



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

OFFICIAL  
 MINUTES

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **14TH DAY OF JULY, 2004** AT 9:30 A.M.

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

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

**Motion to suspend the rules and place a resolution on the agenda:** Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-3; N-2, Katz and Sten) Motion Fails.

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

<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>	<b>Disposition:</b>
<p><b>821</b> Request of Charles E. Long to address Council regarding prayers for our Mayor's well being (Communication)</p>	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<p><b>822</b> Request of Freedom Child to address Council regarding Police abuse, lying in reports, ineffectiveness of Citizen Review Committee and bias of Capt. Schenck (Communication)</p>	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<p><b>823</b> Request of Jay Boss Rubin to address Council regarding historic vessels (Communication)</p>	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>TIME CERTAINS</b>	
<p><b>*824</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM</b> – Authorize a labor agreement between the City and Portland Police Association relating to terms and conditions of employment of certain represented employees in the Police Bureau (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendment in 49.3.8.4 to forego the terms annually and semiannually related to medical assessments, when officers are on loss, time loss, and the city's ability to actually get medical documentation and have vocational assessments done:</b> Gaveled down by Mayor Katz after no objections.</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p><b>178591</b> AS AMENDED</p>

July 14, 2004

<b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b>		
<b>825</b>	Statement of cash and investments June 3, 2004 through June 30, 2004 (Report; Treasurer)  (Y-5)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>826</b>	Vacate certain portions of SE Kelton Street under certain conditions (Ordinance by Order of Council; VAC 10018)	<b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 21, 2004 AT 9:30 AM</b>
<b>Mayor Vera Katz</b>		
<b>*827</b>	Amend agreement with Frances Portillo to increase the number of classes to be taught and allow for payment (Ordinance; amend Purchase Order No. 1026828)  (Y-5)	<b>178580</b>
<b>*828</b>	Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the State of Oregon to provide up to \$125,500 for the completion of the Division Green Street/Main Street project under the State Transportation and Growth Management Program (Ordinance)  (Y-5)	<b>178581</b>
<b>829</b>	Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Lake Oswego and the Police Bureau to provide additional access to the Portland Police Data System (Second Reading Agenda 805)  (Y-5)	<b>178582</b>
<b>Commissioner Jim Francesconi</b>		
<b>*830</b>	Authorize a contract and provide for payment for the Old Town Chinatown 3rd and 4th Avenue Improvements Project (Ordinance)  (Y-5)	<b>178583</b>
<b>*831</b>	Authorize an Interagency Agreement between the Portland Office of Transportation and the Portland Development Commission to provide professional, technical and construction services for transportation improvements in fiscal year 2004-2005 (Ordinance)  (Y-5)	<b>178584</b>
<b>*832</b>	Authorize application to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for a grant in the amount of \$89,469 for the Portland Streetcar Eastside Extension Project (Ordinance)  (Y-5)	<b>178585</b>
<b>*833</b>	Amend contract with Recycled Technology, Inc. to manufacture a prefabricated rubber speed bump and for payment of royalties (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 51154)  (Y-5)	<b>178586</b>

July 14, 2004

<p><b>*834</b> Authorize contract with Loaves and Fishes Center, Inc. to provide a mid-day meal service to senior citizens and Meals on Wheels at East Portland Community Center (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>178587</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Dan Saltzman</b></p>	
<p><b>*835</b> Amend agreement with The Climate Trust to extend deadline to acquire additional carbon offsets (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>178588</b></p>
<p><b>*836</b> Amend contract with Community Energy Project for water conservation self-help workshops to extend date, change scope and increase dollar amount by \$50,000 (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 33676) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>178589</b></p>
<p><b>Commissioner Erik Sten</b></p>	
<p><b>837</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with State of Oregon through its Housing and Community Services Department to manage the Ready to Rent Landlord Guarantee Fund (Second Reading Agenda 815) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>178590</b></p>

At 10:13 a.m., Council recessed.

**July 14, 2004**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **14TH DAY OF JULY, 2004** AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Commissioner Saltzman, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi and Sten, 3.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Frank Hudson, Deputy City Attorney; and there was no Sergeant at Arms.

<p><b>838 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Endorse the Memorandum of Understanding with Oregon Health and Science University for future development on Marquam Hill and in the Central City (Resolution introduced by Mayor Katz)</p> <p><b>Motion to accept amendment to change the wording on page 7 in the last paragraph of section V to read the project will commence when the remainder of the necessary funds become available, and accept amendments in memorandum dated July 14, 2004:</b> Moved by Commissioner Sten and seconded by Commissioner Francesconi and gavelled down by President Saltzman after no objections.</p> <p>(Y-3)</p>	<p><b>Disposition:</b></p> <p><b>36233</b> AS AMENDED</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------

At 3:22 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER  
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love  
Clerk of the Council

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

**July 14, 2004**  
**Closed Caption Transcript of Portland City Council Meeting**

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

Key: \*\*\*\*\* means unidentified speaker.

**JULY 14, 2004      9:30 AM**

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

**Katz:** All right, let's do communications. 821.

**Item 821.**

**Charles E. Long:** I think I speak for the whole city council and those in attendance, that we're very happy to have the mayor here in person, and I just want to speak a moment about-- about the mayor has great responsibility until her tenure expires in late december, and i'm sure she has some goals she would like to fulfill. We also, as people of faith, also have a responsibility to pray for the mayor and those in authority and for her well-being. I'd like to quote a couple of scriptures regarding this importance. First, timothy two, paul writes, I exhort therefore that first of all prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks be given for all man, for all in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceful life in all godliness and honesty, for this is good and acceptable in the sight of god our savior. Redeemth thy life from destruction, crownth with loving kindness and tender mercies. Yesterday "the Oregonian" published an article on the 16 soldiers on duty in iraq. There's one soldier that made a remark that I would like to quote. His name is sergeant first class bruce kutchall. I feel their prayers, and I hope that our mayor also would feel the prayers that the community gives on her behalf at this time. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you. 822.

**Item 822.**

**Freedom Child:** Good morning. I'm here this week to tell you about my situation, which i've described to you before, and I wanted to talk to you about the police reports that I got and how disturbing I found this to be. I got -- when I got the police reports and read them, I was just shocked by what they wrote in them, because what they wrote is not the truth. It's not what really happened, and that was very disturbing for me. I did some extensive analysis of the police reports, and there was -- you know, they're full of lies, full of omissions. They're full of -- they don't actually report what I did say and do, and they made up stories to protect their failure to follow the police standards of procedure. And they did that, you know, to protect their jobs. So it concerns me that they're so cavalier about lying in their police reports about such a situation incident over a bike light, and makes me wonder what else they'll lie about. If I lie to a police officer, that's a felony. It's disturbing to me that they think nothing about lying in their reports to protect themselves. They took an oath to tell the truth, and they both sat there and lied, lied, lied. I guess they think they can get away with this, you know, because I was by myself, and they think I had no witnesses. So they're going to find out, if their parents didn't teach them not to lie, i'm going to teach them. They're not going to get away with this. You know, I feel this whole process is set up to protect the police, and what is there to really protect me as a citizen when the police do these stupid things? So i'm very concerned about that there's no accountability for this. When I tried to, you know, file my complaint, it was denied. So, you know, I just want you to know that the cops do these things, and then they walk away, and there's no actions or consequences to them, but, you know, there's consequences in my life. It took a lot of time and energy for me to like to have to get an attorney to defend me and, you know, like evaluate the police reports and all the phone calls and everything i've had to make. I'm sorry, i'm being a little scattered this morning. I should be more prepared. I just want you to know that these police reports really bothered me. This is wrong. The

**July 14, 2004**

police officials can't lie. You know, when you represent the state, you have a duty to the public, you know, to be honest. And so, you know, i'm going to file a lawsuit and put them on the stand, and then i'm going to let a jury of citizens of this city determine whether or not these police are telling the truth. And, you know, i'm going to be back next week and talk about the independent police review process that did not work for me.

**Katz:** Thank you. 823.

**Item 823.**

**Jay Boss Rubin:** My name is jay rubin, 306 southeast ash. This is my first 10 trips to the willamette cove barge. The first person to take me out is from linton. The leonards know about it from fishing. I couldn't believe there's a giant old wooden barge beached out in north Portland. I went back to the barge by myself a month later, trespassed down from willamette boulevard. Feels scary down there by yourself, like that thing is haunted. I climbed up on it, but couldn't get down in it. The third time I went out to the barge, adam clay and I were jogging from 13th and alberta out to linton, a real challenge. We approached the barge from the railroad tracks. Fourth time out to the barge, me and heath were in search of little river history. It worked. The oldest oldtimers at the portway tavern said that barge was their favorite fishing spot. It's been there as long as any of the oldtimers' oldtime memories can remember. Fifth time out to the barge I was on a date. Sixth time, seventh time I went with a historian. The barge had transformed into a construction site. The next morning I went into commissioner Saltzman's office and I was helped to find out that barge was slated for demolition. Eighth time I went with a reporter from "willamette week." ninth time out I went with an archaeologist. We made flapjacks made with water with the willamette river. My last trip was with a ragtag group of four. Everyone has gazed at it in sheer wonder. It's unique. On the deck of the barge near the bow someone has written "lost tale of a city" and drawn the Portland skyline. Portland didn't always have a skyline, and river barges in the pacific northwest have been viewed as generally uninteresting. I have that in writing. I thought nancy boggs' barge was uninteresting. She had a saloon and whore house. That barge is worthless and uninteresting, that barge is worth nothing. The willamette cove barge is old, decrepit and dangerous. The barge is worth nothing, as a piece of living history, or potential culture resource, that barge ain't worth nothing at all. It's simply a vessel for that far off thing we cannot name. I've walked across the burnside bridge at dawn, felt the nitty-gritty spirit of this town in my bones, a port town built by our city fathers looking for a fresh start out west. That represents 70 years of maritime history to reconnect Portlanders with what this town is about. These developers and master planners should think twice before chopping up the oldest remaining vessel on the entire willamette river. We need to start thinking about it. We'll have critical mass on our waterways and every citizen will carve out his own canoe. Let's think about the values of that old wooden barge before tearing it to pieces. Thank you.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Francesconi:** I move to suspend the rules to place a resolution on the agenda.

**Leonard:** Second.

**Katz:** Just a minute. Thank you. All right. Go ahead.

**Francesconi:** The resolution is here, mayor.

**Katz:** All right. Why don't you pass it out because none of us have seen it.

**Francesconi:** We've given you a copy.

**Katz:** We've seen several copies that have emerged.

**Francesconi:** So we're placing the motion in front of the council at this point, because it's just an important matter for public discussion. Community safety is all of our responsibilities. This is urgent. We need to hire more officers of color to reflect the community. We need to improve our standards. And we had a work session about three months ago at which the whole council weighed

**July 14, 2004**

in on this. So the intent is to just have a report back to the community in 60 days about how we're going to do it. The time to act is now.

