter Wilmarth: My name is peter wilmarth. I'm not a resident of mt. Tabor. I don't belong to any of the organizations. I'm just a citizen who appreciates the parks and the reservoirs. I also want to speak about priorities here. Those of us in the chamber don't realize how much pain is out there. This state is in the worst financial crisis in a generation. Dozens of vital programs, all over the state are being cut and cancelled. My daughter's school is being closed, the school year is being

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

cut, I think the priorities are wrong here. It's irresponsible and the appearance is wrong to dedicate \$75 million and trust me, it will be \$150 million before they're finished, to an infrastructure project at the same time the school system is being ravaged. It's wrong, and it looks wrong. The fact that the cost will be rolled into a water bills suggests that soon Oregon will have both the shortest school year and the highest water rates in the country. And that is just bad policy. I understand that the mt. Tabor plan was sort of a back burner project prior to the september 11th attack. It should remain in that category. We simply can't throw \$65 million at every conceivable terror threat. Reservoir poisoning is a difficult unlikely avenue of attack. If a terrorist is dedicated to poisoning our water, they probably can succeed by finding another inlet to the system. I personally regard that scenario as less likely than a truck bomb or a sniper, and I don't think it's cost effective securitiwise. I'm also not persuaded that poor water quality is a high enough priority to move this project ahead of so many other pressing problems. Nor am I convinced the reservoir replacement is as good an investment as improving maintenance on our aging system of types and other distribution infrastructure. I've heard that the water bureau has a number of other massively expensive projects that they're promoting. The water bureau has been good stewards of the utility, but I think the public needs a more decisive say in these major policy issues. And the city council needs to provide responsible leadership on issues like the mt. Tabor project. Decisions of this magnitude can't be left to the engineers alone. Above all, the city council needs to seek public input and trust on controversial expensive planning issues so they can be decided on their merits. And I am not persuaded by the merits of this project, and I doubt that a majority of voters would approve it if they were given a chance so I think the immediate construction plans should be halted, and there should be a public hearing, and the one option must be preservation of the reservoirs or the city's citizens will feel cheated. And the last point i'll make is, on the security issue, one time a country that felt threatened built an enormous fortunate if I indication. It turned out to be simply something you could go around. I won't say more. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Lois heying: My name is lois heying. I have been participating since september in actions to save the reservoirs. I want to share with you the following words from herbert dryside, a water visionary, an urban landscaper. The way water is handled in towns shows more than the mere tech come ingenuity of its citizens. It reflects myth and religion, and shows spiritual constitution of its people. As you know, dryside has been selected by the city of Portland to design a new park in the pearl district. I commend the city for choosing him, because his design will resurrect the water footprints that have so long been buried there. Ironically, while you are encouraging reconnection of citizens to the tanner creek watershed in the pearl district, you are about to abandon the vision of form and function embodied in the open reservoirs. For many citizens, the reservoirs of Portland not only represent, but they are the structures that directly connect us to the bull run watershed. And are integral to a sense of place in Portland. Dryside also laments that technology and aesthetics are usually kept neatly apart as contradictions that cannot be bridged. His body of work refutes this artificial division, as did the olmstead design for the reservoirs. But since september, your message has been loud and clear to we citizens, to us citizens. By saying that citizens can only talk about what goes on top, you are reinforcing that artificial distinction between engineering and design. You have also denied the citizen involvement and integrated planning that dryside so strongly argues for in water projects. I believe we must examine closely what we are about when we choose to destroy our sense of place. Please remember, the public memory is deep for beloved places. We should not be seduced into decisions out of fear in bureaucratic decisions dictates. Our decision should spring forth from the creative and visionary energies that citizens can provide.

Katz: Thank you.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Charles Heying: My name is Charles Hine. In the process of working on this as a friend of the reservoir, I came into contact with a person named Jeanette Newquist. She's elderly and somewhat ill, and she was not able to make it tonight. And she asked me to read this letter to you from her. Dear Mayor and Commissioners. First my apologies for not being able to attend tonight as planned. My name is Jeanette Newquist, my address is 6125 Southeast Division Street, Portland. I was born August 23, 1918, at my parents' home on North Simpson Street in Portland. My great grandfather, migrated from Iowa to Portland via covered wagon in 1862. I have a day-to-day diary of his journey from in 1862. He was elected to the first legislature in the new capital building. My father was born in North Portland. He attended Portland schools and graduated from Hill Military Academy. Although he was offered an appointment to Annapolis, he chose to follow a career in Portland as a surveyor. As such, he was part of the team of surveyors who had the opportunity to work on the development of the reservoirs in question. My father was proud of his work and so am I. I am 84 years old, and I have seen so many of the interesting old buildings in Portland be torn down for run-of-the-mill replacements. I'm afraid my generation and later generations have not done an adequate job of preserving historic places such as the Old Portland Hotel. Other cities such as Spokane are doing this. Please seriously consider saving this unique piece of architecture for our younger generations to admire and enjoy. I now live in and pass through the area and I know that as heavily used and enjoyed by many on a regular basis. While I recognize fully the threat of terrorism, our country has gone through two world wars without harm to this area. I feel a temporary cover could be used until the threat passes. Please don't destroy the only really interesting and unique thing we have left on the east side of Portland. I feel strongly the money destined for this proposed project could be much better used to cover some of the school budget shortfall. Thank you for your consideration.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: We're going to do -- I know it's somewhat unfair, but we're losing everybody. We're going to do two minutes each. So look at the time and try to time yourself. I apologize. Go ahead. I'm sorry, we have a young man here and we'll let him go first. Are you going to testify?

