



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

OFFICIAL
 MINUTES

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

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

Commissioner Leonard arrived at 9:34 a.m.

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

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

COMMUNICATIONS	Disposition:
<p>1322 Request of Absolom Tamar Stiletto to address Council regarding the principles that this country was founded upon still continue to be cherished by all peoples (Communication)</p>	PLACED ON FILE
TIME CERTAINS	
<p>1323 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Create a local improvement district to construct street improvements in the SW 19th Avenue Local Improvement District (Hearing introduced by Commissioner Francesconi; Ordinance; C-10004)</p>	PASSED TO SECOND READING DECEMBER 3, 2003 AT 9:30 AM
<p>1324 TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM – Adopt the recommendations in the Russell Street Improvement Planning Project Final Report (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Francesconi) (Y-5)</p>	36184
<p>1325 TIME CERTAIN: 10:45 AM – Summary Report on Interim Alternative Enforcement Approaches for Environmental Zone Violations (Report introduced by Commissioner Leonard)</p>	CONTINUED TO DATE TO BE ANNOUNCED
CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION	

November 19, 2003

<p>1326 Vacate a certain portion of the Alley in Block 34, Portsmouth under certain conditions (Ordinance by Order of Council; VAC -10010)</p>	<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING DECEMBER 3, 2003 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p align="center">Mayor Vera Katz</p>	
<p>*1327 Accept a grant from the State of Oregon, Department of Transportation for reimbursement of police traffic patrols in specific work zones (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178032</p>
<p>*1328 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County and Washington County, contract with Williams Aviation Consultants, Inc. for \$6,510 to evaluate the Port of Portland Noise Study related to Portland International Airport and authorize payment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178033</p>
<p>*1329 Compensate employees working out of the Sandy River Station for standby time (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178034</p>
<p>*1330 Authorize agreement with Communication Management Services to provide public pay telephone vending services at the Smart Park Garage locations (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178035</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Jim Francesconi</p>	
<p>1331 Set hearing date, 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, December 10, 2003, to vacate SE Main Street west of SE 26th Avenue (Report; VAC-10012) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">ADOPTED</p>
<p>1332 Declare the intent of the City to initiate local improvement district formation proceedings to construct street improvements in the SE 128th Avenue Local Improvement District (Resolution; C-10007) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">36183</p>
<p>*1333 Designate four Heritage Trees and remove one tree from the Heritage Tree List (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178036</p>
<p>*1334 Issue a permit to the City of Gresham to construct, operate and maintain Linneman Station building and trailhead and related facilities within a portion of the Springwater Corridor (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">178037</p>

November 19, 2003

Commissioner Dan Saltzman	
<p>*1335 Authorize contract with Ant Hill Marketing for \$160,000 for Marketing Services for the 2003-2004 Integrated Multi-Media Marketing Campaign on behalf of the Regional Water Providers Consortium (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	178038
<p>1336 Authorize a contract and provide for payment for the construction of water mains in the Kings Heights Mains Package (Ordinance)</p>	PASSED TO SECOND READING DECEMBER 3, 2003 AT 9:30 AM
<p>*1337 Authorize contracts with Cedarwood School, Columbia Slough Watershed Council, Island Station Neighborhood Association, Northeast Coalitions of Neighborhoods and the Sabin Parent-Teachers Association to provide services related to the Community Watershed Stewardship Grant Program (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	178039
REGULAR AGENDA	
Mayor Vera Katz	
<p>*1338 Accept a U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, Homeland Security Overtime Grant to support community policing and homeland security efforts (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	178040
<p>*1339 Authorize a contract with Breakwater Security Associates and provide payment for professional and technical services for the assessment and enhancement of Portland's Enterprise Information Security environment (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	178041
<p>1340 Adopt the Ninth Amendment to the South Park Blocks Urban Renewal Plan to establish authority to acquire three properties in the vicinity of SW Montgomery Street and 4th Avenue, including by condemnation if necessary (Second Reading Agenda 1317)</p> <p>(Y-4; N-1, Saltzman)</p>	178042
Commissioner Jim Francesconi	
<p>1341 Consider vacating the Plat of Columbia Villa and all public streets within the Plat of Columbia Villa, at the request of the Housing Authority of Portland (Hearing; Report; VAC-10014)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	APPROVED CITY ENGINEER PREPARE CONTRACT

November 19, 2003

<p>1342 Create a local improvement district to construct street improvements in the Lents III Extension Local Improvement District (Second Reading Agenda 1311; C-10006) (Y-5)</p>	<p>178043</p>
<p>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p>	
<p>*1343 Authorize the Office of Sustainable Development to collect fees to facilitate Business Energy Tax Credit Pass-through Agreements (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p>178044</p>
<p>City Auditor Gary Blackmer</p>	
<p>1344 Approve the appointment of members to the Citizen Review Committee for Independent Police Review (Resolution)</p>	<p>CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 3, 2003 AT 9:30 AM</p>

At 11:09 a.m., Council recessed.

November 19, 2003
Closed Caption Transcript of Portland City Council Meeting

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

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

NOVEMBER 19, 2003 9:30 AM

[Roll call]

Katz: Communications, 1322. Come on up. You have three minutes.

Item 1322.

Absolom Tamar Stiletto: Good morning. Ladies and gentlemen. Praise to all the united states government, are we sitting comfortably? Let us begin. I ask for forgiveness from all who are offended and insulted by my diatribe intended to be peaceful means. Unconstitutional, unchristian plots against all the people's of the u.s. and the world. Festering in the darkest recesses of the minds and imaginations of per dishes power structures in government and civilian sectors they were intended for who are allied with the beast, the anti-christ. Number 34. As in as scripture states, the struggle for souls won. For all true christians and all other lord above fearing facing in government and civilian life, I apologize one and all for my un-christian remarks and comments. Crumpets, anyone? You're buying. I thank salvation army for guarding us all by unwanted influence in the u.s. Military, and it's object -- its desire for a rise of misplaced power of all citizens to usurp the power of we the people into their hands as stated best in code red of homeland security. As it's obvious a pen is an excellent instrument to fix a man's attention. Right, thomas, thomas, I like the preamble to the u.s. Constitution and its contents and amendments as they were in mr. Bill's presidency. Prior to your current agenda and amendments under the guise of protecting the people's freedom and power of democracy to obvious to all educated to transform elected public civil servants of we the people into exact opposites of elected public servants that I of commander in chief of the lord will not tolerate. Nor will my little brother who number as is -- whose numbers are as enumerable as the stars above. Israel's 12 tribes who enjoy the cherished by all, king james version bible and the u.s. Constitution just the way it was before the current administration was elected. I sincerely feel government -- that good government is the outcome of private virtue and truth is the glue that holds government together. The happiness of society is the lord thy -- the happiness of society for the lord thy god is a jealous god is the end of mortal man's government. Let us continue to carry forward the banner that 39 years ago fell from dr. Martin luther king's hands because when the rights of one man are threatened, the rights of all are threatened. May the grace and peace be multiplied. My father's name is peace. The prince of peace, jesus christ, as verified by the israeli government, I work for you all. Ok? When you are ready with the lord i'm to fly out of bakersfield airport to australia I love you all, and more power to the people.

Katz: Thank you. Ok. Thanks. Consent agenda. Any items to be taken off consent agenda? Anybody in the audience wanting to take an item off? If not, roll call on consent agenda.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] all right. 1323.

Item 1323.

Katz: We have one remonstrance? Ok.

Andrew Aebi, Local Improvement District Administrator: Good morning. Andrew aebi, local improvement district administrator. Before you is the l.i.d. formation ordinance which creates the southwest 19th avenue local improvement district to improve southwest 19th avenue south of evans and to improve storm water drainage on the street. I would like to thank the bureau of environmental services for providing the funding for storm water cost to help defray the cost of the

November 19, 2003

project for property owners. If council approves this project at the second reading, which would be held on december 3, we are planning to start construction in approximately six months which would make this the last winter with inadequate storm water drainage for residents along the street. Earlier this year we received a complaint from one of the property owners on the street that several of his apartments had filled up with up to 2 inches of water, resulting in extensive damages which had triggered an inspection by the fire bureau on the livability of the apartments. For these and other reasons, the recommendation is to move forward. We have received one remonstrance representing 27.6% of the assessable area in the district. Therefore, council retains jurisdiction to decide whether to form this local improvement district. If you wish to sustain this remonstrance, you may simply vote no on the ordinance at the second reading, which will be held on december 3. If you wish to overrule this remonstrance, you may vote yes on the ordinance at the second reading as it includes the directive to overrule this remonstrance. Thank you.

Katz: Ok. Thanks. Questions? All right. Karla? Anybody sign up? Ok. Come on up.

Katz: Please turn off your cell phones. Thank you. Identify yourself for the record and you have three minutes, and your time is viewed on the screen.

Craig Cooley: All right. I'm craig cooley, a property owner on southwest 19th street. I have -- see no problem there with the street, the drainage. My six-plex is doing just great. The cost is a tremendous amount. It's way more than any benefit i'm going to receive from this. So, gosh, please, the \$35,000, it's just going to kill me. I'm going to -- that's supposedly what i'm going to have to pay for this. And I am going to have to try to put it back on my tenants and get it out of my tenants, do everything possible to do that, and of course that's not in -- I know the interest of council for affordable rents, but, boy, it's just going to kill me. So, anyway, i'm totally, totally opposed to this. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Let me just add, you have more units than anybody else on the street. Is that correct?

Cooley: Right. Right. And I know barbur rents is opposed to this as well. They were supposed to be here too, but I think there's a traffic problem this morning.

Katz: Thank you.

Jason Sieminsky, Davis Wright Tremaine: Good morning. My name is jason sieminsky. I'm from the law firm of davis wright tremaine. I'm here on behalf of scott and Cora Edwards who also have property that would be part of this lid. The edwards never received actual notice pursuant to o.r.s.223.389. That is mailing of the l.i.d. proposal to their residence or delivery to the residence, and therefore this remonstrance is quite late. But we ask that the council accept this written remonstrance because of the fact that mr. Edwards didn't know about it until quite late. The main reasons for the edwards' objection are as cited in the document i've presented to you -- I should mention one other thing about the document. You'll notice there's a fax signature of notice of authority from mr. Edwards. Again, because of the late notice that he received as outlined in the document, I didn't receive his signature until over fax just this morning. I thought he was going to be able to appear, but because of business reasons he couldn't get away. The main reasons that the edwards would object is -- this is on page 2 of the document -- three-fifths of the area in terms of property ownership oppose the l.i.d. that is combining the edwards' percentage ownership with mr. Cooley's. That would bring it to 64.3% in objection. There's no special benefit, number 2, there's no special benefit to the edwards' property created by this l.i.d., and three, that the estimated assessment -- this is in the alternative -- if the estimated assessment were to pass, the edwards can see without conceding there's any special benefit, the amount of the assessment far exceeds any special benefit that would flow to the edwards. Quite simply, their business in this area has no access to 19th street. The frontage of the business is on capitol street, so there's no benefit flowing to the edwards. Thank you, council.

Katz: Thank you.

November 19, 2003

Aebi: Andrew aebi. The issues mr. Cooley has raised in his remonstrance have been addressed in exhibit e, the last exhibit on the ordinance. With respect to a remonstrance from barbur rentals, they cannot file a remonstrance. They have signed a waiver of remonstrance. They have no ability to file a remonstrance whether timely or not. The issues they have raised --

Leonard: Excuse me --

Aebi: -- were raised five years ago.

Leonard: And why is that?

Aebi: Because they have signed a waiver of remonstrance in conjunction with an action.

Leonard: Didn't I understand they are saying they hadn't been notified?

Aebi: I was going to address that. City code provides three methods of notification -- mail notice, posting notice and publication notice. All three of those notification methods were used. The other property owners received notification. We sent notification to barbur rentals --

Leonard: Let me help you a little bit. If they're saying they didn't get notified and you're saying they signed a waiver filing a remonstrance, how do we explain that apparent discrepancy? You're saying somebody --

Aebi: Oh. Thank you, commissioner. The waiver and the notification are two separate issues. The waiver was signed in 1991. So the waiver was signed 12 years ago. The notification was sent out on october 28. Now, the notification --

Leonard: Of 1991?

Aebi: October 28 of this year. 2003.

Leonard: How could somebody sign a waiver before a notification was sent out? I'm sure i'm missing something here.

Aebi: The waiver binds that property owner and all future property owners to be in support of an l.i.d. When one is formed. Basically what happened is we had 11 years lapse between the time the waiver was signed and today, when we're proposing the formation of the l.i.d..

Leonard: Our city attorney sees me looking at him.

Ben Walters, Sr. Deputy City Attorney: Two things, commissioner leonard. The -- as has been explained to me, a prior property owner did sign, or one -- a property owner somewhere in the chain of title for this property did sign a waiver. It was recorded in the chain of title, and can be identified through an examination of the county records. And as such, any subsequent property owners are on notice that the property is responsible for participating in an l.i.d. And are on notice that they will have to participate and if they come into that, then they're bound by the waiver. That's the first -- so the waiver is an enforceable obligation on the property.

Leonard: But is it -- is it good policy to have somebody waive something that may occur in the future the cost of which is unknown?

Walters: Well, we do that all the time in various guises.

Leonard: I'm sure we do, but is it a good idea?

Walters: That's a decision for the council to make. And then secondly, it's my understanding that the edwards are the owners of barbur rental, and therefore were aware this was going on. So i'm a bit puzzled about the argument made that they were not notified and did not have notice that this was moving forward.

Leonard: Thank you.

Aebi: What I would suggest is I would be happy to prepare a memo to council that addresses the issues raised in this document that was brought in this morning, and i'd be happy to submit it to council in advance of the second reading on december 3.

Leonard: It would be helpful for me if I could hear a response from their representative.

Katz: Don't go away, I have a couple questions for you too. Go ahead.

Sieminsky: The issue of waiver is addressed on page 3 of the memorandum of letter we sent to you. The waiver as in the block quote stated, planned by the city of Portland and designed to serve

November 19, 2003

this property emphasis on the word "serve." Because the edwards' business, the boulevard rental business, does not have access nor frontage on 19th street, this improvement would not serve the edwards' property. There might be some slight ancillary benefit, but it's not designed to serve the property, and therefore the waiver does not go to this issue. Mr. Cooley has indicated to me that he was the person who actually told mr. Edwards of this l.i.d. Proposal very recently, and would testify that mr. Edwards again didn't know about it until very recently.

Saltzman: What is the rule about the percentage of ownership that object, they mentioned it was 65%?

Aebi: The rule by charter is 60%. There's 60% objection, but because barbur rentals has waived their right to remonstrate, council retains jurisdiction as to whether to form the l.i.d. I might also point out that --

Saltzman: So the 60% does or doesn't govern this situation?

Aebi: There is no way for this l.i.d. To fall outside of council's jurisdiction because barbur rentals property is all waived in favor of the street improvements. So it's council's decision whether to form the l.i.d. Barbur rentals cannot file a remonstrance. Their area cannot be counted toward that 60% threshold.

Saltzman: Oh, barbur rentals was included in that figure?

Katz: Let me see what i'm looking at in exhibit d, am I looking at the five properties there that --

Aebi: Yes.

Katz: Ok. And we have two of them or three of them that have signed waivers?

Aebi: Two of them, yes. Excuse me, two of the barbur rentals, both of the rental properties.

Katz: Which properties have not signed waivers that would be impacted?

