



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

**OFFICIAL  
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **21ST DAY OF MAY, 2003** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, Leonard and Saltzman, 4.

Commissioner Saltzman arrived at 9:35 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-4 roll call, the Consent Agenda was adopted.

<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>	<b>Disposition:</b>
<b>460</b> Request of Todd Kurylowicz to address Council regarding Portland Peace Encampment (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>461</b> Request of Annalisa Mary Bandalera to address Council regarding Peace Encampment 24 hour vigil (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>462</b> Request of Joe Kallunki to address Council regarding Portland Peace Encampment (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>463</b> Request of Glenn Warren to address Council regarding Portland Peace Encampment (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>464</b> Request of Leonard Alexander to address Council regarding continued human rights violations in the Middle East (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>TIME CERTAINS</b>	
<b>465</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM</b> – Portland Rose Festival Association update by Executive Director (Presentation introduced by Mayor Katz)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>

**May 21, 2003**

<p><b>*466</b> Grant a revocable permit to the Portland Rose Festival Association to erect and maintain flags and banners on the ornamental light standards in downtown Portland from May 24 through June 30, 2003 (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177491</b></p>
<p><b>*467</b> Grant revocable permit to the Portland Rose Festival Association to use Tom McCall Waterfront Park for its Waterfront Village from May 16 through June 16, 2003 or as approved by the Portland Parks and Recreation Bureau (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177492</b></p>
<p><b>*468</b> Grant revocable permits to the Portland Rose Festival Association to hold the Starlight Parade in downtown Portland on May 31, 2003 (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177493</b></p>
<p><b>*469</b> Grant revocable permits to the Portland Rose Festival Association to hold the Junior Rose Festival Parade on June 4, 2003 (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177494</b></p>
<p><b>*470</b> Grant a revocable permit to the Portland Rose Festival Association to close portions of city streets for activities related to the Grand Floral Parade for formation area from 5:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. on Saturday, June 7, 2003; for erection of seating in Winning Way from 8:00 a.m. Friday, June 6 through 4:00 p.m. Saturday, June 7, 2003 (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177495</b></p>
<p><b>*471</b> Grant revocable permits to the Portland Rose Festival Association to hold the Grand Floral Parade on June 7, 2003 (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177496</b></p>
<p><b>*472</b> Grant revocable permit to Portland Rose Festival Association to close certain streets from June 11 to June 15, 2003 to hold its Rose Festival Art Festival, waive fees for some permits and inspections (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177497</b></p>
<p><b>473</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM</b> – Recognize Chinese American heroes and the invaluable role of Portland native Hazel Ying Lee in the Second World War (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>36139</b></p>

**May 21, 2003**

<p><b>474</b>    <b>TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM</b> - Accept the Waterfront Park Master Plan as proposed by Portland Parks and Recreation as a guide to the future development and management of the park (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz and Commissioner Francesconi)</p> <p><b>Motion to place a period after "attendance," and the elimination of the rest of that bullet:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-4)</p> <p><b>Motion to eliminate the third bullet:</b> Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. Motion Failed. (Y-1; N-3, Commissioner's Francesconi, Leonard and Mayor Katz.)</p> <p><b>Motion to adopt the four amendments listed in the May 21 letter:</b> Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and gaveled down by Mayor Katz after no objections.</p> <p><b>Motion to accept the entire plan as amended:</b> Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>36140</b> AS AMENDED</p>
<p><b>475</b>    <b>TIME CERTAIN: 11:00 AM</b> - Authorize the rates and charges for water and water-related services by the City during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004 and fix an effective date (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p>	<p align="center"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 28, 2003 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>476</b>    Amend Title 17 of the City Code to revise sewer and drainage rates and charges in accordance with the Fiscal Year 2003-2004 Sewer User Rate Study (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz; amend Code Chapters 17.35 and 17.36)</p>	<p align="center"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 28, 2003 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b></p>	
<p><b>477</b>    Reject all bids for the Montana pump station upgrade (Purchasing Report – Bid No. 102069) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>ACCEPTED</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>Mayor Vera Katz</b></p>	
<p><b>478</b>    Reappoint Dan Saltzman for a term to expire June 30, 2006 and appoint Brad Hutton for an indefinite term to the Visitor Development Fund Board (Report) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>
<p><b>479</b>    Appoint Linda Barnes to the Building Code Board of Appeal to replace John Lape for a term to expire April 30, 2006 (Report) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>CONFIRMED</b></p>

**May 21, 2003**

<p><b>*480</b> Pay claim of Frank and Laurie Bird (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177470</b></p>
<p><b>*481</b> Pay claim of Elmer and Olga Boag (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177471</b></p>
<p><b>*482</b> Extend Legal Service Agreement with Preston Gates Ellis, LLP for outside counsel (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 34486) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177472</b></p>
<p><b>*483</b> Accept donation of a weight machine for the Police Bureau Northeast Precinct weight room (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177473</b></p>
<p><b>*484</b> Amend contract with NWP &amp; Associates, Inc. to increase total compensation for engineering and implementation project management of the Integrated Regional Network Enterprises (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 34119) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177474</b></p>
<p><b>*485</b> Authorize application to the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development for several transportation and growth management program grants in an amount up to \$900,000 (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177475</b></p>
<p><b>*486</b> Amend Title 3 Organization of Portland Office of Transportation to meet Administrative Rules requirements (Ordinance; amend Code Section 3.12.010) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177476</b></p>
<p><b>*487</b> Authorize the continuance of negotiations for the purchase of rights-of-way required for the North Lombard Overcrossing Project and authorize the City Attorney to commence condemnation proceedings, if necessary, and obtain early possession (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177477</b></p>
<p><b>*488</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation for \$50,000 in State Highway Funds for the I-5/I-405 Freeway Loop Study (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177478</b></p>
<p><b>*489</b> Authorize a contract with Youth Employment Institute to provide a summer work experience program (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177479</b></p>
<p><b>*490</b> Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County to change scope and increase dollar amount by \$90,000 for low income customer plumbing repair program (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 33298) (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177480</b></p>

**May 21, 2003**

<p><b>*491</b> Amend contract with RESOLVE, Inc., to provide professional services for public involvement and negotiation of administrative agreements for management of the Bull Run watershed (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 33091)  (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177481</b></p>
<p><b>*492</b> Authorize the Director of the Bureau of Environmental Services to enter into an Easement and Maintenance Agreement with Portland Public Schools for construction of a stormwater detention and infiltration facility at Glencoe School (Ordinance)  (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177482</b></p>
<p><b>*493</b> Increase funding by \$55,567 for Jean's Place for services to homeless men and women (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 34312)  (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177483</b></p>
<p><b>*494</b> Accept donation from Roadway Express, Inc. of spill guns and cartridges for Portland Fire &amp; Rescue (Ordinance)  (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177484</b></p>
<p><b>*495</b> Amend agreement with Providence Health Systems for respiratory evaluations for Portland Fire &amp; Rescue employees, extending the timeline and providing for payment (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 33011)  (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177485</b></p>
<p><b>*496</b> Accept \$57,342 grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency for Portland Fire &amp; Rescue (Ordinance)  (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177486</b></p>
<p><b>*497</b> Amend agreement with the State of Oregon, Office of the State Fire Marshal, for Regional Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Team Services (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 51969)  (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177487</b></p>
<p><b>*498</b> Authorize lease with Linnton Plywood Association for placement of a Temporary Emergency Response Facility during St. Johns Bridge closure (Ordinance)  (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177488</b></p>
<p><b>*499</b> Accept \$39,375 grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency for Portland Office of Emergency Management (Ordinance)  (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177489</b></p>
<p><b>500</b> Amend a contract with Carollo Engineers, P.C. for Sullivan, Stark and Holladay Basins Predesign Project No. 6073 (Second Reading Agenda 446; amend Contract No. 32170)  (Y-4)</p>	<p align="center"><b>177490</b></p>

May 21, 2003

<b>REGULAR AGENDA</b>	
<b>Mayor Vera Katz</b>	
<b>*501</b> Accept a \$5,028 grant from the Oregon Department of Transportation, Motor Carrier Safety Transportation Division, Intensified Speed Enforcement Project (Ordinance)  (Y-4)	<b>177498</b>
<b>*502</b> Authorize issuance of a competitive Request for Proposals for an 18 month pilot project to implement business and operations services for Parks & Recreation Stores/Warehouse System; exempt the selection of a vendor to provide Turnkey Parts Operation for parts and equipment inventory management, inventory control, and procurement services from competitive bidding (Ordinance)  (Y-4)	<b>177499</b>
<b>City Auditor Gary Blackmer</b>	
<b>503</b> Assess property for sidewalk repair by the Bureau of Maintenance (Hearing; Ordinance; Y1048)	<b>REFERRED TO AUDITOR BLACKMER</b>

At 1:12 p.m., Council recessed.

**May 21, 2003**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,  
OREGON WAS HELD THIS 21ST DAY OF MAY, 2003 AT 6:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Leonard, Saltzman  
and Sten, 4.

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

<b>504</b> TIME CERTAIN: 6:00 PM – Adopt the Northwest District Plan (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)	<b>Disposition: CONTINUED TO JUNE 11, 2003 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b>
<b>505</b> Amend the Northwest Plan District Parking Regulations (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz; amend Code Chapter 33.562)	<b>CONTINUED TO JUNE 19, 2003 AT 3:15 PM TIME CERTAIN</b>
<b>506</b> Adopt the Northwest District Plan Urban Design Concept and Action Charts (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)	<b>CONTINUED TO JUNE 11, 2003 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b>
<b>507</b> Amend Property Tax Exemption for New Transit Supportive Residential and Mixed Use Development (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz; amend City Code 3.103)	<b>CONTINUED TO JUNE 11, 2003 AT 2:00 PM TIME CERTAIN</b>

At 10:18 p.m., Council recessed.

May 22, 2003

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS 22ND DAY OF MAY, 2003 AT 2:00 P.M.

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

Commissioner Francesconi arrived at 2:09 p.m. and left at 3:34 p.m.

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

<p><b>*508 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Authorize contract with Management Systems Utility Group for project management services for replacement of the City’s water and sewer utility customer information and billing system (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz and Commissioner Saltzman) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>Disposition:</b>  <b>177500</b></p>
<p><b>*509</b> Amend contract with TMG Consulting for assistance in assessing options for a replacement water and sewer utility customer information and billing system (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 34533) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>177501</b></p>
<p><b>510 TIME CERTAIN: 2:30 PM</b> - Accept proposal from Star Park/Alliance of Minority Chambers for Garage System Services for estimated \$4.35 million (Purchasing Report - RFP No. 102042 introduced by Mayor Katz)  <b>Motion to accept the proposal:</b> Moved by Commissioner Leonard and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi. (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b></p>	
<p><b>511</b> Tentatively deny appeal of Center Neighborhood Association and uphold Hearings Officer's decision with conditions to approve the application of Providence Portland Medical Center for a conditional use master plan with adjustments to expand development at 4805 NE Glisan Street (Findings; Previous Agenda 459; LU 02-120615 CU MS AD)  <b>Motion to approve Findings and deny the appeal of Center Neighborhood Association, uphold the Hearings Officer's decision as modified by the Council’s Findings and Decision:</b> Moved by Commissioner Leonard and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman. (Y-4)</p>	<p><b>FINDINGS ADOPTED</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Mayor Vera Katz</b></p>	
<p><b>512</b> Approve Settlement Agreement between the City and Oregon AFSCME Council 75, Local 189, to resolve the unfair labor practice complaint, Case No. UP-31-01 (Resolution) (Y-4; N-1, Saltzman)</p>	<p><b>36141</b></p>



**May 22, 2003**

At 3:38 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.

May 21, 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.

**MAY 21, 2003 9:30 AM**

**Katz:** Council will come to order and we will wait until we have a quorum.

**Francesconi:** We were all celebrating:

**Katz:** I'm starting at 9:30, and you need to be here.

**Francesconi:** I was counting on commissioner leonard being later: [laughter] is it just the three of us?

**Katz:** Well, we're going to start because we have three. Good morning, everybody. The council will come to order. Will you take the roll call, please. [ roll call ]

**Katz:** All right, everybody, let's start with communications. 460.

**Item 460.**

**Katz:** You have three minutes.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Good morning. How are you this morning?

**Katz:** Good morning.

**Todd Kurylowicz:** Thanks again, jim, for stopping by and saying hello to us. It's always a pleasure. Detached, that's what I see. People are so detached from what's going on in the world. Terrorist threat went up to orange, was it? Hmm. I don't think it went down. P.R. reasons, maybe. Drop it after the invasion, make the people feel that it was a good thing to do. It never went down. I heard today that -- on npr, that Portland, due to the most amount of navy ships coming into the port, is really -- has really made a terrorist threat. Next second highest to new york city. So it just really blows my mind whether people are detached because of blind nationalism and not even getting the notion to question what the government is doing, if it's right or wrong, or whether it be through economic interests or -- in realizing it's an economic war. I didn't have enough time for a moment of silence last week, so i'd like to continue the moment of silence for what's going on over there, the bombings in morocco, saudi arabia, the heightened violence in the israeli-palestinian area. And for all the families that lost loved ones over there, all the innocent people, men, women, and children, and please, do me a favor, think about this. Spend some time. Before you go to sleep at night, think of what it looks like over there. Imagine what it would look like if it happened over here. Bombs dropping in cities. This is a reality that people just choose to detach themselves from. I'd like to spend the rest of my minutes in silence.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right. 461.

**Item 461.**

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Good morning.

**Katz:** Morning.

**Annalisa Mary Bandalera:** Initially my intent in addressing the council was to submit a list of requests from the peace encampment so we could have a 24-hour/7 vigil that addresses global and local injustice. I have decided not to do that because that is a tactic that was used by president bush in his illegal war against the iraqi people. It has been evidenced by the world media how ineffective this method is. As reports of saddam hussein came across the wire that he was willing to comply, president bush kept upping the ante. We all know the tragic results of this tactic that is affecting people worldwide, and if you have chosen to forget, I ask you to look at the front cover of the new

**May 21, 2003**

york times this morning, where we have iraqi citizens on their knees, blindfolded with their hands tied behind their backs. With the u.s. Soldier over him and this is injustice. I am a voice, and I am asking you to be my voice that speaks to others that you be a representative of mine, and that you speak out against global injustices, and by doing that, you speak first to local injustices. You speak to the fact that people in this city who are homeless, who have no shelter, who have no food, are allowed to have a blanket at night without being fined \$250. I ask you to be human. That is all I can do as a fellow human being on this planet. Thank you.

**Katz:** 462.

**Item 462.**

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Hi, how is everybody?

**Katz:** Fine, thank you. Why don't you identify yourself for the record.

**Joe Kallunki:** My name is joe kallunki, i'm from across the street at the peace encampment. What I would like to say today is basically that I think on a very local level again try to tie this in to what we're doing, and why it's important that we're here, why we're sitting here today. Last time I talked briefly about what was going on with the police harassment. That has in fact continued. They're actually implicating force at this point, stealing things out of people's hands. I asked that you pay heed to the message that you try to come to a resolution to try to do some checks and balances. And recently a 21-year-old woman was murdered by the Portland police, named kendra james. At which you yourself said that the police needed -- the Portland police in particular needed to be under serious scrutiny and review for this action. And "the Oregonian," not particularly those words, I think the words were, a necessity for a review. I'm addressing this now because of the recent federal findings that they deemed it to be insufficient -- not funds, but insufficient evidence to appropriate a case, and because it's at a federal level, they have seized all public records, and the public does not have the right anymore to assess what our government has deemed to be legitimate. I know at a very local level, on a very personal level, the harassment is ill begotten and happens. I know from experience that these people are doing their jobs, but their jobs inflict and infringe upon human and social liberties and rights. This is not being addressed, and I ask you as people to address it, because this is in fact a war at home, with the patriot act as well as the way our cities are maintained and our laws are enforced. I would also ask you all again to a second time, I think it's been addressed, to maybe participate and show up, there's a rally saturday, may 24, at alberta park for kendra james. I think this is an important issue among others. I think it's a heading issue, because it shows every resolve and regards -- in regards to the type of actions that are being implicated against people in the city.

**Katz:** Thank you.

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

**Katz:** 463.

**Item 463.**

**Glenn Warren:** Good morning, city council. Glen warren from peace encampment. I'd like to thank commissioner Francesconi for stopping by. It was a little brief, maybe we can expand upon it in the future. We do need dialogue, and there's been some interested parties and mediating might not be the right word, but involvement in city government over social issues and civil rights. And we're trying to organize some sort of gathering, if you will, to sit down and address these situations. Excuse me. So that's one thing we can look forward to, because these conversations aren't really conversations. So it would be nice to get feedback and find out how we can work this out, because the violations can't continue, and they're escalating to a point where it has -- it will be taken to court because somebody actually got hurt. So we would still like to continue a dialogue before things get worse than they are. It's true that people want to pretend that this war is not over, because they don't want to look at what's happening in iraq to the people that are there. The bush administration

May 21, 2003

is saying democracy, and when they show up in the street they're getting shot for it. I can't think of a city owner that wouldn't be responding to total destruction of utilities and medical -- access to medical supplies and food, I can't think of a city that wouldn't respond the way Iraq -- the cities in Iraq are responding, and yet they're being blamed for the chaos and the looting -- looting, and people freaking out and going into survival mode. They're being blamed for this. And the Bush administration is pretending that this is a surprise to them. It's not a surprise. It's historically recognizable. And it's a serious injustice to people's rights, and it's the beginning of another conflict, and people will be back out in the streets and we will be maintaining a vigilant peace watch, and catching the truth alive. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. 464.

**Item 464.**

\*\*\*\*\*: Hello council members.

**Katz:** Good morning.

\*\*\*\*\*: Morning. Good morning --

**Katz:** Why don't you identify yourself for the record.

**Leonard Alexander:** My name is Leonard Alexander. I'm speaking on behalf of the Portland peace encampment. What can I say? There's really not much to say. The events going on right now as we speak, if you just turn on the news probably right now at this second, speak for themselves. Decisions are going to be made in more ways than one. Right now in this time, in this uncertain time, there are certain pockets of untainted truth, and -- well, first of all, I'd like to say that I find it strange that the only place you can really find a picture of a young 3-year-old Iraqi child's, half his head blown off, is on the back of a car in the middle of Portland. You don't see that on the news, you don't see truthful images like that. We continue to see the glorification of these clownish ideals that back nothing, that have nothing to do with what's pertinent right now. Right now there is a great injustice going on every day. I woke up to the news of there's going to be S.W.A.T. Teams prepared for terrorist attacks, and yet at the peace encampment, we have tons of people driving by telling us the war is over, and go home. And telling us to watch the news, and there's general sort of confusion going on. The truth isn't getting out the way it's supposed to, and we have been getting lots of nonsupport from law enforcement. I got woke up several nights in a row with belongings being taken from me and my friends here without any due process. Just saying, this is our stuff now, and -- it's just a tragedy that people would rather go on believing that there are futures and investments -- their future and investments are safe right now when obviously they're not. At any second things are coming to a big head.

**Katz:** Thank you.

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

**Katz:** All right. Let's jump to the consent agenda. Any items to be taken off the consent agenda? By members of the council? The members of the public? If not, roll call on consent agenda.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] I neglected to say that commissioner Sten is excused for the business of the city. All right. 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472. Rose festival.

**Item Nos. 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471 and 472.**

**Katz:** Thank you. We have our invited guests here again every year. I think I said to Dick a couple of months ago that I can't wait for May 29, when the economy really is very poor and people are hurting, and concerned, and fearful. It's nice to have a little break for the civic celebration that is not only renowned in the state of Oregon, but internationally. And a lot of that is due to the two gentlemen that are sitting in front of you, and you're going to hear from Dick Clark in a second. I also want to share with you that this year, because of Dick Clark's commitment to expand the Rose Festival to include international cities and to celebrate us as an international city, two mayors of our

**May 21, 2003**

sister cities are going to be joining the celebration, actually one mayor of a sister city, and one potentially a sister city, a friendship city. We're going to have the mayor of a city in korea, he is sending a large delegation and a float, and the mayor of balogna, italy, our newest friendship city, will be joining us with representatives from their government. And we'll have other sister cities and friendship cities participating. We have other schools that will be coming to enhance the international city component of it. So it's a wonderful time for children, it's a wonderful time for families, it's a wonderful time for community. The st. Johns parade was the first start, and people feel good about their city, their community, and we'll have a wonderful period of time celebrating this city. So, with that, dick clark, executive director.

**Jim Franz, President, 2003 Rose Festival Association (RFA):** Thank you very much. Thank you, mayor. Those were wonderful words. I can shorten my comments real briefly. What a great presentation. That really emulates the feeling we have with regards to the celebration that we bring to the city every year. Good morning. I'm jim franz, the president of the Portland rose festival association. We oversee more than 5,000 volunteers who produce this annual celebration for our community. We're pleased and thank you for the opportunity this morning to present a brief glimpse of what we have in store for the 96th annual Portland rose festival.

**Dick Clark, Executive Director (RFA):** I echo jim's remark. My name is dick clark, the executive director of the Portland rose festival association. We appreciate your consideration this morning in the passage of those ordinance that's allow the rose festival to happen. We appreciate randy leonard's license bureau and jim wadsworth's work in making that all happen. At your desks this morning we have these pins to give to you. They're small in heart but big in size, and they promote the spirit of the rose festival, and all of that -- what the city of Portland does for us, so we hope that you wear it with pride. We also have a schedule of events so that you can have all the activities at your fingertips. The 96th rose festival will begin next thursday, may 29, with the fred meyer queen coronation, and that's where the mayor will be participating in the crowning of the new queen of the rose festival. The activities will continue until june 30 and feature more than 60 activities ranging from parades to environmental activities to art shows, garden contests, to many youth activities. We even have 14 new sanctioned events this this year. As we've all discussed, Portland is ready for a community celebration. We've all grappled with war, terrorism, sars, a weak economy, budget cuts, and uncertain school future that was brightened last night, and lots of rain. Tough times hit the rose festival in the year 2002, and many of you know about those activities. We had our largest financial loss ever. The good news is we've emerged stronger and more focused than ever before. We worked hard to achieve that new strength. We dropped some programming, we discontinued the air show, we renegotiated our auto race contract, we enhanced our volunteer activities, and we trimmed some personnel costs. Now we're ready to introduce the new rose festival for 2003.

**Franz:** Thank you, dick. The new rose festival maintains the best of our traditions, and adds further contemporary and relevant components so we can maintain our status as one of the top 10 community celebrations in the nation. Let's start with the southwest airlines grand floral parade on saturday, june 7. Picture weather just like we have today. The parade will feature 23 all-floral floats, which is two more than we had last year. And we also have 10 new sponsors that have come on board. Mayor Katz will lead the largest international section we've ever had, four floats this year, all representing pacific rim partners. The parade's telecast will have an international flavor as well. In addition to being televised in 35 million tv households, we will be reaching into western canada for the first time, and we'll continue to air the broadcast in both english and spanish. Portland can be proud that a p.i.l. Band will be represented this year. We're happy to welcome cleveland high school to the parade.

**Katz:** Good:

May 21, 2003

**Franz:** And possibly the best representatives of the parade's character will be the salute to teamwork and youth with our parade's grand marshals, Clive Charles and his university of Portland's women's national soccer team. We're very proud of the team's character and the accomplishments.

**Clark:** At waterfront park we're ready to welcome more than 500,000 visitors to the new Pepsi Waterfront Village. The village will offer new programming and a new layout, all of which begin to showcase our desire to implement the waterfront park master plan that you'll hear about more this morning. The waterfront village will feature the Rose Festival concert series, a new event, featuring some great national acts. We'll also offer a showcase of local talent, ranging from high school bands, to the community-minded Michael Allen Harrison. The new layout to provide for the largest children's area for any waterfront event. The area will include a fun, hands-on science pavilion. Additionally, we'll continue the international expo, which will feature Portlanders performing in song and dance to other Portlanders. We're delighted to welcome back our fleet program, even though we will and -- continue to adhere to the comprehensive and thorough security precautions that they instituted last year. The Rose Festival will also introduce a new Rose Festival historical display, as we begin preparing for our centennial in 2007. After all the fun is over, the Rose Festival will make a \$50,000 donation to the Portland Parks Foundation from Waterfront Village proceeds. This will go toward music education and leadership development programs for low-income children this summer in the Portland Parks program.

**Franz:** Among our highly visible and traditional programs are the Rose Festival's court and youth activities. These 14 young ambassadors are representing all of us as they travel the communities -- to community centers to advise witness seniors and to hospitals to bring cheer to children. Last week these young ladies bridged the state's east-west divide by visiting Pendleton, and continued our long exchange with the Pendleton Round-up and the Happy Canyon programs. We appreciate Commissioner Jim Francesconi and his role as spokesperson for the Rose Festival Kids program. About 300 children spent a total of a thousand hours cleaning parks, visiting nursing centers and remodeling community service for their peers. The Rose Festival is a lot about kids. Please enjoy this four-minute video that incorporates all of these themes today. \m\m

\*\*\*\*\*: It's a blast: \m\m

\*\*\*\*\*: Your 1999 Queen of the Rose Festival -- [cheers]

\*\*\*\*\*: We got to see all the floats up close:

\*\*\*\*\*: We love having perfect weather for the parade every year.

\*\*\*\*\*: I love the parade:

\*\*\*\*\*: The floats are incredible:

\*\*\*\*\*: Fun:

\*\*\*\*\*: Wow:

\*\*\*\*\*: We love the Rose Festival:

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Franz:** For a number of years I've tried to figure out how you can get 26 hours out of a 24-hour day. You start in the morning with that videotape, and it works. [laughter] We'd like to thank you for the time and consideration this morning, and on behalf of the Rose Festival, Mayor, we'd like to present you with these.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Franz:** You're welcome.

**Clark:** Thank you, Mayor. We'd also like to thank Commissioner Francesconi as serving as the Rose Festival liaison. He does a great job.

**Katz:** I'm going to leave this for everybody.

**May 21, 2003**

**Clark:** Absolutely, so they can enjoy. And you can divide them up later. I'm sure you'll be equitable, right? That's our presentation. We're available to answer any questions that you might have before you consider the ordinances.

**Katz:** Questions? All right.

**Saltzman:** Where's the ambassadors?

**Clark:** The ambassadors will be visiting the mayor later on this week.

**Katz:** Tomorrow.

**Clark:** So we're -- and we tried to schedule them in coordination, but they have 100 visits that they tried to put together, and so this morning i'm sure they're out visiting some other community centers, and will be here at city hall tomorrow. So thank you for hosting them, mayor.

**Katz:** It's my pleasure. It's one of the nicest breakfasts that we have. My opportunity to meet the young ladies. All right. Anybody else want to testify? Jada, come on up. Thank you, gentlemen. Thank you for all your work, your hard work. You've got new ties, is that --

**Clark:** We do. They're from the rose garden store.

**Katz:** I recognized them. They're very nice. They've got scarves and ties in these roses.

**Clark:** And the proceeds go to benefit the Portland park system and the rose garden.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Jada Mae Langloss:** My name is jada mae langloss, i've been the candidate unelected going on 27 years. Many times I really do appreciate the fact that I didn't get elected, because I used to think you were the second bravest woman in town, and I was the bravest, vera, but i'll trade places with you, because i'm not as brave as I used to be. And i've been going through a few things, like defending the mayor, and I do defend you, and I think you're one of my favorite sheroes. Outside, that i've had the islamic and arabic connection since before I was 10 years old. How I made it from rome to london, I can thank the algerian terrorists, which -- in the early 1970's, was an arab person who was poor, and that's the label. They -- that's the label they stuck on arabic people when they're poor. That's a wonderful story, how I got from rome to london on \$10. A group of people got together, got me all the way through. I'll never forget that kindness. Figure yourself being in rome with \$10, and having a whole group of people help you go all the way. But that's another book. Another thing, I couldn't find my other floppy hat, and I want to present this hat as -- for the new council member, the fireman. This is a hat that I like to say is my hiding out in a forest fire camouflage hat.

**Leonard:** You think I need that?

**Langloss:** Well, i'm afraid it will be too small for you, because i've got a pin head and you've got a fat head. [laughter] so this is my gift to the council member.

**Leonard:** Thank you.

**Langloss:** Now i'm hatless. But somebody will take care of that sometime. Anyway, good luck for whatever you're up to.

**Katz:** You look absolutely wonderful, and you're very special person.

**Katz:** All right. Anybody else? Then let's vote on item 466 -- 466.

**Francesconi:** I want to make a few brief remarks, thanking the rose festival association and all the volunteers as well as dick and the staff for being among our very best city partners for at least five reasons. And they've all been mentioned here today. You're extremely well managed, and you made some tough decisions to cut costs and to lessen any exposure, not only your organization, but to the city, where we might have to come in. So you are a great benefit to the taxpayers. In doing things important to the city, because you're well managed. The second is the economic impact that the mayor alluded to. This is really important that we all do our part in this economy, and you bring in -- it varies, but \$70 million to \$80 million in benefits to or community that's spent here in our -- on our businesses and for the benefit of our residents. So that's the second. In terms of parks,

**May 21, 2003**

which we're going to hear more about, you help bring activities to our parks and activate our parks and our cities and public spaces, and then you use some of the proceeds to maintain them, as was seen in this video. And then the fourth reason, you help market our city. We're going to talk more about this and the need to market, but you help market us internationally. All the good things you have, you highlight the best of who we are and what we have to present. And -- which leads to the fifth thing, and that -- in that you remind us we're all in this together, and we can celebrate together, and there's a role for all of us to play, and you reflect that in your organization, in the events, and for all those reasons the citizens wanted to make sure there was a permanent home for you on waterfront park in our park system, and we're going to make sure that happens with the help of commissioner Saltzman and the staff and everybody. So we just wanted to thank you for all you've done for our community, and we're coming back. Aye.

**Leonard:** Well, it's -- it was fun meeting with dick earlier this year, and I really appreciate the grand marshal selection that you -- that's a fabulous story on a lot of levels. You know, I -- dick said, what are your impressions of the rose festival? And for a kid who grew up on eighth and siskiyou, my earliest memories being the rose festival parade and remembering going to holladay park when the fun center was located over there and in the parking lot across the street, and then also when I was first in the Portland fire bureau, we actually had floats that the firefighters were volunteered to go over and put individual roses on this -- thousands and thousands of these things. It's really quite an honor now to be in this position to help the rose festival, an activity that's really part of the heart and soul of this city. So i'm real pleased to help. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye.

**Katz:** Let me also add my appreciation. I've worked with dick and the association over the years. I don't have to work very hard with them, because they have figured out all the answers. They never come in and whine to any of us, they solve their problems, all they ask is about a half an hour once a year to present us roses and nice videos, and pins. What more can you ask? But what's important that they point out during this wonderful time of the season is that this is all about people. We set our differences aside, all the political differences, all the arguments on the international scene, and the national scene, our -- are set aside and it's a time for joy. And it's a time to thank people who volunteer many, many hours to make the rose festival a success. And it's a time to celebrate the spirit of Portland. So thank you all. Aye. [gavel pounded] 467.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 468.

**Francesconi:** Be nice to the mayor of bologna. He likes john wayne, by the way. Aye.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 469.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 470.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 471.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 472.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] thank you, everybody, and have a wonderful rose festival.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Thank you, mayor.

**Katz:** All right. Item 473.

**Item 473.**



May 21, 2003

**Katz:** I wanted to bring -- thank you, karla. I wanted to bring this item to you because I didn't have this history, and was educated by the chinese american community a couple of months ago. This resolution is brought to you because it's very important to honor chinese americans who have actively participated not only in the defense of this country since the days of the civil war, and more than 20,000 who served in world war ii, but they helped build this city. Chinese-americans have not really been recognized here in america and around the world for their contributions to our national defense. And it is time to give them that recognition. And we found out that there is a wonderful member -- was a wonderful member, the family is still here, you'll meet part of the family in a minute, hazel ying lee, a photograph is to my left, was a member of our city's community and was the first chinese american woman to fly for the u.s. Military. She received her pilot license at the age of 19, when less than 1% of pilots were women. So not only was she a woman, but she was a minority. And she risked her life to serve this country. There is a film made and produced by filmmakers montgomery holm and alan rosenberg about this inspiring story, about hazel, entitled, "a brief flight." and the film teaches us a little bit about the courage of this wonderful woman. And I hope that one of these days you'll be able to see the film. Portland has a very active chinese-american community. And i'm going to invite bill to come on up. It's led by the Portland american-chinese citizens alliance. We're blessed because not only do we have this wonderful leadership in our community, but we have taken our role seriously as an international city and have ties to two chinas, taiwan and the mainland of china. So it's all yours, welcome, bill.

**Bill Chinn:** I'm bill chinn, and also welcome all veterans in attendance. In recognizing hazel ying lee, we look back nearly 60 years, and I can't help but reflect how much has changed since then. We've gone to the moon, and soviet empire has crumbled, the berlin wall has fallen, but some things still endure, and what endures is commitment to public service, national service, and our belief that there is a greater good that we can all share in. And those are aspects that hazel ying lee and other chinese-american veterans exhibited. I find it heartening hear in asian heritage month that the Portland city council will honor hazel and other chinese-americans. And she was a Portland native, and it's Portland city council that will recognize Portland native. And so mayor and commissioners, thank you for recognizing the service of hazel ying lee and other chinese-americans. Indeed, thank you for recognizing the service of these americans.

**Katz:** Thank you. We have a member of the family, francis, come on up. Tell us a little bit about -- first a little bit about you and then a little bit about your sister. And identify yourself for the record.

**Francis Lee Tak:** My name is francis lee tak. I'm married so I have to have my husband's name too. Hazel, is number 5 in our family. I'm number 7. And she was -- let me see. She was seven years older than i, but I was always considered the young one underdog. I have two younger brothers. But hazel was always one that was doing things that she should not do. [laughter] dad had passed away, and the war invasion started, and hazel was one of the two chinese girls in Portland who volunteered to go back to china. Hazel returned to china, but she was a woman, she was not permitted to fly. She had an office job. She did do some commercial flying. And shortly after that, the -- the invasion down in canton, we were refugees in hong kong, we were there just about a year or so that hazel said she would rather go back to america. She did. Allen rosenberg, in his hard work, found out that my sister hazel worked for a very short period for ripley's believe it or not. However, she worked for a company that was very active for the war in china. Then shortly after that the war started, world war ii, hazel joined the u.s. And I think she was happiest time of her life. She was able to do what she wanted to do, despite what my mother had told her. [laughter] and in a way, I think we miss her, but i'm happy for her. Especially now, for the appreciation and

May 21, 2003

the honor that you're giving her, to the chinese-american veterans and to include my sister. I thank you all council members and mayor Katz. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. Does anybody else want to add a few words? Bill, did you want to say anything else? Come on up.

**Chinn:** Just that again, it's been many decades, but as the saying goes, better late than never, and this is not late, as frances indicated. It's just I think perhaps things occur at the proper time, and this is the proper time for us as we head into the 21st century. Thank you once again, mayor, and all commissioners.

**Katz:** Thank you. Anybody else? If not, roll call.

**Francesconi:** Bill, I agreed with everything you said except the very last thing. I think we're late. We're a little late. But mayor, thanks for bringing this, and on behalf -- thank you for all that you've done, the chinese-american community, for the country and especially for the city. Aye.

**Leonard:** I want to thank the mayor as well for bringing this. This is -- it's really wonderful to be in a position to honor hazeel ying lee, and her family, with this recognition. She was a very courageous woman, and I look forward to this special on may 25 on pbs to learn more about her life. Aye.

**Saltzman:** This is an interesting kernel of history, and I look forward to learning more about it. This one woman's contribution is certainly remarkable. You've had a long, rich history here, and we're the better for it. Aye.

**Katz:** This weekend we celebrated arms forces day, and I was fortunate to put some yellow ribbons around a tree. I haven't told anybody this, but one of the yellow ribbons that I put around the tree was for hazel, and thank you so much for sharing her life and a little bit of yours with us, and bill, thank you thank you for bringing this. We did do a proclamation in april, but I thought it would be wonderful for the city council to honor one of the first women to do something so brave, and in that way also honor the chinese-americans who served in all the wars that unfortunately we had to be in. Aye. [gavel pounded] all right. 474.

**Item 474.**

**Katz:** Before you start, I just want you to know that I had distributed gil's memo, so we decided that would probably be the best way, since this is your show.

\*\*\*\*\*: I would have welcomed gil's presence, but that's fine.

**Katz:** Ok. Go ahead.

\*\*\*\*\*: Good morning.

**Katz:** Whoa. Let commissioner Francesconi introduce this, please.

**Francesconi:** I just want to say a brief word. Though this plan cannot be realized during a recession, this is a fantastic blueprint for our future. If pioneer square is our living room, then this is our front porch. And it's a widely used front porch. From cyclists to walkers, to --

**Katz:** We don't have a quorum.

**Francesconi:** That's all right. He's sitting over there. From cyclists to walkers, to the festival, we have an area that's really well used here. To make it more intense, it's right next to naito parkway, which is important not only for traffic, but also for freight. And that divides the wonderful front porch from the rest of the city. In order to make this work for the benefit of our future generations, it takes planning. And we need good planning in order to have a place for contemplation, a place for major public events, and to make sure it's connected to the city. And to do good planning, you need terrific staff. And that's actually a little late for us to have the first woman parks director in the history of parks leading this effort. But we also have terrific staff in david, who really knows how to bring the best out of citizens. And then we have harriet, who chaired this committee, and a terrific group of citizens who weighed the balances and the trade-offs, who heard from staff, from professionals, who heard from the interest groups and put aside their own individual views and

May 21, 2003

acted for the good of the community, and therefore, as a result, we have a product that we need to endorse and embrace, and move forward, because this will guarantee that a front porch that is more vital for all of our citizens and interests. So I just wanted to say in advance thanks for your work.

**Zari Santner, Director, Portland Parks and Recreation (PPR):** Thank you, Zari Santner, Portland parks and recreation. With me is harriet, the chair of the waterfront park master plan and david, the project manager and staff. We're here before you requesting your acceptance of the recommendations of the master plan for a waterfront park. As you -- some of you may know, the last master plan was developed in 1976. The conditions and circumstances have changed greatly since then, and particularly in light of the fact that per your directions, the city is focusing more on willamette river through the river renaissance process. We thought it was a good timing to revisit the plan for -- to revisit this park and develop an updated plan. Harriet will discuss some of the major issues that the committee had to consider, and -- in order to develop this plan. David will describe the process, and then our consultants from san francisco will present to you the recommendation of our plan. But before I turn over to harriet, I want to let you know that this was not a clean slate. It was as you know, this is the most popular park in the city. And there are a variety of events and uses that occur there. So the committee had a very challenging job to consider all the issues, talk to all the stakeholders, and then develop a plan that is well balanced and meets the needs of various stakeholders and users of the park. We also went to an extensive involvement process, several of our meetings were well attended over 400 people, because this park is so critical to the city as a -- as commissioner Francesconi mentioned. We also worked very, very collaboratively with planning bureau, with bureau of transportation, who is redeveloping all -- rerenovating the naito parkway, to make sure that our work is well coordinated as well as the consideration that -- that goes into the park is also reflected in terms of renovation, as well as Portland development commission, who is in the process of developing a development strategy, opportunities for development, the blocks adjacent to the park. As you may have heard me say before, the parking not be by itself successful. What happens adjacent to parks and how it's connected to the core of the city is very, very critical. So these were the challenges that the committee faced. We also, through this process, as you may recall, we came before you in the early stages of the process, to share with you the issues that we had heard that were raised, and to get some direction from you. And we heard it very clearly from you that you felt that events and festivals are -- need to occur in the city, and the waterfront park is an appropriate venue for those festivals and events. And I need to tell you that not only we heard that from you, and we used the committee -- the committee used that as a guide to develop this plan, but also that was echoed by the majority of the public, that communicated to us through the public process and through our e-mail and web pages. So what you see before you is as a result of all that collaboration. And I want to turn to harriet right now.

**Harriett Cormack, 1616 SW Harbor Way, 97201:** Thanks, zari. I'm very pleased to be here today, as the chair of the citizen advisory committee representing 15 citizens who worked long and hard. We were appointed almost two years ago, and I think it's been a very committed ensemble of people who did just as commissioner Francesconi indicated, put their interests on -- aside, as we considered the issues, and tried to come up with something that is genuinely in the public interest and timely for our era just now. We also know that we're in a time of great changes. Who knew there would be inline skating and joggers pushing baby carriages, and that sort of thing, that would make use of the park? I think we're mindful that there will be detailed consideration of these issues as specific segments of the park are designed. And so there will be a lot of flavor and character that we can't know today, but each implementation stage will have its own tastes. We do believe that the guiding principles, which are on page 43 and 44 in the report that you've received, do state what we were trying to get at as we considered various design alternatives. The master plan that we're

May 21, 2003

recommending does provide for continued use of the park as a venue for civic celebrations, concerts, and events. We feel they're an expression of the character of our community. However, change is contemplated with the creation of a central urban plaza that can encourage activity to occur in that space for more months of the year, concentrate the set-up area for such events so there can be greater frequency, and turnover, and try and deal with the dead grass issue as events have been moved around the entire mile-long length of the park. So events are there, but there is change to help them happen better and to perhaps have more throughout the year. The master plan had to address circulation issues. We wondered whether an auto and truck freeway had been removed from the site only to be replaced with a through-way of bikes, skates, scooters, runners and the like on the highly congested esplanade. Through the analysis and design process, more paths through and -- to and through the park are in the plan, and in some cases, the path actually goes over the river. So this will offer more choices to all the users, and the experiences will be of a better quality for all those who come to the site. In addition, commuter bikes will have dedicated lanes in the rebuilt naito parkway, and that will eliminate one of the conflicts that happens in the esplanade today. Third major thing is that the sea wall and esplanade along the river's edge are retained, reflecting the historic urban character of the site. We talked about the rest of the river and that there are a lot of projects and ideas that will be implemented over the course of time, that this is the urban center, this is where the river turns, and the sea wall is there for a reason. And even though we talked a lot about whether there should be major modifications or take it all away, I think we came up with a balanced approach that makes changes in the area between morris -- morrison and burnside bridges, so there is another meadow that's shaped so more people will have visual and psychological links to the water, but not get into major flooding problems or anything that creates endangerment. The report describes the dozens of meetings and extensive involvement process that resulted in three strong design alternatives. And ultimately there was strong community support for alternative c that underlies what you will see in the presentation. However, the advisory committee worked with the designers and staff to take some of the really strong notions from schemes a and b and incorporate them in an appropriate manner. As we received continuing comments on our recommendations and progress, we gave them serious consideration, and there were some strong proposals from the planning bureau, and there was a high-level meeting that you recall where we talked about the divergence of view. I think the committee gave at your instruction, very serious consideration to those planning bureau recommendations, and we think that a number of our recommendations really fit with them and can be further addressed when you're doing the implementation. But there were some places where we really disagreed, and we have confidence that the proposal that we have put before you is a good one, a fine framework to proceed. As was identified before, the park is along -- a long ribbon, and it's very much affected by the water side and the land side, which is transportation and land uses across the way. Fortunately there were other departments working on these issues at the same time, and as chair of this committee, I got to be on two more committees to try and assure there would be some compatibility between what p.d.c. Was looking at and what the transportation folks were looking at. And I think that as a combination of our collaborative approach, we're coming up with recommendations for all three -- for three major project areas that will create a great edge for a dynamic and healthy downtown, and that will stand as a great gift for future generations and our community. In conclusion I thank you for the opportunity to be involved in this project. It's been some of the hardest work i've done in a long time, and I appreciate that you trusted me with this responsibility. I'd like to turn now to david.