*******:** Sure.

Katz: We need your name.

Kori Mai: My name is Kori. I'm friends of the reservoir. I was born in my house, and probably one of the first things I ever saw was Mt. Tabor, and I don't want to see that change. I mean, it's going to be perfectly flat, and it's going to be like -- I don't want, like, 300 million dollars to be wasted on making a park ugly. You know what I'm saying? They could use -- [laughter] they could use that money for my school, it barely even has heating, and they could open my old school that shut down, 185 times with that money. Ok? And, yeah, and today's my birthday. [applause]

Katz: You can -- we can all clap and wish you a happy birthday. [applause]

Mai: I was born two hours ago, ok? Right now nine years ago, I would be glancing at Mt. Tabor, probably.

Katz: You're something else. Thank you very much. We're going to try to help the schools as well, but we can't use the same money for this that we can use for the schools. But we will try to help the schools.

Mori: Why are they talking about spending money when there's a bunch of other things that can do it?

Katz: That's an issue. But -- thank you. Thank you for making that point. Who does he belong to?

*******:** They're not here right now.

Katz: You came by yourself? He's a neighbor?

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

*****: A good neighbor, too.

Katz: Thank you very much for caring for all of us.

Robin Denburg: My name is robin, i'm -- I live in the mt. Tabor area and I live four houses from where the staging area is going to be. I can't be as cute as he has been, but i'll try to provide some facts to back up my story. I also want to start by thanking you for having this forum. It's really important to have evening for ulc, and I think we need to do this more often. Thank you for having us. I want to start by -- i'm representing the southeast uplift land use and transportation committee. We met on monday and I was asked to give a brief statement on behalf of that committee. We added our voices in support of the statement that was issued by the southeast uplift board of directors. We want to create a true public process on this issue and are seriously concerned with the public process that's occurred so far. And the plan process that is to be. As an individual I want to express concerns about the process on this issue. My fear is that we're going to have this public meeting tonight and then we're going to go back to the current process, which is extremely flawed. You need to explain to me \$72 million is being spent well and consider alternatives to catching that meet the security needs and this hasn't been done. And I need to be able to see that. When I look at an environmental impact statement you have several choices. And that process hasn't occurred. As far as the continuing problems with the current process, one is, your public information officer tries to discredit and deny opposition to this project. Dan sam even tried to do that tonight by discounting the board of directors vote. So maybe that's -- maybe that's where the public information officers are taking direction. P.a.c. Meetings have not been announced, especially to the city's reservoir list serve. I repeatedly requested and this has not occurred. There's a group being created to discuss the construction access route. I as a neighbor who lives four blocks from the proposed staging area have not been contacted with regards to this group. I would be interested in knowing why. I don't feel the p.a.c. Is representative enough. And there's been no discussion about the negative impact of property values with three to five years of construction.

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

Denburg: Paul and laura's ideas as far as the public process is a much better one than what we have currently planned. I want to applaud them for their leadership.

Katz: Thank you.

Gilman Vital: Yes, my name is gil, and i'm not a native Portlander, i'm originally from chicago. I came here in '85 looking for a job in the electronics industry. Right when there was the first wave of mass layoffs. And between looking for work and because I didn't know anyone in Portland, I would spend many hours in the park by the reservoirs. Most of that time I would spend writing letters to various people as I didn't know anyone in Portland. People who received those letters told me later about how incredibly beautiful it sounded by my description, and how unique it was. And indeed, just being -- being a person who's been to many cities and lived many places, i've never been able to find anything quite as unique that has such a contemplative and serene quality as the reservoirs at mt. Tabor. I can understand the need for protecting the water supply. As a technical professional, it seems to me I can envision many possible uses of technology to detect objects thrown in the reservoir. Use of laser systems or a network of motion detectors and infrared imaging systems. You could easily detect harmful objects, or even constant water monitoring. I think that also burying the tanks deeper and augmenting the gravity flow could alleviate the need for changing the appearance, you know, like the reservoirs, and the surface could be left intact and still accomplish the protecting of the water. I feel the existing plan would permanently eliminate the unique and priceless quality of the reservoirs. And deprive future generations of that.

