



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **19TH DAY OF APRIL, 2006** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Potter, Presiding; Commissioners Adams, Leonard, Saltzman and Sten, 5.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Susan Parsons, Acting Clerk of the Council; Ben Walters, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and Gary Crane, Sergeant at Arms.

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

COMMUNICATIONS		Disposition:
477 Request of Richard L. Koenig to address Council regarding a claim against police (Communication)		PLACED ON FILE
478 Request of Alex Ansary to address Council regarding taser use (Communication)		PLACED ON FILE
479 Request of Paul Phillips to address Council regarding article in November 29, 2005 Daily Journal of Commerce (Communication)		PLACED ON FILE
TIME CERTAINS		
*480 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Authorize an agreement with the Portland Parks Foundation for enhanced maintenance services at Sellwood Park (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Saltzman) (Y-5)		180074
481 TIME CERTAIN: 10:15 AM – Form a drug strategy group for the City to address the problem of substance abuse through education, policy recommendations, prevention, treatment and law enforcement strategies and techniques (Resolution introduced by Mayor Potter) (Y-5)		36399
482 TIME CERTAIN: 10:30 AM – Accept Portland Development Commission Report and assist implementation of the public obligations under the South Waterfront Project Development Agreement (Resolution introduced by Mayor Potter) Motion to accept the Resolution: Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman. (Y-3; N-2, Leonard and Sten)		36400

April 19, 2006

CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION	
Mayor Tom Potter	
Office of Emergency Management	
*483 Authorize contract with CH2MHill in the amount of \$219,795 to develop the Portland Urban Area Public Infrastructure Protection Plan (Ordinance) (Y-5)	180068
Office of Management and Finance – Purchasing	
484 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the State of Oregon for surplus property disposition (Second Reading Agenda 453) (Y-5)	180069
Police Bureau	
485 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement in the amount of \$5,900 with Western Oregon University, Western Community Policing Institute to provide officer training (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 26, 2006 AT 9:30 AM
Commissioner Sam Adams	
Bureau of Environmental Services	
*486 Authorize the Commissioner of Public Utilities to enter into an Amended Administrative Order on Consent with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and other parties to fund the remedial investigation and feasibility study for the Portland Harbor Superfund Site (Ordinance) (Y-5)	180070
487 Designate certain City property as a Storm Drainage Facility and transfer management responsibility from the Bureau of Parks and Recreation to the Bureau of Environmental Services (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 26, 2006 AT 9:30 AM
488 Authorize agreement with Multnomah County to cover cost of facilities upgrades to the Vector Control Buildings located on the Columbia Blvd Wastewater Treatment Plant Campus (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 26, 2006 AT 9:30 AM
Office of Transportation	
489 Amend contract with Northgate Group, LLC to provide additional professional services (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 34833)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 26, 2006 AT 9:30 AM
490 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation to reconstruct the traffic signals at N Lombard and Portsmouth and install a new traffic signal at NE 122nd & Whitaker Street (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 26, 2006 AT 9:30 AM
Commissioner Dan Saltzman	

April 19,2006

Parks and Recreation		PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 26, 2006 AT 9:30 AM
491	Apply for a \$500,000 grant from Oregon Parks and Recreation Local Government Grant Program to rehabilitate and develop West Powellhurst and Gilbert Heights Parks in outer East Portland (Ordinance)	
492	Apply for a \$100,000 grant from the Land & Water Conservation Fund to rehabilitate Pier Pool in North Portland (Second Reading Agenda 460) (Y-5)	180071
Commissioner Erik Sten		
Bureau of Housing and Community Development		
*493	Amend subrecipient contract with Housing Authority of Portland by an additional \$47,271 for a total of 289,872 and provide for payment (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 36356) (Y-5)	180072
*494	Authorize application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for a grant in the amount of \$3,000,000 for the implementation of lead-based paint hazard control activities and administration (Ordinance) (Y-5)	180073
REGULAR AGENDA		
Mayor Tom Potter		
Office of Management and Finance – Bond Counsel		
495	Authorize lines of credit for costs related to construction of South Waterfront aerial tram (Second Reading Agenda 476) (Y-3; N-2, Leonard and Sten)	180075 AS AMENDED
Office of Management and Finance – Bureau of General Services		
496	Authorize contract and provide for payment for the Union Station Enhancement Grant project (Second Reading Agenda 468) (Y-5)	180076
Commissioner Sam Adams		
497	Require contractors on City contracts to provide equivalent employee benefits between their employees with domestic partners and their employees with spouses (Second Reading Agenda 446; add Code Sections 3.100.050 through 3.100.056) (Y-5)	180077
Office of Transportation		
498	Amend contract with Kiewit Pacific Company to construct the Portland Aerial Tram project (Second Reading Agenda 475; amend Contract No. 35951) (Y-3; N-2, Leonard and Sten)	180078 AS AMENDED

At 11:40 a.m., Council recessed.

April 19,2006

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,
OREGON WAS HELD THIS **19TH DAY OF APRIL, 2006** AT 6:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Potter, Presiding; Commissioners Adams, Leonard,
Saltzman and Sten, 5.

Commissioners Adams and Leonard arrived at 6:13 p.m.
Commissioner Adams left at 6:36 p.m.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Susan Parsons, Acting Clerk of the Council; Pete
Kasting, Chief Deputy City Attorney; and there was no Sergeant at Arms.

LOCATION: Interstate Firehouse Cultural Center 5340 N Interstate Ave., between Alberta and Killingsworth	Disposition:
499 TIME CERTAIN: 6:00 PM – Proposal to rename Portland Blvd to Rosa Parks Way (Presentation introduced by Commissioner Saltzman)	PLACED ON FILE

At 7:19 p.m., Council recessed.

April 20, 2006

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,
OREGON WAS HELD THIS **20TH DAY OF APRIL, 2006** AT 2:00 P.M.

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

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Susan Parsons, Acting Clerk of the Council; Kathryn
Beaumont, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and Gary Crane, Sergeant at Arms.

<p>500 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM – Appeal of Global Events Group against the Noise Review Board decision on the noise variance for the Champ Car World Series on June 16-19, 2006 (Hearing introduced by Auditor Blackmer)</p> <p>Motion to uphold the appeal and modify the Noise Review Board decision by modifying the condition to allow a 9:00 a.m. start time: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Adams. (Y-2; N-2, Leonard and Potter) Motion Failed.</p> <p>Motion to deny the appeal and uphold Noise Review Board decision to allow a 10:00 a.m. start time: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-4)</p>	<p>Disposition:</p> <p>DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD NOISE REVIEW BOARD DECISION TO ALLOW A 10:00AM START TIME</p>
<p>501 TIME CERTAIN: 3:00 PM – Adopt and implement the Linnton Hillside Recommended Plan (Previous Agenda 347; amend Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map; amend Title 33)</p> <p>Motion to accept the Staff's revised substitute Exhibit A dated April 6, 2006: Moved by Commissioner Leonard and seconded by Commissioner Adams. (Y-3, Saltzman absent)</p> <p>Motion to adopt the Rezone Map: Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman. (Y-4)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 26, 2006 AT 2PM AS AMENDED</p>

At 4:53 pm, Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Susan Parsons
Acting Clerk of the Council

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

April 19, 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.

[The following text is the byproduct of the closed captioning of this broadcast. The text has not been proofread, and should not be considered a final transcript.] * * *

APRIL 19, 2006 9:30 AM

Potter: Each week we ask our community to consider the question, how are the children? The reason we do that is because we know that when our children are well cared for, when they're well educated, when they have a roof over their heads and caring adults in their lives, they're more likely to become successful human beings. Today we have a couple of experts that are going to talk to us.

If Megan and Olivia would please come forward. Both of these students go to Bridger, and they're both in the third grade. Megan Miller and Olivia Jensen. Who is accompanying them today.

*****: I'm their principal, they asked if I would sit with them.

Potter: If you would begin, when you start speaking, please give us your name.

Meghan Miller: Ok. My name is Megan Miller.

Olivia Jensen: My name is Olivia Jensen. Dear City Council. Thank you for helping the Portland public schools this year. We go to the Creative Science School at Bridger Elementary School. Our school will have changes next year. There are some things we love about our school and things we would like to change. Please help us keep the things we love that would -- things we would like to change. Please help us keep the things we love that make our school what it is.

*****: Some of the things we like about our school are a licensed school counselor.

*****: Our P.E. teacher.

*****: Our principal, who is right here today.

*****: After school classes like math, science, and model rockets.

*****: After-school classes like yoga and garden art class.

*****: Having lots of library books.

*****: Our rain water garden that we have built over the last four years.

*****: Our computer lab.

*****: There are some things we would like to change, like out-of-control noise.

*****: Trash talk.

*****: Bullying.

*****: Not enough money for things like drama class.

*****: We would like to have music in our teachers.

*****: We don't like sitting on the rug for too long.

*****: Things like licensed school counselors, P.E. Teachers and librarians make a difference. We wish we had music and drama classes. We want to keep the people who matter to us even though the school is changing. We thank you for listening to real kids.

Potter: Thank you very much. You did an excellent job. Thank you. Let's give them a hand. [applause] [gavel pounded] City Council will come to order. Sue, please call the roll. [roll call] please read communications. Item 477.

Item 477.

Richard Koenig: Good morning, City of Portland, City Council, Mayor. My name is Richard Koenig. Again, to correct the record a little bit, it's really a claim against the city for hiring and

April 19, 2006

training policies that get cops on the job that aren't prepared. I'm honored to be blazing a trail with the cooperation of Portland city council that will not only open the way to expedited handling of claims against the city, but will result in a constitutionally empowered police bureau worthy of citizen respect. The claim I make against the city for damages is characterized as a rising from inadequate hiring and training policies. The events of the past few weeks have highlighted the problem that settlement of my claim will address. The literary deficiencies of our police bureau members gives one pause to wonder not whether officers have had legally required courses in constitutional studies, but whether they have the english background to read through the constitutions to begin studying them. The judgment calls of Portland's top cops past and present indicate that they have -- they and those under their command, assuming birds of a feather, indicate that they may not choose to work on comprehending the constitutions that they swore to uphold. "the Oregonian's" front page story of april 14th's edition emphasizes the lack of will on the part of the city to -- over many years. City council cannot miss the implication of the brightest and most promising member of the independent police review's citizen review committee resigning in disgust just last month. To begin where we left off when I last appeared before city council, we will now discuss any objections that the council may have to adding the actions of officer daniel lugeeberg and sergeant bailey of northeast precinct as a basis of my claim. These members refuse to take a crime report that police commissioner Potter has subsequently filed with the district attorney's office, they then went to the d.a. to seek a warrant against me for trying to get them to enforce the law. Of course their effort to secure a warrant was not rewarded. Do you gentlemen of city council have any objections to adding the actions of dalberg and bailey as an example of inadequate hiring and training policy practices to my claim against the city?

Potter: You're here to make a statement.

Koenig: And to secure agreements, for the record. Ok, we're agreed. When we get together next week, we'll discuss any objection that city council may have to finding that achieve forth -- chief foxworth's failure to take could go answer is of a letter from the attorney general's office is a more compelling concern than his literary efforts to the police bureau -- than his literary efforts on police bureau computers. Another hiring and training policy issue. Thank you.

Potter: Please read the next item, sue.

Item 478.

*******:** Is alex here?

Potter: You have to sign up. Please read the next item.

Item 479.

Potter: Please state your name when you testify. You have three minutes.

Paul Phillips: Paul phillips, I read part of this article last week, which i'll finish today. Plan uses -- plaintiff uses little known theory to win against construction firm. The trial highlights company's increased efforts to minimize on-the-job injury reports by natalie white. Dolan news wire. The d.j.c. published that november 29, 2005. Before I jump to the -- where I was last week, do you know what a ventriloquist dummies? Or should I start from there?

Potter: You're here to make a statement, sir.

Phillips: Ok. I'll start from there. The insurance company was the ventriloquist dummy in the case. The employer was trying to speak through them. He said the material defended its action in part by saying it wasn't responsible for granting or denying claims that was the sole role of the insurance company. They said the insurance company handles claims. All we did was tell them what we thought, and we had a right to do that. If we didn't handle the claim the right way, they are the ones who should be held accountable. Using a little used theory, it was argued the construction company aided and abetted in the commission of a tort when it tried to convince the insurance company to deny medical claims from ron hubbard. An attorney stumbled upon the theory while doing research on bad faith claims. We've all heard of aiding and abetting in the criminal content. I'm embarrassed to say that I didn't even know it existed in the civil content. It's not really an exotic

April 19, 2006

theory, it's recognized by the restatement of torts. I'm not sure why it isn't used more. He simply says if a party gives substantial assistance to encouragement to another party in the commission of a tort, they can be held liable for the tort. In this instance, he wanted to hold the construction company and not the insurance company, which had settled earlier, responsible for preventing the client from collecting benefits for work-related injury. In this case we had an employer that vigorously got involved who calls to the insurance company -- i'll finish this next time. May 3. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you. Move to the consent agenda. Do any of the commissioners wish to pull any items off the consent agenda? Any member of the audience wish to pull any items off the consent agenda? Sue, please call the roll.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] move to the 9:30 time certain. Sue, please read item 480.

Item 480.

Potter: Commissioner Saltzman.

Saltzman: Thank you, mr. Mayor, members of the council. This is one of those items that's truly fun to introduce and support. Portland parks and recreation is not only one of the true gems of our city, but it's also a critical piece as the city council has recognized in its latest budget. It's a critical piece of our city's infrastructure, and that's why we now consider our parks bureau, along with transportation, water, and sewer, to be one of the four key infrastructure bureaus. Part of our challenge in parks is forging new partnerships with groups, business groups with friends of organizations and other nonprofits to assist us in carrying out the mission of parks and recreation, to provide good quality parks and recreation areas and community centers that people can use throughout the city. And i'm thrilled to bring this agreement today with columbia sportswear as it will improve upon part of that infrastructure, sellwood park. The Portland parks foundation, created in 2001, has worked tirelessly with columbia sportswear to solidify the details of this incredible donation of \$1 million over the next 10 years, to enhance the maintenance of sellwood park. I'll let tim boyle explain his connection to sellwood park, and then we have the chairman of the foundation to explain to us how the donation fits into their large effort to find nine more parks to connect with nine more companies to complete their 10 for 10 program. So -- and our parks director is also here.

So my part comes down to nothing more than saying a very hearty thank you to mr. Boyle, thank you for all of the employees and customers of columbia sportswear for their help, and this is a wonderful gift to Portland and i'm proud to be the parks commissioner at this historic moment.

David Fouks: Thank you, commissioner, mr. Mayor, members of the commission. We're very happy to be with you. My name is david fouks, i'm the president of the board of the Portland parks foundation. And we're delighted to have this opportunity to acknowledge columbia sportswear and tim boyle. Tim not only is joining luminaries of the recent past who have done great things for our parks, nike, freightliner, and others who have really stepped up, but he's joining the parents of the city from the distant past who helped to truly steward the creation of a unique park system and a city within a park. This is really a remarkable asset that we have. Tim, what you have done is a true act of philanthropy as an individual and as a business leader, and it is really impressive to me that the way you stepped up. We were just praised by the commissioner for our tenacity in working with you, but I have to say I praise your tenacity in working with us and working with the city. It took a lot of patience, and a lot of time, because we were doing something that has never been done before in establishing a template for giving to the community. This is about philanthropy. It isn't just charity, it's about love of human beings. And you have expressed a love of your city and of your community, and of people through this generous gift through columbia sportswear, which we are so grateful for. Mr. Mayor and commissioners, the gift is enormous not only in terms of the million dollars it gives, but your commitment to continue to use resource that's were dedicated to sellwood park will turn that park into the jewel in the crown of neighborhood parks. It's our hope there will be others who step forward. Our park foundation is undertaking a campaign, we're

April 19, 2006

calling it 10 for 10. Our goal will be to find nine other parks that we can ask the business community to step up and help us to steward in the way the columbia sportswear has done today. So mr. Boyle, I want to present to you a mock-up of what will be an acknowledgment of columbia sportswear that will be at the entrances, at several of the entrances of sellwood park. It is a wonderful thing to be able to acknowledge you and to thank you, and you have our heartfelt thanks on behalf of the city of Portland.

Tim Boyles: Thank you, david. We appreciate this. You know, we consider a significant component of our company's success having been citizens of Portland. We have very significant investments in the city, including our distribution center in river gate, our flagship store downtown, our sellwood store, and my first movement into the city of Portland from eugene was into sellwood. So very warm place in our hearts for sellwood, and we're just thrilled to be able to have the opportunity to give back to the community. So hopefully with this gift we can encourage other businesses that might have a connection to a certain park to be a contributor. The well-known requirements for maintenance in the park system is significant, and we think it's all of our jobs to help maintain those parks. So we're thrilled to be able to do it, and thank you, david, thank you very much for the recognition.

Zari Santner: Good morning, mayor, members of the council. I'm zari santner, director of Portland parks. This has been a banner week for Portland parks and recreation, starting with yesterday, mayor's announcement, his proposed budget for Portland parks, which based on the recommendation of the team, reinvests in the infrastructure of our park system, and focuses on establishing equity of access throughout the city. I want to thank you all for your support. And then today this incredible, amazing gift, which not only helps one of our most historic and cherished neighborhood parks, but also the fact that tim and the foundation are going to lead and i'm hoping with your support and your collaborations, to solicit nine more corporations, businesses, to do the same in various neighborhoods. We've already identified a list of parks, about 15 parks throughout the cities that the foundation and hopefully with tim's help we will try to recruit for. I just wanted to tell you what we're going to do with this money, \$100,000 a year. In addition to daily maintenance of the park, cleaning restrooms, picking up trash, and mowing lawns, we will be able to fix the historic wrought iron fence, to repair the broken walkways and basically enhance the level of maintenance in the parks, and also there's a capital component of this fund that as over the years it accumulates, it will allow us to renovate the historic restrooms and some of the other buildings in the park. So it's a combination of the city funding and this is going to make this really demonstrate to citizens what we can do when we have sufficient money to maintain parks. I want to take the opportunity to thank tim and david, tim particularly for his willingness to work with us to continue this trend with other businesses, and also the foundation for their advocacy and particularly david, whose leadership as a chair will end the end of this month, and he's -- it's been a terrific leader for the foundation. We are very, very appreciative of all you've done, and the foundation will continue to do. Thank you very much. And thank you for your support.

Saltzman: We have other foundation members here if they'd maybe want to stand up so they could be acknowledged. [applause]

Potter: Is there a sign-up sheet?

*******:** Yes, there is.

Chet Orloff: I'm chet orloff, president of the parks board. I want to second everyone's expression of thanks to tim boyle, and gert boyle, and the entire staff of columbia sportswear. This is of course great news, and it helps us continue to build on an important vision, that's the 2020 vision for Portland parks. And this is the kind of leadership we've been looking for, and it comes again as zari said, at a perfect time when, mayor, you have presented your budget, and I trust that members of the council will support that wholeheartedly, this private support builds on the public support to help us continue to work toward the vision of 2020. Thank you very much.

Potter: Thank you, chet.

April 19, 2006

*****: Someone signed you up.

John Emrick: I thought that was a raffle out in front I was signing up for. I'm John Emrick, I'm with Norm Thompson. I think in support of what's happened here with the Parks Foundation, and as I call him, Brother Tim, Tim Boyle stepping up with this leadership, I think we'll see other organizations follow in the 10 for 10. It's something that's going to happen very shortly. We know it's for a good cause. I'm a 64-year-old native of Portland, there's a few parks that I've been in trouble with in earlier years -- [laughter] it's narrowed down to a few that I think make sense, so we'll see what happens. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you. Is that the sign-up sheet?

*****: That's all.

Potter: Please call the roll.

Adams: I want to certainly thank you, Mr. Boyle, and Parks Foundation, and the leadership team at the Portland Parks Bureau for all the good work that you've done to bring this great public-private partnership together. I would also like to, for Tim, I've said this privately, but also it's a rare opportunity for me to say it publicly as well, that I want to apologize for the poor service that you received from the city team years back when you were looking to relocate your headquarters within the city. You received very poor service. I was part of the team that was intended to help you. It certainly was not our intent to provide you poor service, but we did. And as a result of that and other factors, you chose a location outside the city of Portland. Maybe someday we can rectify that. But in the meantime, this generous gift that you've given to the city in a park that has special relationship to you and your company is very much appreciated, and hopefully it will spur other great companies to step forward as well. So thank you. Aye. [applause]

Leonard: I too very much appreciate Tim, your generosity, and John, I want you to know that I understand your history in some of the parks as a younger person, and I'll just leave it at all. Having grown up next -- I next -- grew up next to Irving Park and went to Grant High, so those are two parks where I have a lot of good memories. And one of the reasons I'm such a ferocious person I suppose when it comes to looking at the Parks Bureau, because I know how great parks can be, because I've lived in an era when parks was probably one of the best systems in the country if not the world. And so to see Tim and Columbia Sportswear step forward and really recognize that same thing through this donation is heartwarming to me, and I appreciate it more than my words can express. Thank you. Aye.

Saltzman: I want to thank Mr. Boyle and the Parks Foundation. This is an ambitious plan to have 10 companies come up with money to maintain 10 parks, and it always takes a first step, somebody that does it first to really I think get the other nine to come on board. It's always -- people always want to see how somebody else has done it, and it's working and they can talk to you and you can tell them how good the park looks and how the arrangement is working well. I'm sure that will help the foundation find nine other companies, and I'm certainly willing to link ours with the -- arms with the foundation in that effort. We want to make this a real success for all of the citizens of the city of Portland. Thank you. Aye.

Sten: I agree. Thanks to the foundation and Columbia Sportswear, it really is inspiring. I think people want to think of the Parks image like the image Columbia Sportswear already has -- innovative, smart, fun, all the things you can do with Columbia Sportswear, it's a great fit. I couldn't think of a better way to send the right message to the citizens. I also like Randy grew up in the time where you just got sent down to the park by your parents. You would just go down there and there would be somebody doing something, playing basketball, and there was always people watching you. I think we're trying to get back there, and we can only do it with private sector help. And I want to thank the rest of your family, Tim, because I know they've been very committed to this as well. It's a great pleasure to vote aye, and thank you.

Potter: It seems like a chorus of applause, but I think it certainly is well deserved. To the Parks Bureau, to leadership there, to the foundation for its work and commitment to improving our parks

April 19, 2006

systems here in Portland, and to the business community, which from time to time we've had our differences, but the fact is that you contribute much to our community, and we truly appreciate what you do. Thank you, mr. Boyle, thank you all to the folks who sit on that foundation, thank you david fouks for your time as president there. I look forward to working with the business community and finding those other nine partners out there. I know they're out there. And I know we've got the parks for them. So let's work together and again thank you, and it's a great, great program. I vote aye. [gavel pounded] thank you folks.

Potter: We're a tad early for our 10:15 time certain.

*****: Shall we take some of the regular agenda items?

Potter: Yes, let's go through the regular agenda items.

*****: We could save the tram items, but if you wanted to -- or start on 496, perhaps?

Potter: What was 495?

*****: The lines of credit for the tram.

Potter: Oh. Please read that.

Item 495.

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

Adams: Aye. **Leonard:** No. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** No.

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] please read the next item.

Item 496.

Potter: Second -- excuse me. Second reading, vote-only.