**Francesconi:** Before you go, let me help you I hope, let me put to rest -- let me kill a rumor that's out there. We do need some art -- more artificial grass, folks. We need it at delta park and we need

May 21, 2003

it on our soccer fields, and we're working on that. We don't need it -- we won't have it on our front porch. Go ahead, david.

**David Yamashita, Planner (PPR):** Thanks very much, jim. I thought I made it clear to the reporter I spoke with.

**Francesconi:** That's why I emphasized it. You did. I just helped you.

**Yamashita:** Thanks very much. What i'm going to do is briefly describe the planning process and the public involvement process, which typically aren't real exciting, but in this case, process was a big part of the project. And process was the vehicle that allowed us to address some of the issues. And i'd like to talk about how we got from the beginning to where we are today. As harriet mentioned, we started about actually a little more than two years ago with an internal staff report on an assessment of conditions and issues in the parks.

**Katz:** Let me interrupt you. Are you going to show --

**Yamashita:** Yes. Our consultant will.

**Katz:** Ok.

**Yamashita:** I'm just giving you a little background. So we started with this assessment of conditions and issues, and that gave us the background then to go out for -- with an r.f.p. To select a consultant. We did attract firms from across the country for the project, and after our selection process was done, we selected the san francisco office of e.d.a., teamed up with kirk langow, bob brummel and bob dillenger. We worked with the committee that harriet chaired, we had something like 19 or 20 meetings, and there were three phases as harriet had mentioned. One here we looked at -- we just went to the public and said what do you think about the park, and the second phase we came back and brought three options back and the third phase we selected a preferred option and continued to refine it. In terms of the public involvement process, I wanted to make a few points. As I said, the project really was about process. Second thing is that the process that we had for public involvement was very extensive, and I would attribute that to our public involvement coordinator, gay gregor with her assistant, and we did have a variety of ways to engage the public. The third point we learned is that the public really loves waterfront park. This was clear when we had public open houses and as zari mentioned, we had over 400 people at a couple of these early on in the process, and we've never had that kind of attendance before at public open houses. We had one here and at the central library. Just wanted to close also with how we engaged the public in the whole process. As I mentioned, we did the initial assessment -- we also had a survey that we handed out to people and put on the web, and the first project of the project, we got I think about 400 responses to that. We also had four public open houses, we had two public lectures, one on the park's history and one on managing public open spaces where we brought in a firm from new york city there. We had three focus groups that met at critical points in the project. We had a website through the life of the project that attracted over 1500 hits. We had a newsletter that was published four times through the life of the project, and we had a variety of meetings and briefings to any number of groups that ranged from central eastside industrial council, to Portland business alliance public spaces committee, old town, china town, and so on. So we did have a lot of public involvement, and through that work we've ended up -- we've create add set of recommendations that I think provide a real effective framework for the future of the park. And with that i'd like to invite the principle with e.d.a. to walk you through the basic recommendations.

**Katz:** As she's coming up, can we find out what schools we have up here?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Sunnyside and north clackamas school district.

**Katz:** Nice to have all of you here. We're talking about the waterfront park, most of you i'm sure have seen it, and there's some changes planned and you'll probably be an adult before you see them all completed. [laughter]

May 21, 2003

**Jazinta McCain, EDA:** Good morning. I'm with part of the consultant team for this really incredible project, and what I would like to do now is spend a few minutes describing some of the ideas in the plan and the key recommendations. I'm going to use slides that will be projected on the screen, but I will walk across and point out some of the key features on the plan as well. Just starting with the overall ideas for the plan, harriet mentioned before that one of the key things that came out of the design process in talking with the community and getting input was to create two major activity centers in the park. This doesn't really exist at the moment. The salmon springs, but we wanted to create a second major activity center, and that is proposed to be centered around the ankeny dock and a series of new ideas implemented at that location. The second big idea was redeveloping the large lawn area that exists north of morrison bridge into something that we call -- we are calling the meadow. And that has a new relationship to the river, which will give it much better view access to the river, and really create this sort of jewel purpose -- dual purpose area which can accommodate expanded use, but also become an expanded park area for future residents who will live across naito parkway. Other key ideas of development of an old -- all-weather waterfront plaza at salmon springs, so we can better accommodate an extended period of festivals, and then the expansion and the development of the prom need as a curved pathway system in addition to the water edge path. And that's really to help people access the full park amenities. We also want to make sure that the esplanade is integrated with all of the downtown pedestrian systems. I think one of the things we put a lot of attention into was making sure that access into the path, the intersections across the parkway and the connections back downtown to transit and other important destinations were emphasized. We also want to make sure that the -- and the plan does this really, really row enforces stronger pedestrian and bicycle connections, across all of the bridges, across the river, and also both north and south of the park and into the city. And of course into regional trails as well. We put a lot of attention into developing and launching the idea of a long-term management program so that events and the operational strategy for managing the park would be well undertaken. And then of course we wanted to make sure that public art and our consultant was instrumental in this, and art became an integral experience in the park. We put a lot of attention into the trees, analyzing the existing trees, and of course we want to preserve those wherever we can, and introduce further native trees and vegetation into the park. And of course we want to provide for continued fleet docking. I'm going to move to the plan now and point out the major destinations, and then i'm going to come back here and just show you some slides that show some of the more detailed features of each area. The major areas in the park that we developed detailed ideas for, working from south to north, an area associated with -- a series of recommendations there in relation to -- [inaudible] relate to creating bigger outdoor entertainment facilities creating -- utilizing some of the existing buildings for a more viable more energetic uses, and of course enlarging and creating this major new facility [inaudible] able to accommodate a whole range of uses. The next major area which is called the meadow, is located here north of morrison. It becomes a really beautiful counter point to the more active salmon springs festival area, and this very large grassed terrace has been -- is proposed to -- gently to create a better view to the river, and at this location, we're also proposing to lower the sea wall along the river, still to keep it above flood heats so there's no flood issue, but to improve people's visuals. The second major destination I referred to earlier is the area located at salmon springs, and we see tremendous potential there, of course initiated by the improvements required to the sewer upgrade, but tremendous potential to create a strong gateway, a series of activities centered around the plaza that -- including a large new water feature, indirect water feature, something a little like -- [inaudible] and then much improved access to the river. So people can get down and not experience the quite dangerous situation at the moment [inaudible] of course the japanese memorial area, very significant part of the park, it's something we want to preserve and improve some access into with some carefully placed paths.

**May 21, 2003**

And then up here at the northern end of the park at steel bridge we want to create a strong gateway entry into the park. -- at present, and safe access into the park. At this location as well we'll -- the proposal is to access a floating dock, walkway, a little like on east bank, so people can in the future connect under the steel bridge and into the trail system to the north of the park. So i'm going to come back now to show a few more detailed slides.

**Leonard:** Can I ask a question?

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

**Leonard:** I think mayor, you'll appreciate this question. How do we lower the height of the sea wall, and how are we then still able to protect the downtown area in case of a flood?

**McCain:** Commissioner, I have a slide that shows a cross-section through there, but in simple terms, the proposal is to lower the sea wall height by several feet, and to contour the meadow so that in an extreme flood, there would still be a flood protection barrier provided a little farther back within the meadows. So the same system that exists at present would still be functional.

**Leonard:** So you would have some footings or infrastructure in place that you could put the --

**McCain:** You could slide panels into, correct.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Francesconi:** Good answer: Commissioner Leonard was satisfied with that one, that was good:

**Leonard:** I was out there helping Vera in 1996.

**McCain:** So moving very quickly through these slides, one of the key opportunities in the park, and I think very exciting for making the element has been the creation of this new curved esplanade walk. And we think this is really a great breakthrough, and it helps to define these new areas. It will help to define the new publicly accessible walkways through the park even during festivals, and will also create a much stronger connection to the downtown. The next slide here just shows with blue dot and red dots where the major entry points into the park will be, and we've worked very closely with pdot and with p.d.c. In relation to enhancing the opportunity for good connections for future redevelopment along Naito Parkway as well. This is the overall plan, and I just took you through that briefly. This sketch shows a prospective rendering illustrating the potential form and appearance of the park when the concepts are implemented. Moving to some details, within the bowl, we have a couple of specific proposals which we feel are going to enhance the area greatly. A foreshore enhanced foreshore shown with riparian planting, and then some improved layout and configuration within the bowl itself.

**Katz:** Have a good day.

**McCain:** Including a new path. And this illustration just shows a potential representation of how the area would be -- this illustration shows a potential representation of how this area would be occupied during festivals. Moving through the salmon springs, I talked about several of these features already. One thing that we do think we'll add -- will add a related point of interest is the relocation of the stern wheeler, the battleship "Oregon" memorial into this area. And you can see here a plan showing how in more detail how the area is proposed to be laid out. And again, this shot shows in festival configuration just a representation of how the events could be organized and how some of the different areas would function. And in cross-section here, you can see the section is taken through a small amphitheater area that we are suggesting be developed at the southern end of salmon springs, and you can see the representation of the battle ship "Oregon" mast. The waterfront plaza itself is of course a major new element within the park. We see this as producing a tremendous opportunity to enlarge the period during which events can be staged. And also to launch new possibilities in terms of the way in which the area can be used. In addition, this representation here of the concept shows how the plaza is framed by the new curved walkway that extends a little over the river at this location as well, so that people will get that sense of overlook and engagement with the river. And here's some illustrations again, just a conceptual layout of how

**May 21, 2003**

it might appear at festival. Moving further along the park representation here, again of how the expanded cross-section, how the expanded festival plaza might appear relative to the river edge itself. Now, in the area that we are terming the meadow, you can see here in a larger view the way in which the foreshore, the promenade esplanade along the water edge will continue right through, but then step up to this sloping crescent meadow, gently sloping meadow, framed again by this arced new path. And again, in festival in major festival configuration, the opportunity for expanded festival usage of this area. And a sketch illustrating the character of that area, showing again the way in which the esplanade will slope down gently at that water's edge. And in cross-section, an illustration of highway that will work. And you can see at the backside of the sloped area there the low protection barrier that we just referred to. Ankeny plaza is as I said before, a tremendous opportunity for renewal of vigor and activity, and centering a whole new set of activities within the park. And the illustration here shows how some of those activities could be related to each other. We see this area as a tremendous opportunity for family gathering, continued weekend markets, and a whole range of other uses. And again some illustrations there of the character of the area, how play -- interpretive play structures, weekend markets, and colorful planting and other activities can be introduced into that area, creating a very dynamic and vibrant space. In cross-section here, the illustration of this area, but also showing how the floating walkway that will extend is proposed to extend under steel bridge will be configured. So moving to the Japanese memorial and the steel bridge plaza, we have an illustration here showing how that can work with the -- of course the double row of cherry trees preserved as a very important feature of the park.

**Katz:** Good.

**Francesconi:** The mayor just leaned over and said, they better not touch the trees.

**Katz:** They're gifts.

**McCain:** These are incredibly important trees, as all of the area and the other associated memorial developments are in this part of the park. So we will be treading very gently here. We already see this as a tremendously -- it already is what it should be, so we are enhancing it with some just minor additional paths, and then we suggest that the pathway along the promenade, that the curved section of the walkway that would extend under steel bridge would be commenced. And here in cross-section you can see how that would be configured, and this cross-section here shows at steel bridge how the plaza relationship to the water is conceived. Just in conclusion, I would like to say I really appreciate the comment of for example Francesconi's remark about this being a major new porch for the city. I think the team, the staff certainly the c.a.c. And the community really see this as a tremendous opportunity to create the framework for a new world class front porch for the city, and we have been very pleased to be part of the team on this project. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. Where are you all from? North clackamas? Welcome to the city. We're just describing the waterfront, and that will change dramatically by the time you're in your 30's. [laughter] but that's how you do it. Thank you very much. Questions by the council on any of the details?

**Saltzman:** I have a couple.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Saltzman:** So the meadow area is available for festival use?

**McCain:** Yes.

**Saltzman:** Ok. I think you know one great concern of mine has been that the intent to accommodate festivals, I think festivals are an important part of our culture, they're also an important economic engine for the downtown area, and I've had concerns, and I understand the total festival square footage areas now is less than what it was currently. By about a couple hundred thousand square feet.



May 21, 2003

**Yamashita:** It's not quite that short. I'd like to have actually maybe Dick Clark and maybe other event people speak to that, just so you know, Commissioner, after we got our direction from you at that one briefing, we start add whole series of meetings and conversations with the events group that Dick Clark put together, and we were able to work out a balanced approach to the whole square footage needs they have, and at the same time trying to advance our goals.

**Saltzman:** I'm glad to hear that. When I read the part in here on festivals, on page 52, I guess, 52 and 53, it still gives me the impression that festivals are not really desired. Take away the marquee events, rose festival, cinco de mayo, I'm talking about the \$100's, 95.5 million, which is just as much part of the city, particularly as we talked about before, people who live in the outer regions of the city who come downtown for these festivals, it still speaks about establishing a management committee that will establish criteria events have to meet, establish guidelines for the external parents of events along southwest Naito and things like that. It just doesn't evoke a welcome signal to me, and it makes me think we're going to appoint some high-if a lieutenant 89 committee that will turn down these festivals because they don't look right, the people who don't look like -- the people who go to the festivals don't look like the management committee, how can you allay that concern of mine?

**Yamashita:** That was -- that was not the intent at all. What we heard from -- there were two messages we heard. One is that events are important, but we also -- there was a segment of the public who said, there's some aspects of the events that we're not really crazy about, so we tried to focus on those. Fencing, for example, is one of those things. Access to the waterfront. The second thing is that there were so many issues we had to deal with we were able to strike this balance, but we weren't able to address a hundred percent of everybody's issues to everybody's satisfaction, so we came up with this recommendation as way to continue the dialogue between parks staff and events people. Really to this point there hasn't been any real vehicle to sit down together and say this, is what we need, this is what you need, let's figure out a way to make this work for parks and for the general public. So this is a way actually to continue the conversation and to make events better and to make the park work better when events are in there.

**Saltzman:** It seems to suggest we're going to be pricing the lower end events out of the park, and that's almost by design. If you tell a sponsor we've got our design guidelines too, you look at that on top of liability insurance, which I think the planning bureau mentions is an escalating cost of doing festivals, aren't we getting to the point where we're not saying it directly, but we're --

**Yamashita:** No, and that's not the intent. In fact what we're proposing or recommending is that we need to have smaller events that can use the waterfront plaza and -- because those are the events that actually draw a diverse group of people, a perfect example, I like to use is Doggy Dash. That was held last year, it was a one-day event, they came in, set up their event, and had it and they were gone the next day. And attracted not only lots of people, but lots of dogs, which were an interesting aspect of the whole park.

**Francesconi:** Let me interrupt you a minute. It's really important that the festival be designed in a way to accommodate -- I'm sorry, that our front porch be designed in such a way to accommodate the festivals. When we get into the question of how then the design is utilized by a variety of groups, then that switches really from the committee to parks, and -- because that becomes our decision. But we want input from a committee. The idea of a management committee to look at who maintains the park and who pays for it is a really good idea. I was going to say it would be nice if Clackamas county, Washington county, and others that use waterfront park actually pay in a regional system. But also, some of the users of this park are great causes, like the food bank, but there's a variety of other people that are making money off waterfront park by promoting these festivals, and they're the middle people in this. And the question is, who pays to maintain the park, and who gets the benefit of the park, the citizens of Portland, or these middle groups that are

May 21, 2003

making money off of it? So we frankly need to design the park in a way that the public can access, but then that becomes our decision not this committee's decision, about how it's actually programmed. So you make recommendations, and zari is looking hard at this question, but the key point is, our community partners that are providing a benefit to our citizens, like the rose festival, cinco de mayo and a lot of others, plus other groups, like the food bank and others, we want to accommodate, because they provide a public purpose. So this committee gives a vehicle in the maintenance of the park, but the decision on that rests with me and the city council. So you don't have to worry about it, because you're going to be part of making sure that your concerns with justified. But there's a broader issue here, and that is, who benefits, the public or other people?

**Saltzman:** I guess -- I appreciate what you're saying, but I don't think a lot of these will rise to our level. And I think -- decisions will ever rise to our level. I'm concerned some of these festivals that aren't the marquee events, I think every event on waterfront park makes money.

**Francesconi:** Then the issue is parks, not this committee. Or this design.

**Saltzman:** I'm looking at the language on page 52 and 53, and it just -- it sounds like you have to generate national awareness of Portland and pacific northwest in order to be an eyes that's going to be looked upon favorably, you have to be unique in character and quality, I just think -- i'm concerned, i'm not -- I don't know where to go with this, but I am concerned, other than maybe establishing legislative history right here, that we be open to all events that are not necessarily the sexy events, like the marquee events, and I would be very disappoint first degree we start seeing a diminution of those types of festivals, because I think they play a role. It brings people downtown, it brings people downtown who often don't come downtown for any other purpose, and it provides some sort of recreation and opportunities for leisure for different segments of the population than who I think we think about typically more than not. So I just -- like I said, I fear that there's a lot written between the lines that's sort of make something judgments, and I guess i'd like to say, who will this management committee be composed of? Will it include a cross representation of event organizers?

**Yamashita:** It will include stakeholders, but we -- and park staff, but that's about as far as we've gone. We're just trying to set up a vehicle. I think harriet had --

**Saltzman:** I don't want to belabor this anymore.

**Leonard:** I want to add I looked at that and didn't read it that way, and after you pointed that out, I agree -- I do agree with you, that it would appear that this could be interpreted to mean that there might be some elitism that gets injected into which events occur there, and I share commissioner Saltzman's concern.

**Katz:** Why don't you share with us a little bit, just a little bit, my hope is that as you begin to develop stages in the park, there's more discussion, because things change, and i'll mention one of the things that we're working on now. But give us a little bit of history on this particular issue, since I have two commissioners who have a little concern.

**Cormack:** Thank you. This is a dicey issue, and I think the committee concluded it should be a place for events, and we should make it easier for there to be events, particularly the smaller events and things that might be indigenous to the community. The bowl will be easier for concerts to set up, and those are some of the events you're alluding to. And also the plaza will be very good for things that are smaller than the marquee events, like brew fest, which would meet the criteria, that it's a local industry, it gets promoted, it's unique to our town.

**Leonard:** Could you give us an example of something that wouldn't meet the criteria?

**Cormack:** One of my personal concerns is there are getting to be cookie cutter things that travel around the country. They just go to every town and --

**Leonard:** What does that mean?

**Katz:** Some examples.

May 21, 2003

**McCain:** The barbecue festival was one of the things that was concerning me. It had just come -- happened to see their route map, and it's just the same group of trailers and things that just go town-to-town, where it did -- it included a couple of local vendors, but basically it's a road show. And it was a question that if our park needed some breathing room for the general public to use it, or to have some things that were more local in character, that that might be a trade-off. I think that our notion in writing this was that everything that's there stays there. And it's just having some criteria as there's some new events proposed, and as you're trying to weigh and balance between. And if something has a strong local flavor, a northwest flavor, and is special, rather than cookie cutter, it should have some priority. Those were the value that's we were looking at.

**Saltzman:** You're saying two things -- every event that's ever been in waterfront park has some presumption of being grandfathered in for future use of waterfront park. But secondly, what is necessarily wrong -- this will be the last -- I don't see anything necessarily wrong with a cookie cutter event if people from Portland want to attend that event. These events probably wouldn't come to Portland if they didn't in fact draw people. I'll just leave it at that.

**Cormack:** It's true.

**Katz:** Moving right along.

**Yamashita:** I'd like to ask, this is my only --

**Katz:** Let me -- because i'm sure commissioner Francesconi gets e-mails, but I also get e-mails about complaints from citizens that they can't use the park during the summer. And so i'm sure that was part of the discussion that you had. They wanted access to the park. And maybe that's a piece of it. But I think you satisfied the fact that we're grandfathering everything that's going to be here.

**McCain:** Could I just add, the design recommendation to build a plaza which has a paving system, although porous, is still able to accommodate the setting up and taking down of festival events in a much shorter space of time. That was a really key part of the plan. And we feel that that will first of all enable more events to be staged, but also extend the period within which festivals can be staged during the year. So that was a very important part of the physical design recommend education.

**Yamashita:** I just wanted to ask my colleagues from pdot and p.d.c. To come up and say a few words about I think the real unusual but effective partnership that we created with their projects and how we worked together.

**Katz:** And david, I talked to -- you and him will be working on with folks from the water bureau and the park bureau on competition.

**Yamashita:** We're actually meeting I think its tomorrow.

**Katz:** Good.

**Saltzman:** Today.

**Katz:** This is something. This is something else. All right. Come on p.d.c., and transportation.

**Joanna Guzzetta, Project Manager, PDOT:** My name is joanna, i'm a project manager for the office of transportation. I'm relatively new to the city.

**Katz:** Is this your first appearance?

**Guzzetta:** Before you, yes.

**Katz:** Be careful. [laughter]

**Leonard:** That's mean.

**Katz:** You're nervous, aren't you?

**Guzzetta:** Extremely.

**Katz:** Good.

**Guzzetta:** First of all, i'm going to start out saying that i'm going to pronounce naito a little bit differently. We were asked in our process, the public process, stakeholder process by the naito family that from now on we pronounce it as nye-toe.

May 21, 2003

**Katz:** Let's not go there, please.

**Guzzetta:** I'm just used to saying it, so my apologies to those who still want to hang on to naito. As project manager, i've been given the wonderful opportunity actually to deal with a very high sensitive project, and that is reconstruct naito parkway from market to davis. If as you all know it is so bad, it is actually needing -- in need of complete reconstruction from the base up. And it's currently right now not being fixed because it is so bad. So there's an urgency there on our part. So we have funding to do this, and there's a time urgency to get this done. But putting that aside, when we started the process, we realized that it was also great timing because of what was happening on either side of naito parkway. And so I made it -- we got together with p.d.c. And with parks and we made it really important that they be not only a part of our external stakeholder group, but also our internal technical advisory committee, and it's worked out extremely well. As part of being the outside stakeholder group, I think it's given a strong message to the public that we are all working well together, because naito parkway is like a spine connecting, you know, a very important front porch to the west side, which amy will talk about in a minute. So it's not just about fixing the road, but it's also how do we compliment and coordinate it so when all is said and done, even though our project goes first, we continually work so that when everything is done, 30 years from now, it will look like it was all done at the same time. So i've been very -- i've enjoyed the process very much, and we're going to continue working together.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Amy Miller Dowell, Portland Development Commission:** Amy miller dowell from Portland development commission, and i'm a project manager that worked on the downtown waterfront development opportunity project. And our consultants just complete add report that I will make sure we brief all of you on, we have some time during the process, but it was just the report was accepted by the development commission last month. It is a project that really was asked to be done about 20 -- 30 years ago in the 1970's when the downtown waterfront urban renewal district was formed, one of the main components of it was one of its biggest tenants was to improve the buildings on the city edge along the park. So when parks came and said, you know, we're beginning this process, naito parkway is undertaking, we all saw the opportunity, and how important almost like three legs, they're all very integral for one to succeed the others have to also succeed. So -- and this area, especially between morrison bridge and steel bridge, we looked at the development opportunities between naito parkway and second, just the river's edge. It was an arbitrary boundary, but it was meant to really look at redevelopment to be stimulated across from this park. There are numerous issues we worked with stakeholders, property owners, and business people in the area, as well as residents, and our work really came about from the work that had started on the park plan, but also the downtown retail strategy that called for putting in mixed use housing close to our retail core. And the park is extremely important, p.d.c. Is supportive of this plan in that -- in the new waterfront park plan because it is basically the amenity for our city. And that area. If you look at the area between morrison and burnside bridge, 85% of the city edge is currently surface parking lot. And we discussed the term blighted, and that is a major concern, there are safety concerns in the area because it's like -- they're gap teeth down there, it's not continuous city fabric, and the area is perceived safetiwise to be going downhill. One of the elements we've worked with the police bureau, one of the biggest elements and most important for the park is that in that area, we really do infill development, helping with -- reinforcing the historic districts, and to one of our focus areas is the ankeny plaza area, that's right across the street from the ankeny pump station, and there are some implementation plans in place that are causing -- that are very exciting to a number of organizations and private and public property owners to really look at bringing out some significant change in that ankeny plaza area about the same time the ankeny pump station might be completed. So we've worked with this group on the connections across that's

May 21, 2003

really important to link or city, the city edge, and we have entered into an agreement with pdot, we have -- we're working on an i.g.a. That will add parking on the city edge of the street of naito parkway, we've worked very closely together and we'll continue to work with parks as well.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Francesconi:** I have one question for you, amy. Thank you both for your work on this. You've both done terrific staff work on this. If commissioner Hales were here, maybe i'm asking this on his behalf, I know what he would say about 85% of vacant parking lots and how he would take off like a rocket, legitimately so, because it's not contributing. So what is it we can do on the city council to help stimulate housing along naito parkway.

**Miller Dowell:** We'll be meeting with all of your staff and you to ask for that, but I think there are some key first steps, and there are many steps in this process, because, for instance, we worked primarily with property owners and overlaps, there are going to be some public processes that come out, recommendation by consultants were -- so your support and help in creating those public processes would be very helpful. And key right now is the ankeny plaza area, we're working with fire to --

**Katz:** Why don't you be specific. [laughter] fire station, and it's the area around the saturday market, and --

**Miller Dowell:** And we're looking -- we're working with fire right now and b.g.s. to find relocation sites for a fire station one, so that that particular site, which is our key initiation site that would help stimulate everything south of there, and a bit north, could take place. We're looking for the relocation sites and working with them and hope to come back --

**Katz:** And you're working with commissioner Sten on that, and he's given them an extended period of time to work --

**Miller Dowell:** Yes, we have 120 days to find an acceptable operationally equivalent fire station site.

**Katz:** So both chief wilson and commissioner Sten are working with p.d.c. to make this happen.

**Leonard:** And I would just add that I have had a briefing on that, and it's an exciting project. The plans are exciting, and I would hope that the fire bureau was taking you up on your offer to find an equivalent site. I think they are -- I hope they do.

**Miller Dowell:** It would have to go to the Portland development commission for final authorization, but our commission has given the green light to say, find out what the costs are for relocation, but p.d.c. would pay any differential in what renovating their current site would cost, and a relocation to a new site.

**Katz:** They have some bond money, but they may need -- somebody may need to add a slight difference to fill the gap. The notion is that the saturday market may then move to the waterfront area.

**Miller Dowell:** The public market.

**Katz:** I'm sorry, the public market.

**Miller Dowell:** Portland public market has expressed a lot of interest. On their website they have a private developer went ahead with further than our study, got very excited by this study and did a plan in which they show a public market near the skidmore building on the block that is opposite the fire station surrounding ankeny square, and a series of -- it would be able to start out small with public market, and then extend to other buildings. We see the ankeny plaza really in that scheme being very activated, the max station under the bridge having more eyes on it, becoming a real destination, and a connection from ankeny plaza over to the park with the ankeny pump station being redone.

**Katz:** See what a pump station can do? It can really get the balling rolling. So to speak. I just -- when I first came to Portland, I was taken back by the fact that housing wasn't on naito parkway.

May 21, 2003

**Leonard:** Nye-toe parkway. [laughter]

**Katz:** Naito parkway. I was amazed that -- and we've been talking about it for a long time, and I there really was the pump station, the waterfront park master plan, the fire bond that passed, all of those little pieces start beginning to come together. So you look for the disparate dots and start connecting them at the right time, and I think there's an alignment right now. It's not going to happen tomorrow, but at least that's the planning that needs to go into it.

**Miller Dowell:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Anything else? Anybody else? All right. Anybody else want to testify on this?

**Moore:** There's a sign-up sheet.

**Katz:** We have a sign-up sheet? All right.

**Dick Clerk, Executive Director, Portland Rose Festival Association:** Good morning again. My name is dick clark, executive director of the Portland rose festival association. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today on behalf of the entire Portland special events community about its qualified support of the proposed tom mccall waterfront park master plan. The park -- the participation of the special events community in this master plan process has been particularly important because as you've mentioned this morning, special events at waterfront park represent some of Portland's most successful and high-profile nonprofits, including the Portland guadalajara sister city association that just recently produced cinco de mayo celebration, the Portland rose festival association, which will unveil the new version of the pepsi waterfront village in about one week, the Oregon food bank, which will host the waterfront blues festival on the july 4 weekend, and special olympics Oregon, which will produce the 20th anniversary of the bite of Oregon this year. These special events define Portland in many ways. They attract more than 1 million people to waterfront park, and provide a lot of energy and economic impact for downtown Portland. Each event provides very valuable funding for its respective nonprofit sponsoring organization, which eliminates the need of these groups to seek public funding from you or other public agencies. At this time, special events are really fragile. They've been battered by a weak economy, fears of terrorism, security costs, sars, and Oregon's uncertain spring and summer weather. While unpredictable conditions will always exist, the events have to depend on a critical mass of open, accessible space to hold these important fund-raising events. There is no other space than waterfront park in Portland that can meet this need. Myself and other special event organizers initially felt very threatened by the proposed master plan process, because we were not included in the membership of the plan's citizen advisory committee, and we sensed as you mentioned this morning, special events were being taken for granted, and our opinions were not as important. However, during the last two years, the Portland parks planning staff and the citizen advisory committee, have grown to appreciate the value and impact of special events in the park. We have shared ideas and have achieved common ground for all users. In the end, special events didn't get everything that they wanted, like the relatively open space that we have right now. However, the plan is better today because everyone worked together and compromised. We have provided you a letter today from the special events community that we request four minor but important amendments to the plan before it's approved. We've worked with park staff over the last couple days and the citizens advisory committee to discuss these, and I believe we have their support. Once incorporated, we believe that the entire plan will meet most of our major needs. Even though the master plan is just being adopted this morning, special events this summer are already starting to fulfill the goals of better appearance from naito parkway and the accessibility of all park users. In conclusion, the special events community will work with the parks department and other interest groups to execute this master plan. We will maintain the same commitment of partnership that we exhibited in 1996 when we collectively supported the parks bond measure and donated \$500,000 of

May 21, 2003

our own money to help pay for infrastructure improvements in waterfront park. Thank you for your consideration this morning.

**Leonard:** Thank you. Questions? I actually did have a question. In the letter that you talked about, dick, these amendments that you've proposed, are they reflected in something we're going to vote on, or did they --

**Clark:** They're not included in what you have in front of you, but I believe the park staff would include them in the final document. But you'd have to ask the park staff.

**Francesconi:** That's what I just did. We're fine with it. When we adopt this we can include the amendments.

**Clark:** Thank you.

**Leonard:** Thank you. Next?

**Teresa Followell, 525 NE 113<sup>th</sup> Ave., 97220:** My name is teresa fallowell, i'm probably going to sound like the bad person here, because I am in opposition to the city of Portland's spending approximately \$30 million to put down astroturf-type material on top of waterfront park. I was reading in "the Oregonian" how, you know, so much destruction is done each year by the different events at waterfront park. I've been a resident here in Portland since approximately 1983, and I have been to many events each year at waterfront park, and there does not appear to be that much destruction to the park each year, other than the year that we almost got flooded out. And it was rather soggy for quite a while. And \$30 million is an awful lot of money. It seems to be to us that live on the east side, number 1, that host of the major improvements are being done on the west side of the river. For years we've been attempting to get a pike place-type market on the east side of the river, which nothing ever seems to get done about it. But not only that, there are places on the east side of the river that could be developed for events to take place. But even in that respect, I think that with the economic swaying, the situation of security, and i'm talking about the fact that we do get a lot of the ships from not only our country, but different conditions in -- and during rose festival, and right now it's kind of a priority I think to protect those ships and the personnel that are on them which is going to take probably quite a chunk of money out of the city's budget.

**Katz:** Thank you. Your time is up. Thank you. I'm going to respond to the issues you raise in my closing comments, because I think they deserve a response. Ok? All right.

**Howard Weiner, Chair, Old Town-Chinatown Neighborhood Association, 210 NW 6<sup>th</sup> Ave.:** My name is howard weiner, 210 northwest sixth. I'm the current chair of the old town-chinatown neighborhood association. First wanted to say what a wonderful day today is, measure 26-48 passed. And i'm so thankful. Two, i'd like to make a short announcement that the old town-chinatown neighborhood association has grown to include the entire skidmore historic district. As of last night, the downtown community association changed their bylaw and essentially gave that turf back to old town-chinatown. I'm here today to speak on the waterfront master plan, which we have been briefed on twice. And we're encouraged by this plan. It has a lot of good elements. I had some concerns as dan brought out to being a small-time retailer, i'm always trying to look out for those who don't have as much clout as some of the larger events. But our neighborhood really took a position and focusing on north of the burnside bridge, and in particular, crossings that connect the old town-chinatown neighborhood and waterfront park. We believe that more is needed than what's shown in this plan. The crosswalks, any of that you have tried to use a crosswalk going across naito parkway, it's named after bill naito, would know that those crosswalks do not really adequately provide for the pedestrians to go across those streets. And we would encourage that we would have lit crossings. We also would like to encourage saturday market. Portland saturday market is an anchor to old town-chinatown. Paul will be testifying in a few minutes, but I wanted to speak to this too. It's entering its 30th season, continues to be a major retail and tourist an correspond in our community, and with the idea of building a public market, there's a chance of

May 21, 2003

dislocating saturday market. And I believe that the parks bureau should work in very earnest way with saturday market to insure its existence, whether it be on ankeny plaza or on the waterfront itself, that's very important to our neighborhood. And secondly, i'd like to talk about the proposed study of the north waterfront area. Like dick, you know, we weren't part of the steering committee, and we had very little really to offer up or be involved in an interactive way. I don't fault the steering committee for that, but that's a fact. It's our understanding there's going to be a proposed study for the north waterfront area, and we would like to have an active role on that committee. We would also like to, if I can wear my skateboarder hat for a moment, keep alive the steel bridge skate park, which was endorsed not only by the visions committee, but by the old town-chinatown neighborhood.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right. We're going to need to rush it along. We still have a long agenda.

**Katz:** Somebody start. Go ahead.

**Paul Verhoeven, Executive Director, Portland Saturday Market:** Good morning, mayor, paul verhoeven, executive director saturday market. I didn't prepare my remarks, so bear with me. It's always dangerous, but I want to endorse the waterfront plan, I think it's a good plan, but I want to caution the commissioners and ask you, I think it's already become apparent, that you are -- to look at this in a holistic way with not just the parks master plan, but also the rebuild of naito parkway and the pdc plan. I've been in the neighborhood there for 20 years with saturday market as both a vendor and now as the executive director, and that neighborhood has so much potential, it's been not realized yet, and I think we're at a real unique point to really realize some change there, and it's - I just want -- I hope everybody can work together and we can say what we have and make things better. Thank you.

**Susan Stone, Oregon Food Bank's Waterfront Blues Festival:** My name is susan stone, and i'm representing the Oregon food bank's waterfront blues festival. This year is our 16th annual festival and we're the second largest festival in the country. More importantly, we are the single largest source of funding for the Oregon food bank. And last year we raised \$310,000 and 115,000 pounds of food for the food bank. Every dollar collected at the gate went directly to the food bank, because the food bank owns the festival. We would like to compliment the park staff who worked very hard to accommodate events in the plan, and they worked with us in the spirit of cooperation. We really appreciate it. The master plan identifies the concert bowl as something that is working well and should be basically left, quote, as is. The site's large continuous capacity as long the waterfront and its ability to accommodate two stages are among the blues festival's defining features. After pointing out the bowl works very well, the plan proposes changes that could cut bowl capacity by up to 30% and preclude the critical two-stage functioning of the festival there. Are two issues and the first is access. We use a donation system so our festival is free and the corridors are open to everyone. However, the plan suggests maintaining more corridors through the festival which would reduce capacity hampering the flow of people. A riverside corridor maintained during the festival could make placement of the stages very difficult. And we'd like to see these and other access issues addressed in a way that preserves the full festival venue and this two-stage configuration. The second issue involves the recommendations and illustrations that relate directly to the bowl. The recommendations add terrace seating, trees, additional walkways and other structural elements. The illustrations labeled as what the bowl will look like under the proposed master plan consistently show a space that cannot accommodate the blues festival. Again, capacity is reduced up to 30% and there's no room for the main stage. And we know the illustrations are meant to show possibilities, but they send a strong message about intent. And the council and the public have expressed their support for the festival, park staff have told us they're committed to the two-stage festival and don't intend to reduce the bowl's capacity significantly. The master plan itself says the bowl fences well as is. We believe the entire plan should reflect these views. As a solution, we ask



**May 21, 2003**

the council to formally indicate that their intent is to see the blues festival continue to be successful and that the two -- the full venue with two stages be preserved. We would ask council to further indicate that the drawings in the plan do not reflect this intent and there is a commitment to work with the blues festival to substantially maintain the full venue preserve the two-stage configuration and substitute illustrations that reflect this commitment. The blues festival is vital to the food bank and the festival puts Portland on the national music map in a big way. It's also the centerpiece of Portland's 4th of July celebration. You've voiced your support for the festival and the food bank and we'd like to see your commitment reflected in the final master plan. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Rob Degraff, Portland Business Alliance:** Mayor, members of council, my name is rob degraff, and i'm here on half of the Portland business alliance. I was a member of the citizens advisory committee to the waterfront master plan. I'm here really speaking on behalf of the downtown business community and our support for the master plan as it's being presented to you. And in particular it's -- the preservation of waterfront park as a place of major festivals for the city of Portland. It's very important to the downtown business community that waterfront park remain the premier venue for these community festivals in the city, thus protecting if you will downtown Portland's brand as the heart of the city and the center of these kinds of activities. I do want to make a comment about the terrific cooperation between pdot, p.d.c., and the parks bureau as the naito parkway rebuild, the p.d.c. planning process along naito and first avenue, and of course this master plan. The interrelationship between the three, I also sat on the pdot citizens advisory committee, and there was a great deal of communication back and forth between those two groups, making sure we were all on the same page, working in the same direction and trying to achieve multiple goals for the benefit of the city. So we think this is a good plan. I think that your concerns frankly about the management committee being gate keepers, if you will, and somehow keeping people out is really just the opposite of what we were anticipating as we were making those recommendations. I think we believe that this facility needs to be managed, it's a very important public facility, and if you'll recall, at our first briefing we had a very interesting graphic that showed how much time the park is tied up with festivals in terms of set-up, actually producing the festivals, and then the opportunity for the park to breathe, if you will, or rest, in between. And I think that our really groundbreaking proposal for a hard surface in the park was an attempt to manage that, that is, create more opportunities by telescoping those periods of time so that more events actually can get into the park during the season as opposed to fewer. But that we recognize that we really do need a management structure, and we were thinking in terms of something -- somewhat akin to what takes place on pioneer courthouse square, with the board that actually manages that facility. We didn't want to go quite that far, but this management group is an attempt to mirror that kind of management structure so that this facility gets used to the benefit of the community. Thank you.

**Katz:** All right.

**Moore:** That's all.

**Katz:** Anybody else want to testify?

**Moore:** One more person.

**Larry Delly:** Larry delly, member of the waterfront park citizens advisory committee. I think there's been an excellent presentation here today, the only thing I could add is that the committee worked very hard not only to address and accommodate the needs of festival users, but also tried to look hard at the needs of individual users of the park who didn't necessarily want to come down for a festival and I haven't heard much testimony on behalf of individuals, so I guess that will be my point here. I don't represent a festival, just a citizen at large, and I think we've worked hard to try and accommodate both uses and the plan reflects that.

**Katz:** Ok. All right. Let's then take the item 474, roll call. [talking at once]

May 21, 2003

**Harry Auerbach, Senior, City Attorney:** Were you going to take a motion to accept the rose festival amendment?

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Francesconi:** You weren't there, you stepped out. That's why you didn't hear it.

**Katz:** All right. Let's take some amendments.

**Saltzman:** I want to suggest two amendments first. And it's on page 53. And it relates to the management committee deciding what events should be allowed. I guess I propose to strike the first bulleted paragraph and the third bulleted paragraph. Because I think these do speak to concerns that we're trying to encourage events that somehow only generate national awareness of Portland and the pacific northwest, and that we try to only encourage events that somehow are of international relationships, diversity, culture, I just don't think that stuff is really necessary. Nor do I do want to see that applied by this committee in deciding what sort of events should be on waterfront park.

**Leonard:** And I will second that.

**Katz:** All right. Before -- harriet and zari come on up, because I know you spent a lot of time, and -- i'm sorry, david, you too. Do you want to comment on that, and then we'll take a vote. Identify yourself, harriet.

**Harriet :** I just want to be sure I understand, on page 53 it's taking out the first and third bullets that are at the margin.

**Saltzman:** Right.

**Katz:** Zari you can comment too if you want to, zari.

**Santner:** Yes, of course.

**Saltzman:** I realize there may be a difference opinion about what the nature of events we should be encouraging down there.

**Leonard:** I might just add in addition to the points you've made, one of the things that makes -- that I learned this week, mayor, in a conference I went in-to-in your stead to talk to small businesses, is how vibrant Portland particularly downtown is viewed to be. And it isn't just an 8-5 city, Monday through Friday that shuts down without any weekend activities, that businesses, restaurants, particularly small businesses depend on a vibrant downtown community seven days a week, including Saturdays and Sundays, and I would hate to with all the good intentions behind what it is that your attempting to accomplish, inadvertently cause activities not to occur in that park that ends up hurting the core of the city that's the engine that drives the entire city. I would be real concerned that we would do that.

**Santner:** Commissioner Saltzman, would it be ok if we deleted the language that says, "should be unique in character and quality," but keep the rest? "and events should attract broad community and visitor attendance, generate national awareness of Portland pacific northwest, celebrate activities," would that meet your concern?

**Saltzman:** If you want to stop it after "an event should be unique in character and quality, such that it attracts unique visitor attendance," that would be fine.

**Santner:** That's fine too. Ok. I didn't quite understand --

**Saltzman:** Delete the rest of that bulleted paragraph, and then delete the third bulleted paragraph.

**Santner:** Ok.

**Katz:** Do you have a problem with the -- so there's a period after "visitor attendance," and commissioner Saltzman is going to pay for the printing of this page out of the department --  
[laughter]

**Santner:** -- should celebrate the heritage, values, diversity and international relationship of the pacific northwest. I think I have to turn to the citizens committee to see -- to what degree that was.

May 21, 2003

**Cormack:** I think that it is desirable to have that as a goal, and maybe it's -- i'm looking at the introductory phrase too, a management committee shall encourage events to meet the following criteria. And it seems to me that's fairly permissive, and I would prefer to keep that third item, because I think it does speak to the fact that we want things that are special to Portland and the community. And one of the things that comes to mind is, when I was working on the Portland, Oregon, visitors association cultural tourism effort, one of the things that was given some attention is that there are many communities in Portland, we have an unusually high proportion of ethnic communities, and giving attention and celebration opportunities to those is one of the things we could do to elevate the image of Portland. So I think that there are more people than us that are thinking that there is a lot of heritage, diversity, and internationalism in the community that could be celebrated to our advantage.

**Saltzman:** And I don't disagree with that, but the way this is worded, it creates the presumption that unless you meet one of those criteria you're not going to be able to do an event down there, and I am saying we should be more open-minded, broad based in its approach. We may decide if z100 wants to do a musicfest, you're going to tell them, come back and figure out how to configure it to celebrate diversity, international relationships of the pacific northwest, and I think that's just around about way of saying we don't want you. I prefer to be silent on it all together.