**Katz:** Did I hear a second?

**Leonard:** Yes.

**Katz:** Ok. Discussion? Roll call.

**Francesconi:** Aye.

**Leonard:** Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye.

**Sten:** I want to discuss my vote just quickly. I share, I think the whole council probably does, share the concern that we need to move quickly on police issues. I'm not going to support this resolution for several reasons. The first is that I think these kind of conversations don't work unless we have ongoing community dialogue. Well its true I did see the resolution it was last Thursday after it was press released. And to my knowledge I have not -- it may have been my fault, because i've been at meetings, I have not read the current resolution. When you do a 4/5 amendment, you basically say to the public, which is what this motion does, the urgency of this matter supersedes your need to know what we're voting on, because it's not published, it's not noticed, and there's no opportunity for anybody who's not here today to get on this before it becomes city policy. It's an important mechanism. It's in the city charter to be able to put things on the council agenda in this way, but I think because of the obvious, you know, message to the public, that our judgment this morning is more important than their chance to review it, it should only be used when either the matter is of some sort of procedural consequence that people we can say in our judgment people won't want to discuss or because the matter is so urgent that it supersedes the need to talk about it. A resolution telling the police to do things that they're already working on on another timeline clearly fits neither of those criteria. It is not -- it is not procedural. There will be no opportunity lost to this community if this resolution is not voted on today. And it clearly is not an emergency. It's a political emergency, I suppose, but it is not a substantive one. I am open to a resolution like this. I will not vote for it, nor will I cosponsor it, unless it comes to me on enough time to talk to the chief of police about it, to talk to the community members about it, to talk to the citizen review board whose jobs will be changed through this, and to let people inform me as to what they think about it.

While this may have been in the works for a long time, it is not something that i've become familiar with. There's been a lot of debate as to whether or not it's appropriate for a city commissioner to introduce a resolution about another commissioner's bureaus. I don't have any problem with that. And frankly if commissioner Saltzman does bring a resolution next week saying that the council rules are going to change, I would support that. I have no problem with that. I have no problem with anybody bringing a resolution forward to look at other commissioners' bureaus. The problem I have is that the charter is -- the code is what it is now, and there are three, as far as I can tell, mechanisms to bring this resolution forward and give it proper notice and allow people to debate it and think about it. One is for the commissioner in charge to sign it. That was the commissioner in charge's decision not to do that. The other is for the auditor to sign it, an independent elected officials, and I think everybody believes is extraordinarily substantive, chose not to do that. And the fourth is for four members to put it on the agenda. I would consider doing that. I want to be crystal clear. I would consider using the authority that was given to me by the voters to supersede the commissioner in charge's wishes and put something on to a ballot. I would not do it after it's been press released with no community conversation and no actual request to me to do so except through the media in what is obviously a play. So I cannot support this. I don't even know what the final resolution says that we're asking the citizens to trust our judgment on and say your input is less important than our judgment this morning, therefore we're going to suspend all rules and pass through a resolution that may change the entire face of the police bureau if the chief were to follow what it said. I haven't even read this version. So I would love to talk about these issues. I'd be glad

**July 14, 2004**

to work with it. Frankly, I have more faith in chief foxworth than this resolution implies. But I haven't heard him say he's against a resolution. So I would be willing to talk about this. I am not going to use my vote to supersede public process. No.

**Katz:** Let me talk about the process and then the substance. I have tried my entire 32 years of public service to work collaboratively in the legislature, with democrats and republicans, and if you recall the kitz and Katz team probably had the best three sessions in the long legislative history because of that. I've tried to bring that to the council as well. And because of the councilmembers, it's been successful. Not that we haven't disagreed, but at least we respect each other and we communicate with each other. This resolution has morphed several times. In fact, the version I saw yesterday when I met with the ad hoc committee of the albina ministerial alliance was a different resolution. I have not seen this one before. I personally found it very unfortunate and very disappointing, that two of my colleagues would introduce this without having the courtesy -- and we talk a lot about courtesy -- without having the courtesy to even show me the resolution and talk to me personally. This has been done staff to staff, and i've been here, i've been home, and there's been no conversation. I will support a measure to change the code. This was one of the ways that I had to clearly send a message that this is not the way we do business here. And it's unfortunate that it ended up this way. Now as mayor I can't allow these things to fester. My responsibility is to get to closure and hopefully to a win-win. What the members of the community that I met with, for over an hour yesterday wanted, what they want is a unanimous message by the council, that they do support the reforms that the chief and the bureau are working on. That's fair. We've done it informally, people comment on it, we do it through the budget. But a unanimous message is a fair request. And then we discussed the substance. Let me get to the substance right now. I have an assignment that i've given to the chief. I've given pieces of this to chief kroeker and chief moose over the years, is that we have an organization that needs to rethink itself, just like any organization needs to rethink itself. Certainly every 10 years we ought to rethink the way we do our work. And the way we change management or we reinvent government is to make sure that the parties who are involved, who have the responsibility of making it happen, are involved in making it happen are involved in making it happen, otherwise it doesn't happen. You heard gary blackmer lecture us on that when we did the i.p.r. You've got to give management and employees of an organization the accountability and the responsibility to be part of that conversation, otherwise you'll pass a resolution, you'll feel good about it, you'll go do your politics related to this resolution, and nothing's really going to happen. So it's absolutely critical that the chief and certainly the commissioner in charge, in this particular case the mayor, and the council be involved, because my goal is to bring a resolution, and this was the conversation I had with the ad hoc alliance, was to bring a resolution that the -- the chief and I and the councilmembers could all agree, so that we truly could send a unanimous message to the community, that this is where we're at, this is what the chief has been doing. I won't even go through in detail what chief foxworth has been working on and how many reports he needs to respond to and what he's been doing in increasing the diversity and what the next class of candidates are going to look like. This is all work that's currently being done. I want to make sure that everybody knows that, and we have the opportunity to ask him to bring us a resolution or a report. I will then work with the entire council, so you all feel comfortable with it, and we'll pass it and it will be a strong message, which is what the community really wants. And what's important here, if you're going to do it for the community, the community needs to be involved in it, as well as the community that has the responsibility for implementing it. And that's the reason i'm voting no. [gavel pounding]

**Saltzman:** The reason I supported the motion to suspend the rules was less on the substance of the resolution we were being asked to consider and moreover my objection to the fact that only a commissioner in charge, under our code, is allowed to bring matters before city council affecting their bureaus. I came back from vacation on monday and found out for the first time in the five



**July 14, 2004**

years i've been here this was actually a matter of code. It's always been a strong informal rule around here, I thought, and informal rules are fine, but a written code to that limiting effect is a whole different thing. I don't believe we should have that. I think city councilmembers, we take an oath of office to be city commissioners, not city commissioners in charge. Our breadth and view has to be citywide. And I think towards that end it's a healthier body politic if any member at any time can bring something to the agenda regarding any bureau. So I intend to offer an ordinance next week that will change the code to make the code exactly that. Any city council or the mayor or the auditor can place any item on the agenda affecting any bureau at any time. The practical impact of that next week, if it passes, will be, I think, as the mayor has said, she wants to work with commissioner Francesconi to come up with a resolution we can all support. I think that's great. So it will buy some time. If those talks don't succeed a week from now the code will be changed and this resolution can be introduced again by any member of city council and --

**Francesconi:** Commissioner Saltzman, I think that is the right way to proceed. Mayor, I think that's the right way to proceed. I tried to bring this, with commissioner Leonard, last week, so that there could be a public hearing of this. The last way to do it is on a 4/5ths, but when we went to the auditor they wouldn't accept it so that it could be noticed and so that the whole community could hear about it. When we began this, when I began this with commissioner Leonard, there was no agreement that there was going to be any response to the Albina Ministerial Alliance or any resolution at all. So I won't get into who said what between us, but I offered to work with you on the resolution, and now it is more appropriate for the mayor and for you as police commissioner to do it, and now you've included the council in this, which is -- we have a role on public safety. Commissioner Saltzman clarifies that we have a role. So the right way to do this is with a unified council that talks about diversifying the police bureau, because the last 23 hires have all been white folks. How we're going to diversify this bureau, how we're going to institute national standards for training, and how we're going to work with our officers in the community to achieve it is the right result, with your leadership. So I'm satisfied.

**Katz:** Thank you. Let's move on.

**Leonard:** I want to just take the opportunity to explain my vote and hopefully drop this for today. I appreciated the discussion, but, you know, frankly I had a lot of input in the development of the resolution. I am not running for anything. I am doing this because these are issues I've spoken to publicly since I've been here. To suggest, for instance, that the deadly use force policy is not something that has been contemplated by the council up till now is not accurate. It's something I've talked about here in informal sessions. To suggest another provision of this proposal that calls for labor management system has not been publicly discussed is a little flabbergasting to me. I've discussed it with you, mayor, and other commissioners, and the chief, a number of times. That's spoke to in the resolution. And I guess I would agree with the mayor that for an organization to change requires everybody to be involved. And that's exactly what the resolution requires, is not just one side of the police bureau be involved in these fundamental changes, that they include the work force. That is a key to success for changing the police bureau. And if the message I'm hearing today, which frankly is the first time I've heard it, that the mayor is willing to be inclusive of all of us in developing a resolution, I'm very satisfied at that message and I'm happy to work with the mayor in developing that. But I -- I have to say that this is something I have felt strongly about and expressed here for some time and it is something I'm not willing to just sit back and forget. And so based on that, I'm willing to do what I can to collaborate and work with the mayor and the police bureau, but I intend to vote on a resolution soon.

**Katz:** Thank you, everybody. All right, consent agenda. Any items to be removed off the consent agenda. Anybody in the audience? Roll call on consent agenda.

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

**Katz:** Mayor votes aye. [gavel pounded] 824.

July 14, 2004

**Item 824.**

**Yvonne Deckard:** Good morning, mayor, commissioners. For the record, my name it's yvonne deckard and i'm the director of the bureau for human resources. I'm losing my voice this morning. I'll try to speak up.

**Katz:** Oh, and we have an amendment.

**Deckard:** Right, we do have an amendment. You have before you for ratification the labor agreement between --

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Louder, please. Thank you.