Adams: Great project. Aye.

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

Potter: I want to reiterate my thanks to the Oregon department of transportation for their help. Aye. Please read the next item.

Item 497.

Adams: I just want to thank the council for their enthusiastic support of this. I know on behalf of all the people that will benefit from it, your support is noted and very much appreciated. Aye.

Leonard: I really do appreciate commissioner Adams bringing this forward. It is about treating people as people, and I really appreciate working with a group of people who share that value. In the context of my prior public service, it causes me to appreciate these points of view even more. Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Sten: I want to particularly thank commissioner Adams and his team for putting this together. It's not only the right statement and the right policy choice, and I think when the city is able to use its purchasing power proactively it makes a big difference. We're not requiring people, we're saying if you want to do business with the city. But I think what's more important is that this purchasing signal has already pushed changes that I think were going to happen and needed to happen in the insurance industry faster, so it's not a symbolic action, it's an actual step forward, and my understanding from talking to some employers, there have been many who have would done these benefits sooner if they could get the right kind of coverage. By the city moving this forward it makes everybody's life more affordable, and I think it's a good line of business for these insurance companies. So it's a great, great day I think to move this forward, and I want to thank sam again. Aye.

Potter: I think what commissioner Adams did was a stroke of genius in that not only did we rectify inequity with a group of citizens who deserved to have these benefits, but they're also going to be extended to many small business groups, and I think this is one of those areas that for small businesses in Portland, I think it gives them a definite advantage here. So I think it's an excellent piece of work, commissioner Adams. I vote aye. [gavel pounded]

Item 498.

Potter: Second reading, vote only.

April 19, 2006

Adams: Aye.

Leonard: I'm sorry, the number again?

*******:** 498.

Leonard: No.

Saltzman: Aye.

Sten: No.

Potter: No. [gavel pounded] So we still have a few minutes before that 10:15.

Adams: Wow, we're good.

Leonard: We can take a recess.

Potter: This young man wanted to say something. Could you please come up so you have a chance to make your statement? Remember, you have three minutes, and please state your name when you speak.

Russ Holcomb: Russ holcomb. If terra is land, our terra-ism is our belief in our land. If we discuss our belief in Oregon's fundamental lands we're considered terraists. If we're rational, cooperative, and sharing individuals, and if we strive toward public ownership, economic rights, labor, and credit unions, freedom, equality and independence we're considered communist. We believe in the fundamentals of a terra that is our land, we rationally share or land for this -- interests in our communities. In Oregon we achieve our goals cooperatively. That is why we're labeled communist, if anticonfederallist anticommunist organize crimes against our democratically communist confederated nations of Oregon and our international city state of Portland, then these are the most troublesome of times. Oregon had two nukes. If we have less than two nukes, then dismantling detonation or repossession has occurred. If we are currently nukeless, if mass graves, eyewitnesses, and waves of destruction point towards one atomic blasts, crimes against humanity need to be pressed against our dictator if we had one. If the majority of earth's nations depend on the accountability, liability and responsibility of dictator leaders, majority rules. If Oregon's responsibilities associated with a nuclear liabilities continues, it will cost us our \$9 trillion in home equity. So our land needs preemptive authoritarian assistance. There are followers and they have leaders. Some leaders are followers, other leaders. There is a leader of all leaders. If that leader led our leaders into his darkness, then we are doomed to follow into that darkness associated with the sixth day of the sixth month of the sixth year of the third like, which is just another word for the 21st century. If the legitimacy of the constitution of our terra delegit ma tieses all imaginations -- nations on comparison, a sovereign Oregon will raise the bar on what is considered a legitimate government. If Oregon's lead government is a current member of a dishonorable fascist anticommunist antiterrorist republic of terrorism, then we are illegitimate in our constitution of confederated communal land is void, therefore our members which has been recalled due to the unconstitutional suppression of the only true democracy currently in existence. If we believe in equality, then we should be equal. It's not fair to show people something that they can't have, so we will give it to them and show them how it works as we enter the international community as the only legitimate nation. Bull run, with it's protective constitution of direct democracy, now encompasses the globe and equality can be established internationally. Except israel, the district of columbia --

Potter: Is your name russ?

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

Potter: Your time is up.

*******:** Oh. I just want you guys to expand the borders of bull run. But I didn't get to talk the little thing about the --

Adams: And jane here from my staff wants to hear the rest of your testimony.

Potter: Ok. We've got some of the folks here for the 481. Could you go ahead and read that?

Item 481.

April 19, 2006

Potter: In 2003, the major cities drug initiative that was launched by the office of the national drug control policy in Washington, d.c., was launched in 25 of the nation's largest metropolitan areas, including Portland. During on the resource -- drawing on the resource and dedication of local officials on the front lines of combatting drug problems in their neighborhoods, it brings together federal, state, local officials working in drug prevention treatment and law enforcement to identify the unique challenges drugs pose in each community. Is the deputy director and her assistant here? I just want to acknowledge you folks. These folks are from the office of the national drug policy, control policy in Washington, d.c., and we're going to be meeting with them later today. Thank you folks for being here. We appreciate your attendance. In learning best practices, they help cities learn valuable lessons by providing training and technical assistance, and brokering improved relationships between cities and their federal partners. Community action to reduce substance abuse focuses efforts in two areas. Including publication of a new drug impact index for Portland. So this resolution will officially establish the city of Portland's drug strategy work group. This group is made -- has made a subgroup of carsa and will work collaboratively with Oregon partnership, vision p.d.x., other stakeholders in developing Portland's drug strategy. So folks, who's going to start? You've got the floor.

Gary Cobb: Gary cobb. Good morning. This resolution makes sense. It will indeed make Portland a safer city for us to leave in, and will definitely save lives. I'm very honor and very proud to be a part of this team, and to be able to sit here and speak to this resolution. Treatment does indeed work, it worked for me, it works for councilless of others. Fortunately I -- unfortunately I didn't have enough time to bring some of those to in -- in this morning, but give me another day to do this and I won't let you indian ever down on that. So it's -- this resolution does make sense. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you, gary.

Bill Diez: Bill diez, with Oregon partnership as a communications director. I want to commend the city of Portland for taking this step of formulating a drug strategy for the city of Portland. We need to look at it as an coordinated way in which prevention treatment law enforcement all play a role in the strategy, and in savings lives. I'm very excited to be part of this team, and I look forward to us being able to develop some workable things that will help alleviate the situation. I know prevention, for instance, is declining in our schools, and we need to somehow get the word out that prevention works and treatment works too. I call your attention to the fact when you're a parent you put your kid in a car seat, when you get in the car you buckle up your seat belt. These are prevention things that work, and we get this whole dialogue about evident-based practices, which sometimes clouds the fact that when you really can communicate to kids about the harms and dangers of alcohol and other drugs, you can make headway. And when we get kids involved in the solutions to these problems, which we're doing in a lot of our projects, they also have some benefit. But I just want to thank you for being part of this team, and we look forward to doing some good work.

Mike Reese: Good morning. Captain mike reese with the Portland police bureau. I'm assigned to our drugs and vice division. Thank you for the opportunity to come before you and talk about the resolution. There's two points that I would like to make. Last year the mayor and county chair held a policy action congress to discuss the meth problem facing our community. And to formulate policy recommendation that's would focus resources on effective strategies to reduce addiction to meth. For several months, prevention specialist, treatment providers, and law enforcement representatives moat to share our perspectives on the growing meth epidemic as we prepared recommendations for the congress. It was apparent to all of us that we're participating in these meetings that this labtive process works. And is a critical component are terror making positive changes in the cycle of drug addiction. Secondly, I was surprised how little disagreement there was among the three groups represented, treatment, prevention, and law enforcement. As to what needs to be done. We all see this not as a war on drugs, but as helping people who struggle with

April 19, 2006

addiction. Helping families and our communities find solutions to the problems of illegal drug use and most importantly, to save children from the cycle of drug abuse. I urge your support of this resolution and of the collaborative work being performed by the group's represented here today. Thank you.

Potter: Do the council members have any questions for these folks? I want to thank all of you for your efforts in this. I know all of you personally, and I really appreciate what you do for our community to eliminate the use of drugs and the effects of that drug use. And I know Gary, you've been out in the trenches for a long time, and I really appreciate what you do.

*****: Thank you. You're welcome.

Potter: We have a sign-up sheet for this?

Parsons: We do. And we have Teresa Teeter, Mike Reece, and Veronica Vernais.

Teresa Teater: Good morning. As you know, I attended your meth congress last year in June, and still harping on the alcohol tax increase to help fund this type of program, intervention, prevention. We just took a 3% cut to the police budget and we need funding. And I've been doing a lot of photography of the drug dealings going on in Chinatown, and boy, do we need some massive police presence down there. It's like the handshake, money slide drug thing going and coming out from behind the clothes really fast. I can see three of them in less than 15 seconds from two guys to a woman, etc. It's just horrendous. So to help with prevention, we've got to stop it first. We've got to stop the dealing, and once we dry up the source, then they're going to want prevention and treatment. Thank you very much.

Veronica Bernier: Good job. Good morning. Veronica from community health education. Retired LVN. I speak to this issue because I have two years of experience in the field of chemical dependency recovery. I have a little hay fever, sorry. I worked as an LVN in the Trinity Phoenix program where we set up a drug rehab program for chemically dependent teenagers. I think that prevention is the focus of a lot of treatment, and I think basically if you put a lot of money into prevention, you're going to help these teens. But what I'd like to speak to is something a little bigger. If you could put money into prevention around the areas where the teen congregates, like the greenhouse outside in, places like that, that is important. We see these kids out on the street, they're dressed in black, and people are very predatory, and they do interact with them, sometimes the girls seek out boyfriends where they have housing needs and things like that, so prevention is very important. And also there's one other item I wanted to underline, we have an idea about doing Oxford Homes for teens, places for emancipated minors to recover in. And I think that idea, I would like to raise in the future as a possibility for a place for kids to live away from their parents when they have a dysfunctional family. So prevention, I would support that and put mine into that, and you'll help kids out in the future. Thanks.

Potter: Thank you.

*****: That's all.

Potter: Please call the vote.

Adams: I want to -- I strongly support this formation of the drug strategy group, and I want to thank and commend the mayor for his leadership in this area. The impacts of substance abuse as hopefully we know now better than ever reach every citizen of this community, and for me, this issue is personal, having grown up in a family heavily impacted by drug and alcohol abuse in Newport and Eugene. Direct impacts continue. Despite more knowledge of the efforts. And it -- employment suffers, the ability to be good parents, students' educational achievements, even if the child is not a drug or alcohol abuser, then, growing up in that family of drug and alcohol abuse, it is hard for a child to succeed at school in such an environment. Insurance costs rise, identity theft is propelled by drug use, and our perceived and actual safety in our neighborhoods and our city is compromised. Because substance abuse is pervasive, our efforts to combat it need to be comprehensive. And with the mayor's launching today of coordination and sustained strategies, we'll look at every angle, from prevention and intervention, to treat. I recently spent a day working

April 19, 2006

at outside in with their needle exchange and other programs, and disparity to hear that for low and no-income drug treatment options in Portland that there's up to a 400-person waiting list. These are people that want to get off drugs, want to get off alcohol abuse, and with a 400-person waiting list, months pass. And during those months all kinds of self-afflicted abuse happens, abuse to others, and costs to society. So I'm very optimistic that the strategy that you've set forward here is going to make a real impact, and I want to commend you again for your leadership in starting it. Aye.

Leonard: I do very much appreciate this strategy, and I'm just wondering if somehow we might have some capacity in what I now see as a continuation in your proposed budget, mayor, of our jail contract that includes \$500,000 for treatment. I think there was some capacity last year that we didn't utilize because of the lack of coordination or whatever, but I'm a true believer that treatment not just helps the individual, but serves the community by reducing crime. And victimization. And all of the issues associated with drug abuse and alcoholism. So I really appreciate this approach, and I will support any initiative like this or related to it. It makes all kinds of sense and is good for the community. Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Sten: I appreciate bringing this in, mayor. I thank Gary and all the folks, I was actually at an event for the recovery association last night, and there were a couple of hundred people there, all of whom had been clean and sober from a couple of days to many, many years. I just would say when you see the human potential and what actually happens when you invest in treatment as opposed to some of the other approaches, it's not only inspiring, it's actually a lot cheaper. And I was going to make the same comment I think Commissioner Leonard did, I hope we can wrap some of our jail and other strategies into this, because we do have resources there. Keep up the good work. It was - I was asked to come and give them some thoughts about six years ago, we started a project to build some alcohol and drug-free housing, which is now the northwest 8th building, and it's the home to a couple hundred people who are now really contributing to society. The quick story I would tell is just a couple weeks ago I was meeting with Mark Elan, one of the of largest developers in town and doing a lot in the brewery blocks, and he said the park blocks are safer because of that drug-free housing is there, as opposed to it shouldn't be there because it's bringing in the wrong element. His point of view was that the community of clean and sober people on the park blocks kept the park blocks cleaner because they actually know what should and shouldn't be going on, and are out there at night and enforcing things. So I think that was just a terrific example, and so I was - they were there last night to thank the city for some of our work and getting the housing in place, and it was the other way around. I got so much energy from the group, it inspired me to keep moving forward. So thanks again, you guys. Aye.

Potter: When communities come together and they develop integrated strategies all the way from prevention, to intervention, to treatment, to law enforcement strategies, the community is better served by it. And I really want to thank the office of national drug policy, control policy and their efforts to work with cities all over the United States. The commissioners received a map of the 25 cities, and there are several on the west coast, and we certainly appreciate their efforts to bring our communities together and to share lessons learned so we don't have to go back and reinvent the wheel. So we're looking forward to working with them, working with Carisa, and all the agents that are going to make our community safer. We all know here in Portland that most of the property crime is driven by drugs, and so by reducing the use of drugs, we can actually reduce crime. So it's an excellent crime prevention technique and I appreciate and applaud the efforts of everybody. Aye. [gavel pounded] we have one item remaining. Item 482, it's for a 10:30 time certain.

Item 482.

Sten: We're running a very fast meeting today.

Potter: Something is happening. Do we have the staff here that are going to speak to this issue? Can we go ahead and start? As people come in for signing up to speak, we can invite them up.

April 19, 2006

Potter: Please come forward.

Bob Alexander: Good morning, mayor and council. I'm bob alexander, with the Portland development commission. As a follow-up to the resolution presented last week, directing the Portland office of transportation to continue and complete work on the tram, the resolution before you today calls for implementing actions necessary to fund public infrastructure and affordable housing in the north macadam urban renewal area. One is the apartment answer of the report from the Portland development commission on the contract points of the eighth amendment to the south waterfront development agreement, and the second is implementing the actions necessary by city bureaus to assist in implementing resolution and ordinances. Apparently proceeding this resolution you have already approved the second reading of two ordinances related to construction and funding of the tram, and the financing for the other south waterfront projects. Last december city council requested the p.d.c. develop a comprehensive funding strategy for a number of projects in the south waterfront area, in addition to the tram, including affordable housing, parks, greenway, streetcar, and transportation projects. In response to that direction, the funding plan was developed for inclusion in the south waterfront development agreement. On april 11, 2006, the p.d.c. Commission directed the executive director to complete final negotiations and execute an eighth amendment to the south waterfront development agreement on april 12, resolution 36398 you directed Portland office of transportation to complete the tram. Based on those resolutions, the development agreement parties, ohsu, north macadam investors and p.d.c., will move forward to execute the eighth amendment. You heard at length the components of the agreement and they're also included in the attached resolution for your reference. I've provided with you copies of that presentation from your last meeting. P.d.c. Requires the assistance of various city bureaus, in this resolution it indicates the types of i.g.a.'s required to accomplish the eighth amendment and directs its bureau and offices to support that process. I.g.a.'s may include those with parks, pdot and o.m.f. It's our intent to bring back the completed eighth amendment in eight to 10 weeks for your acceptance and approval of the implementation of the amendment and the implementing the i.g.a.'s. I'll be happy to answer questions. Thank you.

Leonard: When did you want us to ask questions, mayor?

Potter: Please go ahead now.

Leonard: Can you explain the economic development bioscience initiative, specifically the proposed eighth amendment has adding 3.5 million to the current funding of \$5 million. What is the reason for that, and what is the source of \$3.5 million?

Alexander: The second part first, the tax increment financing will be the source.

Leonard: Paying for the extra --

Alexander: Correct. Which the purpose will be divide in addition two pots. One, approximately \$1.5 million will be in a joint strategy developed by p.d.c. And ohsu to attract bioscience industry -

Leonard: Does that mean --

Alexander: There will be a recruitment plan developed for that area. As you know, that was one of the promises of the potential of this area --

Leonard: You're confining your remarks just to the \$3.5 million extra?

Alexander: Yes. And the intent was to encourage bioscience industries to locate in that area next to ohsu, which has considerable research and development activities going on. So --

Leonard: I'm asking the \$1.5 million you're asking to -- using to attract groups there, literally how do you do that? Do you put -- are you buying advertisements, are you going to other cities, doing job kinds of fairs, what are you spending \$1.5 million on?

Alexander: The agreement, which is to be worked out, calls for a plan to be developed jointly with the p.d.c. and ohsu. I suspect it will include actual direct representation at those kinds of activities, bioscience industry activities that happen nationally.

April 19, 2006

Leonard: Is it fair to say the 1.5 million we would agree to in this extra \$3.5 million has no plan on how to spend it yet?

Alexander: The plan has not been developed. The idea would be to develop that plan with -- in conjunction with ohsu and in conjunction with our plans that the Oregon biosciences industry also had developed.

Leonard: The other \$2 million?

Alexander: It would be used for direct reimbursement of actual construction by bioscience industries to help them physically locate in that area. This would be for bricks and mortar kinds of improvements to their facilities. This is similar to a plan we have existing in all the other you're ban renewal areas.

Leonard: Like? Give me an example.

Alexander: Tenant improvement that's go into an area developing actual labs.

Leonard: Isn't it accurate typically in those kinds of tenant improvements people move in, they pay rent, and part of that rent is in taxes, property taxes? Isn't it accurate in this case this building will not pay property taxes?

Alexander: It depends on the ownership of the building. Typically if there's a leased situation and you have a for-profit company, there are taxes due on that property. If it goes into the ohsu one building, it may not pay taxes, i'm not -- I can't answer that definitively. This is not intended strictly for ohsu one, it's intended for the entire south waterfront area. So it could go anywhere.

Leonard: The \$2 million intended for the entire -- what is the specific plan to spend that, or is it the case that you haven't developed a specific plan for that \$2 million?

Alexander: It's an opportunity fund, similar to what exists in all the other 10 you're ban -- urban renewal areas, so it would be based on a qualifying company that would have to make application. They would have to have certain job generation in order to justify that. Typically in those other areas we would give them between \$2,000 and \$4,000 per job generated.

Leonard: Why is this in an amendment and not in the original development agreement? Why is this kind of initiative being added on at this late date?

Alexander: As you know, there was not funding to do everything that we wanted to do in that area. Economic development was one of those things that really had to come after all the basic infrastructure things. So our own commission actually asked that we put money in for economic development for north macadam area, which wasn't previously -- we weren't able to fund because we didn't have the tax increment generated.

Leonard: If what I read this morning is accurate and we actually have a shortfall in property tax revenues in the district, why would we add something that wouldn't appear to be absolutely necessary and in fact doesn't even have a specific plan on how to spend the money? I'm unclear why we would authorize those dollars given the lack of resource that's we'd earlier projected in property tax revenues. It seems like something should go, and this might be -- I have obviously other choices I would make as well, but this seems to be one that doesn't seem to be critical for the development of the district. I'm unclear why we would fund that.

Alexander: I think it's a question of timing. This plan is over a five-year period, roughly \$700,000 a year would be dedicated to this particular of effort over that five-year period. The article that you read this morning talks about a shortfall for the first two years, several hundred thousands, and after that there's an increase over what the original plan.

Leonard: If the market stays hot for condos, clearly in the context that I read it, that we're depending --

Alexander: I think there's some other -- perhaps ken russ can add reace that more fully. I believe with the gap payment obligation that's being provided, there minimizes the amount of risk to go forward, and in the first two years, \$700,000 a year would be dedicated towards this economic development effort.

Potter: And there's --

April 19, 2006

Leonard: There's -- this i'm asking to help you help me understand better this relationship that exists, and I haven't been able to figure this out. There's a group of physicians that work for ohsu that have developed a 5013c for the purpose of developing specific projects. Is that accurate?

Alexander: I believe that's true. I believe they're participants, but I don't have details.

Leonard: You don't have any relationship with them?

Alexander: I do not.

Leonard: Ok. Obviously a lot of this discussion has been around the tram, but there appears there's other unrelated issues, at least not directly related to the tram. Another one is the transportation infrastructure contingency, the eighth amendment apparently provides for p.d.c. Funding. That's all I have, it provides p.d.c. Funding of \$3 million to cover unanticipated shortfalls. I assume that's apart from the tram.

Alexander: Yes.

Leonard: That is specific to the streetcar?

Alexander: Streetcar, roads, other transportation issues that could happen within that area.

Leonard: Can you explain to me this shortfall? What is the basis for that shortfall?

Alexander: I'm sorry --

Leonard: You're asking for \$3 million. What i'm reading is a document -- is the amendment, page 5, board report number 06-3a, item g. Are you there?

Alexander: Yes.

Leonard: Item g, transportation infrastructure contingency. The eighth amendment provides for p.d.c. funding of \$3 million, a transportation infrastructure contingency to cover unanticipated shortfalls in transportation projects.

*******:** Right.

Leonard: So this is new money. Correct?

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

Leonard: Ok. So i'm asking why do we need new money? What happened that caused us to need new money, beyond to cause us to include this in the amendment beyond the original funding that we approved in 2003?

Alexander: Again, we believe it's prudent to have a contingency for the transportation projects there. There are road projects in that area that have had some difficulties --

Leonard: For instance?

Alexander: I believe -- I don't have the specific roads, but I think gibbs and related cross streets to gibbs road also extension of the streetcar, there may shall potential shortfalls relative to funding of the streetcar itself.

Adams: And there also is -- we have to come up with a match for the macadam interchange state grant, it's a matching grant.

Leonard: You have -- we're voting to give \$3 million in new money s in anywhere in here, or is there something available that specifically outlines how you got the \$3 million, what that is for? You've mentioned the gibbs street problem, you've mentioned funding of the streetcar problem. Is that itemized somewhere?

Adams: My understanding, bob, correct me if i'm wrong, this is to be viewed as a contingency as opposed to having -- we know there's -- we -- there's a \$15 million potential match for the macadam interchange time prove access to south waterfront that we don't have any money identified for that, and I think the discussion has been -- there's been concerns about potential increased costs in the budgets related to the extension of the streetcar to gibbs, so based on the experience of the tram, where cost for basic materials have gone up, that might or might not be reflected in all the existing budgets for all the transportation projects. It gives me some reassurance that we have a contingency set aside for it.