\*\*\*\*\*: That's --

**Saltzman:** I think the management we'll have enough discretion on its own as it is.

**Cormack:** That's fine.

**Saltzman:** Ok.

**Francesconi:** Could we take these separate please? Could there be a motion on the first one, and then a motion on the second one?

**Katz:** Ok. The first -- let me -- I think the first motion is, a period after "attendance," and the elimination of the rest of that bullet.

**Saltzman:** Ok. I --

**Katz:** I heard a second. Roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] ok. And then the next one is the elimination of the third bullet.

**Francesconi:** I think you need a roll call.

**Saltzman:** It was moved and seconded.

**Katz:** Roll call.

**Francesconi:** I oppose this for three reasons. The first is, this is an attempt -- what the makers of this motion, although well intentioned, what they don't understand is that there's a lot of competition for this limited space. And somebody's got to set some priorities here. And the way you set some priorities is you celebrate the heritage, the values, including food bank, diversity, and international relationships of the pacific northwest. So -- that's the first reason I object to it. The second is, this imposes on the commission form of government. You look at that phrase, you look back, permanent entry to work with Portland parks to develop. That's what this says. This is the commissioner in charge and the parks bureau who's charged with managing this. And what we want is a broad-based group to advise, and then if you're not happy with how we're managing this park for the good of the public, then the commission, the council can intervene. But this is going micromanaging going way beyond. The third reason, we've assembled a group of citizen who's have had open houses, who have spent time and effort on this manner, who have dealt with the festivals, who have conceded to council's wish to have the structure. To do this is micromanaging and disrespectful to the citizens. No.

**Leonard:** No.

May 21, 2003

**Saltzman:** Well, I respectfully disagree with the characterization of my attempt to offer this amendment. We are the city council, we are the final armatures, policy makers and budget setters, and I think too often we try to delegate all our decision making responsibilities to a process that's preceded us, or the commissioner in charge. If there's no point in us doing this, why did we take an hour and a half to hear a presentation about this plan unless it's to be some big celebration. I assume when a document is brought to me, it's asked for my approval, and if it's before me, it's subject to possible amendments as the city council decides. That's the way I view this city government as working. To speak to the merits of my amendment, as I said, I believe there's plenty of discretion invested in this management committee, in the parks bureau, and the parks commissioner in charge to affect whatever policy desires it so chooses with respect to events. But I find this particular paragraph to be elitist, and I know that it will be used to basically deny the types of events that I think are sort of ordinary people events that bring people downtown that don't often, like I said earlier, don't look, don't come from the same social economic backgrounds as those of us who sit on management committees, or on city councils. But it's important to accommodate those festivals too. And we've just heard how this new not astroturf, but pervious surface is going to be -- enable more events to be down there, more set-up, so we're not going to be tying up the park as much. So I think this is, as I said, it's a paragraph that is elitist in nature and I believe will be used to really reduce the number of events here. I vote aye.

**Katz:** I'm going to vote no. I want to -- I agree with harriet, the management committee -- by the way, there's a typo, you have to eliminate b. a management committee will encourage events to meet the criteria. It doesn't mean that it must, they'll try to encourage it and they'll make the final decision. No. [gavel pounded] all right. Let me -- are there any more amendments that dick -- dick brought some amendments. Commissioner Francesconi, what do you want to do with those?

**Francesconi:** We agreed when you were out that parks agreed with all of them. We'll just incorporate them into the motion. I'll move -- i'll move that we adopt all the amendments, the four amendments listed in the may 21 letter.

**Katz:** You have those?

**Auerbach:** I don't.

**Katz:** Make sure that the city attorney has them. All right. Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [gavel pounded] all right. Roll call. I need a motion to accept the entire plan as amended.

**Francesconi:** So moved.

**Katz:** Second?

**Leonard:** Second.

**Katz:** Roll call.

**Francesconi:** Maybe three points. Well, maybe just two. One is now it our job to implement this. Over a 30-year period. Because now is not the time during this recession, and at a time that we're struggling to meet basic services, like fixing potholes. But this is a 30-year vision, and one of the great things about Portland is we stick to things. Like that east bank park, and esplanade that the mayor is going to talk more about later. We have a vision, commissioners come and go, park directors come and go, but good ideas survive. And that's what this is. That's what this plan is. So to implement it, that means we need more housing, and we have to work with p.d.c. along naito parkway to activate this park, put eyes on the street, especially in the north part of this park, where we need people, frankly. This is a great amenity that can increase property values. And so we need to execute and work with p.d.c. and amy miller to do that. The second is naito park way itself, I have two of the best bureaus in the city. And if naito park way and waterfront park don't work out, i'm to blame. But with have terrific staff here that can help increase the connections, we'll look at that issue of the crosswalk that howard raised through the naito park process, and we can make

May 21, 2003

better connections to our downtown, and the plan is already good with a lot of help from the business community, make sure that there is parking and other things. Remembering we still have freight going through naito park way. And then the third is to begin over a 30-year period to implement this. Despite this exchange between commissioner Saltzman and i, i'm very grateful to commissioner Saltzman and b.e.s., because it was their money and the ankeny pump station redo that helps us get to where we are. And it also can be some of the beginning processes of a north side for funding this. There's other things we -- ways we can do this without taking property tax dollars from our citizens, which we can't now. The boat -- the dock is a candidate for the grant from the marine -- from the state lands division, and so there's opportunities that over a long period of time we can begin to implement this. And the reason i'm saying this is citizens, you spend all this time doing this, you have other things to do with your life, and it's incumbent upon us to begin to execute it. The second is -- commitment, we've got to make sure we can maintain this. So parks and others came back and david bragdon from minneapolis this, is a regional park. It's used by the citizens of clackamas, by the parents of those kids that were here, it's used by Washington county, there should be a regional funding source to help develop this and to help maintain it. And so we have to continue to work with david bragdon, who's very interested in that. But also, the private sector, folks, they need to help us maintain this. And the festivals that use it need to help it, and the small festivals, we need to make sure that we have a way that you can do it without the exorbitant cost. That's the whole idea. That's why I need a management committee to give some guidance and advice to parks and to me as to how we're going to proceed. And I appreciate very much the fact that you sent up this management committee. I guess the last thing I want to say is that i'm very proud of parks for -- if parks were not for people, parks could have come up with a better design that would have been more exciting, more visionary. If parks wasn't concerned about the sea wall and safety for the city, we could have come up with a more exciting design. But the purpose here is not exciting design, it's to be a part -- a park that a variety of people can use, from the festivals to the residents who are going to live across the street, to the businesses that use waterfront park to the citizens who come across the esplanade from the east side. Where we do need more investments. So the idea is to create parks for people. And elitist? Are you kidding me? With the history of parks? And what we've done? And these citizens that contributed on this? There are times when we, me, act elitist there. Are times maybe when parks is -- has acted elitist. But this is not one of them. And i'm very proud of being associated with the people with the class and the bureau and the people on this citizens committee. Aye.

**Leonard:** I'd like to make two points. First, I understood it clearly on the record that the sea wall, the technical aspects and protection the sea wall provides have been engineered into the design. So I want to make that real clear that i'm voting on this understanding that answer to mean that. Second, with all due respect, commissioner Francesconi, I do think commissioner Saltzman makes a point about the potential for Portlanders sometimes to impose our judgment in place of others. Because we are a beautiful city, and we are a great city, and with all due respect to the citizen committee, an example you gave of the barbecue is exactly the kind of event I would disagree with you on, and is exactly why I voted for the first amendment. Because as my intent for those kind of events not to be precluded, it is I think commissioner Francesconi made a point on the second amendment, that that language wouldn't preclude something as the example that was given. It is my intent to make sure that this is a user friendly park, but that also we keep in mind that it is used for economic vitality in the downtown core area, and that's great to have a park for citizens, but we won't have parks for citizens if we don't generate revenues to maintain the parks. So there's a connection of the dots that we all have to connect when we talk about issues like this. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Well, despite my focus and concerns about the future use of festivals downtown on the waterfront park, I don't want to detract from the larger value of this product in front of us, and it's

May 21, 2003

been a good piece of work, it's taken two years. Many of the points i've raised have been heard, and some have been addressed today through amendment and establishing a legislative history that in fact all previous events at waterfront park are in fact presumptively grandfathered in for future use of waterfront park. So I think with those policies things on the record, i'm very comfortable supporting this plan and I think it's a good step and thanks to all that have worked on this. Aye.

**Katz:** Welcome zari this is your first presentation to all of us. Folks this is a plan. It's a concept, it will change. Think back of the design of the esplanade when former commissioner linberg had the architects and the landscape designing esplanade. It underwent some changes. The next phase has undergone some changes. This will change too. So don't get to excited because there's a word or two there that might seem offensive to you. Having said that this is a wonderful citizen's process zari and harriett and dave thank you. I'm not pleased with every element of it, I hope that as you begin developing piece of it, you'll come back and think about connecting more to the river. Connecting more to the downtown, as gil kelley points out that things will change on naito parkway. Housing will grow, retail, commercial opportunities will enhance the housing. And there will be more desire to make those kinds of connections from the river all the way into the core of the downtown. Now, I missed the gentleman's name who talked about the east side versus the west side. I tried to explain a lot of issues using the analogy of the color of money. You're going to hear two next items that have different colors of money. We can't use the money from the water bureau or from the bureau of environmental services to do things that people in this community dearly want to do, and can do things that all of us want to do. This money primarily is originated from urban renewal areas. That has a color of money. It cannot be used if it's generated in an urban renewal area, cannot be used to be spent somewhere else. Both of the urban renewal areas are limited in funds, but the central east side, unfortunately, is more limited in dollars. And what we want to do in the central eastside is really look at development projects in the central eastside that will generate an increase in the tax base that then will be captured to plow back into the central eastside. My goal is to finish the esplanade. And to finish the esplanade in a short period of time. It has a way to go, but we don't have the resources to make that happen today. We do, to work on the holeman building, and that will occur very shortly. So it isn't the eastside versus the west side, it is urban renewal boundaries that we have urban -- time lines in some cases we're going to have to make a decision to the council to either close down an urban renewal area, create new ones, or close it down, and capture the increase in the tax base for general fund purposes, or extend the time lines so that we can have additional time to fund all the projects that people want, whether it's on the west side or the eastside. And the east side, we have the urban renewal areas that are dealing with lloyd center, and convention center, and the esplanade, and interstate light rail, gateway, lents, all those are -- the revenues are waiting to grow until the development projects occur. When they do, and they will, when the economy improves, then we'll be able to plow back additional money and do what citizens want us to do. Let me just add for this gentleman, we have urban renewal areas on the west side that don't have a lot of resources, and a lot of the work that's been envisioned for those parts of the west side also have to be delayed because the revenues are not there. So having explained that, it's different colored moneys, it's a long-term plan, none of that is going to be spent tomorrow, but part of the Portland history is part of the Portland heritage and part of the Portland values is that we as a community plan our future. And as our future changes, the plans change. And I -- that's about all I want to say, the color of money or the future, but I also want to thank all of you for doing a wonderful job. Commissioner Francesconi, thank you for bringing this forward to us. Aye. [gavel pounded] ok. 475.

**Item 475.**

**Katz:** Commissioner Saltzman?

May 21, 2003

**Saltzman:** I want to make a couple introductory remarks for all the rate increases, the rate hearings we're having right now on water and environmental services. I'm pleased that the city's utilities have worked hard to reduce the amount of the proposed rate increases for this year. Water has in fact gone from looking at a double-digit rate increase to now an increase of 6% by making some strategic cuts and leveraging as many resources as possible. We actually have a handout behind the clerk's desk about the cost-cutting measures the water bureau has implemented over the last few years. That's available in this room. The most significant impact to ratepayers will continue to be in their utility and storm water rates, which the bureau of environmental services is proposing a 6.2% rate increase. This is driven by our massive capital project to eliminate combined sewage overflows from the willamette river and the columbia river slew. Until this project work is finned in 2011, or some opportunity for other funds becomes available, we'll be facing continuing pressure to increase rates and further pressure on our combined water and sewer rates. Finally, to end on a positive note, there will be no solid waste -- solid waste rates will remain unchanged this year. I wanted to congratulate susan anderson and her staff for their success at managing their budget and keeping costs reasonable in this program. With that we'll start with water.

**Mort Anoushiravani, Director, Water Bureau:** Good afternoon, mayor and the commissioners. My name is Mort Anoushiravani. I am the director of the portland water bureau. I would like to briefly go over the water rates that have been proposed as a part of the mayor's budget. As the commissioners mentioned, average retail rate increase for the water this year is a modest 6%. This 6% rate increase includes our current service level that have included some cost as well as additional services that we have to provide in terms of a new building system, groundwater protection, g.i.s., maintenance of the grounds at the powell butte, as well as some funds to meet the regulatory requirements for fish protection and as well as the security measures we have to implement since 9-11. As a part of putting the budget together, we have taken care of the significant demand reduction we have had both in our retail as well as the wholesale, as well as some of the costs -- cost increases we have had, we have made some major cuts in the bureau as well as we have made adjustment in the debt service coverage, as well as using the legal settlement funds that we have received over the last year also. In terms of the impact to single family residential, the current rate -- the current bill for monthly residential is about \$14.60 a month. Its going to be increased to \$15.91, which is basically \$1.31 more a month, which is less than \$16 a year. So it's a very small jump. And then to compare that to a median commercial user, that would be using 200 c.c.f., that is like a dairy company or a nightclub, which is a significant operation, the monthly increase for a bill for such a commercial account would be about \$5.68 a month, which is about \$68 a year. And the current bill is at \$330, that would jump to \$336. The percentage increases for these two examples that I gave, it ranges from 9% to 1.7%, respectively. And the reason for the difference is that basically how we have to allocate the cost of the new billing system that basically following the cost of service model that we have to allocate that rather than the volume usage, it has to be allocated on the number of the bills generated. So that's why you have a different percentage for different accounts. The next thing I was going to share with you is basically the cost of the basic utilities and I think this time i've tried to have both the percentages and the dollar amounts that the mayor asked last time I shared this with the council, and the water portion of the basic utilities is -- still remains the lowest, both in terms of the cost and the percentages, and -- at \$15.91 a month for a single residential. Then in terms of the rates over the last few years, if you do take actually inflation into account over the last six years, the water rate increases basically the very modest amount of 1.6% average over the last few years. And that has basically accomplished current service level as well as allowed us to establish a better customer service as well as increase our service level and do a better job of maintaining the water system. Just for a person in the -- for a comparison in the regional bills for water and sewer, the mayor

**May 21, 2003**

asked us to show the sewer monthly typical charges along with the water, we have that for the metro area, and the water costs essentially remains one of the lowest in the region. Specially you can say basically our water rate is lower than 90% of what is being charged in the Portland metro area if this budget were to approve to increase the 6% across -- for the 6% average number. And then also, another cost that we track in terms of how development friendly or how affordable our charges are our system development charges. And our system development charges for next year we proposing to be did \$1,557, and that is still one of the lowest one in the region, and that's basically going to -- building a home in Portland at a slightly more affordable in terms of keeping the charges down. I'll be glad to answer any questions the council may have now.

**Katz:** All right. Questions?

**Francesconi:** I just have one. Let me preface it by saying, you and the commissioner have done a terrific job of managing a difficult situation. The fiscal analysis says that the average increase for a single family residential customer using the average cubic feet is actually going to be 9%. The rates are 6%, but for the average homeowner, is that accurate?

**Anoushiravani:** Yes, that is accurate. The reason that is across the board, when you basically aggregate all the charges, the rate increase is 6%. And the way we have to account for the billing system charges, if you will, if you include the billing system replacement cost in the volume charges, if you will, rather than basically cost of service, which is basically a business we'll also produce a single bill as well as a single residential, that way if you do it following the volume charges, would you have businesses paying several hundred dollars a month for a billing system that basically they will be getting the same service out of it as a single residential. So that's how the cost has to account for that, basically -- to the cost of service principle, if you will.

**Francesconi:** Got it. Thank you.

**Katz:** Ok. Thank you. Further questions? All right.

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

**Katz:** Let's start. Paul, why don't you start.

**Paul Leistner, 2350 SE 57<sup>th</sup>, Portland, 97215:** My name is paul leistner, i'm the president of the mt. Tabor neighborhood association. I just wanted to quickly make some comments related to the water rates issue. One, it wasn't clear to me in the handout, it looks like there was \$15 million that's included in the capital improvement plan for the reservoir projects in the two parks, and I didn't see that reflected in here, so I would be curious to know how much of that is related in this increase. Also, I had a question about the budget hearings that -- we're very grateful you guys are coming out to mt. Tabor this thursday to have a budget hearing, but it sounds like you're already deciding the rates today, and then the things rah that are going to go in the budget are going to be decided thursday. Maybe it's because i'm not understanding the system, but it that looks a little odd to some people. One of the things we really want is this -- it's a lot of money, and we want you to really encourage you to look at a real prudent use of these millions of dollars that are going into these rate increases. And again, people have come over and over and suggested that you guys take a look at this monitoring at the outlet option, which would be much, much cheaper, maybe that's not the right thing to do, but I think we should look at it as -- in the interest of trying to use this money most effectively. Because maybe we could save some money and then shift it over to the seismic issues that the waterfront bureau has set a high priority for them. So we encourage you to slow down this process with these reservoirs. I think there's a lot of sort of deliberation that would be helpful here, a little more information to help us make good decision that's are going to affect us in the future. I think again with the process we're very grateful that three of you up here, commissioner Saltzman, commissioner Francesconi, commissioner leonard have signed off on the citizen involvement task force that's looking at how to do citizen involvement a little better in the city, and this reservoir project is exactly the kind of project that that group is looking at and has some very good



May 21, 2003

recommendations. I think there's a chance to stop the process and try to pick up some of those good best practices and incorporate them in here and come out with a better product that people feel more comfortable and may be less costly to the city and more effective. And again, I would just ask you guys to please come up or develop a new -- what the new process strategy is for this reservoir project, how we'll -- how will the city plan to comply with the ferc requirements the land use requirements, and the permitting requirements, I think that would really help calm people down a lot. Thank you very much.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Floy Jones, 2204 SE 59<sup>th</sup>, Portland, 97215:** My name is floy jones, i'm a member of the friends of the reservoir, an organization that was formed a few months back in response to your decision to bury the historic reservoirs at mt. Tabor and Washington park without the benefit of a public process. We continue to oppose the decision, which will result in spending millions of dollars to destroy these nationally significant reservoirs that have provided Portland with safe and clean drinking water for more than a century. We advocate that you choose less expensive alternatives. We have spent months researching this project and we believe the consultant on this project has not thoroughly explored nor brought forth to the public the less expensive less destructive alternatives. This company is now in Portland, and as you know, they have millions of dollars in contracts with the city each year, and of course it would not be in their best interest to promote or support a less expensive alternative, so we believe that their recommendations are biased. As you're aware, they've had this study contract for eight years, there's been eight amendments, they've secured additional money in this contract without additional competition. There's subcontractors in this process, run the public process for what goes on top, and we fully expect that they're going to receive the next landscape design contract, walker macy. We're concerned that montgomery watson did not step aside after recommending the destruction of the reservoirs, but instead stood first in line to secure this lucrative contract. Although we were told that they were not guaranteed to receive this contract, we do know that they have been awarded the contract, and are essentially setting the costs of this project, as they've had all of the inside information for eight years. And the bidding process did not include bidding on the cost. If this project goes forth, it's conceivable that this consultant may have the longest running consultant contract in the city's history. This study contract started in 1995, and would likely end with the burial of the Washington park reservoirs in 2012. We believe that this project is too costly. Our water and sewer rates rise annually and it appears these are permanent increases. Portland has one of the poorest economies in the country. We've been featured on national news, bill morris now, and doonsbury, and we're all burdened with the country's second highest combined water and sewer rates. This project is much more expensive than ratepayers can afford. We believe improved water safety can be achieved at a lower cost, and we urge you to consider alternatives that are affordable and that will help maintain the quality of life in Portland. I did want to let you know that these historic reservoirs have been nominated to the national register of historic places, and that nomination went before the landmark commission on monday. And it was approved unanimously by that board, and it has been forwarded to the state historic preservation office. And they will consider that nomination on may 29. These are significant facilities and I really think you should take another look at the decision.

**Katz:** Thanks.

**Jeff Boly, Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association, 2879 SW Champlain Dr., Portland, 97205:** I'm jeff boly, arlington heights neighborhood association. Yesterday I had occasion to take a close look at the capital improvement programs document of the water bureau. I was looking at that to try to ascertain exactly when the decision was made to bury the reservoirs, and when it was officially approved. My conclusion is that it happened a year ago, when you adopted the budget that approved the money to do this. I also believe that's a land use decision. And we'll be

May 21, 2003

addressing that issue. But this is the -- this is what I found out as I went through this yesterday. And madam mayor, how -- what I wouldn't give to have my mentor and your former colleague, John Mauser, back here today. Because his ability -- his ability to look and analyze something like this is unprecedented. So I am struggling, and I -- but I wish to -- he was available. But this is what I've noticed. I believe that when we simply talk about the current rates, that we're really not seeing much of the picture. What this document demonstrates is that there are capital improvement projects, projected for the next 10 years, about half of which are the burial of the reservoirs, that's 107 million, and another 200 million for the filtration plant. And that's built into this budget, which is now being funded. What is scary is that only 30% of the revenue to cover the expense that's -- that these -- that this budget necessitates come from current resources. The other 70% comes from revenue bonds. The debt service, according to their own document, for these projects that have been approved by accepting this budget, is \$1 billion -- \$1 billion 190 million. That's just the debt service. Now, that assumes that the projects are going to get done for the budgeted amount. So that if the burial project ends up being 200 million rather than 107 million, and I think we could all agree the track record of the water bureau in making estimates of what something is going to cost and what it end up costing is not particularly good, that that could dramatically increase the amount that is borrowed and hence what this debt service would be. But the other even more disturbing part of it is that these are going to be covered or dealt with with 20-year serial bonds. Those bonds get issued over time as the need arises. Well, we're in the best interest rate environment we're ever going to get. So you can imagine what's going to happen if the interest rates go up. So we are looking at a huge potential obligation here, and that's the reason why I think it's so important to consider these other alternatives.

**Katz:** Thank you. And you'll have an opportunity at the budget hearing to focus in on this issue again.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Ok. When is that?

**Katz:** Why is it? Tomorrow.

**Francesconi:** How does this relate --

**Katz:** No, I'm talking about the reservoir. All right. I made note of that, to double-check with our office of finance and management. I have asked our office of finance and management to keep a close eye on the construction of the reservoir -- the burying of the reservoir, and I have an idea that I just thought of, mort, that I need to talk to you about, to have another pair of eyes looking at the management costs and whether we could manage some savings. But we'll talk later about it. Thank you. All right. Anybody else? Passes on to second. All right. Let's take 476.

**Item 476.**

**Saltzman:** As I mentioned, the bureau of environmental services is introducing a rate increase at 6.2%, less than the forecasted rate increase in the five-year financial plan, and it's down from the 7.9% increase adopted one year ago. Which is quite an accomplishment, considering the extensive capital expenditures of this bureau. This required b.e.s. To have another fiscal year where their operating cost does not increase past the rate of inflation. One thing I wanted to mention, in an ideal world would I have been bringing today a resolution to establish the one-year retroactivity for the storm water discount, but we don't have that resolution prepared yet, so my intention will be to bring that resolution within the next several weeks to city council, so we can adopt or hopefully adopt this one-year retroactivity for the storm water discount program as well.

**Dean Marriott, Director, Bureau of Environmental Services:** Thank you very much, members of the council, I'm Dean Marriott, environmental services director. Some of the highlights, the average single family residential sewer bill, if you approve these rates would increase by 6.2%. The primary driver of this is our five-year, \$574 million capital improvement program. You're all very well aware of the magnitude and scope of the projects that we're in the midst of constructing right

May 21, 2003

now. Will the second page on the handout is an actual breakdown of the rates by the different categories. And can point out for you on the residential rates at the top you can see the average single family residential bill there portrayed as 6.2% increase. The one just above that, the surface water management, that is the storm water charge, which will go up an estimated 5.8% next year. So it is a slightly lower rate of increase. Those two combined are the drivers of what the typical family sees in their monthly bill. The lower half of that page represents the commercial rates. As you know we have different rates for commercial and commercial customers. Turning the page, I just want to mention one thing about industrial waste. Permit fees. The federal clean water act and regulations require that we maintain a separate permitting inspection and compliance management system for categories of industrial dischargers. It is to protect the treatment system. In the past we would perhaps be on the receiving end of some particular waste extreme that would enter the sewer treatment system and essentially compromise the effectiveness of that. So there's a special program set up to make sure that that system works well. We started in fiscal 2000 to shift the cost recovery of that to a more cost of service basis. It used to be spread across all commercial industrial customers. With the council's direction, we began to move toward a 33% cost recovery in 2000 that was increased to basically a 50% cost recovery in 2002, and we are proposing in this rate ordinance to move to a 75% cost recovery for that program. We discussed this with you earlier in our five-year financial plan, it is consistent with o.m.f. Recommendations. I think o.m.f. Recommends we move to 100% cost recovery, but consistent with the strategy we've had since 2000, we've tried to do this in increments. The projected fee revenue from this change would generate about \$505,000, and that is money that otherwise would have to be charged through the commercial rate. The last point I want to make is what our challenges are. I mentioned already our five-year capital program, it is significant, it is very large, \$574 million, we also of course have the ongoing Portland harbor superfund effort. We don't yet know the ultimate cost of that, but we know it will -- it has a potential to be significant. And of course we're all working hard to deal with the billing system replacement. With that I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have of me.

**Katz:** Questions?

**Francesconi:** Dean, I don't like this industrial waste discharge permit fee going from 50 to 75%. I don't believe now is the time to do it. Given these rates, increases, given the fact we've gone to volume charges which put a disproportionate impact on some of these large users, it just doesn't seem -- and given the fact I think we may be one of the few cities in the whole country that are trying to reclaim 100%, and given the fact I don't know what efficiencies or what attempts at efficiencies to reduce the costs are there, those are all my reasons. Now, what I don't know, and maybe I wasn't -- what's the impact going to be on these other commercial industrial customers? And I need to see that. Do you have that, do you have it broken down as to what it would be?

**Marriott:** Yes, commissioner.

**Francesconi:** Can I see that.

**Marriott:** I can tell you what it is. If it remains the way it s. Which is roughly a 50% cost recovery, the commercial rate, commercial volume rate would go up from the projected 6% increase next year to between 6.1 and 6.2%. So the --

**Francesconi:** So it's spread out. So how many different customers commercial industrial customers would pay it, versus how much would pay it if we leave it going up to 75%?

**Marriott:** The -- there's about 160 customers that would -- the steeper increase, because those are the ones that have the permit with us. The required permit with us. The broad category of industrial customers I think is about 12,000.

**Francesconi:** Ok. So is there any way that you can increase efficiencies the way that you have in the past and the way the water bureau has in order to have less of a total increase, and thereby saving money to both the industrial waste folks as well as the commercial industrial customers?

**May 21, 2003**

**Marriott:** Commissioner, that's a good question. It's always on our minds. You may recall a couple of years ago I think when we did this -- I guess it was about three years ago when we first made this move to one-third cost recovery, there were many industrial customers in here talking about this very subject. And we -- working with them we agreed to put in this tracking system where we can account for all of the time that we spend dealing with these customers. And that information is available to all of the customers. We can tell them how many staff hours we spend on inspections, and reviewing applications, and compliance and so forth, which is what we -- which is what comprises the bill, the cost of their bill, annual bill. We also have set up a point system so that there's an -- so there's inducements to move to lower points, which means your cost per year is lower. So if you have a perfect compliance record that gives you fewer points. If you discharge fewer of a category of chemicals, you have fewer points. So you can -- to some degree have some control over the cost of the program. So we've tried to institute those sorts of incentives as well. We think we're running a very good program, very tight program. What I would suggest to you is that it's ultimately your decision as to how far to move along the spectrum of cost recovery, we're roughly at 50% now, if it was uncomfortable for you to go to 75, you can move anywhere you want in that spectrum.

**Katz:** If you do that, somebody's got to subsidize the cost, unless you make major reductions in efficiencies.

**Marriott:** Yes, mayor. And what would happen is those 12,000 folks in the general pool of commercial industrial customers would continue to subsidize the program to whatever extent you did not have the 160 permit holders pay for the cost.

**Francesconi:** What kind of increase are we talking about on the individual bill for these 160?

**Marriott:** Well, it depends again on what category you find yourself. I can give you some examples. We project that about 25 firms would see an increase of about \$150 a year. That's the lowest impact. The top 10 or 11 firms would potentially pay as much as \$3,400 in increase.

**Francesconi:** Is my assumption correct that other cities -- most other cities don't recover 100% of cost?

**Marriott:** I haven't seen any information lately about what precisely other cities do. I do know other cities do have cost recovery programs, do require that the permitted industries pay for the cost of the program. I could not tell you whether that's 20% or 50%, or what percentage of communities do that.

**Francesconi:** This may be a good idea, but I think we need a two-year break on this. And then we revisit it in a couple years. Now is not the time to have steep increases on a narrow group. So after I hear testimony, just to alert the council, i'm going to move that we take this out.

**Katz:** Before we do, this budget is based on all of this. Correct?

**Marriott:** Yes.

**Katz:** Ok. I think you need to explore the budget first, and the impact of removing it to other users. The issue of fairness I guess is set aside for now, with this, but I want to make sure, I would prefer if you did that, that it wouldn't be passed on to somebody else to subsidize, if that's not -- and I don't think that's appropriate, then the other issue is, you need to make hey juror reductions in this -- major reductions in this section of your operation. And I would like -- I think it would be responsible of us to go through that carefully before we make that motion. So --

**Francesconi:** I agree with the mayor.

**Katz:** So let's --

**Marriott:** Let me just suggest one thing. I'm following your train of shot here, and it makes perfect sense to me. I just want to caution you that this is a very highly regulated program. We have the federal statutes and regulations, which are administered by the state in this case --

**Katz:** If you don't meet the requirements of the regulations you get fined? What's your point?

**May 21, 2003**

**Marriott:** Right, that's the point. We would then be held not in compliance with state regulations, and as a utility, we would face those consequences. So I can -- I don't want to dismiss the notion that we could make efficiencies in this program. I cannot promise you that we could for instance cut 20% of the cost, because we -- I would literally have to go to the regulatory agencies with a list of changes and seek their permission before we, for instance, do fewer inspections, or require less paperwork, or any of the other things that would then translate into a savings. Let me just suggest what's going on now is the status quo now is roughly 50% of the cost of the program has paid for by the permitted companies, the rest of the universe of commercial industrial counts subsidizes them to roughly 50%. So if commissioner Francesconi had his way, I think that the status quo would stay the same. There would be some subsidizing going on. The question I think before you is, do you move along the spectrum toward less subsidizing, more cost recovery from the 160 companies, and that's the decision you have to be comfortable.

**Francesconi:** I would like both what I said, but also added by what the mayor said, where you go back and look at efficiencies too. I guess her point is right, if you could not pass it on, great. We're not suggesting you get the program, because it's an important program. We are suggesting you give it the same level of scrutiny of all the other programs.

**Leonard:** What did you say the impact was if you didn't raise the fee 25% for these 153 customers, did you say two-tenths of 1% would be the increase for all of the customers if we didn't raise the cost recovery from 50 to 75%?

**Marriott:** The other commercial industrial accounts would see their volume charge increase from what we're proposing now, 6%, to between 6.1 and 6.2%.

**Katz:** And translate that into dollars.

**Marriott:** It depends on how much volume they use, but --

**Katz:** Average.

**Marriott:** I would have to ask. Do you have a guess, jim? Somewhere in the nature of \$15 a year.

**Leonard:** I am real sympathetic to what commissioner Francesconi is raising, in terms of the economy, these businesses getting hit with a 25% increase. Versus that other -- as opposed to having you gut the program, substituting a -- an incrementally smaller inbound crease for all commercial users.

**Katz:** So what -- let's do it so that we know what we're doing. We need a chart from you as to what the cost shift is, I don't think there's a desire to tie your hands to do the regulatory work unless you can do a little bit of both, maybe you can reduce the operating costs slightly, and let's see where the cost shift is to the rest of the universe. Show us the cost differential between the categories. We don't have that in front of us.

**Marriott:** Ok.

**Katz:** We're not voting on this this week. I'd like to see -- I think the commissioner would also like to see it since we put the budget together, before we rip it apart.

**Marriott:** Yes.

**Katz:** Ok? Is that fair?

**Francesconi:** Yes.

**Katz:** Ok. So let's try to do it before next week, but if you can't we'll just delay it another week.

**Marriott:** We'll get you something before next week.

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

**Bill Briggs:** Good afternoon, my name is bill briggs. I happen to be major stockholder in four or five recycling companies. Operate in eleven states. I do have the pleasure appearing in front of many councils and particularly epa and deq activities because of the many changes rules that are going on. I'm sure your all suffering from them. I can see that in the water bureau's new mandated

May 21, 2003

that are unfunded coming to you. I would have to comment that the city of Portland's dean's bureau probably from my point of view does as good a job in cost control and activity and budgeting as anyone I've seen in most of the areas. So I commend him for that. However, as a business man trying to survive you all have in front of you a little spiel, I don't necessarily have to read it but will hit on some points. First of all what do we do. Were a little different than most of the discharges. We pick up all the waste that we call problem waste. Of course certainly sewer is a problem waste but we pick up things like oily waste, drain oils, fats, oils and greases, clean up rags and brooms, pumping from the pump -- or collection pits in your parking lot. That get oil in them and things, we try to do something with those and in almost every case we make a product out of anything that can be made a product out of. Clean the water up to be able to discharge it to the sewer. In some cases we have a small amount that go to the landfill. Of course there tested to prove that there not hazardous so that everyone's aware that what were doing. I did have a set of these pictures, there wasn't quite enough for all of you but perhaps I can at least call your attention to them. This is the kind of things that we do. We pick up materials that might have 2% oil in them and 90%, 99% or 98% waters that are too contaminated to go down the sewer. We treat them and bring them into compliance with the rules and regulations. Presently were doing a plastic to diesel fuel operation. This is unheard of as is this one in the northwest. Both of these are technologies that do not exist in the united states. This I'm developing in kelso right now, primarily because I can not find a way to keep my costs down in the city of portland. Its very important - - - that's good technology to come along. The third thing I think gives you some idea of the things we do pick up.

Enough said on me so the industrial rates today there are several areas that we all need to work together as a group to be able to do and that is as an example we need to level the field.

**Katz:** Bill your times up. I'm going to give you an extra minute.

**Briggs:** Okay. I'm sorry.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Briggs:** Well quickly then. We need to level the field. Dean said that there were 12,000 people that could have extra strength fees. For some reason they don't have although we've gone through those hearings. I think the association of restaurants, primarily in food processors need to have some fee. That's where a great deal of your contamination levels are. They need to be spread to that.

**Katz:** All right. Let me, because we've read your testimony. Let me ask the question who isn't paying those fees.

**Briggs:** Today, primarily and I work in this arena. Today primarily is the restaurant and food processors. They are almost all over strength and no one monitors them so you don't know where their over strength. Many cities monitor. For instances the city of Vancouver has a grease trap inspector who goes around and samples the outflow of the grease trap and their required to have it under plumbing code. He samples that outflow and if that outflow is at a certain level they get a different charge or their required to clean their traps and so on. So there are those things. So we need to level the field. We need to enlarge the base and that's primarily - - we have outside people who come into our city and pump these products I'm talking about and they take them out of the city out of metro. So they don't have the fees. They don't have the metro dumping fee, they don't have the sewer fees. So I can't compete with them. So it makes it very difficult. Someway we ought to be able to address that if they operate within the city they have to contribute to our problem here in the city and that is how to keep our cost down in the sewer.

**Katz:** I'm going to cut you off right now. We'll ask dean to come back and talk about that.

**Briggs:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you for educating us. So you're not proposing that we spread - - your not proposing that others subsidize. What you're really proposing is spread the base, enlarge the base.

May 21, 2003

**Briggs:** Yes, actually it helps the big users who are more and more penalized all the time and this spreads it out on an even base.

**Katz:** Fine. Other industrial users who may not be paying at this point.

**Briggs:** That's correct.

**Katz:** Ok. Go ahead.

**John Oxford, Vice President, Fuel Processors Inc.:** Thank you for allowing me this chance to address you. My name is John Oxford, I am vice-president of Fuel Processors Incorporated. I work for Mr. Briggs. What Director Marriott said I was surprised, because we just all three of us attended a meeting with the city, Bureau of Environmental Services, to which they handed us the proposed sewer and environmental charges. I did not bring enough copies for everyone, but I'll forget this -- forfeit this one to you. Our permit was this year \$5,711, and it's going up 60%. I don't know where this \$2 -- this 2.2% figure came in, but my proposed permit for next year is \$9,150. This is on top of the bill for \$240,000 the city sent us for not billing us apparently because of a broken system, and they went back to the second quarter of 1999 and said, ok, here's your charges for sewer usage and over strength -- I cannot go back to a customer and say, by the way, we should have charged you. That's impossible to regain the money, but the city says pay the bill. But -- the other problem we have is one national environmental company that takes their material out of state, but does business in this city, and the second one, my competitor in Seattle, simply is laughing at this saying, well, Portland's got their problems, but you don't have to pay that to us. And they are under cutting the prices that we're going to have to charge to stay in business. This has not been addressed by the city to these people. So that material can go out and they can undercut our pricing. That's not fair. We're seeing here on these percentages that the city's proposing the lowest rate I see is drainage services going up 7.2%. And this is the city's own figures. Historically my permit in year 2000 was 3 thousand -- 3,002. Next year proposed is \$9,150. Now, as Mr. Briggs stated, there are 12,000 commercial users of the sewer. Only 160 are permitted. The raises in the charges are going at those 160. This is not fair. If we're going to put in a system, let's put it in so that all 12,000 users of the sewer are paying their fair share. We serve a service to the city last year. We recycled 838,645 gallons of fat soil and greases and turned that into a fuel. Much of that was water, which we have discharged to the city sewer, and I call your attention to the handouts I gave you. We have won awards for excellence for no violation -- no permit violations of our water permit for four of the last five years. The one violation we did have was a 5.4 to 5.5 p.h. violation which was stopped immediately. There was no water -- there was no fine charged to us, it was a telephone memorandum. We do quite a job for recycling for the city.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Oxford:** Thank you.

**Steve Ganiere, Operations Manager, Continental Brass Co., 11555 NE Sumner, Portland,**

**97220:** My name is Steve Ganiere, and I am the operations manager for Continental Brass Company.

We've been a Portland manufacturer for over 30 years now, and feel that we are an important part of the business community here in Portland. I can't speak for all businesses in Portland, but I do feel that I can speak for many of the businesses that attended the meeting that he brought up with the -- at the water -- environmental services last Friday. I want to talk on two different things. One, as mentioned by council members, now is a difficult economic time for many businesses. To withstand an increase over \$3,000 on the permit fee that back in 1999 was zero, is difficult to say the least. Our company has seen a decrease in sales of half. We've laid off half our employees over the last couple years, we've had to cut our budgets down to be able to meet that. And increases in fees like this make it nearly impossible for us to meet budgets to be able to stay in business. The second thing is that the city has shown us what the projected recoverable costs are, and over the last five years, those costs have increased from \$510,000 to \$674,000. So while businesses were cutting

May 21, 2003

their budgets, these costs were increasing. I agree with the mayor in that I think that the water bureau needs to look and see, are there ways in the budget that we can cut things, or minimize the costs of things. Some of the notes that were given to us were that many of these cost were due to increases in costs of labor, be it through cost of living increases, or the mix of employees, meaning more management, more supervisors. Believe me, when i've done our budgets, i've not been able to increase the mix nor give raises, nor give cost of living increases. We've been forced to find out how to do things at less of a budget. And i'd like for the city to take a look that the to figure out if there's ways that we could minimize the budget costs for this operation.

**Katz:** Thank you. We're going to get dean back up here in a minute and then give him a little bit of time to educate the council on this issue. Karla?

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

**Katz:** Ok. Dean, come on up. So he had indicate us very briefly, because we still have some items on the expanding the base.

**Marriott:** Well, expanding the base. I think what's being discussed is this commercial class charge, where you look at the strength -- right now we have an extra strength charge, you'll see out your list of rates. If you generate a waste that has particularly high levels of b.o.d. and other substances, you're charged a surcharge, because it cost more money to treat that waste. More and more people around the country are trying to create other tiers of strength, and charge different rates on a sliding scale based on the strength of the waste. We have talked about doing that for some time here, frankly we've not moved forward with it, we're waiting until we have a functioning billing system. Then we would be back to you to propose talking about a more graded scale of -- and that way you'd pick up some of the types of businesses that you heard described other people have said are not paying their fair share.

**Katz:** Let me just -- are they paying their fair share?

**Marriott:** We think it's a totally legitimate request to come in with different grades of strengths, so I think --

**Katz:** They may not pay as much as these gentlemen, but they're paying -- but they should be paying more than what they're paying now.

**Marriott:** Yes.

**Katz:** And you can't do that because --

**Marriott:** It would create additional classes of charges, and the -- given the state of the current billing system, we did not want to risk any more problems with that, so we're waiting until the new system is up and running and tested, and went they'll -- then we'll be back --

**Leonard:** Didn't that just identify prolonging the increased -- different increase that's you're proposing? Doesn't it make some rational sense to continue the system at the 50% cost recovery --

**Marriott:** This is entirely up to you.

**Katz:** Ok.

**Francesconi:** The answer is yes.

**Marriott:** Let me just say that the person earlier said 1999 the cost of the permit was zero. The cost to his business was zero, because everybody else was paying for it. What this council decided in 2000 was to make the industries that were generating the cost of the program pay the cost of service. And we started moving in that direction. We've been following that advice. It's perfectly your decision to make, if you want to take a pause on that, that's your call.

**Katz:** We heard a lecture about our form of government, and the commissioner in charges with a half an hour ago, I tell you these things come back.

**Francesconi:** They do. I was hoping they would take a while. [laughter] [talking at once] so I want to be consistent with the group.

**Francesconi:** I thought were you going to give me a little break here and bring it up tomorrow.



**May 21, 2003**

**Katz:** So I think what I heard was a desire to review this again. I think there's an understanding, yes, do you have a problem at this point with the billing system, and the tiered approach. This is not the time to do it. So your commitment is to eventually do it, and broaden that base. But I think you also heard some concerns about the cost, and what may appear to be a -- if the council wants to reduce the cost for the 160 users, that it should be shifted to the remaining commercial, we need to see that data, or more efficiencies in your shop. I'm going to --

**Marriott:** Let me just -- I think maybe there's a misunderstanding. The 160 permitted industries will not see the cost of the program diminish if we move to more gradations in the charges to other customers. The cost of that -- inspecting and administering the program to these 160 required businesses will not decrease.

**Leonard:** The cost of doing it, but the cost to them will decrease.

**Marriott:** Only if other people pay --

**Katz:** Other people will pay.

**Leonard:** We don't misunderstand. That is exactly the point.

**Katz:** They want a cost shift.

**Leonard:** It isn't that we're saying don't do the program or don't incur the cost, it's that you're having a few people pay a lot of the increase, when the argument is being made that there are others that are skating because you don't have the gradation in the billing capability of having the gradation --

**Marriott:** We'll talk about it some more. I don't think i'm making myself clear.

**Saltzman:** right, I don't think you're making yourself clear, but --

**Katz:** See, the commissioner in charge is telling him that.

**Saltzman:** I think there's a disconnect. We're just getting here and we're all getting confused, and -

**Katz:** I'm going to ask commissioner Saltzman as the commissioner of the bureau of environmental services to take a look at this and give him some time, and you, and we'll see where we're at.