**Deckard:** You have before you for ratification the labor agreement between the city of Portland and the Portland police association. This agreement reflects the analysis and award issued by arbitrator carlton snow as amended by stipulations of the parties. The contract covers the period of july 1, 2002, through june 30 of 2006, and replaces the contract that expired june 30 of 2002. On july 7 of 2004, the p.p.a. membership ratified this agreement. Some of the highlights of the new agreement includes a c.p.i. wage increase of 2.2% effective july 1 of 2002. A c.p.i. wage increase of 2%, plus an additional 1% effective july 1 of 2003. A c.p.i. wage increase of 2-- of 2%, plus an additional 1% effective july 1 of 2004. And a c.p.i. wage increase with a floor of 2% and a maximum of 5% effective july 1 of 2005. On benefits, effective july 1 of 2004, the p.p.a. ceased its participation as a voting members of the labor management benefit committee. Effective july 1 of 2004, ppa members were provided a specific ppo plan called city net. The city net reflects the city core's plan with the lower out-of-pocket maximum of \$1,000 per individual and \$2500 per family for in network use and \$3600 per individual and \$9,000 per family for out of network use. There is no longer a fixed dollar cap for this employee group. The city will pay 95% of the cost of premiums and the p.p.a. members will pay 5% of the cost of premiums. The cost of medical, visual, dental plans are based on p.p.a. claims alone, data alone. Domestic partner coverage is included, and p.p.a. has relinquished all interest in the health fund reserves. Concerning on call, the city and p.p.a. has moved from the one for six called for in the last best offer that the arbitrator awarded to a percentage pay in order to mitigate cost impact associated with on call. The new agreement stipulates that on call pay will equal 10% of a day's base pay for each day or portion thereof an officer is in on call status. A day is defined as an eight-hour workday. Base pay is defined as the top of base pay of the police officer classification. On call is defined all time an officer is subject to immediate on call duty and required to be reachable by pager or phone and where the officer would be subject to discipline for failing to respond to an on call notification. Concerning working out of class, each time an officer is assigned temporarily the full substantial duties of the -- of a higher classification for a period of one shift or more, the officer will be paid his regular -- his or her regular pay, plus an 8.2% increase, or the entry rate of the higher classification, whichever is greater. Concerning extended bereavement leave, with the approval of the chief an additional 30 days of paid leave may be granted a p.p.a. member in the event of the death of a child or spouse. Transport of prisoners, time on duty for transport of prisoners is to be paid at regular duty time, overtime rates shall apply if appropriate under the terms of the agreement. And then concerning use of vehicles, the city shall not assess the officers a fee for use of take-home vehicles unless so required by i.r.s. regulations. The p.p.a., the Portland police bureau, and the bureau of human resources, have worked very collaboratively and diligently in the implementation of this award and I recommend that the council ratifies this labor agreement.

**Katz:** Thank you. Did you want to add anything? Questions of yvonne?

**Saltzman:** So the new plan city net is to be administered by the Portland police association entirely? Is that correct? We're no longer the administrator or third-party administrator?

**Deckard:** Well, we're still at this time the administrator of the program, and so just like the benefits office administers city core, it will administer city net. We're looking at the impact of the rates, since the p.p.a. will be rated separately and will determine whether or not the most

**July 14, 2004**

economical way of administering that program is through the city self-insured or if we need to go out for an insured rate, but currently the city is administering that program.

**Saltzman:** And so Portland police association will no longer use kaiser or --

**Deckard:** No. The Portland police -- the city net program actually mirror city core, so they will use kaiser as the insured program, and it's the kaiser northwest, which is the same kaiser plan that the rest of our employee groups are using. Instead of the city core program, it is actually using city net, which mirrors the city core program, except it has a lower out-of-pocket maximum.

**Saltzman:** Ok, thanks.

**Katz:** Chief, Robert, do you want to -- robert, why don't you -- why don't both of you come up.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Mayor, first of all, i'd like to say on behalf --

**Katz:** Identify yourself.

**Robert King:** Robert king, president of the Portland police association. On behalf of the police officers of Portland, we wish you healing and health. We admire the courage with which you have displayed in your treatment and that you are here. We recognize and acknowledge the struggle that you're going through personally and I just want to tell you on behalf of every police officer who's working in Portland, that we want you to heal and to have health and long life.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**King:** This brings to a close a very lengthy process. We have, as yvonne as indicated, worked hand in hand with b.h.r. and the police bureau in an effort to implement the award. We've made a modification to the award, which the officers have ratified, both a change in how on call pay is paid to officers and an extension to the contract. We think that it allows the police bureau to maintain current operational staffing levels across the police bureau and also complies with the intent of the arbitrator's award, which was to compensate officers who were placed on call. We really do think that while this has been lengthy and difficult for all of us, that yvonne and I have been in constant contact since this. Ed and I have spoken extensively. The chief and I have been working together in a whole host of areas to include issues relating to labor management and recruiting, and that we are truly working together in a way that I think is collaborative and that is beneficial. It's what we want and I think it's -- we stand a better chance at getting the results that we want for our community by doing all of that. So in closing, I just think that the officers and probably the whole city will be grateful that this process has drawn to a close. It been three years in coming. And I believe that it's the -- it's the beginning of a relationship that's going to lead to a more cooperative and collaborative effort that will help us solve constructively the real and difficult problems we face together as a city.

**Katz:** Thank you.

**Derrick Foxworth:** Good morning members of the city council. My name is derrick foxworth. I currently serve as the chief of police for the citizens of Portland. I'd like to also weigh in and say that we've worked closely with the bureau of human resources, worked closely with the Portland police association, in determining how to implement this contract. And working with them, the issues of on call pay, we believe that this is something that we can -- that we can live with. We've identified those positions that we feel that it's necessary for members to carry pagers with. The issue of the out of class pay, those are things we're also trying to work on developing the language actually implement the contract, and we're working closely with the p.p.a. and bureau of human resource and this is something that i'm personally glad to say that it looks as though we're at a point now where we can get this contract ratified. I do believe it's also going to have a tremendous impact on morale in the organization. It's been weighing heavily on the officers, sergeants and detectives for quite some time, and I believe that the contract, hopefully if it is ratified, will have a very good impact on the morale of the organization, help us move forward on many fronts.

**Katz:** Thank you. Questions by the council?

**July 14, 2004**

**Leonard:** I do want to say that i'm notwithstanding the earlier concerns I raised about the lack of effective labor management system, this ironically is an example where I personally experienced chief foxworth leading the way to try to resolve this issue. And I appreciated it then, and I told you privately, but I wanted to say publicly that I thought you exhibited unique leadership in trying to resolve this, notwithstanding some of the pressures you were receiving from your side. I want to acknowledge that and say I appreciate it and hope we can build on that kind of model for the future relationships between the management of the police bureau, which is up to and including the commissioner in charge, and the police officers, because I -- you know, I go back to what the mayor said earlier. We cannot make the changes that we're talking about unless everybody's on board.

**Katz:** Thank you. All right. Is there anybody else that wants to testify before I present the amendment? It's a minor one. It's 49.3.8.4. Yvonne, you want to share the two words that we're pulling out? Annual and semiannual.

**Deckard:** Yes. In 49.3.8.4 in the original agreement you have before you, it has the words annually and semiannually. This is related to medical assessments, when officers are on loss, time loss, and the city's ability to actually get medical documentation and have vocational assessments done, the p.p.a. and the city agree that rather than to have it done annually or semiannually, that we would forego those terms so that we could do them as we agreed that they needed to be done. That's what that change reflects.

**Katz:** Ok. Any objections to the amendment? Hearing none, so ordered. [gavel pounded] anybody else want to testify? If not, roll call.

**Francesconi:** Three points. First the chief and the union led by robert king deserve credit, because this is also cheaper than it could have been. Working together, this is still expensive to the taxpayers at \$3.7 million annually, but it could have been worse, and so you working together made it happen with your members. I guess I appreciate the second point, something you said, robert, which is the police officers did this because they understand there's an issue with staffing. And so how we get more police officers on the street has to be part of our highest priorities. And it's good to see that the members are willing to sacrifice even some potential money to work with the chief on making that happen. The third point is it is the end of one era in terms of negotiations and improved morale. And we hope it's the beginning of another era in terms of the discussion you just witnessed, because it is significant resources that are going to the police, which they deserve for -- for putting their lives on the line, burr it comes at the expense of other things we could be doing. So it is important, as I know, because you and I have talked about it, and you and I have met with the ministers, that the issue about how to diversify the police force, has to be part of this new era and we need the union's help to do it. How we're going to improve training, to at least equal the national standard, if not exceed it, we need both of you and the chief is working on it, but our citizens demand it. As we end this one era and begin the next, we have a lot of common grounds with our citizens, so let's just do this. Aye.

**Leonard:** Aye.

**Saltzman:** Well, this was a long one, and I want to just thank the chief and robert, yvonne deckert, and all of the people in our attorneys' offices and human resources and the mayor's office who labored long and hard to get to where we are today. I particularly want to echo commissioner Francesconi's thanks to the chief and robert king for working out the on call pay to substantially reduce the financial impact on this year's budget of that provision. That was a big -- big bone in our direction. So thank you. Aye.

**Sten:** I'm very glad to be here today. Thanks to everyone. Aye.

**Katz:** It's about time. It's about time. I want to thank everybody involved. I have wished that we would have gotten to agreement much sooner. I've got to tell you, i've learned a lot through this particular process, this particular award. We're going to make it work. Unfortunately, as the council knows, the reductions need to be made. And the chief and I have already had conversation

**July 14, 2004**

that the money I was able to put into add 20 officers is gone, however he's also been asked to find enough money within materials and services to at least make a commitment for 10 additional officers. So we're halfway -- we're halfway there. And as the economy's improving, my goal is to get us the other way, so that not only do we fill the existing vacancies, but we begin to unfreeze the vacancies we had to freeze and add eventually 20 more. 10 will be added. Aye. [gavel pounding] ok. That's it. All right, everybody. We don't have anything further on our agenda, but we will be back at 2:00 today. We stand adjourned. [gavel pounded]

At 10:13 a.m., Council recessed.

**July 14, 2004**  
**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.

**JULY 14, 2004**

**2:00 PM**

[Roll call taken]

**Saltzman:** Mayor Katz will not be joining us. I understand commissioner Leonard is running a little late. We're here today to accept the memorandum of understanding between the city of Portland and Oregon Health and Science University regarding the future development of the OHSU campus and the surrounding neighborhoods. This memorandum spells out our joint aspirations for the future expansion of OHSU's facilities. I realize not everyone in the community is 100% happy with this, but I believe it breaks new ground in the level of the cooperation between the city and OHSU in many areas of mutual concern. I'm delivering remarks on behalf of the mayor. I should clarify, although I associate myself with these remarks entirely. We want to thank Peter Kollar for his leadership and also for the work he's done and others at OHSU with the city on this important joint venture. And thanks also to Steve Statum, Dr. Leslie Hallick and Leslie White. Gil Kelley and Troy Daas for the hard work they put into this document. I'd like also to thank the residents of Southwest Portland, many of whom have served countless volunteer hours on various committees for their continuing commitment to working collaboratively with the city and OHSU to produce the outcomes that we can all be proud of. This m.o.u. is an important next step for the commitment this council has made for the aerial tram final report and recommendations, to deliver many of the improvements and mitigations the community has requested. This m.o.u. contains a lot of good things for Portland. In addition to the benefits of excellent health care services, family-wage jobs, cutting-edge bioscience research and training, we receive from OHSU, this memorandum, the residents of Portland will also benefit from 45 additional acres of open space, improved traffic, safety and roads, bicycle and pedestrian access, stormwater management, not to mention a much-needed update to the 25-year-old Terwilliger Corridor plan. The Schnitzer family's generous land donation came unexpectedly in the middle of this process. So I believe we have amendment language offered later to make sure we work together on its future development. And I'll ask Gil Kelley, director of planning, to describe that amendment in a minute. And before turning it over to Gil Kelley, just Mayor would like to highlight a few -- highlight just a few elements of the m.o.u. that are addressed. Development of new institutional facilities off of Marquam Hill, widening of Southwest Sixth Avenue between Sheridan and Broadway, traffic calming in the Homestead neighborhood, enhanced pedestrian trails and bicycle access, LEED green building standards for new development, natural resource inventory and environmental management plans, improved landscaping and other improvements along Terwilliger Parkway and transfer by OHSU of new open space to the city. And with that I'll turn it over now to Gil Kelley.