Leonard: My understanding of contingencies, I have some experience in dealing with budgets beyond here at the council, is contingencies are for unanticipated expenses that may occur. What

April 19, 2006

i've heard you say is you anticipate there to be additional expenses because of gibbs street and because of the streetcar, and i'm asking to have more than just you say you think that there are going to be cost overrun-ins a document. What is it that you base that on? Is it something -- some extra construction costs we didn't realize early on? Let necessity get right to the point. I am uncomfortable doesn't quite capture how I feel about creating a contingency fund for dollars that we know are going to be spent somewhere. If you know where they're going to be expect, I expect to know today, and how -- or before we vote if not today, how that money is intended to be spent. If you know right now that the streetcar is going to cost x hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars more than what we're projecting, if you know right now because of these other projects --

Adams: We don't.

Leonard: I just heard -- i'm not asking you this question, commissioner, i'm asking this of p.d.c.

Adams: This was developed in consul station with my bureau, soy feel the need to try to clarify. We don't know exactly, and we hope that we will not have to use this contingency, but I will tell you it's likely that we will. We already know just one project where we lack a match of \$15 million.

Leonard: Which project?

Adams: That would be the interchange, to make interchange improvements from south waterfront from i-5. So --

Leonard: I'm not trying to put on you the spot. Let me ask my question. What i'm asking is what I heard out of bob is that we think the cost of the streetcar is going to be more than what is projected. Is that accurate or not?

Adams: I'm going to answer that question, because it's my project. I know you're asking bob, but bob isn't the expert on transportation issues. We have --

Leonard: I'm just asking for an answer. I don't care who answers it. Is it going to come in beyond what is projected or not?

Adams: The reason we don't know for sure, we haven't programmed the money right now, and we put it in contingency, is so that we have to go back to decision-makers. I think this is a more prudent conservative approach than simply assigning it. We also have a number of things in the air.

We're currently negotiating, will be negotiating with odot regarding the match requirements and the assumptions about improving the interstate on-ramp off-ramp on south waterfront. So those conversations are underway. They're not definitive, so I can't assign -- I can't ask for anything specifically. The streetcar extension still has to go the further extensions to gibbs still have to go through preliminary engineering. So we have to come back. These are not automatic. This is not an automatic contingency. We would have to come back for approval, and the reason that we put it in there and asked for it is because I don't want to face what the tram has endured, and that is inadequate contingencies.

Leonard: Ok. I want to put in context this question. I think commissioner Adams, since he got this assignment, has done an outstanding job. I believe he continues to do an outstanding job. But there has been no little criticism of three of us here on the council of which commissioner Adams and mayor Potter were not a part of, because of a lack of questioning when this original development agreement came through a short time after I arrived on council. I've looked back at the transcript, i've appreciated the questions that both commissioner Sten and Saltzman asked at the time, and I will note I asked none. That's not going to happen this time. I took for faith a lot of what was being presented. I'm not taking it for faith this time. Soy hope I don't offend anybody by these questions, but I want you to understand the community can't have it both ways. They can't say, well, accept on faith, or I shouldn't even mean the community, some can't have it both ways. You can't expect on the one hand me to take on faith what you're saying and on the other hand say, you didn't ask me at the time. So i'm asking and i'm going to push a little harder on the specific issue of the streetcar, because this has my attention right now. And it has my attention because i'm not satisfied with

April 19, 2006

what i'm hearing. What i'm asking straightforward is, do you anticipate -- what -- when we first approved the streetcar, I was here. And we had a construction amount. What was that?

Greg Jones: Greg jones with transportation. We've -- what last came before council was the gibbs street extension that. Took the streetcar from riverplace down to gibbs. And I believe it was about a \$6 million expenditure.

Leonard: We had a specific number.

Jones: We had a specific number. And -- it involved the purchase of some additional cars.

Leonard: The original number.

Jones: Right. What's being discussed at this point is the extension from gibbs down to lowell through the central district. So that's the next link of streetcar.

Leonard: Is this --

Jones: That has to go back to council for formation through an l.i.d., and that would happen this summer with the intent to construct or start construction in august.

Adams: And if I could add to that, we've applied -- you're going to have to be patient. This is my project.

Leonard: I wish you'd take notes on what you want to ask me so you can finish my line.

Adams: I need to add to the factual basis. I appreciate the questions. I think it's important. But you need to get additional I want to make sure you're getting full answers, and these are my projects, you're going to have to bear with me. We have asked for money from correct Oregon on the gaps we face on the streetcar in south waterfront. So we know we have a lack of a match on the interchange. And so there are a variety of different things that we are hustling to find money for outside of p.d.c., outside of city resources, because we have gaps on transportation projects.

Leonard: That's not my issue. New projects, if you're talking about an extension that was beyond the original project we approved, I see that in my reasoning as distinctly different than costs beyond what we originally projected for the original project. My comments and queries at this point are focused on the original project, what the cost was.

Adams: Costs have gone up.

Leonard: But let me get there in my own way, please. We agreed according to you, to pay \$6 million for the extension from riverplace to gibbs street.

Jones: Which is where the tram, that's where the tram --

Leonard: This will go a lot quicker if people just listen to my question and answer it. What i'm asking is, the \$6 million that we originally projected that cost to be. That greater now than what we projected it to be then? And if so, by how much?

Jones: No, it's not. Basically we're closing that project out and we'll start operations in probably the end of july or early august. And that will come back to council with a final assessment on that l.i.d. Fairly soon.

Leonard: We're on target, on budget. So when bob said there's increased costs to the streetcar, was he referring to the new extension that we have not --

Jones: That's right. The lowell extension was a phase two project under the original d.a., and it's being advance. So the question is --

Leonard: How much is that?

Jones: I believe the cost is about \$11 million for that.

Leonard: That's not related to this \$3.5 million contingency fund.

Jones: We're pulling together a bunch of funding sources for that extension, for the lowell extension.

Leonard: We've identified that 1.5 million of the of \$3.5 million contingency transportation fund is for recruitment.

Alexander: No. The \$3.5 million is for economic development. \$1.5 million was a portion of that recruited the, \$2 million for tax increment. So that's the \$3.5 million. There's a separate \$3 million infrastructure contingency.

April 19, 2006

Leonard: I'm talking about the \$3.5 million we started talking about, item g on page 5.

Alexander: \$3 million, yes.

Leonard: I'm sorry. So the biotech recruitment was how much of that \$3 million?

Alexander: That's all in item f, economic development, \$3.5 million.

Leonard: The eighth amendment provides for p.d.c. Funding of \$3 million transportation infrastructure contingency to cover unanticipated shortfalls and transportation projects.

Alexander: Correct.

Leonard: I guided you to do that and you read that and I understood you to say that \$1.5 million was for --

Jones: That was in response to your previous question about economic development.

Leonard: On item five. Ok. And item g, what is the \$3 million for in item g?

Alexander: The \$3 million was for potential cost overruns on streets and potentially things like the streetcar in that area.

Leonard: I want to bring this back so it all relates. So I asked about the \$6 million original estimate, and what I heard is, there isn't any anticipated overrun of the original estimate.

Jones: That's right, for the extension to gibbs.

Leonard: But the second portion, would it be fair to characterize that as an overrun, or is that a brand-new project?

Jones: It is a new project. It is not an overrun. We --

Leonard: What were you talking about when you mentioned the \$3 million may be needed to help cover costs for the streetcar?

Alexander: I said it potentially may be one of the -- you asked for examples of how the contingency may be spent, and I said it could be spent either on -- to cover unanticipated costs for the streets and/or for the streetcar in that area.

Leonard: All right. That helps clear that up. Thank you. Of the \$3 million. If we approve this \$3 million, what I want a clearance, is any of that \$3 million contingency fund known at this point to be dedicated to any project because of cost overruns?

Alexander: No, it is not.

Leonard: Ok. That's clearer.

Adams: I want to be very clear, the reason I welcome this contingency, some of the budgets for some of the streets, for instance, are based on pre-katrina estimates. And therefore the contingency is probably prudent. Again, I would not support an automatic draw on the contingency. It has to make its way back through the decision-makers, and we are aware of -- we have yet to identify, and we're trying to get some exception and waivers to the requirements on the interchange on i-5. But we haven't received those yet.

Leonard: And I appreciate that. That makes total sense to me. I do want to jump back up to item f. I think I was waiting between the two and I apologize for that. So i'm clear, I think you've answered this, but I think as I said I think I was going back and forth between the two items and started confusing them. The \$3.5 million in item f for economic development, \$1.5 million would be characterized as the dollars you're going to spend for attempting to recruit biotech industry businesses into that building.

Alexander: Into that area, geographic area.

Leonard: Not a specific building. And the other \$2 million, i'm sorry?

Alexander: It would be used for bricks and mortar, to help a company actually do build-out within their facility to do labs, that kind of research work. Within the urban renewal area.

Leonard: Gotcha. I think i've probably covered the questions that I -- I think it's just characterized differently in different places. Is that accurate? It seems the report --

Alexander: We tried to be consistent, but there may be some different references.

Leonard: This item b on page 4 of that same report says in -- and it's talking about them, I just have a question mark, you may have answered it already, it says pdot has agreed to provide \$1 million

April 19, 2006

towards the lowell extension of the streetcar, and has applied for \$2.1 million from odot. Is that what you were speaking to? And the million dollars is for the \$11 million project, not the \$6 million original project.

Alexander: That's my understanding.

Adams: Not for phase one, for phase two. You got it.

Leonard: Ok. Thank you for your patience with me. I think that covers -- I do have -- on page 5 I had a question mark. You may have addressed this, but it just -- I need to have it clarified. In the same report, page 5, item c, p.d.c. will provide an amount equal to 50% of the t.i.f. proceeds from actual taxable value to applied to the construction of the block 33 parking garage. I've read and heard other references to that. Can you explain that to me?

Alexander: Certainly. The primary intent with this particular clause was to encourage ohsu obviously what they bill primarily will be tax exempt within that area as an educational institution. But to the extent that they would encourage taxable development in that area, we would want to be able to use a certain percentage of that taxable development to help --

Leonard: The parking garage --

Alexander: The parking garage itself wouldn't, but another taxable use would.

Leonard: Why wouldn't a parking garage be taxable?

Alexander: Well, I guess it could be taxable, but it typically the parking garages that we have are not taxable within the city.

Leonard: Parks and garages in the city are not taxable?

Alexander: Right.

Leonard: In general?

Alexander: Well, I may stand corrected on that issue, but I don't believe they are.

Leonard: Smart park and city center parking, they must pay taxes.

Alexander: I honestly don't know. If in -- in this case it doesn't relate to the parking garage itself, it relates to other taxable buildings that could be built.

Leonard: What would be an example of something that they would pay taxes on that they would build?

Alexander: It could be a senior center, a hotel, perhaps. If those kinds of facilities were built, revenue from that could be used to help pay for the parking garage, which in effect is the platform for our affordable housing. And we expect to have between 200-400 units of affordable housing on top of that parking garage. So it would be a way to assist get can that parking garage built.

Leonard: What kicks in the requirement that a development by ohsu would have to pay property taxes? What is the point at which you cross the line from them not having to have it? Is there some objective criteria?

Alexander: There is, and it's done by the county assessor. But I believe it relates to the actual use in the building at the time.

Leonard: I see. And I apologize, I do have -- I found another note here. This is in exhibit a. On page three. Again, I don't know that via concern so much as I don't really understand what this is describing. So exhibit a, page three, it's item f, e and f, and it's somewhat lengthy, but it's basically what it says is ohsu's applied for and obtained some s.d.c. Transportation credits concurrent with -- in accordance with current code. And the part I have a question about is actually under sub two.

Potter: Which one are you referring to?

*******:** Exhibit a, not the development agreement itself.

Potter: I've got exhibit a.

Leonard: Page three, starting at item f. Roman numeral two, f, sub one, two after that. So i'm focused on item f, sub one, two. It's talking about s.d.c. Credits that ohsu has. And the part that i'm asking about is in sub two where it says "changes to state or federal law result -- that result in decreased value of f.d.c. Credits the parties will negotiate in good faith." " holds ohsu harmless

April 19, 2006

from such fate or federal action." when I read that that leads to me as though we're agreeing to give ohsu money if somehow the feds take away a credit. Am I reading that incorrectly?

Alexander: There was issues related to s.d.c. Transportation credits, and if --

Leonard: What are those?

Alexander: The credits for transportation for investment and qualified transportation projects.

Leonard: Those are federal credits?

Alexander: No, those are primarily city credits.

Leonard: I'm asking because this references state or federal law that result in decreased value of the s.d.c. Credits.

Alexander: Right. Sub one of that particular section relates to city changes in that law, the second would relate to state or federal regulations that may change or prohibit the use of that. So there's the idea here was, there was a certain value which was indicated that we --

Leonard: I'm asking what that is, because I don't know what that is. Why would a -- an entity that doesn't operate for profit have any use of a federal credit? I don't understand?

Jones: Greg jones again with transportation. The concern is these are city transportation s.d.c. Credits, so if --

Leonard: What's that mean?

Jones: If you build a qualified improvement that's on the s.d.c. List, so if you make an improvement through a permit process or some development activity, you get credit towards a future s.d.c. charge. Ohsu has done that in this case.

Leonard: Give me an example.

Jones: In south waterfront they've made improvements related to the tram, which is a qualified improvement. So the concern is that if the legislature were to change the state systems development charge ordinance in some way that would prohibit credits or would modify the way credits could be given, then this language would kick in.

Leonard: I'm going to ask you some questions so I can understand what you just said. What I heard you say is because of ohsu's investment in the tram, it qualifies them to not pay or have a credit that they would otherwise have to pay for s.d.c.'s system development charges.

Jones: In the future, right.

Leonard: So what's the future? Another building?

*******:** That's right.

Leonard: So I want to go from that to a building. What's the next projected building that credit could apply to?

Jones: For example f. They were to build something in the Oregon graduate center.

Leonard: And a credit would be a percentage of the value of the building.

Jones: Right. Based upon the traffic impacts resulting from that building.

Leonard: How much in credits are they getting because of the construction of the tram? Have we quantified that?

Jones: I believe so.

Alexander: It was capped there in item e above at \$4.3 million. The.

Leonard: The amount they would pay?

Alexander: The amount they would be capped for credits.

Leonard: Total?

Alexander: Yes.

Leonard: What would it be without that agreement, that cap?

Saltzman: 4.3 million.

*******:** 4.3 is the cap.

Leonard: If you didn't have a cap and they were paying s.d.c.'s as anybody else would, what is the projected value to them of having the \$4.3 million cap. If they didn't have this agreement, let's just

April 19, 2006

-- i'm going to throw outlets say normally they would owe \$10 million in s.d.c.'s because of this cap it's \$4.3 million, so we've saved them --

Alexander: Using your math, if it was a \$10 million charge, the maximum they could get back was \$4.3, so they'd still have to pay \$5 --

Leonard: The credit is 4.3 --

Alexander: Right.

Leonard: Ok. So we know the extent -- the absolute maximum ceiling of the credit, and that is the \$4.3 million.

*****: That's correct.

Leonard: Will they hit that \$4.3 million?

Jones: It's available to them for the next 10 years.

Leonard: They will hit it.

*****: That's right.

Leonard: So this is not in the original agreement?

Alexander: It's a credit procedure --

Leonard: I understand that, but this is new in this agreement. Why did we agree to a cap for ohsu on system development charges that anybody else would pay? What was the reason for us agreeing to that?

Alexander: I think we wanted to restrict the total amount of credit they might be able to get.

Leonard: Why?

Alexander: I think because the -- this particular issue we wanted to make sure that based on their total investment into the tram, which is roughly \$9.5 million, that roughly half of that amount, \$4.3, was considered to be a reasonable amount. It was part of an overall negotiation --

Leonard: They're not really paying \$9.3 million, they're paying \$9.3 million minus \$4.3. Is that right?

*****: That's correct -- well, they're getting a credit for \$4.3 million in future -- against --

Leonard: That they would otherwise pay without this agreement.

*****: That is correct.

Leonard: That's why us handing them a check for \$4.3 million.

Alexander: They would have gotten the credit anyway.

Leonard: Why?

Jones: In the s.d.c. Ordinance allows for this credit.

Leonard: Doesn't the council have to vote for that?

Jones: Anyone can apply for a credit at the time they make an improvement that's a qualified improvement under the s.d.c. Ordinance.

Adams: Why don't you just for the sake of all of us, how does one qualify for an s.d.c. credit?

Jones: The qualification for an s.d.c. credit is based upon making an improvement that is one of the projects that is identified in the capital improvement program for the s.d.c. program. For the transportation s.d.c. program. So it can't be just any improvement, any transportation improvement, it has to be specific to those that are identified in the --

Potter: Why --

Leonard: Why did you put it in the development agreement if they would have qualified it anyway?

Jones: It was a way to clarify and answer the question as to what would be available to them.

Leonard: It is because they thought they might not qualify?

Jones: I think it's -- I don't think so. It was a way to give them some surety.

Adams: If I could just, commissioner, clarify, when a private contractor or private individual pays for a public improvement, they potentially qualify for an s.d.c. credit?

Jones: That's right. It's a project that's on the s.d.c. list, or it's a project that was required through a land use action.

April 19, 2006

Leonard: How did you come up with the \$4.3 million? Is there a formula? How did you arrive at that number?

Jones: We went through a process to identify how much improvement is a part of the patient services building up on the upper campus area was specifically made for the -- to accommodate the tram. And ohsu went through an accounting process to figure out how much of that building was specifically for improvements for the tram.

Leonard: So we lied on the number ohsu gave us.

Jones: We checked it.

Leonard: How did we check it?

Jones: We went back through the records to look at what they said those improvements were.

Leonard: Is it a matter in this s.d.c. Credit provision that you say exists, is it a matter of plugging numbers into a formula that pops out the credit at the end, or is there some subjectivity involved?

Jones: I'd say there's some subjectivity involved. It isn't a formula-based process.

Leonard: I'm asking how you came up with the \$4.3 million, then.

Jones: Ok. First we worked -- we first needed to determine out of the total cost how much excess capacity was being provided as a part of the tram. And then we looked at how much investment ohsu made into the building itself. Christie white, ohsu's attorney, was -- worked with us to develop that. I think she's here today if you have specific questions. But the cost in the patient services building, we went through their files in terms of their actual expenses to look at what improvement were made specifically to accommodate the tram that would not otherwise have had to have been built.

Leonard: Is it fair for me to conclude that there are -- their cull contribution is offset by the city for \$4.3 million to the construction of the tram?

Adams: I think it's fair.

*******:** If they were to use all of those credits. But it's capped at \$4.3.

Adams: I think it's a fair -- your statement is a fair statement.

Leonard: Ok. I think I have other question, but I think it will go beyond -- it will be tedium and really relate to the same points. I'm done.

*******:** [inaudible]

Potter: You're out of order.

Sue Keil: I'm not as grounded in this as some other people are, but the simple explanation for me is when you look at the excess capacity provided --

Leonard: Are you talking about the s.d.c.?

Keil: Yes. When you look at the excess capacity that --

Potter: Please state your name for the record.

Keil: Susan keil, transportation. Sorry. There is a percentage of excess capacity that is provided by that tram.

Leonard: What's that mean?

Keil: That means that we're projecting usage of x and there is the ability to carry people beyond what we believe ohsu will use at this point in time. They're building this thing and there is capacity beyond their own requirements on it. So that excess capacity percentage is applied against the investment for this transportation improvement. And that's what the s.d.c. is developed on.

Leonard: That may be, but what is kind of a burr under my saddle is they are characterized, they being ohsu, they're stepping up with \$9 million to cover the increased cost, when in fact no attention has been paid to this city offset to them beyond the extra \$5 million that we're paying beyond the \$3.5 million we've previously agreed to pay, beyond -- and I don't know who to ask about this lobbying credit. Who is it that I can ask questions about that?

Alexander: I could answer questions about that.

Leonard: What in the world is that?

Alexander: I've never heard of such a thing. He's running, and I don't blame him.

April 19, 2006

Adams: Are you running, greg?

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

Leonard: Where did that come from? We give them a credit for lobbying Washington, d.c. For a grant?

Alexander: Right. Those grants were to be used for infrastructure within the north macadam urban renewal area. We could not pay for a lobbyist, so they agreed to go ahead --

Leonard: We have a lobbyist. We have two lobbyists in Washington, d.c. That's what they do.

*******:** So this lobbyist --

Leonard: You said we don't have a lobbyist. We do. We pay them. I meet with them. They're very effective.

*******:** We actually worked through our city lobbyist initially and I think we got something less than \$50,000 for infrastructure in that area.

Leonard: How much are we giving them because of this lobbying credit? What's that amount to?

Alexander: The total amount owed is based I believe to -- the formula was based on an amount over \$5.6 million, and I think the amount they actually got in terms of infrastructure, assistance in that area was \$12 million.

Leonard: What -- have you ever heard of such an agreement between any two entities before?

Alexander: I think it's -- commissioner, I believe it is a good deal for the city. With got an additional -- we got an additional \$6 million worth of money --

Leonard: How much did we give them back?

Alexander: We haven't given them back anything yet. We will be giving them \$3.4 million that they can use for other projects within that area.

Leonard: Ohsu is a public body. Why isn't it out lobbying on its own behalf for its own interest?

Alexander: The interest is not for them directly, it's for the urban renewal area itself, and for public infrastructure within that area.

Leonard: Don't they benefit from the urban renewal area as well?

Alexander: As do all the citizens.

Leonard: Why it is we are on the hook for everything they do? Including lobbying? I don't quite get that. I just -- i've seen many agreements from state government and local government, i've never heard of such a deal. It must have been their idea. It's not something we proposed.

*******:** I think that was reached as a mutual agreement between ohsu and ourselves. After our --

Leonard: I can --

*******:** After the city's lobbyist was not successful in getting any funds for the area.

Leonard: I can only vote no once, so I should probably stop.

Adams: What was the total cost of the lobbying?

*******:** I'm not sure what they actually paid directly for lobbying. I think it was over a million dollars in lobbying costs. And the amount of money that we would be using is basically a credit that would go back against infrastructure within the area.

Sten: How much was that again?

*******:** \$3.4 million, I believe.

Sten: That was the amount we're paying them back?

Alexander: That would be allowed as a credit. Initially it was allowed as a credit against phase two infrastructure that would be required in the area. They could use that since many of the phase two projects were being brought forward that \$3.4 million could be used for infrastructure requirements within the area.

Sten: Was there an invoice -- public document on what our lobbying money was spent on, since it was our money? Who was paid how much and how much they worked?

Alexander: I have not seen that record, commissioner, so I don't know what that number is.

Sten: Would it be usual and customary to accept a bill without documentation, or is that a special arrangement for ohsu?

April 19, 2006

Alexander: We don't have a bill at that point that i've seen, but we believe that would be the amount. It's actually based on the amount of money received from the federal government for projects within the area, so I expect that the pedestrian overpass, when it is constructed, will be -- that's what the money will be used for.

Sten: So it's not a credit on their actual cost of lobbying? The original concept was we weren't allowed to hire a lobbyist, or we couldn't afford it?

Alexander: Our lobbyist wasn't effective in getting the funds we needed to build the infrastructure in that area. This is part of the seventh amendment that was done about two years ago.

Sten: I know who they hired and I get that argument, I just am trying to get at why we would give a bunch of bonus money beyond what it costs and -- there's a series of questions.

Alexander: I believe we felt that we had come up with some sort of a cautionary mechanism ultimately and it ought to be based on their success, and getting additional funding for the public.

Sten: Their money was based on the amount of grant they got, not amount of costs. It would seem like if it's cost sharing, wouldn't you share the cost of the lobbyist as opposed to the results of the lobbyist?