**Marriott:** Ok. Thanks.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right, everybody. Item 501.

**Item 501.**

**Katz:** Anybody want to testify on that one? Roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 502.

**Item 502.**

**Katz:** Let me just say, this is a cooperative work between those who do a.s.r., and parks. Part of the a.s.r. Review that we started was to look at some of our services and centralize them. I wish more of the business community was here, because we do try in many respects to act and work like a business. What we found out, we had seven different warehouses functioning in the a.s.r. Review with an inventory of about half a million and 30 full-time staff. So the parks bureau -- i'll let you -- the remainder of the testimony turned over to you, but potentially we think we can save \$250,000 annually, and maybe more, and then you need to explain to us how you -- this will not impact staff.

**Francesconi:** I guess I just wanted to emphasize that the 250 has already come out of our budget.

**Katz:** Yes. I forgot to mention that.

**Francesconi:** Or else -- what we've tried to do, and I appreciate mary huff in particular, what we've tried to do is make sure we do it in a way that we don't -- we try to protect our own employees. So there were two staff people, and we made sure that they didn't lose their jobs. I also want to thank the union, because - for working with us. This started out as another kind of burr under the saddle as were trying to improve our union relations. But the union municipal employees worked with

May 21, 2003

mary, mary, you worked with them to do this in a way to protect the jobs, but also try to save taxpayers money. And where the potential to save money is, is it's not on the employees' backs, it's on buying the products cheaper, by the just in time delivery, which allows us access to a national chain. And that way we don't have to store products. It's catching up to the private sector on the just in time side that offers that kind of savings. But again, I want to thank mary and really thank the union for working with us on this.

**Katz:** I don't know if there's anything left for any of you to say. But go ahead.

**Sue Klobertanz, Director, Purchases:** Mayor and council, sue klobertanz, director of purchases. The one thing I would like to add, you've introduced this very well. I just want to specifically remind us that this ordinance allows for the procurement process, and allows for our vendor selection by the members of a request for proposal rather than a low bid type situation. And so we're jumping through some legal hoops here in taking an exemption from what's called in the statute competitive bidding. It doesn't mean there won't be competition, it just means we won't be using low bid. I think the other thing that needs to be said is that the future plan is that this has been written as an 18-month pilot project following the first 12 months, written into the ordinance in the r.f.p. as indication that the auditor's office, the bureau of purchases and the parks bureau will do an evaluation of this provision of services by outside contractors, and will be looking at things such as cost savings, ability to deliver the required services, and also the impact on our minority women and emerging small businesses. Following that review, any expansion, extension, or renewal of this contract would come back to the council for approval. So we've written this with sort of a tight box around it, so that it can't just by accident expand to include all of the other warehouses in the city, because we want to be real careful that we have addressed the union issues and we have addressed all of those other issues. Other than that, I just want to say this is an example of about a two-year effort between mary and jim carr and the bureau of parks and other folks, h.r., city attorneys office, and then people in my staff, I think this is a perfect example of what can happen when bureaus work together, and that we continue to review our operations for ways to be more efficient and effective. And I guess with that, i'll allow mary to talk for a minute about what the services would be.

**Mary Huff, Operations Manager, Parks and Recreation:** Yes, with the levy we wanted to maximize the amount of product that we could buy and by talking with other entities we found out we could probably get a 20% to 30% discount on price by tying into a national network. And we met with the union over a year ago for the first time, and worked through this with them because they were concerned about the jobs, we fully intend to apply -- comply with article 6 of the union, it does not represent a displacement because of the timing with the levy. We're going to use the existing staff to help us determine the parts that we need in the field to do the repairs, and the deferred maintenance that we need.

**Katz:** So they will be working at other --

**Huff:** They will be working at other jobs within parks, essentially in the same type of classification.

**Katz:** Anybody else want to testify? Anybody want to testify? Going once, roll call.

**Francesconi:** Well, given the economic climate that first hit the state, the county, and the schools, but is threatening us, we have to try to do business differently. But we have to recognize that our employees are our most valuable assets. So this is a way of doing that. I'm hopeful that we can have more service improvement initiatives, where we really engage the creativity of our workers in a way that allows value to their work and saves the taxpayers money. Mary, especially mary and sue, thanks for your help, but especially mary. You're very good in terms of your expertise. You would be good in the operations job in any place in the private sector, but you care about the public service, so thanks. And thanks to the union for working with us. Aye.

**Leonard:** This is a very good project. Thank you. Aye.

**May 21, 2003**

**Saltzman:** Sounds like a very good idea. Appreciate all the work and hope it's a success. Aye.

**Katz:** Thanks both of you. I remember we had this discussion when we put the budget together two years ago. It may have been three or four years ago. So thank you for the work. And I think this is as a result of the a.s.r. Initiative to take a look at how we do business differently. Aye. [gavel pounded] all right. Item 503.

**Item 503.**

**Katz:** Anybody -- who wants -- all right.

**Francesconi:** Michael, do you want to say something?

**Katz:** Don't go away.

**Michael Harrison, Liaison, Commissioner Francesconi's Office:** I'm michael harrison, commissioner francesconi's liaison to the transportation. The right transportation staffer is a half hour away. And wouldn't be able to make it in time. They were hoping that this assessment, this gentleman -- would be held over to a later time, but since he's here and he's taken up a good part of his day to make it here, we wouldn't want to deprive him of his opportunity to talk.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I've been -- I signed up at 9:25 this morning, so they've known for 31/2 hours I was here.

**Katz:** That's all right.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I'd like to --

**Katz:** Relax. We're going to let you testify. Did you have any information on this item -- no, all right. Jim? Come on down. Sit down.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Thank you. You have three --

**Katz:** Have you three minutes.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** It says there's going to be a hearing starting at 9:30 this morning to discuss the proposed assessment.

**Katz:** This is item 503? Just because it says 9:30 doesn't mean --

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I understand that.

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

**J A Atwood, 33 SW 3<sup>rd</sup>, Portland, 97204:** Jay atwood, 33 southwest third, Portland. I don't know how many assessments you have on your calendar, but with particular regard to account numbers 133009, and 133010, I would request that you not assess these properties.

**Katz:** Do you want to tell us why?

**Atwood:** Well, I have not received any paperwork on why it's -- on why they're being assessed or any information whatsoever.

**Francesconi:** I'm tempted to just pull this back and then redo it, but I don't know -- I don't want to waste your time. I guess mayor we can either -- let me ask you, do you want to -- no, first, do you -- mayor, do you want to put it on tomorrow's calendar?

**Katz:** Not tomorrow. We, do it -- no, hold on. Tonight's tough. We can put it on -- we can put it on tomorrow's calendar.

**Francesconi:** Can you come back tomorrow at 2:00.

**Moore:** One moment.

**Francesconi:** Just introduce yourself and tell us what you recommend.

**Harrison:** My name is michael harrison. I work for commissioner Francesconi. I think it sounds like there's some confusion between the bureau and the person being assessed. So I think it would probably be most appropriate as maybe to take the amount of time necessary to work out the issues to the satisfaction -- and so the auditor's office is here and they can tell us exactly what the mechanism would be, the option for pulling it back and then they'd refer it back to the bureau.

**Katz:** Oh, no, we can do that. They don't need to tell us. We know what to do. It depends --

**Francesconi:** There's no timing issue?

**Harrison:** There is no time sensitivity issues for this.

**May 21, 2003**

**Katz:** Make a motion. Make a motion to take it back.

**Francesconi:** And there's no timing issue?

**Katz:** Take it back to auditor blackmer's office.

**Francesconi:** I'm going to move we're just going to take it back to the auditor's office.

**Katz:** Ok. Do I hear a second?

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Katz:** Hearing no objections. [gavel pounded] that means they'll try to work it out, and if not we'll set it for another hearing and make sure staff is here. All right, everybody. We're going to stand adjourned until 6:00. Be prepared to stay. It might -- my gut tells me it may be a long evening.

**Francesconi:** are you going to take amendments tonight?

**Katz:** No, before we adjourn we'll do it the way we do planning. I'll pick up ideas see if there's support and then have them come back. I think they still need some work on the parking plan.

**Francesconi:** That's good.

**Katz:** We stand adjourned.

At 1:12 p.m., Council recessed.

May 21, 2003

MAY 21, 2003

6:00 PM

**Katz:** Thank you. Before we start, item 478, there was a scrivener's error on the expiration date, the date on that item should be June 30, 2006. I don't know what the item is, I didn't look at it this evening, but if there is no objections we'll adopt the change just to be sure. Alright, lets read items 504-507.

**Items 504, 505, 506 and 507:**

**Katz:** Alright. Before we start, let me just make some introductory remarks. You're in my neighborhood now. [laughter] this is a comprehensive policy plan that will last for 20 years. The last one we adopted was in 1977, and if I recall correctly, we may have started working on it in the late 1960's. And it started with a community, and I was fortunate to be part of that community, to stop a freeway going through the neighborhood. How many of you remember this, or are you -- ah, we have a few old-timers. I just want to say a lot of people worked on the details of this plan. It is complicated. And I want to say that also that this is a very special neighborhood. I know all the neighborhoods are very special, but this is a very special neighborhood. It one of the oldest neighborhoods, it's the densest in the city, it has more people by the square foot than any other neighborhood. It is a mixture of retail businesses that have grown, and flourished. The diversity of the population in this neighborhood is incredible. Old, young, gay, straight, of all colors. All income levels. The ability to do anything that you need done, from health care, to going to dazzle - - a special favorite on that street, one of my special favorites, dazzle, you can do anything there by just either walking or parking your car, getting out of the car, and walking to do all of your shopping for any needs that you have. So former commissioner Hales had this planning principle that if on a sunday you're running out of orange juice and you have to get in your car to get the orange juice, you haven't planned a neighborhood. I guarantee you there are probably several places in this neighborhood that you can get some orange juice on a sunday morning. So what we're going to do today is listen, ask questions. We will come back. This is not the final hearing on the northwest plan. Let me give you some dates, because the city attorney recommended that I do that. On june 11, at 2:00 p.m., we will discuss the nonparking issues. And vote to adopt the nonparking-related amendments. And then we'll come back and adopt it the following week. On june 19, at 3:15, these are time certain, we'll discuss the parking issues and vote them on to second reading. On october 15, we'll deal with parking issues, pdot will bring the rest of the on-street parking and transportation management association issues back to the council, and people will be able to testify on these issues. There will be no additional testimony on the off-street portion of the plan. The reason we're doing this is that this is how we've been dealing with most of the neighborhood plans. And this is not going to be any different. We're going to allow the community and the stakeholders to further discuss some of the issues until most everybody feels comfortable that we've done the right thing for the neighborhood, both the neighbors and the retail businesses. So that's the plan. All right? Gil?

**Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning:** Great. Thank you, madam mayor, thank you for having me here this evening, along with the planning, commissioner chair ethan seltzer, we're going to make some brief introductory remarks and turn it over to staff to make a presentation. I wanted to say that we have with us tonight also rob burchfield from the transportation office, who is going to be here to sort of set the stage and framework for a lot of the parking and transportation discussion that's wrapped up in this planning effort. So he'll be part of our presentation as well. As you mentioned, mayor, this is a very, very complex and vibrant district, a favorite place for all of us, and a district that's needed some attention. It is probably the most urban and complex in the

May 21, 2003

city, and has all the complexities you would expect that kind of situation, and frankly if there are 15 or 20,000 residents and employees in the district there are probably 30 or 40,000 opinions on any given issue. So these have been hard to wrestle to the ground, but we've had a very productive dialogue over the last couple of years in doing this. We're essentially extending the urban fabric to what we call the transition area, which has historically been industrial, but is now transitioning into more urban uses, and that brings up a whole lot of issues that you'll be hearing about from debbie, including the interface between industrial districts and newly urbanizing areas. So without getting into more of the plan, i'd just like to thank all the staff who's work so hard on this, and to the planning commission who I think did a wonderful job of hearing a lot of testimony and directing people to finding solutions, and I think there's been a lot of that work that's gone on in this process. So i'm very happy about that. As you said, we will be happy to hear from the council tonight after testimony on issues of particular interest to you, and use that as a way to focus our work sessions on the 11th and 19th. We hope to dedicate the 11th to the nonparking issues and the 19th to the parking issues. And then we'll proceed from that point forward. Let me turn it over to ethan seltzer, president of the planning commission.

**Ethan Seltzer, President, Planning Commission:** Thank you, gil. Mayor, members of the city council, my name is ethan Seltzer, President of the Portland City Planning Commission. Thank you for having us here tonight. This is an important issue, and the planning commission takes the role that it plays as a public forum giving an opportunity for issues to come up, get a chance to be discussed, get into the record seriously. As gil mentioned, not just the staff, but the community members from the business community, from the neighborhood, from the surrounding neighborhoods have worked very hard in this plan. There's been a tremendous amount of involvement I think as evidenced by the number of people here tonight. And we've benefited from that as well. We feel confident that what -- you're being asked to wrestle with an important neighborhood with new pressures, yet at the same time a real desire to ensure that that strong sense of place that we associate with northwest not only remains, but actually grows and becomes more important in years to come. There are a couple of key issues you'll hear about. We spent a long time working on the parking issues. I won't talk about those tonight except to say that we see this as part of a package. These things work together. We insisted that the people working throughout this process tried to bring these issues together and see how they could work with each other through this process. And I think they succeeded. Not everybody gets everything they want out of this, but I think in large part when you look at the list of issues that were meant to be addressed by this process, the folks involved have done a tremendous job and are bringing a high-quality product to you tonight. So i'm delighted to see the plan before you tonight. I'm delighted that we were able to play a small role in giving people a chance to have their say as the plan came together, and we're looking forward to another not just 20 fine years, but another 120 fine years in northwest Portland.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Kelley:** I think that ethan and I are going to sit back now and allow two other staff -- joe zehnder, who has been a real hero, and rob burchfield will be joining debbie for the presentation.

**Katz:** Debbie brought us the hollywood and sandy plan, and you know how successful that worked out. So we're lucky we have her on this project.

**Debbie Bischoff, Planning Bureau:** Thank you very much. Good evening mayor and commissioners. It's a pleasure to bring you the northwest district plan this evening. First I would like to acknowledge the project staff that has worked very hard on this plan. If they could please

May 21, 2003

stand up, that would be great. Nicholas starin and bill cunningham, phil goff, douglas hardy, our intern, jeanne harrison from pdot, I think i've got everybody. That's the main staff involved.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Bischoff:** Second, for the record, I need to say that the project files are to the right against the wall. Third, before I get going, there is a memorandum from Joe Zehnder, our principle planner to city council dated today that has just a few minor corrections and omissions, and there's copies of this over behind our attorney if folks are interested. There's no substantive changes, they're just correcting some omissions and errors. The northwest district plan is a comprehensive plan to guide public and private decision-making over the next 20 years. It amends the comprehensive plan, the zoning code, and the community design guidelines, and as the mayor said, replaces the 1977 northwest district policy plan. The plan area that is encompassed in this plan includes most of the northwest district neighborhood, except for a portion that's on the north side of vaughn that's part of the lake industrial sanctuary plan, and an area on the north side of burnside that's part of central city plan. The northwest district association, we'll refer to as nwda, completed an update to that 1977 neighborhood plan in 1999, and this plan that they forwarded to the city is the foundation for the plan before you today. We have engaged in a lengthy public process with lots of public involvement events, advisory committees, and meetings with stakeholders, including neighborhood and business associations. As with most of our plans, this plan has a vision for the next 20 years for the northwest district. A key element or what is highlighted in that vision is the preservation and continuation of elements that make the northwest district such a great place. The vision is illustrated in a graphic form as a concept plan. This plan talks about protecting established residential areas, it also talks about reinforcing and extending the main street character in northwest, and northwest is blessed with four main streets, burnside, 21st, 23rd, and thurman. There's also the transition subarea that was -- has just been mentioned that is an area that has traditionally been industrial zoned that is primed for the future for mixed use development. As I said, the elements of this plan include comprehensive plan, policy and map changes, zoning code amendments, and map changes, changes to our design guidelines, a new northwest district master street plan, and other amendments. There are three main themes in this plan. One is to preserve the urban character. As you can see, much of the core of the northwest district already has a design d overlay zone applied to it, and this plan suggests extending that d overlay zone into the transition subarea and along the thurman main street. Another aspect of preserving the urban character is to provide more detail, more specifics that relate to the northwest plan district in the community design guidelines. There's a Portland personality, p-1 guideline, and there are new elements to this plan that again guide new development to be unique and -- not unique, but to fit in with the character of the area. Another aspect as I mentioned before, is the transition area and to focus -- that is the focus area of new development in the northwest district. So as not to promote additional residential development or mixed use development in established residential areas. The second theme is the main streets and streetcar line, and this plan includes both policy and plan district recommendations, which seek to continue the pedestrian and transit oriented development with ground floor retailer active uses of an urban scale, meaning multistory buildings with parking areas behind the active uses. The third major theme, again, is the transition subarea. As you'll recall, the northwest transition zoning project previously rezoned part of the transition area to the ex central employment zone in 2001. This plan comprehensively addresses long-range policy and implementation details for the overall area north of lovejoy to vaughn, and west of 405. Goals for this transition subarea are to integrate this area into the urban fabric to encourage a mix of land uses and to provide a location for additional job and housing growth close to the central city,

May 21, 2003

relieving pressure on established residential areas. One of the key recommendations is the changing of what is the remaining industrial zoning to central employment, to the ex zone, which again allows a mix of employment, housing, and light industrial uses. And the creation of this helps to diminish the creation of nonconforming uses in this historically industrial developed area. Another community goal for the transition area is more housing, especially affordable housing, and there are some bonus options in the plan that encourage housing and affordable housing to take place. A third element tailors the very flexible central employment zone to meet the needs of this plan. For example, retail square footage is limited in the plan district to 20,000 square feet, except between main streets, where it's limited to 3,000 square feet in the ex zone, and this fits in with the scale of retail in this neighborhood. The e.x. Zone as a base zone allows a 3-1 floor-to-area ratio and a great deal more potential retail than what is recommended in this plan. The fourth aspect is as I mentioned, the application or extension of design overlay zone and design review, and the more detailed specifics related to desired character and tradition statements. The city is required to conduct a regional transportation modeling exercise when changes are proposed to our comprehensive plan map. This broad-based review included other comprehensive plan changes that have occurred since 1994 in the pearl district that were previously not taken into account. The findings show an increase in households and jobs along with an increase in transit ridership and auto trips. I would -- the strategies in the northwest district plan are numerous to address the traffic impacts of a future growth. They are both in the form of land use, zoning, and transportation system recommendations. Two examples are street connectivity and an increase in transit service. I would now like to turn over the presentation to rob burchfield the city engineer with pdot.

**Rob Burchfield, Portland Office of Transportation :** There's been a number of processes to try to address the parking problem in northwest Portland over the last couple of decades. This most recent process for developing a strategy for managing parking in the neighborhood started in may of 2000, and -- after city council adopted the good neighbor agreement for p.g.e. Park. And made a commitment to the surrounding neighborhoods that we would mitigate the impact of any event parking on the neighborhoods. Subsequent to that, we formed a citizens advisory committee to work with us on that effort in the fall of that year, and embarked on a dialogue about the parking issues and problems in the neighborhood. The c.a.c. consisted of 21 community members that represent a broad cross-section of neighborhood interests. We collected parking data and conducted surveys, held focus groups and open houses. The results of our data collection survey and focus groups confirm the popular perception that the availability of on-street parking in the district is poor. Our survey results found that a high percentage of residents, employees, and visitors rated the availability of on-street parking as poor, very poor. I might add that the recent auditor's survey of business services in the city, which I saw just today, confirms that businesses consider parking in -- and the availability of on-street parking in the northwest to be poor as well. We analyzed parking data to determine the level of utilization of on-street parking at various times during the day, and found these utilization rates were very high. The areas shown in red in this graphic, for example, represent areas that are occupied at a rate of 95% or more of capacity during the hours of 10:00 a.m. To 3:00 p.m. On a typical day. In practical terms, on-street park is saturated in the core area of the neighborhood during many hours of a typical day. We met with our citizen advisory committee 27 times over a period of approximately a year and a half. It was a process that took a lot of work. There was additional subcommittee meetings and a lot of effort by the community to try to find something that we could call a consensus-based solution. The outcomes of the c.a.c. process led us to an agreement for an interim p.g.e. Permit program which was first approved in april 2001 and is now in its third year of operation. The development of a



**May 21, 2003**

broader concept for managing on-street parking in the district was endorsed by the c.a.c. Was developed and endorsed by the c.a.c. And has received conditional endorsement from both the northwest district association and the nob hill business association. The c.a.c. Also recommended that off-street parking provisions be considered as a part of the overall solution to the parking problem in northwest Portland. And the northwest district plan offered the opportunity to address objectives related to off-street parking. So picking up from where the recommendation of the c.a.c. And the process that pdot was -- had led, we incorporated a five-provision strategy into the northwest district plan, a strategy to address the parking problem, playing with all the variables that we could, related to parking. On-street parking, improving its utilization, increasing the supply of off-street parking, dealing with the design issues related to parking, and we've added a novel ingredient of the transportation management association to -- on an ongoing basis manage and invent new programs to encourage use of ways of getting to northwest other than the automobile. I just want to briefly lead you through the five points of this strategy. First, on-street parking management. To increase turnover to prevent the use of the area for commuter parking and to increase the availability on a general basis of on-street parking for visitors and residents, and employees, on-street parking management, a permit system is recommended. This would include time limits and include the regulation of those time limits through a pay-to-park on-street metering system. The second provision is to create a transportation management association which would be a nonprofit organization given the charge of managing the traffic -- and parking program within the northwest parking district. It's an organization that we have several models of in Portland already, but that will on an ongoing basis and sort of in a real-time basis, be able to implement on-street and off-street parking management mechanisms to monitor their effectiveness to going -- propose changes to those with the encouragement -- with the purpose of optimizing the use of parking in northwest, and encouraging accessibility to northwest through means other than driving. The kind of duties that the transportation management association would have is to design and implement these kind of transportation demand management programs, such as encouraging -- such as creating a fare-free streetcar zone, creating incentives for the use of tri-met bus passes, for -- they also have the responsibility for managing and implementing the on-street parking permit program, selling permits to residents as well as businesses. Annually they would be in the position to recommend uses for the on-street parking revenues that would be generated in the northwest district for programs such as the transportation demand management programs, but also for pedestrian improvements, for operations improvements such as hiring additional parking enforcement officers or actually hiring dedicated police enforcement-related to traffic issues, as well as managing or providing subsidy for the creation of additional off-street parking. Also, the transportation management association we are looking to as a means to regulate and monitor the use of shared parking, which i'll explain in a little bit. The transportation management association itself is a nonprofit organization and would be executed with the board that would have representation from all the various stakeholders in the northwest on that board. So whereas we put forward for you today a strategy that's got five elements as a starting place, on an ongoing basis, this same sort of negotiated decision making that's got us to this point would be embodied in the t.m.a. Board, and they would be able to continue to strike the balances that are going to be necessary to see the parking plan through to implementation. In addition, the third element of the parking strategy is the most controversial, and that is increasing the supply of off-street parking within the northwest parking district. Or northwest district. By tightening up on the use of on-street supply through a permit and meter parking system, we believe there's going to be additional pressure created for having some additional supply of off-street parking. In the proposal that was

May 21, 2003

forwarded by planning commission, there is a -- an approach that will allow off-street parking to be developed on a specific number of sites, five sites, and then allow as a conditional use off-street parking to be developed on an additional three sites. The total number of marking space that's could be created according to this program would be 800 spaces within the area south of pettygrove, and within the different sites we've tied for the potential creation of off-street parking, we've got three types of regulations. The first, type a, would allow as a permitted use, the construction of off-street parking up to 75 spaces in a parking structure or deck. Type b, which is two sites, would allow the creation of up to 160 spaces in a parking structure or deck as a permitted use, and then three more sites would allow the creation of a -- an unspecified number of spaces as part of a conditional use. The specific number of spaces would be set as part of the conditional use process. By showing the specific sites that would be considered for these off-street parking locations, we were attempting to find a way to resolve or at least put some boundaries on both business and neighborhood concerns about the potential impacts of these structures. The other essential ingredient of how we were trying to address through the plan the concerns about the potential impacts of the structures is by limiting the size, and the permitted structures you will notice are very small parking structures in the scheme of how large parking structures typically are. Three examples of those show that we believe that there are locations where parking can be introduced into the northwest district to have a very low impact in terms of the physical impact of the structures to take advantage of lots that are already dedicated and partially to surface parking, and also by spreading out these additional supply of off-street parking at a number of small locations can handle the traffic that might be generated by the new structures. One example shown in this slide is the metropolitan learning center at 21st, between glisan and hoyt. It's a surface lot currently used by the school. The proposal in this case would be to create a two-layer deck, taking advantage of the gray difference between glisan and hoyt where you would have one layer of approximately 40 spaces entered off of hoyt, and a second layer, a second parking layer of a similar number of spaces entered off of glisan, no ramps connecting the two. It's where the get the efficiencies to be able to get parking decks on such small sites. The net increase in this particular proposal is approximately 95 sites. You can see in the next example, which is a site we call elizabeth street, which is located at 23rd between hoyt and irving, and the proposal would be to have -- locate a similar type of two-deck structure behind the commercial frontages that now face on to 23rd street. Again, using the gray difference between the two streets of hoyt and irving, you'd have two relatively small decks with no ramps connecting the two, once again, dissipating where the traffic is leaving the site, but as you can see in the illustrations, being able to really diminish the physical impact of what these structures could look like. For instance, on this view that you're looking at which I believe is from hoyt, the new structure would read, remarkably like a surface lot, since hoyt is high enough above irving to the north that you would be able to enter this layer directly from the street. The third location I wanted to show you is a location behind the papa hayden restaurant at 23rd and irving. This is a slightly different version of the same type of theme. This is a very small lot. It would be a 75-space structure, one layer would be below grade, one layer would spiral around to be above grade. The critical element, one of the most controversial elements of this particular proposal is that the structure would require removal of a four-flat -- a single detached residential structure on irving street. It's not a contributing historic structure, none of the sites that we've talked about affect contributing historic structures within the historic district, but the site would, to be practical works require removal of a structure. In addition to the small decks, there's a number of conditional use decks that would be potentially larger than the 75 or 160 spaces. But the idea with the conditional use deck is that those sites would be developed as part of

May 21, 2003

a larger development proposal for the entire site. So on none of the sites that we're discussing as conditional use locations are we envisioning a dedicated sole purpose parking structure. It's always additional parking built as part of another residential or commercial use that would be on those sites. This is a prototypical illustration of how such a structure could work, and it's also emphasizing that through design review, which all of these structures, both permit and conditional would be required to go through, we can believe you can design a structure of this type to be compatible with the scale and character of the location in the neighborhood. The fourth provision of the parking strategy is to allow shared use parking at the existing parking lots. The idea is that within the neighborhood already at schools and churches and office and other institutions, there are surface parking lots. The use of which by residents in the evening or employees during the day is not a permitted use. Through the provisions of this plan we would allow this -- allow those existing parking resources to be utilized, taking some of the pressure off the parking on the street, some of the pressure off the need for additional off-street parking, and we would regulate the potential impacts of having shared use parking through having a licensing agreement with the t.m.a. The t.m.a. Would license the lots, if there's any performance problems with noise or other issues with those lots, the license could be revoked. The final element of the parking strategy is to regulate the design of surface lots and the parking structures i've described through design review. We also have a number of other provisions required -- requiring location of parking to the rear of new development and the like to mitigate the physical impact of the design of parking on the neighborhood.

**Bischoff:** I would like to finish up with commenting on a few other plan strategies in the northwest district plan. The 1999 NWDA plan recommended the rezoning of land along burnside that was zoned general commercial to central commercial with design overlay zone applied and to incorporate it into the central city plan which is an extension of already an area in the neighborhood as I mentioned before, along burnside that's within the central city plan. I should note that Nwda borders on the north side of Burnside and the south side is goose hollow neighborhood- and we did receive input from goose hollow in terms of rezoning the south side, there were few properties along the south side from general commercial to central commercial and incorporating the south side additionally and to the central city plan. The recommendation before you does incorporate both north and south side and rezones the remaining c.g. Property to c.x.d. In addition, there's one final designation of a residential bonus target area, only on the north side of burnside at the uptown shopping center for the purposes of a residential development. Another key strategy which you will hear testimony on tonight relates to the guilds lake industrial sanctuary plan. As you'll recall, city council directed us during the adoption process of that plan about a year and a half ago to look at this four-block area between 23rd and 27th on the north side of vaughn as an area of transition between the industrial sanctuary, the very successful industrial district, and the mixed use neighborhood of northwest to the south. The recommended northwest district plan proposal calls for a comprehensive plan designation of mixed employment, which allows property owners in this area to rezone their property. If they desire, to a general employment, e.g. One or eg two zone with the ability to provide a little bit more office development than otherwise allowed. This -- the amount allowed in this provision is consistent with the e.g. One base zone regulation of a floor area of 1-1. There are also other special development standards that would apply to the guilds lake area upon rezoning that help to make vaughn street more uniform both on the north and south side and help to meet the needs of allowing this additional office development to happen. Another strategy in this area is application of the transit oriented development tax abatement to most of the northwest plan district area the northwest plan district is outside of central city, and in

May 21, 2003

our planning process, we tried long and hard to come up with incentives and programs that might apply to the northwest district to encourage affordable housing. As you may know, new housing, especially owner occupied market rate housing, is very -- getting more costly every year in the northwest district. The application of the transit oriented development tax abatement, along with our housing bonus strategies, we hope will provide an important tool and incentive to bring some new affordable housing into the northwest district. Another key strategy is street connectivity, especially in the transition area, which has been an area with industrial use super block-type development. But as the area is transforming to more lighter industrial office use, housing, and retail, it is important that the fabric of this transition area link into the established street pattern surrounding in the northwest principal district. With the approval of the transportation system plan, there's a great encouragement as we do our planning to complete these street plans for areas that we work in, and this is an element of the northwest district plan. And I should add with that that the street connectivity and the other provisions for the transition area replace the need for a master plan requirement in the transition area, because the details for implementing the main streets, the street connectivity redesign review are all encompassed in the specifics of this northwest district plan. Finally, i'd like to end with the recommendations for city council. The planning commission recommends that city council adopt the ordinance that approves the northwest district plan, that amends the comprehensive plan, and the comprehensive plan map, and amends title 33, our planning and zoning code. Planning commission also recommends that city council adopt the ordinance that amends title 33 to establish off-street parking provisions related to this plan, but set the effective date of the off-street parking provisions to coincide with the effective date of on-street provision that's will be introduced by pdot at a future date. Planning commission also recommends that city council adopt a resolution that approves the northwest district plan's urban design concept and action charts. And finally, well, there's two more points. The Portland planning design commission recommends the planning commission forward to city council the staff proposed application of design, the d overlay zone as proposed in the northwest district plan. And planning staff recommends that city council adopt the ordinance that extends the area eligible for the transit oriented development tax abatement to include a portion of the northwest plan district. We welcome your comments and questions and look forward to hearing the public's testimony on the plan. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right. We'll hold off on questions and we'll -- we have 86, maybe by now 90 people signed up. So what i'm going to do is we'll start with the neighborhood and business association, and we'll continue with three minutes for maybe a little longer, and then we'll shift to two minutes, otherwise it's going to be very late. Nwda, NINA, nob hill business association, pearl district neighborhood association, come on up.

**Katz:** I have something like 10 minutes for each of you.

**Frank Dixon, President, NW District Association:** Good evening, my name is frank dixon, i'm president of the northwest district association. I live at 2205 nw johson in portland. The final draft of the northwest district plan under consideration this evening is an outgrowth of the nwda's 1999 neighborhood policy plan, and while it often reflect our goals for preserving and enhancing the quality of our neighborhood, the nwda's planning and transportation committee chairs will address some of the remaining key issues of concern. This process has a venerable history which began when the nwda was awarded a Mott Foundation grant in 1989. During the 1990's, the nwda hosted over 160 public meetings and held well attended open houses to collect public comment under the guidance of the planning bureau. We want to thank city staff, including joe Zehnder, debbie bischoff and Rob Burchfield for continuing this work most recently. Northwest Portland has a

May 21, 2003

unique and vibrant character which we wish to retain while improving the diversity and human scale. This commitment is evident in the vision and goals of the current document the as you make the final decisions to complete this process, we have one basic request -- please protect the balance between urban livability and mixed uses in northwest Portland that has benefited every stakeholder in this room, and the city of Portland for the last 25 years. I've handed to the clerk a copy of the resolutions that the membership voted on at the meeting. These are advisory resolutions to the nwda board, and to council, and are not at this point the official position of the nwda. The board remains to meet in June to take a final decision. Thank you.

**John Bradley, Planning Chair, NW District Association:** My name is John Bradley. I'm chair of planning for the nwda. We have three major items of concern, policy plan as written. They involve c.n.f., Vaughn, and some of the transition zone bonuses. Vaughn we continue to believe that high density office development along this street and the industrial sanctuary is incompatible with the existing traffic infrastructure. You probably will see a map later showing that Vaughn and 23rd fails, and existing -- and the addition of more offices to that area is a greater failure, and will cause more cut-through on 24th and 25th through the neighborhood. If the council does decide that Vaughn should be rezoned, we would suggest an unmodified e.g.-1 zone with the standard height allowances, lot coverages and setbacks to mitigate some of the potential problems. C.n.f. We suggest the development of c.f.n. proceed under a master plan guide this. Is a large area of the transition zone, it has some unopened streets currently, and the addition of 750,000 square feet of offices will have a great impact on traffic in that area, and may suck all the infrastructure for the traffic out of the area. A master plan would allow us to look at some of these traffic demand management schemes that are necessary. So it's also very important that c.n.f. fit into the urban fabric of the neighborhood and become part of the neighborhood and not an isolated island. Last thing is the transition zone and some of the bonuses in that area. I'd like to say that we wholeheartedly support the bonuses given for low-income and lower income housing. Any suggestions that you have for more, encouraging more economic diversity in that area would be greatly appreciated. We do not, however, believe the other bonuses are necessary, because they will create an incentive for things that are already happening in that neighborhood and will continue to happen. Thank you very much. There's some other additional items of concern that I can talk about at the next meeting.

**Chris Smith:** Chris Smith, 2343 Northwest Pettygrove Street, chair of the nwda transportation committee. I think we're done with the slides. I will explain why we don't have a position on the parking plan. To do that I have to recount some of the history. As Rob mentioned, the current plan evolved from the p.g.e. Park comprehensive transportation--

**Francesconi:** All politicians know what it's like not to take positions.

**Smith:** The c.a.c. Did recommend the off-street plan that Rob talked about, the pay to park and permit system, and nwda enthusiastically endorsed that almost 18 months ago. The Nob Hill business association, however, reserved their endorsement pending further consideration of the off-street component, and I want to be careful that nwda's endorsement of the c.a.c. Plan, which does talk about off-street parking, doesn't constitute an endorsement of the off-street components in front of you. C.a.c. Recommendation very deliberately didn't describe the amount, form, or location of off-street parking obviously we have something than more specific in front of us now. Following Nob Hill's conditional endorsement, nwda sat down with Nob Hill for a very respectful listening to their needs, and some of us here have been involved in that process intensely through the last six months. That emerged as the plan that went to planning commission, and again, our listening shouldn't be construed as endorsement. We have only taken that plan back to our

May 21, 2003

constituency, and I think the mildest thing I can say is they're not enthusiastic about it. There's a very strong feeling this is just too much intrusion into the residential core of the neighborhood. The membership did adopt an advisory resolution on Monday night calling for two things, before any parking structures were built in residential zones, which is what this plan is about, that first all the other alternatives be exhausted, including things like shared parking, p.d.m. Strategies, shells to existing parking resources, and a definitive need be established through an economic study of some kind to suggest that parking is really the solution to the economic concerns of the neighborhood at the moment. So our membership didn't say no, but they put a lot of conditions on us before they wanted us to be supporting this. Having said that, I would say I am personally enthusiastically supporting the t.m.a. component. This is the first time a t.m.a. would be applied to residential transportation issues in Portland. I think there's a lot of good work we can do there, and it bodes well for the future of the neighborhood if we can get that launch. And finally, I'd like to clarify a few issues on the on-street plan. We endorsed this almost 18 months ago, I -- when a plan sits on the shelf that long it starts to get stale, and there are issues that have come up since then that the plan needs to be flexible to reflect. One is the four-hour time limits that are in the plan. That was developed after one year's experience with p.g.e. Park. We've heard from neighbors north of Hoyt that p.g.e. Park users have learned to park north of Hoyt and that four-hour zone is not a sufficient protection against p.g.e. Park, so we want to look at tightening that down to three hours. Pay stations on residential streets are clearly a sensitive issue. They were when we endorsed the plan, they continue to be, and we'd like to look at some additional flexibility in the placement of those. Currently the plan calls for pay stations every 200 feet, so you don't have to walk more than a hundred feet to a pay station. That means there will be -- they will be directly in front of some people's house, and that's not a popular thing. We'd like to maintain the 200-foot spacing in the commercial zones. We think that's appropriate. Once we get into the residential zones, we'd like more flexibility about the distance and placement, so you might put them on corners rather than mid-block. That's something we'd like to look at as we continue to develop the plan. Finally, I have to mention an issue on which the c.a.c. never did reach agreement, and that is the employee permit provision of the plan. If you're familiar with permit systems in the city today, there are two models. In residential neighborhoods like Goose Hollow and Lair Hill, typically -- businesses are allowed permits for up to 50% of their full-time equivalents, in more commercial districts, that number is 75%. The Nob Hill Business Association has insisted that this number be 100% in Northwest, the most transit served neighborhood in the city. That's a great concern, because we're supposed to be entering into a partnership with Nob Hill and the t.m.a., and if we don't get the transit and get their employees to the neighborhood how are we going to have any hope of making a t.m.a. work? So we would appreciate strong guidance from you on that issue as it is one that's there's never been any consensus on in this plan development. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. You've got about a minute left.

**Dixon:** And that's fine. You can get started with the rest.

**Katz:** All right. Good. Thank you. Nina. Five minutes, four minutes?

**Warren Rosenfeld, NW Industrial Neighborhood Association:** Easy. I'm Warren Rosenfeld, 2495 Northwest Nicolai, Portland, Oregon, 97210. Mayor, commissioners, I come before you representing the will of the Northwest Industrial Neighborhood Association. The Northwest Sanctuary represents an important part of the city's -- attract and retain family wage jobs in Portland. The members of the Northwest Industrial Neighborhood Association are the industries and supporting businesses in the sanctuary, individually and together we're strong supporters. Industrial businesses in the sanctuary and of protecting their ability to operate and grow within

**May 21, 2003**

Portland. One fruit of the Costco controversy eight years ago was the joint effort of the council, city staff, and five neighborhoods to reconcile the diverse interests of the neighborhoods with the land use patterns that existed. That effort produced a unique compact that revised neighborhood lines to be consistent with actual land use. The bright line that resulted was drawn along Vaughn Street. North of Vaughn Street is the Industrial Sanctuary. When you adopted the Guild's Lake Industrial Plan, you envisioned two blocks between Thurman and Vaughn as transitional areas. Green forests by zoning X.D., buffering the Industrial Sanctuary from the residential and commercial uses of the south. The Thurman-Vaughn transition area also reaffirmed the city's commitment to the area north of Vaughn as a place where industry can't invest and grow with confidence. The proposal to establish the Subdistrict B area is quite frankly a big step back from the city's commitments to its industrial employers. Because it moves the transitional zone inside the Industrial Sanctuary. This has two adverse effects on the Sanctuary, and industrial employers. First, it effectively shrinks the Sanctuary itself by creating competing demands for the city's industrial land, and second, it brings conflicting and potentially incompatible users closer to the city's industries. Commercial uses will face industrial uses front and center. That being said, there is some merit to changing the Comprehensive Plan designation for the Vaughn Street corridor to allow headquarters and other office facilities to be located along both sides of Vaughn Street. If those offices are compatible with the Industrial District and will act as a buffer between commercial uses south of Vaughn and industrial uses north of Vaughn, without reducing the city's commitment to attracting and retaining industrial employers in the Sanctuary. It is for that reason that the board last week voted unanimously in support of the Subdistrict. However, the proposal does not do everything. The F.A.R.'s and transfers don't specify what kind of buildings will be built. They don't specify floor plates and other design features for new projects. So ultimately they don't guarantee that new projects will form the buffer the city and the neighborhoods want. Someone who wants to build an office building along Vaughn Street will have to apply for a zone change, but the only real requirement is that the applicant submit a public facilities analysis. A traffic study. If you change the Comprehensive Plan designation for Subdistrict B or other land north of Vaughn Street, then you should at the same time adopt form code requirements to protect this area for industrial uses. And for headquarters in other compatible office uses, from being crowded out by competition from retail uses, ensuring that Vaughn Street does not develop into another commercial strip similar to 21st and 23rd Aves. Neither Nina nor NWDA needs another congested street. These requirements could include the following: office buildings must have a substantial occupancy component, say, 75% linked to nearby industrial uses, as for instance a factory or distribution center within 500 to 1,000' of the office. Retail use will not be allowed except under strict limits, for example, 10% of building area or maximum of X number of square foot per building or project. Or perhaps for internal use only, for example, coffee shops serving primarily people working within the building. Third, new dwelling units will not be allowed. Please note that e.g. 1 and 2 allow dwelling units as a conditional use, and new dwelling unit should not be permitted north of Vaughn as they increase the pressure on nearby industry not to expand and ultimately leave the area. Finally, all new projects in the Subdistrict should be subject to a design review to further limit incompatible uses. The city should pursue traffic improvements identified by the D.T.S. Traffic study, particularly for traffic generated by Interstate 405, Northwest 23rd Avenue, the Vaughn Street ramps and the Yeon Avenue ramps. The intersection with 23rd Avenue is already unsafe. The city should ensure that future development in the Subdistrict is reviewed with these recommendations in mind. As a matter of good traffic planning, the city should evaluate not just how much remaining capacity Vaughn Street may have, but how best to allocate that limited capacity among the

May 21, 2003

residential and commercial uses to the south and the industrial uses to the north. Although Nina and its neighbors have taken different positions on the code for subdistrict B in its present draft, we are of one mind about the importance of protecting the industrial sanctuary to the north, the commercial and residential neighborhoods to the south and the buffer area in between.

**Katz:** I've got to ask you a question. Commissioner Saltzman and I sit on impact where we've done battle to maintain industrial sanctuaries, and where we've done battle in trying to limit the expansion of the urban growth boundary into farm and forest lands for industrial sanctuary because of the jurisdictions of misuse, their industrial sanctuary for commercial and retail purposes. Just very briefly explain why Nina's position is to make those changes on north of Vaughn, in light of the fact that the top priority for everybody is maintaining industrial sanctuary land.