Katz: Thank you.

Mike Royce: My name is mike royce, i'm a lifetime resident of Portland, Oregon. I'm a vietnam veteran and i'm also a teamster for 34 years here in Portland. The reservoirs at mt. Tabor have

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

been an enjoyable part of people's lives for 100 years. Always respected and protected by the community around the area. In my opinion, that's why we haven't had any devastating events concerning the reservoirs in the past. They've been in existence through world war ii, the korean conflict, vietnam war and desert storm. After the events of 9-11, city council and the Portland water bureau are pushing to have the reservoirs destroyed and want to replace them with buried storage tanks. What happened to our government's advice to our communities to be aware of the possibility of terrorism? We can't allow such a small percentage of insane people to dictate changes in our living conditions. In my opinion, covering or burying tanks where the reservoirs are now would eliminate the collection of large amounts of water which represent the same exact thing that comes naturally from melting snow and water runoff into the bull run river. In the future we'll probably wish we had more of these water collecting devices. We'll probably be looking to design more high-tech water collectors similar to the ones you plan to destroy. The spending of this money to make changes that aren't really necessary in my opinion sends the wrong message to our citizen who's are struggling to survive in any way they can during the worst economic situation in the state of Oregon in the long time. Imagine yourself on a fixed income barely making it. Or without a job. Or maybe sick. And a program you depend on was just discontinued because of cutbacks. Or how about your school kid -- or you're a school kid and your school was closed because there was no money and you're being bused to another neighborhood to attend class at a different school? How do you think these people feel about the millions of dollars being spent now with the plan to increase water rates to pay the debt you've created. Regular people know water rates aren't taxes, but just another expense for the already burdened taxpayer. They also know the future of water is important, but wonder why their financial being isn't as important to you. You say it's about terrorism, and the protection of water, but isn't it really about the regular salvation of our bull run water? How come you've talked about the expense of mt. Tabor, but have avoided talking about the future remodel of powell butte and the new plant you plan to build there?

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

Dee White: My name is dee white, I live and work in southeast Portland. Times are tough for me, and for almost all of us. My local government is being forced to close schools, cut off aid and resources for our mentally and physically disabled citizens, and cut back on our infrastructure. And yet my local government is getting ready to force me to pay for something that I cannot afford, and more importantly, cannot justify. In fact, i'm totally opposed to this project that was born in a budget meeting and will end up raising my water rates by at least 20% over the next ten years or less. I've been to every public meeting and every public advisory committee meeting since the beginning. I have listened to presentations by the water bureau, and its consultants. I have not found any -- one compelling reason for accepting this project. This project will force me to pay for more for an already expensive necessity, and it will not stop all of the ways our water can be contaminated. One example, and this is a big one, is backflow. I know we've been talking about it all night, but this is a big one for me. If I were a terrorist organization, it would be the first avenue I would take. It would be fast and easy, it can be done in the middle of the day and no one would know it and it would be more effective than attempting to contaminate a large open body of water. Our water, buried or not, is vulnerable to backflow and I have yet to see or hear any viable argument on this from the water bureau. At the very least this project should be tabled until we can be convinced that -- back flow is not possible. Is it possible? Absolutely. Are my rates going up if the contracts are signed? Absolutely. Was the decision fast tracked after 9-11? Absolutely. Is this decision like so many other decisions being made in the wake of 9-11 based largely on fear and not fact and requirements? Absolutely. I beg you all to please table this project until all of the options

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

are explored. The risks objectively analyzed. Our economic outlook improves and common sense prevails.

Katz: Thank you.

Herschel Soles: Herschel Soles, resident of northeast Portland. I became a friend of the reservoir because I look upon this project as a little bit of a scam. I really would like to see a lot more public input. I saw a movie last week, it said if you want to reduce terrorism, stop participating in terrorist acts. Of course he's referring to our federal government. Participating. I know this council doesn't like to get involved in foreign policy, because I was here when the war thing was being discussed. It's perfect. They had a sign in the paper talking about terrorism, and the sign said, terrorism -- war is terrorism with a bigger budget. I think we -- this council has to get concerned with our foreign policy. We have to make some voice, because that's the way you reduce terrorism. Close down the school of americas. Stop this aid to israel. It's causing a genocide against the palestinians. I want to second everything that was said just ahead of me about the public input. I think that's what this plan needs. It looks too much like inside political payoffs. We want to see more public input, more discussion, we don't want to be separated from something we consider to be very artistic, very serene, very pleasant place to go. It was a couple years ago that taliban destroyed some 2,000-year-old temples there. I mean, we're all appalled at this kind of artistic destruction would take place. I'm hoping you people don't follow a similar route there. Let's get some public input and maybe we can have our reservoirs for another 100 years. We think it can go for another hundred. So i'm all in favor of postponing the -- any decision about this thing, getting more public input, and don't destroy anything unless you hear from us and it says that what we really want to do.

