



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **1ST DAY OF MARCH, 2006** AT 9:30 A.M.

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

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Harry Auerbach, Chief Deputy City Attorney; and Larry Sparks, Sergeant at Arms.

On a Y-4 roll call, the Consent Agenda was adopted.

COMMUNICATIONS		Disposition:
232 Request of Bruce Broussard to address Council regarding Portland Public Schools (Communication)		PLACED ON FILE
TIME CERTAINS		
233 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Open Meadow City Corps (Presentation introduced by Mayor Potter)		PLACED ON FILE
234 TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM – Approve Community Vision Grants (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter) Motion to accept Substitute Exhibit B: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-4) Motion to authorize an amendment allocate up to an additional \$50,000 to direct the committee to reevaluate the existing proposals that were not accepted and if necessary renegotiate the scope of work in those proposals that were not accepted and fund up to \$50,000 among those proposals that are targeted specifically to include the voices of sexual minorities the Asian community and the Native American community and others as funds allow: Moved by Commissioner Leonard and seconded by Commissioner Sten. (Y-4)		PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED MARCH 8, 2006 AT 9:30 AM
235 TIME CERTAIN: 10:30 AM – Advise Metro Council on elements of proposed 2006 Metro Bond Measure (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Saltzman) (Y-4)		36382
CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION		

March 1, 2006

236	Statement of cash and investments January 12, 2006 through February 08, 2006 (Report; Treasurer) (Y-4)	PLACED ON FILE
237	Accept bid of Cedar Mill Construction Company for the Justice Center Tenant Improvements Project for \$869,000 (Purchasing Report--Bid No. 104885) (Y-4)	ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT
Mayor Tom Potter		
238	Appoint Jocelyn Cox, Susan Pearce, Kerrie Standlee, Jeff Willcox and Vance Yoakum to the Noise Review Board (Report) (Y-4)	CONFIRMED
City Attorney		
*239	Extend contract with Damon L. Vickers of Cummins, Goodman, Fish, Denley & Vickers for outside legal services (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 52398) (Y-4)	179971
Office of Management and Finance – Bureau of Human Resources		
240	Change the salary range of the nonrepresented classification of Vehicle Maintenance Supervisor II (Second Reading Agenda 200) (Y-4)	179949
241	Create a new nonrepresented classification of Assistant Hydroelectric Power Project Manager and establish a compensation rate for this classification (Second Reading Agenda 201) (Y-4)	179950
Office of Management and Finance – Revenue Bureau		
*242	Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County by \$30,000 to provide administration of eligibility verification for the Water/Sewer Bill Discount and Crisis Assistance Program (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 35389) (Y-4)	179951
Office of Management and Finance – Risk		
*243	Pay claim of Joseph Midgett (Ordinance) (Y-4)	179952
Commissioner Sam Adams		
Bureau of Environmental Services		
*244	Authorize lease agreement with ZRZ Realty Company for property and associated surface parking facilities for the Woods Trunk Sewer Rehabilitation Project No. 8164 (Ordinance) (Y-4)	179953

March 1, 2006

<p>*245 Approve a contract with Jones and Stokes Associates to conduct biological modeling and analysis in support of Portland Watershed Management Plan implementation and state and federal environmental permitting (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">179954</p>
<p>246 Authorize a contract with the lowest responsible bidder for the Columbia Slough wastewater pump station construction Project No. 7048 (Second Reading Agenda 205)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">179955</p>
<p>247 Amend contract with David Evans and Associates, Inc. to extend agreement to June 30, 2007 for completion of the California wastewater pump station upgrade Project No. 7151 (Second Reading Agenda 206; amend Contract No. 33351)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">179956</p>
<p>248 Authorize grant application for fish barrier removal and habitat restoration in the Johnson Creek Watershed to the Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership Foundation in the amount of \$120,000 (Second Reading Agenda 207)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">179957</p>
<p>249 Authorize grant application for fish barrier removal and habitat restoration in the Johnson Creek Watershed to the FishAmerica Foundation in the amount of \$50,000 (Second Reading Agenda 208)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">179958</p>
<p>250 Grant revocable permit to Red Dress PDX to close NE 9th Avenue between NE Flanders Street and NE Glisan Street March 31, 2006 through April 2, 2006 (Second Reading Agenda 209)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	<p align="center">179959</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Randy Leonard</p> <p align="center">Water Bureau</p> <p>251 Authorize grant to Regional Arts and Culture Council for renovations to Dreamer Fountain (Second Reading Agenda 212)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	
<p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p> <p align="center">Office of Cable Communications and Franchise Management</p> <p>*252 Ratify the transfer of franchised telecommunications facilities from Tyco Telecommunications (US), Inc. to WiTel Communications, LLC (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 179787)</p> <p>(Y-4)</p>	
<p align="center">Parks and Recreation</p>	

March 1, 2006

253	Apply for an \$85,405 grant from Recreation Trails Grant Program to repair the Springwater Corridor Bridge at Circle Avenue in Southeast Portland (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING MARCH 8, 2006 AT 9:30 AM
Commissioner Erik Sten		
Bureau of Housing and Community Development		
*254	Amend master ordinance to execute the Hacienda Community Development Corporation contract for an additional \$8,000 to provide financial assistance to lower income homebuyers and provide for payment (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 179363) (Y-4)	179962
*255	Authorize subrecipient agreement with City of Gresham for \$918,770 for the HOME Investment Partnership Program and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)	179963
Fire and Rescue		
*256	Accept \$484,392 grant from the Department of Homeland Security to continue the Safe & Sound media campaign (Ordinance) (Y-4)	179964
*257	Accept \$100 donation from Ziba Design to benefit fire and life safety efforts (Ordinance) (Y-4)	179965
City Auditor Gary Blackmer		
*258	Assess property for system development charge contracts and private plumbing loan contracts (Ordinance; Z0756, K0082, T0094, K0081, T0095, P0071) (Y-4)	179966
*259	Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the State of Oregon for hearings officer services (Ordinance) (Y-4)	179967
REGULAR AGENDA		
Mayor Tom Potter		
Office of Management and Finance – Bureau of General Services		
260	Amend contract with Glumac International to provide additional mechanical engineering consultant services for the Justice Center remodel project (Second Reading Agenda 220; amend Contract No. 34575) (Y-4)	179968

March 1, 2006

261	Authorize acquisition of vehicles for use by City bureaus (Second Reading Agenda 221) (Y-4)	179969
Office of Management and Finance – Revenue Bureau		
262	Adopt Revenue Bureau Administrative Rules (Resolution) (Y-4)	36383
263	Clarify Revenue Bureau duties and responsibilities (Ordinance; amend Code Titles 3, 17 and 21 and repeal Code Sections 17.36.110 and 21.04.180)	PASSED TO SECOND READING MARCH 8, 2006 AT 9:30 AM
Commissioner Dan Saltzman		
Office of Cable Communications and Franchise Management		
264	Grant a franchise to Northwest Metal Fab and Pipe Inc. for a period of ten years (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 5, 2006 AT 9:30 AM

At 12:30 p.m., Council recessed.

March 1, 2006

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,
OREGON WAS HELD THIS **1ST DAY OF MARCH, 2006** AT 3:00 P.M.

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

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

**Mayor Potter asked if there were any objections to hearing Item 264-1 under
Suspension of the Rules:** After hearing no objections Mayor Potter gavelled down the
motion.

Mayor Tom Potter		Disposition:
City Attorney		
<u>SUSPENSION OF RULES</u>		
*264-1	Authorize filing of lawsuit for recovery of damages resulting from catastrophic failure of GLOCK handguns (Ordinance) (Y-4)	179970
265	TIME CERTAIN: 3:00 PM – Accept the Regulatory Improvement Workplan 2004-2005 Progress Report (Report introduced by Mayor Potter and Commissioner Leonard) Motion to accept the Report: Moved by Commissioner Leonard and seconded by Commissioner Sten. (Y-4)	ACCEPTED
266	Update and improve land use regulations and procedures through the Regulatory Improvement Code Amendment Package 1 (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter; amend Title 33)	PASSED TO SECOND READING MARCH 8, 2006 AT 2:00 PM

At 4:24 p.m., Council recessed.

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.

March 1, 2006
Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting

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

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

MARCH 1, 2006 9:30 AM

Potter: Good morning, everybody. Welcome to Portland city council. Before we begin the official part of city council, we have a tradition where I ask the question of the community, how are the children? And I think in these days when we're searching for funds for our schools, when children are homeless, when we are not doing the job we should for our children, I think it's an important question. Because we all know when our children are safe, when they're healthy, when they're well educated, our community as well too. So what we normally do, and today's no exception, we have experts come in and talk to us. And this morning we have two experts, mary ann and cardeana. Could you please come up? They are from friends of Oregon. I'll tell you about mary ann, she's age 14 and goes to gordon russell middle school. She made the honor local last semester and wants to be a lawyer when she grows up. She's always been interested in justice and equal rights. Cardeana, age 10, king school, is in the fifth grade. She wants to be a teacher or mentor. She loves to talk so she's been told she would make an excellent lawyer too. [laughter] cardeana, when is your birthday?

Cardeana: Tomorrow.

Potter: Tomorrow. And will you be 11 then?

Cardeana: Yes.

Potter: Congratulations and happy birthday to you.

Cardeana: Thank you.

Potter: What would you folks like us to know today?

Cardeana: Well, hi, my name is cardena, i'm 10, i'm in fifth grade at king. And what I wanted to talk about was ways that I can make my school better and how friends of of the children has helped me improve.

Potter: Good.

Cardeana: What I want us to talk about was, our music teacher says that we don't have enough books because we used to be prek-5, but now we're pre-k through 6, and we're about to have seventh and eighth, and the books we have are only for fifth grade, and there are not enough, so we have to share from time to time. And the sixth graders really don't have books, so they have to work with paper and pencil. The other thing I wanted to talk about is that we don't have enough lunch varieties, because we have the same thing every week, but we have different -- but they just mix it up in a different week. And then if you -- if you are the last class to come, you're going to get leftovers from tomorrow -- yesterday or something that you don't want. And the way that friends of the children has helped me improve is by, like, when I was in first grade I used to struggle with math, but then I got my mentor and now math is my favorite subject. And I got to do other things that people probably really don't get to do, so I got to play basketball, flag football, and I get to meet the mayor. [laughter] and it's just been really fun.

Potter: Thank you, cardena. In addition to loving to speak, I think you're an excellent speaker.

Cardeana: Thank you.

Potter: MaryAnn.

MaryAnn: Hello, my name is maryann. I'm 14 years old, i've been in the program friends of the children for almost eight years. In that time i've reevaluated my goals in life and changed a lot. At first I really didn't care about myself or my future, because I didn't understand what it was all about. But now that i've had two different mentors my life has changed a lot. Now I want to become a

March 1, 2006

lawyer and fight for the good of the people, and I wish to go on in life and suck said, whereas I didn't before. My grades have taken a leap from all f's to almost straight a's. I was removed from my mother's home at age 7, and it was a difficult time. I became very confused, and my mentor at the time, her name was andrea, she helped me through it. She send me -- helped me sort out my feelings and understand it was ok to be emotional. She showed me life was more important than I even -- even could I comprehend. After I grew to trust her and become fond of her, she moved away. She settled down and started to have -- decided to have a baby. So I got a new mentor and she's my current one, her name is joya. She helped me through grand matter's death, and my sister's hospitalization for mental illness. I've learned to appreciate the time with my family. I have studied social justice in my pursuit of becoming a lawyer. One of the things i've noticed is many people don't think teens understand or have a clue about what's going on in the world. But not every teen would rather spend hours in front of a mirror when they can be learning things that can be beneficial to our community. Like child abuse and rape. Both have very high percentage rates in our -- and affect the lives of millions. However, many people aren't supportive, especially when it comes to youth, because of this factor many people are afraid to speak out in fear of being abandoned or ridiculed. Many are afraid that if they speak out and say it, they won't be believed, and unfortunately in some cases they're not. Another injustice is homosexual marriage. If race and sex doesn't hold people back from marriage, why should sexuality. Being bi, grey, or straight shouldn't have an effect, because it's just who you are. It's like people spend hours or time lots of time telling people they should be themselves, but what if who you are is a supposed crime? I just don't think that's right. I would like to thank you for taking time off your schedules to listen to me speak on my beliefs and I want to share with you what a great honor this has been and an asset in my pursuit of fulfilling my ultimate goal. I cannot thank you enough for allowing me this time to share with you my view and my opinions as well as my past and future goals.

Potter: Maryann, you're quite impressive. I know you're going to make a good lawyer, but after you're tired of that, why don't you run for public office. [laughter] thank you both very much for being here. I think you're great examples, and I hope the adults not just up here but throughout our city were listening to what you said. Thank you very much.

MaryAnn: Thank you.

Potter: You can go back to your -- makes me feel pretty good about our generation coming up. [gavel pounded] city council will come to order. Karla, please call the roll. [roll call]

Potter: You folks don't have to stick around if you don't want to. This gets to be a little different than -- may not be as interesting, but on the other hand, maryann, if you want to find out about human nature, watch what happens. [laughter] Karla, please read the communications item.

Item 232.

Bruce Broussard: Mayor, councilmen, bruce broussard, Portland. I don't know if I can follow the young lady. I may have to hire her to represent me in my quest for city council. Anyway, I want to thank you for giving us the opportunity to lower the flag on that date for coretta scott king. It was just great. It was one of several states that did this, the federal government lowered it, but I work with -- thank you very much for that piece. The other thing is that I know your passionate for kids, I remember when you retired from the police department you took on this job here downtown to work with the kids. When I -- what I want to talk about from the standpoint of Portland public schools, there was an article in "the Oregonian," it said district says \$21 million can protect school days. When I look at the article, you read the first paragraph, it said, Portland public school leaders said they need \$21 million in one-time supplemental money from the city of Portland Multnomah county and businesses to avoid cutting school days next year. I really think the article should have read, "Portland public school leader said they need \$100 million maybe more in one-time money from the city of Portland, Multnomah county, and businesses to avoid cut can school days next year." what i'm referring to is that we've got to factor in the custodial issue. Recently the supreme court said that in fact as a result of the civil service board decision, it said that the civil service

March 1, 2006

board were right when they said to reinstate the custodians at Portland public schools. Therefore they were interviewed by "the Oregonian" both jim coon, who represented the seiu 140, and all these people, some 300, are going to have to be made whole. All of those people lost their pers, their retirement, and they got nothing. And in fact several of them died as a result of stress along that particular line. Pam brown was quoted in "the Oregonian" from the Portland public schools, she estimated it was going to be about \$55 million, but she didn't include attorney fees and the like.

So we may be look at \$100 million sitting there. I really think the public needs to know that, and again, I want to thank you for -- and the council for bringing on the summits you had, you met with the parents, you met with the business leaders and the like, I would also suggest maybe you may want to include one more, and that is those our delegation from this area, from congress, the senate, the congress person, and also those local legislators so they know. That's really where the buck should stop. But thanks to you, you've taken the lead role, because it's really not a job of the city, you've taken the lead role to take this issues, because I note when the school district, when you threw the ball back to them, they threw it back to you. So I think they need to factor in this extra money, because in all due respect it's something we're we're going to have to look at it, and citizens are upset. So if you disband the situation before you talk to serious dollars, we've got to do this. The last thing I would say is that we need to assure the kids that they're going to have a full school year this next time around. And that teachers are going to be in that classroom to be able to instruct them. So I think that's very important. Thank you very much.

Potter: Thank you, mr. Broussard. Is that the only communications item?

Moore: Yes.

Potter: Ok. The consent agenda, do any commissioners wish to pull any items from the consent agenda? Does anybody from the community wish to pull any items from the consent agenda? Karla, please call the roll.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] let's hear the 9:30 time certain, item 233.

Item 233.

Potter: Open meadow.

Michele Taylor: Good morning. I'm michelle taylor, from open meadow schools. I'd like to introduce kevin -- lieutenant kevin modica, who will be doing an introduction for us.

Lt. Kevin Modica: Good morning, mayor Potter, and city council. Kevin modica, assigned to the Portland police bureau. I currently work in the personnel division, and real briefly on behalf of chief foxworth, and the police bureau, i'd like to thank you and ms. Karen hansen and open meadow and work systems inc. For providing us with the opportunity to work with these young people from city corps. We believe it's very important that there's a place at the table for the young people. It's a piece of disengagement that is very much prevalent in our current community. We find it important to rebuild relationships not only with the adult population, but also our community's youth. And youth are described as from 12 years of age to 25 years of age, and while that's a broad range, those are individuals that we'll have an impact on decisions made in our community with regard to public safety. The problem statement that was given to them was how to make law enforcement a more attractive career opportunity. And why do young people stray away from considering that. We found that the energy and the solutions that they came up with were absolutely incredible. I don't want to take any more time from them because I think the presentation will speak for itself. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you very much, lieutenant.

Ari Alberg: Good morning. My name is ari, i'm the city corps project leader. I'm going to give you more background and context about the presentation you're about to hear from these students. Quickly, the nine students in city corps, 5 were previously enrolled in classes and four were not in school at all. All nine are expected to enroll full-time either in the open meadow program or another Portland public school. In preparation for this project, they have undergone training from

March 1, 2006

problem solving, power point and public speaking. In addition, they have spent extensive time in the community attending the chiefs forum, doing a service project for the police activity league youth service center and holding meetings with police bureau personnel. Also, this presentation is not the end of this project. The city corps was originally intended to be a six-week project ending friday. The extraordinary amount of student interest has prompted us to extend the project for another six weeks. We look forward in the future to updating you as the project does come to its conclusion. Lastly, I really need to make it perfectly clear this project has been completely student driven. The ideas, actions, and initiatives are the result -- initiatives are the result of the hard work of these students. So thank you for having us and enjoy the presentation.

Potter: Thank you.

Steve Mawson: Good morning. My name is steven mossen. City corps is a project-based social studies, slash, work experience course. It serves youth ages 16-21. Students earn .75 social studies credit. Students partner with city bureaus to help solve city issues. We're operated by open meadow alternative schools in partnership with the city of Portland. And we are funded by work systems inc.

Harrison Sloan: Good morning. My name is harrison sloan, and i'm talking to you today about the partnership with the Portland police bureau, along with kevin modica and officer larry anderson. Lieutenant modica is one of the ofters from the Portland police bureau working along with this project. Officer larry anderson is a police recruiter from the Portland police bureau also, he's also working with us on this project. Officer larry anderson and lieutenant modica have asked city corps to find ways to generate interest among youth of diverse backgrounds to pursue careers in public safety. The problem is to find ways to attract a diverse youth population to pursue careers in public safety. The bureau wants to diversify its staff so the bureau reflects the diversity among community. That's basically it.

Kevin Cha: Kevin cha, i'm 18 years old. The police image among the youth is a problem. The image they see is a negative one. This has a big effect on youth when considering a job in the police bureau. If we can make the police understand each other and improve the relations, maybe the youth would begin to consider police job as a career. We created a survey to determine how the youth in the community felt and think about the police. The survey is directed at minority youth in the community from north Portland to northeast Portland. A total of 225 survey were filled out, recorded, and collected.