\*\*\*\*\*: I should probably read the item, commissioner.

**Saltzman:** Oh, ok. Please read the resolution.

**Gil Kelley:** Thank you, commissioner Saltzman, and good afternoon city council. Gil Kelley, director of bureau of planning. And to my left is Steve Statum, the chief administrative officer for OHSU, and to my right is Troy Doss from the bureau of planning who's been a project manager on the completion of this m.o.u. I'd like to just offer a couple of initial thoughts and allow Steve to add any of his. Then we'd like Troy to walk through the amendments that you referred to, commissioner Saltzman, and to hit some of the highlights of the content of the agreement. I would just like to say

**July 14, 2004**

a couple things at the beginning. One is about the structure of this agreement. It really has sort of three key components. One is that it lays out the long-term partnership aspirations between the city of Portland and Oregon health and science university. The second part is that it posits certain key deliverables as certain ongoing activities, and troy will allude to at least the topics that are involved there. So we've pledged to work together in very specific ways on a number of areas that you mentioned a moment ago. And thirdly, it requires ongoing dialogue indefinitely in the form of an annual report, which would be furnished by ohsu on the progress of the agreement. We would be adding information from our side, and that would be information collected and put together by me and forwarded to you on an annual basis so that you and the community know that we're keeping faith with the agreement here. So that was the basic structure. We've tried to really make this the highest level kind of agreement between these two institutions, and to really capture the synergy between our missions, because there are overlaps that benefit the community as a whole, both in terms of public health care and in terms of advancement of the new economy in Portland. We've also tried to pay attention to this as a large good neighbor agreement and taking into concerns what we heard in the marquam hill planning process, the tram process, and even to some extent the south waterfront process. As ongoing concerns of proximate neighborhoods, and although we don't have a prescription for everything there we've tried to make this agreement an umbrella, to continue to address those things. We have not gone back and sort of upped the ante or reinvented the baseline from the marquam hill plan, which contains many mitigations, but tried to put here, sort of long-term proactive measures that would allow us to continue the good neighbor aspects of living side by side. So with that, i'd like to allow steve to make any comments and then we'll turn it over to troy. Thank you.

**Steve Stadum:** Thank you. Good afternoon, steve stadum, chief administrative officer, ohsu. I'm not going to read any comments to you. I do have a letter i'll submit. I just want to say a couple things. First of all, we have worked very well, I think, with your planning staff and have a good partnership in terms of our working relationship. The m.o.u -- to me this is an opportunity to be somewhat celebratory, because we've made a lot of progress the last two years, even before the m.o.u. was completed. A lot of steps have been taken and a lot of work has been done. The m.o.u. is not intended really to amend the marquam hill plan, it's really intended to supplement it and enhance many of the features. I think we've been doing that on the ground, but I think the m.o.u. documents the partnership that we've attained. Obviously there have been changes, as commissioner Saltzman alluded to, including the schnitzer land donation. So I just want to speak in support of the efforts that we've achieved in terms of the document, but also the many things that have happened over the last couple years. There are some amendments that I think, both with respect to the schnitzer property and some other amendments, that will be offered, as I understand it by the homestead neighborhood, and we support most of those amendments as well. And so I think that really we're at a good point here, where we can move forward with a document that provides a vehicle for us to keep a dialogue going as we started the last two years. Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Thank you, steve. Troy?

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Go ahead, you can cover that, too.

**Doss:** Troy doss of planning. We've passed out a memorandum that outlines some of the amendments that have been submitted into the -- or added into the m.o.u. just recently. The one that both commissioner Saltzman and gil allude to do is ohsu south waterfront planning and basically outlines our collaborative efforts to continue planning with ohsu's additional 20 acres of land in south waterfront. We'd already been working successfully we believe with ohsu and south waterfront planning. This adds a whole new dynamic to the district and we want to make sure we can keep our efforts lockstep as the years go on. There's a few other amendments. Attached to this memorandum are a number of letters. I believe you have a copy of these already, but we've sent them to you again to just to make sure. They're from various organizations, such as homestead

**July 14, 2004**

neighborhood association, hillsdale neighborhood association, swni, friends of terwilliger, and I believe that's -- I believe that's it. And there's various amendments that were offered to the m.o.u. I'm sure you'll hear testimony on those today. We reviewed a number of those and found there were several from homestead that we were able to accept in terms of both the negotiation team being ohsu and the city. So we've added those here and they're outlined here as to where they're located in the draft of the m.o.u. There were a number of other issues that we either felt were duplicated either in the marquam hill plan or in other language in the m.o.u. So we didn't add them, or for one reason or another members of the negotiation team didn't think the items suggested could be added in the m.o.u. We can address those later. I'd rather have those amendments submitted by the petitioners. That basically covers this. Just a real quick outline, there's also -- should have been handed out a list of deliverables that the m.o.u. will result in. They cover the full gamut, so we everything from - - and the reporting of our education and job preparation efforts and reporting of our building a bioscience industry in the city, natural resource issues, such as the development of this stewardship work plan, natural resource strategy for the ohsu properties on marquam hill, continued work for the city, and with ohsu on city inventory work for natural resources on the hill. There's the references to the dedication of 45 acres of new open space from property that was rezoned from residential to open space during the marquam hill plan. That property will now be deeded over to the city. There's discussions about an update of the terwilliger corridor plan, with a gift from ohsu of \$50,000 towards the funding of that project. Language discussing the stormwater -- stormwater stewardship, specifically the development of a stormwater management plan, an annual reporting, and then a number of transportation issues, such as an i.g.a. Recently agreed upon regarding roadway improvements at sixth and sheridan, an outcome of the marquam hill plan. Continued transportation demand management, strategy work, local street calming work, and then additional bicycle and pedestrian route development, and furthering of ohsu's policy regarding Portland leed standards. And I believe that about covers it.

**Saltzman:** The last one was on what page?

**Dpss:** There's actually a section in the m.o.u. that deals with annual -- well, actually we have some -- there's going to be an adoption by ohsu of Portland leed standards as part of a kind of institutional policy for development on the hill. They've been pursuing leed development, both south waterfront and marquam hill already, but this just furthers that over the years to come through the life of the m.o.u.

**Saltzman:** All these amendments are in the current --

**Doss:** No. I'm sorry, the last list of the deliverables are not in the amendment. Only the first series, a separate memo. Sorry to confuse you on that. There's a memorandum handed out today dated July 14, and that has the new language regarding south waterfront planning, all new language, as well as a series of other amendments that were proposed by homestead.

**Kelley:** Rather lengthy list of deliverables that troy just read off are highlights of the agreement. They're already in the agreement. The July 14 memo has these four amendments.

**Saltzman:** Ok. So we've made changes in section three to reflect the schnitzer land donation and all that?

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

**Saltzman:** Ok. Questions, members of the council?

**Francesconi:** On the issue of terwilliger parkway, especially the southern portion of terwilliger parkway, because I think we're going to -- I know we're going to here about this, and so it looks like under the section four, there is an agreement that the city and ohsu recognize and value the parkway and supporting the terwilliger corridor parkway plan and design guidelines, and I think, so this is an acknowledgment of this, and then you've set up a process that includes, under section d there, an update of the inventory, an update of the plan, an update of the guidelines. Are we going to -- is



**July 14, 2004**

this future process going to also address the southern portion, and if any changes can be made so that it doesn't just serve ohsu, but also retains the historic nature?

**Doss:** Yeah. When this actual notion came out of when the -- the Portland aerial tram was being developed and the c.a.c. had recognized that a number of capital improvements are necessary along terwilliger, and we have to agree with that, we also talked with bureau of development services who felt that the design guideline process is a little bit cumbersome and doesn't address things people want addressed. There was a refining of those, retooling of those, as well as a capital improvements program for the entire parkway. One of the things we also heard a lot about is trying to implement speed controls along terwilliger. Although it's difficult to implement speed bumps, because it's an emergency route, there's maybe things that we could address through this update, such as creating a greater sense of place, gateway portals, so you have a greater sense when you're entering terwilliger you're entering a special place. In many ways people when they enter it, they don't know where they're at. There's not an established gateway at any entrance there. We thought there's a number of things we could do. We could also help to re-establish the scenic viewpoints which have been lost over the years because they haven't been maintained, and look at other improvements, and that would cover the entire parkway, not just the area around ohsu. We've heard concerns as well, you know, why is there \$50,000 coming toward this from ohsu. We're looking at it as a gift. It would probably cover maybe 20% of the cost of the project, just on our basic estimates of it.

**Francesconi:** Ok. Mr. President, Janet Bebb is here from parks. I would suggest maybe after we hear some testimony on this, I think it would be get park's perspective on this issue from Janet.

**Saltzman:** Ok.

**Francesconi:** I don't have any other questions.

**Saltzman:** Ok, thank you. Karla, people to testify, maybe call them three at a time.

**Saltzman:** Good afternoon. Please give us your name. You each have three minutes.

**Walt Amacher:** My name is Walt Amacker. First I'd like to say that sometimes that people complain about Marquam Hill plan are seen as being objecting to ohsu. I'd first like to say that ohsu is a wonderful asset for the city. They employ 11,000 people -- over 11,000 top-notch medical center. In 1988 they sewed up my arm and I couldn't be happier. It was a bad accident, and I'm so happy. And it just a very valuable asset, but the problem is that it's just got placed in the wrong place. Now in the memorandum it says both parties support the policies and guidelines of Marquam Hill plan. I'd like to read those. The goals, there's eight of them. The first one, terwilliger parkway corridor plan, the first is to preserve and enhance the scenic character and natural beauty of terwilliger parkway and boulevard. Second, to maintain and enhance unobstructed views from terwilliger boulevard and the trail. Third, to improve opportunities for a variety of recreational uses along terwilliger and reduce conflicts between these uses. Fourth, to guide the siting, scale, landscaping, traffic impacts and design of new development to enhance the aesthetic experience of terwilliger. Next one, to manage the location and design of new vehicular access to terwilliger in order to reduce traffic hazards and incompatible visual impacts. The next one, very important, which we tend to disregard is to reinforce the primary transportation function of the parkway as a leisurely scenic drive and a bicycle commuting path rather than a heavily-used route for vehicular through traffic. The next one to improve public safety and protect citizens from crime and to reduce maintenance and improvement costs. Now I had a conversation with Mike Lindberg about a year ago and asked him about this. He was one of the original signers on this design. And he said that at that time they never envisioned ohsu as having this much impact on the corridor. Now to put it in perspective, the corridor plan says that right now there's 20,000 vehicles that use the parkway, 2/3 of which is ohsu's traffic. They've projected in 2040 there will be 40,000 vehicles using the parkway, 2/3 of which is ohsu. Put that in perspective. 25,000 cars pass through Hood River each day on I-5. It's very hard to find any intersection in this town that has 20,000 vehicles going through. And we're talking about doubling that. Now one of the things I want to bring up about

July 14, 2004

this -- this amendment is, are these rights going to be available to other people? I own 107 feet of frontage on terwilliger parkway. Can I put in a speed bump, take back some of the public good that was donated in the original bequeath? I'm part of the original terwilliger bequeath. The next thing, why is it in the interest of protecting the parkway by increasing traffic. This is a problem. And so -

**Saltzman:** Can you wrap up, paul?

**Amacher:** Pardon?

**Saltzman:** Your time is up.

**Amacher:** One more thing. I think the city is long overdue of connecting campus drive directly to barbur. It's public property. There's no reason it can't than be done and a bridge over the gulch to connect terwilliger. It solves the problem. Something that's long overdue. If as mr. Francesconi said they're going to buy the property on gibbs, that gives you the right-of-way to continue it down to the macadam area.