Katz: Thank you.

Lenore Bijan: My name is lenore, and I have some concerns with this. I have seen over the course of the last few years, so many changes in technology, where things are presented as the last word in something, and they're going to cost so many millions of dollars, and then the bill comes in, and they cost double that amount, or another third, and they're not the last word. They're very faulty. And have to be revamped at public expense. As far as the water bureau is concerned, the sewer system negotiations I was in on that, I live in northeast Portland, i'm a low-income person, i'm older, and water is extremely important to me because I raise everything I eat. I grow it in my garden. And the sewer rates went sky high. A lot of things we were promised didn't come to pass. A lot of things that had been -- that absolutely on the board, just disappeared. And i'm very concerned about this sort of thing. What i'm most concerned about is the climate of fear, where roosevelt said the thing to fear is fear itself. And it seems to me that right now this country is in the grips of a horrible fear, where we're doing a lot of counterproductive things, like the duct tape fiasco, that our -- we're not considering the other possibilities. If we, for instance, covered a reservoir and sunlight couldn't get in there, and things can get under the membrane, or under the cover, we don't know what the long-range potential for disaster to the water supply by purely natural means might be. Or how technology might be able to improve. We don't know what the federal government is going to require of our water system.

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

John Larsen: My name is john larsen, and i'm here to beseech you to not to -- i'm not asking you to not cover the reservoirs or to cover the reservoirs, but to give this matter a full ventilation and a full public hearing. I'm distressed sitting here listening to my fellow citizens having to race through their testimony on this matter, because they believe that this three minutes or this two minutes is the only chance they're going to have to tell you about how they feel about it. Because although your decision was made nine months ago, this is the first and as far as they know, the only opportunity that they're going to have to address this matter and be heard. I live in mt. Tabor, and I own commercial property in mt. Tabor, and I work in mt. Tabor, and I have been there for over 20

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

years. And although I don't represent mt. Tabor, I believe that i'm representative of it. We're good citizens, we pay our taxes, we vote, if my fellow -- my neighbors are anything like me, they voted for each of you, as a matter of fact. And we participate in public processes, I chaired the -- cochaired the hawthorne boulevard process a few years ago. I go to neighborhood meetings where civic participants and what I see happening in my neighborhood is the erosion of confidence in government. I -- when I go to neighborhood meetings I don't hear bashing of government, I don't hear -- people were all in favor of voting for measure 28, they're in favor of what city government does. But right now it -- there's a tremendous citizen -- cynicism that's being bred because of the way this process has unfolded, or rather this lack of process. There may have been a water bureau process, but there hasn't been a citizens process. Hi nothing to do with the proposal that paul and laura, my neighbors, brought to you tonight. But i'd really urge you to give that some serious considering. If this project is that important, then so is the participation of your constituents. And our fellow citizens. Thank you.

John Wish: Mayor Katz and councilmen, thank you for allowing us to talk. Since 2001, as a member of the mt. Tabor neighborhood association and the mt. Tabor neighborhood association board, has been asking the water bureau for full citizen participation. We were stone walled and we were not given any information until late 2002, supper of 2002, and then we were told you may talk about only what goes on top. I would also like to call attention to mort's presentation e. Scenarios two, three, and four. I have reviewed that -- the financial information with joe glicker, the water bureau consultant and with dennis kessler, and I find problems with those numbers. I think there are alternatives, which are cheaper, which will meet the safety needs and they need full public discussion. Final, my final point, I support paul and laura's comments and would hope that there is full public discussion, because the water bureau and best are going to be talking about -- b.e.s. Are going to be talking about hundreds of millions of dollars of needed capital investment in the next ten years, which could triple our rates for water and sewer. We need full public support to do that. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Bruce Hollen: Yes, hello, i'm bruce hollin, I live in southeast Portland. What I -- my comment is, I think it should properly go to a vote of the people on this issue. This is something that the people should vote on. That is my opinion on this issue. And as far as this -- there will still be risks, even if this thing is put into place. It's not going to eliminate all the risks, because you're dealing also with the source of the -- which is up there in bull run. I mean, and like the other person said, backflow. So it's not going to eliminate all the risks, the very thing that's been said to sell the program. That's all I have.

Katz: Thank you.