Aebi: The only property in this l.i.d. That has not signed a waiver is mr. Cooley's property. There are two other properties in the l.i.d. That were waived that petitioned in favor.

Katz: Ok. And then mr. Cooley's come in with --

Aebi: 27.

Katz: So just one property wants this, actually -- forget the waiver issue. I understand it. But only one of the properties wants this l.i.d.?

Aebi: Two of the four property owners are in favor of this l.i.d. So we have half the property owners that are in favor.

Katz: And they are the smaller properties.

Aebi: Yes.

Katz: Rentals as well? And the rents for those would be increases would be relatively small?

Aebi: Those property owners have not discussed with me whether they would raise rents.

Katz: Are they h.a.p. Properties?

Aebi: The burden for those properties that petitioned in favor would be higher because they have fewer units over which to spread the assessment or the cost of the assessment.

Katz: Are they h.a.p. Properties, housing authority --

Aebi: Oh. Mr. Lamb's property is a section 8 rental unit and h.a.p. Inspected that unit and found problems with the storm water drainage coming off the street and flooding his property. What I also heard from the other property in favor is that they're having a very difficult time renting those units down there with the condition of the street and the street flooding and all of that.

Katz: Ok.

Leonard: I need a little education on the whole waiver process. Why would a property owner ever -- why would it be in the best interest of a property owner to ever agree to a waiver?

Aebi: The reason it would be in the interest of a property owner to sign a waiver is in the absence of the waiver, we could require them to do the entire street improvement by themselves at their own expense. So there is a nexus between the impact created by the development and the need for street improvements. And in lieu of requiring those street improvements at the time that develop

November 19, 2003

development occurs, we ask for a waiver and come back later and form an l.i.d. In which case the cost is spread not only among that property owner, but the other benefiting property owners in the l.i.d.

Leonard: So is it -- am I -- is my impression correct, then, that some people might agree to a waiver not because they want to waive their rights, but the alternative is worse finance they don't sign the waiver? So they're giving a couple bad choices?

Aebi: Could be. But I think we have a very --

Leonard: Today it's clear that if there were no waivers involved, that the majority of the property owners would not support the l.i.d.?

Aebi: The majority in terms of the assessable area, yes.

Leonard: Would that be enough to stop the l.i.d.?

Aebi: If barbur rentals were not waived and they had filed a remonstrance, a timely one, yes, they could have stopped the l.i.d. They are waived and did not file a timely objection, so it doesn't apply.

Leonard: Thank you.

Katz: Let me ask another question with regarding the housing authority project. Are those section 8's?

Aebi: Yes.

Katz: So the renters would have an increase in their rent.

Aebi: I am not -- it's not clear to me whether or not their rents would be increased. I'm not sure how that works.

Katz: Well, who pays for the improvements?

Aebi: Well, the landlords pay for the improvements. My hope is that the vacancy rates of all these units on the street will decline and the landlords will make it up through increased rent.

Katz: We don't know that.

Aebi: We don't know that.

Katz: Ok. All right. All right, everybody. You can read the material and get additional material and make up your mind next week.

Leonard: I'm not -- I will do that. I'm not fairly inclined to support this based on what i've heard so far. Unless something else that I look at helps, I don't think I can get there.

Aebi: Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. All right. This passes to second and we'll see what happens next week. 1324.
Item 1324.

Katz: Come on up.

Francesconi: We have some citizens here to testify along with steve and the department of transportation. Let me briefly say this street, russell street, is as the first sentence in this plan says, russell street was the main street of the original city of albina and connected the lower albina industrial area and the river with the commercial hub. Then we went on with -- to build a freeway, do memorial coliseum, clear commercial and residential areas, and we destroyed a neighborhood. But now it's coming back, and light rail and the investment there is helping with some pedestrian opportunities. This is an important freight street as well, and so it's a coming back neighborhood, led by the citizens here who are going to testify. Go ahead. Thanks, steve.

Steve Iwata, Portland Office of Transportation: Thank you. Good morning. My name is steve iwata, i'm with the Portland office of transportation. I'm here with phil harris, the project manager for the project. The russell street project was funded by odot as part of the t.g.m. Grant program. And actually this was --

Katz: Bring the mike closer to you.

Iwata: This was part two of two t.g.m. Grants. The first t.g.m. Grant was with p.d.c. On the interstate station revitalization study. At that point in time, we were looking at the stations between

November 19, 2003

kaiser and lombard. And doing that -- during that process of community members from russell street approach pdot and p.d.c. Staff to do a similar type effort for russell street, so as a result of that, we applied for a second grant through the state and was awarded that grant, and we had two projects now completed. The first one was the killingsworth project that was before council in september, and now the second project here is the russell street project. So with that i'll have phil harris here do an overview of the project.

Phillip Harris, Office of Transportation: Thank you. Good morning, mayor and commissioners.

My name is philip harris, I work for the office of transportation. I'm going to do a power point slide show which will give you some background about the project. As steve said and commissioner Francesconi also said, russell street is an important east-west street. It connects the elliott neighborhood, the hospital, lower albina industrial area, and several diverse land uses along that street. There's an entertainment district, a conservation area at mississippi and russell, and institutional uses such as emanuel hospital and some residential uses as you go east of williams avenue -- north williams avenue.

Leonard: Is that the street the white eagle is on?

Harris: That's right.

Katz: You know it, huh?

Leonard: I've heard about it. [laughter]

Harris: Also as stated by commissioner Francesconi, russell street was the original main street of the city of albina, which was before it consolidated with the city of Portland in 1991. Much of the commercial developments of that street was tied to the streetcar system. Best example of that is the commercial area which existed at the hub of russell and williams, and the picture shows a famous building which has the onion dome, which is preserved in the park. Over the years the whole area has been an area for different ethnic groups. Polish, germans, scandinavians, african-american community. So it's had a lot of ethnic diversity. Starting in the late 1950's, early 1960's, the area went into decline, and as a result of some projects such as memorial coliseum, construction of i-5, also the clearing of land for the emanuel hospital expansion, some of which never happened. So in the last 10 to 15 years it's been new initiatives aimed at revitalizing the area. These have included the albina community plan, the elliot neighborhood plan, also p.d.c.'s renewal areas. And also the Oregon convention center renewal area. And then the latest part, reinvestment in the whole of north and northeast, the interstate max project. The impact interstate max brings new challenges to the street. It's been stated the area is especially in the lower albina area west of i-5 is an industrial area.

I want -- one of the challenges is, it's going to be increased pedestrian traffic when max comes. How do we accommodate that traffic and still accommodate the truck traffic which is very important to the businesses down there? Another challenge is i-5 itself, the bridge over russell, is very dark underneath and it's a disincentive for people to walk up and down the street. So the project's area goes -- is russell street going from interstate, originally to williams, but we expanded the project to include russell street east of williams to martin luther king, because that seemed the more natural gateway to the area. And also it includes the short stretches of mississippi and albina avenues between russell street and the max station on interstate avenue. A big component of the project was the community involvement. We had several hundred people take part, we tried to use a nontraditional approach because we tried to reach a diverse population. It includes door-to-door canvassing and focus groups, the project materials were printed -- as much as possible were printed in five different languages to include more people. As we were doing the surveys, we are interpreters available via cell phone. At the public workshops, to get people to take part, we had child care available at the workshops, and we also included some catering from local businesses. During the process we had a community advisor committee, made up of 20 people. They met regularly and helped guide the planning process. The first event was a community walk. It was followed by a design work station. During these two sessions, participants were able to outline

November 19, 2003

challenges they saw in the project area, and half the facilitators and -- make notes and sketch down ideas. After the design work session, which took place in july of 2002, the project team analyzed the input from participants and they saw there was a number of common questions and issues that need to be dealt with. So on -- in september 2002, we had a workshop, an alternative prioritization workshop, where we addressed those question and outlined three alternatives, alternative concepts for russell street. People made comments on those alternatives. About a month later, it was followed by an open house in which we presented what we called the preferred option, which is an amalgamation of the free concepts talked about. Also at this session people were able to look at some more details, looking at things like what kind of street lighting they'd like to see along the street. This slide show is the preferred plan and concept, which was called -- i'll explain the ribbons with places in just a second, but the theme for this was to have some kind artistic reck nation of cultural identities to the area. And also to recognize that the mix of industrial commercial and institutional uses would be recognized at places along the street. So the elements of this concept, this includes new sidewalks with markers placed intervals along the sidewalk, and also included new street lights, ornamental street lights.

Katz: They're nice.

Harris: And some of those have already been installed as part of interstate max project on albina and mississippi avenue. So this would be an option to continue that lighting all the way up russell street.

Katz: By the way, I think the notion of your ribbon sidewalk markers, you actually -- are you actually going to do that? Do you know what i'm talking about? It's on page 36.

Iwata: That would be the intention. If we get money to proceed -- this is a plan. We have no funding for construction.

Katz: I know, but if -- once the funding is there, do you envision the -- those street markers?

Iwata: Yes.

Katz: That's a very nice, very nice touch to -- it's almost like the freedom walk in boston. We should be using it downtown. Freedom trail. Whatever. Anyway. Go ahead.

Harris: Another important place is the i-5 overpass itself. That presents the biggest challenge because if you're familiar with that street as you walk along russell street, i-5 presents this barrier. It's very dark underneath. So one proposal that's shown here is not only to brighten the other side of the freeway, possibly art under there and maybe use the freeway structure itself as an archway, which would be a more welcoming structure than it is now. Moving a little east, where the vacated portion of the street meets russell street, maybe a new entrance to the park on the south side of the street and the connection with emanuel hospital along the vacated portion of the avenue. A little to the east of that on the north side of the street, the proposed -- ha we call the promenade, various intervals along the sidewalk, a number of benches, maybe some historical plaques explaining what was there before. Possibly water fountains. And then to mark the edges of the -- of russell street, the entrances is an idea to have a gateway at martin luther king boulevard and interstate avenue and also at the max station. The example here just shows the design -- it's just a conceptual design, but the design is based on the dome, so we're trying to recognize the history of the area. The project also looked at a set of improvements which were a little bit toward the edge of the project area. This included looking at school crossing safety, and the major area of concern was the interception of williams and stanton. We had several of our public meetings at immaculate church, which is on that corner, and the concern was based around trying to cross that street, that intersection, where the side streets don't actually meet up. And the traffic causes concerns. So it creates a traffic light, and we had traffic investigations group actually look at the area and do traffic counts. The counts didn't warrant a traffic light. What we propose there is some -- is curb extensions with a marked crosswalk, and several people here are going to come and testify how they feel about that situation. But building from that, recommendation to the c.a.c., which is c.a.c. Supported, was that williams

November 19, 2003

and vancouver should be studied and -- in a more comprehensive fashion, because to deal with one intersection at a time really pushes the problems into the other intersection. We need to look at the areas as a whole project. So recommendation is to sort of find funding to do those intersection and do them as a whole. The approximate cost of the improvements outlined in this project is about \$3.3 million. Some funding opportunities may exist through other agencies such as p.d.c., there may be some opportunity to do what was done around light rail, so maybe opportunities to increase that treatment along russell. There's been some incremental improvements in the past few months, some curb ramps were added in the area of russell west of interstate having -- the i-5 overpass, that's probably going to be -- need a targeted funding strategy, but it also presents an opportunity for the community and local artists to work at having some kind of artwork or attraction at that location which would encourage more pedestrian traffic.

Katz: Can I make a suggestion there? We had -- when we were looking at covering the i-405 in the freeway, there was talk about using it as an opportunity to deal with water run-offs and plantings, so i'm going to take a page from my commissioner to the left, to do -- begin thinking of stretches of green freeways if that's at all doable. The tendency is to paint the posts -- the poles or do some elegant graffiti, but think of it so that it has a dual function as well.

Harris: I think this is a great opportunity for something like that. To summarize, the plan improves access to interstate max for pedestrians. It's also an opportunity to build upon those improvements which have already taken place. And improved pedestrian environment, and also lessens the impact to the i-5 overpass as a barrier and make it more attractive. An important thing about the plan is also to -- the idea of preserving truck access through those businesses in the lower albina area. We've had several conversations with business owners about how their trucks use the street, and we try to make sure that any improvements wouldn't adversely impact truck access. And as much as possible try to preserve on-street parking, which is important to the businesses in the lower albina section. So that concludes the slide presentation.

Katz: Thank you. Let's get the lights on. When do you perceive funding available to do this?

Iwata: It's not clear at this point. The first step is to adopt the plan and get it formally adopted into the t.s.p., and then start making requests. As phil mentioned, we're looking at different alternative funding strategies, whether we could get some funding through the urban renewal district as well as some federal funds, so we're looking at different avenues.

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

Francesconi: I have one question. The truck issues, can we keep trucks out of this area so that it's more pedestrian friendly? I don't think so.

Iwata: No. This is an industrial area, so what actually phil and cathy mulder, one of our engineers has come up with is a -- is a truck friendly curb extension. So we --

Francesconi: I saw that.

Iwata: We tried to design a curb extension that narrowed the street for pedestrians to improve safety, but also accommodate the turning movements for trucks. And so they spent a lot of time working with the business owners, trying to design a truck friendly curb extension.

Francesconi: So this is also a designated freight route as well?

Iwata: And a truck district as well, and the t.s.p..

Francesconi: That would be good if we can come up with a way to do both at the same time. It would be great in our areas of our city as well.

Iwata: That was the balancing act we had, to accommodate the trucks as well as try to improve the pedestrian environment.

Katz: You almost have a parallel. I may be stretching it a little bit, but we're thinking of in terms of the creation of rooms on the transit mall, with different -- probably it's much more obvious on russell where you have areas that are very commercially focused, and then other areas that are less. So you want to think about it as different rooms.

November 19, 2003

Iwata: Exactly.

Harris: It's kind of referred to, commissioner Leonard talked about the white eagle, but there's that whole area which is kind of becoming more of an entertainment district, at least in the evenings. There's the white eagle, and some new residents there too in that area. So -- but it's kind of a theme for that, at least during the evening hours. But you've still got industrial uses during the day.

Francesconi: Is there enough housing near by to make this thing go from the pedestrian standpoint? It's our elimination of housing that hurt it.

Harris: There's no housing, especially at the west end of the project area.

Saltzman: It's not residential.

Harris: There is one apartment building north of the Russell and Mississippi intersection, and there's a couple of residences there, but on the whole there's not a whole lot of housing in that section. As you go east, in the area of Emanuel Hospital and east, there's much more of a residential neighborhood. There's the remains of the -- what used to be a much larger neighborhood I guess.

Katz: Ok. Let's open it up. I'm sure there are citizens from the citizens advisory committee.

Katz: How did you get involved in this one?