Shalini Dass: Good morning, this is the survey we handed out. The first three questions are general questions, asking ethnicity, age, and gender. For question number four we asked them to please rank the police performance on a scale of 1-10. 1 being very poor and 10 being very good. For question number five we asked, would you consider a career in the police bureau. If no, why not and to check all the reasons that apply below. For question number six we asked them to put a check by any statement they agree with. For question number seven, we asked, do you think there should be a way for young people to meet with police and talk about police issues? And if no, why not? For question number eight, we asked, do you think that police are approachable and easy to talk to? If no, why not? For question number nine we asked, do you feel you have access to resources for information about the police? For question number 10, did you know there's a police website where you can learn all about the police? And for question number 11 we asked, would you be willing to participate in these discussions and help out your community? And of course we asked for comments. Are there any questions about the survey?

Potter: Just the results.

*****: They'll be coming up.

Potter: Oh, ok. That's not yet? That's in the next phase?

*****: They're actually coming up. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you. Kind of a cliff-hanger. [laughter] thanks for being here this morning.

March 1, 2006

Brook Alban: Good morning. My name is brook alban, I have the result and conclusions for you. The first is basic racial breakdown of all the youth we surveyed from the different schools. It's pretty much a reflection of the youth we had in the schools. The second is the question was asked on our survey, do you think there should abway for the youth to meet with police and talk to them in a nonthreatening environment. Overall the results of the surveys said that almost half of the students of all ethnicities male and female said she with would -- they would be willing to meet with the police. The african-american youth were less interested in meeting with the police in all -- than all other ethnic groups. Side three is a comparison of the police readings among racial groups in gender. Overall the ratings were low, but hispanic females especially hispanic females gave the police the highest ratings overall. Slide four posed the question, would you participate in a discussion with the police time prove the relationship between police and youth? Relatively high numbers agree they would be willing to meet with the police. Minorities especially hispanics agreed they would be willing to meet. And generally --

Shaundrika Smith: My name is chandra. I'm going to be talking about our action plan. We need to start productive, safe communications between police and youth. We are targeting local high schools with diverse student populations, especially hispanic and latino youth. We're going to begin youth groups to discuss police issues. Our objective is youth -- is for youth to form personal relationships with police and get a better understanding of what police actually do and go through. Police will learn how youth feel about the way they are treated and the issues they face. The results will be improved perception of the police among youth that will slowly spread by word of mouth. If police image improves, then more youth will be willing to consider the police bureau as a career possibility.

Potter: Thank you.

Jameka Lathan: I'm going to explain about the three group projects we're doing at roosevelt, madison, and open meadow high school. Roosevelt high school is located in north st. Johns Portland. It also has a large variety of mixed races. Roosevelt is being selected for its large hispanic population. Brooke, kevin and tamika are talking about communicating better with the police. Tamiko has been in contact with two staff members, ms. Peterson, and ms. Higgins. Our goal is to hold our first meeting before spring break. Madison high school is located off of 82nd avenue in northeast Portland. Madison also has a large variety of mixed races. At madison, you really can't determine the main ethnic group. Each year the school gets more and more culturally diverse. Three students are taking time at madison to talk to you about having better communication with the police. We have also been in contact with roger, the vice principal of madison high school. He is more than happy to have us come and talk with the group of students. Open meadow high school is located off polk and willamette. It has a fairly diverse student body. Op meadow high school is a community-based high school. We always work together. At open meadow high school, steven and christina are talking to the students about having better communication with the police. Open meadow high school has committed to facilitating this partnership.

Kristina Brouwer: Hello and good morning. My name is christina, i'm 17 years old and attend open meadow high school. Today we face the future. Next steps, the project continues. City corps students will conduct peer groups and discuss police image. New observations will be made. We will identify student leaders and dedicated staff within the three schools. We will closely monitor, compare, and contrast the three peer groups to record what works and what does not work. It is our goal at city corps to develop a sustainable model for conducting youth initiated meetings between students and police. Thank you.

Tomoko Malone: My name is tameko. I will be reviewing what you have already heard in our conclusion. We have city corps, a student group that helps solve city problems. The problem statement -- time prove the relationship between police and youth. Solution -- begin student groups time prove relationships with the police. The student groups will begin in march before spring

March 1, 2006

break, and the school that's were chosen, and those schools are open meadow high school, madison high school, and roosevelt high school. City corps students and faculty would like to thank city council, the police bureau, police activities league, also known as p.a.l., open meadow, work systems inc., and anyone else who has taken out time to help city corps. Thank you for listening to our youth voices and opinions about positive changes in our community. Are there any questions?

Potter: I have just one for you. What has it done for you.

Malone: Well, it's changed my thought about police officers. I really didn't have, like -- I really didn't like police officers. I really didn't. And me meeting with kevin modica and larry anderson, like, it's changed because I know they want to listen, I know they want to help, and they want you to help them. They need the youth. So them needing the youth and us needing the police officers in the community, it can help community more.

Saltzman: Will these youth groups meet for six weeks?

Malone: Yes. It will continue for six weeks, and then after that we would all meet together and come up with a solution for these meetings.

Potter: Are there questions? Thank you very much. Is that the conclusion of the presentation?

Taylor: One more. I just want to recognize a few people. I would be remiss if I didn't recognize a few people and thank them. I hope they'll stand or raise their hands so everyone in the audience can see who they are. Yvonne deckert set up the initial meeting, so I want to recognize her. Karen hansen conceptualized -- had the initial conceptualization of the project, and has been a continued supporter for us. So I want to recognize her. Andrew mcgoff who is the executive director for work systems inc. Is in the office, and they've been amazing supporters and funders for many projects, and this is just one of them. Also, of course lieutenant kevin modica, who has taken time and energy and really just given the students a voice. That's been wonderful. And I also just wanted to say, because of my position as the coordinator for this project, for the past year I have had the pleasure of meeting city employees from all levels, and they're some of the most dedicated and competent and caring individuals. And it's just obvious that this is a city that cares about youth, and that you care about youth, and about youth voice. So I just want to thank you for that. Also, we're in the process of identifying our next project, soy wanted you to be thinking about which of your bureaus you'd like city corps to partner with next, so i'll be contacting you so we can figure that out. Thank you for supporting this program, and caring about our youth. Thank you very much.

Potter: Thank you very much. [applause] that was very impressive. I know in the long run it will pay to result -- I know when police officers and citizens, whether they're young people or adults, can talk to each other, can build trust, and mutual respect. It leads to a safer community, and it leads to a better community. So thank you so much for taking those efforts, and all of you adults who have helped on this, thank you. All of the young people who are engaged in this, i'm just so impressed. Your leadership, your intelligence, and the way you've put these programs together. So thank you very much. Any other comments from council? Thank you.

Saltzman: Please get ahold of me. I want to work with you in some of my bureaus.

Potter: And he has the parks bureau, so that would be an interesting one. Thank you for being here.

Potter: Please read the 10:00 a.m. Time certain.

Item 234.

Potter: Staff, please come forward. And our cochairs. The vision committee was established this fall, and the two cochairs, sheila martin and marvin kaiser will give a brief update on the vision committee. But we'll also discuss and carlos will discuss with you about the recommendations for the grants, and then we'll have some input from the community. So who wants to start?

Marvin Kaiser: We're pleased to be here. My name is marvin kaiser. I thank you for first establishing the vision committee and allowing us to serve as cochairs in this capacity with a large group of citizens from the community. Just to introduce the vision committee work again, I think

March 1, 2006

it's useful to think back well over 100 years ago in this city when a gentleman by the name of John Charles Olmstead talked about what it would mean in this city to have a world class park system. It was -- he laid out a vision for that, and he said it would -- it's the vision that will guide us over the next 50 to 100 years to have this kind of a park system. And if you overlay the park system today in Portland, much of that is correlated to this -- to that vision that laid out there. So it is the notion of having an intentional purpose of where we are going, and then talking about action strategies to get to this place where we want to be as a community. And so we believe, and we feel privileged to be part of this effort, to help us think not just about where we are now, but in an intentional way about where we want to be in the future. So we're engaging a large group of citizens and part of what we want to talk about today is that engagement process, the grants being part of that. So I turn over to my colleague Sheila Martin, who will talk some more about our process.

Potter: Mr. Kaiser, could you first tell us what your background is?

Kaiser: Yes. Now I'm the dean of the college of liberal arts and sciences at Portland State University, been in that position now for 12 years. I'm a gerontologist, and what we leave as our legacies is a very important part of all of us when we think about the meeting -- meaning in our community. It's part of the privilege of being on a committee like this, but one thinks about generation who's will follow us and what we leave for them. Thank you.

Sheila Martin: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and commissioners. I'm Sheila Martin. I'm the director of the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies at Portland State University, and it's been my privilege to cochair this with Dr. Kaiser, who far outranks me at the university, but we get to be equals in this committee. And it's been wonderful for me to learn from his leadership. The group of people that you've chosen for the committee is a very dedicated group, and it's really been my privilege to work with them over these last few months putting this process in place. And I'd like to call your attention to this slide that just sort of lays out the basics of the process that we're going through right now. The first of those steps is discovery and inspiration. And that's the stage that we're in right now. This process, even the process is being designed by the committee, and so even though we're being guided by the staff, the citizens themselves that form this committee are really driving how we're going to do this as well as what we're going to do. And so right now we are putting the structure in place and we are going to begin reaching out to the community to find out what their hopes and dreams are for the future of the city of Portland. And also analyzing the baseline conditions that we find ourselves in to figure out where we are now in order to help us envision where we might go. The second step is the dreaming and visioning, so during that stage we'll be using the input that we'll be receiving from all different parts of the community in order to develop some notions of possible ranges of what the future of the city might look like. So we'll be developing what we call alternative scenarios for the future of our city. And then in the final stage we'll be designing the actions and making the vision -- that will make the vision happen. So after developing a range of preferred scenarios, we'll be going back out to the community to get their input on which of these scenarios is the preferred scenario, choosing that, and then purposely constructing a strategy around making that vision happen. Through this entire process, it's very important that we engage with all different kinds of stakeholder groups in the community, because if we've done our job right, not only will the city adopt the vision for the future, but the whole community will embrace it. Because we know that the public sector alone can't -- won't be able to make a vision happen. It will require the private sector as well as the public sector and nonprofit organizations, and all of the citizens in this community to be thinking about how their decisions and investments and how they spend their time can be guided by our shared vision for the future. So it will really give us a strategic direction for all of those policy and investment decisions we'll be making over the next many years, just as Olmstead's vision guided a number of the decisions that we made around our parks back when that vision was created over 100 years ago.

Kaiser: Now, today with will be voting -- you will be voting on the grants that are being awarded as part of our community engagement process. And to contextualize that, one of our committees in

March 1, 2006

the visioning process is called the engagement committee. And the work of that committee as sheila said, is to be absolutely as broad as we can in the community to get people involved in the process. Mr. Mayor, you have stated that you hoped that we will have tens of thousands of individuals involved in that, so it's the groups of individuals, the organizations, and as sheila said the partners, that we're trying to get invested in the future. The grants process that we will look at shortly is a process by which we are asking for ideas from the citizenry of the community to help us get out to as many groups as possible so that we expand that participation in any way we can. So it's a process about asking for help from citizens themselves that we can get out into the community in the -- in those broad sort of ways. That's the context for what it is we're looking in the grants process today.

Martin: And it's part of a broader engagement strategy, and we could really use your help in this whole visioning process. We want the commissioners' ideas and the bureau chiefs' ideas, and a broad range of people's ideas about how to engage citizens in this process. So we'd really like to come back to you on occasion and check in with you and get your ideas about how to better bring people in to this process. And so this was just one of we hope many conversation that's we'll have with all of you about how we can make this visioning process richer and better, and bring more of our citizens into it. And I would like to bring up next eliza and carol, who will tell you about how the grants were developed and decided on.

Potter: Thank you, folks.

Juan Carlos Ocaña: I'd like to take -- my name is Juan Carlos Ocaña, I'm on staff with the vision project at the mayor's office. I want to say a few words and introduce the cochairs of the grant subcommittee. This process was a very rich process in terms of publication generated from the citizens of Portland. Unfortunately it wasn't as rich in resources, we only had \$200,000 to distribute. So we had to come up with a competitive process. We had to come up with a process that would ensure that all proposals would be measured by the same standards. We modeled the process that -- staff researched different processes and presented them to the committee, and the process we ended up recommending and presenting in committee approving was modeled after the regional arts and culture council, and that was -- is really looking at giving that same treatment to all proposals. At the same time, we know that we have not a lot of resources to distribute, unfortunately, and one of the things that we as staff are also exploring is context with the foundation community in order to try to leverage more dollars that hopefully we'll be able to spread among other community groups that are not funded through this process. And we were fortunate to have two great people as the cochairs of the grant subcommittee. There's Carol Morris, and -- who works as -- directs the foundation on her professional life, and Eliza, a small business owner from northeast Portland who agreed kindly to cochair this. So I'm going to turn the meeting over to them.

Carole Morse: Thank you. Mayor and council members, I'm Carol Morse, and I do run the p.g.e. foundation for Portland General Electric, so I've been doing this kind of work for about 10 years. I'm a member of the vision committee as well as cochair of the grant subcommittee, as you just heard. And I first want to really compliment you, Mayor, on the group of people you put together on this vision committee. I have never seen such a diverse group of people in my whole time here in Portland. And the people represent so many kinds of diversity, from ethnicity, to income levels, to philosophical background, age, all of it. So if you're in these meetings, and I know you've come to some of them, it's a very rich sometimes intense conversation that goes on, which I think is just what you want. And I think it's a microcosm of the Portland of the future, so congratulations on that. And the staff is incredible. Juan Carlos Cam Campos and Amanda Rhodes and Lisa Went have been putting their hearts and souls into this and giving us a whole lot of good staff support. So we have been the stewards on the grant subcommittee of 200,000 dollars allocated for community grants, and we have taken that role very seriously. We understand the financial constraints that the

March 1, 2006

city has been under, and we're very grateful that this funding has been made available to enable more people to participate in the conversation about Portland's future. I've heard frequently people say we don't want just the normal usual cast of characters coming forward and putting this vision together, and I can attest to the fact that we've heard from some groups that I've never heard of before. Our task has been to invite community groups to propose project ideas for reaching out to their communities and engaging people in the vision project, and to develop a process to determine which proposals would best serve the project and the organizations. The primary motivation for establishing the grants program was to create outreach opportunities to hear from diverse Portlanders. Within this framework we had a few key goals and objectives. One was to reach people throughout the entire city of Portland. Second, to reach out to diverse populations as I said, groups that would normally take part in this process, and third, to engage the public through new and creative outreach strategies. And we certainly saw some of them in the grant request. As you may have heard, we had an overwhelming response to the grants program. In fact, we all blanched when we saw that stack of 143 grant proposals totalling over \$1.6 million, knowing we only had \$200,000. And we were all impressed, but with so many groups that stepped forward and so many of them that really got what we were looking for. And I attribute that to the fact that the staff did some incredible work in doing technical assistance workshops, really keying the groups up for what the city was looking for in this proper subject -- in this project. These groups are ready to start conversations with their constituents about Portland's future, and they really displayed great integrity, thoughtfulness and creativity in their proposals. It's been wonderful to learn about these groups doing such good work in the community through this whole process. But I will tell you that the large number of grant proposals did create challenges for the reviewers. There were so many good projects and only limited funding. Limiting the list of funded projects to \$200,000 was very difficult to us as a review team, and created some very tense moments, as I'm sure you all are aware of as you go through your own budget process. But it's important to remember that the grants program is only part of the overall outreach strategies for visioning. Another set of volunteers has created an extensive community engagement plan. The grants are part of the plan as well as online surveys, public events, and a speaker's bureau, and other outreach activities. The overarching engagement streams are very broad and deep, and we're not going to lose track of the proposals we are not able to offer funding to now. We are just going to need to be really creative about finding partners and other resources to support the good work that we want to see happen. In fact, we're already out there trying to see if we can get some private funding to fund some of the projects in what we call our waiting list. My cochair is going to talk more about the process we used to get us to this point. I'd like to reiterate my support for the process and the slate of grants in front of you, and I do truly appreciate council's funding to make these projects possible. These grants will help us immensely in our work of bringing people together to talk about Portland's future. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you.

Eleza Faison: Good morning, council, I appreciate the opportunity to speak before you once again.

I wanted to thank the mayor for inviting myself to participate in the process. I do find it to be a valid process indeed to plan out your future. I want to thank staff as -- who has participated and chased me down on many occasions to make sure this process goes smoothly, and I also want to invite all elected officials to come and see what we're doing, because it's also going to direct the path of your participation in the future with the overall scope of the vision. My name is eliza, I'm a small business owner in north and northeast Portland in a -- and a community activist in my neighborhood and other civic organizations. I'm going to be talking to you today about what we recommended these -- what we came up with to recommend these 20 grant proposals that we're requesting funding for today. I want to start with the recruitment process. We developed a grant application form which was released back in november 2005. We promoted it widely through media and other email and various list serves that had been compiled over a period of time. Over the next two months we had held three workshops in various different areas of the city and had

March 1, 2006

participation of over 200 at those workshops to gain understanding of what we were looking for out of the end result of these grants to make sure the grant proposals that were received fit the mission. A video of those workshops was repeatedly broadcast on local cable access so that people that couldn't be in attendance still had the ability to get the information. All of this work paid off, as you have heard earlier. We received by the deadline of January 31 143 applications from a broad range of community organizations. In the review process, this is where we took a real long look at -- as a subcommittee at the collected 143 grants to -- and developed a plan and strategy as outlined by Juan Carlos, and we used that to judge the projects in the original grant application. Ufo receiving a large number of applications, we recruited additional reviewers so that each of the applications was thoroughly reviewed by three people in the first round. The proposals were scored on a five criteria in the proposal, including a targeted population, outreach strategy, partnership development, and quality of budget. Those were the criteria by which we rank these grants. The grant proposals which scored in the top 20% were discussed in a day-long, long, long meeting. In a long meeting just to say that we really made sure we were thorough in the review of each application and discussed it to its eventuality. In the past week we scored these proposals, then collectively discussed the funding allocations. The results of this were -- is given to you I believe in a list -- these projects represent organizations of diverse background in the Portland area. We have projects with low-income latinos, people in drug and alcohol recovery programs, african-americans, day laborers, people in affordable housing projects, refugees, immigrant community members, unfortunately it doesn't always -- with a limited budget and itself to representing everything in that scope, but we have other aspects in the engagement committee, as you've heard before, that we can help facilitate dialogue with all the groups in Portland. Some projects focus in particular on neighborhoods and others are citywide projects. Projects will engage people in all quadrants of our city, some projects use theater to connect people and some organize community events. Others will capture videos, audio tapes, and things that can be long-standing results of this process. We believe that our rigorous review process allows us to recommend the 20 quality projects that will engage a broad section of the residents here in the Portland area. We received many high-quality proposals, and because of the limited resources, we had to make difficult choices about the projects that we ended up funding. We would have -- we would have to -- we would like to fund more if we were able too, so feel free to give us more money. We received many high-quality -- I already did that. Our vision is active in seeking organizations to leverage additional funding, and we will reach out to community partners to do as such. We thank you for your consideration of the grants. These represent complex process in a driven community, members of the vision committee time, effort, lots of reading, lots of contemplating, and lots of collaboration, and it was an honor to be a part of the process. The process is not always perfect, but it is a process that is equal amongst all the participants and all -- in all the grants that were put before us. As you can see, we have a wide -- I would hope you can see, that we have a large list of grants that were funded, not all of those grants were funded to their full request, determined by the visioning committee in outlook on how many people and what diverse population they had hoped to reach. So we tried to spread the money out as much as we possibly could. And with that, we just ask that you fund this and make it possible so that we can move on and move forward into making the vision happen. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Ocaña: I think Carol and Eliza gave the commissioners and the Mora really good snapshot of how we conducted the process. They talked about the challenges of trying to fund as many good projects with as relatively small amount of money, and this is something that again at the end of the meeting I don't think anyone was completely happy with the list, because we wished we had a lot more money to spread even further, but on the other hand, we had to go as far as we could, and follow the process that was laid out. So I don't know what else follows procedurally. I think we can answer questions if people have them.