**Saltzman:** Ok, thank you.

**Amacher:** Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Doug.

**Doug Weir:** Doug weir with friends of terwilliger and president of friends of terwilliger. I live at 342 southwest hamilton court. The reason we're here, each generation, we only have a short time here, and what we're trying to do is we're trying to protect and leave a legacy for future generations. And we're really counting on the city to help protect those scenic resources. Parks, the main difficulty is that everybody's trying -- encroaching on parks. They want to develop natural areas all the time. We're fighting a battle of trying to keep it -- you know, protect the boundaries and keep it nice and natural. And our natural areas is what keeps Portland nice. I mean, it's what makes the city special. As walt said, you know, the goal f talks about to reinforce the primary function of terwilliger as a scenic drive. And really that's what we're trying to do. And we know that there's some language in the m.o.u. talking about a commitment in general to the terwilliger as outlined in the m.h.p., but I think we need something stronger in the language that shows a real strong commitment to the parkway. And what we're really asking for, and what -- what friends of terwilliger is asking for, is the same level of commitment and effort that the city has given to solving ohsu's internal transportation with the tram and all the tax, you know, relief been given down on north macadam, that same level of commitment toward solving the traffic issues on terwilliger and in the surrounding neighborhoods. And we understand that this is going to be a long-term process. This isn't a fast fix, but we believe that this resource is just too important to pass it down to future generations in a degraded manner. That's why we're here. Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Thanks.

**Don Baack:** Don bach, southwest burlingame place, i'm here representing hillsdale and comments from southwest trails are my private view. First of all, I agree with walt. Ohsu is a great employer. We've got our housing values in southwest are largely affected by lots of people working there. We support that. However, terwilliger plan should not be put in just hopped over everything else we've been planning on in southwest. We've been looking at having a barbur plan for a long time. I'll get into that later. This council should establish a charter of what's going on with -- what should happen on the terwilliger study that include the points raised in our hillsdale motion. I won't get into all those details. You have that in front of you. The city should fund this plan for terwilliger. Ohsu should be just another player, just like walt, who lives along it, and a lot of other people in hillsdale that live along it, ohsu should live along it. They should not own the table. The funds they're willing to put up should be spent on projects. Hillsdale is adversely affected by traffic from terwilliger, and that's what we'd like to see if and when that study is done. Other comments, in the m.o.u. several reports asked of staff, the citizens involved in developing a lot of those recommendations should be involved in preparation of those reports. That's really important. A lot

**July 14, 2004**

of those things, we took staff around them to show what was needed. If there's a change of staff, we'll have to do that again, and if they don't ask, they'll put stuff down they don't know anything about. It's really important to have citizens involved in the reports and updates. And not just ohsu. They should be the same as the citizens, another person at the table. Include informed citizens in all of these reviews. In regard to the donation of land, i'm very thankful they're willing to do it, however it's got defects. It's infested with ivy, blackberries. A sample take nearby estimates 85% infestation with english ivy. There's a cost to remove that. In our own parks, we don't know how much is involved in this, but we're taking on unfunded liabilities here. That part to be part of the process of this m.o.u. Not take it as they're offering it. Furthermore, earlier this year, when they got their big building permit, or last year, for their building, they got a buy on having to put sidewalks on sam jackson. Just given to them. No quid pro quo, for mediation for that. Anybody else, their feet would be held to the fire to mitigate things not put in. That needs to be part of the negotiation. The barbur plan, in 1999 we had conflicts between -- the reason this is really important to us, that this plan, the terwilliger plan, be deferred, in 1999 we had conflicts on standards with the state and the state basically said, if I may finish this comment, mr. President, the state and the city said, wow, we can't address this quickly, so charlie hale said let's have a study, and if we get done with the study we'll have a funding for you. And then we said, wait a minute, there's a southwest community plan effort going, shouldn't we look at that? No, that's not a problem, we'll go ahead and do that. So I actually chaired the technical and citizen advisory committee working on the streetscape plan. It was adopted by council and then metro funding was asked for. This last year, the whole thing was dropped from financially constrained to sort of like never-never land. We're basically -- and then it was said, well, we're going to connect it to the doing of the study on barbur. So barbur basically is the key to \$10 million to \$12 million of funding for really needed pedestrian and basically streetscape improvements on barbur. And that's one of the 45% of city substandard streets, arterials we have in southwest. Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Thank you.

**Amanda Fritz:** I'm amanda fritz. I'm one of the mighty registered nurses working at ohsu, so i'm required by my employer to state the following. Although i'm employed at Oregon health and science university, i'm not representing ohsu, its board, or any of its employees or their position on this issue. I am, however, representing the mighty neighborhood association. Allowing an interested party to fund a planning process introduces unacceptable bias, and if ohsu has \$50,000 to put toward improvements on terwilliger, they should go to improvements on terwilliger and not to the planning process. Second of all, where is the rest of the funding coming from and where is the process to balance those -- the funding for this project with other park and planning needs? This is not -- the update to the terwilliger plan is not the most pressing parks project in the city. It's not the most pressing planning project in the city. So why is the city proposing to give funds to this update and promising to do it within a year without going through the impact analysis, impact assessment approach without asking the rest of the city, do we all agree that this is our number one priority for our city planners and parks department to be spending their time on this? And why are we doing it without asking the residents living nearby in a holistic and timely manner, are you willing to put your time into this, or are you busy on other projects? Southwest neighborhoods hasn't taken a position that this is a priority project for us. In west Portland park, our priorities, I agree with don, are the barbur project and the west Portland town center. We don't support this jumping the line for the terwilliger plan simply because there's a very small amount of funding that shouldn't be going into a planning project in the first place. And finally, when we were doing the marquam hill plan, it was evident that many of the conditions of approval of previous land use reviews affecting ohsu had not in fact been completed. I would suggest it's better to rehalf this element from the m.o.u. And see if the rest of it is done properly before we go ahead and open the terwilliger plan again. So on behalf of my neighborhood association, I request that you remove that element.

**July 14, 2004**

**Francesconi:** Wait, i'm confused a little bit, amanda. The reason I wanted janet to come up here was to talk about the update to the plan, but also the funding issue that you raise. But the problem is, if we do what you say and take it out completely, because there is higher priorities, because your statement is correct from both the planning and a parks statement, that there are higher priorities, but if we do that then we just kind of leave the parkway and don't address some of these impacts that could be on it, so we don't improve the parkway. And that doesn't seem fair to the friends of terwilliger frankly.

**Fritz:** Commissioner, there are a lot of things that are waiting to be done, and there are impacts happening because we're not funding them. And the \$50,000, as was mentioned, is only 20% of the funding. So the 80% comes from the city. Terwilliger and the marquam hill area have had just had an extensive planning process. Those \$50,000 could well be put to ivy removal, which the long are we leave that ivy the more it's going to spread and the more of a problem it's go going to be, perhaps we should turn to other parks and planning priorities, or perhaps we should do it in the annual review, is this a priority, is the best way because we're getting the \$50,000, but the \$50,000 could be put to other uses.

**Francesconi:** I have a feeling ohsu doesn't care how the \$50,000 is spent, but we'll find out.

**Fritz:** We're always willing to do more than we have the fund for. We always promise things in planning projects that we're going to do things and don't ever look at things in a citywide manner -- well, occasionally we do, but not as much as we should -- look at things on a citywide manner as we're promising things to say, is this the most urgent thing that we ought to be doing right now.

**Francesconi:** My last question. Have you talked this over with antoine and all the other folks so we have a consistent neighborhood view or do you have one perspective on behalf of one neighborhood that's different than someone else's?

**Fritz:** Antoine --

**Francesconi:** That's ok if it's different. That's not your job to make it coordinate. I just want to know for my own sake.

**Fritz:** We have talked and emailed and had some discussions. The purpose of each neighborhood association is to advocate for the best for its neighborhood.

**Francesconi:** Right.

**Fritz:** And so hopefully homestead would like this done sooner rather than later. Other neighborhoods have other projects they would like done sooner rather than later. I learned on the planning commission to have a little bit more broad look at things, which is why i'm speaking for my neighborhood association but not going overboard that we would like the barbur and west Portland town center done sooner. But certainly in the southwest neighborhoods we have a very collegial and collaborative relationship, but there's hasn't been very much time for this discussion.

**Francesconi:** Ok, thanks.

**Marcy McInelly:** Marcy mcinelly on southwest condor avenue. That puts me in the homestead neighborhood. I'm here to ask you to consider seriously the changes in that anton vetterloin will be talking to you about after we leave the table. These are changes to the memorandum. And I want to just say that these may seem like subtle changes, but they're very, very important to protecting the original intent of the terwilliger plan that people have spoken of just previously. I'm a former planning commissioner. I worked on this plan. It was one of the last projects I completed before I resigned. And i've been following this one thread about the terwilliger plan and the way it will be addressed and the m.o.u. for years since the plan has been making its way through. I'm a little disappointed to see that this language has been eliminated from the memorandum of understanding and that we're here on the eve of the city council adopting the memorandum of understanding to assure that this language is taken in. If it's true that city and ohsu recognize that we value the unique characteristics of the terwilliger parkway, as the m.o.u. states, then the language that is being proposed by anton here really needs to be in the memorandum as well. The way that the

**July 14, 2004**

memorandum of understanding has simplified the original intent of the terwilliger plan jeopardizes the health of terwilliger. In particular the traffic calming language that's used to ensure that certain mitigation, traffic mitigation measures will be carried out in the future, is a kind of interesting language shift, traffic calming does not allow you to address terwilliger because traffic calming measures are not allowed on streets that serve emergency vehicles. And this is something that we fault for in the very beginning, the last months that I was working on this plan, it's been systemically dropped. So i'm here to say if these things are very important to, and I think terwilliger as a parkway, as it was originally intended in the terwilliger parkway plan, needs to be preserved. This language is very important.