Lenny Anderson: I'll explain. My name is Lenny Anderson, I live in northeast Portland. I work with businesses on Swan Island, but I've been meeting informally with the businesses in the lower Russell area on a group that is trying to focus -- maximize the effectiveness of the interstate light rail project in that part of Portland. I'm on the advisory committee will -- citizens advisory committee for the light rail in north Portland, and I was on the governor's I-5 task force. What really inspired me was the opportunity to walk for -- down Russell Street for 150 feet under I-5 without a single ugly, not one single light. Not even an ugly mercury vapor light. And you look up and down the interstate light rail, and you see that every one of our stations is on an arterial, cut off from a whole population, whether it's Bridgetown in the north, or Elliot in the south, or Humboldt in the middle, by the freeway. When the freeway was built, not much was spent on making those overcrossings or undercrossings anything but ugly, ugly, not functional. I pursued this with the businesses down there as well as elsewhere on the alignment, we need to do things that make it possible for someone to get with some comfort to the light rail we've built on the other side of the freeway. So I think of this as another piece, just like Killingsworth, in trying to fix what was done to north Portland with the construction of I-5 40 years ago. The task force came up with the idea that, hey, if any more work is done on I-5, 1% of that project cost should be set aside for restoration. And we don't know when that might happen, if it happens. I would urge you, members of the council, mayor, to continue to make clear to ODOT that the city believes ODOT has an obligation to fix these overcrossings and undercrossings, and make them presentable, decent places where people can walk and bike and use toll get to light rail to get to the other half of their community that was cut in half. So we've got two really great plans now at Russell and Killingsworth. I'm -- I know there will be more work done. Bridgetown has the same problem, Hayden Island has the same problem, and I really urge you to not let this one hold the feet to the fire, that they haven't finished I-5 yet. They've got the sound walls up most recently, but they still got to fix their overcrossings and undercrossings, and it's their deal. It's their deal. And one last aside in my last 10 seconds. Curb -- freight friendly curb extensions are explained in here in some detail, and it's a wonderful win-win in the sense of making a street safer to cross and making it easier for trucks to make difficult turning movements. So that was a great addition to our repertoire.

Katz: Go ahead.

Pauline Bradford: Good morning, mayor and city council members. I'm Pauline Bradford from Elliot, back again to talk about something. I think the plan, the Russell Street plan is wonderful. It will be a great addition to the city. I have one concern that I need to bring from the residents on Williams and Stanton and around that area. And that's that corner. That intersection. It's a very -- it's a safety issue that's only going to get worse. As soon as the Broadway Bridge is open fully and

November 19, 2003

light rail is going, there will be more traffic coming down there, and that corner has 40 tractors. There's the church, there's the grocery -- four detractors. The church, the grocery store, the park, the main entrance to emanuel hospital. That area has accidents constantly, and besides that, there are -- there's parking with the big trucks to service the store, there's a bike lane on there, and there's a light down at russell, and the nearest other light is fremont. And between russell and fremont, the traffic has a tendency to decide oh, I can go. Because after all, they had a light at broadway, from broadway to russell. And then from russell to fremont. And there's that 30 mile-an-hour deal going there, and you have -- it's just nothing to slow them down, really. And you also have at cook, around there, traffic coming off the fremont bridge floating in there. So that section is in bad need of something really strongly done, and for the members of the congregation, people who live around there and people in elliot, i'm asking you to please look at a light. Even if the count was below when they did it, i'm sure when the bridge opens, light rail is going, that count is going to go up. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Gary Hampton: My name is gary hampton, i'm one of the few residents that live in the area. My wife and I own a building on russell. I've been involved in this project from the beginning. I think overall the plan is just great. The only problem I think I see is just the stanton and williams section. There is a lot of involvement with that, especially with the urban league as far as traffic on that street and we thought officially that cathy mulder we would put the flashing yellow light there. We have a park there and the church. The father there is very concerned about his people coming to the church and getting across that street. And also the nighttime activity for users of the park. And I think that as our neighborhood grows and dense identifies more, I think the -- the light is definitely going to be needed in order to get those people safely to that park, because that's what our whole goal is, to get people to use facilities in our neighborhoods. And if they can't get over to that park safely across that street, then they're not going to use it. Back to russell street, like I said, overall it's a good plan, and my wife and I have -- we've lived in our building since we purchased our first piece of property in 1992 down there, and we actually live in our building. My wife is a counselor - - counselor at a school, and she works out of our building. We moved into that area, I grew up in an area -- we moved back into the area in 1985, and there's always been that disconnection between lower albina and elliot. And one stumbling -- stumbling block is that underpass. It is just the scariest place at nighttime, because there is no lights there. I've seen that lower part of russell go from barbed wire and no one there, to what it is now. We had mcmenamin's, we have mint, we have witnessed mere, we have ripe, we have will the coffee shop, it's definitely changing, and in order to get people to come down, there are those few trail blazers that do come under that overpass at nighttime, which is pretty scary, but if we can get odot to come to the table to look at that, that would definitely provide a better connection for people to walk from elliot down through lower albina. So we hope you guys look at that and really -- I wish you would use stronger language, because it definitely needs it. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Alem Gebrehinot: I own queen of sheba, and i've been in the neighborhood since 1985, 1986. We've been -- the neighborhood has changed quite well. Russell street has come very well, but I think it is more work. It is so nice and very famous popular as we draw our customers from all over Oregon and Washington. For us it's very easy to say --

Katz: Let me interrupt you. You want to identify the address and the hours that you're open and what it is so that you can advertise it?

Gebrehinot: Ok. It's queen of sheba, it's an ethiopian restaurant at 2413 northeast m.l.k. We're open seven days a week for dinner, and open for lunch tuesday through saturday noon till 2:30. It's an ethiopian restaurant. We draw customers from all over Oregon and Washington. And we are very proud to be there and we have made ourselves home. M.l.k. Is a nice street, but we don't have

November 19, 2003

any foot traffic customers, and we hope to change, and to make a nice short neighborhood, very warm. It could be very entertainment center. It has very nice spots. The minute has very nice bars and the last few years has really made customers very comfortable. People have come from all over. And we see forward to be more so, nice entertainment center for the areas around there. It would be beyond Broadway. People would come more to that short nice neighborhood. We look for work very well for the district to be that short and nice neighborhood. And I think you will be worthwhile to put the effort and to beautify that short famous street. It needs -- a working environment. If people could walk in that area, it would be very nice. I see -- I live in the neighborhood, so I see quite a lot of people walking, jogging in that area, and a lot of people walking and jogging to the community center. I think beautifying it is really very essential. It has quite a lot of traffic right now, but I think if it's beautified, people would walk into that neighborhood and people deserve that neighborhood not only jamming traffic, but if it's beautified, neighborhood people would benefit out of it. And if it would help us all. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Brad Perkins: Good morning. Brad Perkins, I own a company called Perkins Development Realty. I work in the inner northeast in my projects. I'd like to commend the city and the neighborhood for coming up with this plan very well thought out. I was involved with one of the meetings they had. One of the problems that I see with this plan, though, is the lack of a major institution's part into the redevelopment of this area. I'd like to draw your attention to page 6 and 7 of this, especially regarding page 7 under decline. I think the role of Emanuel Hospital in this plan really needs to be taken a stronger look at. I know they participated in this plan quite a bit, but it doesn't address the opportunity that the neighborhood could have here to take another look at this area as to what they have planned for the future. I guess I'm encouraging the city to put something in here regarding step 2 to this plan. Not just the implementation of this valuable project, but without their involvement, there are pieces of land especially between I-5 and Williams on the north side of the street that block -- that half-block area you have plans to have cut-outs in the sidewalk that could very well be mixed use retail, clinic, housing, right up to the curb, excuse me, right up to the edge there where the property line is. So it really begs the question, what is going to happen in this area regarding the hospital? The other two items on a periphery could involve the neighborhood as well. We've talked about the future location for the baseball stadium, I think the best location there is where the school district site is. That enters into the discussion as well, and also a major contention I've had all along is the location for the maintenance yards underneath the Fremont bridge.

Rezoning that area to e.x. Rather than industrial really needs to be taken a strong look at. So --

Francesconi: Everybody in the audience is agreeing with you on the baseball stadium. They're all really excited, I can see it. [laughter] They all want to testify in support of it:

Katz: All right, all right, that's enough.

Francesconi: You just extended the life of this hearing, let me tell you.

Katz: That's enough.

Perkins: With those questions out there, this is a good beginning point with the plan, and I would -- especially the main item, what is the hospital going to do in the future now that they've built another facility in Vancouver? It seems like the land, tremendous amount of acreage they have, they tore it down in the 1960's, and specially took -- essentially took away a vibrant part of the neighborhood. Let's bring that back. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Anybody else?

Moore: Yes.

Lee Pearlman: Lee Pearlman, 512 Northeast Brazee Street. Another part of the Elliot neighborhood. The plan went into some of the history of the Elliot neighborhood, good and bad. Unfortunately, people, other people seemed to constantly have an agenda for this piece of ground. You might say we've recently found someone in the industrial area who is a fan of putting the

November 19, 2003

baseball stadium at the blanchard site. They can't wait to tear down their plant, lay off their people, and put in a parking lot. That will serve that facility. The first of many. We're not looking forward to it. Another thing you might consider is that, just to put the record straight, in terms of recent history, in planning for the light rail line, elliot spent three years trying to create the best service with the least impact. The latest iteration of it we got to see where tri-met had proposed to put it, where it was easiest to go, least service to the neighborhood, and they said we hope you like it, because this is where it's going to go. What we got out of it is the russell street improvement project. We would say please at least give us that.

Katz: Let me just add, I don't want to get off on the baseball stadium, but a, we don't have a finance plan put together yet. B, we certainly don't have a location identified, so tell the gentleman that if he's anticipating it being there and he's ready to rip down a building and create a parking lot, it's probably a little bit premature.

Pearlman: Well, we're -- I am one of the stakeholders and I want to put mine through its heart.

Katz: I know where you are on it. I've heard from you before. Moving right along.

Francesconi: That was a good quotable line. Do you write yourself into the columns? How do you do that? [laughter]

Chris Reisner: Morning, mayor and -- I just wanted to -- i've been -- my name is chris risener, I live on north williams right on the corner of russell and williams. Where I live is right across from the very corner of the start of this -- the east end of this project area. I'd actually like to see the planning project or the improvement project moved to include the area between williams and m.l.k. It's another two blocks of area that could stand some fairly serious improvement in that area. But I just wanted to say that i've been part of this project sort of from the beginning. I was on the advisory council and attended a lot of the meetings where a lot of the planning was done with tours of the neighborhood, and the planning that went into a lot of this. I have no feelings one way or the other on baseball stadiums or any of that, but I really would like to see this project take place, the improvements take place in that area, because it's an area that -- I didn't realize this very well until I was involved in this planning project, but there's still seems ton a lot of hard feelings about the -- what happened to the neighborhood during the emanuel hospital project whether all the housing was torn down and so on. And I think this would be a good way to make -- to make sort of make amends for some of what happened there. I'd also like to say that the growth in the lower albina area, with the mcmenamins, the white eagle, the new restaurants that have been put in, the widmer brothers brewery, the light rail, that whole area is going to be quite a bit more connected, and I noticed that some curb cuts have been put in in the area between williams and at least the white eagle, I know there's a couple of areas a little bit west of there that still need curb cuts. But I think that that's a big improvement, and i'd like to see the same thing happen on the north side of russell. So I think that this is a project that needs to take place. I'm really looking forward to seeing how it comes about, and having the improvements that will make the area a lot more usable for pedestrians for the people that live in the area, and also for the people that work in the area. The connection is not there right now, and I think that there's a real opportunity for some major improvements as far as getting the areas sort of consolidated to make it coalesce into a much more usable and livable and area where people would like to spend their time, even from outside the neighborhood.

Katz: Thank you. Anybody else?

Moore: That's all who signed up.

Katz: All right. Does anybody have any questions of staff? I think it's absolutely critical that if you -- whether you have the ribbon markers or not, that you have historic markers on the street so we can continue to remind ourselves about the past, and what not to do again, and celebrate the past but now also have the ability to celebrate the future. All right. Roll call.

Francesconi: Well, I guess i'd like to thank all the citizens for their work on this. We like to think with history, you know, progress is made and we're moving kind of forward. But here we're going -

November 19, 2003

- we've gone backwards in this area. It wasn't just the minnesota freeway, which divided this area, but the effect of that. It was -- these were -- this was the heart of the black community, and this is where the black-owned businesses were, and there were a lot of them right here. And it's almost like now there's this -- people have forgotten that, and it's like we have to create something new that's never existed in Portland. When the reality is, we had it all along. We also had a streetcar here that connected, and it was a community that we frankly destroyed with our land use and transportation policies. One of the best things i've seen in the last few years is how we've crossed the racial barrier as we relook at killingsworth, we relook at interstate, we relook at these projects and people are really working together to do that. So I guess I want to thank you, because it holds some hope that we can kind of hang in here. In terms of how do we execute this, it is going to take emanuel hospital's participation, as the document says, especially for phase ii. It's going to take that. We're going to need help from p.d.c. As well. This is a transportation plan, and there's some things we need to do through transportation. But to take advantage of the whole area we're going to need the private property owners as well. And we have a good property owner there in emanuel who's done a lot for the community, and we're going to need their help to help execute this now. And we're going to need some help from p.d.c., which is overstretched in this area. And we have a good urban renewal committee that can help us prioritize. I do have a little good news to share, and will be doing more of this in the future, because the last transportation plan was killingsworth, and my job was to come up with some financing to help execute it. And we're making progress. We have some money. Not enough, but we're working on some partners to help make that happen. So I promise that I would do that. I guess i'm telling you now, because I don't have a strategy to execute this one. But one at a time, here. But we're working on it, because we know to keep faith with our citizens we have to be able to deliver. I think as we move forward on this, the loan assistance, the marketing for p.d.c. As we tie our small business effort, that also has to be integrated into the land use and transportation so that we can try to give opportunities to businesses that used to be here without any government help before we wiped them out. Thanks for all your work on this, and fred, thank you for your work on this as well. Philip, i'm sorry. I apologize. Did you a very nice job on this. Aye.

Leonard: This is very interesting for me, because I live -- I grew up not far from here and used to walk after school starting in the 1960's, mid-1960's to tubman grade school as my part-time janitor job after school. So I used to walk right by williams and russell, the building that was removed by emanuel hospital, where I was born. And it was a very interesting place to walk by in the mid-1960's. I don't know that I would have recommended it to anybody but I thought at 15 and 16 years old I was invulnerable, and it -- being destroyed by emanuel in the 1960's has left a scar in that neighborhood that -- I appreciated the comments about emanuel participating, particularly on that block, because it seems to me that's a block that could be the heart of the neighborhood if you had the right kind of housing and commercial kinds of occupancies. And done in a way that reflects the character of this -- the building that i'm looking at that was removed. I also really appreciated the -- I was going to ask a question about what we could do with the overpass, and then sure enough I saw a picture of -- that you had designed that -- the elliot name to be on the overpass. So I think this is a -- one of those plans that i'm personally very interested in and excited about. And I appreciate all the hard work that went into it and don't worry, would I never vote to put a stadium at this neighborhood. I will in lents, however.

Saltzman: This is a beautiful plan, and I like the improvements. I can just hardly wait for the day, though I guess we don't know when that day will be when we can actually realize these improvements. But it really with help connect the street and reestablish it as the preimminent thoroughfare it once was for the city of albina, and make it a preimminent thoroughfare for the city of Portland. As it is becoming through its important job creation, important jobs that are there now, the growing commercial sector, and just the opportunities to do more that this plan can -- the

November 19, 2003

fundamental structure improvements like transportation improvements can often generate. It's a great plan, and let's make it happen. Aye.

Sten: Of course I tend to support it, and I want to thank everybody who's here and for a lot of reasons, but the main one, I think this is an area that's both been neglected, and setting aside the baseball stadium debate, I think it's -- this is an area that could develop and lose some of the really - - there's some really cool things about the fact that it's been neglected. I'm not quite saying it as articulately as I like. It's a neat area of town and it's going to need the active involvement of everybody here to allow some development to happen, some transportation improvements to happen without just writing the area off. And it becoming just one more place. So I really think your efforts are well focused and well timed, and we're glad to support them. Aye.