March 1, 2006

Potter: Any questions of these folks?

Saltzman: These are going to take the form of contracts with these organizations?

Ocaña: They will be grant agreements, yes. We have -- staff has been working with the office of the city attorney and the office of neighborhood involvement to create the contracts -- the agreements. You can see there's -- in your ordinance packet is the contract. However, we're introducing a substitute exhibit b, which is -- was more tailored to this grant agreement by jim van dyke, senior deputy city attorney.

Saltzman: So there will be a statement of work, a delivery schedule for the work, is there any limit on administrative expense for the organizations receiving grants? I don't see that anywhere.

Ocaña: No, there was not -- we did not set a limit. However, most of the organizations requested funds that really did not include administrative amounts. They were very focused on trying to use the funding for either staffing or different materials that they would use to get to their creative strategies.

*******:** But if I can address that, there were some that had some administrative costs built in, and the grant review committee was very cognizant of that, and we would discuss it and wanted to see it pretty low. And I think when we did see it, it was 10% or under, which is in my experience, a low percentage.

Saltzman: The statement of work will contain -- you gave us a summary of each one of the grants. Is this the staple of work, or is it going to be more detailed?

Ocaña: It will be more detailed. We will be -- once the council approves the slate, if that is your will, we will negotiate with each of the grantee and we will make sure the statement, the scope of work reflects the proposal and reflects the budget that they presented to us.

Saltzman: I guess i'm looking at one, the broad arts theater. Number nine in the ranking. Can somebody explain to me what exactly -- i've read it twice now and I don't understand what exactly - - I don't at all what it is. Is it a play? We're spending \$14,000 to put on a play?

Ocaña: My understanding is that it is indeed a theater troupe. It is that -- that creates different theater plays and takes them around the city. It wouldn't be a one-time-only performance, but they will go around and partner with different organizations to take this play all around Portland and -- and then they will also incorporate strategies to engage the people who attend the performances in the vision conversation and report that information back to the vision project.

Morse: Broad arts is a community dialogue theater. If you're familiar with sojourn theater and the witness our schools project they did last year, similar kind of thing of engaging people. And we were looking for creative ways for -- to reach out to people, especially folks that would normally want to just fill out a survey.

Saltzman: What is the payment schedule to the grantees? A certain amount up front and a certain amount upon completion?

Ocaña: Yes, absolutely.

Saltzman: What is that?

Ocaña: I think it's going to be 80/20, 80% up front. We haven't -- it hasn't been -- a formal decision hasn't been made, but the idea was to give 80% up front and 20% up on completion, and turn in the -- and turning in of the final report. A lot of the organizations you see on your slate are small, and a lot of them are very grass-roots, so they certainly -- the feeling of the committee members was that it would be best to give them enough funds so they can really start -- hit the ground running and then still hold some money for the end to make sure we get the reports back.

Saltzman: Ok. Thank you.

Potter: Other questions? Thank you, folks, very much. Karla, do we have a sign-up list?

Moore: One person signed up. Colin mccormick.

Colin McCormack: Good morning, gentlemen. Thank you for hearing my testimony. Again, my name is colin mccormack. I work for the native american youth and family center, and among my duties i'm the coordinator nor the native american youth and elders council, an organization that

March 1, 2006

seeks to increase and heighten advocacy from the native community in Oregon -- in Portland and beyond. Today I'd like to register a concern on behalf of the native community with the grants-making -- the grant-making portion of the visioning project. My specific concern is not relative to the money or the youth and elders council that did put forth a proposal was not funded specifically, my concern is not project specific but community specific. And that no group associated with the native american community was represented. While we're highly appreciated and glad to see strong community organizations, sisters of the road, the african-american health coalition, it really glad to see the -- concerned again that the native american community is not represented. Furthermore, we do understand the sheer number of applications that came in and the complexity of the process, and that the process was intended to be as objective as possible. Unfortunately, the world is not objective. The r.a.c. model, which was implemented as a decision-making process is one that has a demonstrated history of underfunding communities of color, and has not -- is not set up to serve -- underserved communities. The larger issue is that 38,000 local native americans have once again been left out of a civic process. This is a voice that needs to be represented in all of our city and local discussions. Otherwise, the message is that we don't count. No longer can the status of a silent minority can accepted. Very glad to see a very honorable, strong, and committed leader of the native american community sitting in on the engagement committee and certainly heard people this morning speak of other ways to get involved with the process, via the engagement committee. But it's too much to expect of one volunteer to represent the voice of an entire community, again, 38,000 local citizens. It's too much pressure to put on one community to channel all of its voices through this one individual. And frankly, smacks of tokenism. When we look at the list of groups that were funded, there are some curious groups on that list, as commissioner Saltzman pointed out, and a question might be why was this opportunity to look at underresourced communities increasing their capacities to participate in civic discussions not more of a priority when neighborhood associations and neighborhood coalitions which already receive city monies for the same ideals are represented on the list. Again, it's just very important that the community be involved -- the native community be involved in this larger process. They spoke this morning of inclusiveness in reaching out to broad sectors. This is a repeating message which has a note of historical familiarity for the community. To embrace this plan they need to be involved, the feeling is native americans were left out of the picture, left out of the game, and will not be able to embrace this vision and will have continuing problems that have played themselves out. Over the years. I thank you for hearing me.

Potter: Thank you.

Potter: I realize there were limited funds, and that you do have a waiting list. But talk a little bit about how you factored things in like what they're suggesting.

Ocaña: Certainly. In the procedures of the grants subcommittee, at the beginning it's very clearly stated that the goals of the process were to allocate the funds to communities that are traditionally not participated in this kind of long-range planning processes. And there is a listing of all of those communities. We also talked about the importance of the geographic distribution, so not just one sector of the city receives most of the allocations. That said, the finding how to make it operational was very difficult, because everyone has different conceptions of what is an underrepresented community and how -- what is the best definition for that. So the way how we -- we're actually -- it's an issue that not just the grant subcommittee is dealing with, but also the engagement subcommittee and all of the other subcommittees, and we're hoping to develop it as we go, to really create a definition for the vision project that is developed as we go. However, at the time we decided to say to the community side to put forth the strong preference for funding groups from that community, but then it was left to the -- each of the committee members could score the proposals according to what they saw as being important in terms of reaching out to particular communities and the involvement strategy and all of the other criteria that you have in front of you. So, again, the committee members were aware this was an important goal, the operation of the -- of how to

March 1, 2006

express that preference was difficult, and it was then each of the reviewers corey tire ya of how they thought each of the proposals compared to one another. Again, we used the r.a.c. Model, we tried to -- we knew we had to create a competitive process, and we knew we had to make it as objective as possible, and in the end we ended up with this slate as you can see it.

Liesl Wendt: My name is liesl wendt. One of the other keys of the project is looking at effective and new and innovative engagement strategies. We clearly heard from community groups before we developed the grants program that there are different ways to reach out to folks through traditional forums or focus groups, but we also heard there's opportunity through like the broad arts group, different ways to reach out to people who may not want to go to a forum like that, who may not have access to different community-based organizations. So looking at creative ways to open the conversation about Portland's future, the engagement piece is a really important part of the overall vision project. Within the engagement plan was a plan, it's now turn nothing a booklet, it's really a guide of how do we reach out to as many organizations as possible to follow up on what the fellow previous was talking about so there's input into the vision, but also support for what that vision is when we're done with this process. As the mayor has often said, we hope to talked to 100,000 folks, and in as many different ways and venues as possible. The grants is one piece of that, and as was mentioned earlier, we've had preliminary, very positive conversations with the foundation community who also is interested in reaching out to folks who typically aren't involved. So using the city process as a way to leverage other funds we can work through we hope the slate of grants that we had submitted to us.

Potter: Are there questions from the commissioners?

Leonard: Can you react to the comment by the witness with respect to -- all I can identify is two, the southwest neighborhoods inc. Receiving \$13,500, center neighborhood association receiving \$6700, and his point being those are organizations that are set up to do outreach and take citizen input currently, why are we having to give them money on top of their existing budget to do what I think some people think is their primary task.

Ocaña: Certainly. When the grants process was started, the idea was to really open up the competition for these fundings to as many organization and government entities as possible with the idea that they will know how to best reach their own constituents. So also my understanding is that the funding for this piece came from the office of neighborhood involvement, so with that all together, we did not want to single out specific groups or kinds of organizations that could apply or could not apply for these funds. We purpose 30 tried to make it as open as possible for many different groups. We had several requests from neighborhood associations, and these two requests from the neighborhood associations were the ones that were deemed by the committee to be worthy of receiving the funding. And it's not that the other ones were not worthy, but this is just where we ran out of money. They were very impressed by the -- for the center association, which is the example that is fresh in my memory, they were very impressed with how that particular neighborhood association has been able to really reach out to communities that traditionally do not participate in that system, and they wanted to encourage that work to continue.

Leonard: You did not answer my question. It was a good answer, but it wasn't to the question I asked. The question I asked was not whether or not you treated all neighborhood associations fairly, the question is, aren't they already set up, don't think have a mechanism currently that doesn't require existing funds to do outreach into their neighborhoods? And why didn't we go to them first to ask them what they had in place to do what it is that you want to do before we contracted with them?

Ocaña: Well, I think my answer again would be, we wanted to hear from everyone, including neighborhood associations, and see if they had any ideas and proposals that would be contributing even more so to this. We didn't think about talking to them first. I think it's a point well taken.

Wendt: I want to add to that. We did involve the office of neighborhood involvement in planning and review of the grant application itself. We specifically said to neighborhood organizations, we

March 1, 2006

would like you to be involved in this process and we know some of have you a harder time than others reaching out to different communities within your neighbors, within your neighborhoods, so the center proposal for example, is mostly funds for child care or transportation or translation to involve I believe a small community in particular. So it was what are things you would need to do kind of the extra work to involve communities that live in your neighborhood that traditionally aren't at neighborhood association meetings.

Leonard: They don't have the staff currently to reach out to, or the resources?

Wendt: Or the resources. And in particular that proposal, because it's fresh in my mind, is I don't believe there's any staff dollars in that proposal, it's mostly how is it that we can bring the community together, and that's going to involve translation, it's going to involve food, it's going to involve transportation issues.

Leonard: So you are doing things that the neighborhood associations would not normally do.

Wendt: It was without -- exactly. It was outside of the realm of what a neighborhood association would normally do. So, for example, the question routinely came up, can we do something at our neighborhood association meeting, and we said, we assume you're going to do that anyway. We want something above and beyond that.

Leonard: Thank you. That's what I was looking for.

Faison: I have some expertise in neighborhood association budgets. I was the director of the piedmont neighborhood association for two consecutive years by which you all had an opportunity to come to our meetings. These are volunteer organizations that really play more so on the goodwill of its constituency and advertisement through mediocre means of a newsletter to get outside funding to do any types of recruitment, and that's been a challenge for us with the office of neighborhood involvement and limited budget with the city for a long time. And we have always looked for grant opportunities such as these to increase our outreach not only to bolster our participation within our organizations of nontraditional underrepresented renters, minority populations, nonnative american -- nonenglish-speaking participants in the neighborhood, and we have consistently been unable to get those funds from any sources within the organization. So opportunities like this that come from the city I can tell you my colleagues at the office of neighborhood involvement as well as other neighborhood associations saw this as the one unique opportunity to leverage some funds to do some outside projects that would increase and recruit and enrich the neighborhood associations' representation in the city's process.

Potter: A few years ago I think all the neighborhoods got together and proposed to the city that \$350,000 be set aside to go out and try to recruit groups within the neighborhoods that had traditionally not been engaged in the process. And I believe that this does that. Not just in neighborhoods, but in the organizations that have been funded. The question specific, are they on a waiting list? You said had you a list that was to be funded. Are they one of the programs that was to be fund?

Ocaña: I can distribute this so you can see it together with me. The list you will see are the 28 organizations that represent the top 20% of all the 143 organizations that applied for funding. So you can see as far -- they're ranked in order, the first ranked proposals at the top, you can see the committee struggle with how to fund these organizations and to answer the question concisely, there is one native american organization that is within the 28th proposals that made the final list, and they are ranked 27 according to the process. So we were not able to spread the funds far down enough in order to reach that group. And, yes, they will be considered to be on a waiting list if we are able to leverage more money from the foundation community.

Potter: So it was the native people's circle of hope --

Ocaña: Correct, the native people's circle of hope. They proposed -- they submitted a proposal for \$14,825.

March 1, 2006

Potter: What are the chances of the foundations actually putting some money into this, these efforts and would they also then be working with you to fund some of these specific programs that had not been funded?

Wendt: I will speculate, I think the opportunity to receive some funds is high. I think we would also have the opportunity if we were using foundation dollars to obviously work with them on developing criteria. So we would have an opportunity in some ways be a bit more subjective than we were through the process. So there might be some opportunity to look at the entire list, how things were ranked and enjoy that we're meeting their criteria around diverse population and work weekend their definitions of that.

Potter: Any further questions?

Leonard: I'm just curious, for instance, Oregon film and video foundation, is going to receive \$15,000. Is that right?

Ocaña: \$11,217. It's on the partial funding column should say amount recommended.

Leonard: I wasn't reading that right. So i'm wondering if there is some sense that because of the concern raised here that might be more equitable to replace them with the group that we just heard identified.

Wendt: I think one of the pieces to consider is that the proposal in particular is proposing to create their leveraging more dollars than they're asking for, which is important, and -- in considering, and also that they are creating a tool that would travel around the city and be an interactive way to receive input at many different place throughout the city. So that's an important piece to consider.

Leonard: And I didn't mean to pick on them, i'm just looking for something that would be obvious that --

Saltzman: Let me suggest, going back to the broad arts theater, do you think the outreach from the broad arts theater is going to be greater than perhaps native people circle of snowy plover they're about the same amount.

Ocaña: Unfortunately I don't have the full -- my full spreadsheet in front of me where it shows the number of proposed context, so I will be able to get back to you on how many -- that's one of the criteria or the questions we asked in the proposal, was to tell us how many people you are looking at reaching with what amount of money. Because we are very -- we are very interested in leveraging and getting as much context as much bang for our buck. So I don't have that answer right now. We'll have to go back to that and take a look at it. What I can say, and probably lisa can talk about how the committee members considered that trade-off between amount requested and number of contacts.

Faison: And I guess one of the things we had talked about as a committee is a word of caution to try to segment out different underrepresented groups that didn't make the cut in the sense that there are a lot of underrepresented groups that didn't make the cut, and we might open up the pandora's box of switching around funds and skipping people to the front and to the back, and we have an entire city of citizenry that could very welcome to the table and say, you gave -- you cut this and gave them money, and we were the next people on the list.

Leonard: And I respect that, but I think what you're hearing from commissioner Saltzman and I is when we're weighing those things, and I think you've approached this in a very forthright manner and tried to include as many folks as possible, but when we have groups that actually are suffering as a culture to survive, I think what you're hearing from us is maybe that should move them up to replace some of these other worthy groups that we completely understand, but I think the argument that there might be other groups that want to be included isn't a reason not to do it, I think it might be a reason to listen to their argument and maybe replace other like groups such as commissioner Saltzman has pointed out, with them. To me it's -- I appreciate what broad arts theater does, but I am also deeply concerned as some of the issues -- of some of the issues in the american indian population culture, and it would be more than I think well received to have their input into this process.

March 1, 2006

Faison: No, absolutely. And I absolutely agree with you. Another underrepresented group would be the asian community. There were several grants on the ballot for the asian community to participate. And unfortunately they didn't make this 28 cut, and so some of the question within the committee discussion was, can we give due influence based solely on selected underrepresented groups. And being an underrepresented group I understand the importance of participation. Unfortunately, though, once you start to do that, you start to look as the young lady earlier stated, you start to look at sexual orientation representation, you start to look at --

Leonard: Those aren't arguments to me not to do what we're doing. They are an argument to include those folks and -- because all of them are involved in the arts, all of them are involved in -- within those communities, i'm assuming film, professionalism, and I think we can tap all of that. And I want to be real clear, i'm not at all criticizing what you did, I understand how difficult, i've been in the place where you are, but we're gist I think giving you an observation that we think might make this a more useful process if we identify the groups that maybe represent population that's we do want to specifically hear from. And I want to hear from the asian community. Way than to know what their issues are that are specific to them. I want to hear from the american indian community, and the issues specific to them, and every community. I just speaking for myself, I would want this as a starting point to have had included those groups and then whatever was left certainly do these other organizations.

Faison: And I think that was the goal of the committee as well. But through a legal -- there's a due process for everything when you open up a grant committee, you can't just -- you have to have a criteria, and from my understanding you have to have a criteria by which to give away city money, you can't arbitrarily have what you'd like to see.

Sten: Commissioner, I think it's been an excellent discussion, I just want to compliment both the mayor and the process in terms of as I look at all the groups that are funded, I mean all of them, theorize they're groups that really have a direct tie to people that will not be involved in this process, otherwise, or as I read them they're innovative uses by the more traditional groups that the neighborhood associations, and one of the things we push very hard on is to get the neighborhood associations to do more of this. And neighborhood association level, they don't do not have resource, we give them \$so much00 each a year. The idea they're going to do any of this with \$700 is not realistic, as you know as the chair of piedmont. So I am not personally interested in sort of second guessing the rankings sitting up here, but the rankings are very clear, and I would be personally willing to support, I don't remember ever doing this, I don't do this very often, but I think this is so forward moving, I would be personally prepared to support allocating a little more money into this process rather than pulling somebody off the list.

Potter: I agree.

Sten: My inclination, I would be open to funding the native american and asian groups that were ranked very highly in the process, and the reason I would do them other than the others is the others are neighborhood associations, are the tryon creek life form who just received a very large grant from the council, and if you look at the list, there's two that jump out as not having made the cut who -- that's what the council is here to do, is occasionally use some judgment, even when there's been a process, I would make a motion to find some funds from our contingencies to fund those two groups.

Leonard: Second. I appreciate that solution.

Saltzman: Shouldn't this -- couldn't this money come from your existing visioning project money? The \$600,000 or so?

Wendt: The funds we have for the existing project really, the \$200,000 for the grants program and the additional resource paid for two city planners and the staff and the mayor's office, there isn't a lot of extraneous funds I think we could look for there.

Faison: Can I ask a question? If you do decide to do that, please open it up to the opportunity that all the grants submitted that targeted those groups be reevaluated, because through our process we

March 1, 2006

didn't take that criteria to culminate this list as a priority. And so there were various within that 143 grants, there were various different organization that's chose to target those specific groups that didn't make this top.

Leonard: So did you have groups that apride -- applied for like sexual orientation, or sexual minorities? I would be interested I think just if we're going to do what commissioner Sten suggests, is to maybe allocate enough extra money that gives you some discretion to identify those kind of groups.

Faison: And that is what the committee wanted to do posthaste, because we saw the same types of things that you're discussing right now.