**Saltzman:** Thank you.

**Rich Davidson:** Thank you, dan. My name is rich davidson. I reside at 3434 southwest 12th. I've lived just west of ohsu for the past 28 years. And i've been involved in -- I was originally a member of the friends of terwilliger and been involved in the homestead neighborhood association for most of those years. Clearly i've seen a great deal of change at ohsu over all of those years, and certainly this new era is going to bring this facility and the bio/tech corridors right to the forefront of Portland's front door. And as everyone comes to Portland and sees this, it's going to be one of the main items that people will think of and look at Portland. It's been stated before, and I want to first of all reinforce that again, that our protection of terwilliger, in the long run, is at least on the top scale of some of our priorities that we should be continuing to address. Along those issues, as I said i've said a lot of change at ohsu. One of the things that I would like to speak on today is that we've thought of a lot of new solutions at ohsu. When I was first involved with gordon of the design of doernbecher, we couldn't figure out how to maximize the money to build a building that would -- that would facilitate as much room for the children. We built a bridge and made it into a building. It's one of the most successful buildings on ohsu. That's a new dream that came up and became a reality. I'm saying to you that I think in the future we'll be able to find a way to access the hill, possibly a road or something that is going to resolve our terwilliger traffic problem and ohsu. I'm convinced of that. And so along those lines, let's keep the door wide open about the responsibility that we have to reduce the traffic on terwilliger, to maintain the scenic beauty, and to -- and the wording perhaps in section 11, in that first section, due to limited number of road accesses, or traffic, make sure we have language in there that we're seeking to solve that traffic problem on terwilliger into the future. And that's my -- I guess the strongest mission that I have in our planning and our long-term vision today. Thank you very much.

**Saltzman:** Thank you.

**Anton Vetterlein:** Anton vetterlein, i'm the homestead neighborhood president. And I do want to say before I launch into criticisms, that I do support a lot of this m.o.u. There's a lot of great things in it. The donation of ohsu property to the city parks bureau is a great thing, and so I don't want to detract from that. In my mind that serves as an offset to the increased density on the hill by providing for some open space. Though it doesn't necessarily deal with the problem of impacts to terwilliger, and that's the thing I wanted to address here. I don't think the m.o.u. adequately addresses the issues. There's plenty of language in the draft m.o.u. that further enshrines the ohsu right to use terwilliger as a vehicle access route and even as a construction staging area, but there's little, if any, that seeks to protect or enhance its standing as a city park. The marquam hill plan was crafted the same way, and I think the protections that are offered in it are indirect and were designed more by traffic engineers who weren't taking into consideration the special standing of terwilliger as a parkway. Both the marquam hill plan and the draft m.o.u. have sidestepped the discussion of what terwilliger means to our city and what kind of place it will be in the future. Both documents explicitly define it as a vehicle access route to ohsu, yet neither recognize that it has any special standing. Terwilliger parkway will suffer a long, slow decline as more traffic traverses it and more concessions are made unless we act now to better define how we will protect it from traffic impacts.

**July 14, 2004**

An update to the terwilliger parkway plan, as proposed in the m.o.u., I think will be meaningless unless we do something to deal with this issue of traffic on terwilliger now. So i'm supportive of the idea of an update to the plan if we can make these changes to the m.o.u. Otherwise I think it's going to be kind of pointless, because most people recognize the biggest problem is traffic, and that, i've been told, is something they do not want to deal with in a terwilliger plan update. I really don't think the marquam hill plan was written so tightly that there isn't room for refinement on the issue of terwilliger." submitted additions and changes which hopefully you have before you to the language of the m.o.u. draft that will better define terwilliger as the important and historic parkway that it is and help ensure that it will remain the city's premier parkway for walking, running, biking, and as a link between numerous other parks and natural areas. And what i've given you, in the bold italics is what has not been accepted by ohsu and the bureau of planning. So certainly some things have been included in that I requested, and I think those were a lot easier for them, but they haven't addressed this issue of, you know, is it a park or is it not? Let me just quickly finish here. I don't think this proposed language denies ohsu their right to use terwilliger. We're not saying they can't traverse any part of terwilliger, it's just expresses an intention to limit the impacts in the exercise of their right. And so my main idea has been talking about endorsing goal f of the terwilliger parkway corridor plan, particularly south of campus drive. I think there's a visual that can help explain why that's important. Here's duniway park, here's i-5, here's capitol highway, here's ohsu, and there's campus drive. This is all they really need to access the campus. That's what all their planning, their vehicular circulation site development concepts are set up to recognize, and they really haven't talked about using this length of terwilliger down here. However, I think they're wanting to keep it available as a pressure relief valve, keep their options open, but I don't think that's essential for access to the parkway. And yet it would mean so much to the parkway to protect that section of it. Thank you.

**Saltzman:** So we have two handouts you've given us.

**Vetterlein:** I gave you one handout which has --

**Saltzman:** I'm looking at two here.

**Vetterlein:** It looks like this, and has the goals of the parkway attached to the pack three pages. Tom just gave you the handout as well.

**Saltzman:** Ok. That's the one you're referring to, the boldface language is the language that was not adopted?

**Vetterlein:** Right. And specifically I would like to see added, in adopting the marquam hill plan the city council also reaffirmed its commitment to the terwilliger parkway corridor plan. Ohsu and the city support maintain the primary transportation function of the parkway south of campus drive as a leisurely scenic drive and as a bicycle commuting path as described in the terwilliger parkway corridor plan goal f.

**Saltzman:** Ok. Great, thanks. Tom.

**Tom Miller:** Yes, thank you. My name is tom miller, 1225 southwest curry road. I've given you in writing all my suggestions for the m.o.u. I won't dwell on terwilliger, because I was planning, and i'm glad a lot of people have already addressed that issue. I'd like to start with just highlighting a few things here. Under exhibit c in the transportation and parking, the implementation section, talking about where the deliveries, ohsu vehicles are going to run, etc., I -- well, anton and I sat down with susan and gil to go over the m.o.u. Almost 2 1/2 years ago now, and I suggested something I repeated lots of times in the year and a half of the ctag meeting, trying to ohsu vehicles off of 11th street. There's veterans hospital road, which runs right adjacent to the school. You can see the list of all the vehicles that use 11th street. It's actually -- it's not as direct, but if you're getting paid a wage it's easier to take the long way to get from north campus to south campus than going through the neighborhood. I do believe that would be an appropriate policy to have in this. The next issue would be almost an omission of jackson park road. I'm talking about from shriners

**July 14, 2004**

hospital down the hill. It's dangerous and substandard street, and i'd like to share with you three stories about that section of road. I went down there here last week, middle of the night. I found six sections where I could measure 26 feet from the cliff on the uphill side to the railing on the downhill side. Each road -- each direction of road -- traffic lane is 11 feet wide. So you do the math. There's like not enough space -- I mean, it's just substandard. I've been on the bus twice in the last two months and had each bus driver stop and pick up a pedestrian walking down that street. Once said i'm just going to the bottom of the hill. He said, don't worry, i'll give you a ride anyway. They said I can't afford a fee. She said, just get on, i'll give you a ride, this is too dangerous to walk on. The other section is that unfortunately the drainage is terrible there. We had eight days of inclement weather in june. One of those days had a big rain shower. As I expected, it put a bunch of rock and gravel across the road. There's one other -- there were four of us. One is deceased, one lives in a old folks home, one chose not to, and I didn't go down to shovel the snow like we have in years gone by. This issue needs to be addressed. This section of sam jackson is substandard and dangerous. I do believe it's should be addressed. Another issue is motorcycles and scooters. They park on a substandard section of ninth street west of the campus. I've counted as many as 39 vehicles there. It's inundating that corner, the mail truck can't get by. I've brought this up at the marquam hill oversight committee. I believe this issue needs to be remedied. I think it's appropriate to be in here. Express buses, too, I brought up at the marquam hill oversight committee, i'd like to get them off terwilliger. I've cited that from the beginning. Now they closed the sellwood bridge, at least the one in milwaukie would be stopped. That hasn't happened. Rather than going down to the major arterials, going out barbur, it's all written in here, going out barbur, going out mcloughlin, beaverton-hillsdale highway, they take terwilliger and unfortunately pick up a great number of hide and ride parkers that inundate these other neighborhoods. I believe this is -- I believe it can be remedied. I do cite in there that t-41 talks about the satellite buses. I believe that could be enhanced.

**Saltzman:** Ok.

**Miller:** Several other things in here. Remember, we talked about fairmount. It's been omitted. This is a tremendous oversight for this plan.

**Saltzman:** Ok, thank you.

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

**Saltzman:** Anybody else wish to testify? Janet, we'll have you come up. I just want to see if there's anybody else in the public that wishes to testify. Ok, janet with the parks department.

**Janet Bebb:** I'm janet bebb with Portland parks and recreation. Thank you for this opportunity to talk with you. I've been working with bureau of planning on the m.o.u. We've been talking primarily about terwilliger parkway. From the park bureau's point of view, terwilliger parkway is one of our most outstanding assets. We're very interested in the historical integrity of it and preserving the experience for the users on the parkway. We did in 1997 bond project improvements on terwilliger parkway that included sidewalk improvements, the length of it. During that process we identified some aspects of the parkway that we need to look into and remedy, and since that time it's has been on our minds that we need to address some capital improvements on terwilliger parkway. Primary of those include lighting, signage, a unified signage plan, and a view management plan that takes into account both the natural resource values and the user experience of the views within its historic context. Those are items that we believe require sophisticated consultant assistance in doing a study to come up with a plan that's worthy of this special place. In order to do that we need funding for it. At this time, when we began the conversation, it appeared that the tram in its outreach to the neighborhood, identified several tiers of neighborhood outreach projects in working with matt brown he identified 50,000 per year that he was proposing come to parks, and we earmarked the first two years to take care of terwilliger. That would be then matched with funds from ohsu. Unfortunately the funds were not available. So from our point of view, this

**July 14, 2004**

is an unfunded great idea. We would like to proceed, but I would like to see that the m.o.u. say when funding becomes available. We'd like to do it in a manner that we think is highly professional and full of integrity and to do that we need the funds we were looking for. That said, I want to address a couple of things from amanda fritz's testimony. One is that we have, for our use, for our planners, in the general fund, we have criteria of how to do master plans. We have over 250 parks, many of them need master plans. So we have criteria, based on use, pressure, deterioration of resources. One of the criteria is interest from the neighborhood. One of the criteria is special funding. So it is true that terwilliger has been on our minds for a long time. We have a whole list of five-year programs that could not include terwilliger, but should we receive special funding for that it's completely justifiable in our point of view that it's a resource that needs continuing protection and needs study on it. So I do also want to say that from the park point of view, when we receive outside funds to do a study, we do it on a contractual basis. There is no bias. There's no obligation that we feel associated with money. That said, one final point is that I understand from talking with some of the neighbors and working with bureau of planning, that traffic really is the neighborhood's number one issue. It's not lighting, signage, view management, those things that are park priorities. We would prefer to do the project in a manner that addressed the neighborhood concerns on traffic to the extent possible so that we get a free field and willing answer to address the capital concerns that are on our minds. So we would advise a two-part study. I know we've talked with troy about this, and with pdot, that the first part address traffic, and then the second part move on to the terwilliger plan update and the capital improvements.