Alexander: That's another way you could do it.

Potter: You just said amendment number seven, not the new amendment. It's already approved previously.

Alexander: It is.

Saltzman: This federal money is largely to go for the pedestrian bridge?

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

Saltzman: That was one of my questions. The pedestrian bridge is still very much alive and kicking in this whole deal?

Alexander: It depends upon, as you know, appropriation and earmarked and it depends on how much money we actually get in will determine the ultimate amount that would be shared further infrastructure.

Saltzman: Do we have a federal appropriation secured in hand for the pedestrian bridge? We --

Alexander: We have a federal appropriation. We do have the money in hand.

Saltzman: Cleared by congress, signed into law by the president?

*******:** Commissioner, i'm sort of how the end of my -- I think the total amount was \$12 million, but it's going to be an -- actually appropriated at the city over several years, and we think based on the way the federal folks dole out the money, it's like 89 or 93% of the total appropriation amount. So ultimately --

Saltzman: My question is. It's an appropriation that's already been previously approved by congress, signed into law, it's not something --

*******:** It has.

Saltzman: Not something in the current congress. Ok.

Jones: Maybe I can help out. Greg Jones again with transportation. The \$11 million mark was approved as part of the national transportation bill in 2005. We are in the process right now of going through the -- developing the design cost estimating information to submit and get an idea -- an i.d.a. with odot so we can have access to the money. What Bob is referring to is you get that money on an annual basis, and congress imposes a debt ceiling or limitation each year. So what they tell you you're going to get at the beginning and what you actually get on an annual basis varies upon what that obligation is every year. Right now it's about 15%. So you get about 15% less each year. At this point we believe we still have enough funds to do the pedestrian bridge.

Adams: I'd like to ask a follow-up question on commissioner Leonard's questions, which I think are excellent and appropriate, and healthy. So if one was to add up all the direct and indirect contributions, indirect, direct, and indirect expenditures that arguably help OHSU and then all of their expenditures direct and indirect, that mostly benefit the public that are being done so at our request,

April 19, 2006

whoever we are, p.d.x. Or -- p.d.c. Or otherwise, has anyone done sort of the net of that? The net summation of that total?

*****: I don't know that we've really done it in that way, commissioner.

Leonard: You haven't estimated how much we're actually giving in tax money for the tram from the city? In s.d.c.'s and tiff money, and lobbying credits and all that? You haven't added all that up?

Adams: I think you mean -- yeah. The overall polamalues and minuses on both sides?

Leonard: You haven't?

*****: We have not, no.

Adams: When I added it up, depended on how you look at it, the direct and indirect benefits to ohsu I think are what, between \$8 million and \$14 million, but that's on the back of an envelope. Based on the information I have. But I haven't added up the expenditures they're making that are largely of benefit to the public. I don't necessarily know all that.

Potter: Further questions.

Saltzman: I guess I need to come back to the pedestrian bridge. I'm a little concerned here. So money has been appropriated, but the federal government basically is not allowing us to capture the full amount of that appropriation by basically -- no.

Saltzman: Impressing it's by 15% a year or withholding 15% probably to do a larger budget balancing routine. So how do we know we're not going to end up short?

Jones: I think the 15% limitation, the -- the haircut they would take off the top per year, and again, we get the money in annual increments. It would certainly be the worst case obligation limitation that congress would impose. That's the most i've seen over the last bill.

Saltzman: So how many years are we going to draw this money out?

Jones: You draw it out through 2009. And --

Adams: That's unfortunately pretty standard for most transportation-related projects.

*****: Right.

Adams: However, once you're in the funding pipeline they don't cut you off. They can trim you, but they don't --

Saltzman: Are we in risk of being trimmed to where we suddenly can't complete the \$4 million pedestrian bridge?

Jones: No. It is not going to be a \$4 million bridge. The cost estimating that we're starting to do it, there was no cost estimate that was done originally, that was just someone thought that would be the approximate cost. We're in the process with kpff, a local engineering firm, doing the cost estimating right now to get that moving forwards. Would I say the more likely scenario is it's probably \$7 million, \$7 million range. What i'd like to bring back is the options. If you want to do it for less so you can move and use more of those funds for something else, then we need to have that discussion about what range of improvement you want to make.

Saltzman: My other concern is we don't have enough appropriation to do it, and you're saying that's not going to happen.

Jones: The other flip side to the obligation limitation is congress also gives you inflation money through the life of the bill, so while they take it away, they can also give back money during that same process.

Adams: I just want to qualify greg's accurate portrayal of our intentions. We don't know what the federal government will do exactly. We can't speak with total certainty, but we've got great delegation support on this, we've lobbied, i've personally lobbied on it four times in d.c., and everyone, congresswoman hooley and representative blumenauer, and defazio, all have this as a high priority, which is to our benefit. But nothing is certain and the price range that you've heard is based on total guess mats at this point of qualified individuals, but it is guess mats.

Jones: And it is a reimbursement grant. In other words, you don't get the money up front as you make the improvements you get reimbursed. So as commissioner said, congress could do

April 19, 2006

something we can't anticipate that might affect that bill. It's not been done in the past. Can't rule it out.

Adams: Taking on this project I was clear, campaign promise, I wouldn't move forward on the tram if I didn't feel certain the funding was there for the pedestrian bridge, and I still hold to that commitment. Based on my experience, this is as good a commitment as we can possibly get from the folks that provide these kinds of resources.

Jones: In the last transportation bill we built the north lombard overcrossing, about an \$18 million project. Same kind of ear mark, same issues, got it over the life of the bill, didn't have think problems on that one.

Saltzman: In a worse case scenario were the federal money not to be official -- sufficient, we would need another amendment to the development agreement to ensure the three parties to the development agreement come up with the money.

Adams: That's part of why the \$3 million contingency in transportation is important. The pedestrian bridge is not entirely within the tax increment district, but it's another one of those uncertainties that for which the transportation contingency I think is a transparent way to flag up front there are still unknowns on a variety of projects, and I think what's prudent.

Potter: Further questions. Thank you, folks.

Leonard: Thank you.

Potter: Was there a sign-up sheet?

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

Teresa Teater: Good morning. Did I road construction for 15 years -- teresa teeter. Oregon city. I did road construction for 15 years in nebraska, and I had slipped --

Potter: Start the timer, sue.

Teater: I had slipped message to commissioner Leonard a couple weeks ago about penalties for future cost overruns. You should probably implement penalties on any new projects in the city that you're giving city dollars out to. And my other suggestion is that you sublet out for cheaper bids on possible contingency problems, you know, like the major company that's building the projects, you know, and come back to you with the cheapest bid and let you folks decide on who's going to fix the problem instead of just letting this company go out and run up a massive bill. Show the possible cost projection increase of cost and labor, in case there's a cost of living increase, you have to pay higher salaries to many employees, and also to -- this is the big one, if they don't use a contingency dollars, get them back. Ask for them back. And the other thing that we had the 15 years I observed was a lot of bid letting, and it got busted by the feds all the time. So after the jobs were settled on who was going to do what, if you got the job done ahead of time, you got a \$5,000 bonus, I think it was per day to get the job done sooner because it cut down on traffic accidents on the highway that's we were working on. If we had to make everything go down to two lanes, head-on collision, insurance companies appreciated this. And so they wound up working over time, but it was offset by getting the job done sooner and cutting down on costs. Thank you very much. Get those contingency funds back.in the event they don't use them and prove what they used them on.

Potter: Thank you.

Potter: I do hear a motion to accept the record?

Adams: So moved.

Saltzman: Second.

Potter: Please call the vote.

Adams: I just want to maybe underscore a portion of the comments I provided last time. It is clear we are making a very large investment in ohsu, and in turn, ohsu is making a very large investment in their campus here in the city of Portland. This deal has risks, as is associated with taking a brownfield and turning it into something productive. This deal is not perfect. I've never come across a deal that I agree 100%, however, this particular deal has earned my support for a couple of reasons. And I would just like to highlight the fact as I said last time, that as good as Portland is

April 19, 2006

during each evaluation of our city, the achilles heel that is often pointed out is that we lack a top tier research university in this region. And so we don't get the benefits that the bostons, austin, and seattles get from having university of massachusetts, university of texas, and university of Washington, and the jobs and the research for the local communities that come from having a top tier college or university in the community. We are living in the most cutthroat economy, global economy that we have ever witnessed, and we will be punished if we don't make efforts to raise up our universities and colleges. I was part of a team under mayor katz that invested for the first time real dollars into Portland state university, \$8 million that helped complete the urban studies center, the school of engineering, not to mention the investments into the streetcar connection for p.s.u. \$8 million for p.s.u., I think it was a good investment and I think we need to make more there. This is an investment in ohsu. It's a public-private partnership, they're our largest employer, as a percentage it's a very high percentage of family wage jobs. And the fact that during the course of these arduous but necessary negotiations they've agreed to consolidate their campuses here in the city of Portland, I think is an often overlooked benefit of moving forward. As many know in the room, I have been a demanding -- demanding participant in these discussions. My support for south waterfront, my support for ohsu, for the tram, has not been a blank check, and I have been a very active and demanding participant. We have all had to compromise. And I do think that the line of questioning of commissioner Leonard is very useful, and buying very tragedies apparent with the public what are the indirect and direct costs and benefits of the major stakeholders involved with this deal. And so I would ask staff to come up with that so that we are very crystal clear, as crystal clear with our public and transparent with our public as we possibly can be. But having said all that, I am pleased that with compromise we have reached an agreement, that this is going forward, that we spare potential additional costs to the general fund, that we spare ourselves unnecessary costly litigation, and in the end, this agreement has earned my support. I think that Portland job seekers in the future are the ones that stand to benefit from us moving forward. Aye.

Leonard: It may surprise many that I support most of what commissioner Adams just said. Ohsu is an institution in this city, is second to none. How about the state in this nation? The world? I get that. I get that so well that as a young firefighter when I had to write where I wanted to be taken if I was incapacitated I wrote ohsu and I would write it today. So this is not a quarrel I have with ohsu the institution. I not only love it, I revere it. And when I revere something, and I feel like it's gone wrong, it does something inside me that makes me a little more tenacious than the normal run of the mill mistakes. And because I care for this institution so much, I have focused a lot on what I see are leadership issues at ohsu. A couple times it's been said here, well, the lobbying agreement was in the seventh amendment, the implied message being, you voted for that. I did vote for that. I give institutions like ohsu, p.d.c., staff, the benefit of the doubt every day. Until I have reason not to do that anymore. I believe that I have reason not to give these two entities the benefit of the doubt. Not that I don't trust them, but I'm going to ask questions, and I may even ask questions about things that have been approved in the past, including this lobbying agreement that I think is inappropriate. I appreciate the discussions on item e and f, I believe. The item with respect to the reserve fund, \$3 million, makes sense. I think that's a good prudent addition by commissioner Adams and I'm satisfied with the answers. Item f, the \$3.5 million for the bioscience industry development, in concept of course I support ideas like that. I always have. When I was in the legislature I was proud to support initiatives to attract new industry. But I'll tell you what, I never voted for one that didn't have a plan. Nor would anybody ever expect me to vote for anything that didn't have a specific plan. I am not going to vote for something for \$3.5 million, not because I don't like the idea of biotech recruitment and bricks and mortar, but I want to see a plan. If I'm voting \$3.5 million of taxpayers' dollars, I don't think it's unreasonable for me to expect an itemized detailed plan of how that money is going to be spent. That's not here, and it's not appropriate I think for me to give my question vote without that. Yes vote without that. I do appreciate the work commissioner Adams has done. I don't want it to be misunderstood I'm criticizing him. He was

April 19, 2006

handed this package pretty much without asking, and was trying to make the best of what he was given, and I think he's done a remarkable job, and i'm glad he's doing it and i'm not. And as a result, I am giving some benefit of the doubt on some of these items that -- as I said earlier, I can only vote once and there are a number of items in this agreement that I think by themselves stand alone require a no vote. The track is just one of them. I think the public participation in terms of financial backing for the tram is much greater than the \$8.5 million that seems to be characterized as the amount the city is given. That's only in tiff dollars. There are s.d.c. Credit dollars, there are the lobbying dollars, there are lord knows what else might be lingering out there that I have yet to identify. For all those reasons, I want to make it really clear, I am not apposed to the urban renewal area, the south waterfront urban renewal area. I think the developers, homer, and others are doing exactly what I would expect people like homer to do. They're doing good work, and they are makeing a community out of what used to be vacant and in some cases contaminated land. And I appreciate that. What I don't think we've done a good job at is representing the best interests of the taxpayer and getting the best deal possible. I have some ideas to fix that, but they require restructuring the charter and making those that negotiate on our behalf more accountable directly to the elected officials, but that's for another day. And all I can do today is vote no. No.

Saltzman: Aye.

Sten: I feel like I gave my thoughts last week, but I want to share a couple more. To sum rise where I was last week, I do also appreciate commissioner Adams' work on this and I want to say that very explicitly. With the cost rising to \$57 million, there was no easy answer. I think I recognize that. My soon-to-be no vote on this package is not pretending there's an easy answer that somehow was missed. I think staff worked in due diligence. I believe there was a better deal available to the taxpayers, I also believe the actual cost to the taxpayers is quite a bit beyond the \$8.5 million. I believe there are concessions made in a number of areas. The s.d.c. Credit I think is a reasonable one, but it's there, I think the reduction in the l.i.d. Financing charge is a reasonable thing, but it's also a deduction for money that could go to other things eventually. And also as I review the housing package from the deal on march 17 when it was a \$50 million tram to \$57 million, there's been concession made on the housing side to the private developers, which also help pay some of the cost that's the developers are now picking up. So I think we need to push harder and was prepared to do so. I do want to frame my thoughts on housing because it will be I think the first discussion that will lead to a resolution that I will be bringing forward next week. And as I view it, what has happened with the affordable housing strategy is simple. It was pushed off for good reasons for justifiable reasons until it was too late to negotiate a good package. I put some numbers out there last week, and i've had long conversations with the developers and p.d.c., and I think the point is not exactly what the numbers are, it's that when you negotiate an affordable howking -- housing strategy, when you have no l lage, you don't get the best strategy you can get. When you fund affordable housing last, it doesn't get funded properly. The agreement I agreed to, there's been a lot of talk about what many of us think, we were to -- we would fund affordable housing after we did the tram, streetcar, and greenway. And that made sense, because you have to get them built in order to get the district going. The problem is when those prices went up to the point they have, it was just unrealistic to say housing is going to come after that. So that was the first mistake. The second mistake was there became a concept that actually I believe was partly driven by a public relations campaign on some of our partners' part that I would be the third vote if they paid enough for affordable housing out of the taxing increment financing. I think that was -- I think that was not the right approach because the affordable housing was supposed to be there all along. There's lately in the last week been an argument that the reason, it's coming to me consistently from affordable housing advocates and people who are knowledgeable about this deal, have raised the question, why is the deal not as good as what was on the table for -- on moor 16? The answer is, erik won't vote for that deal, so we got a worse affordable housing deal that. Is outrageous. We should never be in a position of trying to negotiate affordable housing into a

April 19, 2006

district of this importance where the city policy is housing that matches all income levels at the last minute and trading it for a vote on the tram or whatever the strategy was. So i'm going to next week bring back a policy to debate, i'll start a process in which it's debated over the summer and head towards a september adoption if there are three votes, of putting a official number on all of -- on all urban renewal districts and say 30% of the money should go to affordable housing. And it is a policy that I have actually as reasonably well known affordability housing advocate resisted in the past, because I felt if you put an arbitrary number, it's arbitrary. But this district in this last series of negotiations and the way affordable housing has been played has led me to believe that I was being far too generous to the system and to the approach, and that what's being lost by that are the housing that the workers and patients of ohsu desperately need in this area. So I will bring back that policy not so much to say it would fix this district at this point, but to say I never want to be in this position again. And for that, that's really a preview of a debate to come next week, but for all the other reasons I vote no.

Potter: I stated my position last week, and I haven't changed it. I vote aye. [gavel pounded] we are recessed until 6:00 p.m. this evening. We will be meeting at the interstate firehouse cultural center at 5340 north interstate to discuss commissioner Saltzman's proposal to rename Portland boulevard to rosa parks way.

At 11:40 a.m., Council recessed.

April 19, 2006

APRIL 19, 2006 6:00 PM

Saltzman: Thank you, mr. Mayor, and commissioner Sten and those of you in attendance tonight. I am very honored to introduce the idea of renaming Portland boulevard in honor of rosa parks. I wanted to explain that this is not my idea. This was an idea that was suggested to me, and I think it's a good idea and I want to bring it forward tonight for discussion and the opportunity for the public to comment. But as the mayor said, this is not the final action tonight nor is it even -- it's simply a first step tonight. But I was approached by -- I was actually attending the church's pastor b.e. Johnson in january of this year and he admonished me to consider two things and one of those was to make sure that we were doing right by african-american youth in our city and that's certainly a daunting challenge but I heard his message. And the other message really was we should consider renaming Portland boulevard in honor of rosa parks. He had several good reasons, which I will repeat now. I don't want to steal his thunder but one of the reasons was that it's not named after somebody historically, of houckal significance. It also intersect was martin luther king boulevard. So it's within that spirit that I agreed to sponsor tonight's forum and to take responsibility for hearing what gets said tonight, coming back with ideas for the council to consider, in a couple months. Certainly I think we should have something achieved whether it's renaming Portland boulevard in honor of rosa parks, renaming it rosa parks way or other proposals we will also take under advisement. I believe it would be all very fitting and appropriate that we have an action bun by city council no later than the first anniversary of rosa parks's passing away in october, maybe even sooner but tonight is a hearing and we have three invited panels. We will open it up for public testimony. First panel consists of pastor b.e. Johnson, pastor alan bethel, and -- see where my list is. Reverend willy banks. So if you would all -- we only have two chairs. Maybe two of auto a time. Reverend bethel and pastor johnson perhaps could start. Welcome.

Potter: Would council clerk note our two commissioners.

Leonard: My fault. I gave him a ride in my car and there was a traffic accident. I apologize.

Potter: Thank you for being here, folks.

B.E. Johnson: Mayor, council, clerks, persons present, we are grateful for this great time of consideration. A few weeks ago, it came to mind that how wonderful it would be for a street in Portland to be named after rosa parks. Beautiful lady, lady that had dedicated her life to civil rights after the movement, and we thought that possibly Portland would, with open arms, would welcome this idea. Because just a few miles up the i-5 north, there's a town named after african america, chehalis, Washington. We are not asking Portland to change its, to rosa parks, Oregon. Just a little piece of asphalt that runs east and west about two and a half miles in length. Whether she couldn't or wouldn't move, we know she didn't. And do you to this the modern day civil rights movement was begun. It sparked a spark in a young man a few miles aaway by the martin luther king. And we thought again how wonderful it would be for Portland boulevard to connect again with martin luther king in the name of rosa parks. This is our proposal that we have for the city and the mayor and the councilmens, and our great citizens of Portland. I hope and pray that we all will be able to come to realize that the need is here. I am pastor b.e. Johnson of cornerstone community church of god in christ. Thank you.

Rev. Allen Bethel: Good evening, commissioners and mayor. Dr. Bethel, senior pastor, maranatha church, president of albina ministerial alliance. I want to look at history of this great nation in which we live we have taken many opportunities to honor people who have made significant contributions to us through their lives and through the work that they do. Be it in terms of indication, in terms of civil rights, in terms of fighting in cars civil wars, opportunities to name things after them because we think it's very fitting and honorable to do the thing. When I think about rosa parks, I think about an individual, a lady, who yes, indeed, begun and helped spark what we know as the great civil rights movement. Not only were those civil rights something that happened to help all african americans, but it's something that has helped to guarantee the rights of

April 19, 2006

every individual who calls themselves an american. I think, and I believe that it is fitting to honor rosa parks for what she's done in terms of how she's made those strides in what has happened in transportation and that each person today who rides upon public transportation realizes and have something that affects because of her life and her stand that was done. I think it is very fitting that the city of Portland would consider honoring her in such a way that it would be very very visible, it would be very meaningful and significant to not only those of the city but to those who come in the city, to know and understand this is a city that recognizes individuals, be it on the local level or national level, for the great contributions they have made to society and indeed to these united states of america. So therefore we have come, we have asked, we have considered what can be done? What can we name and in behalf and remembering in honor of such a great legend, if you might say, a great person? And we have looked at Portland boulevard. You have heard the reasons as to why. You may hear reasons as to why not. I simply want to leave a reason that it can be done. And, yes, it will indeed cost someone to cause letterhead, it indeed cause someone to change maybe the sign that is printed or outside of their business. But we have done it before. We can do it again. I think it would be very fitting that we would do it for such a great lady as this. Thank you so much for your time.

Saltzman: Thank you very much. Next we would like to call up reverend willy banks and pastor w.g. Harding. I think I saw him walk in here.

Potter: Please state your name.

Wilbert G. Hardy, Jr.: Wilbert g. Hardy junior.

Reverend Willy Banks: Reverend willy banks.

Harding: First of all, I would like to say thank you to the mayor and to the city commissioners for taking your time to hear the issues and concerns of the community. I did not come with a prepared speech. I will speak from high heart. I heard with dr. Bethel said. Diall those comments. When I think of ms. Rosa parks and the contributions she has given to our country, the sense of pride to the african-american community, and as well as to the entire fabric of the united states of america, I can't think of a more fitting memorial than to rename Portland boulevard to the rosa parks boulevard. I appreciate the forefathers of Portland and what they have contributed to lay a foundation for others to build on but when I think of naito parkway and his contributions, and of that family, immigrately indebted to that family. But when I consider and compare the contributions that ms. Rosa parks gave to america as a whole, to the bus transportation industry, where most of the addition enfranchised, underprivileged have no other choice, I can't think of a more fitting way of sharing and showing it than when riding on a bus to look up and see the rosa parks signs. Yes, it will cost money. But it is an investment. It's an investment for what Portland, I believe, really stands for and that is includesy and dignity to all. I thank you for this opportunity to hear what I have to share and I no he that there will be those who don't ng favor of it for various reasons. But I think it is the right thing for us to do as a community, as a whole. Thank you.

Banks: To the mayor, to the commissioners, to the city attorney, council clerk, it is a blessing to be here. To the mayor, I thank you so much for taking time to be here tonight, to listen to what we have to say. And in deed it is a pleasure, and I would like to just stress on some of my own experience. I came from the south. And I know what it's like to go out and pass out voter registrations. I know what it is to have to go to the back door and have your lunch. I know what it is to be a five-year-old that had to pick cotton just to survive. As a young man. Matter of fact, my history goes way back. I started picking cotton when I was five years old. And from that point, I have obtained a job. I said that the city, because i'm taking very, very seriously, and when this great lady first passed away, one night, I was just thinking about it and I said, this is something that I personally wants to do. I say, I will, myself, contact the city councilmens and present this idea, and with all my heart, with all my mind, and my will, this is a city that I love. I love the peoples in this city. I love the city as a whole. This is a great city. And I believe that this city is going to do right about this. Now, I like to stress to you that there was a pledge made to african americans that we

April 19, 2006

was to receive 40 acres and a mule and we have not received that 40 acres and a mule just yet. So we are asking -- this is not a big thing. And I know that we going to get some resistance and I believe that is good for the case. I myself don't look for things to just be easy. I don't want them to be easy. I like the challenge. I like to challenge a challenge. So I am asking our commissioners, I am asking our city, our city leaders to consider this idea seriously, because I am willing to see this happen. Willing to put up whatever time I have to put out to make sure that this happen. And we are not asking for any tokens. We earn our way in this country. We have paid the price. And I thank you very much for being here tonight.