Leonard: I'm thinking like \$30,000, could that --

Potter: How about 50, because, those are three groups right there. The grants are up to \$15,000. So I would -- I would like to at least have them have the same --

Leonard: I think that's fair. I approached this process I think fairly conservatively, and so I --

Sten: You were against this money all together.

Leonard: If we're going to do it, I want to do it in a way that's fair. If we're doing it in the way the mayor suggests, I can support that.

Potter: Thank you folks. I believe nicole would like to say something. She's been sort of on the edge of her chair.

Sten: If we were going to go that approach, which I do like and support, I would suggest something along the lines that no more applications be asked for, because I think we have enough groups, that we ask the committee to go back and with the sense of what we're trying to do in mind, give them a little bit of room to -- this happens a lot with bhcd, to renegotiate scope with groups and just kind of come to a conclusion that solves the concerns that have been raised as opposed to take it or leave it kind of approach.

*******:** Thank you. I just wanted to reiterate --

Potter: State your name for the record.

Nicole June Maher: Nicole June maher, I just wanted to reiterate we're not here to advocate for our organization, we're really here to advocate for the voice of the community to be included. So what you're talking about as far as going back and relooking at the organizations that applied or what have you, I think that sounds wonderful. Our concern is really truly the process and really making sure the process is set up to truly include folks who have been historically excluded from having a voice. And I know that the process is not trying to make the statement that the native community's voice is not valuable, but that's certainly the way we felt to see such a good job being done trying to include sow many voices and yet several important voices were not included. So that was really the concern I wanted to bring forward. And our concern was really truly the process that was chosen, which was the r.a.c. Process that does have a history of underserving people of color, and so in any process that we do on behalf of the city of Portland or any community, it's just so important that we think about our objective, think about our process that will truly, truly engage communities that have not been engaged. Soy appreciate all of your commitment and all of the effort that you're making to include all communities. Thanks.

Potter: Can we amend the contract? There's \$200,000 set aside. How do we make the amendment so it includes up to \$50,000?

Harry Auerbach: First of all, there was a substitute of the form of the agreement. That's separate from what you're asking me. I just want to remind you you're going to need an amendment to substitute the exhibit b before you bring this thing to conclusion. As far as amending the grants, you can amend the grants to the additional money, and direct the group to reevaluate the existing proposals, and as commissioner Sten said, if necessary renegotiate this scope of work, and fund an additional number of projects that are directed at whatever specific communities you have identified.

March 1, 2006

Leonard: I would make that motion and then say that -- add that up to \$50,000 would be suspended to -- expended to meet the goals you just articulated, which is the substance of my motion.

Auerbach: Did you get that? You need to tell -- so the motion I believe commissioner Leonard is making is to amend the ordinance to allocate up to an additional \$50,000 to direct the committee to reevaluate the economizing -- existing proposals and fund up to an additional three --

Leonard: Reevaluate the existing proposals that weren't accepted.

Auerbach: That weren't accepted, and fund up to an additional three proposals that are --

Leonard: I don't want to limit to it three.

Auerbach: Up to \$50,000, among those proposals, that are targeted specifically to include the voices of sexual minorities, the asian communities, and the native american community.

Leonard: And others as the fund may allow.

Auerbach: It's your motion. [laughter]

Potter: Did you get that, Karla?

Moore: I got it on tape.

Potter: Good. So first there is an amendment to -- what was the amendment to?

Auerbach: To substitute exhibit b.

Potter: Oh, yes. This is the substitute. It was refinement of the grant agreement. To more specifically make it to fit the categories that have been considered today.

Auerbach: You need a motion and second.

Saltzman: Move to substitute exhibit b.

Leonard: Second.

Potter: Please call the roll.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] is this an amendment as well then?

Auerbach: Yes.

Potter: This amendment, and it's form as written and spoken.

Moore: Was there a second?

Sten: Second.

Leonard: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Great work. Aye.

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] do we need a vote?

Auerbach: No, it passes to second.

Leonard: I probably should have said something at the time to explain myself, because as commissioner Sten accurately pointed out, I voted no on this proposal when it came barbara welch us to allocate \$600,000, and now i'm not only speaking what appears to be in favor of it. I've actually argued to add \$50,000 to the --

Sten: You were against it because it wasn't enough, right?

Leonard: That's right. So I should probably explain myself for the benefit of those that are going to be asking me later once again, what were you thinking, randy, perhaps --

Potter: Perhaps it wasn't what.

Leonard: So I did -- I have to tell you i've been employed at the city in one capacity or another for approaching 30 years. That's shocking to say. And i've had a lot of experience in some of the processes at the city starting back in honestly the late 1970's, culminating through this, and I will admit to sometimes being a little cynical, and I fear I was approaching this process a little cynically, and with more than just a little negative thinking. And I noticed on my calendar last week that I had a meeting at 5:30 in the evening scheduled with a person from the mayor's office, and I caught myself grousing through the day about this 5:30 meeting to talk about this visioning thing, and oh, my goodness, aren't there other things I could be doing that would actually be productive. And so the appointment arrived and they showed up on time, so long with senali arrived a woman named kate and christina, and christina is the brand-new president of the lents neighborhood association who I had read of and heard of had not met. And so they arrived and came into the office to talk to

March 1, 2006

me about their perspective of those two community members being involved with this visioning project. And I have to tell you, it was one of those unexpected experiences that we occasionally have that you can't prepare yourself -- I can honestly tell you I left the meeting inspired talking to these two community members who I have some relationship with the lents community having represented it for a decade in the legislature, so I actually knocked on doors, i've gone to more meetings out there than I care to remember, and it's -- let's just say the atmosphere in the lents neighborhood association is distinctly different than the one at the irvington neighborhood association, and always has been. It can be a little challenging for even their friends to go. And to have met these brand-new two activist who's have -- are bringing a renewed energy, renewed commitment, and this absolute drive to include everybody in lents and adjoining communities in this visioning project, I have to tell you, I recognize that I reflected on going home that night that I had become a little cynical about this effort of the mayors and what's probably not as fair to it as I should have been, and that they had actually been out into the community, including people already in activities as pa part of this visioning project who had heretofor not connected with the community and the larger city. So I actually, because of the good work that senali did in connecting me with those two folks, think that this might actually be something that's going to work well for the community, and thus today I wanted to make sure the entire community was involved and engaged, and I think that this was an excellent discussion, and I look forward -- I want to make sure this goes in a way that I think achieves what the mayor has said he wants to achieve, so i'll be asking questions along the way, but I will from this point on work to support this effort in any way that I can to make sure that we get a good product.

Potter: There's one other thing to consider, and that is what did you at the water bureau. This is not dissimilar from that.

Leonard: I have to tell that you is not lost on me. And I will also say that I have noticed a distinct, you know, change in the tenor and behavior of city government since you've come on board, mayor Potter, and it's been for the good. And for those reasons I think you deserve to get the benefit of the doubt on this initiative. I appreciate it.

Potter: Any other comments from commissioners? Ok. It moves to a second reading next week. Karla?

Moore: Yes.

Potter: Please read the 10:30 time certain.

Item 235.

Saltzman: Mr. Mayor, members of the council. Metro's 1995 natural areas bond measure passed overwhelmingly by Portland voters. It was extremely successful and the acquisition efforts protect over 8,000 acres, 500 of those right here in Portland. The 2006 bond measure continues the goal of protecting clean water and preserving fish and wildlife habitat in the face of continued growth and development. The resolution before the council accomplishes two things. It establishes this council's support for the proposed metro bond measure with recommendations on components of the measure, and establishes the council support for components of the city's local share portion of the bond measure. We will have park staff delve into that shortly about what we want to see in the local share. But I also want to call out the extensive public effort, public involvement effort, the Portland parks and recreation undertook in connecting with the public as metro began developing the idea of going to our region's voters in november. The parks and recreation bureau solicited public input through two public meetings and through our webpage on Portland online. And if the bond measure passes, there will be extensive additional citizen involvement sought in the refinement of how we'll spend our local share. So we have I think we lost metro council rex burk holder but we have robert liberty and metro president david bragdon here to discuss the measure.

David Bradgon: We appreciate commissioner Saltzman's introduction. We have been working very closely with our staff in the development of this effort as well as the volunteer and nonprofit groups within the city of Portland and throughout the other 24 cities in the region. The connection

March 1, 2006

that people in this region feel to nature is very tangible and real, and has a true value in spiritual terms and economic terms as well. The need is as great as ever, in fact with the population estimates for increasing population in the area, habitat continues to disappear to development. That threatens water quality in the region, also diminishes our recreational opportunities, so building on the effort from 1995 to acquire natural areas for public use in perpetuity, we've been crafting this measure. Commissioner Saltzman mentioned the 1995 measure that was passed with 62% approval of the voters throughout the region, and provided \$135.6 million for acquisition of natural areas. During that period we have acquired over 8,000 acres which include 74 miles of river and stream frontage and valuable riparian areas. It also provided \$25 million, and I think also very importantly it activated a lot of volunteer groups and other nonprofits to be active in this area. Back in 1995 the measure provided \$7.4 million to the city of Portland, which funded activities throughout the city for quite a few arboretum, Kelly Butte, Rocky Butte, Powell Butte, there were accusations in all of those areas with local share. There was also work on the trails, both through the regional share and the city's share. OMSI to Spring Water being one of the notable ones. The through the regional part of that program we add over 800 acres to Forest Park. Through the acquisition program which has then been managed by the city. Looking forward to the 2006 measure, familiar elements to the successful components of the past, a regional natural area focus in terms of target areas, selected for the regional significance, and then local share on a per capita basis to the cities throughout the region, and we're also contemplating a proposed capital fund program for neighborhood projects, particularly in under-natured areas, particularly to provide more urban focus for the program and also to provide activity for nonprofit groups. The proposal that we're considering, this is subject to amendment over the next two metro council meetings, amounts to a \$220 million program region wide, 165 million of which would go for regional natural area acquisition, with some additional target areas added from last time, again to give the program more -- a little more of an urban focus. \$44 million local share which the portion we've been discussing with some specificity with your staff, and then what's currently proposed as an \$11 million capital grant fund that would be emphasizing under-natured areas, in fact we've been discussing developing the criteria for those grants, including factors -- based on the biological science we've introduced social and equity factors such as lower income neighborhoods in terms of eligibility on the criteria for that capital program. The cost of that spread regionwide, \$220 million package, is about 18 cents a thousand. If we look at the regional natural areas, the scientific criteria, what drive that, your staff both in parks and B.E.S. And the planning bureau have all been active, and we salute you for bringing all of those bureaus together, because we think this is an interdisciplinary program, and that the biological elements, the human and social elements all need to be considered, so the fact your planning bureau was a part of this I think speaks well so it -- to it. You're familiar with the biological criteria, the biodiversity values, scenic resources then become more of the social and the partnerships that can result with local communities also being important. That let us to a focus on headwaters and upper water sheds, particular focus along rivers and streams, as well as some of the more fragile wetlands and floodplains, and then the existing trail corridors. I want to focus on two that we have proposed to add to the regional list, and this would not come out of the local share that the city of Portland's coffers would be responsible for, this would be out of the regional pot of money to target areas that are council -- that our council feels deserves attention, that we would like to pursue in concert with your existing activities, through B.E.S. or through the parks bureau. The first being the Johnson Creek target area, which was not included in the 1995 measure, but which we do choose to elevate. We propose to elevate to the level of a regional target area in the upcoming measure. We see there's a lot of work to be done in the Johnson Creek area in terms of floodplain acquisition and restoration of the habitat in that area, and again, it's close to where people live today, and has the possibility to connect with a lot of good activity going on by nonprofits as well as your own city bureaus. Second I wanted to emphasize we proposed to add to the regional list, and again, while we're talking now about committing regional funds to this target area, we see an opportunity to leverage that with the

March 1, 2006

local activities is the columbia slough target area. This is an area where there's a very active watershed council, similar to johnson creek, and real opportunities. As the managers of smith and bybee lakes today we've recognized the value of that area. So proposing to add those to the list that were not on the list in 1995. We also wanted to highlight a couple of the other regional projects that are within the city limits of Portland, completing the sellwood -- closing the sellwood gap on the spring water trail, and then continuing the work that has been ongoing. I mentioned we added 800 acres to forest park as a result of the 1995 measure, and that's something we want to continue to do again in concert with you. As well as some of the willamette river areas. Moving on to the local projects, and this is with your discretion area, and we think very highly of our relationship between our staff and your staff, in the -- and the work that gets done. As I mentioned, it was a \$44 million pot that's proposed for the cities. Of the 25 cities, obviously you have the most per capita, so that amounts to about just over \$15 million in capital funds that would come to the city of Portland that would be spent at your discretion on natural area projects. That's what your staff will be talking with you about a little bit later. Finally I wanted to conclude with a proposal that we're considering, and the amount is one of the things that is still being debated by our council. Is a new program to be directed particularly toward neighborhoods at the neighborhood level to renature areas that are currently deficient in that. They may have been disadvantaged for one historical reason or another over the years, and to engage them in the work of not just preserving nature, but also restoring it where it has been obliterated in the past. But for the same objectives in terms of protecting the water quality, improving fish and wildlife habitat and increasing the access we have to nature. So it's the same values, but just applied perhaps in a slightly different urban setting. That's something we're work can on for now, it's not something that has to be settled immediately, it would be something that we would continue to work through. But we have some examples of what might be useful fore that type -- might be eligible for that -- would be eligible for that type of grant program. So to summarize, our vision is very similar to the vision that animated the 1995 measure. In fact, animated efforts like it in decades past, which is to preserve that connection to nature that I think all of us who live here feel very strongly about and preserve that legacy for future generations. So we appreciate the work we've done together and we appreciate the chance to be with you here today. Council may have comments as well and I know that your staff is also prepared to talk in some technical detail with regard to your own proposal.

Potter: I have a question to president bragdon, the nature of the neighborhoods enhancing, what do you call it, renaturing? A lot of our city east of 82nd avenue is really park deficient. Would these monies be available for those kind of efforts to restore some of the quality of life in east Portland?

Bragdon: That's exactly an example of the type of intent.

Potter: Good.

Robert Liberty: If I may respond, my district goes out to 148th roughly and halsey, and i've spent some time talking to people in those communities, and there are some opportunities to do things that are very interesting if the council approves this funding to match programs you already have. And Portland's been a leader in green infrastructure and design to create a community asset and also to promote goals of building gateway, for example, or lents into town and regional centers. And you have a great group of citizens out there who I think would be partners. The capital grants program is a matching grant program, but would count donated services and time and materials. So we think it's not only community greening, but community build can, and building civic infrastructure as well as restoring green to places a little park deficient, nature deficient.

Potter: Does it have to be natural or can we also look at -- such as community gardens.

Liberty: Right now the list of potential projects has been discussing includes pocket parks and community gardens as well, as well as renaturing projects that -- of the type you've done in different parts of the city, one on the west side is daylighting a creek, and actually using something like that to save the cost of piping and hard infrastructure. It's still a requirement that it be something the public owns, of course, but we've also benefitted from comments and suggestions from your staff at

March 1, 2006

b.e.s. and the park bureau about integrated approaches. So, yes, I think all of those things could be encompassed and it's a real opportunity for creativity in green design and revitalization of neighborhoods.

Potter: Thank you very much.

Saltzman: We have people from our parks bureau who can talk about the process and the suggestions of how we would use the roughly \$15 million of our local share under the bond measure.

Potter: What time period is this \$15 million for? Is it over multiple years?

Saltzman: Good question.

Potter: Do we know the length of time -- Portland's local share of \$15 million, that's over how long a period of time?

Bradgon: If the measure is successful in november the bonds would likely be sold in february, roughly, of 2007. The funds then are subject to release by us upon execution of an intergovernmental agreement. In terms of the duration, it really varies jurisdiction by jurisdiction, those that have had a list of capital projects that are ready to go, the experience over the 1995 measure is that most of the jurisdictions had accomplished their list probably by 2000, 2001, 2003 n. That -- 2002, in that period, but we released the funds as projects are submitted according to a list that their governing body such as the city council has approved. Soy would guess that the duration depends how fast the jurisdiction draws them down, but it's probably roughly five- to 10-year period in most cases.

Potter: Thank you very much. Good morning.

Dave McAllister: Good morning. My name is dave mcallister, parks city nature manager. With me is deborah, senior environmental planner. As commissioner Saltzman mentioned, there's two components to the resolution in front of you. The first is general support for the bond measure as a whole, and then there's -- and specific components of that bond, your recommendations, and the second is a listing of target areas that we will be focusing on in our local share. And we'll go into that in some detail, but I want to give you a brief overview of the other components. Under the first components, the resolution speaks to general support for the bond measure of up to or greater than \$220 million. Of this bond request, the resolution supports allocating 20% as local share legacy funding too Portland parks and recreation as the local park provider, and as you've heard earlier, that will represent about 15.2 million dollars. The resolution supports allocating 20% for the nature -- in the neighborhood grant program, and further supports that the match requirement be two to one, that is \$2 of bond money versus \$1 of share money. And this will mean the city council will go on record in supporting something different than what you've heard from the metro council letters today that. Currently is around 5% and the request or the suggestion by city council through this resolution will be that will be increased to 20%. The resolution also recommends inclusion of several areas that you've heard about in -- as part of the regional share that are within the city of Portland, that is johnson creek, forest park, and the columbia slough riparian areas. Finally the resolution recommends several access to neighborhood capital projects within the city be included in the regional share. These include a new entrance to forest park, a pedestrian bridge across west burnside, smith and bybee trails and bridges and spring water gap corridor additions. The second component of the resolution which we were going to focus on is this listing of our local share target areas. And this is at the request of the metro council. These areas will focus local share accusation and restoration by the city. Again, as mentioned by commissioner Saltzman, these recommendations were developed collaboratively through discussions with several city bureaus and a public review process that involved comments directed to our park website and now we'll discuss through power point local share portion.

Deb Lev: I'll try and be quick because I know we have a lot of citizens waiting to talk about this measure. You just heard from metro counsels letters of the different elements as recommended by metro's blue ribbon committee. We're going to talk about the local share passed through here.