Kerry Brown: Mayor Katz and city council. Why does the city council think they are smarter than the citizens of Portland when it comes to making a decision about the mt. Tabor reservoirs? The citizens of Portland are telling you no to this. We cannot trust you to make a decision with this one. It appears that this is just one more incidence where you forget that you work for us. The real issue is the financing. In defense of our country and impending war, our city and nation does not have the extra money to fund this project. Citizens are concerned about terrorism, but we're not so frightened that millions of dollars must be taken from us and directed toward the burial of these two reservoirs. The Washington park reservoirs, and the water filtration system for the bull run. We're comfortable with the current safeguards. Why impose a permanent seven-plus increase on our water rates when you can just leave these reservoirs alone? It is documented that the bull run is one of the most protected watersheds in the nation. There's no federal or state law requiring you cover these sites. The number of projects in the works within the city of Portland is out of control and budgets are inflated. The implications to the mt. Tabor neighborhood and damage to the butte are

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

serious considerations that jeopardize the livability. The construction, erosion, redirection of traffic, the noise, the length of time to complete this, the list goes on and on. I ask you to stop now, while you're ahead. It is time each of you realizes that this continued need for personal recognition, future remembrance, and the building of monuments for yourselves has to end. Does commissioner dan Saltzman wish to be compared and remembered as commissioner erik Sten was with his mismanagement and incompetence? Thank you.

Katz: Go ahead.

Roger Cathey: My name is roger cathy, i'm an independent systems analyst and research engineer.

Francesconi: Personal stuff doesn't help. It really doesn't.

*******:** Ok.

Katz: Go ahead.

Cathey: I guess the first thing i'd mention is a technical issue such as those that were pertaining to the types of systems that we have in -- that are similar to those in new york. They have a budget many times greater than Portland does, and their experts decided not to cover the reservoirs. What's good enough for them should be good enough for us. And the technical issues of burying a reservoir, I did a great deal of study on the subject of biotoxins. Since 1974 I got into biochemistry and i've studied the issue of biological toxins. And the kinds of things that terrorists have access to don't in my mind represent a serious risk. Probably the most dangerous toxin that we could find at any form after system would be prions. They're not affected by anything except for filtration. Filtration is the best way to go. And filtration can include a subsidiary or auxiliary system of treatment that includes ozone and electroradio therapy. Those are things that could be put into a little slope between the top reservoir and the bottom reservoir of mt. Tabor very efficiently and be part and parcel of the upgrades. Finally if you bury water, it's not exposed to natural ozone of the atmosphere, it's not exposed to sunlight and you could return to the issue of spraying water to increase that exposure, because fungus cannot grow in systems like that. And buried tanks are a perfect way to culture fungus. And that's a huge issue. Finally i'll just say that if this is a system that's to protect people, it has to be truly representative and not just an appeasement process. And so I know that you're going to do that and carry this forward to a more serious consideration, because believe me, you don't want to get fungus in your system. One thing about the ducks.

Katz: Let's not go there.

Cathey: Duck poop has enzymes that prevents fungus. If you have toenail fungus, put duck poop on it to get rid of it. You bury the water, you're going to regret it. None of those things are a problem when exposed to the air or sun. But you're going to regret it in 50 years. You're going to think, why did we do that?

*******:** Thank you for having me here. For a lot of really good --

Katz: Identify yourself.

Greg Davis: Greg davis. I've heard really good heart felt speeches, but I think what's important is to have a dialogue. I'd like to ask a couple of quick questions to help me understand this project.

Katz: Let me just interrupt you. We're not going to have a dialogue in this kind of a forum. So why don't you go ahead and ask your questions, I don't think they're going to be any responses. Let us hear how you feel about it.

Davis: I was just curious if this is strictly a Portland and Portland-funded project. And whether or not you're getting any pressure from the federal government to do this. And if there are any plans to protect the bull run watershed and dam from an aerial attack.

Katz: Thank you. Did you want to answer any -- there may be an answer later. Ok.

Davis: We can't have a dialogue?

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Saltzman: A lot of those answers are in the presentation. Yes, there is a federal rule, yes, it will be Portland fund and I don't feel comfortable commenting on security protects of bull run.

*****: Oh.

Randall Smith: I'm randy smith, native of Portland. Resident of south tabor. I am also trained by the united states environmental protection agency and the u.s. Coast guard and oil and hazardous materials bills response, damage assessment, safety and contingency planning. And i'm a past senior scientists with the water policy workshop at Portland state university. And a trained aquatic biologist. I have a statement which I will send, but I -- as i've listened to everyone tonight, I think maybe there are two things I could just say which would be helpful. I disagree with the water bureau in that there aren't adequate safety concerns. I think there's modern methods of flowcytometry, which could be incorporated. But safety isn't the major issue. The open reservoir system is just an absolute treasure. I had the opportunity to go to southern france a couple years ago, and maybe you've seen the volkswagen ad with the roman aqueduct in the background. That's the -- aqueduct and it's a french national treasure. Kids go there every spring to see the aqueduct and visit. What would happen if someone said, someone's going to fall off that treasure, we'll just tear it down. And it would be gone. We don't think of our reservoir system as that kind of treasure, but truly our open reservoir system is a national treasure. There are alternatives to underground reservoir systems that could be placed elsewhere in the system, there could be diversions that go around mt. Tabor that could address safety issues, earthquake issues, things like that. But truly, you know, as a biologist, water is always more dangerous in a can than an open water system anyway, as someone else has said. And truly, I want to affirm what the woman said from ireland, that highlighting something with barbed wire is always a greater target than the thing you have.