Saltzman: Thank you very much, both of you.

Adams: Some of the feedback we got prior to tonight's hearing was that Portland boulevard is not a prominent enough street, not an important enough street, not well traveled enough street. To name rosa parks after. I wanted to give you and others an opportunity to comment on that.

Harding: I appreciate that, commissioner Adams. Absolutely.

Sten: At alternative heard that is intrigue treaguig, I am all for doing the name is the downtown bus mall. Obviously the connection to the buses is there. And so I would just be curious if that was one of the alternatives to give your thoughts on.

Harding: Thank you to both commissioners. In talking in the meetings that we have had and shared with community members, part of the logistics and strategy is that because rosa parks intersects with m.l.k. It would be a fitting location to also have the community invest in the statue that would intersecond there because of the obvious relationships with that. Also in taking consideration, it is not just a power push that we african americans want recognition and you need to do the right thing. We are trying to mitigate and minimize the impact on the city. So, yeah, although it might not be significant enough, we are trying to take into consideration cost. We have not done a cost analysis to see what costs would be greater but we are trying to minimize the impact of businesses and Portland boulevard does not have that many businesses as compared to a lot of other areas.

Adams: Just for point of information, having done worked on the renaming of front avenue for naito parkway, the way we usually do it or we have done it in the past is that we, there's an overlap of name of -- names of usually three or four years so it's the legal address in that case was either front avenue or naito parkway. And usually after three or four years people use up their stationery and the signage costers there but it's done in a way that the costs are usually zero for the businesses. That's at least how we have done it in the past.

*******:** And that is totally acceptable as a logical transition.

Adams: If you noticed we had two names up on naito parkway, naito parkway and then we also had a sign that said front avenue. I was worried that it might confuse people but people seemed to catch on pretty good.

Leonard: Maybe just push a little bit on commissioner Sten's point. I really like his point of considering the mall because of the obvious connection with rosa parks and public transportation. Not to mention that every bus line goes through the mall at one point. So I heard you say you were trying to minimize the impact. I didn't hear you directly respond to his suggestion of the mall. What do you think of that?

Harding: Not speaking entirely for the entire committee, but being a member on the committee, I know that it is not cast in stone. It was a desire that was expressed and then the initiate the movement toward that. It's definitely an idea I would be willing and the other -- committee members are here to go back and consider and to talk about that. And share with the community and bring back and report.

Sten: I actually don't know who controls the name of the bus mall. Whether that's -- I don't know that it has a name.

Adams: It does.

Leonard: It does?

April 19, 2006

Adams: The bill robertson transit mall. My understanding it was a cooperative arrangement between tri-met and the city of Portland.

Sten: I think that's another matter if it's already named. I didn't realize that's what they had named after. I think that's a major problem. My thought it would be -- and I like Portland boulevard. It's a perfectly good strategy to me. What was interesting about the downtown location is that every tourist would see it I think it would make a much more lasting impression about this community's values than it would, it's almost more of a local move to do Portland which is very important. It's almost a statement of the city's values if you do something that's in the heart of downtown where everybody who visits the city goes. Seems to me that's the tradeoff.

Harding: Knowing that if it already has a name and it's already assigned to a name, I think that would be a, you know, yes.

Leonard: Embarrassed to tell you that I wasn't aware that the transit mall had a name. It's fourth avenue and fifth avenue technically so I am just from a technical point of view assuming we are talking about changing the designation from either fourth or fifth.

*******:** Absolutely. Absolutely.

Sten: Very open government, as you can tell. I think technically --

Leonard: For the record -- I think it's healthy.

Sten: Fourth and fifth, I think it's the mall which is both fifth and sixth is the bill robertson mall. The streets are not. The streets north named bill robertson. The mall itself is named the bill robertson mall on fifth and sixth.

Leonard: Would it be inconsistent to keep the name that and then name fifth or sixth rosa parks?

Adams: We could do that.

Harding: Again, I would be more than happy and the other committee members are here to go back and talk about that. Those things. The thing that we would like to keep in consideration is the time and energy that's invested in this so far and wherever we go we would like to make the most of our time and efforts. But I will take that back and then maybe we can partner and do some more investigating. I think the next reporting back is on the 26th. When is the next hearing?

Saltzman: We don't have a next hearing date set. The whole idea was to get the ideas on the table tonight and come back with a proposal.

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

Saltzman: We will work with you. Thank you both.

*******:** Thank you very much.

Saltzman: Is bishop daniels here? We can't see out in the audience very far. Let's do the bowmans.

Joanne Bowman: Good afternoon mayor and commissioner's. For the record my name is Joanne bowman. And I want to first thank commissioner Saltzman for really listening to the community and taking this back and really trying to figure out what would be a good result for community members as well as for the people that will be impacted by the name change. So I'm here tonight to say I am absolutely, totally, 500,000% in support of changing portland boulevard to rosa parks way.

And I think that we do a disservice to rosa parks when we try to minimize here influence to just a bus mall. Because she wasn't about a bus mall she was about equality and treating all people with dignity and respect. And respect in a hard days work. And so portland is our working class neighborhood. It's a neighborhood that goes it alone. You know people go to work every day they come home they run their businesses and what's interesting to me is that there are so many kids in our neighborhood that don't even know who rosa parks was. They don't know who dr martin luther king was. Even though they ride the bus up and down martin luther king, jr. boulevard every single day I spend a lot of time talking to young people and they need role models they need to be able to point to a sign in their neighborhood and know this is a woman who stood for something and she stood for something great and it wasn't just about riding a bus it was about how dare you not treat me with the same dignity that you treat somebody else with and so I think the, my personal opinion is that the bus mall idea minimizes the impact that rosa parks had because, remember, it wasn't

April 19, 2006

about the bus it was about a community saying, you are right, and we are going to stand up and we are going to stand up together and people got up very early in the morning and people walked a long way to work and people walked a long way home and it wasn't about the bus. And so I would like to you to really consider the proposal that has been put before you and to figure out a way for us to make it happen and then make the other part happen, too, the education component about why this name change is so important to so many people. And I also think it's not an african-american issue. It's a issue of having a name on a street in a community that reflects the values of a community. And that's the kind of community I want to live in. So thank you for being here tonight. And, gosh, you guys have been in northeast a lot in the last couple of weeks. And welcome and come back.

Shawn Bowman: Boy, yeah. Separated at birth, I would say. [laughter] that is a community that I want to live in, too. I just showed rosa parks biography as a part of a week long children's film series that was hosted by "willamette week", the longwell film festival and everything I know about rosa said that she stood not just for the african-american community but for every man, that when one person does not have the same rights as every other person in the room, then, we do not have those rights. My children do not know who this person is and I want them to. We owe our children this recognition, a historical recognition, that one person's life is as valuable as the next person's life. For the city to pick a street legitimizes the action of that individual. That that individual's actions are no longer a political issue is hugely important. Those days were past. We all came out of that time as a winner. And we now need this to not be a political issue but the city legitimizing those actions and saying, you are right, here is one more individual who is a component of the quilt of this community. And to the people who are questioning this process, I certainly understand. To the people who might not want their street named after somebody, I understand that, too, but in a rapidly gentrifying neighborhood I wonder what the real issue is in naming a street after a black woman. I did make notes. So I am sorry. These people risked not just the inconvenient walk but they risked their lives, their houses were bombed. They were ill treated and we cannot go back in time. We cannot repeat these mistakes. We need to make this a legitimate issue. So thank you.

Saltzman: Thank you. The last panel then we will open it up for public testimony, were the three neighborhoods who would join Portland boulevard, chris duffy from arbor lodge, shawn solanz from piedmont and we do not have someone from woodlawn. I can't see whether shawn or chris are out there. Well, they will certainly probably be here but I guess we can now open it to anybody that wishes to testify. I don't know if we have a signup list, sue.

*****: We do have a signup list.

Saltzman: We will accept public testimony. Three minutes. [inaudible] sure. Sure.

Potter: Commissioner Adams has to leave so he wanted to apologize for that.

Adams: I apologize. I have a previous commitment to a speech across town so but I will have an opportunity to review the tape and I appreciate the testimony thus far. And look forward to working with commissioner Saltzman on moving forward on this issue. Thank you.

Saltzman: Sue, who do we have?

Parsons: First -- our first two, david meyer and roger wendlick.

Potter: Is roger here? Ah. Thank you, folks, for being here. When you speak would you please state your name.

*****: I would like to let roger go first because I was a little bit rude to him out there. I would like to let him speak his mind.

Roger Wendlick: Not at all. Welcome, mayor and commissioners. Thank you for being here. I am probably on the minority here this evening. I live along Portland boulevard and -- roger wendlick. And I love the street and I like the name that's been there forever. I grew up in north Portland. Attend jefferson high school. Beech grade school. I am third generation in this city, in north Portland working community. And I just like to see the name retained itself. Now, getting to the other issue, rosa parks was a very brave, honorable woman. And she stood very strongly for

April 19, 2006

civil rights. And I do not disagree or degrade that whatsoever. In my opinion, Portland boulevard is a rather shorter street and if we are going to do something that we want to do an honorable thing, then, I think we should do something on a larger scale. Again, maybe grand avenue. I mean it's not named after a person and it runs parallel to martin luther king. So the same significance. And the bus mall I think I agree with -- I hadn't heard that before but I think that would be a good location because it would be visible to so many young people and visitors to the city, realizing that we have recognition for a wonderful black woman in our history. But just in my opinion, and I think some of the members of the community here that I spoke with earlier that they respect my opinion. I would like to see the name remain the same, Portland boulevard. Thank you very much.

David Meier: My name is david meyer. I am speaking in agreement to rename Portland boulevard to rosa parks way. Hopefully I get -- this is a three owe minute timer for me. Hopefully I won't take it all up. I have two pages of notes but I won't use it all. I want to remind you that 115 years ago that Portland itself did rename some streets. And I only knew this because aim computer guy and I spent an hour and a half on the internet before I came here. But it said that in 1891, that east Portland and albina were annexed to the city of Portland. And there is a couple of streets that were renamed and actually two, three, six streets were renamed and you kind of wonder why they would rename these streets. And I kind of researched and it seemed like they named it after people that did make an impact on the city. You know, and not only did rosa parks from what I know -- and I don't know much about her. She didn't make an impact directly on our city per se, but to make the impact on the nation I think is a bigger thing. It says that I have having street became knot street in honor of the operator of the ferry and 17th street was named thompson who was the leading developer of I having ton and mayor of Portland to 1882. 21st avenue was renamed brazee after john w. Brazee. He built the first railroad in Portland, Oregon, and grant was renamed to hancock which was named after winfield s. Hancock, a northern general in the civil war. And coincidentally fourth street was renamed after martin luther king. And I really think we should rename Portland boulevard because it does intersect with martin luther king and even though it's in north Portland, if you drive around there north Portland is growing and there's a lot of less income family of kids who are growing up there. And kind of forced to rename the bus mall, I would have to say no because seem like a couple commissioners didn't even know that it had a name. So if we rename it how many people are going to forget that it even had a name. So I definitely believe that it should be renamed after somebody and in respect to this gentleman here, I approached me early that Portland boulevard should keep its name to honor the city which I agree. But I think that the city is more honored that it has streets named after people. People that have made an impact on the community. So I think people know who Portland is as they walk around our city they see streets named after people. That's what I have to say. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you, folks.

Parsons: Next is jill and melanie allen.

Jill Trinchero: Hello. My name is jill and I live in north Portland. I came prepared with a little speech I guess you would say. But some of what we have talked about has been covered or what I am about to talk about has been covered. And I think that the most important thing is that the discussion continues and that we find a suiting tribute to rosa parks. The city of Portland certainly needs to honor mrs. Rosa parks with a tribute and everyone I have talked to agrees on this point. Instead of a meaningless exit off the freeway north of the city, we want to see something thought provoking and powerful in a location where all Portlanders can be reminded that one person can make a difference and demonstrates that as a city we are proud of our diversity. I along with many of my neighbors, friends, and fellow citizens of Portland, support the idea of renaming the tri-met transit mall in downtown Portland where thousands of people work and visit every day. Doing this would keep the memory of rosa parks and her struggle to make america a better place in the forefront of our minds and in the heart of our city. It would also make sense that mrs. Parks sparked a civil rights movement with her famous act of defiance on public transportation, that the

April 19, 2006

bus mall is currently unnamed -- may actually have a name -- that there could be a grand reopening upon completion of the newly renovated transit mall where our city could celebrate the legacy of mrs. Parks no one would have to suffer through an address change as a result of the tribute. There would be tremendous support for this action. And I think that whatever happens, whether it be Portland boulevard, the transit mall, grand avenue, that there should be something that is erected in tribute to mrs. Parks with a piece of history, that tells who she is, what she did, why she is important to us and thank you so much for your time.

Melanie Allen: My name is melanie allen and I live in piedmont. And first of all thank you very much for this opportunity. I definitely appreciate it. And I have in the last couple weeks all of this has come about it's been, it's great. I have met a lot of people in the community and I appreciate that. And I hope that it sounds as if the process is now slowing down a little bit which is something that I wanted to see because I think it's important to have a lot of dialogue. I think it helps people meet one another. It helps everyone to learn more about rosa parks. I have to say that I did a little more research just to read more detail. And it was a nice reminder because it's been a long time. I guess my comments are that I think we have an opportunity to do something that inspires dog long and discussion about rosa parks' legacy and whatever we choose to could I think it needs to be a tribute that would be seen by a more members of the Portland metro community and especially those who live in neighborhoods that aren't very diverse. And when I think about something in the downtown area, I picture parents and there are children having discussions about who is rosa parks? And I have two nieces who live in beaverton. And I think about them coming in to the city and seeing how the city has chosen to do something really big to honor someone who is so important in our history. I think that we need to get people talking more about how rosa parks changed history because I think we all recognize there is more work to be done. So I think that would be very important. And I do appreciate all of the community members who thought of honoring mrs. Parks because I think, again, it's something we should do and I would like to encourage the council to consider, continue with this idea but maybe to think a little bit bigger. Thank you.

Parsons: Next is brett allen and charles mcgee. They will be followed by sue and antoinette edwards.

Brett Allen: My name is brett allen. I live in the piedmont neighborhood. I had a prepared statement here, too, but with some of the things that have come to light in the fast few minutes I am going to ad lib it. Basically to reflect, you know, some of the things we have just heard the good thing that's coming out of this the process has slowed down. I think I heard originally that there was going to be a vote next week on the actual name change itself does & sounds like that's being spread out a couple more months and I think that's a good thing because it's an important topic of discussion. And the whole point, the whole point is to bring about dialogue and to have community discussion about this. So I will read a little bit of what I have and thank you very much for your time. The legacy of rosa parks is far too important to be taken lightly by remaining Portland boulevard to rosa parks way would be doing a disservice to the memory of the work she did for the betterment of all americans. Portland boulevard is a residential street and part of north Portland who is rarely visited by many who don't live in the area. The intersection of Portland boulevard and martin luther king jr. Boulevard is not a destination for people who live outside the neighborhood. Plus the fact tri-met does not offer bus service on stretches of Portland boulevard is a little bit ironic. If the city council is truly honored interested in honoring her legacy they should explore a more centrally monument. Naming the bus mall or grand avenue would be put the name. Hope that the council's intent would be to make the memory's rosa parks an integral part of the consciousness of all the people of Portland and not just for a subset of the citizens who live in north and northeast neighborhoods. As the city we have an opportunity to proudly display the name of an american hero and prominent way. We should not waste this chance by isolating the name of rosa parks in a part of Portland not familiar to most of the residents of our city. Thank you.

April 19, 2006

Charles McGee: Good afternoon. My name is Charles. I will be very brief. Firstly I want to thank commissioner Saltzman for listening to the community and listening to the committee that has proposed, brought this proposal forth. I am here to just state my support, my unanimous support to say I really do believe whatever the committee wants but I do believe our city needs to honor the residents of the African-American community, honor more importantly Mother Parks for her work during the struggle and what she has inspired and birthed. I believe that in Portland we have come to an era, we have come to a new time and the days of inequality no longer stand and so we have got to, as a city, recognize that it stands tall and stand true to this legacy of this great woman. Thank you.

Parsons: See Antoinette Edwards followed by Bruce Broussard and Chris Jackson.

Antoinette Edwards: Thank you for this opportunity. I think Brother Promise put us on a different but it's ok. Because we are glad to be here. So this is not a rehearsed. My name is Antoinette Edwards and I appreciate this opportunity to come before you and thank you for granting us this. I am in support of all that's gone before me in terms of the community. Sister Bowman who is my sister in love, I think she expressed it very well. The intersection of MLK and Portland Boulevard, somebody brought up Broadway. That's big, too. But what I -- and I appreciate the dialogue that has come from folks that I won't say that are opposing it. Dialogue is good. But this is dialogue. And sometimes I think we can process something to death. So I thank you, commissioner Saltzman, for this opportunity and I think we should go forward with this and I appreciate Reverend Hardy saying we can take it back to the community but let's just move ahead and I think we are all in agreement that we wanted to honor. But we have something in front of us to move forward on and let's move forward in that, with that intention and that direction and I thank you for this opportunity.

Sue Arbuthnot: Thank you. I will sue and I thought I was also signing a different list but thank you for your time. [laughter] Promise. And I am just really breachly I live in the neighborhood and I am very excited to be here and I am really excited that you are sharing your time with us this evening. And for the purpose proposal and I think it sounds wonderful. I am actually more interested, though, in being the eyes and ears tonight of some students that I am representing who couldn't be here at Jefferson High School. There's a group of tenth grade students who are making a film and it's a document tear about the perceptions of their community from within and without the community. And I think this is going to be a really exciting period of time for them to be involved in it and I am hoping that our project continues to empower them in a time where they are a little confused about their, the future of their school and I think that this project and this effort to commemorate Mrs. Parks is going to be something that will advance their interest and engagement in civic affairs and in their own education. Thank you very much.

Potter: Thank you.

Parsons: Bruce Broussard, Chris Jackson followed by Dan Fitger and Dan Rossmiller.

Chris Jackson: Thanks. Good evening. Don expect to come up here. I thought I was signing another list and I expected Chris Duffy to be here. I will do what I can. I am going to speak schizophrenic which some people claim I am well adapted to do. I will speak from Arbor Lodge's point of view. Arbor Lodge is an old community and so is the name Portland Boulevard. Portland Boulevard has a history in that community. We go there, there are people who have lived there since the early 1900's. That itself represents something. It represents something to the Scandinavian community in that area. Additionally, my, the members of my neighborhood association feel that this is an insignificant street to name after Rosa Parks. I have not run into a single person yet who hasn't said need to name something after Rosa Parks. That was left up in the air. I have heard many examples given. Now I can transcend into my personal statement. I grew up in Pontiac, Michigan, for the first 18 years of my life. I know hate means to be in a race riot. I know hate means to be fire bombed. I know hate means to have gunshots come through your windows. I know what it means to be in the first city north of the Mason Dixon line to have forced desegregation of the

April 19, 2006

schools. I know hate means to see the ku klux klan march down your street. I know what it mean to see the nazi party march down middle of your street. Naming a street after rosa parks is not a trivial thing for me. So I am not up here saying don't name Portland boulevard after rosa parks. I am saying you need to open yourself up to bigger options. I personally like fremont. Fremont intersects with martin loot are king. It's a major throughfare. We are going to name that bridge so every day people are going to be driving over the rose parks bridge. It's just seems to me that it's more appropriate and that I look forward to this dialogue. Thank you very much.

Bruce Broussard: I am bruce broussard, Portland will I can't say no to the ministers. That's for sure. And I really respect pastor johnson and the, I had the opportunity to meet with them. But again, what I am noticing is that no one is saying no to recognize rosa parks here in the city of Portland. Again, i, too, had the, my first thought was, why Portland boulevard? And why not downtown somewhere, something of that nature? Something more significant. The reason why I say that is having run for the u.s. Senate, I had the opportunity to go around the state of Oregon, and the only thing they knew about northeast Portland was that didn't want to go there. It was very, very negative. And so the point I am saying is that what is going take to get folks on the other side of the river to come and visit the community? If, in fact, it's going to be, if, in fact, the name is going to be named for Portland boulevard for rosa parks, then, maybe we can do some other little things like, for instance, we got piedmont. The rose garden over by piedmont. Maybe a statue could be there because the rose festival is part and parcel of that but something that will draw folks and make sure that they understand what this woman has really contributed to this country. And it's very, very important because I grew up in the south. I grew up in houston, texas. I won't tell you my age but I was in the back of that bus for a long time. And to me it's a symbol. And I would have liked to even have seen tri-met as far as I was concerned renaming tri-met to rosa parks right up front with you. Just to make sure people are reminded -- I just think -- I think along that way. Maybe a little too much. Because she came from the bus. That's exactly where she is from. And people reminded. On the other hand if you do it downtown, I could still remember when the either effort to get dr. King, we were trying to go downtown on front avenue. It was led by bernie foster of the scanner newspaper and we end upped on union avenue aspect of it. But I think it would be most be fit if some way, shape, or form, as an option, put it downtown, the bus mall aspect of it and erect a statue right there in the living room, full, in pioneer square. And making sure that you erect a statue that would be of significance because people do visit that arena. Everybody's looking for their brick because I look for mine's all the time. Not throwing them. But the bottom line is -- but the bottom line is that I just -- I want to support it. I want to support any effort that's made, like I said, I see everything that's positive about doing this and I think whatever we come out with, along as we get something that recognize this beautiful lady. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you.

Parsons: The next two are dan and david rossmiller and then they will be followed by teresa teeter.

Dan Fieberger: My name is dan fieberger. I hiv on haight boulevard. I have lived there since january 1960. I will take minute or two but not too long. Memorializing rosa parks is a great idea. But I would like to run this al stern active idea by the committee here and the african-american community here. To see what all of you might think of this. How about changing peninsula park to rosa park? Admit lead a play on words but this would save all the hassle of changing street signs and map names and eliminate some of the controversy. And since the peninsula fred meyer store is way out near the st. John's area, I always thought it was kind of ill logical to that pins what park so far away from the st. John's area. Changing peninsula park to rosa park would solve that lapse of logic problem also. And since peninsula park has the second biggest rose garden after Washington park, calling it rosa park would have a nice triple word meaning also. And rosa has a nicer more family friendly peel to it than the more clinical sounding geography peninsula. Aren't we trying to make this entire area including the park more family friendly anyway? Changing the name to rosa

April 19, 2006

park would be a step thin direction. And in addition, the park is not technically a peninsula. As it's not surrounded by water on three sides so why does it have the peninsula name in the first place? I have always wondered that. Having a technically inaccurate name for a park is not conducive to an accurate educational experience for our kids given that there's a school a mere four blocks away that presumably teaches what a peninsula really is. Changing the name to rosa park correct that is problem also. As for Portland boulevard, when it comes to street names, it's hard enough telling people who don't know this area but are trying to visit here how to find my house in Portland via Portland boulevard, without complicating their directions even further by having to tell them that Portland boulevard now has a new name. Especially if they are using a noncurrent map to find us. To preserve her memory which I am definitely in agreement with, I am sure she would have preferred being remembered via a park with all its attendance flowers, trees, set rae, rather than a mere street which is just pavement, concrete and asphalt. Rosa park to me at least just makes more sense for the many reasons I outlined above. But if everyone agreed that that idea didn't fly, I am certainly in favor of one of these other alternative ideas or the original idea because I think rosa parks should be memorialized. And I will give you a copy of this. Thank you.