March 1, 2006

We're proposing of the approximately \$15 million that would come to Portland sort of four main categories. The first and largest being natural area acquisition. We also are interested in adding an element of neighborhood park acquisition based on the guidelines we were given from metro that this local share could be spent for any park acquisition but capital money could only be spent on nature and access to nature projects. Some trails projects limited and some restoration projects. And not included in your resolution is any kind of allocation formula, but whether we did talk to the public whether we talked to our partners in the other bureaus, we did, so people could understand what kinds of projects we were talking about, come up with some preliminary guidelines for how the money would be spent. And so what the public responded to included these different percentages for a little more than half going to natural acquisition, smaller pots going to the others. And there is a handout, I don't know if you've received it yet, that you'll have on this. We based our recommendations on a couple things, one is the parks 2020 vision plan, which outlined what we needed to be working on, where we had parks deficiencies, what our natural resources kinds of goals were, also other city documents such as the new actions for watershed health, Portland watershed management plan, that identifies projects and areas of focus. And I'll go quickly through each of those local share elements. Natural area acquisition, we based on the work that we've already done in parks with cooperation from the other bureaus on setting up a long-term vision of what we would like to acquire and manage as natural area property. This generally shows what we come up with for that conceptual network. If you look at the regional target areas, they were based on the same kind of science and they look very similar. What we were able to do is take these regional target areas to find -- defined by metro and add those local target areas that didn't rise to the regional significance that we'd also like to continue to do acquisitions in. In addition to working with metro on all of their regional target areas. Those included the connection between forest park and Tryon Creek State Natural Area, which we're calling the west side wildlife corridor, west side streams, basically the streams that are still remaining that are outside of the other target areas, that could be some of Fanno Creek and its tributaries, and the Willamette Bluffs area. Going on to neighborhood park acquisition, we all know the importance of neighborhood parks, particularly in our park deficient neighborhoods, which are identified in the 2020 plan. In choosing the neighborhoods our main criteria we're looking at where citizens have access to parks and particularly focus on some of our low-income communities, looking at different demographics, and also where we might have opportunities in the next five, six years to actually acquire some neighborhood park land. And the neighborhoods we are proposing to focus on are Centennial, Cully, and Argay. Moving on to the trails, we have two kinds of projects we'd focus on for trails. One is in keeping with metro's sort of guidelines of how they're choosing to spend the local share, focussing on acquisition, metro has identified within Portland and outside of Portland some regional trails, including the Willamette Greenbelt, the Willamette River Trail, there were two that metro did not focus on for regional share that we'd like to be able to help with acquisitions on as needed to make those trails ready for funding. And that would be the Marine Drive Trail and the Columbia Slough Trail as well as participating with metro on the ones identified under regional share such as the Willamette Greenway. We'd also like to do some projects on our natural area site trails. There's an example where we have dangerous conditions for the environment and the users. So the criteria that you're seeing in the resolution are that we would focus those trail project funds on areas where we have completed site plans for those parks, so we know where we want to close trails, where we want to add new trails if we need new bridges, and where those projects are going to benefit habitat and water quality. Some examples of projects where we know we have the plans and we could well spend those dollars could be Stevens Creek Natural Area, Forest Park, Whitaker Pond and Powell Butte. And the last one restoration, lots of -- we have 7,000 acres of natural areas that we're currently managing in Portland, and almost every one of those acres could use some restoration removal of invasive species, replanting. And the criteria, once again, specific sites are not in the resolution, we would be looking at criteria that we would be agreeing to now and doing a refinement process later if

March 1, 2006

the bond measure passes. The criteria for the restoration would be to protect high-functioning habitats, target priority species, and improve connectivity and coordinate with the trail projects. And here's some examples of projects -- sites where we know we could spend the restoration dollars. And that's what it looks like if you put it all together, just to show the distribution across the city. And we can answer questions and let some of the citizens tell you what they think.

Potter: I did want to ask a couple of questions. You said there was two-to-one match --

McAllister: That is in the resolution, that's correct. That's what you will be --

Potter: Where will that money come from, the local match?

McAllister: The bond will -- has a component, this neighborhood grants program will be the two-part of that match, and then any -- there's a variety of criteria, school districts, 501(c)(3), cities, counties, different jurisdictions --

Potter: I'm asking specific to Portland and specific to our part of the match. If they're putting in almost \$16 million, we'll put in \$8 million?

McAllister: That's correct.

Potter: And where will that \$8 million come from?

McAllister: It will come in our day-to-day activities in terms of other grants that we may receive, it could be our in kind work, our employees working there, it could be used as match.

Saltzman: The \$16 million we're going to get doesn't require a match?

McAllister: Right.

Saltzman: It's the nature and the neighborhoods fund that requires the match.

McAllister: That's correct.

Saltzman: And that's not -- .

Lev: The two-to-one recommendation will be a change from metro's current thoughts, which would be a one-to-one match on those grants. And this resolution sort of followed up on some earlier discussions within the city of Portland, different bureaus saying it would be better to have a lower match requirement from the community. So that the metro bond would pay for not half of the project, but more of it.

Saltzman: So our resolution is recommending a higher share of the bond measure go to the nature and the neighborhoods, and -- and we're recommending a higher --

McAllister: Proportion of the bond measures be used on any given project, yes.

Saltzman: This is not the pass-through we'll get automatically, not \$16 min we'll --

Lev: Correct. Another component of the --

Potter: \$16 million has no match. Is that correct?

McAllister: Correct.

Potter: Ok. In terms of local match, does property count? We have a lot of property, i'm thinking back to commissioner Leonard's efforts on his hydropark in northeast Portland. If we have property available, is that considered a match?

Lev: That's a question for metro. On the grants?

Leonard: Let me explain that to you, what that is. [laughter]

Potter: So we can ask metro that.

Lev: I'm not sure -- I think metro hasn't finished figuring out all the guidelines of how the grant program would work.

Potter: Ok. Between the city of Portland, p.d.c., we have a lot of property, and particularly in some of the park deficient areas.

McAllister: One thing I can say on the guidelining regarding the grant program is that there will be some ownership rights required by a public entity. So, for instance, if the restoration project or activity was on a parks property, that would be the relationship that would be necessary. You can do it on private property and be acceptable under this grant program.

Leonard: It's not just confined to necessarily parks bureau property, it could be other open space properties --

March 1, 2006

McAllister: Exactly. Any public property.

Potter: Ok. Other questions? Thank you. Are there people signed up to testify?

Moore: Yes, we have 10 people signed up to testify.

Potter: When you speak, please state your name and you each have three minutes.

Josephine Pope: I am Josephine Pope, and I'd like to begin by thanking Metro for this bond measure for this suggestion, for the Metro Council letters as well as Metro staff. I believe, I've been involved just peripherally, but I believe it is extremely well responded to and has had broad input. I will also remind you that the 1995 measure promised outlined 6,000 acres to be acquired, and through good management and other techniques, 8,000 -- over 8,100 acres were acquired. So Metro really has in my opinion a fine record in this. I'd like to address the maintenance issues which haven't come up yet, but I understand they have come up. While I believe that the office of management and finance is doing its job in raising these issues, that is, who's going to pay for the maintenance of the land that comes in through these dollars, I think these are valid concerns, but I'm desperately concerned that we not allow our parks vision to be clouded by short-term, medium-term, even long-term financial concerns. That is to say we're all cognizant of the lack of dollars for maintenance, and the good stewardship involves good maintenance, good maintenance. However, we mustn't put in a way the cart before the horse. We must maintain the integrity of the 2020 vision. Let me mention just one thing. We -- among the parts of the future that we can predict is there is a shrinking amount of raw land available. We know the population is going to be -- is going to increase. What we can't predict is exactly how we're going to be able to fund some of these things. For instance, one of the initiatives that you're aware of I believe the Portland Parks Foundation has secured a pledge from Tim Boyle and Columbia Sportswear, which has become our 10 for 10 campaign, that is Columbia has agreed to approximately \$100,000 a year for 10 years to fund the maintenance and some capital needs at Sellwood Park. So the opportunity for creative funding is there. Uh-oh. Anyway, Council accepted the Parks 2020 vision July of 2001 and at that point 1,860 additional acres was identified as being needed to maintain the type of environment that Portlanders have today. I believe that this gift, that this proposal of Metro is in a way a gift. It's an opportunity for us to get toward our goal to accomplish our 2020 vision with Metro dollars. Thank you.

Bob Sallinger: Good afternoon Mayor Potter and City Council. My name is Bob Sallinger, I'm here representing Audubon Society of Portland in our -- and our 10,000 members. We want to express our strong support for the bond measure and for parks recommendations regarding the local share. We think this is a superb way to protect clean water, natural areas and preserve the legacy of -- for current and future generations of green space. Joe from the coalition -- she also asked me to express their strong support for this as well. Mayor Potter has spoken of making Portland the greenest city in the United States. And this is a critical piece in doing that. You also have two more pieces coming before you in the next couple weeks, one is funding our natural resource bureaus adequately and the other is adopting the watershed action plan next Wednesday, I believe. But these are critical pieces to protect and preserve that legacy of dream. As has been noted this, builds upon the success of the 1995 bond measure which acquired 8,000 acres of natural area, the area of the size of the entire Portland park system a huge accomplishment. Why do we need to do it now? During the same time period we acquired 8,000 acres the region lost 16,000 acres. We're losing ground. And we heard about the Olmstead legacy already this morning, it was the Olmsteads' vision that allows us to have such a park system today, but we need to live up to that vision and we need to build upon it. It's all the more important because we're shifting away from regulatory protection and toward voluntary actions, and Metro made a decision to go with a more voluntary goal five program about a year ago, part of that commitment was to follow through with a bond measure to -- while acquisitioned. We think the bond measure works very well at three scales. At the regional scale it will allow us to protect the most ecologically significant areas remaining in the region, places like the Columbia Slough, Clear Creek Canyon, the Damascus Beach, Wapato Lake, Metro did a great job using a scientific process to determine the sites and we support that entirely. The local share

March 1, 2006

allows for protection of local areas, natural areas of significance, and we fully support park bureau's recommendation there's. Finally the opportunity fund allows n.g.o.'s, neighborhoods, and bureaus to get involved and to be creative and we think this is a great new piece. We support the size that metro is currently promoting. We think that's reasonable, we think it's a huge influx of money. But it's also a trial program and we don't want to -- I think it needs some time to develop. We support the one-to-one match that is metro is encouraging as well. One-to-one seems perfectly fair and as an n.g.o. We feel we could come up with that, and we want to spur some creativity, so we think it makes sense. So in conclusion, we just want to express our strong support, lands are disappearing quickly and all the polling indicates voters will support. This we hope city council will support it strongly as well. Thank you.

Mike Houck: Mayor Potter, commissioners, my name is mike hauck, i'm representing the urban green space institute. Having participated in the green spaces policy advisory committee, the blue ribbon committee and also Portland park board, all of whom -- all of which were involved in this process, frankly, I think we should take time out and I wish we had bottles of champagne to pop right now. I don't know -- I hope everybody understands the significance of this next step in addressing the city and the region's needs to really truly move toward creating a sustainable city and a -- in a sustainable metropolitan region, because that's what we're talking about here. Also sustaining the region's economy. Everybody has already gone over I think in great detail why this is important to citizens of Portland. I would like to point out, however, that just in case the issue comes up again, there has been a huge amount of time and energy and effort put in by metro council, especially robert liberty, by the coalition, by audubon society, to recognize that this also needs to be an equitable program. And in fact the coalition produced a map, a regional equity atlas that metro council is utilizing to address some of these issues in terms of accessibility of parks to everybody in the metropolitan region. I'll have to say frankly given the origin of this program, this bond measure came out of the fish and wildlife habitat protection program, that we stepped back as conservationists and agreed that it's reasonable for the city of Portland to spend a portion of I think about 20%, of this money that really in our opinion should go strictly to natural area acquisition, to be used for neighborhood park acquisition, because we recognize there are inequities in park distribution throughout the city, and we think that's a reasonable use of that money, and we're very supportive of that. What i'd like to do is -- to wrap up my comments in urging you to pass this proclamation, not every element of which I believe with, by the way, but for the most part, certainly supporting the bond measure, is that again, if you look at the third paragraph of your resolution it goes back to the original intent of the bond measure, which is fish and wildlife habitat and water quality. But this is importantly, and bob just referred to this, the bond at this point focuses on three scales of landscape which makes this a truly remarkable program, from the truly ecologically significant larger areas within the u.g.b. And the city of Portland as well as outside, at the city level and then of course the neighborhood level through the grant program. And I just want to reiterate what I said the other day to you all, mayor Potter, this -- the context of this program in the context of basically what I think will be the new olmstead vision for this region. Through metro, working at the green spaces policy advisory committee, what we're talking about is creating a bistate regional system of parks, trails, and green space. We're -- in addition to trying to acquire more land to figure out how to pay for long-term and also with the institutional arrangements. So this is just fun piece of that larger very exciting vision. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you, folks.

Houck: No questions today?

Potter: What's in your bottle?

Houck: It's just water. It should be champagne.

Potter: Thank you folks for being here. When you speak, please state your name and you have three minutes each.

March 1, 2006

Louise Cody: Louise cody, chair of centennial association. I would like to say i'm very excited about the acquisition of natural areas and any improvement that's can be made to trails or land. I was up at powell butte this morning, and the sun was out and it was incredible. Two weeks ago I went up there and it was a wintry day about 38 degrees, and there were 45 cars at 5:00 in the park. So these natural areas are discovered now, and a year ago on a winter day you would have seen five, six cars. So natural areas are becoming really important to people in Portland. Secondly, I would like to say I support the bond -- metro bond measure, and also the city's local share proposal.

One of the neighborhood parks -- we mentioned centennial. We are park deficient, we have grown about 7,000 people since 1996, and we have three parks, and we are park deficient south of division near about 148th, and there is land there for acquisition. So I just wanted to speak in support of this, and especially in support of a park for our area, which is growing rapidly and park deficient.

Leonard: May I just point out that on 138th and center, there is the old powell valley water well site that's currently fenced off and in the next year the fence is coming down, and picnic tables are going in, and whatever other facilities that would work with the neighborhood.

Cody: That's wonderful.

Leonard: Yeah.

Potter: Another hydropark for Portland.

Cody: That will be the second one.

Leonard: It's the second on our list.

Cody: And that's the one on the right?

Leonard: On the right. Yep.

Cody: That's right kind of like part much of my neighborhood. It's near 138th.

Leonard: Yes.

Cody: It's a few blocks and it's right near, so we share it like powell --

Leonard: But strictly speaking it's a centennial neighborhood.

Potter: Thank you.

Rick Seifert: My name is rick seifert, I live in hillsdale, i'm quite active in the community there. I come to present a small picture and to raise a couple of larger issues. I certainly support this measure, and particularly i'm going to mention in passing the parks acquisition piece which I commend and think that the parks deficient areas should be served. But I wanted to maybe pry open the parks acquisition issue by talking a little bit about my experience in hillsdale where i'm looking at the expansion of and trying to get the expansion of a pocket park into a park that is directly across in the library, the county library, dewitt park. And don bock alerted me to this measure, and I went to one of the workshops and raised the question. My experience in hillsdale has been as part initially of a vision group. And so when the mayor proposed this envisioning process, I think this is terrific. But the visioning process doesn't mean anything unless it carries through into the decision-making process. And my experience has been that we have had some success and we've had some real disappointments with this implementation.

[Change of captioners]

Saltzman: If I could just respond. I mean, your idea hasn't been lost. We have in fact, the parks bureau, been interested in purchasing the house or two it would take to expand hewett park. We don't have the funds to do it, but have that on our watch list, and as to whether some of this metro money might be able to do that, that's a good point. We'll check into that once we get this passed.

Linda Robinson: I'm linda robinson. I'm here today as both the chair of the citywide parks team, which is an ad hoc citizens committee, and as a member of the columbia slough watershed council. I want to applaud metro for going forth on this bond measure. Particularly pleased to that see that johnson has been and the slough has been added as local target areas, as well as targets. I grew up on unions creek and been involved with the columbia slough for a long time, so it's good to see that. I also applaud the focus on acquiring land, so that it's ready for development, so we can complete some of these major trails that we have. So I agree with that. And i'm particularly pleased about

March 1, 2006

the addition of the grant program, the renaturing program, which I think is really critical in order to get some of the urban vote. They need to see there's something in it for the denser, urban areas, not just the big natural areas on the peripheral of the metropolitan area. So I think that's really critical. There are lots of potential projects that could be done in our denser urban areas. We took Robert Liberty on a tour, to kind of show him, and he agreed that there are a number of regreening things that we could do in the parks that don't have any streams. The local share, I'm pleased -- I think they've done a very good job of parcelling that out to cover a lot of different things. I'm especially pleased to see they'll be able to use some of that on purchasing land. I think centennial be the first one. I think we were looking at a map last night in outer east Portland, parks coalition, and just a huge area that have no parks. I'd like to see that get highest priority. Really, the Columbia Slough Watershed Council talked about this at their meeting on Monday night. Especially pleased to see the trails in the Columbia Slough going forward, maybe more acquisitions, and to see the plans to do a trailhead and canoe launch at the Whitaker Pond site where the watershed council has its office and being gradually developed into an environmental education center. This would be a real plus to take kids out on -- actually get them out on the water, doing things. We have a lot of students who come to that site from inner Portland schools. The grant program, I think is wonderful. I think that the 5%, \$11 million is a little small. I'd like to see it increased. I agree with the city's recommendation that the increase, but I agree with a couple of the others, that I think the -- asking for the larger match is not necessarily appropriate. I think a one to one match would work fine. It would increase the -- the whole idea of partnerships, and when it can include in kind, I don't think it's difficult to provide that match for the grant program, the one-on-one match. So other than that, I will kind of agree with this, this gentleman, that we agreed to take the Gateway Town Center -- the regional town center, the Lents town center, when we did the outer southeast plan, and the idea was that we would take higher density in these areas in exchange for additional amenities, and so this would help provide that.

Potter: Thank you folks. Thank you for being here. When you speak, please state your name and you each have three minutes.

Pam Arden: Thank you. I'm Pam Arden representing the 40-mile loop land trust. This is our 25th year, and so it's our aim to try to fill up the gaps we have on some of the trails. The map that is being distributed to you is our newest addition of the map. And the reason for putting this one out was to illustrate where the gaps are. And so when you look at the map and you see the red dotted line, that is the -- those are the gaps for the 40-mile loop. The purple dotted lines are the connecting trails and other regional trails that will help connect all of it. And part of the goal of the 40-mile loop land trust is to have connectivity. In the community, those are important goals of ours. When we're talking about the bond measure, it would certainly help to get some of these gaps filled up. When we're talking about the Columbia Slough Trail, Marine Drive, those are things that would be really helping us to fill up those gaps and make more connections to the neighborhoods. I'm also interested in a new group that we've started up in north Portland called the Willamette Greenway Trail. And we're interested in having a trail that would go from the East Bank Esplanade, the Steel Bridge, up to Kelley Point Park. We're starting on this adventure. As part of the River Concept Plan, they're figuring that the North Reach, the area between the Steel Bridge and they're saying Broadway Bridge, we would like the Steel Bridge, and go up to at least Cathedral Park. There are acquisition pieces there that would fit into this bond measure very nicely. So there are opportunities here to have something that really happens on the ground. In the last bond measure, we were fortunate up in north Portland to have the Peninsula Crossing Trail to be part of the bond measure, and that was one of the first projects that actually got built. So it can happen in a neighborhood, and we'd like to have it happen for all of the gaps here. Thank you.

Michelle Broussard: I'm Michelle Broussard, director of the Johnson Creek Watershed Council. Thank you, Mayor Potter, and commissioners for this opportunity to present comment on behalf of the council. The council is in a unique position of offering a watershed-based view of conservation

March 1, 2006

needs. Across largely artificial jurisdictional boundaries. The only boundary a fish recognizes is a barrier. With that in mind we've systemically developed boundaries for the entire watershed that is informed by scientist-based conservation principles and is consistent with metro's regional habitat inventory, land acquisition priorities and statewide wildlife conservation strategies. This will position the watershed and the city well to compete for regional state and federal matching dollars, not only for acquisition, but also habitat restoration and environmental education projects. The council generally supports the flexibility intended for the local shared component, but feel strongly that protecting the highest value ecological sites near and far remain the primary focus of capital projects for land acquisition funded by Portland's local share. We also believe that all projects should support watershed function at all three levels -- regional, city and local. Based on our preliminary evaluation of natural area acquisition priorities and the portion of the watershed shared by Portland, you would support local share dollars as follows -- we strongly support using dollars to acquire ahead water streams in the associated upland areas. Two, johnson corridor acquisition. We support using local share dollars to expand the program. It creatively matches bond measure dollars with fema disaster mitigation funds to buy flood-prone properties along the johnson creek corridor that achieves both flood mitigation and salmon recovery goals in johnson creek and makes both ecological and economic sense three, the springwater trail, increasing a sense of place and facilitating community investment. As you know, the 2006 regional greenspaces bond measure had its genesis in metro council's decision to provide performance measures rather than specific regulatory mandates to achieve protection of regionally significant wildlife habitat. Growth pressures continue to result in the loss of Portland's remaining riparian areas, especially in the johnson creek watershed. And the council is being relied on to achieve performance measures. Toward that end, we support the proposed grant program as the one to one match, but urge consideration of increasing the amount of funding available from \$11 million to \$22 million. This approach clearly indicates voters are most concerned, connected and cognizant of their own backyard, so to speak, and strongly favor funding water quality and wildlife habitat projects compared to other capital improvements. Also, I have a copy of jill's testimony she was unable to give, but asked me to submit for the record.