**Rosenfeld:** I think ultimately the Nina board became comfortable with multistory development, if you will, that accommodates office use that clearly supports the users in the neighborhood, and of course allows for headquarters. At the same time, this is no interest in allowing a condition whereby Vaughn begins to resemble the characteristics of a 23rd. And that's the reason for the four recommendations as caveats, if you will, in support of the subdistrict.

**Katz:** Ok. Thank you.

**Katz:** Nob Hill Business Association. 10 minutes.

**Richard Singer:** Mayor Katz and members of the city council, my name is Richard, my address is 635 Northwest 23rd Avenue. Most people know me for my commercial development, but I don't think most people realize our family's commitment to residential. We have over the years owned several apartments, we still do in the area, and we have a unique perspective of the overview of the parking situation in Northwest Portland. But perhaps my greatest credential for being here today is my love for Northwest Portland. I'm a third-generation resident and business owner. My support for the Northwest District Plan is driven by my desire to maintain the livability of the district. You may hear from some that the parking plan will threaten the livability of Northwest. I too view parking as an issue affecting the livability of the district, but from the office of perspective, first, visitors in search of parking routinely circle the blocks into the residential areas looking for space, rather than going to a known off-street parking location. Secondly, the dearth of parking in Northwest threatens the long-term viability of the businesses that help make Northwest a special place we all enjoy. And it is from that perspective that I believe additional general public parking is needed in Northwest. As hard as it may be to imagine, today there are only 87 off-street general public parking spaces within the heart of Northwest. In comparison, several thousand parking spaces have been built in just the past few years in the Pearl District. The Bureau of Planning has estimated that Northwest is deficient by 3,000 parking spaces, given the normal parking ratios. I don't wish that level of parking growth for Northwest, but a limited amount of additional off-street general public parking is essential to the future of the district. I am not alone in that opinion. A survey commissioned by the city and prepared by Davis Hibbitts found that 73% of Northwest residents, 81% of Northwest employees, and 76% of Northwest visitors want off-street parking. The proposed plan provides additional parking in a manner that carefully balances parking with the other objectives of the district. Of the eight sites identified in the plan, all but one are currently in parking use, and that one has been approved for surface lot. These sites are very small and a large number of them are simply one deck built over an existing parking lot, tucked behind existing buildings with active uses. The cap of 800 parking spaces on those sites includes 300 spaces that currently exist. Meaning of only up to 500 more spaces would be allowed. In addition, a high standard of design would be applied to any proposed parking site. I don't believe there's any better way to gently integrate new parking into the fabric of the neighborhood. I have heard some



May 21, 2003

suggest that the plan permits too much parking or too many sites. I cannot imagine how anything could be accomplished if this opportunity for parking supply is reduced below 500 spaces. I have heard others suggest that the large parking structures be placed on the periphery of the district with shuttle buses providing access within the district. This is not a practical solution, because most people will not be able to fit another inconvenience into their busy lives, and instead will continue to circle the block closest to their destination or go to another area. While I fully support the concepts proposed in the plan, the plan comes with some consequences that need to be addressed. First, by basing the plan on extraordinarily small sites, it becomes difficult and expensive to develop. nob hill's amendments must be included in the parking plan if parking spaces are actually to result from the plan. Second, timing is critical. In construction of new commercial parking, it should be a prerequisite to implementing the permit and pay-to-park system. Now more than ever given Portland's fragile business climate, this permit and pay-to-park system must be implemented with care to avoid additional undue hardship to neighborhood businesses. Third, a workable t.m.a. Must be established. As currently conceived, the t.m.a. Is likely to be politicized and potentially ineffective. The nob hill amendments address needed changes so that all neighborhood constituents are represented. I appreciate the political difficulty the parking plan presents to council. Nwda's opposition to even a limited amount of additional parking is deeply held, but the problem is not going to disappear on its own. And there will never be a better time to decide on a solution. I urge the council against pressures to incrementally adopt the plan. The northwest district plan can only work if all the pieces of the plan fit together. That is the course that will help maintain northwest Portland as the premier mixed use neighborhood in Oregon. Thank you.

**Tim Ramis, Nob Hill Business Association:** I'm tim ramis, 1727 northwest hoyt. On this matter i'm not here as a lawyer representing a client, i'm here as a member of nob hill business association. As a resident, as a property owner and business owner in the area for over 30 years. I am pleased to be here, though, to report that the nob hill business association has through their board, has voted to endorse this plan. They are enthusiastically in support of it, they have asked us to submit some amendments which you have which are intended to effectuate the plan intended to clarify some points, but we are clearly in support of it as evidenced by the letter that you received from Mary Edmeades, our association president. Two aspects of this plan were critical to that support. First, the plan is realistic about the sites that are proposed, because they can actually deliver parking. The plan does not rely on sites that are unrealistic in their expectations. For example, not included are commercially zoned properties that really wouldn't be available for parking. Second, all the pieces of this parking plan are designed to move forward together. As one. The suggestion that this plan could be implemented on a piecemeal basis fails to recognize that many locally owned businesses simply would not survive the pay-to-park environment if mitigating off-street parking were not made available. These two considerations drove the support for the project and also drive the amendments which we have offered. The amendments are not designed to change the principles of the plan, instead they're aimed at making sure it delivers on the things it promises. For example, creating clear linkage so that all parts of the plan proceed together. For example, assuring that shared use of existing lots is actually achieved so that the scarce resource is used efficiently. Thus reducing the need to create more off-street spaces. And finally, assuring that the proposed off-street spaces will actually materialize. On this point, one major policy direction of the plan is to accommodate the limited amount of off-street parking by placing it on low single-decked parking facilities in locations that are already either devoted to parking or already approved for surface parking. These sites are small, they are irregularly shaped, and therefore the regulatory controls that dictate the configuration, the setbacks, the landscaping, are absolutely critical to make

May 21, 2003

sure the 500 parking spaces net are actually achieved. Council members I know are probably familiar from their own experience with the difficult parking situations in our neighborhood. As I recall in the summer of 1969, when I moved to the area I had an apartment on northwest 23rd and I didn't have any difficulty parking. 10 years later, when I was opening an office building on 18th, my residential neighbors approached me and said, parking is so difficult now, 1979, that we ask you without charge to please open your lot to shared use by us. We agreed. We said yes. That program has worked well. We have towed exactly on the average one car per decade since we instituted that program. Since -- but that wasn't enough. Since that time, we were again approached to support permit parking. We now have in place zone k, which is permit parking. That alone has not solved the problem. When we started participating in the c.a.c., we realized that problem is one that's literally thousands of parking spaces across the district. It is complex in its cause, it's not simply a matter of businesses bringing more customers into the district. We have an unexpected situation where despite the fact we have great transit service and we have committed transit users, as compared to the rest of the city, our household ownership of cars is increasing at a rate that approaches four times faster than the rest of the city. And when people buy cars and use transit, what happens to parking is that those spaces are unavailable because those cars are still sitting there. We have seen in the c.a.c. Process that there's a divergence of opinion and a divergence of interest. If you own a single family home and you happen to have a curb cut parking space, you don't necessarily feel the same urgency as a tenant who doesn't have a parking space. And 80% of the residents of our area are tenants. They are not homeowners. Against this background the c.a.c. And the leadership of the two organizations and particularly the staff have done a great job in crafting a compromise program which is exactly what this is. It's taken very substantial compromise to get there. I can only speak for nob hill that I have observed them move from a position where they felt thousands of spaces were needed to a position where they're accepting just 500 plus shared use of the existing surface lots. They've gone from opposing permit system to supporting it, so long as it's done concurrently with additional off-street parking, and they have gone from a proposal for many large structures that put literally hundreds of housing units potentially at risk, to a proposal that really involves just three houses. There's been substantial movement on this. I think it's commendable by both sides, and I urge the plan for your consideration, and we'll be back june 19 to talk about the amendments.

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

**Patricia Gardner, Pearl District Neighborhood Association:** Patricia gardner. I reside at 1116 NW Johnson St. Mayor Katz and commissioners, i'd like to comment on the diligence and patience of the planning staff to coming up with a balanced plan for the different constituents of the northwest district. Staff has worked exceptionally hard to satisfy the various needs and goals of all the parties in response to growth, parking, and the direction that the northwest district is going to develop. Pearl has admittedly been an observer to the northwest district plan so much so that the there is only a single page in the entire document in front of you that relates to the pearl at all. I am here on behalf of the pearl district neighborhood association, which did vote unanimously to ask that you remove that single page. And just so you know which page so you can bookmark it for removal, it's page j-9 of the book. We had asked debbie and her staff for a solution to surface parking lots along the streetcar a long time ago when this project began. A solution was created, and through no fault of the staff, but of the definition of the project itself, it is a solution that we're not comfortable in keeping. It's it took us a little while to understand why, and that's why we're here today. Plainly speaking, this project is called northwest district plan because it is really about the northwest district. And I want to point out that the removal of this page will not affect the

May 21, 2003

northwest district at all. They have their own section, which resides in the g section, so completely separate sections here. Basically the language that is being created for the pearl is being created out of a prism of the northwest district. And although we have great respect and fondness for our neighbors to the west, we're not made of the same urban fabric and therefore we're not made of the same words. As many parties in the room will be very happy to hear, the northwest district is different from the pearl district. The northwest district is a wonderful layering of residential streets so single family and multifamily homes and commercial main streets. In contrast, the pearl district is part of the central city, and our best parts are a fantastic mix of residential, office, and retail, typically all in the same block. We are subject to the central city plan district, the central city design guidelines, the central city transportation elements. As part of the central city, the pearl district is actually more like the west end. Than the northwest district. We share the same development goals as the west end of a high density residential and mixed use neighborhood. So in short, and with much thought, we want to stick to the current code as we believe it better serves the pearl district. The code language, the current code language was created out of the west end project and covers both the pearl district and the west end. It simply states that the parking is not -- the park not to be considered a ground floor active use in buildings within 100 feet of streetcar alignment. The current curb has served the pearl district and the west end well and promoting the kind of development envisioned for these two areas. And meeting the desire to have ground floor active use on the streetcar. Pearl district wants to continue to allow quarter blocks to be developed with ground floor active use and to allow ground floor parking where active use is not required when it encourages development or redevelopment. We believe that the proposed code revisions will not promote this as effectively as the current code. So if you'll just please take our page out and we'll just stick with what we've got, that's what we're asking for. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Ann Niles:** I'm ann nils, live at 618 northwest 12th avenue in the pearl district. One aim of the code change was to get a uniform treatment for development along the streetcar alignment. So that would include northwest on through downtown. And the change that's proposed in the northwest district plan, though it doesn't affect the entire streetcar alignment, it only includes northwest and in the river district. The west end and the university district would not be affected by the code change that's in your northwest district plan. So the river district is either going to be part of northwest district plan for the streetcar alignment code, or we're going to be part of the west end parking streetcar alignment. And maybe I should just say what we're talking about in this one page. It's really regarding parking being restricted near a streetcar alignment. And the river district is better served we think by being considered as part of the west end. And the reason that the current code would work so well for the river district is that it is so simple, and it's really tied to ground floor active use. The -- and it's a very simple 27-word code that just says, within 100 feet of a streetcar alignment, parking is not allowed in the 50% of the building that's supposed to be required for active use. We're not sure what the effect of the larger code language which is in the northwest plan, which is about four times longer than the simple code, because it's broader and it's more complex. And that's because of the nature of northwest. The code that's regarding the streetcar parking restrictions in the change includes main streets as well. And that in itself is a change that doesn't apply to the river district. The -- including main streets and not just the streetcar alignment has required language changes. For example, frontage has been substituted for, within 100 feet of a streetcar. We think that's a significant change because it's not as precise as where that will apply. secondly, sites of 10,000 square feet or less are exempted from the new code change. We feel it's very important in the river district that this active ground floor use be required of all properties

May 21, 2003

along the streetcar line, and that the third part of it is that there's just specific requirements set for parking, both surface parking and parking structures, and we feel that in the revision of the code, it's very appropriate for the northwest district and the main streets and the streetcar alignment, but it doesn't apply to the river district. The river district is really more like downtown. You don't have main streets, and the simple code words now that are promoting active use within 100 feet of a streetcar works very well. We feel that in asking you to retain the current code, we want to continue the very successful development and redevelopment that is ongoing in the pearl district.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right. Let's open it up to public testimony for nonparking issues.

**Katz:** You all are testifying? Did you want three minutes each?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Yes, but we've cut it back a little bit.

**Katz:** Ok, good. That's what they all say. [laughter]

**Tad Savinar:** I've been cutting as we've been sitting. We would be here 20 minutes, otherwise.

**Norm Savinar:** I had a long script when I walked in, but he cut me up to two paragraphs:

**Tad:** My name is tad, I live at 3571 southwest council crest drive. I'm here with my father and my daughter and greg baldwin. We wish to combine our allotted testimony time and still beat the clock. I've also have a letter from mr. John emrick, CEO of Norm Thompson which has been placed in the record. My father and my daughter and myself along with my brother and his son are the owners of nine contiguous quarter block parcels within the study area bounded by northwest 19th, northwest 18th, northwest savier and northwest vaughn. In the study area this is referred to as the warehouse district currently zoned i.g. 1 and within the proposed plan you have before you, it is recommended to remain, i.g. 1. Our goal is to provide you with information which may suggest a more appropriate designation. Dad?

**Norm:** My name is Norman D. Savinar, and I reside at 3160 southwest 100. When I return to Portland from overseas shortly after the war, in 1945, my father, who was in the wholesale poultry and dairy business, informed me that he had purchased the Portland ice and cold storage facility located at northwest 18th and thurman. With the intention of having me operate it. Not long after, my brother and I started operating the business. The two-story quarter-block building across 18th came on to the market and with thoughts of expanding our own operations we purchased it. The -- adjacent to this building were four small Portland style frame houses owned by tom o'donnell. When tom died I purchased his property and later built the building that now stand at thurman and 18th for the western cooperage company. When that left in the mid-50's, I was approached with an offer to lease it by peer alport, who founded norm thompson outfitters, first as a mail order fly fishing business, and then later expanded to include an apparel operation. Norm thompson has been our tenant and since then, and constitutes their there today -- and continues there today with a strong relationship that has lasted for over 48 years. During that period, we have purchased adjoining parcels to facilitate norm thompson's expanding and contracting needs for off-street parking. The retail space offices, and distribution, norm thompson has leased as many as nine of our nine quarter blocks and as few as five. Over the years when they have cut back on the number of buildings they needed, we have filled the buildings with other tenants. My point is this -- while we have maintained ownership of these nine parcels, many for over 50 years, never since the mid-1950's have we been able to attract a heavy industrial use tenant. Buildings owned by others around us have suffered the same challenge, remaining vacant for long periods of time. The problem seems to be that the existing building stock was not well suited to modern heavy industrial types of uses. And furthermore, the street patterns can be cumbersome. It's only recently in the last 10 years that the neighborhood has seen some increased viability.

May 21, 2003

**Tad:** Thanks, dad. Within the six-block area, 18th dead ends, 19th dead-ends, 20th dead-ends, vaughn dead-ends, and upshur dead ends. This district currently contains studios for artists. It is home to globe lightings retail location, the cascade health care bookstore, the west coast plant company and pottery row, a show room open to the design trade. Probably 80% of these uses are not in compliance with the current and proposed, i.g. 1 determination, as you can see this neighborhood is not about starbucks, it is not about lofts, it is not about e.x.d., and it is not about wholesale development strategies this. Is a working neighborhood. A place where small businesses can spring up and evolve. It's a rare part of the city and it's about small acts of kindness and a handful of turn of the century buildings. It's about ballast between the tracks that still run along Upshur, it's about maintaining affordable incubators for a bunch of Oregon grown businesses trying to stay alive in the central city. And when one combines all of this with the 48-year presence of norm thompson outfitters this, scrappy little piece of town tells a unique Portland story. Now my daughter will talk about the future.

**Margaret Savinar:** Hello, my name is margaret, I live at 3571 council crest drive. I like the fact my family has been doing business with someone for over 40 years. Sure, I get my hair done in the pearl, I like to shop downtown, I live in one neighborhood and go to school in another. But that's what I love about Portland. There are so many different neighborhoods. I like it the way places people can work but not everything look the same. As a person who will be living in Portland in the future, it would be interesting if we could put modern businesses in old buildings. That's what i'd like to do with my cousin harry when we own the property. We could have the Savinar property office down there, modern businesses in old buildings with lots of trees. That's what I think is one aspect that represents the architecture and historical knowledge and class that Portland possesses. My dad and my poppa have told me a lot about how my family came to own this property and what they've done with it over the years. My poppa started his first business here, my dad had a studio down here. And now other people have been able to start their businesses too. I want to continue that family history into the future and into this neighborhood.

**Tad:** We've come before you to request a zoning designation that is more in keeping with the current uses and more in keeping with the ability for us to improve our properties at a reasonable pace. We don't want to be a destination, we don't want to create densities that will cause stress on the infrastructure, we don't want to build lofts. What we'd like to do is facilitate the continued evolution of the neighborhood. What we'd like to do is place the current uses in the conformity. What we'd like to do is maintain opportunities for small indigenous centrally located businesses. What we'd like to do is stabilize a mixed use employment neighborhood by reinvesting. Unfortunately if this area is to remain i.g. 1, we'll be limited -- not we, but my daughter and her cousin will be limited in their ability to invest in our properties if they continue to be nonconforming. And now i'd like to turn it over to greg baldwin to conclude our comments.

**Greg Baldwin:** Greg baldwin, 320 southwest oak. This is kind of fun. [laughter] The Savinars are talking about promoting something that is derivative of the assets that exist in the neighborhoods. It's a neighborhood that is at a kind of crossroads, a lot of paths cross here, Upshur, thurman, 17th, vaughn. But it's not the certain crossroads where you try to use it to leverage a lot of new development. It has no real connection with a past. Tad has referred to it as an oasis. A place that is an intersection and a place where something special is happening. An oasis is critical to sustain that which distinguishes it in the first place, if it is going to continue to be distinguished. What needs to be promoted is the maintenance of the character of the place. Sort of like creating will ideal shell for the hermit crab so federations of hermit crabs will continue to return. It is as you have said in your plan, synthesizing the best, and I think you're correct in this

May 21, 2003

area. the assets of the infrastructure. The opportunity to make upshur a very special street and by new activities in there to energize it, but at the same time build on the industry and craft that is already there that make it a much better place. To take advantage of 17<sup>th</sup>, not only to connect to the river, connect to the streetcar, make it a part of this neighborhood. To complement thurman as a pedestrian bicycle corridor that passes by, give it a place of value. Take advantage of an architecture that's not in many ways what you can see along 13th. That transformed and strengthen and strengthen the area. Finally, capitalize on the interest of Norm Thompson an unusual company that among other things has a very strong interest in the environment and an interest in improving the environment in this area. tad has said i.g. 1 is probably not the appropriate designation for this area. In fact it is a place where you are going to try to encourage sustained industry and craft of this community, another zone designation would be more appropriate. E.g. 1 perhaps, though it would be good for your staff to look at e.g. 1 and see that it's precisely the best designation for the types of activities we'd like to keep. The best neighborhoods in Portland distinguish themselves on their own terms. Whether it's downtown, northwest, whether it's hollywood. This neighborhood has an opportunity to distinguish itself by strengthening and building on the activities that are already there, and capitalizing on the architecture and extending the architecture, by utilizing those things that locate it in the larger community and finally [inaudible] two generations of residents. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. [applause] it was nice, though. Nice presentation. Do you want to ask --

**Sten:** Did you guys get into the planning process with this approach and talk to the neighborhood?

**Tad:** We were in the planning process, and actually this is a result of a conversation that I had last summer with Jeanne Harrison and Debbie Bischoff from planning in to try and craft. I think there was maybe a little bit of a -- not a misconception, not enough information delivered to fully explain how this little niche operates and what its needs are, and they were in favor of thinking about this designation.

**Katz:** You'll have a little bit of time. Thank you for the presentation. It's nice. It's nice to see a whole family here.

**Tad:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Have you nine minutes.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** I have nine. Thank you.

**Katz:** No, no. You the -- the three of you have nine.

**Steve Able, Attorney representing CNF:** My name is Steve Able, I'm an attorney tonight. 900 Southwest Fifth Avenue. Tonight I represent C.N.F. C.N.F. is located in Northwest Portland in the transition area, and has been in that vicinity since about 1940, actually in the vicinity since 1929, but on those properties since 1940. It has about 1400 employees located in that area. If Gil's figure of 15,000 is correct for the number of employees in the district, this is about 10% of the employees. Recently C.N.F. expanded, renewing its commitment to do business in the city of Portland. The Northwest Neighborhood Association, NWDA testified earlier about a master plan, we agree with the staff that a master plan is not appropriate, however, C.N.F. Does review putting a design review on these blocks does make sense. So we do support the idea of design review. I'm really here to talk about the issue of the street connectivity that exists around the C.N.F. Properties and the C.N.F. Campus. C.N.F. Opposes the reopening of those streets. And I say reopening for a particular reason. We think that creates functional concerns for the operation of C.N.F., security issues, mix of transportation type issues, conflicts with pedestrians in this environment, that is a problem for us. Secondly, it raises a concern for future expansion. This is one of the few big blocks of land that

May 21, 2003

exists in the central city that's available for expansion of business, and it ought to be used in that way. Originally it designating the streets -- these as public streets precludes opportunities not only for c.n.f., but I think for the city. I think we're all better served relying on the policies that are embedded in the plan and when you go back and look at the plan, there are a couple of policies that are important. There are transition subarea objectives of retaining jobs, creating jobs, and protecting existing businesses from having to relocate. More importantly, policy I think it is "b" in the transition element, speaks to connectivity not just in public streets, but speaks to connectivity in existing super blocks with streets or pedestrian accesses. C.n.f. supports that kind of policy but doesn't support the premature designation of these streets as public streets. We think that's detrimental to c.n.f. And frankly we think that's detriment the to the city. It precludes opportunities for future growth, job creation growth in this important district, and we think relying on the policies is the correct way to go. So what we would request is that these -- that you not amend the master street plan, rely upon these policies embedded within the plan that have the flexibility and put design review on the c.n.f. Parcels. Thank you.

**Paul Pope, Operations Manager, Esco:** Good evening, i'm the operations manager for the main plant in Portland at 2141 northwest 25th 97210. Esco is headquartered in Portland with over 600 employees here, and four operating groups with 3600 employees and 25 manufacturing locations spanning six continents. Esco is proud of its operations and its headquarters in Portland. Esco and all of its location and specifically in Portland works hard to prevent odors, noise and dust that might impact our neighbors or the environment we live in. We have consistently met and bettered all environmental standards and we're committed to do this in the future. However, there is an inherent conflict between heavy industry in an intensely urban neighborhood like northwest Portland. Esco believes vaughn needs updating and we need a buffer to help shield it and our neighbors from concerns that arise from time to time. A series of office buildings of sufficient height will have that threshold effect. Further to that, we can envision a need for a building serving as much more than a group headquarters. We believe the right building can provide an opportunity for suppliers and customers of esco and other manufactures in the guilds lake industrial sanctuary to colocate. This would create synergy between these groups that would help the manufacturers remain competitive and provide jobs. Also, one of esco's core strategies is to source productions for low value added, commodity type products into low-cost regions of the world, replacing that volume with higher value added, more intellectual property intensive products. This requires engineering and logistics, core competencies that we hope to build and strengthen working with regional education facilities and based in Portland. A new building would need to serve all these functions. Generally we appreciate the process that council and esco, nwda and nina go through. We think the northwest district plan for vaughn subdistrict b is good. Further, we understand if council passes the proposal, there will be a need for a zone change when esco decides how to develop the property, and a new traffic study will be needed. However, there's one major failing that unless is corrected will make it difficult to get the kind of development that esco needs and the kind of development we think is good for the city and the neighborhood. Specifically, the buildings will be too small to do the things outlined above, and not economically viable if all that is allowed is a floor area ratio of 1-1. Esco has provided traffic analysis done by DKS traffic engineers that shows the development can go into a 1.85-1 and with proper mitigation, the c.n.f. Development can be accommodated and future failure of the 23rd and vaughn intersection can be mitigated. This failure is a certainty in these land use these mitigation measures are taken, even without development. Dale MacHaffie of our company and our counsel Steve Schell have provided a template to small changes needed to make this project work. We respectfully ask that

May 21, 2003

you adopt the proposed changes to the development standards. Steve has additional comments and can answer any technical question you may have.

**Steve Schell:** Mayor and council members, my name is Steve Schell, I have offices on 805 Southwest Broadway and we're here representing ESCO. ESCO is generally happy as Paul has mentioned with the plan, with the steps that are taken. We do think there's one more step that needs to happen, and that is to establish this change in the floor area ratio from the current 1.1 to 1.85-1. There's been a lot of talk about doing this in the form of headquarters, building and that kind of thing. ESCO thinks there are synergies that will go on as a result of its change as Paul has outlined, to a more intellectual property and information technology type activity here in Portland. It needs to be able to make that shift so that keeps its manufacturing activity nearby, but has the office capability of supporting this activity all over the world. We think this buffer makes a great deal of sense at this point, because it provides a separation between the Northwest District and the Guild's Lake Industrial District. That buffer originally was intended to be south of Vaughn. It hasn't happened. There have been changes that have been allowed to go on south of Vaughn that have prevented that buffer from developing appropriately. The solution is to take that one block which is already partially developed in terms of offices, as least as far as ESCO's current administrative buildings go, and make that throughout the 23rd to 27th area. Several arguments have been raised regarding the appropriateness of this activity. One of them is that we don't want to do change- you don't want to look at this -- 1.85-1 justification requires mitigation. That mitigation can affect other people. The key element here is that at the time as the planning commission has set it up and established -- and the staff has set it up, at the time there's a zone change, when ESCO is ready to determine how it's going to develop this area, there will be required another transportation study. That will analyze what can and can't be done in order to prevent a failure of 23rd and Vaughn particularly. As well as prevent the cut-through and other kinds of objections that the Northwest District folks legitimately have. And those steps will be taken -- will be analyzed at that time for public consumption, and there will be much comment. If you don't take this statement, if you don't take this step to provide a viable development opportunity in this area, the problem at 23rd and Vaughn will become worse and worse, and Vaughn will clearly fail. And this is one way to help make sure that there's a way to prevent its failure. But you have to provide a viable alternative so that the businesses in the area can operate effectively. Providing an adequate floor area ratio does that. The Northwest District folks -- excuse me, Nina, has provided some suggestions for changes. We have comments in the material that we can address. Thank you.

**Katz:** Fine. You'll have an opportunity when we meet next -- thank you. Karla?

**Sandy Diedrich:** I'm Sandy Diedrich. Dear Mayor Katz and Commissioners, I have the privilege of living and working in Northwest Portland. I served on the Northwest District Association Board of Directors for the past 10 years, and chaired the Policy Planning Committee through the plan's adoption by the NWDA. Our policy plan represents a diligent work by many parties to address the interests of the neighborhood and the needs of the city. The recommended Northwest District plan before you has taken our plan to the level necessary for incorporation as an element and the city's comprehensive plan. Overwhelmingly the Northwest District plan reflects the results of our neighborhood's deliberation on vital issues and balancing diverse interests. Most of the policies, objectives and implementing actions from our policy plan are readily recognizable in the Northwest District plan. Of particular importance to me is the way the plan provisions for housing, business and residential interaction, quality of life, and the four distinctive subareas have remained intact or improved in the recommended plan. Our committee invented the transition subarea as a way to address the city's need for additional housing and related urban development while preserving the



May 21, 2003

patterns of development in our neighborhood. We championed the preservation and protection of the eastern edge because it is a critically important family wage employment area that also supports neighborhood response of businesses while serving as an incubator area for new business development. We gave special consideration to willamette heights, not only because of its charm, but also because of its historical significance, its physical characteristics, and its access limitations in case of emergencies. We developed ideas to ensure future mix of housing types to retain diversity and increase affordability. We created mechanisms to facilitate constructive interaction between residents and businesses on matters of livability. Overall, the recommended plan has treated the work of our neighborhood with integrity and respect. Setting aside the parking elements and certain exceptions nwda is presenting, the recommended plan should be adopted as presented because it fairly represents the best interest of both our neighborhood and the city. I believe this is due to the outstanding professional service provided by the bureau of planning staff assigned to this process. They have performed in an exemplary manner by carefully considering neighborhood perspectives, reaching out effectively to the many diverse parties in the neighborhood, listening attentively to the input and advice they sought, and finding appropriate planning tools to balance interests without short coming quality. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**Katz:** Thank you. We can't see you. Is that the point? [laughter]

**Bing Sheldon, SERA Architects:** Mayor and council members, my name is bing sheldon, I work at 123 northwest second avenue and I live at 3033 northwest quimby, and as many of you know, i've been active in the district for a many number of years. I'm here to talk about a policy question, and I will quote from a letter that I just -- the clerk just gave you. Within the amendments that have been proposed, there is a -- what I think is a special condition proposed for the parking lot behind the uptown shopping center on the north side of west burnside and northwest westover. In effect, what the staff has recommended at the request of the applicant is to provide housing bonuses for this site. I guess I would like to suggest that the bonus provisions really are subject to further analysis and I think from a policy point of view have some surprising problems. First, the property is not even within the area that's planned for the northwest district plan. And while bonus provisions can achieve important city objectives, they are placed on properties in order to be consistent with the code itself. And let me quote from the code. The city of Portland code is specific about the purposes to be achieved by regulation of height in the central city. These purposes include maximum heights are intended to accomplish several purposes. Protecting views, creating a step-down to building heights to the willamette river, limiting shadows on public open spaces, and ensuring building height capability and step-downs in historic districts. And limiting shadows from new development on residential neighborhoods at the edges of the central city. The site that is earmarked for this bonus sits immediately adjacent to r-zoned property and the recently created alphabet historic district. The district includes numerous historic and valuable residential homes. I think our position is that the size and height that would be allowed under this bonus provision is incompatible with the district. I think you've heard testimony before that this is a very vibrant neighborhood, and I would suggest, and i'm here to suggest that there's a policy problem with granting this bonus at this location. And i'd further add that if this is approved, you're setting a dangerous precedent because it would likely be that this bonus could be applied -- asked for and applied to other properties that line burnside, because the question is, why wouldn't you grant it if you granted it at the extreme western edge of the central city designation?

**Katz:** Thank you. Bing, I don't think -- why don't you show that to the audience. Is this -- forgive me for not knowing all the details at this point, is this with all the bonuses? Is this the result of all the bonuses? At the uptown shopping center?

**May 21, 2003**

**Sheldon:** Yes. In other words, the -- there is an application and included in the plan is a bonus provision for the specific site behind the shopping center. That's all. That's the only one that's incorporated in this recommendation. That's sort of curious, and I think our position is, my position is, it's inconsistent with the policies of height regulation in the code itself. And it does cast shadows on the residential area. And I think we could argue all night with whether this is an accurate representation of the building, but the applicant proposes 135 feet to the mid-line of the roof. That's a big building. And we've tried our best to illustrate just how out of scale that is.

**Lee Stapleton:** Good evening, I'm Lee Stapleton. I reside at 2445 NW Westover. I'm on the NWDA board, but I'm speaking as a private citizen tonight. Especially in light of what Bing just talked about, about the cx designation and variances they proposed for the uptown shopping center, I think the comments I have which I made earlier in the process of review of the NWDA plan should be considered. I specifically addressed a little site which is called the watershed property. It's between Westover and 24<sup>th</sup> and Glisan and Irving. It's the slope of the property that used to be the downgrade from the old St. Vincent's hospital. Unfortunately at this time it is not very well maintained. It used to have a road through the property. There's a suggestion hidden deep in the plan that this would be a great place for a park. I agree. I think it should be a park. It's right now zoned r-h which would allow 33-71 units on there and at one time they had a variance that was going to reduce the number of housing to very upscale condominiums.

**Katz:** Is this the property the nature conservancy wanted to buy?

**Stapleton:** Yes, I believe it is. It actually has a creek also so there's also construction properties. I suggested early on that it would be a great site for a park on top of a parking structure. It would be a great location for a parking structure because it's accessible to essentially Irving and Glisan. You could have underground parking, you could have it hidden from view. It could provide for the apartments in the area for overnight use, much in the same way as some of the other apartment -- parking sites are proposed in the plan. And it could have a promenade or park on top. At one time I suggested that this would have been a great place for the Holocaust memorial, because it was right between two synagogues. But that was never considered. It would be a great place for a park and a scenic view site from Westover to the east. It's a great place. I live across the street and there's no personal interest, because I do not have a view condominium. So -- but it would be nice to see a park in that area. It's underserved, and parks are not considered very much in the plan. I'd like to see it considered a lot more. And I think this would be a great place and it might be a pretty good place to get people in the community to help subsidizing the cost of making some repair of the park on top of a parking structure. Also, I'm also scheduled to talk briefly on the parking, to save time so you don't need to see me again. One of the things about any parking proposal, downtown you have lined parking. The plan suggests that there not be any lined parking spaces. But I think anything you need to do to protect pedestrian and driving safety is that you need signage and signage at the corners to prevent cars parking in the crosswalks, which is a major problem in northwest. So anything on the parking proposals that's developed prevent the parking in the crosswalks. Thank you.

**Jack Onder:** I'm Jack Onder. I work at 1100 Glisan in Portland. I represent 24 Place LLC. We are in contract to purchase the northern part of the western parking lot behind the uptown shopping center. We are purchasing this property for the purpose of building a residential condominium, 114 units over a new parking garage. The garage would provide parking for the residential units as well as replace the retail parking spaces that would be taken by the condominium. We believe that the -- it's a perfect infill site that would help fulfill the city's policy of bringing housing to downtown. We have done preliminary studies on views, traffic and shadows. And believe our

May 21, 2003

condominium works extremely well on the site and will have a positive impact on the surrounding neighborhood. The development would also at least partially conceal the unsightly face of the bluff which is not landscaped and it's rock and turf, basically. We have been working for many months with the planning department and with nwda and we believe the c.x. D. Zone contained in the plan is appropriate. And that the housing bonuses should be applied to this site. The planning commission did confirm this concept. You've heard from Bing Sheldon representing the owner of the uptown heights apartments above, which are located on the bluff above our site, and we have taken into account their views up there, and feel that they will be minimally impacted. Our building goes to about 10 feet above the lowest units up there, and they're about six to eight of those. And the housing bonuses, if applied, would take us to 150 feet, we're talking about 130-foot building. And we believe that works nicely for the site. Jeff will get into some of the details in a minute. Also our building would be more than 200 feet away from those apartments above compared to a typical city street where the 60-foot distance would apply. We do feel the C.x. Zone is appropriate, we feel the housing bonuses are appropriate. The shadows will have to be dealt with, design review. We plan to do a more comprehensive study in preparation for that. Our preliminary studies were very positive. The bluff is now, the hill does create its own shadows.

**Katz:** Your time is up.

**Jeff Hamilton:** My name is Jeff Hamilton, I work at 6720 Southwest Macadam, Portland, Oregon. The boards show an overview of the apartments that are on top of the hill and in the lower left of the upper board is the plan showing the proposed building on the bottom and the -- nine of the apartments that are at the top of the hill and there are seven more shown in the upper right above those, and the lower buildings are about 115 to 130 feet above the proposed building that we have shown. We think it's an excellent place to apply a bonus because the city has goals to increase density within the city next to transportation, it's near Burnside, it's near major shopping, you can walk to get to things. So the ability to put 110 units or so in this location, the height being against the hill as Mr. Onder said minimally impacts. You can see the two we've colored in reddish color there look immediately out towards our building but it's only the bottom two apartments or the bottom four apartment that's look at the approximate height of our roof, where you can see the apartments look above our building and all of the other buildings don't really have the cone of vision towards our building at all. They're looking out to the city. The panoramic view at the bottom shows the worst case if you were at those two reddish buildings looking straight at our building, you still have a wide panorama. Is it a good place to apply the bonus? We feel it is. Because it's against a hill and it's really just blocking trees and rock and it's a great place to increase the density of housing within the city at a really great location, and infill an existing surface parking lot. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Mike Kelly:** Mayor Katz and commissioners, Mike Kelly, Northwest District 6. I had a couple quick comments to make. One, my first point was kind of conceptual. I know it's out of the control of the city. For general reference, I know -- it is being addressed, the price point of auto registration in the state. I'm not sure about the exact numbers, but just alleviate some of the parking problems on the front end I think is what -- in addition to all the other tactics that are being currently considered. Is so-to-boost it up to about I'd say -- which might be inconsiderable to some, but I think it's hard to figure it would be a thousand dollars, 500 to \$1,000, if you own -- have a car registered, boost it up substantially. The second point, as regards to general district plan and parking garages and whatever should they be decided to go forth with that or [inaudible] but to perhaps work with the office of sustainable development and run the design through formally or

**May 21, 2003**

informally -- informally through the leed verification process guidelines, which i'm sure some of you are familiar with, which environmental green building codes suggested by the u.s. Green building council, for instance, if you combine a composite building design, plants on the top, and permeable pavements, and all the other different things they have, they take into consideration. Because Portland, the reason why **I** moved here three years ago, has to -- has to amongst other things, just as a conceptual personal note, has to continue to grow and be seen as a green city. It's really important. That's what a -- why a lot of people come here, and chicago and some of the -- san francisco, and boston, new york, a lot of other places in between, are -- or could catch up to us, and that would be -- a far as bringing businesses and being attracted to the northwest neighborhood itself, in particular, it would -- [inaudible] anyway, those are my general comments.

**Katz:** Thank you. Where did you come from?

**Kelly:** Ann arbor, michigan.

**Katz:** Just want to clarify the legislature now is considering an increase in the registration fees. So you might want to let them know.

**Kelly:** Thanks a lot.

**Meg Fernekees:** Hi. My name is meg fernekees, I reside at 2186 northwest kearney street and i'm representing myself tonight. I think that the northwest district plan is in general a very good plan. About 97% correct except for the parking section, which i'll get to later. And i'd like to operate a little bit at the 22,000-foot level and start with the vision. I notice the vision for the year 2023 for the district has a lot of great things in it, it includes notice -- the human scale environment, pedestrian bicycle transit improvements, vibrancy, but for the life of me **I** could not find any mention of the district becoming a regionally significant commercial shopping center in the year 2023. And so I hope that that stays out of the vision as well. The objectives, the land use objectives I think I can support include supporting small-scale developments that are pedestrian uses, limit large-scale auto dependent retail throughout the district, and concentrate a mix of higher intensity residential and commercial development along main streets and the Portland streetcar. I live within 200 feet of a Portland streetcar stop, I love it. I therefore support increasing floor area ratios from 2.1 to the 4.1, and I hope -- assuming the residential component is necessary requirement of that. The other things I like are the urban design concept, and the urban design review process, the formation of a transportation management association, and the t.o.d. Amendments increasing the tax abatement. And I hope that we can continue to be a liveable city to create that Portland personality in the northwest district plan.

**Tim Ramis:** Tim ramis, 1727 northwest hoyt. Here on this matter, the guild's lake amendments, on behalf of Naito Corporation. Sam naito has submit add letter on this subject which is in the packet that you're receiving. Sam apologizes for not being able to be here. He has twice testified before the planning commission and I think his thoughts are well expressed in this letter. This corporation has not advocated one particular planning solution for how to deal with northwest vaughn and its problems. Instead it has served in the role of a cheerleader urging people, the parties involved, to come together think creatively and come up with planning solutions to revitalize the street. And it is in that vein that the company urges your adoption of the proposal that's been submitted to you by the planning commission for subarea b. It is also in that spirit that they've asked me to bring your attention three points. Number 1, we believe the case has been well made the street does need revitalization and does need help. It's also documented in the photos that you can see where the street features design amenities like barb wire and corrugated buildings. It's also documented excerpts I provided you from the walking tours that the planning department conducted. These are the thoughts of people who live in the neighborhood about the need for

May 21, 2003

redevelopment of the street and the appropriateness of office and mixed use development as a buffer between the south side of the street and the industrial areas beyond. The second point is that subarea b can be used effectively to transition between industrial and other uses, and do so without harming the industrial area, and I think this may begin to address the question that the mayor asked earlier of warren, in the handout, the last -- next-to-the last page is a map. The nonindustrial land uses are within subarea b, and you can see them in orange. As you can see within that subarea, industrial use does not predominate. Other uses do. Unfortunately those are frequently nonconforming uses, and so they are not of high quality. Our hope is to see that area redeveloped and to encourage that so that really can work as a nice transition area. It simply is not working as industrial now. The final point is to urge that you take advantage of the assistance that the private sector owners have offered on this street. Critical transportation planning needed to be done, studies needed to be done and the private sector stepped forward and paid for those studies. I would encourage you to take advantage of that. The way to do that is to amend the task, the action plan list for transportation, item t-22. And i've submitted some suggestion language. Right now it says plan for and implement improvements to northwest 23rd and vaughn in a time period six years to 20. That intersection is going to fail soon. So the suggestion is you move up the time period and not commit purely government resources to that, but include language that requires public – excuse me--requires private investment in the process.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Doug Campbell:** Good evening, my name is doug campbell, and i'm with campbell planning and development at 4380 southwest macadam avenue in Portland. I'm here to speak on behalf of the dove lewis emergency animal hospital, which operates animal hospital at northwest -- in the northwest planning district at 20th and pettygrove. Dove lewis has been a valued member of the northwest community for more than four decades and hopes to continue operating in the northwest district. Dove lewis owns property across pettygrove from their site at 20th and pettygrove, which is a 30,000 square foot parking lot which is in the transition bonus area A. It is proposed for rezone to e.x. The bonus area will allow a base f.a.r. To 3-1, and a residential height bonus of 75 feet. Dove lewis hopes to develop a mixed use animal hospital on the site. As you can see in the overhead, which is upside down and sideways, there's a black area there which is hard to see that shows the dove lewis property within area a. If you put up the next slide, that shows the better location of the dove lewis property. No, the next one, sorry. We are here tonight to propose two amendments which we believe will better serve the dove lewis property and other properties in the transition area and will help to promote the goals of the northwest district plan and off-street parking. That is sideways as well. The first amendment proposes extending the underground parking bonus to other transition areas, bonus area a and b. The second amendment would eliminate the limited use areas restriction on a portion of the dove lewis property. Primarily i'm going to concentrate on underground parking bonus. We're proposing to extend the parking bonus from area c, which is currently offered in the district, to areas a and b, which would -- the bonus would reduce the amount of bonus to two additional square feet per one square foot of parking area, and would only be offered if residential housing is built. One of the issues with the current 3-1 f.a.r. And the seventy five-foot height bonus is that it is difficult to build a mixed use project with residential and to achieve the 75-foot height limit at a 3-1 f.a.r. What the underground parking bonus will do is offer an opportunity to balance the allowed height bonus of 75 feet with the increase f.a.r. While gaining the added benefits of the underground parking. These benefits include fostering more efficient use of a development site, and creating opportunities to develop feasible mixed use projects, residential employment and some commercial. The f.a.r. Bonus will

**May 21, 2003**

promote underground parking and create more aesthetically pleasing development projects with less street level parking garages. The bonus will allow residential projects in the transition area to reach a similar density as surrounding r.h. Zoned land at a 4-1.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Campbell:** So that concludes my presentation. Thank you.