**Saltzman:** I'm a little confused by all the \$50,000 being thrown around.

**Bebb:** Oh, sorry.

**Saltzman:** You mentioned there's a \$50,000 commitment over two years to be matched by ohsu, and that was for capital improvements?

**Bebb:** The -- when you were looking at --

**Saltzman:** Troy, do you want to come up here, too?

**Bebb:** This was part of the tram process from the outreach. Do you want to explain that?

**Doss:** Yeah.

**Saltzman:** What you were recently speaking about was the \$50,000 that amanda was speaking to that was --

**Bebb:** Right, and that it would be a contribution in the m.o.u. From ohsu for the purpose of the study of terwilliger.

**Saltzman:** Which would be the two parts, traffic and then --

**Doss:** No. I want to be clear. Have.

**Saltzman:** Ok.

**Doss:** It was uncommitted to what it goes to, just the update of the plan, however we use it. \$50,000 one time. The parks was -- we were under the impression we would be getting an additional \$50,000 a year for a two-year period as a result of the tram mitigation that could also be applied to this. An additional \$50,000 for a two-year period would come from the bureau of planning from the district liaison program as part of this work. So it's basically 100, 150, 50 coming from ohsu, but as was noted, and actually I do want to note that in terms of the priorities for terwilliger, this council last month reviewed the tram report, and several of the tier two and tier three priorities were updates of the terwilliger plan, specifically capital improvements, looking at gateways, intersection improvements, viewpoints, and trail connections. We looked at the terwilliger plan in the context of how much planning was really thought out about those types of improvements 25 years ago when the plan was originally done. We think it's appropriate to go back and look at the existing conditions, reports, that came out of the terwilliger plan, and see if it's still relevant to these types of improvements before we just rush out there and start saying we should make gateway improvements or intersection improvements. We want to look at this more



**July 14, 2004**

holistically. That's one aspect of the plan, but a big aspect of the plan. As Janet noted we seem to be short of \$100,000. The idea of doing it within a year may not be appropriate. Maybe it's a good idea to push it back a couple of years until funding is available.

**Bebb:** At parks, we also have it on our hit list for grant. We will be seeking grant funds for this as well.

**Doss:** One other thing I did want to note about the traffic issues. There was a comment made that we weren't interested in dealing with traffic issues. We're interested in talking about traffic calming as much as we can possibly do. One of the things we noted earlier is that Terwilliger is an emergency service route. So in terms of doing, you know, speed bumps or roundabouts or other traditional types of traffic calming, that may not be possible. We're not wanting to go back and look at traffic counts again because we had done it for the Marquam Hill plan just two years ago to this day. We looked at all the traffic impacts and came to conclusions on that. I'm not sure where the number of 40,000 trips comes from, because we seem to believe that we were way under that. I thought the Marquam Hill plan reiterated that.

**Saltzman:** That was by 2040.

**Doss:** Something along those lines. Either way, we didn't want to go back and look at the whole traffic count issue again. We wanted to look at a traffic approach to traffic calming. In some respects Terwilliger is sometimes looked at as the best landscaped arterial in the -- landscaped arterial in the city, and that's a shame. There's no gateway, no sense of place there for a people. We thought we could enhance the gateways, the infrastructure, so when you came off the major intersections, Capitol Highway, Sam Jackson -- or not Sam Jackson, but Sixth, you had a sense you were entering spectacular that you weren't aware of before, and that that, as well as maybe enhanced traffic ticketing, photo radar things, things we can't envision right now, those types of things would be a different type of traffic calming than just putting in speed bumps.

**Francesconi:** So you said a lot and said it fast, let me tell you.

**Kelley:** Can I take another crack at it, Jim?

**Francesconi:** Please.

**Kelley:** First of all, you know, in a very general sense, I'm happy here we're only here discussing one issue, out of all the m.o.u. This is great.

**Francesconi:** That's a good point.

**Kelley:** I don't think that everybody in the room is all that far apart. We have mostly the same goal here, which is to ensure that Terwilliger Parkway, the issue we're talking about, not only maintains, but actually enhances its character as a special place. I think the issue here -- well, two parts. One is should this plan have a priority? I think Janet answered that well. We can certainly insert some language that would make some of the participants more at ease along the lines of when funding is available or stretch out the one-year time period to three years to begin the effort, something lining those lines. We're happy to do that for the council. I wouldn't want to see it disappear completely because I think you're also hearing from testifiers that it is important to do this work with Terwilliger Parkway. We believe it is. We thought we were doing a good thing here for the community. The second part of the issue, I think, is really about whether this is about traffic volumes or traffic behavior. And I think there is a difference between what some of the testifiers are saying and what we've articulated for this reason -- we felt we hashed those issues out for better or worse in the Marquam Hill planning effort. We did the traffic studies and the calculations. We did the circulation improvements and mitigations and reporting requirements in that agreement. Essentially I think what you're hearing is a reluctance on the part of OHSU to go back and reopen that debate about how much traffic from OHSU goes on to Terwilliger Parkway. That's an issue that we settled. What we didn't settle completely is how do we improve the character of the parkway as a park and still handle the necessary traffic?

**Francesconi:** Right.

**July 14, 2004**

**Kelley:** And that was really the impetus here and to do it with the community. We were frankly happy to -- and we proposed it, not ohsu -- to actually take some money from them to help in the effort because we knew we had have trouble funding it.

**Francesconi:** That was good, what you just did. It was helpful for me about crystallizing the issues. There's two issues that have been raised about how do you enhance the park and one is, is it language -- I guess i'm asking both gil and janet -- one is that antoine has said that you need stronger language from a policy perspective, and he gave us language. So he's saying one thing, that there's not strong enough policy. I'm not sure he's right, but he's saying that and i'm asking both of you, especially parks, but then the second question is funding, and how do we accomplish it. Do we need a stronger policy statement?

**Kelley:** I think what we -- what we don't want to do is reopen the debate about traffic volumes.

**Francesconi:** Right.

**Kelley:** We don't have any problem with getting at the leisurely drive aspect through the behavioral aspects through physical design and so forth. But if it becomes a reopener to how much development on the hill, what kind of --

**Francesconi:** Got it, got it.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** That becomes --

**Francesconi:** Now I understand.

**Kelley:** I'm not sure that antoine's language on its face is unacceptable. The problem is that it actually leaves it more ambiguous than I think it does otherwise about whether we're running a new neighborhood process to revisit traffic volumes.

**Francesconi:** I see. Now i've got it.

**Kelley:** You know, if we can craft some other language -- I don't think we should disguise the fact that that's a real issue for the negotiating parties.

**Francesconi:** No. I'm glad you clarified it.

**Saltzman:** I'm looking at anton's proposed language, and terwilliger parkway stewardship, subsection d, which is -- if i'm reading it, it's really asking for a reaffirmation of what's already in the marquam hill plan about the parkway south of campus drive as a leisurely commuting drive, bicycle path, is that --

**Kelley:** I don't know if those particular words are as much a problem as much the impression that we're reopening the debate about traffic. It may be awkward construction and i'd want to consult the other half of the negotiating parties here, you know, if you were going to insert language like that. We didn't delete it, we just never had it there in the beginning. But if you were to include that language, we would probably want to include another proviso that said this, this being said, this study is not about reexamining traffic volumes or imposing new traffic reduction burdens on ohsu.

**Saltzman:** Uh-huh.

**Kelley:** So you could do both, and maybe that add to the clarity that's missing. But again, i'd want to consult with the other -- i'm not doing this unilaterally here.

**Francesconi:** That would be helpful, either now or later. We can just do it later.

**Kelley:** And again on the funding, and janet should answer this too, but her suggestion makes sense, we could say that when the other parts of the funding are available. We hadn't made this a top priority for planning, but we were willing to put some in-kind resources toward it from staff time from the district planner in that area, as well as parks was willing to do that. We would be tapping into b.d.s., and other bureaus, b.e.s., for a piece of their staff time. We're still missing the roughly 100,000 needed for the consultants. And that's money that we don't have. We'd have to raise in order to really do this effort. And so --

**Francesconi:** It sounds like we need more work done on the funding side, including by parks, to see if we can come up with some grants or something to put together. So it sounds like -- I don't think we need to do it right now to hold up the m.o.u., but it sounds like we should do more work on

**July 14, 2004**

that side of it. In terms of overall planning priorities, not timing now, i'm saying something different, not timing, but it would seem to me that the town center, which we haven't talked for about five or six years on the west, separate, which is really should be a discussion separate from this conversation, I think the advocate are doing a good job to raise it, but that's really a separate issue, but it's an important one, and more important by itself than planning on marquam. So it seems like, you know, the citizens deserve to know where it does fit, where is it on the planning horizon, given the fact it's a town center, and we've had a lot of discussions with st. Johns, hollywood, gateway, lents, but where is that? I think separate from this we owe them some conversation about where it is. But that's a separate issue.

**Kelley:** Yeah. We're going through a kind of priority-setting session with the planning commission now, and we'll be coming to council with that.

**Francesconi:** Ok.

**Kelley:** We'll let you know about that. We can definitely make an amendment on the timing, so that when other funds are available is when we start the project. That would be helpful.

**Saltzman:** Then there was also, I guess, friends of terwilliger proposed, again, another modification to section four. I guess i'd like some response from you and probably from ohsu about, is this saying anything that's already not in -- is this a reaffirmation of what's already in the marquam hill plan and therefore is it --

**Doss:** Are you referring to the terwilliger parkway stewardship subsection a where they propose language, which is very similar to what antoine had proposed as well?

**Saltzman:** And subsection d as well.

**Doss:** And subsection d. Well, yeah, to be honest --

**Saltzman:** Do you have that in front of you?

**Doss:** Yes, I do. Subsection d language, i'm not sure if antoine proposed the same language or not. We'd have to talk with ohsu as well. But, I mean, it seems that's reasonable language. It's just the - - it was the first section I think regarding what it means to discuss terwilliger as a leisurely drive, is that different than what's already stated in the marquam hill plan or in the m.o.u.? And is that the same?

**Saltzman:** That's kind of what i'm asking. Is that what's in the marquam hill plan?

**Doss:** It talks about reaffirming the entire set of terwilliger parkway goals, yes. So that would be one of the goals.