Potter: Thank you.

Erwin Bergman: My name is irvin bergman. I represent the cully neighborhood, and i'm also on the columbia slough watershed council. I applaud the bond measure and I urge continued operation and working between the metro council and city government. My concern and thoughts are toward the whitaker pond, which is at the north end of the cully neighborhood, which has clearly been identified as a park deficient area in Portland. I have worked on the whitaker pond master plan back in 1995 where it was just a small chunk of land that was littered with garbage, and from that time in 1995 through acquisition of property and cleanup it has really been shaped into a beautiful resource, not just for the neighborhood, but for the entire city, as was prior identified the columbia slough watershed council has an office there. I'm concerned, however, that there is a problem that i'm ware of, challenged basically. My family goes down there quite a bit, and we take out our 3-year-old grandson down, throw pebbles and sticks in the ponds, and he just has a great time. It's come to my attention here just a couple days ago that the family of -- hauteton family has basically proposed to donate a sizable chunk that I identified -- was identified to me as an 800-foot strip to the whitaker ponds -- I mean to the parks bureau, and apparently there has been a partial rejection by the city. The city is basically specifying dual ownership between the city and the halton family, and all I could figure out that the reason behind it could be -- and i'm not sure -- i'm speculating -- that a proposed main trunk line, sewer line, is going to go through it. And with the ownership of that property in halton's hands, basically they would have to fund it -- pay for that, and otherwise if -- if it is going to be turned over to the city, the city would have to pick up the tab. I hope that's not the case, but if it is, it certainly would be a tremendous loss, a lost opportunity to acquire a sizable chunk of property on the south side of whitaker ponds that would complete that as a beautiful area,

March 1, 2006

considering that any natural area needs a buffer strip or a transition zone to be effective. Right now they have only micronatural areas in cully. So I urge you to look into it and hopefully resolve it to the better of the cully and the entire city. I don't know if you have any questions, i'd be willing to respond to.

Saltzman: I'll certainly check into that.

Bergman: Thank you, commissioners.

Potter: Thank you, folks. Ok. I haven't seen a financial impact statement on this. Have you? Did o.m.f. Prepare one?

Saltzman: A financial impact?

Potter: Yes.

Saltzman: Well, I don't think there is a financial impact statement to us. I mean, we would be the beneficiary of \$15 million from metro, and we would acquire lands, and there would be requirements associated with that. But I don't believe we've prepared any o&m projections for these particular targeted areas for new parks. But certainly in due course. I don't know, dave, if you have anything to add to that.

McAllister: I was just going to add, commissioner, there will be -- you know, this is going before a vote. This is simply a recommendation for our interest in -- in a bond measure going before a vote.

After the measure passes and we're -- we're certainly hopeful that it will -- we will be coming back and entering into an intergovernmental agreement with metro and be working on the details of local share, and certainly back into city council for further clarification and certainly the impact statements associated with that.

Potter: Thank you.

Saltzman: I just have one question of council liberty, and that is given that we're -- we're about to pass a resolution that does make recommendations that are different than sort of the current plan for the nature and neighborhoods portion in terms of the share amount, as well as the matching funds, how does this all play out between now and the metro council referral of a bond measure?

Liberty: Well, I can give a partial answer. And mr. Desmond can join me if we need more details.

But we have a council meeting tomorrow in damascus where we'll be taking public testimony. I believe tomorrow is also the deadline we imposed on ourselves for amendments to the draft resolution. Those include not all details, of course, commissioner, but include the amounts of money and basic criteria of the grants program, which include, in addition to the amount, matching grant requirement and also any other criteria, which we include right now as fulfilling 2040, focusing johnson growth there, and serving undernated communities, as well as a preference or bonus points for low-income areas. So the time for a recommendation is upon us. The plan is for us to vote a week from tomorrow on the details. I should also mention, and I can, staff wouldn't be able to, the numbers if play right now in the grant program are \$11 million to about \$25 million. I'm on the high end of that. And there's a range of opinion on the council. The 20% you're discussing is \$44 million, which would imply something kind of significant of what would be done in the regional areas. Obviously we welcome whatever recommendations you wish to make, and those are very important.

Sten: The \$44 million would support your end of the --

Liberty: Well, let's say oversubscribing has its own implications for my --

Sten: Commissioner Leonard makes me a moderate, and that's what i'm getting to.

*****: Yes, that's true.

Leonard: Occasionally.

Sten: Not always, that's for sure.

Liberty: I do want to say that one of the reasons that I think that the grant program and its opportunities are to me is because what you've demonstrated can be done through b.e.s. And you, mr. Mayor, I think, expressed some concern about where the matching is coming from. We're assuming a lot of this matching is not government money, that it's private money. There may well

March 1, 2006

be people in interested, and certainly it creates an amenity that has benefits to a private project, for example, even though it's on public land. We can imagine a whole source of funds that are not governmental. In fact, it's kind of our hope, I think, that we encourage more people to make this kind of investment. It's not just taxpayer money that's involved.

Potter: Thank you very much, councilor, liberty. Ok, this is nonemergency, it moves to --

Sten: It's a resolution.

Potter: Oh, it is a resolution. Ok. Let's have it out. Let's call the roll.

Leonard: Well, I agree with mike hauck, this is a cause for celebration, and it isn't lost on me. You had me at johnson creek, and then you just added on after that. I'm thrilled with a lot of these projects, particularly johnson creek. Columbia slough is just in my lifetime, I mean you have had to have seen it as I did when I used to go with friends there to fish as a child and what it looked like then, see it now, to appreciate what high school happened. I would also say, and I hope that councilor liberty passes this on to his colleagues, that metro has proven to be a wonderful partner on projects like this. I'm thinking of the lone fir cemetery project that we have. I mean, it's an example of government cooperation with the county and metro and the city contributing to different projects to restore lone fir into part of the cemetery and interpretive center and honoring some of the chinese americans that were buried there. I don't think we always get enough attention for these great working relationships that result in a huge asset to the community, that if you'll recall that one started out as quite controversial because someone wanted to build a condo on the site. So I really appreciate work metro has been doing, particularly as of the last few years. And i'm very pleased and hartley recommend this resolution -- this vote to the voters of the region. Aye.

Saltzman: Well, i'm also very enthusiastic about this bond measure. And I guess i'll save myself until november, but I believe it's a well thought out, well-crafted project that responds to the needs of the residents of this region, to provide opportunities for recreation, natural areas for contemplation, and just getting away from it all, which is increasingly important, particularly in some of the outer areas outside of Portland, where not as many -- there's not as blessed with as many great national -- or great parks as we have in the city of Portland, but I also definitely am very enthusiastic about the local share here that gives us the opportunity to acquire new parks in areas that are lacking and deserving of new parks, as all of us on this council know, you know, money is scarce, and opportunities to acquire local parks in park deficient areas is a high priority. And then finally to be able to do nature in the neighborhoods, to focus on open space parks, pocket parks, in our town centers, and revitalizing some of our other areas is a great thing, too. And I hope the metro council will take our recommendations to increase that amount and to change the matching share under advisement and hope they'll incorporate it into the final measure. But appreciate it. And we will support it regardless. Aye.

Sten: Well, this is very exciting. I'm really happy to thank everybody for a really visionary piece of work. 10 years being planned for ahead of that, and I think that anybody that doubts that an agency can do something major and do it effectively should look at what metro has done here. I like the park bureau's recommendations, it frames the debate well for the metro council, and we'll whole heartily campaign for whatever good compromise comes out of that process. I wanted to thank councilor liberty for bringing a focus to the issue of park deficient area, the nexus between open spaces and low-income areas. And I think because of your work we're going to make some progress on that I think really critical issue if we're going to talk about quality of life for everyone. Thank you for that. Look forward to joining you all on the campaign trail in passing this measure. Then I think we'll drink champagne. Aye.

Potter: You know, I did read the olmstead report from 1903 sent to the city council. One of the things they said in there was that it's necessary for the city of Portland, and there was no metro then, so they couldn't count on that, but to set aside money for future parks. And when time for good to set amore, when time for less, then draw upon those reserves. I think this is really to the spirit of what -- that olmstead spoke about in his report to the city council. I remember almost 30 years ago

March 1, 2006

listening to a woman named barbara walker talk about the 40-mile loop. And being a young police sergeant at the time I was thinking, wow, this is really great, a loop around the city of Portland, a hiking trail. That's great. And it's become so much more than that. And certainly our understanding of how we preserve our environment and walk it, all of this goes to that, and I really want to thank councilor liberty and the rest of metro for what you have done in terms of taking a lead on this. Thank you very much. I vote aye. [gavel pounded] where's the champagne, mike?
*****: Celebrating.

Potter: Ok. We'll move on to the regular agenda. Please read item 260.

Item 260.

Potter: This is a second reading, a vote only. Please call the roll.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] please read item 261.

Item 261.

Potter: Second reading. Vote only. Please take the roll.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] please read item 262.

Item 262.

Sten: Mayor, i'm sorry to interrupt. I have to make an appointment and leave at 12:30. This has gone longer than I thought. If there's anything we have to vote on this morning --

Potter: This is the only item. The rest are -- my understanding -- nonemergencies and moved to a second reading.

Sten: Right. I just want to double-check. My apologies.

Potter: If we could expedite that.

Sue Klobertanz: Sue Klobertanz I'm with the office of management and finances, director of the revenue bureau. To be very quick about this, summer, with the creation of the revenue bureau in september of 2005, we were given the responsibility for the customer service policies related to the management of the utility bills, and now, looking very quickly at the implementation of the new billing software next month, it allowed the revenue bureau to modify, clarify, and consolidate some previous policies and procedures and synchronize those with the capability of the new billing system. Council item 262 that you have before you are five policies that run in parallel to the ordinance code changes that you have in item 263. In the essence of time, let me just say that the most significant change in these five policies has to deal with the appeal policy. And the appeal policy was written, rewritten, in collaboration with both water bureau, bureau of environmental services, and the ombudsman, primarily in response to concerns from the ombudsman's office as to in the inequity of how we dealt with appeals on utility billings. The new ordinance, the new policy rather, includes a representative on the three-member administrative review committee, the other members coming from the water bureau and environmental services, appointed by the bureau director and approved by the commissioner in charge. The appeal policy also provides an opportunity for the customer to appeal the decision of the administrative review committee to a hearings officer. So of the five policies, that is probably the most significant change. The rest of them are primarily housekeeping items to reflect either current procedures or the new responsibility of the revenue bureau for these -- this area.

Saltzman: Does the perb appoint its member to the --

Klobertanz: Yes, commissioner. Let me just end by saying that these policies proposed for adoption were approved by both the water bureau and bureau of environmental services, and in addition both the perb and the ombudsman's office were very closely linked to the changes in the appeal policy.

Potter: Thank you. Do I hear a -- resolution, ok. Call for a vote.

Moore: No one signed up. I had a sign-up sheet for 262 and 263 together, but --

Leonard: Aye.

March 1, 2006

Saltzman: Good work. Thank you for doing this. Aye.

Sten: Aye.

Potter: Very good. Aye. Read item number 263.

Item 263.

Sue Klobertanz: Again, mayor and council, these code changes parallel the policy changes you just approved, again for housekeeping and for the purposes of bringing code into line with our current policies and practices. Just before I end real quickly, I want to recognize michael mock of my staff who worked very closely with the staff from water, b.e.s., and the ombudsman's office, as well as the perb members to review these code changes and get us to this place today. So thank you.

Potter: Thank you very much. Is anybody signed up to testify on this one?

Moore: No one signed up.

Potter: This is a nonemergency and moves to a second reading. Please read item 264.

Item 264.

Saltzman: I'm not really -- oh, ok. I guess I wasn't sure why this was on regular agenda.

David Soloos: David soloos, cable and franchise management. In 2001, our office issued a permit to place telecommunications utilities in the streets. In 2002 they went bankrupt. Recently there was a sheriff's foreclosure sale and northwest metal fab and pipe purchased some of the facilities. City code and charter requires they have authority to be in the streets. We've negotiated this franchise, although fairly routine, pretty straightforward, and that's why it's on the agenda here today.

Auerbach: Commissioner Saltzman, in answer to your question, the charter requires these be done by nonemergency ordinance.

Saltzman: Oh, ok.

Leonard: But doesn't railroad we spend a lot of time talking about it. [laughter]

Potter: Does anybody have any questions?

Saltzman: Aren't we supposed to read the entire measure?

Leonard: There's only three of us here.

Saltzman: Thanks, david.

Potter: Thank you very much. Anybody signed up to testify on this?

Moore: No one. I did not have a sign-up sheet.

Potter: Anybody wish to speak on this matter? Ok. So nonemergency, moves to a second reading. We're in recess until 3:00 p.m. today. [gavel pounded]

At 12:30 p.m., Council recessed.

March 1, 2006
Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting

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

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

MARCH 1, 2006 3:00 PM

Potter: Karla, please call the roll. [roll call taken] [gavel pounded] is there any objections to suspending the rules to hear an item in ordinance from the city attorney's office wants to present in regards to proceedings with the glock firearms company? Hearing no objections, let's go ahead and --

Moore: Read the item?

Potter: Please read the item.

Item 264-1.

Potter: Please come up, dave.

David Woboril: Mayor, commissioners --

Potter: Is the chief going to be here?

Woboril: No, sir.

Potter: Ok.

Woboril: Two years ago we had catastrophic failures of two glock handguns within a few days of each other at the training range. We've been in touch with glock since then and have been unable to reach a settlement in a potential lawsuit against glock. The city attorney's office evaluated the situation and believes we have three viable causes of action for recovery of damages. In negotiations recently seemed to hit a dead end. We were hesitant to approach council to sue a company that supplies firearms around the country. We thought it appropriate to our negotiations that we not take that step until we had to. The last three days we've had an agreement on the table to toll the statute of limitations. We've offered to continue negotiating with glock if they would relieve us from the requirement that we file by the two-year statute of limitations deadline. We were unable to reach agreement on that. We feel forced, if we want to continue to negotiate, to file this lawsuit.

Potter: And approximately how many handguns, .45's, is that? Is that like 350 or something?

Woboril: About 300 handguns. What the police bureau did in response to these catastrophic failures was to take all of the glock .45-caliber handguns out of service. That amounted to about 300. So the police bureau currently holds about 300 model 21, .45-caliber handguns that it would like to trade back to glock. Of course, on the open market, the bureau can't get full value that it paid for those guns, and would like to reach an agreement with glock as to those 300 handguns. The city also had to buy a number of nine-millimeter handguns to put into the hands of the officers had to give up their .45's. And we're trying to recover that --

Potter: Those were also glock?

Woboril: Those were also glock. The Portland police bureau armors are quite happy with the nine-millimeter glock. We want to have a good relationship with glock in the future, and to that end we've tried very not hard to go to the lawsuit stage but feel we have no choice now.

Potter: Any questions from the council? It's an emergency ordinance. Karla, please call the roll.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded]

*****: Have a good day. Thank you.

Potter: Ok. Karla, please read the first item certain.

Item 265 and 266.

March 1, 2006

Potter: Staff?

Betsy Ames: Good afternoon, mayor, commissioners. I'm Betsy Ames, the assistant director of the bureau of planning. I'm here with Paul Scarlett, the director of the bureau of development services to present the first -- or the second regulatory improvement work plan progress report. As part of the ongoing regulatory improvement work plan, planning is the lead on the regulatory side coordinating minor code and policy changes. You'll be hearing more about some of those later. And the bureau of development services is the lead on the process side, streamlining procedures and practices. While this is our second report, it's our first since implementing the new system approved by council a little over a year ago. That system includes an online database for requests allowing both internal and external stakeholders the opportunity to provide suggestions on regulatory and process improvements 24 hours a day, seven days a week, via the internet. It also includes the regulatory improvement stakeholder advisory team which provides a form for a variety of stakeholders to provide input to staff on both process and regulatory improvements, helping identify issues for further action. The RISA has proven to represent the bureaus. We've worked to find solutions that address multiple needs and objectives. The report documents the results we've made and identifies areas we still need to work on. The report also provides some updates on the bureau's regulatory rethink project and are monitoring evaluation efforts. Before I turn the rest of the presentation over to Paul, I want to acknowledge that both regulatory improvement and impact assessment are ongoing, broad, encompassing principles which need to be incorporated into all of our projects in the bureau of planning and throughout the city. That means we need to always try to develop nonregulatory solutions to issues, keep those regulations which we do have as clear and simple as possible, consider the costs of implementation to the city and to private stakeholders, and identify desired outcomes and understand how we can measure our success.

Paul Scarlett: Paul Scarlett. Good afternoon, mayor and commissioners. I'm the director for bureau of development services. I'm also here to share my support for the regulatory improvement work plan, its update and continued work that's been undertaken by my bureau and the other bureaus, certainly bureau of planning, and other interagency bureaus that are involved. The regulatory improvement work plan outlines throughout, but specifically for B.D.S., from page 19 to 23, highlights a number of the accomplishments that have been realized over last several years. A couple of them that I'd like to point out. Certainly there's ongoing coordination, collaboration, between the bureau of planning and B.D.S. And other bureaus, but, for example, in the -- in the area of communication and publication, the bureau of development services currently has a webpage that provides a lot of online publication and forms, which allows applicants and customers to access information such as appeal forms and essentially makes that process a lot more efficient and speedily. Also, there are other aspects of technology that's been utilized a lot more over the years. For example, our permitting database, called a track system, six-plus years ago, only B.D.S. had access to that information. Other bureaus, such as transportation, now have access and can provide for the public status on projects so that they're aware of not just one bureau's progress and efforts, but also other bureaus. And that's a major accomplishment. The form of -- as you're aware, PIP 19 is under way, investigating more efficient ways of either providing service or how we can better be coordinated amongst ourselves as interagency bureaus, and that is work that continues to come forward and is making good progress. Pretty proud of that. The committee that was formed to -- to monitor the work improvement projects continues to be an ongoing interaction -- or continues to interact closely with the development review advisory committee that's in place for bureau of development services, and in fact shows up on a monthly basis, plan members from transportation and B.E.S. And water to name a few are there to provide update on how efficient and ways of being more collaborative and asking questions and trying to get answers to how can those coordinations be improved. A couple of other things. The bureau -- the planning and development bureaus meet biweekly, and those are the directors that are over the different bureaus. And we meet and discuss large policy issues and really ferret out those details and then of course work closely with staff to

March 1, 2006

reach better decision along with the public. A couple of -- in terms of looking for ways to address the larger issues and maintain the ability to fix details, we have in place code maintenance improvement project, I believe it's called -- or maybe it's something different.