Saltzman: Ok.

David Rossmiller: Mayor Potter, commissioners, thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is david rossmiller. I am a resident of piedmont. When I first heard about the proposal commissioner Saltzman, about a month ago, the question I asked is, why Portland boulevard? I think we can, everybody in this room will agree that rosa parks is a great american, a brave person, who did something that was long overdue to be done. And I agree with everything that's been said here that rosa parks should and must be honored. I also would encourage the council to think in broader terms. The street, for instance, which I work on, sixth avenue, and from which I take the bus home every night, I would love to see named rosa parks avenue. I feel that Portland boulevard is not a broad enough scope for the actions that we are talking about. And I also want to say something else. I called your office this afternoon, commissioner Saltzman, and I spoke with two people, promise king, we had a very good discussion and another gentleman whose name I didn't catch. But something that he said was disconcerting to me. And I thought, reflected poorly, not intentionally, on this process, but made it smaller than it should be. I asked, why is it Portland boulevard as opposed to any other street in town? He said, because this is a historically african-american community. I find it a little bit ironic that we are talking about someone who stood up and did a brave action against segregation, and is that what we are coming down to that we are looking for a street in a "african-american" part of town to name after this great american? I think rosa parks was a great american. Not just an african-american. And I think we should broaden the scope of the honor that we are considering.

Fieberger: Maybe the park can be in addition to one of these other things also. [applause]

Saltzman: Now you have me wonder become that peninsula name, too. Maybe commissioner Leonard will go on a website and give you an answer by tomorrow.

Leonard: I don't know if you have made the change peninsula park to rosa park but I have you have made the case to change the name.

Saltzman: I did notice we had shawn sullen from the piedmont neighborhood association and chris duffy have arrived, too, so maybe after teresa, they can come up and testify.

Teresa Teater: Good evening. Gentlemen, mayor Potter, commissioners, teresa teater from Oregon city, Oregon. My family roots all started with a highway in 1859. My great grandfather ran an underground railroad for john brown in nebraska city and years later I was a dump truck driver in nebraska for 15 years and I ironically built the highway in front of that little cabin where he set the slaves free and me having the high road and black folks happened to take the low road from those years on until the 1950's I grew up in missouri for 10 years, and every day when I got on public transportation, my house was two houses away from the corner of where the black district started. And I was so ostracized by the white kids on the bus because I went right to the back and

April 19, 2006

sat with the black kids because I was always trying to see over the hill from my bedroom window. I could see the black church on the corner right across the street and hear gospel music ever night and I loved it. I wanted to know about these folks. I went to the back of the bus and I was ostracized. And when I got off there, went through some hinges in life. Stuff. But some of these folks have said tonight and this gentleman covered what I was going to say was, you know, you don't want to keep things in the ghetto area. You want to show that rosa parks took and stood a stance -- she didn't know where she was going to take her moment in life. And we don't need to keep folks sequestered in the black areas. We need to show they took a step out into the future. The whole world is theirs and we do not need to keep people sequestered from an area I just came back from ohm ma what and I am shocked they voted racial segregation in owe ma that and the damn governor -- pardon me -- signed the bill. We have got to keep moving forward. This kind of stuff cannot happen again. We are not going -- this is lawsuits are going to be filed obviously to injunct this. Because has always been about moving forward. I was going to mention, peninsula park sounds like a great idea. The post office has a cancellation, you can make, draw your own cancellation to be stamped on a day of issue. First day of issue stamp because dione for lewis and clark for the historical society. But it didn't get approved in time to go through. You can have a contest with the public schools to see who can draw, it's a three inch by four inch, is the allotment size and it gets stamped next to a postage stamp and they have the rosa parks stamps out now. So if you run a contest to see who can draw the best pick tore yul cancellation that's a suggestion. And then when you have the grand ribbon opening ceremony that day have a festival that day. So, you know, a park hooked right on to the highway and I like the grand idea merging into mldk. Hopefully that's not too close to the black area but back to the burnside bridge and beyond over to middle of the Portland. Thank you very much.

Saltzman: Shawn sullens, chris duffy. Chris is the chair of the arbor lodge neighborhood and shawn is the chair of the piedmont neighborhood.

Shaun Sullens: Good evening. Sorry I am late. I was under the impression it was at 7:00. Sorry I am here to represent the piedmont neighborhood association. I was talked to many, many people in the neighborhood and I have gone to the two other public hearings. And we, we as a group have decided, and question write you all a letter stating that we want to honor rosa parks in an appropriate honorable way. And even though naming Portland boulevard would honor her we find that naming another part of the city specifically the transit mall would be quite appropriate and honorable for her. She is, was a civil rights leader and what she is known for, where she stood out was when the bus boycott happened and she sat in the front of the bus. And we find that that would be very appropriated for her and many, many people have agreed with that and written you all letters. I have a couple letters here from the people from holy redeemer and also some more board members stating that. And we know that naito parkway was renamed front I believe to naito parkway and you did it then. And I think that it could be appropriate and also -- well, honorable to name rosa parks in the transit mall as well. And I am sure that you have heard a lot of this before. I just heard dave rossmiller say the same thing and stated it very eloquently the same way we feel and I hope that you really consider doing that because that is the honorable and appropriate way to recognize her so that all the people in the city can celebrate what she did and talk about what she did and have it in the forefront instead of just a small street in north Portland. That's two miles long. And please don't misunderstanding. We appreciate the effort and we are glad that you are doing this. And we hope that you would consider doing something a little bit more appropriate and larger than Portland boulevard.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Chris Duffy: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you, first of all, for taking the time to come out to our neighborhood and to consider this important issue. My sentiments will have to echo shawn's also. We are totally in agreement that something should be named to honor the memory of rosa parks. We feel that she is a very important figure in our recent american history and her impact on people

April 19, 2006

today is so widespread that we would like to honor her as well as we possibly can. I see that the Portland boulevard suggestion is a good one. However, I would like to suggest that we name something in her honor that is more centrally located because she is a figure that not only affected the african-american community but all people. I would like to see something along the lines of the transit mall downtown named in her honor. Or a park perhaps, peninsula park might be a good one but I am sure there are other options, too. But my concern and our neighborhood's concern is that it be more central so that it is visible to all people in our city. And I don't like to think that we are saying this is just a black area of town in north and northeast and that's why the suggestion came up.

Because we really feel that we are not a black area or a white area. We are just a community of people and we are all concerned about honoring her memory in the best way possible. I would like to request, too, that we keep the period for public input open for a time longer to allow people in other neighborhoods and other parts of the city to have their say on this issue and make their suggestion because I think they are all affected by her life and her example and her impact on our american history as much as we are in north and northeast Portland. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you both.

Saltzman: Nobody else signed up? Anybody else wish to testify? Well, I want to -- this is, there is no formal action before us so I will just --

Leonard: We have an opportunity to comment on the testimony?

Saltzman: Sure. I was going to start outlining the next steps.

Leonard: Ok.

Saltzman: Because I said at the outset there is no formal action pending before us tonight. We have a proposal under consideration. We now have several more proposals under consideration. And I would like to take these recommendations and to review them, to work more with the neighbors and other interested citizens and come back with a proposal probably within the next couple months as I said at outset I think certainly by the time of rosa parks' first anniversary of her passing would be long enough for us to come to some resolution and some agreement and have the necessary dialogue in order for us to move forward and honor her. So I will keep true to that commitment. The record is open. Thank you all for coming.

Leonard: I just don't even know the way our process works sometimes. It might well be the next time I get an opportunity to react publicly to what I have heard is the next council session at whatever point that is so I wanted to give my feedback. This is a great discussion. I appreciate commissioner Saltzman bringing it forward. It was excellent. The two ideas that I would just throw out that I am intrigued by, one would not be renaming the mall. Apparently it has a name so I would not support that. I do, I really liked bruce's suggestion of sixth avenue, sixth avenue as I was sitting here thinking it through starts at the train station, and terminates just past Portland state university, passing Portland's living room on the east side. For -- yes? [inaudible] yes. Ok. Bruce mentioned it, too. He mentioned a statue in the living room which is actually -- yes. [inaudible] I was just sitting thinking for a number of reasons it seemed to be one that I would be interested in pursuing more. And the other one that was mentioned was mentioned by a gentleman that lived on Portland boulevard, was grand avenue. Not only does it run parallel as he points out it actually intersects into mlk at about thompson or so somewhere right in that area. And so I just wanted to send a signal that I would be really interested in those two ideas being pursued a little more. And I won't get into why, to the benefits or not, of Portland boulevard but those two suggestions are intriguing.

Sten: I also want to thank everybody. This was a very good hearing. And it was very thought provoking. I came into it perfectly willing to rename Portland boulevard but with an open mind having heard from different folks, and I started out thinking the bus mall was a great second suggestion and maybe a better suggestion, reverend and I talked about this in the halls of city hall a couple days ago. When it became clear to me I once knew it was -- that it is named the bill Robertson bus mall. But I did not remember that even when discussing people it led me to believe

April 19, 2006

that perhaps that isn't the best spot because people don't attach the name to the transit mall.

Because I actually did know and admired very much bill Robertson and knew somewhere in my head it was named after bill was a civic activist who was one of the long time board chairs of tri-met so it is named after mr. Robertson and so I don't think changing that would be appropriate. And I again I don't think people would know it based on the fact that I did not remember that. The other ones I think are intriguing so I will think about it and I actually would be more influenced by the thoughts of the committee as you go back and chew on it than my own. I am basically open to any of these suggestions. I think grand is interesting. I thought the fremont suggestion was interesting.

We can't name the bridge. It's a state bridge.

*******:** We could start calling it the rosa parks bridge.

Sten: But it's really -- that is up to the state and there's been -- [inaudible] so I was trying say I am open to it. I am open to it but the bridge itself is outside of this jurisdiction. So I look forward to hearing back from each of you. I don't think there's any doubt that we are going to name one of these streets and I think the more, if it consensus does not develop among all of I think what are very heartfelt and thoughtful people working on this I would be prepared to make a decision but I have a feeling this might congeal a little bit with some more conversation because everybody sort of pushing in the same direction and I greatly appreciate the effort. [inaudible]

Potter: I would suggest -- I thought I saw an Oregonian reporter here awhile ago. Wouldn't it be great if the Oregonian just put this question out to the entire community? Because I think a lot of people would do like some of the folks here, they would start googling the name rosa parks, and I think it's raising this whole issue is who is she and what did she do. And I think that's really good. And I think that the media, I would hope, would cover this more than just the fact that people have differences of opinion because the one thing we are unified on is that every person that spoke today said that we should do something to honor rosa parks. And that's what we need to focus on and have that larger conversation with the community and what is the best way to do that. But I don't think we should dishonor the folks who came up with the idea either. And that I think they should stay at the forefront of this discussion since it was their idea, it was their energy and it still is. So did you wish to say anything else, commissioner?

Saltzman: No. As I said, we will take all these ideas and put them through a process and come back with a recommendation. For further consideration. Thank everyone for coming tonight.

Potter: Council is adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow. [gavel pounded]

At 7:19 p.m., Council recessed.

April 20, 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.

[The following text is the byproduct of the closed captioning of this broadcast. The text has not been proofread, and should not be considered a final transcript.] * * *

APRIL 20, 2006 2:00 PM

Potter: City council will come to order. Please call the roll. [roll call]

Item 500.

Potter: Staff? I'd like to tell the people how the proceeding will go. We'll have a staff report which will be confined to 10 minutes. The appellant will have 10 minutes. The supporters of the appellant, three minutes each. The principle opponent of the appeal, 15 minutes, and other opponents of the appeal, three minutes each. And then the appellant has a five-minute rebuttal. Then council has discussion and votes.

Paul Van Orden, City Noise Control Officer: Paul van orden, city noise control officer. Today before us we have an appeal of a noise review board decision from february 13,2006, that relates to a request for a race car event at Portland international racetrack. In particular, the specific issue that's being appealed was the element of the noise review board's decision that related to the start times on sunday, june 18, and the request from the applicant was a 9:00 a.m. start time, and the noise review board made a decision very similar to the decision we had an appeal on last year, to grant only a 10:00 a.m. start time. And the major reasons for that, you'll also hear possibly from the members of the noise review board directly on this element, is that in 1989, city council passed a resolution, resolution 34626, that delineated a start time of no earlier than 10:00 a.m. for varianced vehicles on the track. And so in light of that decision back in 1989, the noise review board made a decision that a 9:00 a.m. start time was not in conjunction with the original, not in support of the original decision in 1989. The meeting was a heated meeting, there was public commentary around a number of items. Tonight unlike last year -- today, unlike last year, we do not have an appeal from the citizens or the neighborhood associations, the primary item is this appeal from the appellant to be able to start an hour earlier. There was a resolution last year which was resolution 34626 -- i'm sorry, I misquoted that. Resolution 36311, which related to the ability that council offered global events to actually start the race last year at the 9:00 a.m. time, and part of the conversation that ensued last year as most of the members of council may remember, is that the challenge that global events was facing was one related to scheduling with the television stations, and being able to start the event and have the race start at a time so that the live elements of the race would be broadcast on television. And so that was the same concern that was raised before the noise review board this year, that the ability to start at 9:00 was essential --

Adams: Didn't have it something to do with warming up?

Van Orden: That's correct. So the big element here that is part of the discussion is the vehicles, as they operate on the track, if they're warming up or if they're actually running during the race, it still would relate to the concept of variance vehicles running on the track. In this case the 9:00 a.m. start would be specifically to warm up. Part of what I had sent over to council yesterday was just a quick analysis of the sound readings from handheld readings at the track, and from the automated computer monitoring system at the track. They just simply demonstrated it for part of the dialogue that the warm-up activity last year at 9:00 a.m. was basically operating at the same decibel level as the race itself. So there wasn't a real notable difference, which was one of the element that's council

April 20, 2006

asked us to explore last year. What's the impact on the community, is it a less of an impact before 10:00, or is it the same impact. Granted, it's a shorter time frame, but the decibel level is similar. So the final thing just to add is that this was originally a three-year variance, so as part of last year's discussion before council, the council heard an appeal from the neighborhoods about the multi-year element of the variance, and the council requested that the applicant come back on an annual basis and appear before the noise review board. So this year was the second year of their event, and we -- the noise review board had granted that variance, so it wasn't an outright denial, it was just to close the 9:00 start time that they did not grant and instead grant a 10:00 start time.

Potter: Questions?

Saltzman: So last year we talked about -- I know we started a larger study of noise impacts in north Portland. Where does that stand?

Adams: I wanted to speak to that. I appreciate the question. Council did pass both the resolution which my office authored, and funding to begin the work on a north Portland noise reduction strategy, and the purpose of that is to identify all the noise factors in north Portland, race car, cargo planes, railroad, for some people freeway noise, truck noise, and to identify those factors and to develop strategies for reducing the impact or the source of those noise. The initial technical work, field work is underway, and the committee that will be overseeing the completion of that gathering of that technical data will be empaneled and will be meeting the end of this month to begin work looking at that data and begin to look at opportunities for reducing noise. So it covers the racetrack noise, but goes well beyond that as well. I've heard a lot about, and my own experience of living so close to the railroad, if you were to just look at all the noise created in north Portland in a given year, and let's say just the contribution that the railroad makes and our opportunities working with our federal delegation to reduce the number of whistles and railroad-related noise, I think there's -- I think the committee will see there's great opportunity to reduce that. When it comes to p.i.r., I think that the discussion will be around the noise created and the benefits of the noise created for the various events, which I think is appropriate. This particular event has a positive economic impact on the track, but there are a lot of other events at p.i.r. that create noise that don't have this kind of economic benefit on the track. The goal is to have the citizen committee come back to the city council with elements of a noise reduction package that is comprehensive and it's the first time that we've sort of tried this holistic approach, and you were very all supportive of it, and the first time it's a holistic approach, that's based on perception, because there's money in there for community survey, and also science in terms of following the noise sources and seeing what can be done to address the --

Saltzman: When is the time line for the citizen committee to report back?

Adams: We're letting them go on the their own pace, but the staff has outlined that they'll be back in the fall, with a september -- hopefully with a proposal. And if this works for north Portland, we've never tried exactly this holistic approach, but if it works for north Portland, hopefully we can use it in the other neighborhoods as well.

Saltzman: Thanks.

Potter: Other questions? Thank you. Call up the appellant. Thank you for being here. When you speak, please state your name. You have 10 minutes.

Sharon Tracy, Global Events Group: Sharon tracy, with global events group here in Portland. I've been the race director there for 20 years. In february the noise review board did grant our variance request for the champ car event at p.i.r. in june. The question today for the council, we are seek your approval to include a 9:00 a.m. warm-up on sunday morning for the champ cars. The noise review board could not approve a warm-up starting prior to 10:00 because they did not feel they had the authority to do so. We are asking for the 9:00 a.m. start because, number one, champ car requires a warm-up for safety and mechanical reasons before the actual race. And the warm-up is to take place four hours prior to the start of the actual race. I believe you've all received a copy from champ car expressing their concern to be able to hold this important bit of track time prior to

April 20, 2006

the start on sunday, as well as a letter from the Oregon sports authority and pova, both on our behalf. The champ car event has been allowed to start on sunday since at least 1996, with warm-ups scheduled four hours prior to the start of the actual race. Our race start is scheduled for 12:30 p.m. This year, champ car is asking for a 9-9:30 a.m. warm-up rather than the full four hours, which would be 8:30-9:00. In some years our race has started at 2:00 p.m. And the warm-up was scheduled for 10:00. Last year following our request to the council, global events group was asked to approach champ car prior to the television scheduling for the 2006 race to explore the possibilities of delaying the television broadcast time. Two separate discussions took place shortly after the 2005 Portland event between the president of global events group, and champ car. However, live network television time slots for a 2½-hour program are not easy to find and are somewhat controlled by eastern time scheduling. This telecast brings documented exposure to Portland and Portland international raceway. Viewers are shown shots of the Portland waterfront, the rose garden, pioneer square, Multnomah falls, columbia gorge, even the spruce goose. All enforcing the attractiveness of the Portland area as a visitor destination. Dollar value of this exposure was \$86,150 to Portland, and Portland international raceway received an additional \$570,000 in visual and mention value on the broadcast. The event itself does bring in documented economic dollars to the Portland area of almost \$8 million. Each year. And this would be our 23rd year. In closing, global events is grateful to you, the city, and to p.i.r., for allowing us to be a part of professional racing in Portland for 30 years. We are proud of our record of working with the noise review board, and we are asking for your help in understanding of granting our request for a 9:00 a.m. warm-up on sunday morning. Thank you.

Potter: Questions? Thank you. Now we'll hear from supporters of the appellants. Is there a sign-up sheet?

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

Barbara Steinfeld, Portland Oregon Visitor's Association: Barbara steinfeld, the director of tourism for the Portland, Oregon, visitors association. I'm here to address the positive marketing coverage and economic impact champ car brings to Portland and the region. Champ car helps put Portland on the map. And in the minds of potential visitors. Champ car is televised in almost 200 countries and shows the region with additional beauty shots, not just coverage of the race itself. This is coverage we can't afford to buy. It makes us look good. According to dean runyon research, \$2.9 million is generated by out of town visitors in direct economic impact spending on lodging, meals, entertainment, transportation, and retail shopping. \$2.1 million goes to hotel bookings, and the lodging tax from the hotel rooms, it goes not only to promote the region, but to general funds to support police and infrastructure, sewers, and schools. And the employees in the hotels that benefit from profitable hotel bookings, so do all the places where those employees spend their incomes. Because the city has already recognized the value of champ car by agreeing to have it remain in Portland, now we need to make it possible for the event to really take place. We need to honor the commitment and use reasonable restraint. We're talking about one extra hour of warm-up on one weekend. In the year. Actually on one day on a sunday. Not an ongoing event. Thank you.

Jeff Zurschmeide, Oregon Region Sports Car Club of America: My name is jeff, i'm the regional executive of Oregon region sports car club of america. I'm here to represent the 1,423 members of Oregon region, and to support the request for the variance. We are the staffing for the race for that weekend, and every of other major pro event at p.i.r. One of the things I wanted to touch on, if you follow professional racing at all, you've probably heard that there are talks underway to merge the indy car racing league and -- with its signature, indy 500 event, and champ car. If that happens, they will select 16 events out of their combined schedules, and we want to make sure Portland is on that combined schedule. When these two open-wheel series merge, it's going to be a worldwide event, worldwide series at that point. We want to make sure that we

April 20, 2006

remain on that list, best way to do that, keep us on t.v., best way to do that, grant this variance. That's all I have. Thanks.

Potter: Thank you folks.

*******:** Any questions?

Potter: Thank you for being here. Please state your name when you speak.

Grace Skinner, Volunteer SCCA : Grace skinner, i'm a volunteer worker not only for scca locally, but also for champ car races all over the united states and some of them outside of the united states. Having worked so many events, I can really attest to the fact that not only do the champ car employees and drivers want to race at Portland, they -- all of the workers and fans really, really enjoy the Portland racetrack. It's a big deal to them. I want to support everything sharon tracy said and the director of tourism. It's only one hour on one sunday morning. And having worked so many champ car events, I can tell you they always use a 9:00 start time. This isn't an exception for Portland. I would also like to recommend that the council consider revising the previous ordinance that changed that hour so we don't have to do this every year.

Brian Parrot: Hello, brian parrot, i'm here, I have worked with global events on this event, but i'm really here speaking as a citizen having lived here for over 30 years. And been involved with events like davis cup and tournament of the americas. This is such an asset, the champ car event to the community, that not only is it the economic impact, but the potential for bringing new businesses here that are interested in expanding that it's an asset I believe strongly we need to work together on in promoting the city. I would have to say the davis cup brought any -- nec \$50 million in development when they discovered Oregon, and then 3,000 jobs. And all that came with it. I'd frankly say champ car has five times that potential when worked together with economic development and all the rest. The second thing i'd like to state as an athlete, these people are driving at 190 miles an hour and their lives are on the line, and to shorten the warm-up time for them is a real concern. I happen to be a tennis player, but it might be similar fit was wimbledon and the noise around wimbledon neighborhood said, you can't warm-up until x. And it wouldn't be their lives on the line, but it would really throw off the staging of the event. So it's a very important thing to consider the athletes and the team that's are out there for what they are doing in front of a worldwide audience. And I hate to give them a reason for saying Portland really doesn't want us, and there are plenty of cities that do want an event of this magnitude. Thank you very much.

Mike Nealy: I'm mike nealy, and really, I just wanted to say that we are grateful for being able to stage the event, and for the support that we have received from the city for a good number of years. And I think one of the things that jeff touched on is this merger concept with the i.r.l. And champ car. And I think it is a very possibility, a very big possibility that would come to pass. If that's the case, we want to make sure that we show champ car that we're interested in them coming back. And so I think that's very important also. And the other thing I would like to say is to the neighborhoods, the fact that we understand trying to live within their framework, and so that's why in the past we have fluctuated that warm-up time to coincide with the window, so that's what's dictated it. Thank you.