Katz: As everybody knows, when I first became mayor I said there were two neighborhoods that I wanted to focus on because they were ignored by previous councils. One was old town-chinatown, and the other one was the albina area northeast Portland. And i've never given you the reason for it. As I look through the plan, it's the fact that old town-chinatown, though actually it was south of there where the chinese immigrated, and built a part of the city, but if you look at the history and it's in your report, of this particular area, that -- it was immigrants who moved here first. It was the greek, the russians, the polish, the italian, the germans, the irish, the scandinavians, and it was the home for our african-american community. And those are the communities that usually get left out. And so that was the commitment, and I want to thank transportation and commissioner Francesconi and pdot for clearly understanding that they have to come to assist in helping us redevelop this area with the community support. P.d.c. Is a player, as you all know, most of the money that was available went into the light rail. And the dreams and the hopes of the community that were discussed at that time sort of are going to have to be slightly delayed. But we're going to try to find the resources to -- at least be able to move ahead on some of these transportation plans as well as having conversations that I will have with p.d.c. On the emanuel hospital and what the future of those vacant lots are. So congratulations. Take care of the freeway. There's some wonderful exciting opportunities bring young people who can dream and who have a vision that some of us have left behind somewhere and have them identify what they would like to do to take care of storm water run-offs and gardens from the freeway, using the storm water run-offs, the historic -- and the historic markers as well in the neighborhood. Aye. [gavel pounded] ok. 1325.

Item 1325.

Leonard: Before I got here in may 2002, apparently the council had some hearing regarding environmental zone violations that resulted in the then council opinion excessive fees and fines being levied. The council directed the bureau of development services to develop an alternative. They've worked on doing that, and we still have a little bit more work to do. So -- but I want to remind the council that you all asked for this to happen, so i'm not going to take the heat for this one. So we're going to pull it back -- [laughter] make sure you're all consulted with, and that everybody's concerns are addressed and then we'll bring it back.

Katz: Translation -- do your homework. Understand the issues. And so that we can have a hearing on it. [laughter]

Sten: I think there's an imposter.

Saltzman: Part of our homework was informing us who started this, as randy said, was us, not him.

Leonard: Thank you.

Katz: All right, all right. [laughter] commissioner's asked to have this brought back to your office to --

Leonard: Yes. We're bringing in more, we have talked to everybody in the community up until now. We're going to talk to them again.

Katz: Ok.

November 19, 2003

Leonard: Until we thoroughly exhaust the issue.

Katz: Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [gavel pounded] all right. Regular agenda. 1338.

Item 1338.

Katz: Do I have anybody here from the police bureau? Come on up.

Susan Crabtree, Police Bureau: I can answer questions, or did you want just some general information?

Katz: Just general information.

Crabtree: Ok. It's \$1.3 million grant. It's primarily for overtime associated with homeland security. It can't be used for equipment or materials and services or anything. The overall goals are to increase community policing partnerships through senior neighborhood officer outreach, reduce fear of crime by targeted missions, addressing violent and drug-related crimes. And develop personnel through training for crowd control or terrorist threats. There's a \$327,000 city's cash match, which the bureau is using to access program revenues received in the last fiscal year that were recognized by the office of management and finance.

Katz: I'll explain that. I wanted to make sure that we weren't expending any new monies for the match, and so when the council agreed that those bureaus like police and fire, that save their money and did not expend their full money, they get a percent of that savings, which is a council policy, they've used that portion of those savings to match it.

Francesconi: Thanks for explaining that.

Katz: All right. This is primarily will be used for overtime purposes when there are -- when there are security issues that have been identified, but there's a little bit more flexibility I think in the grant to use it for activities on the street as well. So thank you. Anybody want to testify on that? Roll call.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 1339.

Item 1339.

Matt Lampe, Chief Technology Officer: Good morning. I'm matt lampe, the chief technology officer managing the bureau of technology services. I'd like to begin by thanking the council for your ongoing support to our efforts to improve the efficiencies, security, and usefulness of the city's community -- computing and communication environment. As new technologies continue to be introduced, and as we continue to move toward services that require ongoing connection with citizens and businesses through the web, we also have to face the fact that we're not immune from risks of computer viruses and worms of attacks and of the potential for theft of critical information. Over the last couple years b.t.s. Finds itself spending time firefighting these threats. Almost every security professional will identify the greatest threat really is the result of poor policies and practices regarding information security inside an enterprise. The city is recognized through both the o.m.f. Strategic plan and the five-year information technology strategic plan and in the current budget the need for us to look at information technology security, and in this budget, you authorized an information security assessment. And this ordinance is basically to contract to carry that out. Is a contract with breakwater security associates. They were selected through an r.f.p. Process where we reviewed 10 proposals that met the mandatory requirements. We had an evaluation team that included p.t.s. Employees and the Multnomah county security officer and breakwater was the select -- selected as best qualified to meet our requirements for the assessment. The assessment will include both administrative and physical reviews, looking at things like policies, data and asset classification, personnel security, some of our physical environments on the computing environment, and then some very specific technical issues that, network access controls, account management, etc. So we thank you for authorizing us to move forward with this kind of

November 19, 2003

assessment, we think it will give us a lot of useful information, help us prioritize where we need to make security investments, and we ask your support in passing this ordinance.

Katz: Thank you. This is especially important when we go online to do a lot of online work with customers. So, ok. Anybody want to testify? Roll call.

Francesconi: Matt, this is obviously a terrific thing. You're doing a very good job. I'm hearing about it from a lot of different places. So now that i've buttered you up, if you could consider doing me a favor. The united way needs some help with their information technology. I volunteered you to just look at -- give them some advice.

*****: I will be in contact with them.

Francesconi: Thanks. Aye.

*****: As long as I can do it after my vacation.

Francesconi: That's fine. Thank you. Aye.

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

Katz: We'll talk. Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded]

Francesconi: As a volunteer. Just as a volunteer.

Item 1340.

Katz: 1340.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: I guess I want to emphasize as I think the whole council, if necessary. This is not something we like doing. This is not something we want to do, this is something we rarely do. And by that i'm talking about condemnation. It's a last resort type of measure, and it can only be done if there's a terrific -- if there's a substantial public purpose. Here in reading through that plan that you presented last week, the montgomery blocks as part of the university district, this offers our city and downtown and our city a tremendous opportunity. We've been focused on south waterfront, we've been focus order the river district and the pearl, but right here, here's an opportunity for students, working people to have housing in the heart of our city that's not the pearl that they can afford, and we can benefit an institution that I really think the long range future of the city is tied to Portland state. So for those reasons, we should grant this power of condemnation, but we should also say that only if necessary as a last resort. Aye.

Leonard: Speaking for myself, i'm just glad I get to vote to condemn something. Aye. [laughter]

Saltzman: Well, I guess i'll be the dissenter here. I thought long and hard about this as you know. We asked some questions last week, and I guess I -- I like everything p.d.c. Envisions for these properties, I don't see the compelling public purpose here that would justify condemnation to me. I think it has to be used extremely judiciously, and we have been very careful as a city council to tiptoe around condemnation in areas where it means a lot, like in the interstate area where we established that urban renewal area. We seem to be lapsing back into more of a condemnation isn't such a bad tool after all. And I guess I for one am not there, unless it's a friendly condemnation for tax purposes, I can certainly support that. But I don't see these projects as rising to that level. It's speculative development. It's possibly multifamily commercial, but there's no guarantee, and I don't think it justifies necessarily using a heavy hand with those property owners at this point. I think there's no reason you shouldn't be able to reach a willing seller solution. But with condemnation in your quiver, it's all too often likely to be pulled and used prematurely. And I guess I do find it somewhat interesting that st. Michaels property, for instance, isn't included in this list of potential condemnation acquisitions, certainly we can argue maybe who has the higher authority to condemn whom, whether it's the church or the city. But -- [laughter] nevertheless, I do see that there's somewhat of a double standard, at least to my mind. But -- anyway, I want to see this development occur, but i'm hesitant to support using condemnation to achieve this purpose. So i'll vote no.

Sten: I'm going to support it. I suppose it's not a matter of who has higher authority, it's a matter of timing in terms of when one has higher authority. I think -- [laughter] I want to reiterate, I agree we

November 19, 2003

should -- the bar should be very high, and one other piece I wanted to have on the record, there is 26 units of market rate affordable housing here, and although I think that we've made the right policy statement, that it will be replaced in the district, think I we should think long and hard before we decide that it's worth knocking it down and spending another \$3 million to replace it. Because the value of market rate housing that's that low in downtown is close to \$100,000 a unit. And so it's a big deal in a housing budget that's low on money to say that for civic improvement reasons we're going to knock these apartments down. I think the only reasonable policy is to say we're going to put them back up, but it's expensive, so I want to us think long and hard that it's worth that money, because i'm fighting my tail off as other people are to get money to build affordable housing. And i'm to the point where replacing units isn't enough for me, someday we've got to get ahead. That said, I just want that on the record. I'll vote aye.

*****: I appreciate that.

Katz: You know, we cam it a university district, but it doesn't have the feeling of a district. I don't need to translate that, I do? And there is no there there yet. And I think what we want to do is to create a there there. And I don't know whether will the condemnation issue is one that we're going to need to really hone in on and take very, very seriously. I do know we need to do that very, very seriously. And i'm -- i'm supporting of the notion that commissioner Sten just laid out about ripping down lower rental housing units and then subsidizing it through millions of dollars. That doesn't make much sense. So we need to be thoughtful about it. If you asked me if this was the highest priority in that particular university district, I probably would say no. But again, it is important to create the ambience and the environment for a university district. Aye. [gavel pounded] ok. 1341.

Item 1341.

Katz: Anybody here want to talk to us? I need a motion. To adopt the report and bring back an ordinance. Do I hear a second? Roll call.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 1342.

Item 1342.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: I just -- the earlier discussion we had best money, which by using the -- that for storm water it gives a tremendous discount to these property owners. We're going to have a value in their property that they wouldn't have otherwise had. Subsidized by the public. In this one, we have the same situation. Except it's done by p.d.c. So without streets at this hearing, we had low-income housing folks testify that it's streets that allow the housing to actually develop. And it's a very good project. So thanks to p.d.c. And to andrew. Aye.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded]

Item 1343.

Saltzman: This item allows the Office of Sustainable Development to be more entrepreneurial and allows them to receive compensation in exchange for facilitating the purchase by third parties of business energy tax credits. The Oregon business energy tax credits have been very successful 5-year income tax credit for businesses that invest in energy saving equipment and for over 20 years it's helped many hundreds of local businesses improve productivity, reduce operational cost and increase overall profitability.

Recent changes adopted by the legislature allow third-parties now to buy these 35% tax credits, and this is a particularly good for organizations that do not have tax liability, like nonprofits, public agencies, and our city bureaus. So this allows us to do good work, to facilitate the purchase of these tax credits. And if anybody has any further questions, dave tooze is here.

Katz: Anybody else have questions? Anybody want to testify? Roll call?

November 19, 2003

Francesconi: Entrepreneurship to improve the environment. That's terrific. Aye.

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

Katz: Mayor votes aye.

Item 1344.

Katz: We've been asked to reschedule this item until december 3. Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. All right, folks, we'll adjourn until -- what? Oh, photos, ok, correct. I need a suspension of the rules.

Item 1333.

Katz: The acceptance of the heritage trees was on the consent agenda, which means we didn't see the photos. Phyllis is here. How many photos do you have?

Phyllis Reynolds: About seven.

Katz: Ok. Do I hear approval of suspending the rules to allow phyllis to show us the photos? Hearing none, we'll do it. [gavel pounding] as phyllis is coming up, remember we have a meeting at 1:30 in the rose room, and then we come back at 6:00.

Reynolds: Phyllis reynolds, 4471 southwest fairview circus, where as I speak there's about three inches of snow.

Katz: Yes.

Reynolds: And I came down -- I risked my life to come down here to find out that you'd already voted on these trees, but I do want to show you pictures of them.

Francesconi: There was a problem with -- my office made mistakes, i'm sorry.

Reynolds: No. You really have to see these pictures.

Katz: We're all interested.

Saltzman: We like your pictures.

Reynolds: Ok. The first one is this tree, which doesn't look like much from here. It's a grand fir. It has to be the most visible tree -- can we stop this from going ahead? It's the most visible tree in the city. As you can tell by this picture, where it is, where I took this picture, if the controversial condominium goes in on westover, you will not be able to take a picture like this anymore, but -- keep going. You can see it from burnside. You can see it from the vista avenue bridge. You can see it all over. Grand fir is a native of the pacific northwest. They're not many in town because they've been all logged. Here's another view of it, taken from the condominiums that you see here. Ok, let's go on to the next tree. There it is again. It's a very hard tree to photograph, and it's an impossible tree to measure where it grows, on maywood drive. It grows out of a vacant lot owned by the people next door. Jane glazer and I tried for years to get this to be a heritage tree. Finally the guy who owned the house moved, and someone else came in, bought the house, and in one week she willingly signed for it to be a heritage tree. So it's saved.

Saltzman: Is it a heritage because of its height or because of the type of tree it is?

Reynolds: Both. It's rare. I mean, it's rare in the city. Its height -- I mean, because it's so high and its withstood the 1962 columbus day storm, it with stands all these winds, it was not logged when the whole hill was logged back 120 years ago for some reason, but it's just an incredible tree. Ok, now this is the -- the next one is an american ash in laurelhurst. Big. The guy is standing under is frank from the forestry center and he's about six -- seven feet tall. Anyway, this is a very nice tree. Very few american ashes on the city streets. Ok, the next one.

Katz: Oh, my.

Reynolds: Yes: Isn't this something? I photographed this on july the 9th. It is a california buckeye. And these are rare in Portland, native, as you can see, of california, but this is a very nice specimen. Rob crouch found it in north Portland. Ok, the next one is a smooth-leave elm in irvington. Very big. Not many smooth-leaved elms in town, and so it's rare on that account. And we -- my committee decided to make it a heritage tree. There you have it. Thank you for your time.

Katz: Thank you.

November 19, 2003

Saltzman: I noticed in the ordinance that there's a -- the forestry commission removed designation from a heritage tree because it was no longer appropriate?

Reynolds: Yes. It was a silver -- silver maple that started cracking. The branches were threatening people in the street. It was a privately-owned tree, but it was in such condition and kind of rotten in the center, that it had to come down.

Saltzman: Ok.

Reynolds: And so we've lost -- we lost the big-leaf maple in october, and we lost this silver maple in november. So we're -- we're now at I think 258 heritage trees in town.

Katz: Thank you, phyllis.

Francesconi: Phyllis, thanks for braving the weather.

Reynolds: Yeah. Now i'll go back to the snow.

Katz: We stand adjourned until 1:30 and 6:00 for council hearing. We're not going to cancel it unless nobody shows up.

At 11:09 a.m. Council recessed.

November 19, 2003

NOVEMBER 19, 2003 6:00 PM

[Roll call]

Katz: Commissioner Sten is ill. We sent him home and i'm here. All right. Let's read item 1345.

Item 1345.

Katz: Ok. Come on up and tell us very quickly why we're here tonight, what our assignment is, as if we didn't know, what the commission did, what the staff is recommending, and why did the commission do what they did.

Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning (BOP): Thank you, madam mayor, gil kelley, planning bureau. I'm going to let carry make that entire explanation to you. I just wanted to say that we're back after visiting the planning commission on a referral you made to them about exempting vacant lots, lots that have been vacant for five years or longer from the provisions that you voted on a few weeks ago, which limited the lot segregations on lots in the r5 zone.