**Saltzman:** Uh-huh. Ok.

**Doss:** One of the things I also want to note is there's been discussion about the impacts -- if you went out to terwilliger today, you'd still see traffic. One of the things I want to note is the marquam hill plan looks at additional traffic studies and traffic calming in the neighborhoods, rerouting of patient access to the campus as opposed to employee and student campus, access to the campus. Those full measures haven't been implemented yet. The study is addressed in the m.o.u. That would be out with pdot and ohsu to do a traffic study. The reworking of access will happen after they complete the patient care study as well as the first bio building. So these things haven't occurred yet. I wouldn't say they're not going to be done, they just haven't been done yet and we're just starting to get to that phase.

**Saltzman:** So there's no disagreement that goal f of the terwilliger plan is in fact --

**Doss:** It's addressing the marquam hill plan. If you're suggesting it should be added to the m.o.u., i'd want to hear ohsu's response to that as well, but in terms of is it addressed in the marquam hill plan, yes.

**Saltzman:** Ok. Did you want to respond while you're up here? Steve, do you want to come up to the table, too?

**Stadum:** I'm not exactly sure which language you're talking about.

**Saltzman:** Are you familiar with the language, christy?

July 14, 2004

\*\*\*\*\*: I am.

**Saltzman:** Ok.

**Christe White:** Christy white, 101 southwest main street, Portland, Oregon. We are familiar with the language. One of the proposals to reference the scenic and recreational nature of terwilliger parkway is included in the m.o.u. So that's in there, recognition of those values. And then what we did, in subsection a, is to reaffirm all the goals of the terwilliger corridor plan. It says there that both parties support the policies of the terwilliger corridor parkway plan and the parkway design guidelines. Because the terwilliger corridor plan is a balancing between the various goals and policies, and that's what happened in the marquam hill plan, it's dangerous to excise one and put it into the m.o.u. That's why we objected to it. We don't object to the idea that goal f is out there and it's one of the goals of the terwilliger corridor plan and we support it.

**Saltzman:** Ok. And you were saying, on the proposed change of subsection d, you were saying that that's already in there?

**White:** Yeah. You'll see the underlined and new subsection e, preserve its value as a -- and the amendment is scenic and recreational resource to the people of the city of Portland. It's page six of 16 of the m.o.u.

**Saltzman:** I don't have a section e in my copy of the m.o.u.

**White:** Maybe you have the old one. You should have a strike through, new subsection e, page six of 16, and it says scenic and recreational resource. It's an addition. Yeah, I can hand you mine, too. There it is. Six of 16.

**Francesconi:** While you're doing that, can somebody prepare an amendment on the funding that gil suggested? Is somebody doing that?

**Kelley:** I was just looking for that section.

**Francesconi:** Thanks.

**Saltzman:** Oh, ok. Yeah, I guess -- I apologize, but the copy in front of me was not the current copy. Ok. Ok. Well, any other questions of christy, steve?

**Francesconi:** I have a different question for leslie hallick. Is anybody from p.d.c. Here? Hello, dr. Hallick.

**Lesly Halleck:** Lesly halleck, ohsu. It's about a different section, section one, the education and job preparation. I don't want that to get lost in this. I've never seen anything like this. It's really good. Can you just say a little bit, you know, at the reporting period, i've forgotten if it's a year or not, you know, what's of kind of things you might be able to share with us that shows success in kind of increasing the pipeline so that more of our own kids can go to ohsu?

Well, we have in process, and well under way, programs with the Portland school districts, but all the school districts in Oregon, and even southwest Washington, that start in fourth grade, and we even have some that are earlier than that, but most of them start from then forward, and bring students up to the hill. And the programs vary from a single day to an entire year. So they vary. There's dozens of them. What we do that's very different now that we were doing say two, three, four, five years ago, is that it's a very longitudinal perspective. So these students are tracked. In fact, we're in contact with them monthly, in many cases, as we get older, quarterly in the early years, to see what they're up to, to find out if they were with us one summer, what are they doing the next summer, who's supporting their educational goals, how do we interest them, sustain their interest in math, science, health, careers that are related. So I think the real difference is we now have multiple programs that are coordinated, that are longitudinal and tracked from early age on through. Now some of these students go to medical school or nursing school elsewhere. They don't all come to ohsu. But we applaud that, and we stay in touch with them interestingly, and some of them come back for residency programs or relocate. So the main difference, and I think we're trying to articulate it here in the plan, is we have a very longview of this. This is a very longitudinal program. It's launched now, but we intend it to be looking at decades into the future. Because we

**July 14, 2004**

found that some of the best and brightest in Portland were leaving us, and not necessarily coming back. So we're trying to reverse that trend.

**Francesconi:** So I guess, gil, on behalf of the city, because I don't see p.d.c. here, what's our role a year from now in dealing with ohsu on this work force issue?

**Kelley:** Well, we do have cooperative effort that's just -- that's ongoing. And I think one of the things that we've tried to do in this agreement is to make sure that's visible every year going on. So we have an annual report requirement that -- reporting requirement, not only on the good neighborhood agreements, but on work force development and bioscience industry development. So I think actually that little device is a very powerful one in terms of keeping us both focused on that joint mission. I'm not prepared to talk about the details of what p.d.c.'s doing right now, but that I think is the value of this agreement, is that it keeps the institutions talking about these things together and sharing the success or the lack of success with you and the ohsu board and the community.

**Francesconi:** Good.

**Saltzman:** So did Janet draft an amendment while we were talking here?

**Kelley:** We conferred. What we would like to do, and I did want to confirm what Christe said, we do have the suggestion from Anton about preserving Terwilliger Parkway as a scenic and natural resource included in the final draft. On the time for beginning the work, which goes to the priority issue and the funding issue, on page -- we may have slightly different page numbers just because of the redrafting -- at the end of the section five, Terwilliger Parkway Stewardship, right before the beginning of the stormwater management section, there's a concluding paragraph. The last sentence of that paragraph now reads, the project will commence within one year of the effective date of the m.o.u. We'd like to substitute these words, project will commence when the remainder of the necessary funds become available. So it's much -- it's much looser, but it says when we get the money we'll do it.

**Saltzman:** And how much money do we need? \$150,000?

**Kelley:** Well, in terms of in-kind money, there is roughly \$50,000 a year in in-kind services that is probably -- probably we can just do that if we arrange our work programs effectively. It's really that last \$100,000 in sort of hard money that we'd need. For example, the council to allocate into future budget or to receive a grant for. And that's the money that would go toward the consultant.

**Saltzman:** Ok.

**Kelley:** So we'll be reminding you of this as budget cycles come forward.

**Francesconi:** All right.

**Saltzman:** Ok. Well, we have that amendment, and then we have basically the amendments that are reflected in the m.o.u. dated July 13.

**\*\*\*\*\*:** Correct.

**Saltzman:** Further questions or --

**Sten:** No.

**Saltzman:** I'll entertain a motion to adopt the amendments.

**Sten:** So moved.

**Francesconi:** Second.

**Saltzman:** Ok. Any discussion? All in favor say aye. [chorus of ayes]

**Saltzman:** The amendments pass. I believe that included the amendment we just referred to?

**Francesconi:** Yeah.

**Saltzman:** Ok, great. Ok. No further amendments. I'll take roll call.

**Francesconi:** Well, there's a lot to celebrate, as Gil started. You know, that first sentence, the city and ohsu recognize their future is intrinsically linked, the success of each is based on mutual cooperative efforts. Nice to have the neighborhoods sign that too because we're in this together. That's a great statement. First on behalf of Mark Leer and transportation, roadway improvements on

**July 14, 2004**

sixth avenue that are substantial, the transportation demand management continuing those efforts and actually improving them, the local street traffic calming, the pedestrian and bicycle network and facilities improvements. So from a transportation standpoint there's some significant things in here. From a parks standpoint, we do have the dedication of open space, so that approximately 45 acres, which we appreciate, and then with the other addition to the marquam hill nature park, which we just made recently, we're demonstrating our commitment as a community to natural areas in the heart of our city, because not all our kids can go everywhere else outside of the city, and it's the right way to do it. We also appreciate the natural resource stewardship strategy that does need more funding, but it's outlined in this document. So from a parks standpoint, those still have more work to do on this terwilliger parkway. I'm glad there's at least a process by which we address it. And the importance of the parkway. The whole parkway, but especially the south, has been discussed today. So now we have -- here's another one on the list, where we have to come up with the money.

I do think that there's some hope on the grant side, too, as well. And this is something that Janet and I will have to talk about, because you need to see a commitment of money to this. I think the money is more important than just the language, because I think the language goal is there if you see our commitment on the follow through. That's why I supported the amendment. But I also think that, you know, this education and job preparation piece is really good to see. So it may be a little soft and not as clear, you know, in terms of it doesn't have a capital budget attached to it, etc., but it really offers a lot of hope. If we're going to be able to sustain an economic development effort and to get the resources that it takes to make this happen, there has to be a sense that our own citizens can benefit from this. And here's a tangible commitment that every year we'll report on this. I guess that's the last thing I like about this document a lot. It's the periodic assessment. It not only requires ohsu to report on progress, but it requires all of our bureaus to report to the public about what we're doing that with -- did we do to you that we say we're going to do. Every year we got to give a report back to people. I think that given the scope of this, potential impacts to the neighborhoods, but the importance to the whole city, that's all very, very good. So I appreciate the work that so much -- so many of the staff have done to move this forward and to continue it. So thank you. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Well, I think there's a lot of good things in this memorandum and the under lying plans, and I think the importance of the terwilliger parkway, from its importance both scenic recreational values, it's going to be a challenge to address. I mean, notwithstanding the funding issue, it's going to be -- there's going to be a constant friction, as there has been between ohsu for many years, the neighbors, the traffic, the fact that terwilliger does serve as an emergency access route. But, you know, I do think that we have enough here that underscores our commitment to trying to solve those problems, and maintain the special thing that is -- that is the terwilliger parkway, is there. I'm also particularly pleased with the stormwater management provisions. They are very -- I think ohsu is really -- has really stepped up to the plate in establishing itself as a leadership role here as a major institution committed to managing stormwater on site to the maximum extent possible, which helps our rivers and streams. And also the green building standards. I just met with dr. Kollar today, and he told me the first office building -- or the first building down on south waterfront is within a hair of meeting the leed platinum standard, which we're not sure if there's any platinum standard buildings yet in this country. So that's really encouraging, too. But there's a lot of good in this plan. Jobs, work force development, too. I'm pleased to support it. Aye.

**Sten:** I appreciate everyone's work on this. I do think it's a good agreement. I'm frankly not quite sure how to fine-tune the language going back and forth on antoine's amendment. I just want to be on the record that I think the neighborhood is on the right track on these. I didn't quite see the harm, but I'm going to go with it this way and want to make sure we keep tracking this issue. Gil is nodding. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Ok. Well, we stand adjourned until next Wednesday.

**July 14, 2004**

**Francesconi:** Thank you, president.

At 3:22 p.m., Council adjourned.