Leonard: I do have one question, which gives rise to your comment that it's a safety issue. I assumed that warming up meant bringing the temperature up to operating speed, but i'm wondering if that's an accurate assumption on my part given your safety concern if you're thinking about the tires, or the track, or -- what are you warming up?

Nealy: It has to do with the machine itself, and the fact that mechanically they want to make sure that -- they're very sensitive, so the mechanical aspect of it in terms of breakage of parts and things, that's what -- part of what they're doing, is making sure all of that is in place.

Skinner: I'd like to make another comment. As you know, sometimes accidents do occur, and they may be breaking in a new engine or other replacement parts they need to check before the race.

Adams: I wanted to confirm that the neighborhood remediation fund is still in place by parks, and -
- ok. Thank you.

April 20, 2006

Potter: Thank you folks. Sue, any others?

Parsons: That's all for that side.

Potter: Now we'll hear from the principle opponent of the appeal, the noise review board. Please come forward. Thank you for being here. Please state your name when you speak. You have a total of 15 minutes.

Jocelyn Cox, Chair, Noise Review Board: Jocelyn Cox. I serve as chair for the noise review board. This is Kerrie Standley, Susan Pearce, and Vance Yoakum also is the audience here, there are four of us present, the 5th one happens to be in Arizona working. Here we are. I think our decision really is not so much confrontational as looking at what city council required back in 1989 resolution that said no variance car shall object the track before 10:00 a.m. On a Sunday morning. We are trying to be consistent in that we denied that possibility of them warming up at 9:00 in the morning last year. For this variance, this year's application was bounced back to us again for decision. We felt we needed to be consistent with our last year's decision. Therefore, we have said you may not be on the track until 10:00. No more than that.

Kerrie Standley, Noise Review Board: Kerrie Standley for the record. I wanted to speak to some of the comments that were made by the appellant. We are not suggesting that a shorter warm-up time be used. I want to make sure you understand that. We're not suggesting that they take a shorter amount of time. What I'm hearing is that a 30-minute warm-up time is all they need, because they're talking about 9:00-9:30. We're suggesting it not start until 10:00, which on give them over two hours before the race starts. So I'm hearing different stories about what is actually being needed here. If the cars are to be warmed up for the race, you would think it would be ready to have it closer to the race than four hours before the race when they can get cold again and start having problems. So I think there's some conflicting requests, or information that's being provided as to when they need what they need. We were following your resolution from last year and also your direction to review the situation, giving the applicant plenty of time to try and straighten out the schedule, so we brought it back to you because we didn't want to make that decision again. To change the time. So one other comment I wanted to briefly speak on, I think a couple people said that this is just one hour. It's just one more hour of noise from 9:00-10:00. But we are look at more than one race at the racetrack that we give variances to. I can see where they will all do the same. It's only one more hour. So I think you need to keep that in mind. If you're going to select one to give one more hour, you need to have a reason for it and make it a strong reason. So that we're not being hit with the other applicants coming forth and saying, well, they did it for these. This race. Would you do it for our race? Because I think that we've seen that before where it's come to the board where something was given to one applicant and it should be universal.

Leonard: Can I ask you one question? Did you have a hearing on this?

Standley: Yes, we did.

Leonard: And you just made the point that it seemed inconsistent to say they only needed 30 minutes to warm up, and the race doesn't start until noon, why can't they do it at 10:00. Did you ask them that question at your hearing?

Standley: Yes.

Leonard: And their answer was?

Standley: There was no answer.

Leonard: You asked a question and they were mute?

Standley: They have no answer to why it has to be so early. What I'm hearing leads me to believe that it's more than a one-hour warm-up. It's actually a four-hour warm-up, because -- and I'm now just drawing from information trying to come to this understanding. Especially what I've heard today, if they have mechanical problems, they've got to address them. They've got four hours to address them. They're going to run it again before they run a race. I think what we're hearing, we want a four-hour window in which we're going to test the cars, and if they have problems we're going to test them again, we're going to continue to do this --

April 20, 2006

Leonard: That didn't satisfy for you then the reason for the 9:00?

Standley: No more than 10:00. How much -- why don't we give them a starting at 6:00 in the morning to make sure that they have no problems? I don't see why the four-hour window is any better than a two-hour window or six-hour window. I'm not sure why four is a critical number.

Leonard: Thank you.

Cox: I don't want to repeat what Jocelyn and -- Mrs. Cox and Mr. Standley said, other than to emphasize that we're doing the best to follow the ordinance as it reads. That we do not wish to shorten the start time and their warm-up time, and we're certainly not trying to create a safety problem. I'm trying to remember what all you said. You said it so well. My personal sense is that last year we were told the -- there wasn't time between the time that we were discussing the variance, the time of the race to change the television scheduling because it's so far ahead. And although I'm sensitive to the residents' needs, at the same time I understand that there was bit of scheduling. But this time they've had a full year-plus to negotiate with the television stations about scheduling the start time in a way that allowed an adequate warm-up starting at 10:00. So I'm a little uncomfortable with having once again be having this discussion.

Adams: How many years has council done this?

Cox: Done this what?

Adams: Looked at the request for the hour from the begin something.

Cox: This is -- last year is the first year. What happened was as Sharon Tracy mentioned, there were several years where the warm-up started at 9:00. It was one of those things that fell through the crack situation, where -- because we had five-year variance. The first variance that was given was at 10:00. The next five-year variance that came along, it wasn't picked up that the 9:00 was different from the previous year, or previous 5-year. So it was given as a 9:00 warm-up time. That's been used to say, it was always 9:00. Well, it wasn't always 9:00. It happened, it fell through the cracks. Once we discovered that, we decided to go back to the original decision, the 1989 decision and use that as a guide in setting the future, making sure we had better documentation and recall procedures so that we would not have that happen again.

Potter: Other questions? Thank you folks. Now we'll hear from other opponents of the appeal. These are the supporters of the noise review board. Could you please come forward?

Parsons: We have eight testifiers.

Potter: Please state your name for the record. And also you each have three minutes.

Amanda Berry, Kenton Neighborhood Association: Amanda Berry, representing the Kenton neighborhood association. I'll just read to you a letter that the neighborhood association wrote. "We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the noise variance requested by Global Events Group for the Champ Car race scheduled for June 16-19. The presence of Portland International Raceway within our neighborhood causes the residents of Kenton to experience much higher noise levels in races than other North Portland neighborhoods. The four variances each year create the greatest disturbance. Last year during the Champ Car World Series, residents were awakened mornings by loud race cars, announcers and helicopters. Residents report that sections of the neighborhood became deserted for entire weekends during the height of summer as residents stayed in their homes or leave the area. The Portland Development Commission's downtown Kenton redevelopment project has identified noise from P.I.R. as a major obstacle that Kenton fully realizing its redevelopment potential. As representatives of the neighborhoods, we ask that you uphold the 10:00 a.m. start time as specified by the noise review board. We feel it is unreasonable to subject our neighborhood to such invasive levels of noise any earlier on a Sunday. The start time restriction is more than reasonable considering city council gave the promoter notice regarding this issue last year. And Global Events Group has had a year to make arrangements for a 10:00 a.m. start time. We implore the city to consider limiting P.I.R. noise. Limiting the noise will significantly enhance redevelopment efforts in Kenton." and then there's contact information if you'd like to discuss it with us further. Then I also have testimony from two residents in our neighborhood that weren't able to

April 20, 2006

be here. This is by Jane Chan. "As tax paying citizens of Portland we'd like to make it known we very much object to the variance being granted for races at P.I.R. on June 16-19. This noise has been a very negative impact on our family making it unpleasant to be outdoors, playing with the children, but also even impacts us when we're inside. This is a time of year when it would be nice to have windows open, something which isn't possible with the noise. In particular, we'd like to see the city stick to the 10:00 a.m. start time the variance requires. We feel it would be extremely unreasonable to expose residential neighborhoods to such loud noise any earlier than that." Thank you.

Matt Hoffman: Matt Hoffman, a Kenton resident. And I have copies of a map I'd like you all to see.

Potter: Please leave it with the clerk.

Hoffman: Thank you for the chance to speak on this issue. As Kenton resident, I am strongly opposed to the Champ Car event starting earlier than 10:00 a.m. on Sunday. This entire event is extremely invasive and makes our neighborhood unlivable. Our streets look like a ghost town as neighbors hide indoors or leave town to avoid the loud machines roaring, the noise vibrating houses, and the P.A. system that can be heard indoors. And the helicopters overhead. Sunday morning is our only opportunity for rest during this four-day event. Global Events Group has no excuse for requesting an earlier time since City Council advised them of this issue last year. We are not asking them to shorten their warm-up, but just give us some peace Sunday morning. P.I.R. is a blemish on our community. In particular, the four variances each summer are so loud as to make our neighborhood unlivable during those weekends. We have no notification of these events, and the burden of determining when these races occur falls on the victims. Please consider eliminating these four variances. Only when these events are eliminated will Kenton be able to develop into a thriving neighborhood. Despite the large sum of public money being spent to revitalize North Denver Avenue, the city alone could do more to this end by eliminating or restricting noise from P.I.R. I'd like to thank you for approving the funds for the North Portland noise study, but I ask that you ensure there's adequate funding and focus of the study to assess the impact of P.I.R. specifically on Kenton. As the map shows, almost the entire neighborhood of Kenton is within one mile of P.I.R. And we receive by far the biggest impacts from the races there. Of the approximately 5,000 households within one mile of the track, more than half of them are in Kenton. The noise study seems to assess -- needs to address the -- says the impacts of P.I.R. Closest to the track. This is a severe local problem, and not necessarily a regional North Portland problem. Since the study will quantify the magnitude of P.I.R.'s impact on the community, it would be short-sighted to make any further investment in P.I.R. until a study is complete. Please deny consideration of any capital improvements to P.I.R. Pending completion of the study. I'd also like to ask that the study consider and today you consider quantifying the economic effect of these races, the variances on the neighborhood and not just on the city as a whole. And I'd like to include things like lost revenue to local businesses, and lost productivity of the local residents dealing with the noise. Thank you.

Adams: A clarification, \$60,000 the city council authorized for the study is the most they've ever put towards any study in the history of the city. And we do think that it's adequate to not only look at noise issues on the entire peninsula, but a concentration of research around P.I.R. -- especially around P.I.R. And around the railroad. So I just wanted to give you a little assurance that we feel that's an adequate amount of money to do both.

Hoffman: I thank you for that. I just want to make sure the focus of the study doesn't leave this out of the mix.

Peter Teneau: Peter, I'm a resident of Kenton neighborhood. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. I wish to thank council member Adams for initiating the study concerning the impact of P.I.R. noise on North Portland neighborhoods, together with other noise. I am opposed to the appeal of Global Events before you. It is a step in the wrong direction. From the standpoint of noise generation, rather than increasing the hours of noise producing activities at the track, the city, which

April 20, 2006

has jurisdiction of track operations, should uphold its state dedication to the reduction of noise issuing from the track. No, not one more, but rather less hours of noise, lower noise levels, and ideally no noise at all broadcast into residential neighborhoods. Historically speaking a. Serious effort at noise reduction at p.i.r. has been woefully lacking. Growth of events has been encouraged for -- I will, however, state emphatically that this has been at the expense of neighborhood peace and quiet, or may I substitute the term "livability." yes, the commodity that Portland prides itself for exemplifying. There's not a little hypocrisy. The parks department, whose many other activities I applaud for contributing to the health and well-being of Portland citizens, sponsoring an enterprise that annoys people in the enjoyment of simple daily living, gardening, relaxing, and socializing in the back yard. The kenton neighborhood is moving right along in a major effort focused on revitalizing its village center with the backing of p.d.c. is in its final stages. Within a few hundred yards of planned high density housing, at present noise levels -- present noise levels and constancy a nuisance which is bound to degrade desirability of living there. Well, you ask, why build high density in such a location? The answer is to provide much-needed affordable housing in an absolutely appropriate place in a quantity that will energize the corner of an underdeveloped area of Portland. It is not this larger goal of the city -- is not this a larger goal of the city than running a racetrack inappropriately located in the first place adjacent to a residential neighborhood and then encouraging its growth by creating noise generating events? This is a land use issue. It's a priority issue. It is time for the city to get imaginative and to begin considering alternative usage of west delta park. Options explored which would support neighborhood revitalization which might enhance livability and yes, which would produce even more revenues for the city than p.i.r. -- for the city than p.i.r. does now. P.i.r. is by far the largest source of noise in several north Portland neighborhoods, measured in both noise levels and constancy, and I emphasize that word "constancy." this is in addition to other sources such as aircraft and train noise. The difference is that the latter two sources are a necessary part of transportation. Racetrack noise is not. I would hope the city would join in the effort to find an appropriate location for a nascar facility which could also serve the motor sports community now using p.i.r. In the meantime, hold fast to the ordinance and the good faith agreement which north Portland citizens to reduce, to reduce noise at p.i.r. We don't want compensation, we want less noise.

Potter: Thank you folks.

Susan Landauer: Susan landauer, I live in portsmouth neighborhood. It was good meeting with mayor Potter at the home plate -- patty's home plate cafe, and at that time we talked about -- i'll get to that. P.i.r.'s claims of large financial benefits to the community are inaccurate and misleading. A recent analysis by dean runyon and associates found that the 2005 champ car grand prix by far p.i.r.'s largest most lucrative event, generated a \$7.3 million economic impact. Given that one small local events comprise the bulk of p.i.r.'s operations, and two, those events are subsidized by spectator events, this information is from the p.i.r. website, it is obvious that pih officials -- p.i.r. officials repeated claims of a \$45-\$55 million annual economic impact are grossly exaggerated. Moreover, officials repeated claims that p.i.r. provides family entertainment are fallacious. Motor sports promoters, including those sponsoring events at p.i.r., use pornography or alcohol-related events to attract a primarily adult male audience, and I have here a list of references for that claim. And i'll bring it to you. Motor sports is an unsuitable enterprise for a livable, sustainable city. In are better uses for this valuable property, our city park. And sunday morning is a quiet time. It's not a time to be blasted out of your neighborhood. Thank you.

Gary Woodruff: My name is gary woodruff, i'm a north Portland resident. I'm going to speak on some health issues. I'll read from a draft p.i.r. site development plan which we're happy to share upon request. Motor sports impose inequitable health and environmental burdens on north Portland. It is reported that secondhand noise, even at low levels, causes health damage. The center of disease control says noise causes hearing loss, sleep disturbance, cardiovascular problems. The world health organization says noise is environmental stressor that leads to increased blood

April 20, 2006

pressure and stress hormones and the populations living in the areas have increased risk for hypertension. Like cigarettes, secondhand noise kills. A study of 2,000 heart attack victims found excessive noise from sources like automobile traffic increases heart attack risk 50% in men and 300% in women. The former surgeon general Stewart said there are many instances of heart disease of which noise is a major contributor. Calling noise a nuisance is like calling smog an inconvenience. Children are most vulnerable to secondhand noise according to the World Health Organization. Children in noisy areas have increased stress hormones, elevated blood pressure, reading and problem solving are most strongly affected. The World Health Organization says evidence of noise pollution in children's health is strong enough to warrant noise monitoring programs in schools. Will you allow parks to sacrifice our children's future for an entertainment spectacle? Research shows that low frequency noise, the window rattling type at p.i.r., which is more hazardous than higher frequency noise the type addressed by the city. Low frequency noise induces disease which include epilepsy, brain stem lesions, and respiratory tract tumors. The World Health Organization includes evidence about low frequency noise is sufficiently strong to warrant immediate concern. Although we found no air pollution of studies involving p.i.r., we know that motor sports contribute some amount to the county's ranking as the -- as among the dirtiest in the U.S. For cancer and noncancer health risks from air pollution. Our county has an added cancer risk of 1,000 times higher than the clean air act goal. Portland ranks among the 50 worst cities for respiratory infections. Because motor vehicles emit the most air toxics, the Oregon D.E.Q. suggests that people help by driving less. Given our air quality problems, how can parks justify its motor sports enterprise? Finally, the E.P.A. says residents, particularly children, living near race tracks are at risk from lead poisoning. It's associated with neurological damage and is highly correlated with decreased performance on intelligence tests. EPA does not have authority to regulate use of unleaded gasoline, but the city does. We ask for your leadership today to protect the health of North Portland children, deny this appeal, to send the message, not in our, not at all. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you folks.

Doretta Schrock: Doretta Schrock, the vice chairperson of the neighborhood association, but I'm here talking for myself today. I have a lot of opinions about the broader questions about p.i.r., but I'll talk to you about those any time you're interested. But I want to stick to the question at hand today. The 1989 regulations which are currently in effect that Paul mentioned came about as a compromise between the city and p.i.r. and the neighbors who live around the track. Neighbors were assured at that time that the track would work to decrease the noise and that they would stay below the bounds of those regulations. The 10:00 a.m. start time is one of those regulations. This is the third time in the last year that the track has asked for permission to go outside those bounds. When they asked for this variance last year, you granted it, but several of you said that you would not be inclined to do so again. You granted it last year because it was a short time frame and they already had schedules in place. Please keep faith with the community and uphold the noise review board rule can.

Potter: Thank you folks.

Steve Cox: Steve Cox. First I want to thank you for the study. I really appreciate this. It seems like honestly it's very slow and I'm not the most patient person, but there's hope here.

Jan Woodruff: I'm more impatient.

Steve Cox: I'm confident that the information from the study will really prove that North Portland has more than its share of noise. What's frustrating about this appeal from global events is that last year you graciously allowed them the 9:00 warm-up time, and you gave them to this with a one-hour limit. It seemed like the first time in years council has actually listening to us and supporting us. Pam Arden, who is not able to be here today, she's been fighting for peace in Kenton for 20 years. And finally it seems like you are -- threw us a little morsel of hope, and now global events insist they have to start at 9:00 again. Please be true to your word and allow North Portland residents one hour of precious peace that we -- that weekend. I want to add comparing tennis to

April 20, 2006

racing is comical. P.i.r. is in direct conflict with title 18 and the city sustainability policy. Title 18 should protect public health and safety and promote the value and enjoyment of property. P.i.r. also mocks the city's sustainability policy. This policy clearly states to promote Portland's leadership as a sustainable city prevent additional pollution, reduce adverse impacts, and demand for natural resources and to ensure equity so environmental impacts do not unfairly burden one geographic or socioeconomic sector of the city, north Portland clearly has more than its share of noise. We have the airport, trains, and i-5 all which are vital to the economy. I don't argue that. But why must we listen to grown men driving around in circles wasting fossil fuels, spilling their toxic noise into residential neighborhoods? The fact that a city park is allowed to produce this much pollution in a city that strives to be a leader in livability and sustainability is embarrassing and hypocritical. Why have these important policies if the city itself is going to violate them? P.i.r. has asked for millions of dollars in improvements to make this a world class venue which only means more and louder events. None of these improvements have anything to do with lessening the object noxious noise that the track produces, and this is insulting. And finally, gentlemen, once again, I invite you to my home. Last year I invited you all to my house for the le mans race, and this year the champ car would be great. Sam, you're excused. I know that you live with this, if you're ever home --
*****: But he's a great cook.

Adams: I was there last year. He's a really good cook.

Cox: But the beauty here, gentlemen, is that I know that you're all very busy, but p.i.r. is so very obnoxious, so very often. So really we have every wednesday night, every friday night, and almost every saturday and sunday all summer long. So i'd like to contact your staff to just come by for a half an hour. I'd be glad to leave a glass of ice tea and leave. Just try and sit in my back yard and enjoy what's supposed to be a man's castle. So thank you for this opportunity.

Jan Woodruff: Jan woodruff, a hayden island resident and a member of the friends of west delta ecopark. And I would like to very much like the citizen volunteers on the noise review committee and ask that you support their decision. You've heard from others today about some of the issues outlined in our draft p.i.r. site redevelopment plan, which we are happy to share upon request. I'd imagine that you now realize that motor sports is an unsuitable enterprise for a livable, sustainable Portland, and that these problems create legal exposure for the city. I imagine too that you are troubled about giving up p.i.r.'s revenue. As a consultant who's worked with many tourism entities to create successful marketing plans, I wholeheartedly agree with the representative that said this economic engine is important. Unfortunately, she's without the facts. So let me offer you a solution that will empower you to deny this appeal today and to send a message, not an hour, not at all. P.i.r. sits on an extraordinarily valuable site rich in natural assets, including frontage on the underutilized columbia slough, proximity to existing trail systems, and a key position in what is otherwise an 833-acre outdoor recreation corridor. That acreage amount is just about the same size as new york's central park. So we could have something like that. This site could be redeveloped into a mixed use ecopark that includes light industrial development, perhaps an incubator for green businesses, recreational amenities that make north Portland a great place to live, work, and play, and to visit. A wide range of cultural and recreational amenities, for example, the world's first biodiesel powered merry go round could make this park a leading visitor destination and economic engine. This -- I have a whole list of great ideas like that.

Leonard: You want us to go biodiesel.

Woodruff: This economic park would satisfy the city's economic goals in three ways. First, it would produce a sustainable economic development in north Portland which needs it badly, while at the same time improving environmental quality. Second, the ecopark could reduce demand for energy by providing pedestrian and biking connections that reduce dependence on autos, and provide quality jobs in north Portland to reduce our residents' needs to commute. Finally, this economic engine would help build Portland's image as a sustainable city. We expect that the eco park would at least quadruple p.i.r.'s economic impact. A recent study of urban parks bite

April 20, 2006

sacramento regional research institute showed that urban parks, particularly those that combine conservation and cultural focuses, like our proposal, are powerful economic engines. A medium-size park generated annually \$62 million in visitor expenditures, \$283 million in total business activities and 3600 jobs. P.i.r.'s economic contribution pales in comparison. Finally, in sharp contrast to p.i.r., our vision compliments the economic development plans of all leading government agent significance from the top down in Oregon, which promote green tourism. Through partnerships with these agencies, as well as the light industrial development that we propose, the city could leverage the funding needed for redevelopment. Motor sports is an unsuitable enterprise for a livable city that prevents a better use of this valuable site. Please deny this appeal and send the message that the city committed to sustainable economic development. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you folks. Is that the last of the --

Parsons: Correct.

Leonard: I need to ask a clarifying question. In looking at the technical appeal and hearing the testimony --

Potter: We still have a rebuttal.

Leonard: I'm sorry. I thought we were in discussion.

Potter: I should have made that clear. Could the appellant --

Leonard: Even at that, it would help me in hearing a rebuttal, are we asking for a one-hour variance for one hour for one day, or a one-hour variance for three days?

Saltzman: Or 30 minutes.

Leonard: Just one day. Ok.

*******:** One additional hour.

Sharon Tracy, Global Events Group: I can clarify that very well. That was my first comment. The proposed scheduled from champ car has a warm-up on sunday morning from 9:00-9:30. So it's 30 minutes, and it's a one-time, it's not a four-hour warm-up. It's 30 minutes. The four hours is set by champ car in their rule book because the four hours before the actual start of the race is their estimated time, say a car goes out, has a major physical problem, a mechanical problem, maybe they have to change an engine. The four-hour time period is what the minimum time period that they can do that in. So that's why this four hours prior to the actual start of the race keeps coming back. And they are requesting a 30-minute warm-up from 9-9:30, as stated in their rule book.