Cary Pinard, BOP: Hi, i'm cary pinard, we're with the bureau of planning. We do have a short presentation this evening, as you know, the issue is what to deal with the development on what sometimes are called skinny lots. In september the council passed a resolution that indicated that you intended to create a minimum lot size in the r5 zone and at that time, you asked for a planning commission recommendation on whether there should be additional exceptions to that minimum lot size. On october 28, the planning commission discussed that issue. Sometimes it's called the vacant lot issue. And they voted on a sort of multifaceted recommendation. Their first recommendation is to recommend that you not adopt any further exceptions to the minimum lot size. With that recommendation, as you know, there already are some built-in exceptions, such as the grandfather clause or in the pipeline clause, and any of the skinny lots that get development through that manner have to meet these eight design standards that you have adopted. There will probably be some discussion about this height limit of 1.5-to-1 height and width ratio. The planning commission's second recommendation is if you, the council, decide that you do want additional exceptions, and so in that case they are saying that the following should be considered. The first is what we've called the vacant lot issue that infill would be allowed on these narrow lots if they had been vacant for five years or as of september 10. There -- their second recommendation is to not allow exceptions when part of the site is in an environmental zone. However, that wouldn't prevent normal infill at regular densities from happening if there was an environmental zone. And thirdly, they're recommending two additional development standards. One is a 40% maximum building coverage, and the other would be to lower the height limit to a ratio of 1.2-to-1 of the width rather than the 1.5. With this recommendation, the other nine -- i'm sorry, seven design standards would still apply. Regardless of your decision on either of those first two recommendations, the planning commission is recommending a technical amendment that has to do with clarifying sites. And that is their recommendation. I'd like to take this time to say the record for this case is in the room, and can be reviewed, and i'd also like to point out that we are asking for a -- what we're calling a friendly amendment, and you have a letter about this that's signed yesterday by myself and rebecca from b.d.s. That amendment would change the effective date for policy package 1b from november 14 to november 15, and the recent for -- reason for that is it was widely distributed that the effective date would be november 15, when officially it was the 14th, and because we did get one application in on friday the 14th, we think it's only fair that that application get to use the provisions of the 1b amendment. If there are any questions --

Katz: Ok. Let's address the question that you flagged for us, and that's the height issue. The building lot coverage and the height issue.

Kelley: These were amendments that the planning commission made on the evening of their hearing and decision. Staff had cautioned against imposing new design standards on the fly, but I think the commission talked these threw and felt that as a group they wanted to come to consensus

November 19, 2003

and that was the way they did it. I think the aim there was to try to achieve more neighborhood compatibility. These are relatively narrow, tall houses going into existing r5 neighborhoods. They felt that some additional height control and site coverage control would be beneficial in terms of achieving compatibility. They did hear testimony that evening from neighbors who had lived in their home and experienced one or more of these new structures being built nearby, and sort of testified to those impacts. You may hear some of that yourselves this evening. I think it was in response to that that they elected to do that. The site coverage as it turns out, we've done a little post-planning commission analysis. Nearly everything that we've seen that's been built meets the site coverage requirements, so I don't think you'll hear a lot of testimony about that issue this evening. That seems to be fine. The height limit issue you'll probably hear some testimony about this evening. In either case you could probably still construct a two-story structure, but the methods for achieving that are more limited with the 1.2 ratio that the planning commission recommended.

Katz: I agree with you to do design stuff like this at -- late in the evening is probably not a wise idea. Does -- staff, have you mulled this over and made another recommendation on it?

Kelley: Well, again, we're here to present the planning commission's recommendation.

Katz: I know. I'm getting you off the hook.

Kelley: We've thought about it a little bit, and I think you should hear the testimony, and perhaps we should respond after.

Katz: Fair enough.

*******:** I think that would help us as well.

Leonard: Let me ask a question. We had some standards we adopted that restricted the construction of these back in June that I proposed. And before that was adopted, what was the height limit?

Pinard: It's 30 feet in the r5 zone.

Leonard: After we adopted those standards, what was the new height limit?

Pinard: For these skinnier lots where you get a 15-foot-wide house, because it's based on the width of the house, that turns out to be a 22-foot height limit down from 30 to 22, and remember, that's measured to the midpoint if there's a peak.

Leonard: But in essence, we did take action to reduce the height last summer --

Pinard: Yes.

Leonard: -- eight feet.

Pinard: Yes.

Leonard: Have we seen the results of that occur yet in any new construction?

Pinard: We have had some building permits issued. I don't know if they've been finished. We looked at the height of a lot of those that were built even before you lowered the height limit, and they tend to come in at around between 20 to 23 feet high already. So I don't think that would be that much of a change from what you were seeing.

Leonard: Ok.

Katz: Thank you. Further questions? All right. Let's open it up -- Rick Michaelson is here? Did I see him?

*******:** I'm here.

Katz: All right. He's a planning commission member.

Rick Michaelson, Planning Commission: I'm speaking here on behalf of the planning commission as carrying our message officially to you. It's probably -- I'm probably the most appropriate member to do this, because I'm the strongest advocate on the commission for building smaller houses on smaller lots and loosening up the code. I've also been active for years in antidemolition and infill projects, and was involved in some of the very early housing task force that set the five-year vacant lot limitation, for instance, if you have questions about that later. The commission has asked me who-to-reiterate our position. While we're in favor of small-lot

November 19, 2003

development, just doing it on the basis of lots that were platted 50 years ago is sort of arbitrary and not necessarily putting them in the right places at the right time. And would prefer an approach that says if we want these houses in places, we have to rezone them to allow them, not just as exceptions, but new lots and existing lots consistently. That said, we heard a lot from the community about ways to increase the compatibility of them. We heard consistently that they were too big and too tall. That's why we propose the 1.2 limitation instead of the 1.5. Because in fact the houses that are being built today that people are objecting to do meet the 1.5 limitation and are not getting any lower because of it. This was a quick fix as this whole thing is. Planning commission is more comfortable going on vacant lots than lots where houses have been demolished and think we can in general support that position. However, we think it's important that there not be exceptions raised to this. We heard some proposals for allowing demolition if they were code violations or appraised value of the house was less than certain things. We've studied these thoroughly through a lot of housing task forces in the past. They are always slippery slopes, they always create more difficulty to administer, and more unintended consequences than just staying with straight 5 year limitation on it. So we recommend strongly that you not—if you hear of those kinds of requests—that you not take those into the ordinance at this point. And I will stick around in case you have any questions later. Thank you.

Katz: Rick, how do you feel about leaving the height as is?

Michaelson: I guess to me it's very simple. If you like the way they're being built today, and that's acceptable to you, then leave it at 1.5. If that's not acceptable, you've got to do something different. Either gotta do a 1.2, or a 1, or require a 1.2 and require a peaked roof instead of a flat roof. But that's really -- it's really a judgment and aesthetic call. From a policy point of view we were hearing what's being built today is not compatible with the neighborhoods and if your policy is compatible infill, we need to do something, and that's why we did the 1.2.

Saltzman: If you do a 1.2 with a peaked roof can you have a two-story home?

Michaelson: You can achieve it a couple of ways. You probably can't have a full -- you can't achieve nine-foot ceilings as some of the developers are dog, but you could have a full normal eight-foot ceiling height on the ground floor. On the second floor if you chose to use a flat roof you could also have an eight-foot ceiling, or you could start with the side walls being six feet high and coming up to a peak at 9 or 10 feet and creating it that way. I guess the answer is yes, you can achieve a two-story house, it's not as simple as the way the houses are being built today.

Katz: Is it true -- is it -- so are you saying that if we dropped it to 1.2, we'd end up with roofs looking very much like mine?

Michaelson: I think that's the case. I think there are a number of house was flatter roofs that are of a different style than we're seeing today, but would work at the less bulky appearing in the neighborhoods than the tall ones we're getting now. So it is still our recommendation to go with the 1.2 rather than 1.5.

Katz: Ok. Ok, I know you're busy people, but the phone cells go off. All right. Let's open it up.

Elizabeth Skorohodov: My name is elizabeth, and I live in roseway. I wanted to just say to you today that I am very busy and I have a 2-month-old child at home that i'm putting off to be here tonight.

Katz: You look too good for a 2-month-old at home.

Skorohodov: Thank you. But I wanted you to know this is important enough to me that I made the effort to come out today. I support the planning commission's recommendation, and I would like to just say that when thinking about building on these current vacant lots, and if you are going to consider tear-downs, which hopefully you won't, that if you're really concerned about gentrification and who's being pushed out of these neighborhoods, then we need to build homes that will fit those needs. The people that I see being pushed out of these neighborhoods are the elderly, the disabled, people on fixed limited incomes. These are people who cannot afford houses today. And when we

November 19, 2003

think about affordable homes, I think we need to make a different -- we need to define affordability and market value. Market value is what's being built. Affordability is what we need. And affordable homes are not \$170,000, not even \$160,000. They're \$100,000, \$105,000, and those houses are going to be smaller. So when you're thinking gentrification and building for those people who need homes, then build towards those needs. That's all.

Katz: Thank you.

Tracy Ballew: My name is Tracy Ballew, I live at 3216 northeast 73rd avenue in Portland. Roseway citizen, board member, -- I wholeheartedly support the recommendation. Just as an added point, for a 50 by 100 vacant lot I do not recommend exemptions to the minimum lot size. For the 25 by 100 lots, I can agree with waiving the minimum if the planning commission's recommendations are met. This is the first time in this process I've seen someone make an attempt to define true affordability. And I welcome this.

Katz: Thank you.

Kerrigan Gray: I live at 9511 northwest harbor boulevard. I'm the chairman of the Linton neighborhood association land use committee. Speaking on behalf of Linton neighborhood association, mayor, council members, we have concerns about the impact of the proposed changes to Title 33 on the livability of the Linton neighborhood. Specifically we are concerned with the inclusion, including an exemption for existing lots that do not meet existing lot sizes. Adequacy of service and areas impacted by the proposed change should be considered. Costly service upgrades by the city and negative impact on the livability of the existing neighborhoods should be evaluated before making those proposed changes. Throughout the document regulatory improvement work plan policy package, the predominant statement is to improve city building and land use regulations that hinder desired development. Missing is the public service infrastructure must be brought up to a level which will sustain the new development without adverse impact on the livability and existing neighborhood. The existing codes provide protection for the current neighborhoods to propose changes to -- one size fits all propose. Our neighborhood with this land side problem, drainage problems, substandard storm water drains, substandard one-lane roads, no sidewalks, and locate order a major earthquake fault, lends itself to no reduction to the existing base zoning. When the remaining vacant R10, R7 and R5 lots are built up, the Linton hillside neighborhood will be at or exceed minimum density capacities for the existing infrastructure. The city should upgrade current substandard services before any consideration is given to increasing the residential density. Past experience with appeal hearings has demonstrated an unwillingness to put the cost of upgrading services on each new resident's applicant as they come forth. So the building continues and the current less dense zone structure without needed upgrades to the service infrastructure. Recent construction projects in the neighborhood have not required the builders to upgrade the substandard four-inch storm water drains, for instance, or widen the 9 to 12-foot-wide streets. November 4 cover letter to the council states in the land constraints paragraph that, quote, because most of the areas with land constraints are in an environmental overlay zone, we recommend that no exception of-to-minimum lot size be allowed where any part of the lot is in the environmental zone. In our neighborhood many of the areas with land constraints are not in environmental zones. Most of our R5 is not. So the above statement is a little misleading and the implication that's no problems exist outside the environmental zones. The Linton neighborhood plan submitted this year to the planning bureau and hopefully soon to the city council, states our combined vision for sustaining the livability and character of our unique historic neighborhood. Our plan welcomes carefully planned controlled growth for the future and seeks to preserve the existing base zoning densities on the hills while increasing residential and business density through new development on the riverfront area. In summary, including an exemption for existing platted lots that do not meet minimum lot size standards, should be reconsidered.

Katz: Thank you.

November 19, 2003

Gray: Proposed changes do not fit with the environment of the linton neighborhood --

Katz: Your time is up. Thanks.

Gray: Thank you very much.

Alexandra Schilf: My name is Alexander schilf. I live on northeast 65th avenue in the roseway neighborhood. I support the planning commission's recommendations. I'm here today to ask that you do too. Once again I have stuff written down, but coming from someone who lives right across the street, the recommendations -- i'm for just keeping it, the minimum 3,000. However, if the exemption does pass, there's got to be a way to make the houses truly more affordable and more compatible with the neighborhoods, and they are very tall. They overpower even the two-story houses on the street. And it's just very unusual when you look down and you see this row of house that's all look alike and they're overpowering. And if infill is necessary and needed, then for affordable housing, then let's try to make smaller houses possibly that could create that type of housing that, you know, people that can't afford \$160,000 houses maybe could get into. So I encourage you to vote for the recommendations.

Katz: Thank you.

Steven Eggleston: My name is steven eggleston, I live at 3425 northeast 75th avenue in the roseway neighborhood. Dear city council members. I'm testifying today as a roseway resident and concerned citizen. First and foremost i'd like to support the planning commission's first recommendation for a minimum lot size of 3,000 square feet an r5 zone neighborhoods for vacant lot development. Since you the council have indicated a desire to allow development on vacant lots in skinny plats in r5 zone neighborhoods, I would like to favor the planning commission's second recommendation. If to occur it would be outside environmental zones with standard limits to the new homes being 40% lot coverage with a height-to-width ratio of 1.2-to-1. These standards would be recommended to promote humble housing. As called for under goal four in article 4.13 of the comprehensive plan. They would also be complimenting any new standards resulting from the upcoming design competition on vacant lot development. This is alan attempt to get back to many other very important goals as stated in the comprehensive plan. Like under land use goals and policies, goal four, housing, article 4.7b. Maintain income diversity within neighborhoods by, one, allowing a mix of housing types in 10 yours including houses, houses on smaller lots, small houses, duplexes, attached houses, accessory dwelling units, multidwelling house and mixed use developments. And two, to ensure that income diversity is maintained over the long term. I'm asking you first and foremost to support the planning commission's first recommendation for minimum lot size in a 3,000-square-foot r5 zone neighborhoods for vacant lot development, but if the development must occur, I would like to support the second recommendation which promotes the idea of humble housing. Thank you.

Kelly Ross: Good evening, mayor Katz, commissioners. Kelly ross, representing the home builders association. I'm here tonight to support the planning commission's second recommendation with one amendment. We do feel strongly that this type of development, especially on vacant lots, is an important resource for the city, and is consistent with the comprehensive plan. The one amendment we'd like to suggest is to the height limitation and I might say that in my written testimony to you, we also asked for an amendment to delete the 40% maximum coverage limitation, but after talking among ourselves today and putting pencil to paper and mapping this out, we believe that we can also live comfortably with that, and as gil kelley said earlier, it appears that nearly all of the units that have been built do conform with that standard. So we do accept that. You're going to hear much more detailed perspectives on the height limitations from the builders who follow me. But suffice it to say from my perspective, that we do believe that that limitation could impose significant problems from a construction as well as a design standpoint, and we believe that it could have some unintended consequence that's may make these homes out of character even in a more pronounced way than is currently the case. We'd like to suggest allowing

November 19, 2003

the flexibility in the 1.5 height requirement, especially as we proceed through the design competition project that commissioner leonard's office and b.d.s. Is progressing on to allow as much possibility for innovation in this kind of design as possible. So we would urge you to amend the planning commission's recommendation to a 1.5 requirement to keep it as currently. I -- it doesn't necessarily have to be part of the package that comes from you tonight, but I would like to suggest that more work does need to be made on this -- these demolition standards that are our group proactively put a proposal on the table at the planning commission meeting, and we thought a lot of good discussion resulted from that. We are sensitive to some of the concerns of the planning commission made, but I think in the ethan seltzer's letter he even concedes more study might be necessary on some of this, that there were some valid points raised. And we would like to see that come to you in the near future after planning bureau and planning commission study. We would urge that one change be made.