Ames: Regulatory improvement code amendments packages.

Scarlett: That's a long one. But in short, really what's happening is we've seen a good amount of accomplishments for the smaller projects, but there's also -- there's a database where you and I and the public can, I guess, write in and say, "i want these issues addressed." and that database is kept up to -- certainly kept up current, but it's hard to get to those -- those requests based on limited resources. So we ask the council to also look at -- at this request, that there's a midsize project and large-size projects that are also important, and the implementation of the zoning code is directly related to how the small projects, midsize projects, and large-size projects are addressed in light of all the limitations on resources and funding. But I just want to close in summation that the bureau of development services has enjoyed real good close working relationship with the bureau of planning and other bureaus that are involved, and look forward to continuing this working relationship, in trying to improve development process, making it more streamlined and cost effective for our customers. Thank you.

Potter: Do you have any goals in here? I was looking just at the index. I didn't see them, in terms of service delivery goals and --

Scarlett: I'm not sure if they're in here.

Ames: It's more of a progress report on the things we've worked on so far. I think you'll hear more about some of the items that we're handling in the regulatory improvement code amendment package number one, as well as what's on tap for the next code amendment package, which will be going to the planning commission this summer, in the next presentation.

Scarlett: The ones I called on pages 17 through 23 were either ongoing activities or recommendations. For example, public outreach on page 22, b.d.s. Is involved in a monthly lunch and learn program, which invites the public and staff and -- at the lunch hour to listen and ask questions about the development process, such as stormwater management. We've got a.d.a. Information coming up in march. So those are things that were listed in here that either are not ongoing or in some cases are completed. So those are, I would say, goals as well.

Potter: Certainly be nice to have some kind of way to measure the rate of improvement in terms of how we respond to different types of requests coming into b.d.s.

Scarlett: Right. It would be. I think certainly --

Potter: Yes, it would.

Ames: You know, a lot of this does get measured. B.d.s. has customers service surveys -- does customer service surveys every years, and the numbers have been steadily inching upward as far as satisfaction in services, and I think that's a reflection on both the processing improvements as well as some of the regulatory improvements making it easier to get through the process.

Scarlett: I think she's looking at my notes. I planned on saying that. But commissioner Leonard spoke to that last night at the budget forum that we did receive really high ratings and laudable compliments about our improvements in customer satisfaction over the last year.

Potter: It's always good to have measurable goals.

Scarlett: Yes, sir.

Potter: That's what i'm suggesting, I think, so that we can actually not just describe the degree of satisfaction, but how that translates into work product.

*******:** Ok. We'll do that, for sure.

Potter: I'm very impressed with the collaborative spirit between planning and development services. Exactly what we need.

Scarlett: Thank you.

Potter: Thank you.

*******:** You're welcome.

March 1, 2006

Potter: Is there anyone who wishes to testify? Oh, are we -- you're done. I was wondering if there was anyone who wished to testify on the matter first. Did you raise your hand, sir?

*****: I did, yes. I signed up outside.

Potter: Ok. And that's on the work plan itself, not the actual code. Is that correct?

*****: Well, mine is -- [inaudible]

Moore: I only had one sign-up sheet for both. What do they want to do?

Linly Rees: Mayor, staff has suggested, perhaps because the sign-up sheet isn't clear, if you would rather just have the presentation on the recap as well, and then all testimony could be on both items, so we can take the vote to accept the report and then the recap afterwards.

Potter: The first is to -- a motion -- we'll have to make a motion to accept the report.

*****: Right.

Potter: The second one, is that a --

Moore: Nonemergency ordinance for code change.

Potter: Nonemergency ordinance.

Moore: Uh-huh.

Potter: Any feelings from the council? Either way is fine? Let's proceed with the rest of it and we'll have testimony on everything at once.

*****: Sorry, mayor, before they begin, we need to read that item.

Potter: Please read item 266.

Moore: 266.

Cary Pinard: There are some goals that we do have that i'd be happy to talk about after the testimony, if you have more questions about that, but to get through our presentation --

Moore: State your name.

Pinard: Hello. I'm cary pinard. We're from the planning bureau to give you a short overview of the recap one project. You remember this diagram, showing how regulatory improvement has several aspects that are integrated together. The project that we're discussing today -- where's the mouse? There it is. It's this box. And here's a diagram that we refer to buckets and sieves. At the top, ideas that are -- that come from many places, ideas for improvement are captured in the database. And then through the -- the sieve here, they can be assigned to various processes, shown whether they're more process oriented or for a different bureau, we need to monitor them. The ones that are appropriate for potential recap items are then reviewed and prioritized by the staff and the stakeholder advisory team that betsy mentioned. We don't even have a little picture for them in here because it would make it more complicated. Once we have a proposed amendment package and a proposed list for the next package, which is the little bucket, the big and little buckets, then we go through the regular process that involves planning commission and city council hearings and decision. And that is where we are today, with the first one is here for city council hearing. To get into the content, phil will tell you more.

Phil Nameny: Good afternoon, commissioners. This was agreed and voted by city council when we sort of changed what had been sort of the mayor's top 10 process to the code amendment process. Back in july the planning commission approved a work plan of 46 items for us to do additional research and -- and planning potential solutions for them. Of those, several have been deferred or were solved under other legislative projects. So the package we're working on actually has 42 amendments, 42 issues, that we're proposing zoning code amendments for. Obviously we don't want to go through all 42 items. It would take probably the rest of the afternoon. However, I would like to go over a few of the items that have minor policy implications. Out of the 42 items, most of the amendments we're proposing are actually technical clarifications that just improve the code, but don't actually affect minor policy. And but there are several items that do have some minor policy effects. Of those, we do have five amendments to our tree preservation and tree violation chapters. Generally these affect only land divisions, which is where most of our tree preservation standards are located. Changes in general allow a quicker response to violations and

March 1, 2006

also provide additional mitigation options for tree preservation plans. We also have some changes to our nonconforming use chapter. In this chapter, basically we are allowing uses that may have been allowed when they were built, but are no longer allowed, such as a -- a corner market in a residential zone. We're extending the window of time that they can potentially be vacant and reestablished. And so it helps small businesses out a little bit on that. We also are making some changes to the nonconforming development chapter. Briefly, that is development that may not be up to current codes, such as parking lots that don't have landscaping and so on. We are providing some additional flexibility for those that come in with improvements to their property to meet those standards without having to go through a regimented list, which is what we're currently requiring. Some of the other things we're doing is making some minor changes to the radio frequency traps mission chapter to encourage continued location of these facilities in the right-of-way. And we're making some changes to the buffer overlay zone landscaping to be a little more fair for residential uses in those zones. We are making changes to the sunset clause for drive-thrus in the hollywood plan district to continue to encourage redevelopment of those sites. We're making several changes to the gateway and east corridor plan districts, which are mostly a cleanup of the update to that plan district that occurred a couple years ago. And we are revising our final plat review process to be a nondiscretionary administrative review instead of a land use review, in conformance with changes that happened, Oregon state statute. And finally, we're making a few changes to our administrative and fee procedures to make it easier for b.d.s. to administer these processes. I can go into greater detail as we have testimony and questions, but basically this went through planning commission and planning commission recommends that the report, that the report be adopted, and that the code be amended as shown. This concludes our presentation. Like I said, we're available for any questions you may have.

Potter: I was reading the letter from the planning commission. I know there's at least one person here to testify on tree issues.

Nameny: What. Can you repeat that again?

Potter: The letter from the planning commission to myself and the council on January 10 regarding this regulatory improvement code amendment package, it's the same package.

*******:** Uh-huh.

Potter: Just saying that they, too, have some concerns about the tree issues. I'm wondering, since the time has been written, since this letter from the planning commission, what are you -- what have you folks done to address the -- have you addressed the issue or -- what's the status?

Pinard: Let me explain where the planning commission mentioned in their transmittal letter.

When we originally proposed this package, we had these five pretty minor cleanups for tree issues. And as we were getting approval for what to but in this first package there was some interest on the part of some citizens to say, don't do anything to the tree regulations until you stop and do a comprehensive review of all of the tree regulations in the city that would involve the city forester and the parks bureau, probably b.d.s. As well as planning and b.d.s. So they were saying, wait, we need a big, comprehensive relook. As we discussed at the planning commission, and they seemed to later agree with as they saw the minor nature of these five corrections, our response was we agree that the overall tree could use review, but in the meantime it would be very helpful for b.d.s. If we could get these five minor amendments passed. At the planning commission, there was some testimony from the tree group that agreed with that, and just wanted to sit -- to recommend to the planning commission, hey, we need to spend some time on this more comprehensive review, and planning commission agreed, and therefore wanted to highlight that in their letter to you.

Potter: Ok.

Saltzman: So does that mean it's in your work plan, or will be?

Pinard: No. That's one of the things that we will be talking to you about, budget. Because this would be a good example of something that would cross bureaus, and would we want to integrate

March 1, 2006

work plans and see what we're going to do out for a few years. This is would be one of the ones that would be a good example of we need to work with multiple bureaus to scope it and --

Saltzman: But planning would be the lead? Is that right?

Pinard: I would think so.

Potter: Other questions? Thank you. Is there further staff information?

Pinard: No. Only if you have questions after testimony.

Potter: And Karla, you said we had one name.

Moore: We have four people signed up.

Potter: Please call them. Thank you folks for being here this afternoon. When you speak, please state your name for the record. And you each have three minutes. And anyone can begin.

Tom Nelson: Well, i'll begin. I'd like to. She's going to pass out some photographs that will be helpful for you and also a packet available for you. Tom nelson is my name, northwest Portland. I can't speak to all the bureaucracies between the bureau of planning and development services, so I don't even attempt to do that. This issue came up as a result of some people like myself that had realized that financing old properties, financing old residential properties in Portland that were located in industrial districts, all that financing was being declined because the properties, according to the zoning code in Portland, if they're accidentally destroyed by fire to 75% of their value, they're prohibited from being reconstructed. Now, we just think that's foolish. They've been here for 100 years. They've been homes for people for a long time, for decades, it's their neighborhood. It's the part of the heritage of the city of Portland. So i'm going to take a moment and just read the one section item that mentions this. It says accidental destruction. When a structure containing a nonconforming use, which is a residential structure within an industrial zone, but it occurred there only after the industrial zone boundaries were drawn, and is damaged by fire, other causes beyond the control of the owner, the reestablishment of the nonconforming use, which would be the residential structure, is prohibited if the repair cost of the structure is more than 75% of the assessed value. Well, it always would be more than 75% of the assessed value. The bureau of planning, and particularly phil, over the last year or so, has been very helpful in trying to sort through how we could -- myself specifically -- end up in this position of trying to get a code amendment. And quite frankly, it just seemed like it was going to be unlikely. Made a run at it for this recap one, and it's in the database for recap two. And the general sentiment is that recap 12, it's not even going to happen then. And we continue to think it's just foolish. And so the sentiment was, between some of the historical districts and the special interests and even the bureau of planning, if I could use them as an example, was to simply come down and ask the city council if they couldn't, you know, somehow dynamite the logjam a little bit on an issue that everybody is sympathetic to, and ask whatever agency should be asked, the bureau of planning or development services, or whoever, jump into the database and move this issue that's in there up to a higher priority and try to get it resolved. Right now they just seem to feel that it can't be, because of definitions of conforming and nonconforming, special interest groups that represent industrial districts. There's more explanation, but you will see it in my package. And so anything that you can do to -- to bust it loose would be appreciated. Thank you for listening.

Leonard: I'm ore. What was your name again?

Nelson: Tom nelson.

Margot Barnett: My name is margo barnett. I appreciate the time you're giving me here today. I'm here as a member of a southwest Portland committee that has carefully reviewed the tree protection and preservation code of the city of Portland, and I have concerns that the existing codes are overly complex, do not adequately protect trees or fully implement the existing policies in the Portland urban forestry management plan. There are five items, as you heard already, in the regulatory improvement code package one being presented for approval today dealing with trees. There are other items related to trees that are listed in the regulatory improvement request database. Those aren't in the current package. And rather than a piecemeal response to submit items, we're

March 1, 2006

very concerned that the council direct the bureau of planning to work closely with staff of urban forestry and the city nature section of Portland parks and recreation, the urban forestry commission, b.d.s., b.e.s., all of the bureaus that have some involvement with trees, to really take a more comprehensive look at all tree regulations. We support the approaches that include a combination of education and enforcement to ensure that significant trees and the urban canopy are preserved. The issue here is that the regulations are incredibly complex. And i've attached an analysis document that our committee prepared, and on page eight of that you'll see just a diagram of what somebody has to look at to determine whether or not they can cut a tree on their property. And just that will give you an idea of the complexity. And there's jurisdiction within several different bureaus. And a comprehensive look is needed to understand the relationship between the different regulations and find ways to really simplify the codes and the enforcement mechanisms to determine whether the regulations are adequate, to protect the urban forest, and to really identify the gaps and come up with the necessary changes. Specifically in the recap package that you have in front of you today, I have concerns about the proposed language in items 43 and 44, that they might actually encourage violations, unless there's a link with some form of fine in addition to allowing this proposed new mitigation, which, you know, I think it's great, I really appreciate the new wording that provides a mechanism for people to preserve other trees on a property as mitigation for -- for trees that they've illegally cut, but i'm worried it also might end up encouraging some people to go ahead and cut trees that they know they should be protecting, knowing they can use these other trees as mitigation. I suggest that violations be managed with administrative rules, the rule process that's already in place for assessing penalties and fines for recurring environmental violations. I urge the council, that if you approve this recap one package, to also look at adding a requirement for a more comprehensive look at tree protection as part of the bureau of planning's work plan. They're valuable assets in terms of public health, livability, management of stormwater, all of these things that are really important to the city and really are -- the trees are a cost savings to the city in terms of the functions that they perform. The analysis I provided to you has already been presented to the urban forestry commission and they referred it to one of their committees for action. So thank you for your time. Wood be happy to answer any questions.

Saltzman: When you say the urban forestry committee referred it, meaning the comprehensive planning effort on --

Barnett: They've referred the document that we've provided to them to one of their own committees to look at, so --

Potter: Thank you very much.

Greg Schifsky: I'm greg schifsky, southwest Portland. I would simply default to what margo just said. She's been very instrumental in coming up with a lot of the information in the document that she's asked you to look at. I'm encouraged by the bureaus, that they've been working with our ad hoc tree community group for the last year almost, and i'm quite encouraged by that and very thankful for that, and also your time addressing this issue. The neighborhoods -- the neighborhoods have been losing -- losing out almost on every appeal when there's a true preservation plan. And there are specific codes that allow them to do that. But it seems like the neighborhoods themselves, and in particular southwest associations, trees are losing to development. And they're losing -- our appeals to b.d.s. Seem to be trumped by development and infill. And I would like to see probably a little more representations and maybe validity to the neighborhood associations as these tree preservation plans are approved. There have been challenges, some of them being upheld, some of that being tossed out. We have found gaps in the entire code system, when it does come to tree preservations. And there's some pretty darn smart minds out there, such as margo's, and linda's here, and other people, that I think you could gain a lot to pay attention to a good working group for -- as long as you'll listen to us. And your bureau has said that they would work with our group. I'm very encouraged by that and thankful for that. Thank you for your time.

March 1, 2006

Linda Robinson: My name is Linda Robinson. I live in outer east Portland. I was one of those people who went before the planning commission and urged them to do a comprehensive review of the tree preservation regulations, a thorough review. One of the most common things that's brought up to our neighborhood associations by residents is problems with trees. They either can't figure out what the regulations are that apply to them or they don't understand them, they don't know where to look. They're scattered all through the code. And there's so many different conditions that there really needs to be -- even if there aren't changes, there needs to be a spot somewhere in the code where it's altogether, but it needs to be more readily understandable by folks. So I would like to see something like they did with the environmental code, where they formed a number of task forces, which included citizens, multiple bureaus, including the enforcement folks, too, because with the environmental code they were very useful to let us know which things wouldn't work very well for them and which things might. And people who had violations, we had a couple of those involved. And I think that -- a similar review for the tree code would be extremely helpful. So I'm urging you to kind of move it up on their agenda. I know that planning commission is interested in that, but it hasn't floated up high enough on the agenda to yet be implemented. And we also need some education. We have a lot of newcomers, many coming from areas where trees -- don't understand the importance of trees in a climate like ours, you know, slowing down and dealing with the rain and erosion and all those kinds of things. We need education as well as clarification and simplification of the code.

Potter: Thank you. Are there others?

Moore: That's all.

Potter: Questions from the commissioners? Call the roll. Whoops.

Saltzman: I was just going to inquire, and I know probably what the answer will be, as to the proprietariness of us adding some amendment that would require the comprehensive update of the tree code as being part of your work plan for the coming fiscal year.

Sten: Maybe to add an additional question to that, whether that's possible or not, I was really interested in -- I'm interested in if it's possible, but I'm suspecting we're going to hear it's going to be a lot of work. So I'm most interested in Margo's comment about adding some financial disincentives, if that would be realistic in terms of the potential loophole, where there was some way she described it, but a way to make an explicit choice to cut down a tree and then trade something off later, and they mentioned financial disincentives to make sure that didn't happen. I'm curious if that is a trait forward fix that we might be able to look at this level or if you perceive the problem to be there.

Pinard: That level, because she's talking about one of the five minor tree items in this package --

Sten: Right.

Pinard: -- is something we could look at this level. There are reasons why we're proposing it to be the way it is. It's kind of along the lines of the approach taken recently in the environmental code improvement project that applies in the environmental zones. These regulations are very similar and would apply outside the environmental zones, and for the specific reasons why we're proposing something that I don't think there's a loophole in it, but to explain the -- the balancing system to you, I'd like Eric from B.D.S. to explain more details.

Eric Engstrom: Thank you, Cary. I'm again from the bureau of development services. I manage the group of planners there that reviews subdivision plans, and that's the land division process is where the majority of these tree regulations are housed. And so my group is the one dealing with the nuances and the difficulties that come up. The logic behind that specific amendment request is to, as Cary said, mirror the approach that was taken with the environmental code improvement project, where we went from a system of one-size-fits-all resolution to all violations to a tiered system of resolution, where the -- some of the minor violations are treated in a different way than the large-scale violations. And so, for example, right now the tree code for subdivisions treats a violation involving several acres of large trees in the same manner as one six-inch fruit tree. And so

March 1, 2006

the approach of this amendment is to do what we did with the environmental code improvement, and allow a lesser level of review for the -- for the more minor amendments along the lines of the six-inch fruit tree being cut down when was supposed to be preserved. Right now the remedy for that is a type three land use hearing, which is the same procedure that the entire subdivision goes through initially. So it's a resource balancing issue, where do we want to spend our public resources, in the public review of these projects, and do we want to treat the -- devote as many resources to the removal of one small tree as we do to the entire subdivision process. And I think our conclusion was that we do need some sort of gradient of responses. Certainly the -- the fine issue, aside from the process, could be looked at. I would add that one of the -- one of the big disincentives is time, and that any resolution of this -- of a violation of this code is a land use review process, which involves the public notification and a waiting period because of that. And so that is a -- for a lot of developers, who have maybe a building permit under way, that is a fairly significant disincentive to avoid getting a -- something held up for that reason.