**Robert Simon:** Robert simon, robert simon law firm, suite 295, 4380 southwest macadam. I'm a volunteer for dove lewis, and as a volunteer, i'm here to talk to you about dove lewis's plan for a new animal hospital. As many of you know and as doug has indicated, dove lewis has been in this community for 30 years, it's been in the same facility for 30 years, and it envisions and has planned for five years through the assistance of its leader Frank Piper who is up in the audience now, plans a new hospital. And it's on what's now a surface parking lot of 30,000 square feet. What we'd like to do in order to make this hospital fulfill its mission as a teaching hospital for veterinary residents and as a facility for indigent care and for its big and aggressive programs to assist individuals with disabilities who have assistance animals, not your traditional assistance animals we're talking, monkeys, exotics, we're the only facility that you can call up 365 days a year, 24 hours a day, and take an incredibly ill animal to and expect it to be cared for. We even have an ambulance. So in order to make this new facility home and keep it on pettygrove, we'd like to move it to 19<sup>th</sup> and Pettygrove. As the overhead shows, in addition to conditions mr. Campbell suggested which is some broader code changes, i'd suggest that you take area c and extend it. If you look at the code section, area c is supposed to be used to create a visual barrier between the i-405 and three-block radius. Well, our property fits within that radius. And it just so happens we're at -- if you draw a straight line from the 405, that's the highest part of the 405. So what we want to do is just make us area c. It's not like it's a leap of faith, it's approximate to our physical location and we're within all of the confines and parameters for area c. If you give us area c, and we get some underground parking bonuses, underground parking allows us to park our staff, it allows us to have the ambulance and get a second ambulance, which is our plan, it allows us also to build some affordable housing. We have a vision which includes housing for individuals with disabilities to use assistance animals. It's a vision that includes resident housing for our medical residents. And it a vision that keeps dove lewis and its 60 employees in northwest Portland. And it keeps an emergency medical facility for animals for the whole city in the city. I've provided some written materials that are consistent with my other day job as a lawyer, and they're meant to further articulate other concerns we have and provide some persuasive reasoning for adopting them. But really the simple answer is, if you help dove lewis by making it area c, dove lewis will be able to remain in the city.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Katz:** I'm going to ask that if we have people who are testifying on the same property, that you please limit your testimony to two minutes. Ok? Because I know that's the case right now.

**Edgar Waehrer:** Madam mayor, members of the council, i'm edgar waehrer, I live at 1824 northwest 28th avenue. I've been involved in northwest for many, many, many years. I was the first chair of the nwda planning committee back in 1970, I served a term as president of nwda, and I was very much involved in the 1977 plan, the neighborhood plan. The -- this plan I think is a worthy successor to that plan, to the 1977 plan. I think there's -- the neighborhood has greatly changed over that quarter century, and I think this plan wrestles in a generally good way with those -- with the new environment that presently exists in northwest Portland. I think that they -- I think what you've heard this evening in the way of proposed amendments are interesting, and some of them undoubtedly worthwhile considering, and certainly not prepared to speak to those at this time,

May 21, 2003

I would simply say I would generally support the plan as it's written with one major exception, and that is the proposal to allow the parking structures within the residential zone. I'm also signed up for speaking on that, and when you get to the parking issue, I can either go into that now or can wait until later.

**Susan Sturgis:** My name is susan sturgess, i'm an architect and I reside in northwest Portland and I also own business property in northwest Portland. My address is 1824 northwest 28th avenue. I'm here tonight to indicate my support for the plan, and I hope that the council passes the plan. I share the concerns that were expressed at the beginning of the meeting by the northwest district association about traffic on vaughn, and I have concerns about structured parking in the residentially zoned areas, so I guess I have the same question as edgar, are we speaking about parking now or later, and actually my -- might let us know if it's later tonight, or later on another day? So I won't speak about parking right now. So generally speaking I strongly support the plan and hope you pass it. Thanks.

**Katz:** I'm going to check in with karla to see what the time looks like for this part of the testimony. Go ahead, rick.

**Rick Michaelson:** Good evening, madam mayor, council members. My name is rick michaelson. I'm speaking to you tonight as the treasurer of the northwest neighborhood cultural center. We are a nonprofit organization that is chartered to maintain our historic landmark building at 1819 northwest everett and to provide low-cost space for nonprofit organizations and community groups. In effect we're northwest Portland's community center, the only community center that i'm aware of that gets no government funds and is funded entirely from our rent. We are here tonight to seek a zone change from r.h. To e.x. To give us more flexibility in terms of renters -- this proposal is supported by our membership and unanimously supported by the nwda planning committee at its may meeting. Although this is a small request, it's vital to our future. Our financing is dependent entirely from rental income we get in the building. Defining that we cannot get enough variety of tenants operating under conditional use procedure and we need to move -- have a broader variety of tenants. We can't increase our income without changing our tenant mix. We can't change our tenant mix without a zone change from r.h. To ex. We looked at catering kitchen in the existing building that allows commercial uses and found out it was not allowed. We've been asked by staff and others why other institutions can survive in the neighborhood under conditional use status. The difference is that we're very different sort of institution. We don't have a bigger picture. We only manage the building. We don't have memberships of fees, we don't provide direct services, we're not eligible for governmental fees, our only income source is our rental income. Unless we can get the kind of tenant that can support our operation and make this -- we're in financial trouble.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Thanks. Ok. Let's shift over to parking. We're going to start with three minutes each, and if the testimony repeats itself, we're going to shift it to two. Trust me, you can tell us as much as you want in two minutes as you can in three. All right.

**William Joyce:** My name is william joyce, i'm a resident of northwest Portland. I am also a board member of the nwda. And a member of the parking c.a.c. And the northwest district plan committee. The last time this board heard the issues gestating to tonight's hearing, the board distainfully directed some of the residents -- the residences and the businesses alike to go back, close their long-standing chasms and negotiate a workable plan. Excepting that gauntlet, I have spent the last two years working on this particular problem in the neighborhood. For all that, I only ask that this body have considerable weight to my judgments about where this is going. First,

May 21, 2003

parking is a problem in northwest Portland. It is a fact. Some people will tell you it is not. If they do, they're not living in my part of the neighborhood. Second, the residents and the businesses alike are not going to walk in here in a lock step and deliver consensual plan to this board. There are – we're close, but there are significant divides that remain, and there's still going to be have letting before we're able to get this problem resolved. I beseech you, you must exercise your leadership on this issue, specifically, dare I say your power, and intercede, cram, and close this deal at some point in time. No one is going to be completely happy with whatever this results in. Third, various on-street parking components, and the on-street parking components, by the way, were the original charge of the c.a.c., have been held hostage to leverage a better stake for parking structures in the northwest neighborhood. That is a fact. I can tell from you my participation that that is a fact of what has happened in this over the last two years. However, through the credit of the businesses and the residents alike, they have gone back and they have worked on these hard issues, and whether you agree with the public nature of the process or not, they went back, they've worked this out, they've worked on some of the hard issues, and they've come up with some resolutions. Fourth, the stakeholders, and by that I mean the residents, especially, are going to have to accept in my opinion, as someone who's participated in this process, some off-street parking in the core zone in the northwest neighborhood. I don't see any way around that. Fifth, this body, in my opinion, should take --

**Katz:** I'm going to give you a little more time, since you work order this for two years.

**Joyce:** I'll be brief. I can speed it up. This body should take a lesser cut in my opinion whenever the final plans propose. Than 50% of the revenues after this plan pays for itself. And I think that would be -- that would go a long way to selling this plan to the residents in the neighborhood.

Again, it's just my opinion. Six, there are significant issues relative to the constitution of the tpma. My colleague mr. Smith didn't address them, there are various permutations he proposed that I agree with, but I highlight the issue to you, and my highlighting is that there is going to have to be equal representation on that board with some type of a majority vote so that both sides have to find consensus for a single issue to make it through. In other words, if I give you a brief permutation, by my analysis, you have five residences, five businesses, and let's say three other members. And you impose a condition that there has to be at least a 66% majority vote in order for any initiative to pass. The five residents can't pass it, the five businesses can't pass it and they can't pass it even if the other three come into their fold. At least one business or one resident member on that board has to vote for the resolution for it to pass. It is absolutely essential to the forgoing working of the tpma. Lastly, actually I can skip my last point. Thank you very much.

**Katz:** Thank you. [laughter]

**Richard Anderson, CNF:** Richard anderson. I'm with cnf at 1717 NW 21<sup>st</sup>. I was a member of the c.a.c. I was invited to join this six-month project, and after 21/2 years i'm compelled to come down and give my own feelings on this. I'll try to make it very brief. I visit the neighborhood daily for quality employment. I sneak in the back door, work hard and sneak out the back door. But go spend money in the neighborhood. Most every day I walked neighborhood 21st burnside, 23rd, and it's my gut feeling that the neighborhood is on a decline. I just don't feel that the quality of the businesses are what it used to be, i'm concerned for the small business, without quality small business, I think that eclectic mix of your neighborhood will decline further. I'd hate to see it turn into all t-shirts shops and pizza shops, and the c.a.c. overwhelmingly and quickly, after 21/2 years, agreed to have this plan move forward as long as there was some off-street parking addressed. So that's your challenge. We gave it a hard 2 1/2 years. I've never been associated with such a bright group of people who stuck with it for 2 1/2 years, and so i'm in favor of the plan.



May 21, 2003

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Water Mc Monies:** Hi, i'm walt mcmonies, my address is 101 southwest main street, 15th floor, Portland, Oregon, 97204. I am an attorney but i'm not here representing anybody. I own through my family four apartment buildings in the neighborhood, 150 units, two of them are on the national register of historic places, those two have no parking with them. Other than we did buy the fred meyer photo lab about seven or eight years ago -- five years ago, and we did convert that back to its original garage use. It was an old garage from the turn of the century, and we -- it was probably a horse stable and then turned into a garage. We did convert that back to 31 parking spaces. That's a rare occurrence in northwest Portland, that you can take a building and convert it back to parking. We have 150 units, we have 33 parking spaces for those 150 units. I think that's quite typical for the older apartment buildings in the neighborhood. The pre-1950's apartment buildings. I think parking is one of the most important issues to my tenants. Some of my property managers may disagree with me, but I know that it's pretty hard to rent a unit if there isn't parking. On-street parking is very tight. There isn't very much off-street parking. Just looking at the appendix to the very good plan put together here, I noticed the staff has determined from several studies that there's about 6,000 off-street parking place and 7300 vehicles in northwest Portland. That's not counting employee parking, that's not counting people who commute and drop their cars off in northwest Portland, that's not counting people who come to shop there and so on. So already we have a lot of parking that has to be accommodated on the street and we all know, those of us who frequent that neighborhood know it's almost impossible to find an on-street parking place. For that reason I want to strongly support the concept of limited parking structures being erected in the district, and I think the proposal that's been put together by staff and the neighborhood advocates is a good one. I think it's workable. I think there may be a few too many hurdles to make it an easy process for a developer, but I think it's very important, I want to say also that I very much support the mix in the neighborhood, the commercial vitality of the neighborhood. I think we wouldn't have tenants wanting to move into the neighborhood if you didn't have the vitality of northwest 21st and northwest 23rd that we do have. And just generally i'm supportive of the parking portion of the plan and the plan generally. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Dan Booker:** Good evening. Dan booker. I come to you this evening to question why we haven't heard anything about mass transit. Parking is an issue that I believe is important, but it's the mass transit portion. The streetcar. We've invested so much money into the streetcar, but there hasn't been any effort to market the streetcar, there hasn't been any effort to push the convenience of going from max from a bus, to the streetcar to northwest. To bring 800 more cars into the neighborhood when you could easily put those same folks on the streetcar, and they could go shopping, they could go dining, they could have an adult beverage or two and not have to worry about driving home. 93% of the folks that come to northwest according to the plan were from outside the neighborhood. The business association states that they cannot get the customers who live outside the neighborhood to come visit them. If they would market to the folks who are in the neighborhood, they wouldn't need all those folks from outside the neighborhood. As far as the parking meters go, I would think that the time limits are much too long. I think it would be more viable to have better flow of on-street parking in 30, city -- 60, and 90-minute segments, and to take that money that is generated from those parking meters and use that to market street car. Do a two-year test. Wait two years before you decide to build a structure. My time is almost up, I think. My grandmother used to tell me when I was a kid, it was a good idea today, it would be a good

**May 21, 2003**

idea tomorrow. Wait a couple years. And test. And see. Maybe you may not need a structure, who knows? Thanks so much for your time.

**Leonard:** Remember you said everybody you know here has been here 25 years. He's been here that long, I played basketball with him.

**Katz:** Your head is smaller than his. This is a continuation from a morning comment. Go ahead, sir.

**Jeff Reingold:** Mayor and commissioners, my name is jeff reingold, I work at 721 southwest oak.

I am here tonight in my capacity as a member of the c.a.c. As well as a property manager and apartment owner in the neighborhood since 1984. I also represent a large number of our residents, and i'm sure you've heard before that over 80% of the people living in the neighborhood are apartment dwellers. They are very much in need of the additional parking this plan contemplates.

I became involved when I was contacted by commissioner Hales on november of 2000 to serve on the c.a.c. also for a six-month term. From that time forward, which has been a period of over 21/2 years, the c.a.c. And its wide range of stakeholders worked diligently with exceptionally dedicated and professional city staff members to craft the proposal now under consideration. The c.a.c. Is comprised of members who are serious about solving this issue, and pragmatic as to the means by which this can be accomplished. The plan before you now succeeds on a number of levels. First of all, the plan addresses the clear need for more parking but is convenient to users' destinations.

Neighborhood businesses face severe competition from the pearl district, where abundant parking is now being made available, as well as other vehicle friendly parts of the city. To suggest our local retailers can do without the valuable customer base that arrives by car is both unrealistic and unfair. The very businesses that offer the eclectic and vital mix found so attractive by our apartment residents will be put at serious disadvantage if the acute and demonstrated need for parking is not reasonably and timely addressed. Number 2, this plan's interconnection of on-street metered parking and wisely located off-street parking and the t.m.a. Represent as fair balancing of all stakeholders' needs. Businesses have agreed to the substantial change of offering their customers a pay for parking environment as long as additional off-street parking is made available for their customers' use. It is not reasonable to simply install the on-street measures without accompanying them with the critical and agreed upon off-street parking spaces. The t.m.a.

Component serves the-to-balance the needs of all stakeholders and will provide the resource and guidance necessary to address other modes of transportation serving the area towards the goal of a better environment for all stakeholders. Third, this plan is timely necessary and represents the best compromise of all available choices. Locations that are available now may not be economically feasible to use in the future. The costs to provide this parking are going to increase perhaps to the point of which the opportunity at some or all of the proposed locations may be permanently lost. Alternatives such as remote parking with shuttles are simply not acceptable to customers and clients. Waiting in the rain for a shuttle bus to go shopping is hardly the customer friendly approach needed by local businesses to survive. The same is true of locating the necessary parking only in the peripheral areas of district as opposed to the more centralized area where the need is most significant. Customers and visitors are simply not willing to walk great distances, particularly in inclement weather to visit restaurants, retailers or their friends.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Nick Snell:** Nick snell, 823 northwest albenarle terrace. I've been a resident of northwest Portland for 30-plus years, and during those 30-plus years i've taken advantage of all the shopping that's available, the services, the restaurants in the area, and it has been an evolution that has been -- seen those services and shopping, restaurants improve, but the parking has become truly difficult. It

May 21, 2003

been getting more and more difficult as the years go by. You have to drive around blocks time and time again, so I support off-street parking as being a crucial part of the district plan.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Peter Kost:** My name is Peter Kost, live at 327 Northwest Park and own Lucy's Table at 704 Northwest 21st. We've been in business for about five years and this has been an ongoing issue. What I am here for is to show support for the plan, but to also show I think that a lot of the long-time residents realize we are considered short-term in terms of how long we've been there. They -- I want to show the face of the business is also a little different than what I think a lot of people make it out to be. In other words, it's not a pottery barn, it's not the restoration hardware, that are a viable part of the neighborhood and what makes it a livable area. It's the small businesses, single businesses that need this parking, need a legitimate plan to provide a level of competition that we're facing outside of our neighborhood. That the businesses that are in the area have done many things to try to ease the parking upon the residents over the years, our business along with three other restaurants combine to spend over \$3,000 a month in providing parking for our guests through a valet and paying for off-street parking in the evenings when the businesses that are open during the day close. And I think that is something that is discounted a lot, that it's kind of a business versus residents type of battle, and that a lot of the businesses understand that, and take that into account and have worked with that over the years. We live in the neighborhood and work in the neighborhood because of the diversity that is there. Providing the parking plan and the future plan for the neighborhood is what will keep it viable. I think one of the comments that was made by a gentleman a while ago, that he's worked in the area for many years and walks the streets and has seen a decline in the neighborhood is something that many of the businesses and residents really can't deny. I think I see a resurgence that's been taking place in the last year and a half, and this is what will help keep that going.

**Gabriel Dominec:** Gabriel Dominec, I'm a tenant at 3249 Northwest Glisan in a house. Fortunately we have off-street parking, so I don't have to circle myself looking for parking. But I can tell you during peak hours it's very difficult to get out of my driveway, and I can also tell you summer fun at our house is sitting on the porch watching people circling. Prior to that I lived one block south of Burnside and Goose Hollow and regularly had to park three blocks from my apartment. As a building designer myself, I can see no reason why the parking structures that are proposed would change -- drastically or in any way change the fabric of the neighborhood. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Robert Diedrich:** My name is Robert Diedrich, I live at 117 Northwest Trinity Place in Northwest Portland. I also served the laborious 2 1/2 years on the Citizens Advisory Committee for NW on-street parking. The three things I want to mention tonight with, when we began the process, the first thing we did was implement the permit parking program for -- to combat parking from tenants, or goes to p.g.e. Park. That seemed to be successful and it's now in its third season. The second phase was to have been permit parking on the -- to begin the next year. That seems to have been shelved. One of the main problems that we have in Northwest Portland is commuter parking. Commuters love to come to Northwest and park and take the bus downtown or the streetcar downtown, and save their daily parking fares. That is not been addressed, nor does this plan address that until such time as permit parking is implemented. I think the argument that permit parking should wait until the parking structures are in place, off-street parking in place is specious at best -- the idea that permit parking would harm businesses I don't think it equates. What it would do is help us eliminate the commuters and those people who take advantage of free parking in Northwest Portland. I think the second phase should be that the pay stations that are proposed

May 21, 2003

should be placed only on 21st and 23rd in the half blocks adjoining them, rather than blanketing the entire northwest area with pay stations in residential areas. But whatever income is generated from permit parking and pay stations should be shared equally between expanding parking in the area and creating a fareless square with the streetcar and the max line to p.g.e. Park. Thank you very much.

**Robin Johnson:** My name is robin johnson, I have -- reside at 9814 northwest justice lane in Portland, Oregon. Hopefully soon to be moving into the pearl district. I used to be an avid patron of northwest 23rd and I emphasize used to. My frustration level with the parking with the lack thereafter has reached a peak level. As a result of being forced to circle blocks and being unable to find parking places, i've had to look for alternatives. And I found them. I buy my orange juice at pearl market or at whole foods, not at city market anymore. I can pick up a pizza at hot lips instead of pizzicata and I can go to sur la table instead of kitchen kaboodle. The one thing I can find in the pearl that I can't find in NW is a parking place. Northwest is a vibrant area and you've heard about the dining, you've heard about the shopping, there's business owners. What concerns me is an insidious side effect. The revenue that I once put into northwest i've now taken out of northwest and have taken somewhere else. On-street parking isn't sufficient. I urge you, please adopt the measures that are in front of you and take into account the small business owners need that revenue back. Thank you.

**Jack Bookwalter:** My name is jack bookwalter. I'm an apartment building owner on glisan. I'd like to voice my opposition. The cause for constructing parking structures in the middle of blocks where land use is currently over one-half residential. As is being proposed on my block at the trader joe's lot. I feel this is a drastic and unwarranted intensification of incompatible land use of a block that's still over 60% residential. The trader joe's lot is surrounded by residential on three sides and no amount of landscape and design mitigations nibbling away at the edges is going to change this incompatibility. And even the single deck garage doubles the impact of large parking lot. I know that the advisory motion recently adopted by the neighborhood association calls for a go-slow parking structure policy in residential zones, but this in no way addresses those lots that may be commercially zoned, but are located in residential areas nonetheless. Finally, some refer to the proposed parking plan as a reasonable compromise. It's only a compromise if you're not the one -- if you're not the one that's affected. But if you're the one who ends up living next to one of these structures, it doesn't seem like much of a compromise at all.

**Lee Stapleton:** We've heard some comments earlier this evening about people essentially circling blocks to find a parking place. They're circling blocks to find a free parking place. They're not circling because they want to pay for parking or use what might become under this plan available commercial lots that are shared, in other words, for example, across from sammy's restaurant at 23rd, there's a commercial lot. This available -- frequently it's empty, daytime and nighttime because somebody does not want to pay for the parking. If we're going to get parking structures in the area, people are still not going to want to pay for the parking. They're not going to want to pay for the on-street parking, so we have to think very carefully about the shift in traffic out of the neighborhood. And maybe we can get the turnover and people will pay for an hour or two of parking. But we're going to have unfilled lots available for the public, and I think we have to think about that very seriously about where the people are going, and I think our previous speaker spoke to that, she went to the pearl district. But the pearl district doesn't have free parking. You're paying for the parking in most locations. Either through a subsidy from the merchant or out of your own pocket. Thank you.

**May 21, 2003**

**Mike Lindberg:** My name is mike lindberg, 4023 zest ash in Portland. I'm here representing the nob hill business association and singer properties. I'm also here because I followed this issue for about two decades, care deeply about the neighborhood, lived for about seven years in the neighborhood, and am hopeful we can find a win-win solution and end the divisions. I'm here to appear to ask the city council to approve what is coming to you from the planning commission with minor amendments to ensure that it's workable and practical. I support the plan for the following six reasons -- one, it's a holistic package. It's a plan which as the staff has presented to you is all encompassing and it includes a modest increase of off-street parking that of only 500 in net increase in spaces. It also sets up a t.m.a. Which will generate revenues which I believe will be of great benefit to the neighborhood in many aspects. Second, I believe the economic vitality, the quality of life and livability of the neighborhood in northwest is dependent upon implementing a plan which supports residents and businesses. In its essence, and at its roots, northwest's uniqueness and attractiveness is based on the fact that it is a mixed use neighborhood. The third reason I support this plan is that I found the business interests have been flexible, creative and responsive, rather than come up with big megastructures, they have come up with the centralized lots tucked behind existing businesses which will go through an exhaustive design review and historic review. The fourth reason I support this is the process. Although for the last 20 years i'd say sometime it's warm and sometimes it's hot, in the last few years there's been a concentrated effort to resolve this. The over 20-member c.a.c. Worked for over two years and came to a consensus and that makes up the basic aspects of what was in the planning commission report. My fifth reason for supporting this is the incredible staff effort by planning and pdot. People like joe, debbie, rob, have done everything except acts from cirque du soleil to find solutions that all could come to agree with, to look for the win-win. To me, when you have a once in a decade opportunity, maybe once in a 20-year opportunity to resolve an ongoing problem, we ought to take advantage of that effort not only by the staff people, but by residents and businesses alike. My sixth reason and last is that my own personal experiences when people ask me what I work on, in addition to 11 nonprofit boards, I probably have a 100 people that I talk to that I said I work order northwest parking issues. About 90 of them then have said, they avoid going to restaurants and movies and shops in this area because of parking difficulties. I wish everyone would take transit, but I don't think it's a reality. In closing, would I say that I believe that the future of northwest should have cinema 21's, music milleniums, papa haydens, should be able to go for ice cream, earrings, a doctor, get a meal, in closing, I would say that the status quo I believe will lead to a gradual deterioration of vitality of the neighborhood, making it more and more difficult to live there and to do business there. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Thane Tiensen:** Well said. I'm thane tiensen. I live on northwest irving. I'll take some credit for asking mike. I'm here on behalf of myself. I live in my neighborhood and most of my neighbors are opposed to any off-street parking. I'm not for the simple reason I know having lived in the neighborhood for 15 years, actually having lived there back in the 1970's as well, that the neighborhood has a tremendous parking problem and in fact, much to the dismay of my neighbors, I was forced to put in a driveway a few years ago simply because I got tired of having too many tickets and driving around endlessly looking for a parking spot at night. There's no question there's a problem. I have some anxieties about the installation of meters, the installation of parking garages, but I am comfortable with the notion of the restrictions, the conditions that have been placed upon the parking garages and their locations. There's no question in my mind but that they are needed, and I believe the revenue generated through the meters is going to be a real boon to the

**May 21, 2003**

neighborhood and ensure its continuing vitality. We need a healthy business district. I have particular fondness for the theater. It's a marginal business. A lot of those businesses are marginal.

They come and go. It's a tough economy out there. And these are small businesses. These are not chains. We need to encourage those kinds of small businesses the way to do that is to encourage people to have a fortunately a pedestrian friendly and a vehicle friendly neighborhood. I think the staff work that's gone into this, the energy, the commitment, the hard work, the compromise, all tell me this is a plan that deserves your support and I urge you to do so. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you, thane.

**Jonnie Shobaki:** My name is jonnie shobaki and I live at 2324 northwest hoyt. I'm a homeowner, I don't have tenants. I am not a tenant and it's not my office. It's truly an oxymoron to hear words thoughtful and tasteful used to describe the proposed parking structures to be erected in the midst of nw historic neighborhoods. One such proposed structure is on the property of richard singer, directly to the east and south of my property at 2324 northwest hoyt. My delightful 1895 vintage home and those of my neighbors are slated to be dwarfed by a 45-foot thoughtfully and tastefully designed parking garage. Imagine my shock and the anger at such news and imagine also the impact it will have on me, my neighbors, and the neighborhood in general. The amount of light that will reach my windows from the east and my back yard and inground pool will be minimal. The fumes from cars will render our back yards not fit for relaxation and barbecues, and the access to hoyt street and glisan will be compromised even more by increased traffic trying to enter and exit such a structure not to mention the adjacent to our property, the property behind starbucks, and those shops between hoyt and irving, are also slated for another parking structure. So the traffic congestion generated in an already congested area with the advent of the thoughtfully and tastefully designed structures will only increase. I suspect we will also have property, loss of value, with this propose -- this with proposal should go through. I don't choose to move, about you the conditions would be such that if I wanted to, I would surely lose a substantial amount of money on my property. I would like to propose that these structures be erected as good neighbor structures next to homes of land and/or business owners of northwest 23rd and see if they would favor such a plan.

I listen on may 19 to a man who also presented this evening, and he was selling the package deal saying that actually what would happen is we would have the on-street parking that would go in first, and he assured us that many of the garages would not likely come to fruition because of the expense involved. And I understand the frustration of the people that have worked so hard on this plan. But I would be hard pressed to support such an aggressive plan with a promise that much of it may never actually happen. It would be fool hardy and naive to accept such a plan. In an attempt to allay any of any of our concerns, we've already heard from mr. Ramis who stated that the structures would not impact homes of historic value. As if that were the only consideration. Maybe my home is not of historic value, but it would definitely impact it. I love my neighborhood, I don't want to see it defaced, and ultimately devalued. Parking structures are not a homeowners solution to a perceived parking problem in the area. There are business driven solution and one that could be driven more by breathe and need.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Jeff Love:** My name is jeff love. I live at 2344 northwest johnson street. I am a member of the northwest district association and i've lived there for a little over 10 years. I've submitted some written materials along with a survey that I took a couple of streets in the neighborhood. Testing two questions -- you've heard this described as a compromise between the residents and the businesses where the businesses get their structures, that they want, and then the residents get the parking meters that they want. Well, I find both the structures and the meters awful, and I was

May 21, 2003

curious to find out do residents really want these parking meters? I didn't believe it, so what I did, I took a door-to-door survey on Johnson Street from Northwest 25th to Northwest 20th, on Irving -- including some of your neighbors, on Irving Street from 24th to 21st, went to all of the houses and every one that answered I asked them a couple questions. Are you in favor of the plan as proposed, which I summarized, and I provided them with written materials from the plan, which I've submitted, which includes the parking meters and the parking structures, and I explained they would get the permits to park free. And 90% of the respondents were against the whole package. 90%. That's 43 out of 45. But I also asked them a second question, because I wanted to test the premise. I said throw out the structures. Everybody talks bad about the structures. Assume there aren't any structures. Assume all you have are these parking meters and a permit system so you get preferred parking. You're a resident, you lived here, do you want that? 80% said no. They don't want it. And I'm in that 80%. I just don't buy the premise. And so the question is, what surveys, what studies show that neighbors want parking meters in a residential neighborhood? The city has done a survey I'm told. Well, I went and found -- and the implication was the city -- that survey supports the plan. I went and found a survey, I presented portions of survey in the materials, and in fact that study found that not only are residents opposed to parking meters, but visitors are opposed to parking meters, and employees were opposed to meters. All three groups I surveyed were opposed. And in fact 50% of each of those three groups was strongly opposed to meters. So if the premise is the residents are getting the meters so they're going to have to eat the structure, that's the cut, it's -- I don't buy the premise and I'm not aware of any support for it. If we're going to go forward, I think we need to go forward in the much more -- in a slower fashion. Let's start out with some of the alternatives that aren't so controversial, because this is extremely controversial. The alternatives that people have talked about in particular, don't put structures or meters within the historic Alphabet District. It's historic for a reason. It needs to be preserved. Thank you.

**Debbie Thomas:** Hi. I'm Debbie Thomas, I live at 420 Northwest 11th Avenue number 604. I'm here tonight in support of the plan as it is stated. I think the committees and all the people involved did an incredible job with an incredibly difficult situation, and the main reason I think I'm in such support of it is the land use, but also the parking plan. It implements three distinctly different and very complex ideas, and we definitely need the off-street parking to assist with the permit and the meters systems. I'm a long-term resident, I've lived in Northwest Portland for 19 years. Part of the time right on 23rd without any parking. I can personally attest to how many times I had to drive around looking for parking, and although I loved the neighborhood and I wouldn't live anywhere else, that was a major factor to moving on to another place that did have parking. I now live in the Pearl District. I work in the Pearl District. I'm a huge supporter of mass transit with a wonderful public system that we have in place. The streetcar is an excellent tool for people getting around. It is never going to -- not for my lifetime, going to replace automobiles being a part of what people need to get around from different areas. Not every one lives on mass transit or the streetcar. I think part of being in an urban area is understanding that there are meters or permit systems and trying to accommodate for off-street parking in other ways. The Pearl District has looked at what's happened in Northwest and said, we need to accommodate it. We've put parking in residential buildings. Also in the course of my business I've done parking surveys in the Pearl District as a service for my clients. There are almost 2500 off-street public parking spaces. Whereas upper Northwest has less than 100. It's unbelievable to me. We have plenty of people that I could list -- I won't obviously need to -- that have moved from upper NW to the Pearl District, citing parking as one of the major influencing factors. I think that people in an urban neighborhood need to expect that there will be some price to pay for parking. I do not want to see NW Portland wonderful

**May 21, 2003**

neighborhood have their ability compromised to keep on thriving and flourishing when we have a plan that has been presented to you that is very workable. Thank you.

**Katz:** Let me have a show of hands. Who is going to testify? Alright, we are going to go to two minutes.

**Jimbo Beckmann:** I'm jimbo Beckmann and I've lived in northwest about 26 years, there's been lots of changes, but parking has always been bad. People always complain. I'm a doorman at cinema 21 for about 20-odd years and people always say there's no parking in the northwest. But now there's a plan for parking in northwest. It took a lot of time, a lot of people, a lot of ideas, a lot of dreams. You've had good ideas, and this plan now before you has -- makes new parking in northwest that's needed, and I just think we should give the plan a chance.

**Tom Ranieri:** My name is tom raniere, I operate the cinema 21 which is locate the at 616 northwest 21st avenue. I've been there for 23 years, and over the years i've met literally hundreds of people who have made it a point to tell me how much they appreciate the cinema 21, what an asset it is to the neighborhood and to the community beyond. Hearing those comments are the single most gratifying part of my job. The least gratifying aspect is dealing with parking-related issues and problems. But it is vital that I do that. Next to booking movies, ensuring unfettered access to Cinema 21 is crucial to the health of the theater, especially in these times when my main competition for film happens to be the largest movie exhibitor in north america. But as just about everyone in this room knows, access is fettered – parking is a challenge and hunting season never closes in northwest. My patrons who do come from outside the northwest ask comprise about 70% of my customer base, don't like it. My neighbors who live around the theater don't like it. The complaining has been going on for a long time. 21/2 years ago, when the council mandated pdot to convenient a citizens advisory committee to meet the challenge engendered by the renovation of p.g.e. Park and later by the streetcar, it seemed like the chances for success were slim. Yet another challenge in a challenged land, but under the amazing guidance of pdot, the c.a.c. Took great pains to fashion a parking plan that would try to work for everyone. Try to work for everyone. It was an open, deliberative, careful, thorough, slow-cooked process sorting out a complicated issue. The product of the c.a.c. consensus is before you. Pay to park, exemptions or permit overlay, t.m.a. Off-streets apply. The cac membership knows why all these elements are essential. Now the notion that three of these elements should go forward and the off-street element should be split off for future consideration is an idea that the c.a.c. Did not endorse. In fact it was clear all these elements were linked. Set aside the lack of guarantees and revenues inherent in this, delaying the off-street component would be a disaster for me and other small businesses. It would simply make a bad situation worse by charging for resources universally acknowledged to be scarce on good days. It would in effect ask how bad do you want to come to northwest. A loyalty test. If the idea is to test the limits of what a person will do to be able to come to northwest, this is a good idea. The idea is to add yet another straw to that particular camel's back, this is a good idea. But the small businesses cannot afford this experiment whose outcome we can already predict. Increasing off-street supply on a handful of existing lots will benefit businesses and residents alike. Thank you.

**Vera Moeller:** My name is vera moeller, from the northwest area off 20th and kearney. Parking has been an ongoing problem there. Not only for myself shall but for my family. My friends and neighbors. There are not enough parking spaces for those of us who reside there. Any friends, family or guests that visit the area have always had a hard time finding space to park. I have family members who are elderly, and who are not able to visit due to inconvenience of having to park several blocks from their intended destination. The spaces that are close to my residents are



**May 21, 2003**

usually taken by patrons of the shops in the area. Additional parking spaces would go a long way to alleviating this problem. As far as patronizing our unique shops, or any of the desirable restaurants in the area, we have had to drop family members off at the restaurant, drive a long distance way to find parking, and walk back. As a result, we sometimes have to choose to frequent shops and restaurants out of the area. I would like to see the city implement parking meters and provide more off-street parking spaces with permits for those who work in the area and also residents. This would not only generate much-needed revenue for the city, but would also improve our parking situation. Presently we have a number of vehicles parked in the area that are left there all day by people who catch the trolley car, streetcar to their place of employment, which is out of the area. Parking meters would eliminate this practice. There is also a concern with regard to inoperative vehicles parked on the street for days at a time, instituting parking meters would alleviate -- with also alleviate this problem. Providing more off-street parking would help ease the shortage of spaces for my family and my friends. Thank you.

**LeRoy Ellis:** Mayor Katz, commissioners, my name is leroy ellis and I live in northwest Portland, 8824 northwest 20th. Since i've moved to the area, i've noticed the growing need for additional parking. On a daily basis I see cars circling the blocks searching for a parking space. We need additional parking. I realize that patrons of businesses in the northwest require places to park while shopping, but at the same time, this takes away what limited space we have for residents of the area. Parking structures to accommodate these patrons would be beneficial. Parking meters would be an answer too. We have a number of citizens parking in our neighborhoods and then hop on the tram to their workplace out of the area. Thus parking in northwest all day. Meters would not only deter this practice, but also generate revenue for our cities. Thank you.

**Richard Caplan:** I'm richard caplan, I work at 636 northwest 21st avenue. In the building right next door to tom and cinema 21. I'm a branch manager for a Windemere Cronin and Caplan realty group, and we've been in several locations in northwest Portland since 1997. We have two offices in northwest, approximately 64 people on northwest 20th and johnson, 45 people on northwest 21st and irving. This plan, the parking plan, is not easy for us to accept. But we can see how the five-point strategy works for the greater good. Having to pay for permits and looking at the plans, some of our agents may not get permits. It is not necessarily the best situation for our company. We have to compete with -- in a very aggressive market and our competitors don't have a paid parking environment for their agents. The addition of off-street parking proposed doesn't offer us -- our agents much assistance. Our sales teams come and go several times a day, and our clients are not likely to park at m.l.c. Or trader joe's for a short period of time, nor is valet an option for us. However, as someone who has been part of several tries at forming solutions, I see the five-point strategy as the best way forward. And hopefully this plan will open up some short-term spaces for our clients and others that come to visit us. So that's why i'm here to support the five-point plan.

**Katz:** I don't want to hear from you again.

**Jay Margulies:** My name is jay margulies, I live at 2421 northwest petty drove street in Portland. About 20 years ago I worked at the bureau of traffic management, a good part of the time working on permit parking programs. I was also on the nwda transportation committee for more than 10 years, serving about half the time as chair and cochair. Unfortunately I think the proposed parking plan is a bad one that should not be approved. It a document that has no core of shared vision of what constitutes neighborhood livability. There are also practical issues that could warrant address and assumptions about rights that I find disturbing. During all my years on the transportation committee we worked hard with the business community to identify parking issues and propose solutions. We encouraged hirings from within the neighborhood and tri-met passes for employees.

May 21, 2003

Shared parking and parking structures were concepts I came to see as having potentially beneficial effects. From a transportation perspective, the parking structures make sense. I thought then, and I probably still think that a couple of larger structures in the neighborhood would work better than the proposed ones, but many of the nwda concerns about location and scale are appropriate and the current proposal seems reasonable. However, I think the permit parking plan is so bad, so flawed, it will negatively affect most of the people who have legitimate reasons to be in the neighborhood. Many of them residents. When an elderly friend who lives in the heart of the impossible-to-park area asked me about permit system, I said it would benefit him but seriously inconvenience his friends. My friend is in his early 80's and he relies on regular visits from friends for varying lengths of time. When his friends find they must park and walk to his home, retrieve some sort of permit, and walk back to their vehicles, and back to his home, they will stop coming. Ultimately, it will not benefit him.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Bill McNally:** Mayor Katz, council members, my name is bill mcnally, I represent music millenium at 801 northwest 23rd. We have been in the neighborhood now for 25 years. Music millenium has been a fixture in Portland for 34 years. We feel strongly about coming up with some sort of solution for the parking issue in the northwest neighborhood. It has been an issue. We believe in the metered parking and small inconspicuous parking structures as an option. Certainly our business is not strong right now, our industry is going through a lot of changes, and anything that would be detrimental to keeping our business alive on 23rd certainly parking would be one of those issues. So we feel strongly about coming up with some sort of solution, and we feel the metered parking in the smaller parking structures would be good.

**Faviana Priola:** Mayor Katz, and commissioners, my name is faviana priola, I live in northwest Portland, 2971 northwest santa anita terrace. I also own a business in northwest Portland. I brought notes with me tonight, but because i've sat and listened to all of this testimony, I think i'm going to put my notes aside for a minute and say that I hold a very unique position among all the business owners that are here to speak tonight. For 21 years I owned a business downtown Portland called sun bow gallery. Some of you might remember it. When I closed sun bow in 1995 after 21 years of really contributing to some of the vitality of the city, and some of the interest to create more retail happening in the city, I had to close sun bow and I was very disappointed. And I called the mayor and I asked her to have coffee with me so I could tell her how disappointed I was. And the reasons for which I had to give up something that I really loved. And had developed and spent a lot of time and energy -- i'm sorry. I'm getting emotional. The three reasons I had to close that business were no parking, very little parking, the off-street parking was taken away. And the on-street parking was reduced by the fifth avenue bus mall, the yamhill marketplace, light rail, and pioneer place. Every single time those wonderful things happened to the city, my customers went away. At the same time that I went out of business, every other small business that opened in the same year that I opened, closed at the exact same time. None of us could handle the lack of convenience of bringing our customers down to our stores and allowing them to go to lunch, to go to the dentist, to go shopping, and find a place to park. So when I had the meeting with the mayor, I did it anticipating this moment in history. Because right now eight businesses are closing in northwest Portland. The nwda has not asked one of them, what might you need to have helped you survive? This economic crunch, and the other thing that are happening in our neighborhood. I'm sure more than one of them would have said, could you help me out with some park something but they didn't get asked. I haven't been asked by the northwest district association what I might need to keep the business running that i've had on northwest 23rd for 18 years.

**May 21, 2003**

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Priola:** It is how I support myself. Our city is sometimes known for my store. And many of the other small businesses up on that street need, need off-street parking.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Am I going to see you tomorrow morning?

**Priola:** Yes, you are, at 8:00.

**Katz:** She's kind enough to bring a little surprise for all the princesses.

**Don Singer:** Mayor Katz, city council members, my name is don singer, I live at 4016 northwest hermosa boulevard, Portland, Oregon. As you all know i'm a long-standing resident and business owner in northwest Portland. I've been an active member of the transportation committee of the northwest district association for the past 23 years. During this time i've seen the parking issue hotly debated and a repeated failure to arrive at a practical solution. Over the years i've seen many of the transportation committee's most productive members both at nwda and nob hill leave in exasperation. During that same time frame, the northwest businesses have stepped up to the challenge. We have worked on an ad hoc basis to promote demand management practices with our fellow business owners. The results have been a step forward that is emerged in recent years. Today the northwest businesses actively promote transit use for employee and customers and many cases provide free transit passes to employees, actively seek to hire employees that live in the northwest district, promote walk and buy trips, and when driving is necessary, to have the employees use parking off street for their vehicles to leave on-street parking available to district residents and visitors. As important as these efforts have been, more general public parking is needed. To maintain the vitality the main streets have formed the back bone of the neighborhood. The proposal before you identifies eight parking sites that are fully or partially outside the c.s. Zone and allows 800 parking spaces on the sites. 70 of these sites are surface parking lots today, the -- improved for development in the surface parking lot and 300 of the 800 permitted spaces exist today. So all the plan actually adds is another 500 spaces. If not for the success of the business community's effort at demand management and the promise that more can be accomplished this amount of general public parking would be woefully inadequate. -- is that the end? Thank you. I support the plan very much.

**Katz:** That's it.

**Meg Fernekees:** Good evening. Meg fernekees, 2126 northwest kearney. I support this, this is the on-street parking program. I believe a residential permit parking system is long overdue and i'm glad to see that we'll be able to have that. I support shared parking, I believe that the existing surface and structured parking is a resource that is largely on tap and I think we should continue to explore that, so I do support that. I support the location of smart meters even in front of my house. I think the revenue however should not go to the construction of garages, but to enhancing other modes of transportation within the district. I also support the implementation of any on-street parking program ahead of garage construction. I think you need to remember the assumption we're working on is that shared -- structured parking will satisfy an existing need. I think what we also have to remember is that if we generate those spaces it will actually attract traffic, just like a transportation facility, when you increase its capacity, capacity is used up. Visualize waving a magic wand and northwest 23rd becoming a four-lane highway or something. That capacity would be -- the same thing with garages. I think it would actually add more pressure for parking than there presently exists. With 36 seconds to go i'm going to give it up.