Katz: Thank you. You know, gil, what I think is going to happen after we hear the testimony, the - - commission leonard asked the question, under the design standards that he had proposed, what are those, the skinny houses going to look like before we decide what we're going to do with the 1.2 ratio-to-1 versus 1.5 ratio-to-1. Unless we understand what the impact of that's going to be, it's going to be difficult to make some decisions. So begin thinking about it. Thank you.

Leonard: I was going to ask, before you leave, I was going to ask you, you've mentioned seeing a house that was taller. And is that one of the houses that were built under the 35-foot limit? Is it one of those real tall -- .

*****: [inaudible]

Katz: Not the new ones.

*****: [inaudible]

Leonard: They are. So -- did I hear earlier those were 25 feet, 22 1/2 feet?

Ross: 22 1/2.

Leonard: And those are taller than a two-story house that you see that are going in?

Schlif: Yeah, because we actually -- there's a two-story house that's sandwiched in between, there's five and then two, and then there's the two-story house, and when you --

*****: [inaudible]

Katz: Come on up to the mike.

Leonard: What i'm trying to do is figure out -- make sure we're all talking about the same thing.

Katz: That's why I raised that issue.

Leonard: I knew that. Because we did adopt standards last june that required these houses to essentially be built one story shorter, and I want to make sure --

Katz: Carrie, are you listening to this?

Leonard: We did develop standards last summer that required these houses to be built one story shorter, because all of us agreed that the three-story was out of character. And what I want to make sure we're talking about is houses under the standard that we couldn't adopted in june that won't allow them to be built higher than 22 1/2 feet.

Skorohodov: All the houses on our block are the two-story. We have two homes that were built two years ago without the -- your design standards. There's an english tudor in between, which is two stories, and there's five new ones going in that do have your design standards applied to them. And they're all -- the only thing that really looks different is the new ones have siding, all the way around, which is very helpful, and there is trim going in around the windows. But other than that, the design looks the same. The door's in closer to the front a little bit by I think two feet or something. But --

*****: They're all slightly different.

Leonard: But you're sure they're built under the new standards?

November 19, 2003

Skorohodov: Yes. And the standards have helped. They have helped. But they're the same height, and they have the same appearance from the street.

Eggleston: I can speak on that behalf.

Katz: Identify yourself.

Eggleston: Steven Eggleston. I'm in the roseway neighborhood. I have three houses down from me two brand-new skinnys being built, and they were -- they're framed within the last I would say month, and they dwarf, simply dwarf the house that's sit around them. To me, the standards that were applied, or -- they're just the tip of the iceberg kind of thing. I think lowering the housing height even lower brings them more in the context with the neighborhoods. To be quite frank, I'm concerned about how the design standards are being surveyed, because the houses they're that are being built three houses down from mine have -- don't have the same siding on all four sides, so I'm concerned about the enforcement of those policies. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Do we have photographs of these -- .

*****: [inaudible]

Katz: You didn't bring them? Because it's hard -- ok. Thank you.

*****: [inaudible]

Saltzman: Under the new standards?

Pinard: We didn't measure -- I don't know from our records if this picture you have in slide two, and we have extra copies over behind the city attorney. They could be slightly higher than the 1.5, but it's close to the 1.5. But I can't tell you for sure. There's also the illustration that's to scale on slide six, but it is not representing necessarily what exactly is getting built.

Katz: Ok. Let's continue.

Jeff Fish: Jeff fish, fish construction. First of all, I was going to testify some other things, but I've decided to change my mind. I pretty much want to say I agree with what Kelly Ross testified with, although I'm -- I do believe we ought to keep the 50% ratio in. We're not infringing on the 40%, so I don't see any reason to take it away. I'm also on the design task force, and I'd like to have that option available for one-story houses to be able to use more of the site. I have been passed out to you commissioners a diagram I had drawn up. I'm -- I want to resolve this height issue. If you can get a copy of that diagram, I can speak to you about it. In front of you you have a diagram showing the standard stud length and other components of a house. And they're all minimums except one. If you look on the right side, you'll see 92 and 5/8 stud minimum. That's for the lower floor. Studs come in several lengths, the shortest being 8 5/8. I show 92 5/8 on the lower floor. Even if you took the 92 5/8 out, you would reduce the measurement on the left side, you see that on the left side, to the top of the second story plate. Would you reduce that by 4 inches. So you would be at 17, 4 and a quarter the minimum height from grade you can be at the top of the second floor. If you set a 2 by 12 on top of that for a flat roof, you're still going to exceed 18 feet. Just with a 2 by 12. And a 2 by 12 is the going to be the minimum piece of dimension you're going to be able to span a 15-foot span. So this discussion of staying at 18 feet is off base. We can't stay at 18 feet even if we want to put a flat roof. I disagree with planning commissioner Michaelson about putting flat roofs in existing neighborhoods in the east side. I think you'll have the people come in here yelling worse than they are now about height. This gable you see on the top of the this building rises about 3.775 feet. When you look at this 612 pitched roof, you're at 21 feet, about 4 and a quarter inches off of the ground out there. So there's an example of what's really on the ground out there as far as what's being done. And this testimony that these houses are dwarfing other houses, these are the studs we use on a normal house. If we're building a normal house this way this, building can't be any taller. The final thing to show you that can't be taller is, if you have a 612 roof with a 10-foot base between these two walls as you see there, you're going to have a 3 honey 75 truss height. If you widen that building, if you go in a lot next door and build a wider building with the same 612 truss,

November 19, 2003

you're going to widen that base, you're going to heighten the overall height of that gable. So these houses can't be any higher than two-story houses next door.

Katz: Thank you. Go ahead.

Harry Schumacher: Harry schumacher. 5906 southeast 83rd, number 3. I'm going to talk more about affordability and demolition. I gave you a couple of pictures of some homes i've built. I have only two sets there. The number 1 pictures are of 8511 and 8517 north druid. Because of the present code at the time. I was able to build two new one-story homes on a vacant lot. If I was only to build one home, the price would have been between \$170,000 and \$180,000, which would have been too expensive for the neighborhood. These two new homes sold for between \$116,000 and \$120,000. One home was bought by a couple which the wife works at mcdonald's and who thought they would never be able to afford a home. As you can see by these pictures, these homes are an asset to the neighborhood. The second example we bought a house from the son of an older lady who lived at 5355 southeast malden. On a 62.5 by 100 foot wide. The lots were two 25-foot by 100-foot lots in a 12.5 by 100-foot loot. We divided it into two lots. We would not have been able to do this under the planning -- under planning commission's proposal. The lots were divided into a 37.5 by 100 and a 25 by 100. The son lives in california and had not realized what had happened to the house over the years. The house was beyond repair, in crumbling foundation, plus dry-rot. The grandson had moved with some of his buddies into the garage and we understand from the neighborhoods were involved with drugs and theft. The new two-story home was sold to a single mother with two teenage daughters and the one-story home was sold to an older couple. Being able to afford -- build two affordable homes is better than one. The older lady is now able to live in peace and quiet in a retirement home. The last example is when we demolish add house. The owner bought the house to fix it up while he was living there. Unfortunately after sinking too much money and time into a house that was not structurally sound to begin with, he not only lost his money and time, but his wife too. We were able to come in and buy him out and build three new homes and sold them for between \$100 and \$105,000. The homes next to the -- are next to two duplexes which are also in need of repair. These are only a couple of examples where the homes we built added to the neighborhood livability. Whereas san francisco's homes are the most expensive in the nation because of natural geography restraints, the hills and water, this planning commission is creating hills and water in which is restraining buildable land and affordable housing. They have eliminated tax abatement program by trying to change the program instead of making sure it was available to home buyers. Secondly, increasing minimum lot size to 1.9 and lastly this proposal.

Katz: Thank you.

Schumacher: Can I finish? Just a couple sentences.

Katz: Hurry up.

Schumacher: Portland would still be as beautiful as san francisco, but also be a place where all people can afford homes and not just a few. Just ask the young girl who bought 8511 north truitt. She's at your local mcdonald's.

Katz: Thank you.

Neil Thogerson: I'm neil thogerson. As a registered architect and the member of the home builders association, I provide custom home design and stock house plans. I'm generally in favor of policy package 2a and definitely in support of allowing single family residences on 25 by 100 foot lots in the r5 zone. These lots are a tremendous resource to provide affordable and attractive single family infill housing, and replace substandard structures and revitalize neighborhoods and schools with new residents. I am opposed to city of Portland planning commission's proposed standards, 33.110.123c requiring a height-to-width limitation of 1.2-to-1, and to reduce the building coverage to 40% for 25 by 100-foot lots. Reducing the height to width ratio from the current 1.5-to-1 changes the maximum height for these 15-foot-wide houses from 22-foot, six inches to just 18 feet.

November 19, 2003

If it passes, it will also almost make a two-story structure impossible to build. Figure 1, it's also in the handout, shows the current code allows for nine-foot ceilings on the first floor, vaulted ceilings on the second, and allows for sloped roofs, 8'12" shown and greater roof pitches if you adjust floor heights. This gives an exterior appearance which blends with the roofs in existing Portland neighborhoods. Figure 1b shows how two-story house can be constructed under the proposed 1.2-to-1 ratio. The shortest standard length stud is 885/8. The ceiling height would be 7'8". And a flat-roof requirement. Reducing the maximum site coverage from 50 to 40% on 25 by 100 foot lot is not reasonable for a one-story home. If this passes a one-store home will probably not be built on these lots. Figure 2a -- three bedrooms, two baths, and no off-street parking. Please note the building coverage is 47.8%. Figure two illustrates in modest one hitch story house with two-bedroom, one bad, one-car garage. This plan meets requirements of first-time buyers. The coverage is 43.5% and is still over the 40% proposed by the planning commission. If coverage is limited to 40% or a thousand square feet, including garages, covered porches and patios, the designs would be too small and too limited to be able to provide a well-designed home and have economic - - and to have an economically feasible project with the current cost of lots in Portland neighborhoods. I feel the main objection of neighborhood groups to the narrow lot houses is due to the tall narrow appearance of two-story homes, a direct result of the city of Portland's own base code design standards. These standards have required architects to place second story wall out flush with the front of the garage. Creating an unpleasant 11 feet wide by 22-foot-tall element facing the street. Rather than to allow architects to design low roofs and second floor windows in dormers. Creating a softer line and mitigating the narrowness with horizontal lines and rough lines. I'm currently involved in the narrow lot design committee with susan hartnett and susan feldman. I'm striving to change such arbitrary city imposed design requirements which have backfired and created a neighborhood objection to infill housing on 25 by 100-foot lots. Let's reject the 1.2 height-to-width ratio and the 40% coverage requirements proposed. Let's not end up with the city of Portland dictating more of -- more bad architecture and imposing it on residents of existing neighborhoods.

Katz: Ok. Keep going.

Mark Harding: I'm mark harding, mark harding construction. 1907 northeast 119th in Portland. I'm a developer here in Portland. I've been building these 15-foot-wide houses for the last three years. And I want to talk about affordability also. I -- in the last three years, last year alone, I belt 55. By the end of nine months or 12 months, I had no inventory. We sold those houses between 138 and 148. That's over in southeast and north Portland. Like i'm saying, there's no inventory. Affordability is a big issue here. You can't build \$100,000 house anymore. That I know of, anyway. I've sold my houses to school teachers, single moms, last year I sold six houses to city employees. Because the smaller lots cost less, my fellow home builders and I are able to build the affordable homes for young families starting out. Also, for each one of these houses that I build, I payee they're the city of Portland \$13,000 for a building permit. We've got an influx of people coming into this city that are college educated, they're coming from the northeast, midwest, they're finding our houses affordable. Since november 15, i've found already in north Portland lots, lot cost has a lot to do with affordability. Since november 15, over in north Portland, I have had my realtor bring me an offer, they want \$50,000 for a 25 by 100 lot. You know what that's going to do to affordability? I've never paid that much money for a lot over in that area. You get over into northeast, in the -- this lady was on northeast 76th, those are my houses. Those are built to the new height standard. They're 22 feet high, 22 feet, 6 inches high. The house to the south of my houses is not -- it's higher, it's -- it looks higher than what i'm building. Anyway, if this -- if we're not allowed to build on these 25-foot lots, affordability is going to go away.

Katz: Thank you.

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

November 19, 2003

Steve Schell: I'm Steve Schell, a lawyer with offices 805 Southwest Broadway. I'm here representing the home builders you've just heard and two others as well. In summary, we favor the planning commission's second recommendation. These home builders urge you to pass the vacant lot exception. We're not uncomfortable with the environmental restriction, the environmental overlay limitation on that, and you've heard from Kelly Ross that we've looked at the house situation and can live with the 40%, even though Neil's position we believe is correct, which is why limit that. The place you ought to deal with the question of limitation is in the design review standards that Susan Hartnett and Susan Feldman are staffing at this point. That's where these issues of 40% and the 1.5-to-1 ought to be dealt with, rather than either through the planning commission or even through this process. So we'd urge you to think about that. I want to say a couple of things about planning commission's basic premise. I disagree with the letter that said -- I don't believe the planning commission has a proper grasp of what the comprehensive plan designation of a district really is. I think in Kelly Ross's testimony and as well as in mine, I've indicated that there's a misinterpretation of the basic limitation. The limitation is 8.7 units to the acre. I did a little test on University Park area, and took 130 acres and counted the lots in there, calculated the lots in there. And compared that to the ratio. By the time you take up the streets, the parks, the schools, and everything else, you're below that 8.7, even with a 25 by 100 lot pattern. So there's some miscalculation going on in terms of the planning commission's really thinking through that subject. So I think the basic premise is wrong. These 25 by 100 lots for Portland represent the best chance we have for proper infill. There are design standards that can improve their compatibility with the neighborhood, and as mentioned, Neil and others are working on that. We'd like to encourage you to take the demolition question and send it back to the planning commission at this point. We think there's a valid issue there. The planning commission has indicated more study is needed. We'd like to you combine that with the Bureau of Development Services, and get a proper study of -- estimate the impact and call it back to you in a reasonable time. Finally, if we can get an agreement on the 1.5-to-1 and the secondary package and can get a unanimous consent on emergency clause hopefully can be added to this, and we could get a determination now. If we don't, it affects the lot values and the cost. You are increasing housing.

Katz: Let me just -- the emergency clause is on. You're pushing two of us. Not you specifically. Some of us didn't like this to begin with. If you recall the history on this. The neighborhood asked us to please reconsider, because they had second thoughts about going to the Luba and wanted a compromise. So let's not push two of us too far, because we have to all agree. That's an interesting situation tonight. Because I agree with you, if we don't have a unanimous vote on this, it will delay. Because there is an emergency clause on it.

Schell: Just to respond to that, Mayor, that's one of the reasons why you deem it appropriate, the home builders are willing to give up the 40% to find that value. Even though I think the opinion that the home builders has is that 40% is too strict and could be done better. So believe me, we're trying to do everything we can to work with this. The key element here is the increase in cost that comes from reduced supply.

Katz: Your time is up.