Katz: Thank you.

*****: Thank you.

Geoff Oneil: My name is geoff oneil, i'm from the mt. Tabor neighborhood. On the west side we have Washington park, we have the zoo, the rose garden. And on the east side, mt. Tabor park is the crown of the east side. And those reservoirs are the jewels on that crown. We move to mt. Tabor to enjoy the park, and I would want you to think of the east side of Portland without the reservoirs. It would be like boston without the gardens with the swan rides across the commons. It would be like new york city without central park. It would be like san francisco without golden gate park. And why cover it? I just want to urge you to explore the alternatives of offline storage, or outlet treatment. I think that the reservoirs is an engineering marvel that has sustained us over the last hundred years, and I think we -- together we can find an elegant solution that will retain that functionality. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Katz: You look familiar.

*****: Yes.

Katz: Anybody else? Let's find out. Keep reading.

Katz: Go ahead.

Lew Humble: Ok. My name is lew humble. I live in the sellwood district. I've been around here as long as dorothy mcculloch lee was mayor or the vanport flood. I've run against, well, two of you at least. The other one disappeared.

Francesconi: It's going to be the rest of us now too.

Humble: Well, i'm declared candidate for the mayor of Portland. So you must all know what i'm about. It's water, water, water. The river, bull run, the reservoirs. I don't know exactly how to put it, other than, at this forum, the thing is about the reservoirs. They are a treasure, just like memorial coliseum, and they should be left alone. What I do think we should move the reservoir system to somewhere else. Those things -- mt. Tabor is an active volcano. I keep hearing not if, but plan

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

we're going to have a major earthquake. And when all these buildings are getting retrofit and the bridges are getting retrofit, those reservoirs are going to be the first thing that goes when. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Steve Reinemer: Steve reinemer. I'll be giving I more postcards that have gotten signed. There are awesome of them there to add to the previous thousand or so presented in mid-january. I think about 1500 people now have formally signed postcards or staples questioning this decision. I have no doubt that thousands more would do so at the slightest concentrated every. In my experience, eight or nine people out of ten on mt. Tabor on any given day do sign these cards. I'd also like to say I think each rationale in opposition to the burial decision stand independently in its merits. But and -- and i've crossed quite a few to address because my list is dwindling as people speak. I can just on some of them I can understand why someone might not be concerned with the compromises of burial, if, for example, you weren't concerned with the rate increases or if you didn't think citizens have other pressing priorities for their pocketbooks at a time when people don't feel at liberty to spend as little as measure 28 asks for on a temporary bases for fundamental education and social services. That amount was similar to the amount that all of us will pay permanently through our rate increases for a questionable value if not outright devaluation in the minds of most. Or if you feel such an event is more likely an important as he just referred to, the things like earthquakes, which were rated much higher as other people have said. Including the pipelines across under the willamette that are right along the major fault line. Or if you thought our reservoirs were going to look more or less the same upon completion of the project, in spite of an uneasing feeling I have that the agenda is to capitalize on new park space for active recreation like soccer and ball fields, and in any case not the current unique vast water. That's a design that the city commissioners and public representatives of the on top design p.a.c. Have referred to at times as something really special. Well, I personally know something really special, and that is know something -- no something really special.

Katz: Thank you.

Diane Tweten: My name is diane tweten. Carding to a recent mailer, the reservoirs are relics of the past. There isn't any federal mandate or health situation driving this. Other cities have considered doing it decided against it. Even though as unfiltered, I have never had a duck feather or frisbee come through my tap. Our water comes from many open source and is vulnerable to many catastrophies. It's just hard to poison a large body of water. Does the city council sincerely believe that this threat is so great that this is -- this enormous expenditure is justified? Perhaps I would be more likely to believe that you do. If there's been a full discussion, including a response to issues of vulnerability to backflow. In many cases the modern cure is worse than the problem it seeks to solve. Chlorine is a carcinogen that the e.p.a. Consider recommending be discontinued. Having worked for a did owned by a large manufacturer of chlorine which wouldn't let me post information on an earth day presentation about chlorine-free paper, I have my suspicions. Using the wisdom of mother nature, which is occasionally greater than our own modern wisdom, keepers of the water builds flow forms which are not only beautiful but purify the water through aeration. Being exposed to oxygen helps dissipate the excess chlorine. So far I haven't heard a convincing case that would justify the enormous cost. The Portland city council feels that most Portlanders knew about this. I heard the same thing said about the proposed regional drinking water agency and was having a great deal of difficulty finding anyone who knew anything about it. The statement might be more believable if hit been mentioned as part of the mt. Tabor master plan in 1998. Montgomery water son studied the issues since 1996. No serious discussion occurred until after the may decision. I think the city knows how to truly inform the public.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