Saltzman: And as to my question about the --

*******:** Yeah.

Saltzman: -- the comprehensive review of our tree preservation policies and work plan --

Pinard: Our project, where we're planning on bringing you these packages in the future. This is package one. We're hoping to come back in nine months with package two, and then package three, is set up to deal with technical fixes or just minor policy. And the idea behind that was sometimes the small things can add up to a large impact on having efficient development. And we're working specifically with b.d.s. on these technical and minor policy issues. When I was showing you this, on page 25, if you want to look at it again, some of the requests in the database are for items that don't belong in a recap package. And some of the requests that -- like this comprehensive tree review is bigger than what could be handled by this project. If you would to direct our bureau, and other bureaus, who would also have to get this in their work program, that's something you may want to do as part of the budget decisions, because there would be other projects that we're proposing to do that wouldn't get done if we did the tree. So it's a matter of balancing resources with priority projects.

Saltzman: I look forward to working with you, because I think i'm a member of the budget subcommittee that -- no? Then i'll have to work with my colleagues.

Leonard: I'm glad to take that up for you.

Saltzman: I think it's very necessary. The planning commission has also said it's time to do it. And i've just known from my own experience, sitting on this council for many years, there are so many disparate angles that get to tree preservation. And it's a very important issue, I think, to the livability of our city. I do think it's worthy of getting into the work plan this year. I realize something else has to come out that's equally worthy, but I would like to pursue that anyway. I'll pursue that with my colleagues.

Leonard: Well, I have a question related to what mr. Nelson raised, as to these houses. That's the first i've heard of that issue. Is as he described it accurate? And if so, why are the conditions such that we would actually allow these houses to be torn down -- actually require them to be torn down if more than 75% destroyed in fire?

Pinard: We don't require them to be torn down, but I think that you need to look at the whole policy approach, because what -- again, his request is not a minor policy tweak. It would be a major policy shift --

Leonard: You're jumping ahead of where I asked. I asked if what he described is accurate. If that's true, why is that?

Nameny: There are provisions in the zoning code that state that if there's a fire, other loss beyond the control of the owner, and it exceeds 75% of the previous value, that the use is prohibited at that point.

Leonard: You said you didn't require it to be torn down. How is that different from he just said?

March 1, 2006

Pinard: If there's no fire or you could rebuild the building, but put a conforming use in it. So it's more of a technical point that i'm making. But the idea behind the nonconforming use regulations is -- and over the years we have liberalized them and let nonconforming uses stay if they continue operation. And if they have minor damage, they can repair it and go on. The whole idea behind nonconforming uses is in the long term, in planning, you want the uses in that area to go to uses that are allowed by right and are expected.

Leonard: So he described it accurately, what the state of the allowed use of those houses are?

Pinard: I think he got the 75%. The idea was, once it's that damaged, that would be a good time to switch over to looking at getting a use in there that's allowed by the zoning.

Leonard: What is the zoning?

Pinard: He has industrial sanctuary zoning, heavy industrial.

Nameny: The one thing to keep in mind, is the only place that a residential use is outright prohibited are in the I zones. So once again, the intent is, with the nonconforming chapter, it is the idea that residential uses and heavy industrial uses are not compatible uses, and --

Leonard: But these are pre-existing single-family dwellings that at some point the council decided would be a more appropriately zoned as industrial, heavy industrial?

Nameny: And correct in they're actually surrounded by -- in his case, his case is a little extreme, because it's a collection of houses, but most often you're talking about one or two houses that are surrounded by industrial uses that are maybe a remnant of prior development.

Leonard: May be it's skewed by the picture, but this looks like a neighborhood.

Pinard: Well, this is north of vaughn, in northwest. And over the years the neighborhood, the residential neighborhood, in working with the industrial neighborhood, have talked about should the industry come south, past vaughn, or should residential go north, into the industrial sanctuary, and for the most part vaughn has been the agreed upon dividing line between this part we'll save for industrial and the southern part we'll encouraged mixed uses. This happens to be a block that is north of vaughn, I think it's upshire.

Nameny: I don't know if you're aware, when you go up 30, you're kind of coming off the i-405. There's a collection of some older victorian type homes north of the freeway there that are somewhat isolated.

Leonard: Uh-huh.

Nameny: Once again, at some point may have been a residential neighborhood, but that area has been zoned industrial, I know I did some research for him several months ago, and my recollection it's been industrial for possibly since 1959. I'd have to double-check.

Leonard: So were those conditions established in 1959?

Nameny: If not 1959, established for a probably good 20 to 30 years.

Leonard: And I guess the question is, do they make sense today? Do those conditions that were decided 20 or 30 or 40 years ago make sense today?

Nameny: The discussion that actually the bureau of planning had was that that may be more warranted as part of a larger policy review of nonconforming uses in general, and that was sort of the direction I was given. I think carrie maybe can elaborate on that a little bit.

Saltzman: Does it matter at all, first of all, if the structures predate the existing of the zoning code? Does that make any difference in terms of grandfathering --

Pinard: No. They have the same grandfather rights. The idea is they can stay there and be maintained. Back before 1981, the nonconforming use rules basically had an amortization clause, and after 10 or 15 years of sort of getting your investment out of your nonconforming use, the use is supposed to dry up, blow away, or go someplace else. Over the years, we have liberalized that, so the current approach is as long as you're there and have a viable use, you can stay. The switch for when it would be a good time to go is when that use is otherwise destroyed. We mentioned some of our other regulations are if a building has been vacant for a certain number of years, that's also part of our policy to say that indicates that perhaps it's time for any use that goes on that site again to be

March 1, 2006

conforming rather than nonconforming. So since they're there and they haven't burned down and they're viable houses, they have rights to stay. Mr. Nelson's correct, that it's very hard for them to get financing from a bank for residential use, because if it burnt down, he couldn't build residential back there. We have talked to him. There are some other uses that are allowed in industrial zones, up to 3,000 square feet of office, and, you know, in parts of northwest, a lot of old houses have been converted to office. So there are some uses that would be allowed if something happened to the structures there.

Leonard: I understand that, but I think -- I think we also have to be cognizant that -- with the change in the eras, so do our perceptions of what is an appropriate use and what is of interest to me that I think may not have been as relevant in 1981 or 1959 is that this is -- at that time that would have been an area that I would have thought, and I do remember being in that area at that time, was a -- what I would call a challenged neighborhood at best along with all of northwest 23rd. That has changed. So that these kinds of houses, particularly inner city houses, have a different -- they're perceived differently today than they were in 1981 or 1959. They're -- I can't imagine a condition under which somebody wouldn't rebuild a house like this in 2006 that would not have existed, those conditions in 1981 or 1959. And so the question, in my mind, becomes, obviously in 1959, if they passed that rule, that might have made some sense. In 2006, if one of these houses burned down, you're not going to move an industrial use into that block. I mean, you're going to have an intact neighborhood because of the economics today that are applicable to these kind of residences that will demand that the neighborhood stay intact. I mean, they're just worth more. So have we -- has the regulation evolved to the point that it doesn't make sense anymore? Does it make sense to look back, ok, that may have applied well then, but today the conditions, economic conditions, are completely different. The phenomena that we thought would happen by tearing down a house then is not going to happen today. Should we look at it and say, let's reevaluate this?

Pinard: Well, and we could look at that again. One one of our points is that that's a major policy relook. And it happens to be that that's another one our list, that we would like to do a comprehensive review of our nonconforming approaches. Our preliminary findings are that we may want to loosen up in the commercial and employment zones, but stay pretty strict in industrial sanctuary and residential. That's not a conclusion, just when we're talking about what timing. Is it a good time to review those policies, as you're asking. It is a good time to review them. But it would be a major policy change and should get, you know, reviewed, the industrial neighborhoods should be involved in it, the northwest district association should be involved in the discussions. And that hasn't happened at this point.

Leonard: I'm not sure I understand the need for all of that, given that there are single-family dwellings there. And if one burns down, I can't imagine an industry licking its chops, thinking, i'm going to now purchase that property for industrial. I just don't see that as a practical matter happening.

Pinard: Well, and you know, from my experience, I think it's not so much this block of houses. If you take this block by itself, it is, and over the last few years, has become a much cuter little neighborhood because those houses have been fixed up.

Leonard: Uh-huh, right.

Pinard: Than they were 20 years ago. But if you look at --

Leonard: That's putting it so much better than how I was trying to describe it. It's a cuter neighborhood.

Pinard: More desirable in that block. But if you look at the traditional discussions we've had with industry and the importance of keeping jobs and industry in the city, the idea is you don't want a island of nonconforming uses, especially residential use. So that i'm thinking we can revisit it, but it was a very clear policy decision about how important industrial sanctuaries are.

Leonard: No. I understand that. And part of the discussion, now, ironically on a vacant piece of land out in linnton where it appears that just the exact opposite has happened, that i'm actually

March 1, 2006

arguing your point to the neighborhood. I'm a little confused about what your policy is and how consistent we are in preserving truly industrial zones for industry. I mean, this seems to me to make some sense for an exception, the other doesn't, but the planning bureau seems to be poised to make some agreement to make an exception. So I'm a little confused.

Pinard: I think that's a good example where the discussion in the linnton village is a big policy decision that needs to be made and council will be looking at that and getting information to help them decide that. I'm being consistent in saying changing the rules for these residential areas would also be a major change and should be looked at in an in-depth way, more than we can do in our minor policy technical packages. So I'm not saying it's inappropriate to look at it again. I'm saying not through this process. And then I also want to be clear that if we look at it again, I don't want to imply that we can clean it up easily as soon as we look at it, because there are some pretty tough tradeoff decisions that would have to be made at that point.

Potter: Well, I agree with commissioner Leonard. I think that -- there has to be, at some point, I guess a reasonable standard. Is this heavy industrial or light industrial?

Nameny: I'd have to look it up. It's either an ih or ig1.

Saltzman: It says ig1.

Nameny: I didn't get a copy of his testimony. That would be general industrial.

Potter: That would include a starbucks?

Nameny: It would potentially include retail or office uses up to 3,000 square feet, but would also potentially include manufacturing uses, you know -- I'd have to look at ig1, but I think it allows a lot of the heavier industrial service uses, including, you know, things like auto wrecking, things like that. Not that you would do that on a 2,000-square-foot lot, but just as a -- I don't know if Tom Nelson's here anymore, but I do know that -- I'd heard that this neighborhood had problems with motorcycle repair facility that went in across the street, because of noise issues, and that's something that I think that there needs to be a discussion on, you know, when is it appropriate to have the residential piece still allowed and continue right across from these uses. And what kind of steps can be done to ensure the livability of the residential use and livability and job maintenance for the industrial uses is maintained. Even though his request on face of it is a small request, it potentially brings up this larger policy issue that would have to be looked at, and I think would have to involve both industrial interest and neighborhood interest.

Leonard: The concern I have is there some tool we're not using or some approach we're not taking yet that's different than this that would allow the preservation of a neighborhood like this given the changes in economics I'm not comfortable when I keep hearing us approach a problem based on tools that are. I'm asking are there things we're not thinking about, not contemplating using to preserve housing like this, that we could create that isn't being used currently? I don't know the answer to that. I depend on you guys to come up with the specifics of that kind of a challenge, but it's just hard for me to believe when I look at these pictures and I remember what these houses used to look like, in this area, neighborhood, and what they look like now, we would contemplate allowing them to be removed, or a set of conditions exist where one could not be replaced or rebuilt that was -- it doesn't make sense to me. I don't know that I could have reasonably argued that in 1981 or 1969 or 1959, but I think today you could make that argument.

Saltzman: I see commissioner Leonard's points, but I do see your points, too, that is this is a broader discussion about industrial sanctuaries, and got to involve discussions with the northwest district association. But I think that's the key here, is we're looking at one instance of the broader discussion about the integrity of industrial sanctuaries.

Potter: I try to play this out. You know, I can see five houses. I don't know how many are in that area. What happens if the middle one burns down?

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

Potter: The other four don't go away. But now we've got a piece of property that we can't do anything with.

March 1, 2006

Pinard: Well, they can do quite a few things that are allowed by right that aren't heavy industrial. Like I said office, a small starbucks in the bottom of the office they could do. So there are some economic uses of that land. What I -- we don't know what you've been shown, so we're kind of guessing at what it looks like.

Potter: Come up. Go ahead and keep it.

Saltzman: It just says ig1.

Potter: Go ahead and keep it.

Nameny: The one thing to keep, I think there's two points here. First off, I do believe the situation is unique in that I don't know if there is another place in the city that is zoned industrial that has this concentration of houses. Usually what you find is most of it has been converted do industrial use and maybe one or two homes on the corner that have been -- that are remaining, and in that kind of situation I feel it's still fairly clear and desirable that if something happened to those houses, that the business next door would have an opportunity to expand into those --

Leonard: The part that troubles me about that, is, as I pointed out -- again, this is just from the receiver end -- i'm fully cognizant of this debate that's occurring right now about using this linnton land to allow residences to be built. And everything you're saying right now flies in the face of what I hear is coming our way, which is a recommendation to allow on what had been exclusively industrial land residences to be built in an area i'm arguing with the neighborhood in a friendly way needs to be preserved as industrial use, but you guys, it seems as though, have sided with the neighbors. So I don't get your reluctance on this one, but then your advocacy on the other.

Pinard: Let me propose something else. Without the map that shows where this is on the land I think -- this looks very much like a very viable neighborhood.

Leonard: Uh-huh.

Pinard: If we could come back and show you an aerial of where this block is in relationship to where the freeway kind of --

Leonard: I think I know where it is. I have it in my mind's eye exactly where it is. There's a jack in the box --

*****: No.

Nameny: It's further east of there. It's sort of north of -- I guess it was a consolidated freightways property. So i-405 kind of straddles that, and then you know where that old church is --

*****: Isn't the jack --

Leonard: Isn't jack-in-the-box there?

Nameny: This is east of the ramp. This is an isolated blog on the north side of i-405.

Leonard: I-405, and like 21st or something?

Nameny: Yeah. I think it's something like upshire.

Leonard: I have an idea where it is.

*****: It's wilson and vaughn and --

Leonard: Yeah.

*****: But it's on sort of the northeast side of the freeway.

Leonard: Ok.

*****: So in essence it's isolated from the 23rd --

Leonard: Right.

Nameny: It's very visible from the freeways, coming that direction heading to linnton.

Leonard: I know where it is. But still it's the inner city. People are tripping over themselves to buy this exact kind of house and spending whatever they need to spend to have it look like the way they want, so it seems counterintuitive particularly in light of the linnton debate going on.

Pinard: Like you have some questions of, should our policy that we created back then still apply now. And I think we could be very interested in exploring those questions with you. I think our point is that would need a bigger project. It's a major policy issue, not a minor policy issue, just as you've been told the linnton is a major policy issue.

March 1, 2006

Leonard: I'm trying to figure out why you're doing that, and that's not some part of a larger project, but this has to be.

Pinard: No. That is a large project that has its own staff and has --

Leonard: How is that disconnected from this?

Pinard: Our little packages of small amendments, where we have 42 at a time, are the ones that are supposed to be relatively easy, relatively straightforward, and don't make major changes in policy. If they make major changes in policy, we've had testimony from neighbors saying, don't run those big ones through your packages.

Leonard: I understand that. You're misunderstanding. I get that on this package. I'm just saying outside of that, sounds like that process is going on as though it's different than this. Why can't this question be answered in the question of the larger problem you bring to us of converting industrial land to housing. I mean, why wouldn't this be part of that?

Pinard: Well, how about this is a suggestion, I can talk to the people who are looking at linnton village and get some idea of where they're at in the process, and we can come back with more information about whether it fits and should be put together or whether it is, you know, sort of apples and oranges, because I think we just don't have adequate information today.

Leonard: That sounds good.

Potter: Nonconforming regulations themselves, and perhaps that could answer the question. If it's nonconforming, I can see if it's a commercial structure, pre-existing, they said, well, ok, it's ok to keep this here, but once you try to alter it or burns down, then you've got to use it for the conforming purposes. But when you've got a number of houses together, and they're all nonconforming, it kind of begs the issue, well, at what point then, and you folks have said 75% burn down, does it then convert to the surrounding area's conforming use.

Pinard: Again, I think we could come back with information that we specifically put together to answer some of these questions, and then if you had further direction for us we'd be happy to go there.

Potter: That sounds fine. Thank you. Further questions? Ok. Any other staff information?

Engstrom: I wanted to mention briefly from the bureau of development services' point of view, that we have been very pleased with the work that margo and greg have done on their -- they've produced a report that gives some pretty good analysis of the tree issue and the need for a comprehensive look at that. And I think the bureau agrees with that, that analysis, that there does need to be a large look at it the. Similar to what carrie said, it's something that should be looked at in the budget process in terms of resources for the different bureaus that are going to participate in that. And this is definitely not a situation where staff and the neighborhoods have a differing opinion of what the potential solutions are, it's a resource issue and a time issue.

Potter: Thank you.

Saltzman: I guess, carrie, I would just ask, could you send maybe us a copy -- amendment that would outline all of the agencies that should be involved in such a review of the policy?

Pinard: Ok. And we probably want to check in with them, but I know our staff, our environmental staff, has been doing some preliminary scoping. And I think if we work with you, eric, we could check into the --

Saltzman: Maybe the two of you can just -- I just want to get an idea of the extent.

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

Potter: Thank you folks. Now we have to open it up to citizens?

Moore: We already had a sign-up sheet for this item. We took those.

Potter: Then I need a motion to accept the process report for the regulatory work plan.

Leonard: So moved.

Sten: Second.

Potter: Call the roll.

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

March 1, 2006

Sten: I wanted to say good work. I'm comfortable voting for this. I believe that very much that you're all working together with margo and the team, so i'm just going to trust the staff's position that the concern you see is not going to be an issue in terms of the disincentive, but if it does turn into one I want to bring this back. I think it could be fixed real quickly. I hope both sides will watch, because you both want the same thing. I'm not going to try to create some financial package on the seat of my pants here, but it turns out that margo's fear is real, i'd like to bring that back and address that. And would also like to work with commissioner Saltzman on getting a bigger picture addressed. I was quiet, actually I don't agree with commissioner Leonard on the analogy with linnton, so I would like to see that in a bigger policy discussion. I think it's a good discussion.

Leonard: To be clear, I don't know if I agree with it, I was just raising it as an obvious contrast. It may be something i'm missing here.

Sten: I see something in between, you know, allowing a rebuild in any case, because I generally think the policy is a solid one, not to allow a rebuild versus the middle house of five seems to me two different matters. I get it's tricky to address, but that was to finish my own thoughts, that's how I view that. So good work. I really think the way you bring these minor amendments in in a package is very effective. We're still only a few years into it. It's good work. Aye.

Potter: And, you know, I do have concerns about both of trees as well as the housing, but I also have concerns, and I mentioned it earlier, if this is a regulatory improvement work plan, I think we have to have quantifiable indicators indicating where we've improved, and not just from the regulatory side, but from the citizens side in terms of not just their satisfaction, but the amount of time it takes to resolve different issues with citizens. So but overall, though, i'm very pleased to see the bureaus working together. I think it's an excellent progress report, and I think as we look at these other issues we'll -- some of them are policy issues for the city council to resolve and we'll accept the responsibility for those. Aye. [gavel pounded] please call the vote on the ordinance.

Moore: That's a nonemergency.

Potter: Oh, nonemergency. Moves to a second reading. Ok. That's it. Council is adjourned until 6:00 p.m. tonight. Don't be late.

At 4:24 p.m., Council adjourned.