Leonard: I think everybody is sensitive and what you were hearing from the Mayor is we're going to reach a consensus.

Schell: Thanks very much.

Katz: Ok.

Dixie Johnston: I'm Dixie Johnston, co-land use chair of Collinsview, and I support the planning commission recommendations. I could tell watching them that they had agonized over their decision over a period of time. They took a great deal of time listening to all of the arguments, not just neighborhood people, but also in the development community. They were very concerned to find something that would work. And I really think they did an excellent job. One of the things

November 19, 2003

that meets -- needs to be discussed is we were talking about issues of 8.7, houses to the acre. Remember when we went through that horrible seven-, eight-year process with the land division code rewrite? That issue was decided in that process. We've also been through design review processes in recent years as well. Maybe we need to do a little bit more and tweak it a little bit more. But these decisions have been made over a period of many, many years. Maybe what i'm going to say is a little heretical, but in some of these houses, areas where we're looking at infill housing, these infill houses are being put into areas where there are one-story ranch-style houses. Some of them do overpower the one-story houses. Also, it used to be older houses had lower ceiling heights. Some of them were only seven or eight feet per floor. So even with the two floors, you get the new housing going in, they're higher ceilings. Maybe it wouldn't be all that bad for some of these infill houses to be one-story with this the steeper pitched roofs. I realize it would mean a smaller house per square feet, but it would be more humble, a little bit more affordable. I realize the cost of land keeps going up, because there isn't that much left to build on. But I do think there's enough people around who demand the more expensive housing that I think the home builders could make up for any loss of income. I really do. And I think that should be considered. I do also want to support, and I hope you take seriously some of the comments made by the chair of the linton neighborhood. I think a lot of it has been addressed throughout the years also from the neighborhood perspective. The infrastructure planning before you keep adding density. Thank you so much.

Katz: Amanda, i'm sorry, I apologize, I didn't see you. Did you want to come up as a member of the planning commission?

*****: [inaudible]

Katz: As a private citizen? Ok.

Dave Johnston: I'm dave johnston, the other co-land use chair of collinsview neighborhood association. I live at 0550 southwest palatine hill road. I support the planning commission and their recommendation with a strong preference to keep the minimum lot size at 3,000 square feet. But if that's not to be done, I also strongly recommend that you follow their secondary recommendation and including the height limits. Now, as I listened to the testimony and as i've read through what they recommend, it seems to some extent they're being asked to let the tail wag the dog. Why do I say that? The base zones were established with a good procedure, and presumably that's what the city council and everyone else has ultimately decided, the particular areas should be like. What we're talking about is to make an exception to that. It wasn't that long ago that the r5 zone made a 5,000 square foot minimum lot. Now we allow a 3,000 square foot minimum. We've heard some testimony about why make special design standards, but we have to remember what we're being asked to do is make an exception to the standard 3,000 square-foot-minimum lot size, and which you do that, it's quite reasonable if you're going to do that, to put some special limits to make whatever is built on that lot that's an exception to the base zoning fit well into the neighborhood. And also to accomplish some other things in this particular case, more affordable housing. Now, if you're looking at a 2500 square foot lot, you're 40% coverage gives you a thousand square feet. I have friends that have lived in houses that size as my wife and I started out we lived in an apartment smaller than that, and our first house was only a little larger than that. You can make quite a reasonable house there. We talk about the height of the roof. At 1.2 times the width, you can put a two-story house there. I've been in houses, even lived in houses where you do have a gabled roof. Sure, the construction is slightly more expensive, you have to use a saw to cut off some of the studs, but that doesn't take long with modern tools. And so that seems quite doable, and likely to result in a good many more house that's young couples can start out. My wife and I are now in the position of having grandchildren and our children are facing the same issue of affordable housing. They would like to own houses, but so far they're not able to. We hope someday. But more smaller houses would help. As we see houses built in our neighborhoods, even

November 19, 2003

on small lots they tend to be very large, get a lot of square footage in, a lot more amenities than I remember having in the house that I started out with, and so I think planning commission's recommendation is good and would do us some good.

Katz: Thank you.

Jim Karlock: My name is jim karlock, from the beaumont neighborhood. I support the planning commission's recommendation, but really that's my second choice. My first choice is one of being honest. Make r5 mean r5. Not r3, not r2.5 sometimes, but r5. I'd like to remind you that oh, maybe a year and a half ago we had a vote on density. It was in metro ballot measure, and the voters voted, I believe it was 60% in favor of protecting the neighborhoods from density. Yet once again we're talking about shoving more density down our throats. I think most of you are familiar with sharon nasset's effort in the lombard st. Johns effort. She took a survey, it turns out maybe 270 people answered the survey. They came in 12-1 against skinny lots in their neighborhood. This is not a popular plan. Furthermore, we keep coming up with the subject of required urban density and that sort of stuff. I would like to remind everyone here that Portland is building well above its density target. Our goal is to have 20% of the new housing units -- excuse me, new residential units within the urban growth boundary, yet I cannot find a recent year where we did not beat that goal by 50%. One year we doubled the goal, and another year we beat it by 250%. We don't need any more density. We're meeting metro's goals. It's unpopular with the people. You talk about affordability, well, the first thing i'd do is look very closely at that \$13,000 permit fee the gentleman that testified before me has to pay. That's probably going to be a \$25,000 on the cost of the home by the time it gets marked up. Another thing, if you really care about affordability, maybe you ought to look at allowing some manufactured homes, I don't know what the status is of manufactured homes, I don't recognize any as I drive around Portland. And the final thing I guess I ought to just toss in a recent discovery, because part of affordability is paying property taxes. Everybody's property taxes could go down by 10% if we weren't giving massive exemptions to a lot of things. And I just recently discovered this -- this pearl district condo that is on the market with an asking price of almost \$2 million. Property tax? \$146 per year. Gentlemen, that's an outrage. Thank you.

Greg Hanbey: Very briefly, I support the planning commission's recommendations. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

Amanda Fritz: I'm amanda fritz, speaking for myself. I support the recommendation that the minimum lot size in the r5 zone should be 3,000 square feet. Any exemptions should conform to existing code standards for historic 25 by 100 foot lots platted in the west Portland park subdivision. It's unfair and inconsistent to treat lots differently on the east side and in the northwest section of the city compared with the protections offered in my neighborhood. If we were planning to be fair, and to honor the zoning, would adopt regulations similar to those in 33110212 validation of lots of record. At the very least, you are to apply those regulations in linton. We did try to craft these regulations on the fly on october 28, and I was hoping that the environmental zone regulation would take care of the issue in linton. But evidently from the testimony we heard earlier, it doesn't. And it would be very simple to add linton to the exemption from allows these lot segregations. Given the council has expressed interest in allowing development on vacant lots outside of west Portland park, there should be a definite public benefit to allowing this. This was the core of the motion that comes to you. If we're going to allow development which ignores the zoning, there needs to be a certain public benefit, not just a vague wish for affordability, but standards that make these houses smaller and particularly more humble. We took to heart the policies in the comprehensive plan that call for humble more affordable housing and i've attached those for you. Requiring new homes on lots half the zone size to be small would not only reduce the selling price no matter what neighborhood, it would also meet the comprehensive plan policies better. I'm not a developer, and I made the motion using standards from the zoning code. So you need to know that the land division

November 19, 2003

code that you adopted after a very long process says that if you have a lot that's less than 36 feet wide, then the height limit is 1.2-to-1. That was done over a long period of time, there's lots of discussion and lots of input that's not the correct standard, then there should have been more discussion, it should have been rejected in the land division code. There's no reason why these lots on -- the homes on existing lots should have more height than new skinny lots. Second of all, the detached accessory dwelling unit regulations also limit the height to 18 feet. We just did a study that Mark Bellow did to look at those regulations and see if they were causing problems, and they're not. They're working well. So the 18-foot limit is both reasonable and already in the code. It would have the benefit of increasing the proportion of the living space on the ground floor. It would make the second floor a little smaller. But it would increase the amount of living space on the ground floor and make these homes more likely to be used by senior citizens and people with disabilities. On the issue of demolition, please do not add this to the current work tasks. It should go into the hopper for discussion in next year's process for regulatory reform and impact analysis. It's not fair that the crisis du jour gets put on the list to be put on the list to be tended to immediately when we haven't established a process that allows public discussion of what the priorities are. So please send that issue to process for that prioritization.

Katz: Thank you.

Mary Dorman: I live at 6131 northeast Alameda and I'm the land use chair for our neighborhood association and speaking this evening on behalf of our board. We recommended the council's recommendation with the plan commission recommendation. Our neighborhood is largely developed. We have few vacant lots, we do have some homes that are on oversized lots. I wish I had an exact number, but I would guess maybe one or two every four blocks or so. That adds to the character of the neighborhood. You have people with larger yards, large gardens, and people that adds to the diversity and quality. I think if this proposal is adopted, even though our board supports it, if people come in and build a house on what people just assumed were oversized lots, I'm sure all I'll - I'm sure I'll get phone calls from people saying how did this happen, but we recognize you're looking for a compromise here, and are willing to support the position on the vacant lots. I'm not a designer or builder, so I don't know all the specifics about building height. But I do know that in our neighborhood we have many, many very small almost cottage-like homes that are really very attractive, and fit well within the neighborhood, and I think that's kind of what we'd like to see on these smaller lots. It's an issue of scale and proportion, the lots are so much skinnier that it seems to me that if you go for a smaller cottage-type home, that's going to fit well. The scale is going to fit better. So it may be something you need to look at more closely through your design studies, but I think that's a concept that our neighborhood would like to see, is smaller cottage-style homes if you develop on these smaller lots. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you.

*******:** Members of the council. It seems that even though the people at large --

Katz: Identify yourself for the record.

Amber Keys: I'm sorry. My name is Amber Keys. It seems even though the people at large and the planning commission have expressed a desire to possibly have a lot size minimum that applies even to a vacant lot, the council has already decided to exempt these lots. It has been full steam ahead on the design competition. Instead of standing by their first position, the commission has a back-up hoping they might retain some influence. I'm alarmed that our public process has fallen prey to a small private good. That the voice of developers runs roughshod over mine that. Being here tonight might be futile. Consider affordable housing. It was stated in one hearing that the average cost of a home is \$250,000. The skinny houses are selling for between \$140,000 and \$160,000, significantly lower than average. But average when discussing housing markets at the lowest end is irrelevant and misleading. To say skinny houses are necessary to provide affordable housing is a lie. There are new houses on 5,000 square foot lots for between \$119,000 and \$130,000 in the

November 19, 2003

charleston development in st. Johns fixers for less. While imposing lot coverage and ratio restrictions, may bring prices down, a distinction must be made between affordable and low cost. The neighborhood associations want quality that does not include low-cost housing. Consider the urban growth boundary. And on a more personal note, i'll at the time about you my property. We purchased a home on a 5,000 square foot lot for the same price that a developer purchased the property with the add joining 2500 square foot lots on either side. Good for him. A deal is a deal. I don't know what was happening with the previous owners, but they never had to sign up for sale. If they had we would have bought and it never developed it. We would have slowly fixed up the house, planted and garden and raised our family in st. Johns. We would have cared for the giant tree that has now been cut down. Instead, we will stay while I finish school and then move further out. As prices are inflated and yards disappear, we won't be the only ones. It does not make sense to stick houses just anywhere there's a patch of ground. Not without the proper infrastructure and not in the r5 zone. To contain urban growth and sprawl we need a variety of neighborhoods, density, and affordable housing within the city. Also, consider the effects on industry, traffic, and air quality. Issues that already loom large for people in st. Johns. And what will come of our healthy real estate market? Surely there is no shortage of housing. It is the low interest rates that buoy the market, not a highly competitive surge of buyers. If mass infill continues, there will be mass fallout when rates jump. Already there are sale signs everywhere. Will what about the comprehensive plan that has done so much good for Portland? I urge you to look at the long hitch term ramifications of arbitrary disregard. You should have received a petition today only one person asked to sign that petition, did not sign that petition, and those are the people of st. Johns. I think it's ridiculous you need to see pictures. You should know what we're talking about here. I urge to you drive through these neighborhoods, walk, and talk to people, listen to us. Its not what we want. The net effect of this sort of development is negative, it does not serve the greater good. Everyone has stated the first choice is not to have development on vacant lots.

Katz: Thank you.

Dave Nadal: My name is dave nadal, i'm from Multnomah neighborhood. I'm a homeowner there near where there's dozens of these lots potentially. I have to admit I was -- I have to admit although i've been kind of favoring some sort of modifications to allow a smaller footprint and with a lot of design standards and smaller square footage to allow some of these, but I have to admit if you listen to the bulk of the testimony tonight, you really do wonder if it's a good thing at all. A 15-foot-wide by 40-foot home is kind of a mobile home dimension, nothing wrong with mobile homes, but it's just -- is that really the kind of development we want here in Portland? The other thing that hit me, and I was watching this on t.v. at home, I think a developer was testifying, I think his name was -- maybe it was mr. Fish, i'm not sure. But he pointed out something I wasn't aware of. That was that these things can be built at the 1.2 ratio height with completely flat roofs. And I would say that one amendment I would like to suggest right now was that would be that these -- if they're to be built like this, and i'm not sure there's any call to do that in terms of what the neighbors really think, if they are to be developed, they're absolutely should be a requirement that they be built with a pitched roof. We're talking affordable housing, trying to make it as attractive as possible. I've lived in cramped quarters most of my adult life just to save money so I could do volunteer activities basically live cheap. And a lot of people like a simple lifestyle. Especially when I was younger, you wouldn't believe some of the small places I lived in. Not everybody is going to want exactly go to that extreme, as I have, but there's lots of people when they're younger or they're older or handicapped, to get an affordable place, to get smaller square footage, there's nothing wrong with having a little bit of a different second story that's not a palatial, that's not palatial, that you may have to stoop a little bit when you go to one side or another. That's my testimony tonight, a suggested amendment, that these can't be allowed with flat roofs. And that there has to be an

November 19, 2003

extensive design process for these that with the main thing that there has to be some pitch in the roof. That's where i've kind of changed. I didn't realize that was not a requirement.

Ross Folberg: My name is ross folberg, I live at 962 five northwest roseway in the linton neighborhood. My concern mainly is about the one size fits all approach. It seems this plan is taking on that approach. We have been a model for the nation in our urban growth and the way that Portland's been built and developed, and one of the processes in that is the zoning process. I'm not against building narrow homes, but it needs to be looked at more closely. Have you many people who have testified from I believe the rose way neighborhood that were -- didn't have a problem with this. They didn't have a problem with this or even 3,000 square foot lots. In the linton neighborhood up in the hill there, that's inappropriate. So my concern is, we have a zoning process, we have it for a reason. To ensure the safety, the livability, the impact and the burden on the existing infrastructure, what improvements may be needed. My concern is this one size fits all thing. They talked about desirable development. I would hope when you consider that you consider all those factors. You consider the -- how it impacts the people currently living there. Our -- is the responsibility with adding more homes, with adding increasing the density, it seems it's fair to impossible a burden of responsibility that the infrastructure be accordingly updated. And is that addressed? I believe it's not in this current situation. So if you're changing the zoning, that's fine, but do it right. Do it fair. Make a zoning hearings, let the neighborhoods be notified their area is being zone change and go through the structure f that's what people want, if that's what seems fitting for that neighborhood, that's appropriate. So it's the one size fits all. In our area, we have narrow roads, nine feet wide. To get to my house, there is as little as 50 feet of visibility in front of you because of the narrowness, the curvature of the road, the hillside. That's pretty dangerous. Two cars traveling at 15 miles an hour toward each other really almost don't have time to stop. A fire truck that came up to our -- the last couple times they've come up, they've damaged their trucks trying to get in and out of our neighborhood. So you are aware of this. The last time they came up, I guess they come up annually to check the hydrants. It took them over 10 minutes to back out of my road. That's below us is now zoned an r5. They have to come from st. Johns over the st. Johns bridge, come in, and it takes them 10 minutes to back out. If they needed -- if they are needed in st. Johns, they're looking at over 15 minutes to respond. That's not responsible action for you to allow for those people. My concern is the one size fits all f you're going to adopt this change, our neighborhood especially, as you've heard several people, not just from our neighborhood, but other people testify, would be very detective equipmentally impacted. We're not opposed to building. We have a linton neighborhood plan we've been trying to work on for nearly 10 years that involves lots and lots of redevelopment and infrastructure. We encourage it. We're one of the few plans that have the commercial, the industrial, the business, and the residential people all in support of it. In recent -- in light of recent events, that seems like that would be something you'd look forward to. So if this change is adopted, we request city council and planning bureau to specify linton neighborhood as an exclusionary area in these lot requirement reductions as is the west park -- Portland park subdivision in 33.110.212d. You've already excluded somebody. We feel we should be also.