**David Barts:** Good evening, my name is david barts, I live at 731 southwest king avenue, just across burnside from the neighborhood boundaries. I frequently patronize businesses in the

**May 21, 2003**

northwest district and frequently travel through it. I choose to live where I do because like the mayor and many other people, I like compact service-rich neighborhoods. Frankly the logic behind the construction of new garages in northwest, if I can even call it logic, escapes me. Adding, by various accounts 500 or sometimes 800 more parking spaces as part of a plan to reduce dependence and use of the automobile in the neighborhood, that's -- that strikes me as trying to lose weight by promising to eat five to 800 more calories a day. I can't wrap my mind about that. I also find the claim that garages reduce congestion by reducing the amount of people circulating or looking for parking, I don't see how that is pertinent to the northwest district. If you look at the streets in the northwest, the ones that are congested badly are 21st and 23rd. Both of those have traffic lights on burnside, which people use to get in and out of the neighborhood, and 23rd has ramps connecting to highway 30. It's very clear to me just by going outside and observing traffic that the key problem here is the capacity to move cars in and out of the neighborhood. Encouraging more people to drive is just going to make that worse, not better. Finally, unless someone develops a star trek-like transporter mechanism to beam cars from garages out onto the street, they're going to get out onto the street by crossing sidewalks. And personally I feel assaulted by cars in the middle of blocks crossing sidewalks in and out of garages. I'm sure the drivers don't intend it that way, but it's just the way it feels to me. And I don't think i'm alone. And if you're trying to encourage walking and alternate traffic, making walking feel less comfortable does not seem to be the way to do it. Thank you.

**Nancy Lictwardt:** I'm Nancy Lictwardt and I live at 3114 northeast 36th. I don't live in northwest, I don't own any property in northwest, and I don't own a business in northwest. But I do do tons and tons of business in northwest. And I love what it offers me. I work in the advertising business as a stylist and have to shop for props and wardrobe all of the time as well as picking up food for meetings and photo shoots. I can't take mass transit because I need to go back and forth to my car many, many times in my day to load and unload arm loads of bag and boxes. So I have to have access to easy parking and lots of it. I don't want to be forced to take my business away from northwest to other neighborhoods where parking is more abundant, better or easier.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Kandis Nunn:** Thank you for having us here this evening. I'm kandis nunn. There is some testimony provided to you in writing, but rather than read through that for you, i'd like to just stress a couple of point. Particularly after listening to other people's comments this evening. One, is it possible for us to implement one element of the plan and not the others? I think technically the answer is yes. Does it make sense? And will it get the results we seek? I think the answer is no. I think in the process we may do irreparable harm. I think it's critical that the plan be integrated and that that integration on an implementation basis be done as a holistic approach to this problem. And that all the components of the plan have to be both financially as well as logistically feasible or they're not really true elements of the plan. Secondly, in addition to the research that joe zhender shared with you, there was other research conducted on behalf of the city for its smart park garage system. Both in 1992 and 1997 and '99. It validated the distance by which people were willing to walk in order to get to their destinations, and I think that research has served the city's interest well in the past, and I think it would be very helpful if the city took a look again at that research in terms of how it might apply to parking situations and other areas of the city. Secondly, I think that it would also indicate that the centralization of some of the garages are absolutely critical in terms of the short distances people are willing to walk. If charleston and pittsburgh and other cities in america can site garages in historic areas, I have to believe Portland can do that as well. A couple of other points. You may think there's still room for compromise. I think what you

**May 21, 2003**

have here tonight is about as much compromise that you're going to find. I'd like to say that there have been a lot of interests shared with you here tonight, and -- but there's always been one voice missing from my perspective, and that's been the voice of the rest of the citizens of Portland, and the visitors to our area. We are a city of neighborhoods, and I think everybody ought to feel welcome in those neighborhoods. If we're not careful, we'll create a gated community in this neighborhood that doesn't serve our reputation well. Thank you.

**Don Pagano:** I'm not -- don panano. Richard kaplan. Alan had to leave. He gave me a statement to read.

**Katz:** No. Just pass it on. Give it to us as copies. Will you do that?

**Katz:** At 9:29, I don't think so.

**Page Stokwell:** I live at 2039 northwest irving. I was born and brought up in Portland and moved to the neighborhood four years ago. I've spent a lot of time, effort and money to restore my house to what it was when it was built in 1916. I don't believe this is added significantly to the value of my home, nor have I taken advantage of any tax breaks associated with historic properties. Many of my neighbors have also undertaken similar projects. We have made these efforts because we treasure the historic district and we want to add something back to the neighborhood. We do have a parking problem. I believe there are a number of elements in the proposed parking plan which will help to resolve these problems. There is however one aspect of the plan which I find quite disturbing. This is the intrusion of parking structures into the historic district. I believe this would not only take something away from the neighborhood, and negate my efforts and my neighbor's efforts to add to it. Parking structures should be considered only as a last resort after all other alternatives have been fully explored and implemented. Already encompassed in the plan are alternatives which include parking meters and shared use of existing surface parking lots. Not included in the parking plan but alternatives which should be carefully considered by the transportation management association and which would be an excellent use for parking meter revenues would include extension of fareless square to the historic district, and parking structures or surface lots in the periphery of the historic district with the provision of a shuttle bus. Incidentally, a garage on the uptown shopping site would not require a shuttle business. To summarize, we have on hand a number of solutions aside from parking structures to the parking problem. People visit and shop in our neighborhood because it is unique and not a shopping mall. My home is not threatened by any parking garage. But parking structures in the historic district would send all of the wrong signals regarding the tyranny of the motor car which has ruined so many cities in the past. It would be a major step in the wrong direction in the development of our neighborhood and our city and should be taken only after all of the other alternatives have been exhausted. Thank you very much.

**Chris Beniston:** My name is chris beniston, I live at 2323 northwest lovejoy. I've experienced 23<sup>rd</sup> over the last 8 years starting as a tenant living in a building, never being able to find parking, then of course I bought a house and we no longer have a parking problem because I have my own driveway. But as a business owner, I have a business on 23rd and 21st, the biggest issue I get is the lack of parking. From everybody. In fact to my own amazement, when we moved the portion of our repair to 21st, I had more complaints that, gee, why did you move here, parking is even worse. I never quite figured that one out. In fact I even had one customer who said, i'm not coming back. Parking's to bad on 21<sup>st</sup>, i'm not going there. The entire time i've lived there we had parking issues. I'm hoping you'll adopt a plan. I have great faith that whatever structures may get built will be done in the best way possible. And that's about it. Thank you for hearing me.

May 21, 2003

**Emergon Ong:** My name is emerson ong, I live at 507 northwest 22nd. I do not have a car and i've never owned one. My girlfriend does have one, although she plans to sell it soon. And about 80 to 90% of the time we don't have a problem finding a spot within a block of my condo. I believe the answer to this parking issue is not in building parking garages, but utilizing existing surface lots in the neighborhood. For example right across the street from me trader joe's closes at 9:00 pm but too often i'll pass by on a friday and saturday night and see this vast empty lot while cars are hunting the neighborhood looking for an empty spot in the street. That said i'd like to point out how hypocritical it is for the northwest district plan to say it is protecting and enhancing the livability and urban character of the district and reducing the demand for automobile parking while simultaneously promoting the construction of off-street parking decks. This is like telling people to say no to drugs and then going out and selling glass pipe to crack heads. Parking decks are an extremely unimaginative yet very permanent solution to what is at worse a part-time parking issue. You can say reducing the demand for automobile use is too idealistic and that parking decks are a real solution. Then you forget everything good that has happened in Portland has been nothing short of idealistic. Crazy even. The leveling of a parking deck made pioneer square, to the leveling of a highway to make waterfront park. From the east bank esplanade to max system to the streetcar to the urban growth boundary, Portland's idealism has made it nothing short of a beacon for the rest of the country about what could happen if its citizens strive for something more than the easy way out. In this light constructing multi-story concrete car bunkers in the middle of a national historic district in the most densely residential neighborhood in the state so that s.u.v. driving suburbanites can sip a latte on the sidewalk and buy pricey accessories is a shameful affront to the very meaning of the word livability.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Ted Thomas:** My name is ted thomas, I live at 4605 southwest fairview. But i've lived since 1986 up until just the last year in northwest Portland. My wife and I moved into northwest Portland in 1985 in a little loft apartment on 23rd and johnson. At that time the anchor tenants on the 23rd were lanners tavern, hogarth's and the silver fox, and the sort of unofficial mayor of 23rd was a guy who called himself the barbarian. And sort of bore a resemblance to saddam hussein. He's since gone, I think he may be working as a double in iraq. But in that interim we've seen northwest Portland become literally a gem. Amazing congregation of different kinds of people of all ages from all different walks of life. At christmastime there is no prettier place to be than an evening on 23rd avenue. It's been a smashing success. In my life i've lived on college avenue in oakland, california, i've lived near union street for a couple years in san francisco, balboa island in newport beach, particularly in the bay area, i've seen the effects of allowing unrestrained, unplanned, uncreative creation of parking structures that are a blight. You have created a process here that has motivated the business community and the developers to use their imagination to come up with very aesthetically pleasing solutions to the off-street parking problem. And I think it would be a shame if you don't allow that process to work and reap the benefits of that creativity and all the work they've done to try to make it work for everyone involved.

**Martha Flotten:** Mayor and Commissioners, my name is Martha Flotten and I'm a homeowner on 2326 northwest hoyt. I appreciate the time you're giving to this issue considering we're already a half an hour over and there are much more loud-mouths after me to speak to this issue. One of my major concerns with the parking plan is the parking structure and primarily because one of them would dwarf my house by 15 feet in the back yard. I'm trying to take a step away from it and look at it not as an in my back yard situation, but as what's best for the city are Portland and what's best for the northwest district. Someone who's knew to this area, I love living in northwest

**May 21, 2003**

Portland. I -- I recognize when you live in a city and in this area where you are part business and part residential, that's some of the issues we're dealing with is par for the course. That's part of the joy you get from living in this area. I don't want this to become a battle of business versus residents. One of the reasons we choose to live in the area that we live on Hoyt street is because we adore frequenting the businesses that are there and loyal supporters to the businesses in our area. And I was pleased to see a lot of them here tonight. My concern with the parking structures particularly, too many ideas. My concern with the parking structures is specifically the pizzacato site that would dwarf my house by 15 feet. My neighbor mentioned I would be the lack of light that would come into our home or back yard at all. And I invite to you walk the area, walk the neighborhoods where these structures would be built and really see the impact it would have on the neighbors and on the residents. There's absolutely no way you can deem that livable. Particularly if you're trying to raise a family and have children in that back yard. It simply isn't safe. Additionally, I think environmentally it not safe. There are three parking structures that are slated to go up within a three-block radius. The pizzacato site, the elizabeth street site and the poppa hayden site. Hoyt street is already a nightmare. I know that from trying to exit the parking area we have at our house and try to make a turn between coffee people and starbucks. Not only do you risk your life, but you are -- you can take other people's lives into consideration as well. I can't even imagine what would happen to those three. I think the impact the traffic would have with those three parking structures right in a row, traffic and environmental, I think that's something that needs to be considered.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Phil Geffin:** I'm phillip, i'm from escape from new york pizza. I live on quimby. I ride my bike to work. I try to be part of the solution, not the problem. It's like mayberry r.f.p., from the home to the pizza store, to home, say hi to everybody on the way. It's pretty simple, it's a quiet easy life and i've been there 20 years doing that, and I like the nature of the neighborhood. But what I don't like is having an us versus them thing. The residents versus the businesses. Because i'm both, and these people that own the businesses are my friends and they're good people, and all these people trying to find good solutions. Frank lloyd wright came and said, look, i'm going to build a parking garage on top of a residential little thing or on top of the school and i'm going to make it look really cool and it's going to be on the map. Well, what would they say? Get out of here: If jesus came around and did something, would they kick him out? We've got to think about, like, ok, what's going to work for the system? Right now the only thing that creates more parking spaces is making a few more parking spaces. Like yogi berra would know that [laughter] at the end of the day, as soon as you have to make some control, in a parking situation, you have put some controls in, what happens is you're not creating anymore spaces, you're just having more control, and people aren't going to park off the street that quickly if there's free parking on the street. They'll go round and round and they won't pay \$2 to park. Up to a certain point, like in san francisco when it gets tough enough they'll go to the parking -- for a long time as it is now, they'll go round and round, and they'll have nowhere to -- they'll have nowhere to park. If you have controlled on the street, then they'll go off the street. There's meter on the street. That's the only way to get them off quickly, anyway. So I think the present plan, it's a good compromise and something that works, and it's not great for anybody, but it's great for everybody.

**Katz:** Let -- [applause]

**Katz:** No, no. Let's see in my memory doesn't fail me. Didn't you lose your business for our parking lot?

May 21, 2003

**Geffin:** That's another irony, because -- and I come from New York, it's like I don't think my whole life is going to resolve around the parking junk. I just take the subway and the bus but all after sudden, here it is. And you gotta figure out how everybody --

**Katz:** Tell them where you were located.

**Geffin:** I was located --

**Katz:** Downtown.

**Geffin:** I was -- I was located across from the Galleria, which is now a surface lot, that they're going to make pretty and all this. But it's a surface lot still. I thought that wasn't going to happen basically because they -- it wasn't city policy and -- but that's what happened. And now this is parking, you know, part two, 10 years later. But there's no easy solution to this, but there's a lot of good people working on it, and I like to take the venom out of the situation. That's what I'd like to see mostly.

**Craig Cedros:** I'm Craig Cedros, I live at 2326 Northwest Hoyt Street. Homeowner there, I was the last to speak at the planning commission on this thing and I'm almost last one to speak at this one. It's a little tough to talk because it is an emotional thing because it is our home. And I believe if a parking garage goes in we lose our home. We have the location next to the 45-foot structure behind Pizzacatto. The peak of our house is short of 30 feet. Which means that eye level on the second story even would look right into a parking structure. Our back yard becomes pretty much unusable. We won't be able to have our family there. We'll end up having to move. That's why I think for us in particular, it's very weak, especially when you look at some of the issues around this. We live next to that parking lot that's there right now and most time we look out there and it's empty. So people talk about the parking, people drive around. I don't think that's going to change. People are not going to use the lots unless they're damn sure there's nothing left on the street, even with the on-street parking because the on-street parking probably be cheaper than the garages. So a couple other items related to the needs for this stuff. People talked about occupancy in the housing units. The numbers I see in the appendix to the parking plan, a number of units in Northwest is increased over 400, yet occupancy rate has dropped from nine to 6%. I don't see parking from having limited to anything from it comes to occupancy rate in high density units. I think the impact of these garages, which wasn't depicted very well in the presentation earlier, they showed the lots that were nice and easy to show, how it might not be much of an impact, but they certainly couldn't have done that with that lot right behind Pizzacatto. Putting these 45' structures is more than just what they consider a low impact or modest description.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Edgar Waehrer:** Edgar Waehrer, 1824 Northwest 28th Avenue. Will the devil is in the details. You've heard a lot of general testimony, you've heard some concerns from residents who are immediately adjacent to some of the designated lots. I think you need to look very carefully before you approve this plan. I happen to think that it is -- it cries out for an incremental approach. The on-street parking solutions are good solutions, they will in fact ease the parking problems, because they -- there will be costs attached to parking which will wind up automatically I believe increasing the turnover in parking. Thereby making parking more available for the business and more available for residents. Sure, there's a cost involved. But we're in a big city here. Dick Singer indicated to me that he plans to immediately, as soon as this plan is in place, if all approved, he would immediately plan to build the structure behind the Poppa Hayden's building. Unfortunately, that is a site that also contains a residential structure that has five what I'm sure are moderate-income rental units. There are other better sites that should be examined before that one goes forward, or before any go forward in the residential zones. He has three surface lots, Singer has



May 21, 2003

three surface lots in the immediate area right now. They are currently under utilized because the rate is set at \$2.50 per hour. That's an untenable rate when you have free parking. However, once the parking is -- once there are metered on-street parking, and if that rate is reduced, they are likely to be much more utilized. That will go a long way to making up this first go-around of 75 parking spaces that he is proposing in the papa hayden building. One more comment about, if I may, about the lot at coop school. There is every reason why that could and should go forward as soon as possible, and as I understand it, there's -- it's being worked on between the city and school district. As long as it's kept to a low deck, it can be reasonable for the neighborhood. It can go forward under the present zoning code. It can go forward as a use that is connected to the school, and if the other parts of the plan are implemented -- of the transportation plan are implemented, that could be a shared parking for evening use by cinema 21 and other 21st avenue --

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Francesconi:** Let me quickly ask you one question. You've heard the business folks, small business people here testify about their need for more parking. It's true we have to look at the details of the plan, but do you agree that the small business folks need more park something.

**Waehrer:** Oh, I think it's an easy target. And when I am driving from upper northwest to go to a restaurant on 23rd, i'm always able to park within a block. I've never had to go elsewhere because i've not been able to park. On the other hand, I think that there are better ways of using parking. There's better -- just as the downtown parking structures have the change of rate after four hours in order to encourage short-term parking, I think meters will encourage short-term parking for the -- to the benefit of the businesses along 23rd and 21st. And I think -- I think the way in which to go about this thing is to do it incrementally, look at the results, the traffic management group is an ideal group to monitor this, and to look at the revenue stream that will be there from the fees, from the meters, and look at ways in which to do parking structures some -- at some location in the future.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Katz:** I beg all of you who have testified before -- you know, we tried something new this time, and i'm not sure it worked. Go ahead.

**Susan Sturgis:** I just have some miscellaneous comments because there's -- people have address add lot of things that I also think. But and I think that the sad reality that nobody wants to face up to is that if this parking plan is implemented it will not solve the parking problem. It's a small drop in a big bucket. I grew up in southern California, the land of 15 million freeways and parking structures and it's not going to solve the problem. You get a few more spaces that are going to help some of the businesses that are adjacent right to those spaces. And I think that maybe it just needs to be looked at more before you adopt something. I just think there's -- maybe some radical, more looking at shuttles, parking structures under the freeway or something. But this plan may be a good compromise, but I think that the small business owners that are nervous about losing their businesses now, it's not going to save them, even if you implemented it tomorrow. It's just not going to make the difference.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Christian Fox:** My name is christian, i'm with g.p. Property management. I manage mostly commercial buildings. Medical office use and health practitioners are the primary use of our buildings. I wouldn't say anything that's mostly been said except it didn't seem like many people in the medical community have been up here. On behalf of the medical practitioners that are in my building is why i'm here. They've asked we express our wholehearted support for additional parking capacity in the form of parking structures. It seems that many of our patients to our

May 21, 2003

properties complain routinely about the limited parking and of course they do have limited mobility, a lot of them, so the additional parking capacity is also expressed through the business, the doctors and to myself, and with that in mind, the connection of the vitality of the businesses to the parking capacity is critical and real. I can cite many instances of medical practices that have vacated the buildings I manage because of parking issues. They go to other areas, sw, ne simply for more parking capacity. Many of the medical practitioners in this decade have been squeezed by hmo's, insurance premiums and all of this just serves to simply magnify the importance of parking capacity when it's a touch stone or hot plate for their patients, as it is. Tonight I walked here from my office in northwest Portland, and it a beautiful city to walk. It's -- I guess I would say the livability is obvious. It's attractive. A lot of the medical practitioners in my building as well as their staff also cite that as one of the benefits of being northwest Portland, is that walkability, and they do not see a disconnect between having capacity in the form of structures and the livability and sustainability of that region. Thanks.

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

**Jess Glaeser:** Mayor Katz, members of the council, my name is jess glaeser, I reside at 3136 southwest fairmont. I'm a lawyer but mercifully i'm not representing anyone here except myself. Because i'd hate to bill them for the last four hours. I am here because i'm a former long-term resident of northwest Portland. I lived in the 2100 block of everett from 1982 to 1998. I'm here because I think i'm one of many people who when it came time to look to purchase a residence, made a conscious decision, at least in part, not to stay in northwest Portland because of parking. I think -- and part of the process was going around with a realtor to look at properties. And looking at properties that didn't have off-street parking provided that old problem that we've heard about now for the last four years and her happens we'll continue to hear about that involves parking karma. And we didn't have it. So I think there are a number of people out there that have made a decision not to live in northwest Portland at least in part because of the absence of available on-street parking. I'm speaking in support of what has been proposed. I think the need for off-street lots is essential. And I think that if it's not provided, that you will continue to see a decrease in the livability of northwest Portland from a residential standpoint because of the absence of off-street parking. I've sat here and listened for -- since 6:00. I'm amazed that this issue has been bantered around if i'm last, if i'm to believe the witnesses, some 20 to 25 years. It's time to make a decision, and I think what's been presented to you is a reasonable decision to make. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Michael Gibbons:** My name is Michael Gibbons, I reside at 2818 northwest cumberland, and i'm here on behalf as myself as a resident of northwest Portland, property owner at 701 northwest 23rd and 715 northwest 23rd and a business owner of those property papa hayden and joe rotisserie. 20 years ago in august of 1983 when papa hayden opened its northwest location at 23<sup>rd</sup> and irving, the neighborhood was a somewhat you sleepy area unique mix of dense residential housing, single and multifamily a. Few small retail businesses and some limited office space. We then viewed the neighborhood as possessing a unique potential and opportunity to provide urban amenities within a vibrant community setting. One of the few downsides of that time was a shortage of parking for both residential and commercial community members. Today 20 years one expansion and one additional restaurant later, our neighborhood has by and large involved -- evolved into that vibrant blend of residential and business that makes northwest Portland such a thriving, exciting, admired and often imitated community. We still, however, 20 years later, have a parking shortage. A shortage that due to the neighborhood's success, has been even more exacerbated. And due to successful imitation of the northwest formula throughout the city, the parking shortage has grown

May 21, 2003

from a down side into an obstacle that negatively impacts the continued success and well being of our neighborhood. Tonight with the northwest district parking plan, council has the opportunity to provide a solution to the parking problem. I ask the council to adopt the plan as recommended by the office of planning. It is a workable solution that takes into account the often competing interests of all the districts' constituents. The desire of residents to have available accessible parking is met by the implementation of metering and a permit program. Interests of business for more parking inventory is met by providing identified and guaranteed structures that will allow for 450 to a cap maximum of 800 additional parking spaces. It's also a plan that -- may I continue?

**Katz:** No. You can finish your sentence.

**Gibbons:** Thanks.

**Bill Harris:** My name is bill harris. I come to speak against the parking structures, and on behalf of the people who in the future I hope will be seeking to find a high-quality urban neighborhood in which to live in what is now northwest Portland, and has been a high-quality urban residential area, businesses coming and going and changing character over time. But it has fortunately remained a high-quality urban neighborhood. If we pander to the automobile, as is -- it seems to me evident in building structures into which to put the automobile, we are in essence saying, we're going to make some compromises of -- because of the tastes of current business and current residents who like their cars, and simultaneously put the livability of the neighborhood in jeopardy into the far future.

It is for those folks and the ideal of having a truly enduring high-quality residential community that I wish to favor and I think the parking building and pandering the automobile is a sure way to build barriers to that in the future. It is not an area, it seems to me which should be devoted destination retail which is the appetite that business has as it wants to grow and succeed.

Sometimes success is better by getting bigger and requires a larger audience. However, these two streets 23rd and 21st avenue would seem to me in -- from a policy point of view should be aimed at retail and services, which are an integral part of the lives of the residents in the community, and small amount of destination commerce can happen, but the more we have in our area, the harder it is in our area to be a good neighborhood and the more impossible it is for other neighborhoods-to-in the city to have significant retail.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right. Are you testifying for yourself?

**Chris Smith:** I'm taking off my nwda representative hat right now. And personally I want to thank all the staff that worked on this and most especially rob and joe who have been instrumental in moving the parking portion of this forward. I also want to thank all the participants. You would like to see us define our differences tonight, and that's the nature of this process.

But in fact there's been incredible movement and effort on all sides. Even though we haven't come to a shared vision, I deeply appreciate how hard everybody involved in this has worked to try and find common ground. Having said that, some personal perspectives in the discussion tonight that troubled me, particularly the need to compete with other neighborhoods. In our region, we're about providing choices, choices in transportation, choices in home styles, if every time some neighborhood comes up with a new competitive advantage we have to retrofit the other neighborhoods to match that, we just regress to the mean and we lose the uniqueness that makes our neighborhoods so special. So i'm not persuaded by the arguments we need to compete with the pearl, or even the planning commission competing with lloyd center. I'm also concerned that -- and my heart goes out to the businesses that are trying to survive right now, but pouring concrete that's going to last 20 years or 50 years to deal with a three-year recession is also of great concern to me.

Having said that, i've told my constituency and this is not a secret, that I think some amount of off-street park assisting going to be part of this plan, and of course it's up to you guys to figure out how

**May 21, 2003**

much. And I don't envy you that task, because we clearly haven't succeeded in it. I would say that I think you've heard if you listen to the testimony tonight that all of these sites are not created equal. Some of these offer much more intrusion, some much less. And I know I'll be working with my membership to try and figure out how we react to that, we owe you a neighborhood position when we come back to the work session. But I think if you listen to the testimony you'll get clues to that. And of course the concentration of 3 sites on the west side of 23<sup>rd</sup> is a big issue.

**Katz:** All right.

**Francesconi:** Chris, if I could ask you one question, if -- not all the sites are going to get built, at least right away. There's practical -- there's a lot of -- I've seen pictures, but the truth is, a lot of the sites won't even be built for a sizable point of time even if we authorize them. Isn't that right?

**Smith:** I think that's true. I think both because there will be some ownership issues that won't make them available immediately, because three of the sites have conditional use hurdles, and I think the marketplace will want to build the permitted stuff first. I think you can shape that by selecting what's permitted, and probably make a better neighborhood in the process rather than relying on the market to do that.

**Katz:** I don't want to take everybody's time, but there's another example of how people say the marketplace isn't ready for it, and all of a sudden it got ready and created a problem. But that's a whole story for another day. Staff, come on up here. I've been asked by some of the people that have been working on this, they need a little bit more time. Is it -- is that your understanding as well?

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

**Katz:** Ok. What are you looking at me so puzzled?

**Kelley:** By a little more time what do you mean?

**Katz:** We're coming back in -- that's what I meant. What did you think -- never mind.

**Kelley:** Would you like me to summarize quickly -- I think I can do that. And Joe or Debbie should jump in if I miss something. I think actually the issues boil down to a relatively few, and I would divide them between your two work sessions coming up. On the first work session we're dealing with the land use issues. You heard about the Vaughn Street transition subarea, and I think we'd like to take a look at the suggestions but I don't think we saw them much ahead of time from Warren and Nina just to understand which those requests are. And inform you about the implications of those. You heard from ESCO and their representatives. Essentially a choice you'll have to make about -- I don't think you heard much debate about whether to have a transition area, but more what's the appropriate level of f.a.r. there, and the trade-off for traffic capacity. And we would be happy to get into that issue, probably deserves some attention in your work session to understand the implications of that. And a related issue is the, who funds traffic improvements to make sure that traffic capacity is there and how and when that's done. I think you heard -- I tracked five different individual sites or small areas where you have requests for either modification of what we've done or suggested addition for zone changes and so forth. One was the c.n.f. Property where you heard about the issue of the -- our requirement for reconnecting the street grid versus more flexibility in doing that, including doing whatever was needed through a traffic study. Subsequently, I think that's a fairly straight-ahead issue that you can deal with in your work session. You heard about the Upshur triangle and --

**Francesconi:** Before you leave the c.n.f. Property, the option of maybe giving them a little more flexibility on the street plan, but then having a master plan back on the c.n.f. Property, I'd like you to analyze that one as well.

**Kelley:** Ok.

May 21, 2003

**Katz:** Let him finish and then i'm going to ask you if you want anything else --

**Kelley:** I'm trying to run through the list. The upshur triangle, there's a proposal to rezone that to e.g. 1, but actually from the requesting party that we take a look at that and see if that's the appropriate designation. We'll look at that issue. The animal hospital, whether or not the subarea c height and bonuses ought to be extended to cover a larger territory, including the new site or proposed site for their new hospital. On the northwest cultural heritage center, a request to rezone from r.h. To e.x. In order to improve their potential for tenant mix, we just need to look at that one, that's a new request. And the uptown 24th place housing, proposed housing tower, i'd like to have our urban design staff look at the implications of that work. We're trying not to do an individual building approval process here, but I think it does rate some urban design issues that merit a little bit of looking at.

**Katz:** It's a good infill place, but I think you're right.

**Kelley:** And then there were a couple of other land use issues, one was the request to remove page j-9 for the pearl district association, that had to do with the active street fronts near the streetcar line. I think that's probably fine. I'll double-check with staff, we can probably just pull that page out of the plan. And there was one speaker who recommended imposing leed standards requirement force some buildings at least in the specifically garages, but could be other buildings. And then in your second work session, we'll be dealing with parking issues and again I think that there's a lot of testimony there probably only six or seven issues that that it boils down to. One is whether to take this forward as a package or whether to do this incrementally. You've heard our staff say that we really are biased toward doing this as a package. We think that makes the most sense that probably needs to be a discussion point. There are amendments that i'm not sure we've seen yet from richard singer and that group that we need to look at and see what those do. I think they have to do with shared off-street parking on the existing lots.

**Bischoff:** And some of it is development regulation.

**Kelley:** We need to look at those. I heard a lot of testimony obviously about the garage structures and most particularly about the height of those. The 45-foot height. And I just want to sort of talk with staff about whether there's any sort of relief on the 45-foot on some or all of those sites. We heard something about meter placement. And the hardships that permit parking can place on people who need frequent visitation, elderly and infirm people. That's probably an issue we're not going to regulate in the plan, but something that's an issue for the t.m.a. But we can look at that. We also heard about the pricing structure of off-street parking, whether it's surface or garage, and how important that is. And again, that's not something we're going to regulate through the plan, but something that is an issue that you may want to refer to the tma process. Those are the issues I tracked.

**Katz:** Did you find anything he skipped? I don't think he did.

**Bischoff:** He hit the major ones, but there may be testimony from people who didn't speak tonight that was presented for this hearing that we might want to review.

**Katz:** You want the review.

**Bischoff:** And maybe bring back.

**Katz:** Somebody wanted to testify and for somebody else, so we need to review that material.

**Leonard:** Did you talk about the Savinar families --

**Kelley:** The upsure triangle.

**Leonard:** There -- you know their issue --

**Kelley:** Right.

May 21, 2003

**Katz:** Let's start from our left, if you want -- are there any issues that you want them to take a look at?

**Sten:** The ones they mentioned. [laughter]

**Katz:** Ok.

**Leonard:** He answered my question.

**Francesconi:** You've covered it I think. Maybe a couple -- but let me say it again. It vaughn street i'm worried about. With -- on the land use side. So with nina, there can't be any retail, there can be can't be any housing. Can you limit it to those definitive statements on my part. Can you limit it to office use? That's a question. Industrial-related office use. Then the question is how do you pay for it. So i've already met with transportation to see what transportation could do to improve capacity separate. But then that's why I want to at least look at the idea of a master plan, since we've rezoned the -- that other property to see what can be contributed to vaughn street. And then that's the same kind of thing regarding esco. And either f.a.r. So there's that whole series of issues.

**Ames:** Can I ask a clarifying question? Can we look beyond master plan and look at development agreements or --

**Francesconi:** Absolutely. Absolutely. Please. That's the concern. You covered the other ones. I guess the other issue is to analyze amendments to see if they're necessary for the actual construction, the -- to implement the plan. We have to see -- those amendments have to be looked at. The issue of the structure, the t.m.a. That was raised. So it's an effective t.m.a.

**Katz:** Let me deal with the parking. There was the issue of the underutilization of lots. I haven't seen -- did I miss any material on analysis of the utilization of the existing parking lots and garages?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** No. We do not have sort of existing utilization.

**Katz:** Can we get some?

**Kelley:** Pdot says sure.

**Katz:** Before we make major decisions. So the utilization of the lots are important. People testify -- I don't want to get into a lot of philosophical discussion about that. I think there's no question there needs to be off-street parking. I'm a little nervous about some of the sites. And i'd like the group to take a look at those that directly abut residential neighborhoods that will have a negative impact on the homeowners in the area. There are some sites both on 21st and on 23rd that I think are doable. So I need a little help. I worry a little bit about the balance between the paid garages and the permit -- and the meter parking. And i'm not an economist to know where the balance is to make it all work. So I need a little bit of help on that. And I would ask the citizens advisory committee to take another look at some of those issues and come back. We'll see where we are when you do that. Ok? Did we miss anything? From your perspectives?

**Kelley:** I don't believe so.

**Leonard:** Probably.

**Katz:** We'll hear about it if we do. Let me run back on the dates. June 11, 2:00 p.m., nonparking issues. June 19, parking issues. 3:15 on June 19, 2:00 on June 11. On October 15, parking issues, pdot will bring the rest of the on-street parking, and transportation management association issues back to council. And people will be able to testify on those issues. Only on-street or off-street?

**Bischoff:** We're hoping the council will do a first reading on the off-street that's contained -- the specifics contained in the plan, and it's carried forward, and at the second reading of the off-street occurs at the same time as second reading for the on-street. So it's all adopted at the -- it goes into effect at the same time.

**May 21, 2003**

**Katz:** Ok.

**Francesconi:** Mayor, we did miss something. We missed "west wing." it was a repeat. [laughter]

**Katz:** All right, everybody. Thank you. Thank you for your patience on sitting with us. For those that I may have cut off or not allowed to testify, third time like tim ramis, we know what you were going to say, please bring -- send your written item to us and we promise we'll read it. We stand adjourned until tomorrow at 2:00. [gavel pounded]

At 10:18 p.m., Council recessed.

May 22, 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.

**MAY 22, 2003**      **2:00 PM**

**Katz:** The council will come to order. Karla, please call the roll. [ roll call ]

**Katz:** There's three of us, we will start with 508. Do you want to take them all together?

**Saltzman:** Sure.

**Katz:** Ok. 508 and 509.

**Items 508 and 509.**

**Katz:** All right, sir.

**Tim Grewe, Chief Administrative Officer, Office of Management and Finance:** Good afternoon, tim grewe, chief administrative officer for the city. You have these two ordinances before you today which concern the professional service contracts related to the accusation, implementation of the city's replacement c.i.s. for the water bureau. They're not about the actual selection or the replacement system itself, but they are about the services of consultants who have been assisting us with the r.f.p. process for acquisition of the new system. And for professional project management services for implementing the new system once it's been selected. Both contracts would authorize the -- they include a highly detailed description of expected products and performance expectations, they have a holdback provision to protect the city and ensure that all work is completed, otherwise they will not be paid the full amount. Both contracts will be managed through o.m.f. They will be paid for through interagency agreements with the water bureau and b.e.s. And both ordinances reflect -- are reflected in the current and proposed budgets of the water bureau, environmental services and the office of management services. And finally, both t.m.g. and m.s.u.g. are certified minority contractors. That was one of the provisions. Let me talk a little bit about the t.m.g. ordinance, which is your first ordinance. Let me jump ahead. On the t.m.g. ordinance -- i'm still trying to catch up.

**Katz:** I'm sorry, ignore us.

**Grewe:** Interesting day. The t.m.g. amends the scope of work for an existing p.t.e. contract with t.m.g. consulting for assistance with the r.f.p. process for obtaining replacement system. The original contract we have was for 20,000. I want to remind you when that contract was issued, we were truly in an emergency situation. Because we didn't have a maintenance agreement with the current vendor for the c.i.s. system. So we had to move quickly in the event that we had a system failure and need to fall back on another system. This amendment before you today would increase the contract to t.m.g. to \$431,000. And it extends the time of performance to december 31, 2003. It also waives the city code provision requiring a full r.f.p. process for the consultant. The second ordinance you have before you authorizes a contract with municipal utility services group, m.s.u.g., i'm not sure how to pronounce the acronym yet, for professional project management services for implementing the new system once it has been selected. Implementation of a c.i.s. system of this magnitude, as I know you appreciate, requires us to have both very strong internal project management internally within the city, but also to have project management experience which we do not currently have in the city, for doing a major system replacement of this nature. Last fall we



**May 22, 2003**

conducted a national r.f.p. search for this project expertise. We received 24 proposals, which was a very good response. We interviewed five of those firms in detail, and we selected m.s.u.g. by unanimous consent of the selection committee. The final contract amount is for \$987,000, which will last over 24-month period of time. I should point out m.s.u.g. is owned by former kpmg partners, so one of the advantages we saw, they were very aware of the financial reporting requirements of the new system, which have been of concern to us. So i'll stop there and ask any questions -- answer any questions. I also have staff to help with questions if need be.

**Katz:** Let me just respond, and I think I speak for commissioner Saltzman, but if i'm not, correct me. I think there was some concern, at least there was some concern on my part, on the continue -- the no-source contract issue. And I was -- after the discussion, I felt a little bit more comfortable, but I sent the message loud and clear to dick and to tim, and to all of our bureaus that we need to use that very judiciously. Oregon statute allows and permits us to do that, but it isn't fair to other contractors out in the community. Now, what happens, most of you know, is you do a small piece of a contract, and then it gets extended and extended, and extended, and extended. And we've looked at that, and we really do need to put a halt to that. So I flag that as an issue that I know I felt uncomfortable with, and I think some of you have felt uncomfortable with in some cases it's appropriate, especially during emergencies. Even when we know there may be only one firm in the community we still ought to send out the message to everybody to apply for the possible landing of a consulting contract.

**Grewe:** And you the council know that I more than anybody else should be well aware of the city's purchasing practices and policies, and I am aware of those. I truly do believe this was one of those extraordinary situations where the city needed to act very promptly to continue this administrative service.

**Katz:** This issue has been floating around, and I just wanted to clarify that council -- I hope I speak for the entire council on this issue.

**Francesconi:** I guess I have an additional concern on this, tim. And that is, it's the role of the council in terms of oversight and how 20,000 grew to 400,000 without it coming in front of the council. How much of this is -- have we already spent?

**Grewe:** I don't have that figure in my head right now, commissioner. Maybe my staff does. Dick, do you have a number?

**Dick Hofland, Office of Finance and Administration:** My name is dick with the office of finance and administration. It's approximately \$232,000, I think, to date.

**Francesconi:** So why didn't -- that's the problem.

**Saltzman:** I can maybe shed some light on that. Well, did you want to answer?

**Grewe:** I'll let you answer, commissioner, if you like.

**Saltzman:** One of the reasons this contract was not brought back to council probably when it should have been was our ongoing discussions with severn trent over settlement. So that was one of the reasons which i'll take the blame for for not bringing it to council in then a timely manner. It was part of our settlement strategy.

**Grewe:** The city attorney's office, working with the commissioner, was in active negotiations with severn trent. As a matter of strategy, they did not want to reveal that we were actively pursuing a replacement option until late in the process when we came to agreement on that. Again, commissioner, I want to emphasize at the time we engaged this process, we truly were in a position of potentially having our current consultant leave and not having any options for continuing the system we had. So it was a balance of being sensitive to the negotiations, and trying to move as rapidly as possible to a conclusion as to approach that led to us making these expenditures.

May 22, 2003

**Francesconi:** Ok.

**Katz:** Further questions?

**Francesconi:** No. You're comfortable -- first of all, the negotiations were done very well, and commissioner Saltzman and the team did a very good job on the settlement. So that answers the question on that. How about on the amount, where we have -- this is quite a bit of money combined with the next item in front of us, that's a whole lot of money.

**Grewe:** The second item was fully done through a competitive process. With 24 firms and that was a consultant that got selected based on the selection criteria. I just wanted to clarify that has fully gone through a competitive process. Based upon our review, it's an amount that is consistent with what other cities have paid for this type of project management service.

**Francesconi:** Ok. Thanks.

**Katz:** It was only the first item that was the issue. All right. Further questions by the council? Thank you. Anybody else want to testify on this item? You're all here for the next group. Ok. Roll call on 508.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 509.

**Katz:** Anybody want to testify on 509? Roll call.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] it's 216, is everybody here -- it's 2:16. Is everybody here? It's a time certain for 2:30. And is phil grillo here? He is here. Why don't we go and do 511.

**Moore:** I don't think mark is here.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** He's not, but I can probably --

**Katz:** Ok. Why don't we do 512.

**Katz:** Is everybody here for 512? Ok.

**Item 512.**

**Katz:** Does anybody want to testify? If not, roll call. Did you want to testify?

**Francesconi:** Pdot is here as well.

**Katz:** I'm sorry. I'm fast with the gavel, rick.

**Rick Henson, Business Representative, AFSCME, Local 189:** Hi. My name is rick henson, I am the business representative for american federation of state county municipal employees, local 189. To speak to this issue I wanted to begin by thanking commissioner Francesconi for his leadership on bringing this forward. And in addition, michael from his office who did a lot of lot of hard work on this and also wanted to say that I was very pleased with the elected leadership of the city of Portland for their efforts I think in recognizing this opportunity and this moment in time where we can get past some of the conflict we've had over the years and maybe get a new start moving down in a direction that will benefit both the city and the workers at the city. And so again, you haven't voted yet, so I would encourage you all to vote yes on this recommendation. Thank you.

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

**Francesconi:** Well, I appreciate it. This is a continuing attempt to improve labor management relationships, but it's also done with the admission by the union that they did commit an unfair labor practice, and we worked it out in a way that admits that, but yet lets us move forward to have a constructive relationship without us needing to pursue it further. So that's good. Aye. We thank you. Actually, i'd like to thank pdot too, because pdot, my brother, was -- my bureau, was fully in favor of this, and they felt it was part of good management to do this as well. And so I want to

May 22, 2003

thank pdot. I -- actually, let me thank michael harrison and laurie kraut for working with michael harrison and I as we crafted this. And finally let me thank the council for their allowing me to play this role. And I won't continue to do it, I promise. Aye.

**Leonard:** Aye.

**Saltzman:** Well, i'm going to disagree with this settlement. I do feel that this is a result after work slow-down that was deliberately taken by a bargaining unit during our negotiations. It cost the city money out of its general fund, and while i'm not an interested in recovering the money from the bargaining unit, I do feel that the city should have sustained this -- should have taken this precedent to the employee relations board, as was recommended by our legal council and -- counsel and our bargaining team, and have this practice sustained, as it looked like it was going to be. So i'm not interesting in recovering any money from the union, but I do think it's important to establish the precedent when an unfair labor practice is established. It's important to get that established for several reasons. We need to know what constitutes a strike under the public employees' collective bargaining act. What is a remedy against the union for an unlawful strike under the public employee collective bargaining act, what is the remedy for a violation of a no-strike provision, and what is a work slow-down. All these things were contained in the rulings, and would have been probably sustained by the employee relations board and would serve as valuable precedent for the city and the unions in our future ongoing hopefully improving relationships. But nevertheless, I think it's remiss for the city council to interfere at this point and abort this process prior to its logical conclusion. No.

**Sten:** Well, I think we have a lot to work on together and this is the right approach. Aye.

**Katz:** I would have wished that it -- this issue would have gone to i.r.v., because we did need some legal clarification, and then we would then have passed item 512 afterwards. But that was not the desire of the council, the end result would have been the same, but we're voting now on something we all wanted to do, but we're voting it without setting the legal standard. And that's unfortunate. But i'm going to support it and vote aye. [gavel pounded] all right. I think we're almost -- our staff is here from planning?

**Moore:** They're not here yet.

**Katz:** All right. Why don't we take 510. It is -- we have about 10 minutes, but if anybody comes late, we'll take their testimony before we vote.

**Item 510.**

**Katz:** Let me -- before we start, let me thank ron, he was before this group a couple of weeks ago, and you really had at 'em. We promised you that we would deliver a fair product, and we promised you that we would have enough time for people to ask questions about the contracts and to make some changes, and he'll tell you what had gone on and we're at the point now to act on the selection group's recommendation. Ron?