Larry Beck: Good evening, mayor Katz and commissioners. I have three points, Larry Beck, Southwest Corbett and Gibbs. I have three points I want to make. I don't live in Mt. Tabor and I don't live in Washington Park, so I would support what the neighbors have to say. I'm sorry I just got in about 8:30 tonight. I would listen very carefully to what those neighbors have to say. Even though I'm not a neighbor in those neighbors' neighborhoods, this is my city as well. The other two points are about process. I am pleased to see the council decided to hold an additional hearing here tonight so people could speak. I don't know what level of notice and process were given to the neighbors before, but I think it's helpful when obvious 30 -- obvious 30 was an uproar about people being aware, that you hold the forum. I know Commissioner Leonard and I spoke about process and making sure that these forums are truly an open maybe not an exchange of ideas or debate with the council and people presenting, but it's a true opportunity for you to listen to the citizens and to make a decision after and not have decisions made before. They've had a problem with that in the past. I certainly hope this will be an open forum and a decision is not made until later. Last point is about money. I'm very concerned about money that this city is proposing to spend on certain projects. I've been before you a number of other projects where we're talking about a quarter of a million dollars, or we're going to be talking about 18 million, and now we're looking at 66 to 68 million. It concerns me when we can't keep schools open, we can't fund social services in Multnomah County, when we've got a 23 to \$50 million deficit for next year and they're talking about closing schools and shortening school year, we're devoting resources towards this project that could be devoted towards schools. I understand it's not the city's bailiwick, but the city in the past has given money to the schools, and I'd like to see our resources go to projects like that for the benefit of the public rather than for projects like this. So I would certainly hope you take that into consideration. Thank you.

Katz: We'll have a conversation about that later on.

Beck: I'd be happy to, thank you, mayor.

Brian Pendergast: Good evening, my name is Brian Pendergast, I lived and worked in this area for 40 years. I had many thoughts and points in opposition tonight to convey, but during the session I've heard nearly all mentioned in a very thoughtful, insightful and knowledgeable way. So I'll not repeat them. One of the things that I think is devastatingly important is that we all need to consider how on earth we're going to continue to pay for these kinds of things. It sounds very expensive, and as well it sounds like a hastily drawn-up plan. Another thing I might add is that as I've grown up I've seen a lot of places that I used to be able to go made off limits, and a lot of things that I used to be able to do without any thought is no longer allowed. So what brings that up is the idea of making the reservoir disappear or less accessible, and then lots of surveillance there at our expense to monitor everybody, really. And I guess I close in saying that at what point will the government, whose existence we all pay for, stop restricting and placing under surveillance all of us under the guise of terrorism and homeland security? And also it's beyond me why all of us have to come forward tonight and plead for a chance to -- for the rest of the thousand of us that don't come tonight to have a chance to vote on this. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Richard Carpenter: I'm Richard Carpenter, and thank you for being here tonight. If I had a question, it would be, has there been a final decision made on this? But you without a dialogue, I'll move ahead. No one has enjoyed that part more than my family and I. It's nothing like starting at the bottom.

> walking all the way up to the top, looking out over the west side, and the reservoirs. Down below. Used to be in the early 1980's, there was a guard or someone to do -- they were always there, there was always someone there. And after that, I think the mid-1980's, there stopped being anyone there. I always thought, there ought to at least be someone here. Finally after 9-11, there

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

was. Then I wanted to talk about money priorities. People have talked about schools, and I have to say taxes are still taxes. Schools need to be taken care of first, then the water bureau billing problems need to be dealt with, and then this big pipe going under the willamette river. All these are going to be big expenses that are going to come on our water bills and need to be dealt with. Then I wanted to move on to poisoning the water, or whatever it is, that someone's going to do. And if it gets poisoned or if someone jumps in like they did, the way you deal with it is you just drain it all out. Unfortunately, that has to be done. And those reservoirs are just like big concrete buckets. If a terrorist wants to get in, and they're covered, then they're going to figure out how to get in some way and do what they're going to do.

Katz: Thank you.

Carpenter: But the solution to spending money is to spend it up at bull run.

Katz: Thank you.

Moore: He still has time.

Katz: I'm sorry. Sorry, sir, you have 15 seconds. [laughter] somebody's watch went off.