Katz: That was historic. That's fine. Thank you. Anybody else?

Moore: That's all who signed up.

Katz: Staff, why don't you come on up.

Moore: We have one more.

Linda Bauer: Linda bauer, citizen. I support the planning commission's recommendation, and I want to thank everybody for televising the planning commission meetings. Now everybody can see what great work they do. Thank you.

Saltzman: Thank commissioner leonard.

Katz: We're going to have to find the money, but for now I think we may be all right.

November 19, 2003

Leonard: We need to talk about the p.d.c. too. That would be fun to televise.

Katz: And you can add the design commission, and --

Leonard: No, those --

Katz: Go ahead.

Terry Griffiths: My name is terry griffiths, I live at 4128 southeast reedway. I was going to sit one out, but here I am. I'll be fast --

Katz: Weren't you at another meeting?

Griffiths: No. Fast and factual. In our neighborhood, i've tried to look at housing prices of houses built on 25 by 100 lots. And recent years, and as part of this I asked someone at windemere realty to tell me what the median house price was on the east side of Portland, and she said the median house price on the east side of Portland for a three-bedroom house was \$186,000. That was in august of this year. Summer of this year. There was one of these houses like -- on a 25 by 100 lot on rural in our neighborhood that sold last you know for \$219,000. There's a house on rural within a block or so of that that's listed now at \$249,000 listed, I don't know what it will sell for. And there are four houses on 25 by 100 lots at 39th and bybee that are selling at \$199,999, and probably 99 cents, i'm not sure. So I guess my statement is these are market rate houses, they're not affordable houses, so I think this may be a factual -- some facts that support how can we make this both compatible and a little more humble. I think those things might go together, the compatibility, the smaller size and affordability. Thank you.

Katz: Ok. Staff, come on up. What would your recommendations be?

Gil Kelley: Can I respond to two issues in particular? One is the linton issue, and the other is the height issue. On linton, because this is already around a narrow set of circumstances, I think it needs to be understood that for the most part this phenomenon would not occur in linton. So i'm going to try to describe what the exceptions are. First of all, anything that's in the e zone wouldn't be subject to this provision. It would also have to be zoned not just comp plan, but zoned r5 so that further narrows the full pool of lots. Beyond that they have to be these preplatted small lots. In other words, lots that would be substandard even by r5 standards because they were recorded so long ago. When you sort of overlay those three things, there are perhaps a few lots in the historic linton town plat within the first block or so of the highway that could qualify. And we don't know the exact number of those. We've looked at the maps before, phil can describe that in more detail. So if you're uncomfortable with the risk on those few lots, then you'd have to probably direct us to make an exception saying this shouldn't occur in linton.

Katz: The planning commission have that conversation?

Kelley: About linton, no, they really didn't have that conversation. There was some testimony, but I don't think the planning commission deliberated on that.

Saltzman: Given what you just said, is there a defensible rationale to provide the same exclusion to linton that west Portland park currently has, given what I -- I tend to think there are some unique infrastructure challenges in those -- in that neighborhood. And perhaps some unique seismic issues too.

Kelley: I don't have a lot to add, but you'd have to feel satisfied based on the testimony you heard this evening that there are those more or less exceptional challenges, and make that part of your decision tonight. So we could make sure that your motion on findings reflect that.

Saltzman: So the rationale would simply be a majority of council felt based upon the testimony --

Kelley: Based on the testimony that there are exceptional circumstances there in terms of service delivery and topography that would make this, you know, an unwise --

Saltzman: You're also saying based on your analysis of exclusions, there's only --

Kelley: Relative few.

Phil Nameny: There's probably if you go about a block and a half to two blocks up from the highway, that's about as far as you can go until you start hitting into the environmental zones. The

November 19, 2003

other thing to sort of keep in mind is if you're looking at the linton neighborhood, you are looking at areas that were part of various plats, various historical plats. The only historical plat I saw was -- that had the 25 by 100 platting was the original town of linton. Many of the other areas were platted potentially substandard to what the zoning is, but in a lot of those cases the zoning is r10, so that's not something we're addressing tonight. There are -- there are areas of linton that have comp plan of possibly r5 but are currently zoned at r5 or r7, and those do have other plats, but it's just this one small area which is the original town plat of linton, and it would probably be about at most a two-by-four block area, I would say.

Kelley: Of course the further overlays they have to be vacant, so --

Nameny: And there are existing historical homes that were built with the plat at that point. Once you get west -- once you get west of there there's still the same platting, but some of that is actually part of forest park. So it's land that's owned by the city already.

Saltzman: That two-by-four block area has some homes on it already. So we don't know --

Nameny: Correct.

Katz: So let's --

Kelley: On the height issue, we've been sort of struggling with the numbers. These particular numbers really put us on the horns of a policy dilemma. Let me explain why. I think the rationale for compatibility is what the planning commission is forwarding. The number as far as I can tell is derived from the standard which the planning commission and you used in the land division process. That was where you had a minimum of 36 foot wide lots and so you would comfortably have a two-story dwelling at that ratio. And also just proportionally in compatibility wise, that worked out, and that was hard fought territory. So I think that both amanda and rick have characterized that accurately. When you look at this particular phenomenon, you're dealing with a different minimum width, not 36, but 25 feet, and still with the five foot side yards you're down to a 15 foot wide structure. So proportionately you're limited to a total height of 18 feet for -- at that ratio of 1.2. As we've been sort of noodling back here, I don't think it's possible unless you manipulate the landscape so you are changing the starting grade to do a two-story structure within 18 feet except by a very sort of tortured design, and at some additional expense. And here's why, very simply, assuming you have a flat site and you want to allow roughly a foot and a half for foundation and up to finish floor height, you've got a foot and a half, then you want a minimum of an eight-foot clearance inside the first floor, you're at 9 1/2 feet, a minimum of a foot of structure before you hit the finished floor of the second story, you're then at 10 1/2 feet. Assuming you want, let's just take the flat roof model you want, eight foot clearance minimum on the second floor, you're at 18 1/2 feet and you don't have the roof on it yet, so you really need to be at a minimum of 19 1/2 or 20 feet. We conferred with -- that's for the flat roof model. For the dormer and pitched roof, you could maybe lower that a little bit if you went to a truss system that could support a relatively low pitch roof system, could you probably still get adequate head clearance in there. So you could do it at 19, 19 1/2 feet and have it work. But I think the real question is at one point -- at 1.2 you're probably not going to see two-story structures built. So you are at a choice here I think where you pick one ratio, 1.5, you're allowing two stories fairly comfortably. At 1.2 you're probably for the most part not allowing two-story structures at this lot size. And at one story, just wanted -- so I think rather than us recommending, it's really a policy choice you should make. This sort of humble housing versus a more larger structure. At the one-story you may also run into complications with parking. That is to say under the current rules you'd probably have to have the structure set back very far if were you going to have open parking so to not chew into that 40% coverage. Or if you were to enclose the garage, you may run into some trouble with our other base zone design standards that talks about the percentage of the frontage that can be occupied by the garage or garage opening. So it gets challenging to think about -- to imagine the one-story with on-site parking as well. So I just wanted to weigh those policy implications out.

November 19, 2003

Katz: Let me ask a question with regard -- we heard some -- some comments from one of the builders that you ought to rethink all your designs, because you've taken steps backwards, something though that effect. What's that all about?

Kelley: Well, i'm not clear, since he didn't articulate the tick standards. It's something I think that will get flushed out in the process for doing the pattern book or the competition. I think it will be very enlightening about the designs that can become accomplished within our standards, or maybe where our standards are mitigating against good design. That's sort of the scope we've left for that. One other piece, if you wanted to scrape to the bare minimum to the two-story structure, if that's a goal for you, it's probably more like a 1.35 ratio, so if you want to split hairs, you could probably go there. This hasn't been vetted with the construction folks, but just our rough calculations, 1.35 or 1.375 you could probably shave a little off the 1.5 ratio, and then you're more at the 20 to 20 1/2-foot total height. So that's two feet off of the earlier -- but i'm not sure that's worth splitting hairs over.

Leonard: I wanted to ask, susan, have we started compiling any of the designs in the new design book? Have we seen any? I know I gave -- I saw a 15-foot design I think I gave you some months back, and it was a victorian design that had as I recall a fairly steep roof, and my thinking is that a design like that was -- it had a balcony on the front and was really a very attractive house, would not fit in either the 1.2 or the 1.375. My concern would be that we would end up doing just exactly what the neighbors don't want to do, is to build houses that might not fit.

Katz: A victorian with --

Leonard: It actually --

Susan Feldman, Bureau of Development Services: There are several of them that people have added gingerbread to, or shakes, or porches, etc. And some people -- some of the builders have added -- made them zero setback, which extends the porch, not the house, but the porch -- when they own the house next door, and there's a driveway there and there's a 10-foot driveway, then they're able to go to zero lot line with the porch and it gives it a totally different look. So I think that's the purpose of the design competition which would not be mandatory at this point. We're trying to explore the possibilities of small lot infill, that then the planning commission is also discussing now which will come to you the idea of allowing 25-foot lots for detached single dwelling units in the r2, which is a multifamily zone, and the r2.5 which is the row house zone, where you see the same things attached, but it would allow these structures there, and we're hoping that the competition would bring out some designs that people with will -- that the builders will actually use that will sort of maximize the opportunities of these houses and not create the same -- sort of the sameness, but --

Leonard: I'm not sure we've actually agreed it will be voluntary.

Feldman: Well, ok. At this point we're coming up with -- I think one of the things that we're doing --

Leonard: Our concept was we would develop what the community, a book of these design that's builders would have to choose from that had been preapproved to fit particular neighborhoods and designs. And we adopted the standards we did in june as a gap measure until we get the book, but our thought was actually to have some -- at least that was what I tried to articulate, some minimum - - but they would be -- they wouldn't be mandatory in the sense would you have to built one of those, but something at least like that or better than that. But they'd have to be real close to what we had put in the book.

Feldman: The other thing that we're looking at, we want to have a category of kind of throw out the codes. What would happen if we had met the building code but not the zoning code and had three-foot setbacks and could have a 19-foot-wide house. How on with that change the characters of these and maybe that's for the better having the narrower setbacks. So we're trying to look at the positive side of infill development and then how it would fit into some other zones also to meet

November 19, 2003

alternative housing goals. In the multifamily zones. I'm not going to touch what you said now, but we're looking at some exciting new things.

Leonard: I take great pride in susan disagreeing with me often.

Katz: She disagree was all of us often, but that's ok.

Leonard: I know. Right.

Katz: All right.

Kelley: I might add that susan and her staff actually did a quick sort of at random look back at plans that had been approved on the small detached homes, some in the last few years and some going back further in time. I think she surveyed 50, they pulled 50 sets of plans. There were three constructed at 18 feet or less. They were all one-story. They tended to bunch between 20 and 23 feet in total height, and those were about 45 out of the 50 structures. Now, in some ways you're probably get what you regulate toward, so there's no evidence here if you -- that someone -- it would have been impossible for someone to develop with an 18-foot two stories, but nobody has at least in this random search.

Leonard: So how are we doing on the design competition, where are we at in that process?

Feldman: We hope to have a competition booklet available for the public early december. The judging would probably not be until about the end of march, I think.

Leonard: So we have a process to disseminate it to the interest groups --

Katz: March? How about february?

Feldman: That's when the judging would be. We need to have it out for a month, etc., have a couple months in there.

Leonard: And I think when we're done we have some very competent people involved in this, that -- I felt from the beginning of this debate that there was points -- good points on both sides. Early on I drove around and looked at some of these house and agreed they didn't fit as they were designed, which resulted in the june amendments that we developed. But then after looking at some of these other designs, I think it was susan who provided them to me, there are some quite attractive house that's can be built that I think address some of the concerns of the neighborhood but still allow the builders to build them so we can provide that housing stock. So I think I -- I really think as soon as we get this book done it's going to make people feel a lot better to see what actually will be put on those lots.

Katz: Ok. So you needed -- you needed a couple -- we need to decide on the height ratio, but you had -- let's take the easy ones first. The technical amendment. November 14 to the november 15.

Leonard: I would move that we adopt the recommendation to change the effective date.

Katz: I do hear a second?

Francesconi: Second.

Katz: Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. [gavel pounded] and let's take the -- take an amendment on the height.

Leonard: What I was going to recommend was the compromise proposed, which was that we maintain the 40% maximum building coverage recommended by the planning commission, and their second recommendation, but because I think it would in the long run harm our efforts to develop these design standards, eliminate the recommendation for the 1.2-to-1 maximum height-to-width ratio.

Katz: To keep it -- to keep it at 1.5. Is that what you're --

Leonard: M-hmm.

Katz: Is that a motion?

Leonard: M-hmm.

Katz: Do I hear a second?

Francesconi: I'll second.

Katz: Any objections? Hearing none. [gavel pounded] ok.

November 19, 2003

Leonard: That's the first time that's happened.

Katz: Well, some of us are very reluctant on all of this, but we're trying to move the process ahead. I'll take a motion to adopt the planning --

Leonard: I would move that we adopt the planning commission's second recommendation with the approved amendment.

Pinard: And including the third recommendation for the technical amendment?

Katz: Right.

Leonard: Yes.

Katz: All right. Do I hear a second?

Saltzman: Second.

Katz: Roll call.

Francesconi: Well, actually the harder issue for me is not the height, and i'll talk about that, but the harder one is, do you accept the first recommendation of the planning commission or the second.

To me that's actually the hardest issue. And because of the comprehensive plan and the integrity and the importance of the comprehensive plan, but because -- and that's the issue i've had all along from the very beginning of this. But because of the -- trying to bring some closure to this, because of the need for a variety of housing stock, because it sat vacant primarily, because it sat vacant, i'm willing to go along with this very reluctantly. And I also think we need some healing on this. On the issue -- and we do need more options, and i'm looking forward to more that commissioner Sten is working on for housing for our citizens. On the height issue, i'd think we are now trying to manipulate the market beyond what we should be doing, frankly. And so I had no trouble with supporting the height amendment. Aye.

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

Katz: A reluctant aye. [gavel pounded] thank you, everybody. We stand adjourned. [gavel pounded]

At 7:46 p.m., Council adjourned.