**Ron Bergman, Director, General Services:** Thank you, mayor. Ron bergman, general services director for the city. You have before you today a report from the purchasing director on the recommendations for the high-scoring proposal for the garage management contract. Let me tell you a little bit about the process that we went through. We did issue the request for proposals that you authorized. We did get some comments from a number of the proposers that were responded to by addendum to that r.f.p. We did receive at one point a formal protest to the specifications. There were some 41 items in that protest. After review, approximately 19 of those 41 did require clarification or adjustment in the specifications, and those were issued by addendum also. Another 13 items required not necessarily changes in the specifications, but clarifications to make sure that proposers understood exactly what we were describing, and so those were made by addendum also,

May 22, 2003

and then there were just about five items that we did not agree with in terms of that protest. Those were issued by the purchasing agent as the responses to that protest, and the appeal period on that protest to come to the council actually came and went so the protest decided not to take it any further, so apparently they were satisfied with the results of that process. We did receive the proposals. There were five proposals that were received, three of them were under the option of individual service options. However, we did not receive a proposal under the individual service option for janitorial, which meant that we could not consider any of the individual service options. We did not receive any options under the master lease proposal. What we did have that we could consider were two proposals for the full service option. We convened the selection committee, and I have with me today Pamela Erickson, who was on that selection committee, who will describe for you the process that they went through and the recommendations when she is done, I'll give you a status of where we are with the negotiations with the selected high point proposer, and then I think when we're done, Star Park has some comments that we would like to make as well.

**Pamela Erickson, Member, Selection Committee:** My name is Pamela Erickson, I was a member of the selection committee for this garage management proposal. Let me tell you about the other six members. They were Rick Harris, a certified public accountant, Irma Valdez, a real estate broker and former federal prosecutor, Harry Correspond Mack, former director of the Portland Center for the Performing Arts, Ken Russ, the city's chief financial officer, Stewart Hall, a retired insurance executive, Gloria Lee, director of the Classical Chinese Garden. My background is seven years as director of the Oregon Liquor Control Commission, and most recently I'm running a nonprofit program to reduce underage drinking. We reviewed a great deal of material for this proposal. We reviewed historical materials, management reports about the parking system, and we reviewed the r.f.p. Document. Then we read through all of the proposals and conducted oral interviews with each proposer to clarify their proposals. We then evaluated them based on criteria contained in the city's r.f.p., and individually rated each proposal. Our individual scores were averaged to obtain the recommendation. The two proposals were very close. But in the end, the committee recommends the proposal from Star Park in association with the Alliance of Minority Chambers of Commerce. As required in the r.f.p., we considered the experience of both the organization and the individual staff members, including the ability of the proposal to achieve the objectives of the parking system mission. We also considered cost, references, and diversity issues. So it is my pleasure to present the committee's recommendation to you for approval.

**Bergman:** As you know, each of the proposals that were made were in excess of our ability to pay, principally because of our reduced revenue stream in the garages. That required us to take action under the city's purchasing rules to negotiate the scope of work with the highest rated proposers, so we sat down with Star Park and worked through the issues of scope. We concluded those negotiations yesterday, and I can report that the final cost for the first year of service will be \$848,600, including a \$25,000 contingency for additional services that may be needed during a special event or if we just find we've pegged the standard service too low. These costs are nearly \$400,000 a year less than what our current costs are, and that will help the cash flow of the parking fund considerably, especially since we were spending more than we were taking in in the past. The r.f.p. -- excuse me, the contract that we've negotiated has some reductions in service from what we specified in the r.f.p. itself. In terms of the janitorial tasks, the frequencies and tasks that were identified will virtually all be done as we have specified with only a couple of exceptions that we have reduced the level of service just a little bit in order to fit our dollars that are available. The security services will extend all great number of hours during the week. Monday through Wednesday from 6:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. Thursday and Friday, 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., Saturday

**May 22, 2003**

from 8:00 a.m. To 2:00 a.m., and sunday from 8:00 a.m. To 1:00 a.m. So we have full coverage on -- 4 security and janitorial. Some of the savings were achieved because we were able to leverage an existing contract that we have with st. Vincent depaul for our own security on our downtown buildings, and we'll be sharing a supervisor position with the garages, which allowed for a savings on both sides of the proposal on the contract there. We do have a contingency in that amount, so should we find that we underestimated the need, we can beef up the services within the contract amount that we have. The overall management of the work is more defined than it has been in the past. Some new activity that we'll be seeing look at validation merchant surveying to understand their issues and concerns, additional outreach to those validation merchants, some additional customer service training, some work with the retail community to enhance and find acceptable ways to control costs for the validation program, as well as expand that validation program. As you know, a good deal of that work is hand work in terms of cutting and counting the individual validation tickets, and we need to find a more streamlined way of actually handling that.

But we can't do that on our own without actually working with those validation customers. So that's on the work plan. I want to emphasize that from a customer standpoint and from a validator standpoint, we do not anticipate any validation program changes as a result of this contract. But as I said, we do want to work with those validating merchants to see if there are better ways that can work for all of us. The city council has already in the previous authorization to go to the r.f.p. authorized the mayor to enter into a contract with the selected vendor. Today's action is to approve the selection of the highest-ranking proposal. You had the recommendation from the selection committee.

**Katz:** Questions by council?

**Saltzman:** I have one.

**Katz:** Go ahead.

**Saltzman:** This is not related to the contract itself, but did you mention that the cost will be about 848,000?

**Bergman:** 848,000 a year, yes.

**Saltzman:** Which is 400,000 less than what --

**Bergman:** -- what we're currently paying.

**Saltzman:** Does that mean we have 400,000 to put into some sort after downtown marketing --

**Bergman:** No. We could not have continued to afford what we were paying. We were -- as I said, we had been spending more than we were taking in. We still have -- in terms of our forecast for the future of the funds, still have difficulties that we will need to look at ways of paring our costs.

**Katz:** One of the things we're looking at -- we're subsidizing the -- pdot on this. And so if and when the legislature hopefully enacts the legislation that gives us additional resources, there is a possibility then to move some of the money around and free up some of the money to do the marketing. That's one of the approaches that we're looking at.

**Saltzman:** So we still have sort of two remaining pieces to this puzzle, one is the marketing contract and who's going to do that, and the other is the actual operations of the garage. That's also a competitive process?

**Bergman:** That's correct. The operations contract was a three-year contract with two one-year renewals. The first renewal period comes up the end of august this year. We are currently evaluating what the best strategy is in terms of either rebidding that or extending it for one year in terms of minimizing the risk in terms of this transition that we have at the present time.

**Saltzman:** And then the marketing, doesn't that expire in july?

May 22, 2003

**Bergman:** The marketing contract does expire in July because it was part of the contract that this is replacing. What I have spoken to the mayor about is coming back to the council with a report on what our options are and some recommended actions in terms of the marketing. We are still turning over rocks looking for available resources to make that program work.

**Saltzman:** You're going to come back with us -- to us with a report?

**Bergman:** Yes.

**Katz:** Why don't you share with him what you're doing in terms of trying to analyze what it is, what kind of a marketing approach we want.

**Bergman:** We have been working with each of your offices to try to get some direction in terms of marketing program, what is it that we want to market, how would we measure the success of that marketing program, how would we know that it was accomplishing the right kinds of things, what is the message that we want to convey, how should it tie in, if at all, with other kinds of public marketing that is going on. We know that Pova is doing visitor convention kind of marketing, we know the port is doing industrial marketing, how should the marketing tie in with our economic development strategy, if at all, are there ways of branding the city of Portland so that there is some common theme between all of those marketing efforts, even though they may be targeted to different groups, with a different specific message, but still have the same overall tone to it. Those are some of the questions that we're trying to get at. What we want to do is try to seek input from key interest groups in the community as to what they suggest we might be -- might be answers to some of those questions, to help formulate what those answers might be so that the council can have some input on that.

**Saltzman:** This process will all be done in a timely manner that we can --

**Bergman:** We're certainly hopeful to have that back to the council by the first or second week in June, yeah.

**Katz:** If we don't move quickly enough, there isn't going to be the resources to deal with holiday marketing, and I think that's critical. But what it is, and how we do it, and do we know that it actually performs is really the question. I have looked, thanks for bringing this huge box, I have looked at some of the marketing plans, and would more than -- be more than happy to share it with the rest of the council. I think there are other ways to get the same results, and maybe better.

**Saltzman:** Thanks.

**Francesconi:** I have a couple questions about marketing, but that's in a minute. First, thank you all, and thank the committee especially for this I guess you might even call it historic moment, but for your work that you've done. But about the contract itself, as you know, the issue of the parking garage supporting retail is so important to the vitality of our community. I don't know if you know this, but we actually lost 500 retail jobs last year alone downtown. And so part of it, the question of security has come up, and the question of cleanliness of the garages. So can you talk to us a little bit about, you know, you had to make changes on the 400,000. We don't have the contract in front of us because of the procedure we've approved. But can you talk to us about the security side, and what assurances you can give to the retail community that the garages are going to be safe?

**Bergman:** We tried to analyze the experience that we've had in terms of security when incidences occurred, what we tried to do is target the most security service at those times of the day when we have historically had issues. Never leaving the garages without coverage at all, but staffing up in those times where we had higher incidences that occurred. Those tended to be in the early morning and late evening kinds of time periods, so that's when we've beefed up the security. But again, we've never gone without security during the day. When you cut out that level of a dollar -- level of colors that -- dollars that you're talking about, you can't get a one-for-one service level, so I'm

May 22, 2003

not saying to you that it is exactly the same as what we had before, it is our best judgment that it is an adequate level of security and janitorial. But we have the option within the contract to do several different things. One, if we find that it is in fact inadequate, we can increase the level of service by virtue of a phone call. And the providers can do that, that's within their scope of work within our ability to adjust. So we'll be monitoring that to make sure that we're correct. If we find that there are in fact serious performance problems, where it's not an issue of staffing, but it's an issue of delivery, there is a cancellation clause in the contract, and we can find somebody else to do it if the work isn't being done.

**Francesconi:** Ok. Of all the priorities to watch, I think the most important is the security one from my perspective. Ok. On the question -- not because of any switch but just overall -- that would apply before, after, whoever. The second issue now on the question of the janitorial side, there's -- I have two questions. Is it adequate, and two, are we paying an adequate wage to some people that are the most in need of an adequate wage from my experience? So on -- first, have we reduced the levels of janitors?

**Bergman:** There are some changes in the way janitorial will be done as opposed to the lever. And I say that generally. There are a couple of exceptions where we have reduced the level over what we're currently getting. We went a long time with little if any interior and exterior cleaning of the elevator shaft windows, and so we've slightly reduced that from what we're currently getting. We have four times a year now on the interior, and I think six times on the exterior. We've reduced that slightly, and that's something we have to monitor and see whether or not it's going to be adequate. We think it's going to be adequate, given the -- our understanding of the work. And so we're trying some things out. If they don't work, then we'll have to increase the level of service. Virtually everything else is either going to be performed on the same schedule to the same degree as they have been, what we have done is allowed the contractor to shift work between our locations and other clients that they may have so they're not necessarily at our garages all the time, but all of the scheduled work would be done as scheduled, and then they're available on call in between those scheduled work. So again, we think it is going to be an adequate level. If we're wrong in that, we have the opportunity to increase the level of service.

**Francesconi:** You may have said it and I -- from what number of janitors to what number? I think it might be eight to five. Does that sound right?

**Bergman:** We have about -- I don't have the number that we currently have on with me. We're going to be dropping down to just a hair under five.

**Francesconi:** I think it was eight. On the wages, we have a living wage ordinance. And I think this applies. I think maybe it's for later, the contractor to come up. I think they may be even paying more than living wage.

**Bergman:** The contractor is proposing to pay slightly more than the fair wage requirement that the city has.

**Francesconi:** And there's nothing we can't require union participation, can we on some contracts? I don't think we can legally do that. At least it wasn't --

**Bergman:** It was not required in the r.f.p.

**Francesconi:** I'm not sure that legally we can do that. Is there any way -- this is really for the next group -- it's a good thing to do if we can do it. There's two ways -- one is our living wage ordinance that sets the standard. The other way is if there's more union janitors. And so I guess this is more an editorial rhetorical comment for the next folks. I know they've had some discussions or trying to do that. I guess I'd like to hear whoever coming up next address that subject.

May 22, 2003

**Saltzman:** I have one more question before he leaves.

**Francesconi:** Now i'm ready to talk about marketing briefly. Are we -- it's -- the reason it's important is because of those numbers of the drop in retail downtown and the importance of marketing. It would be good if we could also market, have a strategy for marketing the lloyd center, central eastside and our neighborhood business districts as well. Where there's vital small businesses we should really have a citywide marketing strategy. Focused, you know, the downtown is central city is critical, but we should have a city wide strategy. But -- again, you've been busy, you've been doing a lot, your answer didn't sound a lot more specific than the last time I asked you about this at the time the contract came up. Can we have a firm date by which we'll have this marketing contract?

**Bergman:** I can have the report to you by -- I'll make a commitment to have the report by the first week in june.

**Francesconi:** Ok. And do we have a target amount that we're shooting for? Can I suggest nothing less than 400,000 dollars that you shoot for?

**Katz:** Commissioner Francesconi this is my bureau, remember the conversation you and commissioner Saltzman had yesterday? [laughter] remember that? I'll take care of that, thank you.

**Francesconi:** Ok. I won't respond.

**Saltzman:** Are you through?

**Francesconi:** Yes, commissioner Saltzman.

**Saltzman:** I know we had discussions about this during the development of the r.f.p., but I want to get on the record, what will be the requirements for criminal background checks, particularly with the reference to sex crimes of the management janitorial and the security staff? What will be the -- and what will be the hiring policy?

**Bergman:** There is a two-level security clearance requirement in the contract for supervisory positions. It is one level. All of the employees would be required to have a minimum security check through the Portland police bureau. And there's a higher level for the supervisory positions.

**Saltzman:** And if the check reveals a potential employee is a convicted sex --

**Bergman:** They can't work for us.

**Saltzman:** If they're what?

**Bergman:** I've got a list back at the office. I don't have it off the top of my head.

**Saltzman:** So there's a list of particular crimes --

**Bergman:** Yes.

**Saltzman:** -- that cannot be hired --

**Bergman:** That's correct.

**Saltzman:** Including sex offenses?

**Bergman:** That's correct.

**Katz:** Sex offense assist included?

**Bergman:** Yes, it is.

**Katz:** That's what I thought. Further questions?

**Francesconi:** Just -- I hesitate to do this because it's not my bureau. The other idea, without me mentioning any amounts, is the private sector could contribute money as well in this package marketing approach.

**Katz:** Thank you. Ok. Let's open it up for public testimony.

**Bergman:** I think star park had some comments they wanted to make.



May 22, 2003

**Katz:** Ok. Star park.

**Virgil Oval, Star Park:** Good afternoon. Virgil Oval, with star park. I'm the chief operating officer of star park and on behalf of star park and the minority chambers, we are certainly pleased and enthusiastic to be here before you today. We're excited about this opportunity to bring our collective expertise to managing the city garage system. We want to make it clear that we expect to work closely with the appropriate city staff in running a complete, open book system that provides built-in mechanisms to ensure complete and timely access to all records associated with this contract. All financial and operational documents will be 100% available to the bureau of general services, and all other appropriate city bureaus. Also, we want to assure the downtown retailers that the present validation system will remain the same. The validation system currently in place is one of the nation's most extensive and successful programs, and we pledge to support that completely. I think ron had addressed some operational issues to make that program operate more efficiently, but the balance or the guts of the validation system is very successful, and I think should be supported. It is our goal to work hand in hand with downtown retailers and businesses. We will continue the garage system's mission to support the economic vitality of the central city by providing an affordable system of parking garages which primarily meet the short-term needs of shoppers, businesses and business clients and by investing in other transportation projects. Also I want to make it clear that we fully support the garage system rate structure that encourage short-term parking. I think the whole city garage system and the mission statement have been very good for the downtown community, and has really helped the vitality and maintain the strong vie -- vitality of our central core. One of our priority will be to improve communication between the city and its garage systems manager. We fully understand that we are working for the city, and to meet the system's mission statement is our goal. And we are happy to be in a position to use all of our collective talents and efforts in meeting and exceeding the city's goals for these garages. We pledge to be fair in all of our hiring practices. The r.f.p. encourage us to seek out minority-owned, women-owned and emerging small businesses. This we doll through our association with the minority chambers. Also we have asked ron bergman to assist us in getting the names and contact information of -- as mr. Leonard mentioned in another council meeting, the laid-off school janitors, and anybody else that may lose their position in the change of contract, we want to develop a contact list of these names, including the school janitors, so they can be called forward for interviews as openings occur during the term of this contract. And I just wanted to say thank you for the consideration of our proposal.

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

**Francesconi:** The same but briefer --

**Oval:** We support the marketing. [laughter]

**Francesconi:** Are you going to put some money into it? Huh?

**Oval:** We had to trim our fees so low. But we'll work on it.

**Francesconi:** Ok. It's on the -- talk to the retail community about the security issue and the cleanliness issue.

**Oval:** One thing i'd like to make a comment on that is, we own and operate a privately constructed short-term parking garage, the alder street garage and retail center at southwest sixth and alder, right on the transit mall. And we have many of the same issues that the city garages have. Elevators that open up to the transit mall, about 30,000 square feet of retail space, stairwells that are on alder and Washington street, and the levels that the city garages have been adjusted down to for both janitorial and security are still above what we do in our private garage. And I think if you take a walk through the alder street garage you'll see a very clean, well-lit, safe parking garage, and

May 22, 2003

that's the kind of oversight of the security and janitorial that we expect to bring to the city garage system.

**Francesconi:** Ok. And I guess my last question, commissioner Leonard wants you to do one thing, I want you to do slightly different.

**Oval:** And there's five of you up there.

**Francesconi:** Yeah. And that is, there's three union janitor firms. You could -- you may not -- you may have a business relationship with current -- one option could be you could switch, which is your decision, not our decision, another option could be they could join the union, I guess my request is, could you talk to them about that?

**Oval:** Well, we can talk to them about that. I do want to say about courtesy janitorial, that we are extremely impressed with their dedication and their knowledge of janitor business, their experience in parking garages. I don't know in the r.f.p. If you look at the references of courtesy janitorial, I'm very, very proud to have them as our contractor. But you raise a good point, and we'll certainly discuss it.

**Francesconi:** Again, so I'm clear, and I think -- I think the courtesy janitor, from everything I've heard, everything I've read and everything you just said, is a good employer. The question, though, is, that you can set a standard for others. That's the point that I was -- I'm trying to make in this.

**Oval:** We'll consider that for sure.

**Katz:** Any other questions? Thank you.

**Oval:** Thank you very much.

**Stephanie Mendoza Gray, Executive Director, Oregon Council for Hispanic Advancement:**

Good afternoon. My name is Stephanie Mendoza Gray, the executive director of the Oregon Council for Hispanic Advancement. Our office address is 108 Northwest 9th, we're in the Pearl District above the Pearl Bakery, which is a little dangerous. But I'm here today to support the proposal that is being -- has been submitted by Star Park and the Minority Chamber of Commerce, including the Hispanic Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce, to operate the garage system. I'm going to speak here today about our work with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, which is a long-standing partnership that has been mutually beneficial for the collective community that we do serve. And that is not to say that the other minority chamber of commerce do not have the management and expertise, but the Hispanic Chamber is the one we're most familiar with. We're a private nonprofit organization founded in 1983. Our mission is to help Latino youth achieve a higher level of educational attainment and better employment. Our staff currently serves approximately 1,000 Hispanic students and their families every month. And it's primarily in the Portland metropolitan region, even though we do have a statewide mentoring program as part of our whole system of delivery. One of our core programs with the community to provide work-related training, career counseling, and job placement, and it's from this core program that we have had our strongest partnership with the Hispanic Chamber this. Work is very necessary to ensure certainly the clients we work with are very well prepared to enter the work force. I can say our experience with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce confirms that the organization is very professional in their business dealings, and have mentored and -- met or exceeded expectations throughout the many contracts and partnership opportunities that they have. So the first thing is from a management perspective, they certainly have a very good reputation, and I do have to mention in my former life, I was a small business owner for six years. And so I know what it means to be managing employees, and I really appreciate the sensitivity that certainly the Hispanic Chamber has shown to work force development issues, and knowing what it takes to get the job done. And our other partnership has also been really working on a -- in large part to educate the Latino youth that we serve. So in that

May 22, 2003

regard, I can also attest to their ability to be good collaborator and partners. Certainly in work force development and in educating our kids, you have to have the collaborations and the partnerships and the ability to build consensus to be successful in those regards, because not one entity can do that. So i'm also here to talk and just tell you from our perspective after many years, that the hispanic metropolitan chamber is a good partner and is a good collaborator and is very good at consensus building and working with broad groups of individuals. We are very confident that their excellent track record and management in partnership will reap benefits for this garage system, that they will be part after management team, and I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to that today.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Irwin Mandel, 1511 SW Park Avenue:** Good afternoon. Irwin mandel, 1511 southwest park avenue. I thought I would be an observer, but an issue came up that stirred things up for me, and that's the marketing campaign. The mayor may know probably where i'm going with this. Ok. Fine. You want to market Portland for people to come into the city. Let me suggest that not only this be continued, but expanded to marketing downtown Portland as a place to live. Residential community. This absolutely will feed into the vitality and vibrancy of our retail business downtown, and business in general. And the economic development. All those many years ago when my wife and I were heavily involved in writing the initial drafts of the downtown community associations residential plan, this is something we had written into the plan. In fact my wife came up with some fascinating slogans for the marketing of downtown. We see the beginning of the fulfillment of the 72 downtown plan with the development of the west end now. There are five interesting residential buildings going up between 10th and 11th avenues now. And I hope this is the opening wedge to a real development of the west end and downtown. No one is denying the importance of the central eastside, a lloyd district, or any of the other outlying districts for business vibrancy. But the downtown of this city is the heart of this city. It's where it beats and sometimes it's even the brain of the city. If you strengthen downtown, you will strengthen the rest of the city. So not only don't dump the marketing campaign, make sure it remains, but my suggestion is you expand this to a residential marketing as well, to bring pressure, if you will, upon the landowners in the west end, to get rid of their wonderful surface parking lots, and build some residential housing downtown that will feed into the general vitality and economic success of the city itself. It's a simple -- central core of the city that I think drives the entire city. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Katz:** Good to see you, alicia.

**Alice Dale, President, Local 189, 3536 SE 26<sup>th</sup>:** Good to see you. We hope we'll be joining us, she gets off at three. So she'll be here when she can. I'm alicia dale, the president of local 49. And mike howard is a member of our union, a member of our executive board and a janitor. And alejandra is employed by the company that cleans your parking structures. Local 49 just so you all know, represents 6500 building service and health care workers in Oregon, mostly here in Portland. And first let me say that we support the council's decision to have janitorial -- your janitorial work in the parking structures overseen by the minority chambers of commerce. And I have had some fairly extensive discussions with mr. Jay, who is the president of the african-american chamber of commerce, about this particular project. Our concern at seiu is that we are currently fighting to try to raise the wages and the benefits of janitors who clean buildings in Portland. And we constantly confront the fact that nonunion janitorial firms typically undercut union wages and benefits. They are already very modest. We've talked here today, there's been discussion about living wage. Our members frankly don't earn that even under unionized janitorial contracts. And with the fairly

**May 22, 2003**

modest wages and benefits they have, what happens in the market when it's roughly 50% unionized, which is in -- which it is in Portland, as soon as those wage and benefits go up a bit, the unionized companies get underbid by the nonunion companies, and the losers of the January -- are the janitors who lose their jobs and then move to nonunion wages and benefits. And so to just give you an idea, we're fighting today for hourly wages that are at their top is \$9.50 an hour. Less than fully paid employee only health care, pensions that are 15 cents an hour, when I first saw it I thought it was \$1.50, mistake, no it's 15 cents an hour. And so what we would like -- it may not be possible at this point, is for the chamber to contract with one of the minority contractors that are signatories to the master SEIU janitorial contract. There are three in Portland -- Everclean maintenance, there's skyline building maintenance, and there's coast janitorial services. And all three of those are minority owned firms. Many of the firms, including one source that currently does the work, is not minority owned, but the majority of the workers are Latino. Another alternative if the process is too far along to contract with a union janitorial firm that is minority owned, is for courtesy janitorial to sign on to the master contract. Another alternative, frankly not as good from our standpoint, is for courtesy to meet the contract rates or exceed them, that we provide in our master contract, so that we can be assured the union scale is not undercut by city contracts. And to try to address a couple of issues that were raised, without --

**Katz:** Let me get council's approval to -- approval to extend your time. Go ahead.

**Dale:** Thank you. Without a collective bargaining agreement, there's no enforcement to the terms and provisions of employment. So I have had discussions, and I understand that courtesy intends to exceed the contract rates. Which if they do, that's terrific. We do not have a problem with that. It would be our first experience with that happening in a nonunion environment in Portland, but if that's the case, that would be great. The question is, and I think Commissioner Francesconi raised the question about, is it even legal to say that there would be an obligation to contract with a union contracting firm. I'm not sure whether it would be illegal to do that, but I do know what has happened in a number of contracts is to say that certain standards have to be met. And that there has to be a neutral and binding dispute resolution process in place. And if an employer is willing to put that in, that's fine. That's one way in which public bodies have addressed that issue in the past. The final issue I want to say is, there are currently eight workers that clean your parking structures. It was my understanding we're talking about four, but it sounds like there are five staff. That's nearly a 50% reduction in the staff. So I would ask you just to monitor that carefully and I think there obviously is an intent to try to maintain the standards that you want, but I would think that would be quite challenging with that reduction in staff. So let me at this point turn it over to my Mike Howard to make a few comments.

**Michael Howard:** My name is Michael Howard, I have been a janitor and a union member for 22 years. And the lead janitor at the Wells Fargo building across the street. I'm also a shop steward and a delegate to the Western Region Building Service Leadership Assembly. Over the past 22 years, I have seen janitors' ability to learn decent wages and affordable health care become eroded by nonunion janitorial companies, underbidding union contractors. They are able to underbid because they pay poverty wages to their workers, do not provide health insurance, and often fail to follow wage and hour laws to avoid paying janitors overtime and give them breaks. Portland cleaning industry is so overwhelmed by nonunion companies, our city has the lowest janitorial wages of any major West Coast city where there is janitors unions. We have lunch hour just as for -- to help turn that around. And that is why we are here today. We applaud the city's move to contract with minority businesses, and we are glad that the janitorial contract may go to a small minority business. On the other hand, the great majority of SEIU Local 49 janitors are immigrants and people

**May 22, 2003**

of color. And eight of us, the majority of whom happen to be people of color, stand to lose jobs cleaning the city garages. I would also like to mention that three of the cleaning companies signed on to our collective bargaining agreement are minority-owned businesses. In addition, even if the new janitors earned decent wages under the city's living wage standard, without a union contract, these janitors would not have job security if their employer loses the contract. They would not have a grievance procedure or seniority protection, all vital to our workers, particularly low-wage workers like janitors. We encourage the new contractor to uphold the standards we are trying to raise for all janitors in Portland. And sign on to our master janitorial agreement. We understand the need to contract with minority businesses. We just want to ensure that minority workers and work for these companies have the security of a union contract like many other Portland janitors.

**Katz:** Thank you very much. Why don't you all scoot down. Go ahead.

**Ingrid Translator for Alejandra Lopez:** I'm ingrid, i'm going to be translating from her. Hi, my name is alejandra lopez. I'm a janitor. I work for one source. I'm a clean and safe janitor. And she just got off shift to come here. I am also a member of seiu local 49. I'm a single mom with six kids. I'm here today because eight of my coworkers stand to lose their jobs cleaning the city, the city's garages.

**Lopez (through translator):** I also want to add that clean and safe is one way for exconvict or people coming out of the people system to enter and integrate themselves into this society, and it's a step that's really important to them. I want to encourage the new contractor and the city council to honor seiu local 49 justice for janitors campaign to raise their wage and benefits standards for all of Portland's janitors. Right now janitors who are union make \$9.50 an hour. We have health insurance, individual health insurance, as you can imagine, to pay for all of the co-s of living, bills, insurance for your family, to pay your rent, and all the other bills, for an entire family is really difficult, even with this wage. However, we'll never be able to raise the standards for our families and ourselves if nonunion contractors continue to dominate the market. Many paying -- most paying workers seven to \$8 an hour with no health insurance. My fellow Portland janitors, union janitors and I are reaching out to nonunion janitors and are taking our campaign to the public and to elected officials.

**Lopez (through translator):** It's critical that city janitorial contracts do not undermine or effort to bring justice fair wage, affordable health care, and --

**Katz:** Thank you.

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

**Gale Castillo, Executive Director, Hispanic Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce:** Good afternoon. My name is gail castillo, i'm the executive director of the hispanic metropolitan chamber. My address is 5750 southwest alfred street, Portland, Oregon. Mayors and members of the city council, the hispanic metropolitan chamber is very excited about the opportunity to work with star park, the african-american, and the philippine-american chambers on this very important contract for the city of Portland. This contract represents an historical milestone. This is the first time in 20 years that a new contractor will be working with the city of Portland to manage the garage system services. This is the first time that the city of Portland will contract with such an innovative partnership. Star park and the minority chambers. The four organizations will form a contract management group that will oversee all subcontracts, job hires, training and oversight, and communicate with the city of Portland, and retailers. And I just want to add to that that as you probably all know from previous experiences working with us, we are strong advocates for equality for all members of the community. Star park and the minority chambers are deeply committed to supporting the economic vitality of the central city and the entire city of Portland. Having operated

May 22, 2003

a retail business myself in downtown Portland, I understand personally how important it is to have accessible and affordable parking that is clean, safe, and friendly. This is what keeps shoppers coming downtown. Our commitment to you is to strengthen the existing systems so shoppers will continue to come downtown and local retailers and our other businesses will continue to prosper. We look forward to working with the city of Portland, and members of the business community that rely on this important service. Thank you for your consideration of our organizations. We ask that you vote in favor of the award to star park and the minority chambers. And one last thing I'd like to say is that as you know, the safe and clean program is a separate program, and it's not part of the program that we're discussing here today that was raised previously. Thank you very much.

**Katz:** Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*: Thank you, gail. I'd like to echo what gail just said. But most of all I wanted to thank the -

-

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

**Jaime Lim, President, Phillippine American Chamber of Commerce:** My name is Jaime lim, I'm the president of the philippine-american chamber of commerce. The most important I wanted to tell you here is that I wanted to thank the council for making this a fair, making this fair for everyone, especially us to get us on the table and be able to start talking about fairness and diversity within the city contracting. We thank you very much for what you've done to do this historic event, and hopefully we'll have more of it in the future. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Roy Jay, President, African-American Chamber of Commerce:** Good afternoon. Roy jay, president of the african-american chamber of commerce, 7739 northeast 21st in Portland. Eight, nine months ago is when we started on this long journey. Probably even longer than that. I'm glad that we have got to this point. I'm never assuming anything, you know. I think as I've told the media and our colleagues and told everybody else downtown, I want you as being council people to look back on this two years from now, three years from now and say, we made a very good decision. This is a business decision. I think we come to the table with the skills to be able to manage these garages. I'm very confident in our subcontractors to deliver a quality product at more than a minimum wage. We have talked with them at great length. I'm sort of excited about some of the things that they're going to be able to get some subsidies also from our national office of the african-american chamber to help with some of the benefits. So the numbers that you see are even more than what is required, but there is going to be more because this is a first in the country. So we've got some other resources to be able to bring to that table. So I don't want to spend a whole bunch of time. Vera? Just like that. It's a thing between me and vera. I appreciate the time.

[laughter]

**Francesconi:** Ok.

\*\*\*\*\*: It's nothing, really.

**Harold Williams, Chair, African-American Chamber of Commerce:** I'm chair of the african-american chamber. I want to thank the mayor and the city council for moving in this direction. I also would like to think -- thank our team star park and the hispanic chambers, filipino chamber and of course the african-american chamber for having the wisdom among us to team up. And it's been very positive and creative. You are great leaders for our city. We are good business people. We will show you in the quality of work that we bring forth, we are the people who are underpaid more than anybody else, because we've been fighting not just on this issue, but many times we've been before this council to look for fairness for all human kind. And anybody that is in the employment arena know that's our commitment is for positiveness and to ensure that all of us

May 22, 2003

participate in the bounty of this city. And the team that we put together will give you good management, will give you quality work, you will have clean garages, and they will be safe. And what we will give is what we talk about in the city of roses. We brag about it, we have these beautiful fragrances, what better bouquet than you have sitting here now. That tells it greatly. And we thank our team and we thank all of you for entrusting us, and we hope that you vote in our favor, and thank you very much.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Moore:** That's all.

**Katz:** Anybody else? Come on. We haven't seen you two in a long time. Come on up. You should have been here last night.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Oh, did you miss me?

**Katz:** You would have enjoyed it.

**Lili Mandel, 1511 SW Park Avenue:** Lily mandel, 1511 southwest park avenue. I'm usually up here criticizing you for not just giving lip service to diversity, and I accused you all of that. I included everybody one time. And I will have to say, this contract would really -- I will have to apologize and say, this is the right road to really true diversity. I think you should -- I hope you will of course vote on this, you should certainly do that, and I think you should be commended. This is wonderful. This is wonderful for us all. Thank you. [applause] [gavel pounded]

**Katz:** Is there anybody else? If not -- oh, are we going to be treated: [laughter]

**Wilbur G. Hardy, Jr., Senior Pastor, Highland United Church of Christ:** Thank you very much, mayor. My name is pastor wilbur g. Hardy jr., the senior pastor of highland united church of christ. I just want to express that this is landmark. I pastor a church where 28 -- actually seven years ago we had 28 members. Last easter we had 1,517. A phenomenal success, considering it comes from the heart of inner northeast Portland. The key to our success is that we approach ministry from three different angles -- the mind, the soul and the body. We teach our young people that we no longer want welfare, but we want to farewell. When we take a look at this and we read in "the Oregonian" what is taking place, african-americans, hispanics, asians, we see in the paper an opportunity that goes beyond basketball and music. We see a partnership where diversity is really being put on the front lines. This should you vote in favor of it, and it be successful, you will find that you have marchers and an army behind this where we are now setting an example for our future generation. Thank you for this opportunity to present this. Thank you for considering it. And I hope and pray that you will vote in favor of it.

**Katz:** Thank you, pastor. [applause] [gavel pounded] all right, you're all out of order: Anybody else? All right. Then I will accept a motion to accept the proposal before us.

**Leonard:** I move that we accept the proposal

**Katz:** Second?

**Francesconi:** Second.

**Katz:** Roll call.

**Francesconi:** This is an historic day. First reason it's historic is that we're doing -- this is about business. This is first about business. And it's about business in two ways. Number 1, how the government should be doing business. Which was said here by gail castillo. In 20 years, the first time we competitively bid this? That's not the way government needs to do business, with precious resources like parking garages that are publicly owned. The second -- this is also about business because we've got to remember here, folks, we went through a competitive bid process with competent people evaluating the bid, and it was awarded to the person who won the bid. And so that's what we're following. And so that's good. The second reason, because they came up with the

May 22, 2003

best proposal. The second reason it's historic is not a good reason. But it offers a third historic opportunity. Second reason this is historic, folks, we're in trouble here economically. And this isn't -- it's not just the downtown retail businesses, and it's not just the owners of those businesses, it's the workers of those businesses, whether union or nonunion. By coincidence only, I happen to go to central city concern last week, one of our best nonprofits in the city, and -- by coincidence, had those other janitors that they would refer to the other contractor. They don't anymore. So we had a meeting talking about work force and how their members were feeling. So afterwards I had a little conversation and I asked them, what is it the city could do for you? And I expected low-income housing, drug and alcohol treatment, they said, create a better business environment. So there's more entry level jobs for the homeless. That's what they said. So above all else, these parking garages are critical to the economic vitality of the central city and the downtown, and when you're losing 500 jobs just in the past year, it's essential this be done right. But we have the group that can do it right, and who's aware of all the issues. So the second thing that's historic, we are in a terrible time now. The third reason it's historic, if you can use public resources to also increase wealth, to minority business folks as well as workers, you can accomplish more than one objective at the same time. You can help our city economically, and then you can make sure everyone participates in that. And now we have an historic opportunity to do that. The other maybe best of all is we can create some business relationships, because boy, our social relationships sure haven't worked, among people that -- unlike each other, who are brought together in the workplace around business, a common agenda, we can create those relationships so that we can proceed together. It was said here up at the table, gail said it, here's an opportunity to outreach, to do work, so we can get to know one another. My only request is, I still -- it wasn't so much in this hearing, but I believe, especially that relationships between unions and minorities work together. I was not happy at this hearing we had a couple of weeks ago. I found on the pit -- the divisions between the minority community and labor. I found a martin luther king quote that I wish that I had had then, and I just want to say it now -- african-americans have -- are working people. They benefited more from the labor movement than anything. So my request to guardian is, you're a good company, but just talk and look at this union issue so that we can form some relationships on this as well. It's just -- if you do it, you do it, if you don't, that's up to you. But this is for all the reasons here, this is a very good thing, and it could move our city forward. We can progress together. Aye.

**Leonard:** This contract is being awarded because it's the best bid. Roy jay said it. This is a business decision. But having said that, it is unique that it occurred, and it could be unique and precedent-setting for a lot of cities and a lot of states that this council takes this action today. But having said that, there are those that may not want this contract to succeed for their own purposes. I know everybody involved, some people I know real well, joanne and I sat together for two sessions in the Oregon legislature, some I don't know quite as well, but know of. And I know that everybody involved in this contract is going to be aware that you didn't just win a contract, you're setting an example, and performing the role of a model for many, many people in this community. Including myself. I grew up in inner northeast Portland and i'm very proud of the integrity of the contract, the integrity of the work behind the bid. That we're going to approve today. And I just want to echo one thing that commissioner Francesconi said. I hope as we in -- as we honor the integrity of your hard work in putting together this smart contract, that you honor the integrity of those that work for you and those that represent them. Aye.

**Saltzman:** I'm very pleased to vote in support of this contract, and I want to recognize as has been said, the many -- many of the unique aspects of this new relationship. I think it does, although it's certainly not the first time the city has acted this way, and it certainly won't be the last, it is an



May 22, 2003

example of how we can certainly use our public resources to give more opportunities to ethnic minorities throughout the city. I'm sure when you have this contract star park and the minority chambers will help breed the future businesses, future business owners, women and men who are going to be bidding on future city contracts as they get put out for competitive bid. That is one of the premises of our process, is to have a level playing field, to make sure everybody has an equal shot. And it's always sometimes looks good on paper, doesn't always work in practice, but I think the city has worked hard and long to make sure it does work good in practice as well as on paper. I do think -- I want to go on record as saying, because I have sent letters to other businesses urging them to keep -- use union janitorial service that's I do want to go on record saying I do hope that courtesy will either sign the master contract or the workers will consider organizing. Because I do think unions play a pivotal role in this area. Finally I want to recognize this is not only a collaboration of the hispanic, asian-american, african-american communities, but there is another minority group here, that's some stalwarts of the jewish community, and that's the schlessinger family. Although they're often not perceived to be a minority, I think we all would agree face discrimination in our own right as well. There's certainly been a lot of polarization on an historically strong relationship that the jewish community has had with the african-american community in particular. But this is a chance I think to help cement ties that have been long tarnished and need to be built stronger again. And I know that those ties will be strengthened with the hispanic and asian-american communities as well. So this is a unique partnership in that record too, and I want to thank everybody, I don't know how you all found each other, but it's great that you found each other and came forward with a winning bid that i'm pleased to support. Aye.

**Sten:** And they're waving in the background. It's been said, but competition is very good, and I think this is a forward-looking contract. I think it's an exciting new set of allegiances that have a lot of potential, and to be blunt, I think that the way that we've approached downtown and some of these services and marketing, I think on all sides, the contractor, the city government, have gotten steal and predictable, and you don't create excitement with the same old approach, whether it's perfect or not. And this is a new approach. And I think it's a new day. It's very exciting. I met with the members of the minority chamber groups at the front end of this, and they were making the pitch of how they wanted to be treated fairly, and I said, of course. But I want to see you come in with something exciting. Because the end of the day, that's what's going to win this thing. And I think they did, teaming up with star park. It's a new approach. I think it bodes well, and I hope you'll bring new energy and new ideas, and I know you'll be responsive, but you'll look hard at how we run things and find way to add value, because the economy is in the toilet, and as much as it -- as simple as it is, these garages are critical, and they really do need to run well and get people downtown and make the downtown experiences feel terrific. And I don't see any reason you can't do that. There were under the breath comments about qualifications, it was just nonsense. I think this is a qualified and strong group that I think can be a key part of bringing us back looking forward, and get us back to where we want to be and really create some excitement about a new approach downtown. So I think it's terrific. I'm absolutely glad to support it. When you hear it from every member of the council, it's good advice, I have worked very closely with the justice for janitors campaign, and there's a very strong argument that it's in the employers' interest to get those things nailed down. I would say that what's worked really well is when the issues get worked through as opposed to confrontational. And I know there's good conversations have started since this all came through, and I have no doubt that that will happen in gad faith, and I think it's in everybody's interest, but I want to put in my own plug that i've worked with both these groups, and i've found it to be in everybody's benefit. I have gone to people that i'm friends with who are

May 22, 2003

building owners and said, I would not out of a pressure standpoint, but out of a personal interest and on both sides recommend that you talk closely with this group, because I think they do really solid work. The ultimate testament is the quality of the employees they have brought to the table who are choosing to work with folks affiliated with this campaign. So I think it is worth an exploration and i'm confident that will happen, because you're all methamphetamine of good faith and goodwill. It's with great pleasure I vote aye.

**Katz:** I'm not going to give you any advice. You don't need any advice. You figured it out. And you figured it out based on a business plan. Period. End of story. And your business plan was about this much better, but it was this much better. And because of that, we're excited and thrilled to offer contract to, as commissioner Sten says, a new allegiance of a coalition of people of color, people of faith, different faiths, and that's wonderful and exciting, and you'll be measured by your performance, and all of you know when we talk about performance measurements what that means, and I wish you much success, so when you come back in five years we can say, you did it, you did a good job, and come back and put another business plan together for us. So good luck. [gavel pounded] aye. [applause] [gavel pounded] all right. Wonderful. 511.

**Item 511.**

**Katz:** All right, folks. [gavel pounded] everything is fine?

\*\*\*\*\*: The findings have been reviewed.

**Katz:** Karla, did you read it?

**Linly Rees, Deputy City Attorney, Office of the City Attorney:** We're going to need to put a couple things on the record. Let's wait until it quiets down a little, please.

**Katz:** All right, everybody, clear the chamber: We still have one item. [gavel pounded]

**Katz:** Were still doing business. All right, folks, we're losing control of the situation. Karla.

**Rees:** Linly Rees, city attorney's office. I need to tell you that the findings were reviewed by staff and by the city attorney's office and approved. They are submitted to you. The one thing we need to do in terms of the motion, because of the earlier motion was to include a reference to the good neighbor agreement, we've amended a condition of approval. So i'm going to suggest a motion you make to approve this is, deny the appeal of center neighborhood association, and uphold the hearings officer's decision as modified by the city's findings and decisions.

**Katz:** Who wants to second that?

**Leonard:** So moved as stated by the city attorney.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Katz:** Did you have anything you wanted to add? Roll call.

\*\*\*\*\*: Absolutely not.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] thank you, everybody. 6:00 tonight. [gavel pounded]

At 3:38 p.m., Council adjourned.