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

Katz: Rosemary, why don't we start with you. It's been a while. I know you're going to give us heck, but it's been a while since we've seen you.

*******:** It has been a while. This brought me out again.

Katz: Why don't you identify yourself.

Rose Marie Opp: My name is rose marie opp. I don't live in the area either, but I do appreciate the beauty of both of those lovely places. Mayor, I was in here about a year ago, I told you, someone came up to me in a grocery store and asked, they're getting the character out of Portland, aren't they? And my eyes went down, yeah, well, if you move forward with this, I believe you'll be gutting the character right out of our city on both sides of the river. After everything i've witnessed the past eight years, I sometimes think, what more could happen? After seeing the destruction and change that i've seen in this city, and particularly in our outer southeast, I don't think I need to remind you that we lost nearly six acres of our eight-acre neighborhood parks, so to get away, it's been a refuge for me to go up to that mt. Tabor area. And I would love for you to go up and fall in love with the place and have a heart connection. Feel the warmth of the sun, see the sun set and the glow on that reservoir. It isn't comforting at all to know that you might have a new plan here. I don't think people want a different plan. We need the comfort of keeping what we dearly love, and people who have Portland values need to be respected instead of getting your treatment, if you pardon the pun. And I hate to say this, but I do feel like i've -- i'm being backed up against the wall, and I really feel if you don't love the Portland things in this city as much as the people of this city do, then maybe it's time for you to stay in new york.

Katz: That wasn't nice.

Opp: I know it wasn't nice. But i've seen so much destruction in this city.

Katz: Thank you.

Opp: I and would like to invite you to come up one evening.

Katz: Thank you.

Opp: To the reservoir.

Katz: Rosemary, thank you.

Joe Angel: I'm joe angel, mayor and council, thank you for letting me speak tonight. I live up near Washington park, and I would like to give you a perspective from up there. We need a process that values the open space resource that we now have up there. The temporary covers as I have said to you before, are not a security measure. They simply don't pass the test on being secure. To waste that money for a measure that is represented as security is not what we should be doing. I would like to ask you to value what you have seen tonight, and to draw on the citizens who love this city.

FEBRUARY 19, 2003

You've seen a lot of smart people come up here and raise issues that are legitimate, real issues about the decision that was made. We need to bring forth a process that encourage those kinds of debates and gets to a real solution that is not put forth by a consultant. On the west side we especially need a planning process. We have a regional park there that draws from way far away, draws from british columbia. Tons of people come in buses. We have the rose garden, we have the japanese gardens. There's a lot of stakeholders. We need to plan now, because it will take some time with that many stakeholders. We need to start the process. Lastly, please remove any conflict of interest. I think this is a baseline requirement. It seems common sense to me. The people you seek advice from should be very broad in their perspective and you should start narrowing it down. But they shouldn't be the same people who are going to build whatever it needs to be built.

Katz: Thank you. Your time is up.

Angel: I don't believe there's an access -- axis of evil between the council and the bureau, and the consultant. But I do believe there needs to be separation.

Katz: Thank you.

Francesconi: That would have made tv if they hadn't left. That was a good line.

Katz: Are you the last person?

Autumn Chamberlin: I am the last person. Missed my call earlier, evidently. Mayor Katz -- my name is autumn chamberlain. I've been a southeast Portland resident for 25 years. Generally I think we all need nature. We need to revitalize our troubled, stressed-out souls with mother nature and we need this more now perhaps more than ever. I rejuvenated my spirit frequently on mt. Tabor as i'm sure many if not all of you have as well at one time or another. The water-filled reservoirs have been particularly peaceful places for me. Disruption and destruction of the existing beauty of mt. Tabor would deeply sadden me. I am greatly troubled by all the rushed and closed process. I'm troubled by the general capitalization of fear. I am amazed at the proposal of a construction of a super filtration station so we Portlanders can enjoy I canny willamette river for all our needs. Yum. I strongly agree with the points presented by the physician who spoke earlier, open water contamination is not a big concern of mine. To me, backflow access is the greatest threat. This possibility scares and concerns me far more than possible terrorist or any idiot contaminating any open reservoir. I'll not looking forward to more increases in water bills. So this is not something to be rushed into. Because of this, and much more, I beseech to you completely open this process to us, the citizens. We want neutral facilitators. We want independent fact finders. Please take time to consider all the facts. Please listen to all the citizens. Together, we can preserve the wonderful structures for history, for generations of continued enjoyment. Together we can preserve the beauty of soul-inspiring nature. Together we can. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. [applause] thank you, everybody. Thank you for coming out. I'm sure among our council members we will have discussion as to where we go next on this. But I appreciate everybody out here and thank you for your comments and your recommendations. We stand adjourned. [gavel pounded]

At 9:05 p.m., Council adjourned.