Saltzman: The warm-up continues until race time?

Tracy: No. The warm-up is from 9:00-9:30, the track is quiet from 9:30-10:00. At 10:00 the start of the atlantic race, which is their support race on sunday. That race runs for one hour. So that's a 10:00-11:00 race, which doesn't allow any other warm-ups or anything on the track. The major --

Saltzman: That race is not televised?

Tracy: No, it's not. Not live. It's televised, but not live. And the live telecast starts at p.i.r. At 12:30, which is when the start -- the cars actually start rolling on the grid and start the race. Again, I think the t.v. time is the critical issue here. A live network nationwide broadcast, 2½-hour window is something that champ car sets. Mike neeley talked with them starting back on the first conversation on june 30 of last year. They know our concerns, but they were not able to come up with a telecast time with that window that would allow a 10:00 start at our track.

Adams: You tried?

Tracy: Yes, he had numerous conversation was champ car officials, with joe, dick, and their superiors.

Saltzman: Did they try, or were they just told the rule says no.

Tracy: According to them, they tried.

Saltzman: They being you.

Tracy: No. They tried, but I think the window time across the nation just was not available to do it later in the day. I think historically over the last 10 years our races have always started at either

April 20, 2006

12:30, 1:00, or 2:00. Again, we're asking for about 30-minute warm-up to meet their request to meet their rules as a safety issue, and it's only on Sunday morning. I realize the people behind me may not agree when I say "only Sunday morning," I'm just clarifying that's the time period we're asking for.

Leonard: Aside from what the rule says, and I've read it, as a practical matter aside from the rule, does it matter to you if the warm-up is at 9:00 or at 10:00 if you didn't have the rule to contend with?

Tracy: The 10:00 does not give you four hours before the start of the race.

Leonard: Listen to my question. That's what the rule says. I'm saying, aside from the rule, aside from that, just as practical matter, does it matter to you whether it's at 9:00 or 10:00? It sounds like you have the 9:00 to comply with the rule.

Tracy: The promoter of the race is required to adhere to champ car's rules.

Leonard: I want you to listen to what I'm asking. I'm trying to figure out, are we doing this for the sake of the rule, or because there's a practical reason that we're doing it?

Tracy: I think it's combined. You have a rule, but the rule is there because of the mechanical time period allowed to the drivers if they have a major mechanical issue to face before the actual start of the race.

Leonard: Give me an example of why something might take four hours rather than three if you identify it.

Tracy: Total change of the engine and the set-up of the car.

Leonard: How long does that take?

Tracy: Maybe the car hits the wall and requires some parts, body work.

Leonard: How often has that happened?

*****: [inaudible]

Leonard: I'm sorry?

*****: [inaudible]

Leonard: If you're going to talk, you have to come up here. That's happened at p.i.r.?

Grace Skinner: As I said earlier, I have worked at champ car races all over the United States, it happens at p.i.r., it may involve more than one car.

Leonard: When was the last time it happened at p.i.r.?

Skinner: Last year at the champ car race. I cannot --

Leonard: During warm-up?

Skinner: I cannot attest if it was during warm-up last year. I can attest to you that I have witnessed a fatality at another racetrack during warm-up.

Leonard: How would having three hours versus four have changed that?

Skinner: I believe Sharon answered your question correctly. It's combined with the fact that champ car has determined that they need four hours, and the practicality of having the four-hour time period here in Portland is in compliance that the promoter must comply with the requirements of champ car if they wish to have the race here. Otherwise the race won't be held here.

Leonard: So champ car is telling the city what its rule --

Skinner: Champ car is dictating to the promoter what is required to hold the race in Portland.

Leonard: It doesn't really matter what we say.

Skinner: I cannot attest to them. I'm only a volunteer. I'm not a representative. My impression from working at their races, and also having worked within race control in Portland is that if we were not able to comply with their requests, the risk of losing the race all together is substantial. That's my personal opinion.

Tracy: I think that champ car in the city of Portland work together as partners as they would with any city across the country. You come to an agreement that is satisfactory to both sites. They're not the heavy handed sledgehammer type of person that says you have to do it our way or not at all. And I think you currently are in those conversations with champ car.

April 20, 2006

Tracy: I'm not a mechanic, and I would say they have set that time frame as the time required to make any -- to allow the teams to make any major adjustment or repair to the cars.

Skinner: And they use that same requirement at all of their race tracks.

Leonard: What i'm saying is, again, I don't think this is an unreasonable question, is aside from what the words say, what is the logical basis for it?

Mike Nealy: I guess the only thing we can go by is the request they have for the amount of time. I don't think that your question is necessarily one that I can technically address. I think that they do that as sharon indicated, because there may be something that does require that time. That's all I know.

Leonard: But what i'm hearing is that you need 30 minutes to warm up, and you clock that from 9:00-to--9:30, and the cars then wait for the race to start at 1:00. So --

Nealy: They're on the track at 12:30.

Leonard: So there's three hours the cars are sitting, so I think the -- the obvious question is then what difference does it make if you do it from 10:00-10:30 if they're not on the track until 12:30. What I heard is the rule says what it says, and i'm trying to get to, ok, but --

Nealy: But keep in mind there's a complete schedule. If you look at the -- have we given you the published?

Tracy: We stopped publish because of the hearing.

Nealy: The schedule sunday morning, if you take a look at 9:00 would be the warm-up, from 9:00-9:30. At 9:40 we grid the atlantic cars to start the atlantic race at 10:00. That's over at 11:00. And then at 11:15 they have pace cars on the racetrack from 11:15 to 11:45, and then they grid the champ cars for a 12:30 start. So the idea of moving that around so that there's a 30-minute window in there that still gives them ample time is not something that I think is in keeping with what this full schedule allows. That's all i'm suggesting. Keeping in mind as sharon indicated we have a live television window and the atlantic race, which is from 10:00 live 11:00, is tape delayed broadcast. So that's the reason why they want to start the warm-up early enough so they then would have time to work on the cars, but there isn't, I don't see, another place in here that fits within that time frame if you try to put the warm-up in at, say, 11:15, if they discovered some problem, they wouldn't be able to start the race at 12:30 for the live television window. So that's the predicament there is in terms of putting the schedule together, which champ car puts the schedule in working with us, they give us the schedule here. So that's the situation there, is that from 9:00-9:30 is -- gives them ample time to work on the cars afterwards, but if we were to try to condense that, there's not another place to put it because you've got something else on the track. Like from 10:00-11:00 and so on. I would be happy to have somebody from the technical aspect address your concerns specifically, but I don't feel that i'm qualified to do that. I'm just not a technical person.

Leonard: I don't think I need that. It just speaks for itself, I guess. What i'm -- what -- here's what i'm hearing. I'm hearing they set the schedule and we have to comply with what they set the schedule to be. My inference, though none of you have said this, is there's no technical problem with warming up at 10:00, have you a scheduling problem and you have what the rule says.

Nealy: But the rule is there for a reason, so that if something does happen to those cars, they have ample time to prepare those cars to come back out for the 12:30 start. I think that's true. And I can't answer, I talked to mark also, and I can't recall what's happened or hasn't happened during a warm-up time period. I don't know that. I know we've had cars that have uncovered a problem during the warm-up time period, have made an engine or something like that change, and therefore have had to start at the back of the pack.

Leonard: I'm not disputing that, i'm wondering what the difference would be in fixing that in three hours rather than four, understanding these are master mechanics that time isn't the issue for them that it would be somebody who doesn't understand their industry as well.

Nealy: I think you're right about them being skilled technicians.

April 20, 2006

Adams: If I could put a finer point on the question so we're -- the atlantic race a. Different set of cars, if it started a half an hour later so that you were able to do the warm-up and have the atlantic race, is that from a staging point of view, is that doable? You move the atlantic race so that it's a little -- the start time is a little later in the morning, that allows that you half-hour warm-up.

Nealy: I don't know. I'd have to -- we certainly would -- could go back to champ car and ask them that. The other issue that comes --

Adams: I think when I read your rule book it said four hours, and it didn't say completed in four hours, it just says four hours. So it could be from hour four to hour 3.5.

Nealy: They're already hedging that because we have a 12:30 start. So it goes the other way. They've already done that.

Adams: Isn't the 12:30 start for the start of taking the cars to grid and the race itself normally --

Nealy: No. It's when the cars start to roll, which is the 12:30 time frame.

Adams: What does it mean to take the car to grid?

Nealy: They bring it out to the actual racetrack and park it in its starting position.

*******:** And they don't start up the engines.

Adams: What's a pace car race thing?

Nealy: Those are just ford vehicles that they use as a pace car.

Adams: Are they loud?

Nealy: No. They could run on -- they could drive on the street.

*******:** They give rides to fans.

Adams: And I understand our questions sort of veer into the dangerous territory of micromanaging, but i'm just trying to get a sense of the pacing of this. Is there any chance the pace cars could go, then the warm-up, then the atlantic race?

Nealy: Again, there's the four-hour window. What time do you want -- if you want the -- I can only assume there's a reason for that. It's not an arbitrary amount. We can certainly address --

Adams: That would put us within a three-hour window is your point?

Nealy: Yes. That's only thing i'm saying. I'm not saying it's not a reasonable question, I just can't address it technically from that perspective.

Adams: Thanks.

Saltzman: You mentioned the schedule hasn't been published yet?

Tracy: No. We're not -- champ car is waiting to publish the schedule. We have not --

Saltzman: The whole schedule or just for the Portland event?

Tracy: For the Portland event. For our event here.

Potter: Just for the sunday event?

Tracy: For the weekend schedule.

Nealy: There's been a tentative -- they have the tentative schedule. They all have to have that because everybody works within this time frame. But in terms of the official schedule that's marked official schedule, that would come out this afternoon, hopefully or tomorrow, based upon our approval here.

Saltzman: What would happen if we establish add 10:00 a.m. Start time?

Nealy: I don't know that answer.

Saltzman: Would they just schedule it?

Nealy: I don't know that answer.

Saltzman: I think that was the answer that was supposed to be pursued and answered in the context of last year's discussion.

Nealy: But the discussion was about a four-hour window. And that window is what we're dealing with. The discussion that was had with champ car, and I had it on several occasions, was about the television start time. Because that's what dictates again their scenario. So we had that discussion on several occasions. And trying to deal within that time frame. Their problem is finding a 2½-hour window. Because the live broadcast is 2½ hours.

April 20, 2006

Saltzman: I think you testified that the start times are 1:00 everywhere, the champ car races?

Skinner: It depends on where the race is held. And it depends on if it's eastern standard time lineup for t.v.

Saltzman: It hinges off eastern standard time t.v.

Skinner: It depends on when they can get the t.v. window.

Saltzman: So we don't know they can't get a later t.v. window.

Nealy: Yes, we do. We do know.

Saltzman: They haven't published the schedule yet is what you're telling me?

Nealy: No. The television schedule is out. You can go to your website to [www . Champ car.com](http://www.ChampCar.com) and you can see what the t.v. schedule is. And we are the first cbs broadcast of the year. So we're not a cable broadcast, we're a network broadcast.

Tracy: I think commissioner Leonard, you talked about the warm-up. I think warm-up to us, we know what it means, and it sounds like maybe you're going to go out and warm up your car and your tires and the engine, that's not really the purpose. It's more of a technical test of the car to make sure that since they finish qualifying on saturday afternoon, which they would finish at 3:00 on saturday afternoon and the car sat overnight, that isn't didn't happen that they might need or want to change on correct if they went out for this short 30-minute test and felt they needed to change something on the car.

Potter: My question is perhaps naive, not being familiar with races, car races, and the noise that emanates from it, I will take that gentleman up on his offer to come out and listen. But I would like to ask, is it -- over the years this has been a problem, has p.i.r. investigated baffling or some way to muffle the noise? It just seems like it's such an obvious solution, but what's -- why not?

Tracy: There's noise around the track, barriers, I think mark at p.i.r. Would have to address that. I know they've looked into --

Saltzman: This is mark, who manages p.i.r. For parks.

Mark Wigginton, Parks & Recreation, PIR: Mark wigginton from p.i.r. In was a large study done in the early 1990's, before I took over the track, looking at mitigation track side, and it was just deemed to be way too expensive and ineffective.

Potter: Thank you. Could you repeat that again?

Wigginton: There was a study done in the early 1990's to look at baffles or mitigation at trackside, and it was deemed to be hugely expensive at that time, it was in the \$30 million range and was only going to reduce the decibel levels in the neighborhood by two or three decibels, from what I remember of the study I read.

Leonard: That's about the cost of the tram. [laughter]

Wigginton: I was not going to mention that.

Leonard: Actually they'd get a public benefit.

Potter: My concern is I think if we don't change anything, we're going to be back here again next year with this very same issue. So either we change the ordinance so that everybody understands that it does start at 9:00, or we come to some different agreement with champ car about that.

Saltzman: I wanted to ask mark about that. Aren't we negotiating a new contract with champ car? As we speak?

Wigginton: We have one more year on this contract. This 2006-2007 races are the -- 2007 is when that contract ends. And as far --

Saltzman: It's possible we could negotiate this as part of that contract.

Wigginton: I think --

Saltzman: Realizing champ car can choose from other places to go, but this could be a condition that could be part of --

Wigginton: I think the warm-up, to make it more clear, teams will go out and you have to realize, this is a hugely expensive and competitive business for them. They're in it for prize money points, lots of money, and t.v. exposure for their sponsors. So they'll go out and test and practice, make

April 20, 2006

changes in the car, bring it in, go out, do the first qualifying, repeat that process again on saturday, and after the saturday qualifying, go back into the garage, make more changes on the car to hopefully make it faster for the race, which is different than qualifying, because you're doing three full fuel stops, and 200 miles in our case. So they need to be able to test that car in the morning, and then have a reasonable amount of time to make the changes that are necessary if they went the wrong way, or a driver gets over exuberant and rips the car up, and for champ car, the reason for that window is to make sure everybody has enough time so they can get all their cars on track so they have a good show for all the fans who have spent money to come to the event, or who are watching on t.v.

Saltzman: I'm not questioning the four-hour interval. I don't know enough about the rationale behind it, but I guess if we're going to be negotiating a long-term contract with champ car for future seasons, that's far enough out in terms of my mind in terms of when national t.v. events are scheduled, and I guess it's not axiomatic that an event has to be 1:00 p.m. or 4:00 p.m. eastern-standard time.

Wigginton: No, but it's --

Saltzman: Back when the blazers used to be in the playoffs, cbs found a way to televise those games, regardless of their start times, and they probably catered to east coast start times too. I'm thinking further out with national t.v. scheduling makes champ car better able to accommodate our concerns in scheduling this race.

Wigginton: Another way would be to look at that ordinance in such a way we can guarantee that the national and international sanctioning bodies that bring the shows here are guaranteed that they know exactly what they can and can't do. And so it's been difficult for champ car in the last couple of years because their expectation was they could start at 9:00 or 8:30.

Saltzman: What happened in 1989 and 1990 when we had a 10:00 a.m. Start time? It was televised.

Wigginton: It was before me.

Saltzman: Was it televised nationally?

Wigginton: I don't know if those were televised or not. From p.i.r.'s perspective, quite selfishly, we would much rather have a later start time because our concession sales, we have an extra window to sell concession once the race starts we stop selling food and beverage for the most part. So -- but i've been pushing from my end for a larger start time for my reason, but it's really about t.v. window. When you get to 7:00 p.m. On the east coast you're expected to go to 60 minutes, and they're not going to hold that up for the champ car event.

Adams: I'd like if I could to -- a few more questions around the negotiations. It's I think -- there's a natural suspicion that is applied to listening to the efforts to negotiate with champ car, and I understand they're a big national, international, soon to be bigger merged organization, but reassures that every effort was made and still you failed in your negotiation was them to get a later start time.

Nealy: Well, I had numerous discussions with them about that, and have had discussions with them about that. I think what would be following up on commissioner Saltzman's idea is I think what would be a good idea would be to get someone from champ car out here to meet and talk about, for example, the -- why the four-hour window is there, and number two, to talk about the national television so that you can understand better the television window aspect of things.

Adams: So I don't know what council's mood is on this, but if we were to get a later start time, we could guarantee them for -- if we could guarantee them a longer number of years but a later start time, that might be an area of discussion that we might want to have with them.

Nealy: I think -- that's certainly possible. I think more importantly is -- it really is going to boil down to the issue of -- I think sharon said it best, where champ car I think is trying to be and has always tried to be a good corporate citizen here, and so therefore getting the folks together to discuss it I think is a good suggestion.

April 20, 2006

Leonard: Is --

Adams: It is unusual in terms of the champ car circuit to have a racetrack so close to a neighborhood area?

Wigginton: It's one of the things that champ car in addition to it being an attractive fast natural road course, being so close to the city is a real benefit to them. They want to bring their show more and more to cities which is why they're doing more street racing, like long beach, they're doing events like that.

Adams: In the streets?

Wigginton: In the streets. So it would be right outside as opposed to out at p.i.r. The problem with that, it's hugely expensive to create a racetrack.

Adams: Pearl district 500, i, see it now. [laughter]

Saltzman: You go throughout the city, each neighborhood.

Adams: To be fair, yeah. Ok, dan, i'll let you propose that one.

Wigginton: The problem with a later start time, the city of Portland might lose a lot of valuable exposure on those telecasts, because there's no guarantee we would --

Leonard: I understand that's a good thing, but quantify what that means to me?

Wigginton: I don't have good numbers, except that it's 180 t.v. stations, and it showcases -- 180 countries around the world, and it showcases Portland in a pretty --

Leonard: Does that mean people make plans to vacation here? How do we see that --

Nealy: For example, last year, we had a couple come last year from europe who called up and said that they wanted to come, they go to one race a year around the world for a champ car, and they wanted to come to Portland. Here's a kicker. They don't want to rent a car. Tell me how many other cities, and we pitched this to cbs, how many other cities can they land at p.d.x., take light rail downtown, stay in a hotel, they even could take the trolley over to our party on friday night, go back out to the racetrack, using your mass transit, and then go out to the airport again. It's phenomenal. So, yeah, people do make those kinds of decisions.

Leonard: Where is that paul bunyan guy at?

Wigginton: I know the champ car people themselves come out to go skiing on mt. Hood and to do things like that early in the week as well. And i'll be happy to furnish to your office, for example, the actual footage that was shot where they actually did a tour of the "spruce goose," where they did an opening on champ car -- it's called champ car racer, a t.v. Program, that did a whole thing, talked about how many microbrews within the city limits --

Leonard: We keep saying we get national exposure, and i'm curious what that translates into if we have somehow --

Wigginton: Awareness tourism, it's buying an ad, essentially.

Saltzman: I think we heard testimony there was \$3 million in direct hotel revenues. All letter from champ car states there was total of 900,000 benefits showcasing Portland and its scenic attractions. I was curious, I realize you're not pova or the people who quantify the impacts, but we heard testimony there is no positive impact on kenton neighborhood businesses, and I wonder, has anybody ever documented that, if that's the case or not? Do businesses close up or do they do better business?

Adams: The liquor store might could better business. I don't know. I'm not sure that's enough.

Wigginton: There's a restaurant downtown -- we did a recent -- we did a recent study through econorthwest that I think all of your offices have copies of. Economic impact on -- of the racetrack on Multnomah county, because we really couldn't get much narrower than that. And a huge percentage of the people who come to p.i.r. come in specifically for p.i.r. We were looking at a direct economic benefit of almost \$50 million a year from all of the events. And almost 700 jobs they attribute to activities at the racetrack. And that was net, not a multiplier that comes up with numbers.

Saltzman: But no quantification of the impact on the neighborhood?

April 20, 2006

Wigginton: No. The only real close by regional impact is restaurants and hotels.

Adams: As we discussed last year, there is negligible positive impact in kenton. I don't know about hayden island because I don't live there, but as a resident of kenton, larry that owns the kenton station will tell you that there is not an uptick in -- significant uptick in business. There isn't, and that is something that p.i.r. could do to the economic benefit of kenton to have more sort of -- we talked about this last year, to have more promotion of businesses that people coming or going to the racetrack might frequent.

Adams: This is one of the events, one of handful of noise producing events that does produce an economic benefit for the region, if not for the neighborhood. But -- I can and understand how champ car, and Portland is always discussing these issues, would think we don't necessarily love them. It's not that we don't love them, these issues are legitimate noise issues about p.i.r. being so close to a residential neighborhood that gets a lot of impact, noise impact from a lot of different sources.

Potter: I wanted to ask, how long has p.i.r. been there in its current location?

Wigginton: 45 some years.

Potter: 1989, was that a formal agreement between the city of Portland and neighborhoods and p.i.r. or champ car?

Wigginton: Well before me. But as I understand the history, there was a group of neighbors who either sued or threatened to sue the city and at that time, it was mostly about drag racing. The tracked a that time was doing more than a dozen unmuzzled drag races a year in a nitro fuel cars that are really significantly louder than champ car even, and so that, after a long process, they came to a set of rules that wound up being the ordinance that you have got now. That we work under now.

Saltzman: There was system about this variance setting a precedent by which other organizations would therefore also want waivers. What's your thoughts on --

*******:** Well --

Saltzman: That was from the noise review board.

Wigginton: Of the four variances events now and it's a changeable world, racing changes all the time. So the mix could change so I can't speak -- I can't predict the future. But typically the two historic events, in july and labor day weekend, have only one or two classes of cars and they always schedule around it. It's not professional, it's not a high-level professional event, it's a spectator event but it's not time certain driven by television. American le mans last year for the first time did its race saturday afternoon, again, for a tv -- tv look. It wasn't a live event. It wound up being broadcast on sunday, I think, but they were looking for that afternoon sort of light and feel. So I don't think we have to worry too much about everybody saying I have to be on.

Saltzman: And then I was curious, champ cars, they run on gasoline?

Wigginton: Methanol.

Saltzman: Which is cleaner than gasoline.

Wigginton: And race cars your passenger car at a high rate of speed are much cleaner than they are in traffic. I mean, they very little pollution at high speed.

Potter: Not mine.

Wigginton: Your prius, well, that's different. We have for this year the turbo audi diesel.

Potter: You can say that about commissioner Leonard's car, however.

Saltzman: That's what he will be diving.

Wigginton: A 1966-chevette.

Leonard: Pretty close.

Tracy: Car guys, boy.

Potter: Ok. Any further questions for these folks? You still have your five minutes. You have not used your five minutes. Would you like --

April 20, 2006

Tracy: I used my five minutes. Can I ask commissioner Leonard, some questions? I am only kidding.

Potter: We have to either start your five minutes so you can finish up or put you and commissioner Leonard in a room. [laughter]

Tracy: I will just finish by thanking you for listening to us. I know you have a lot of questions. There are a lot of technical issues we would not expect you to understand. Or to be up to speed on and just be, and even us as the promoters, we do events. We don't work on the cars. So in trying to address some of those technical questions about how long does it take to actually change an engine if you need to change the engine, I am sorry, we have to fall back on what we have been asked to give them four hours. I think the 30-minute warmup is still important to champ car but it's up to you to decide how important. And I don't think it would have another impact. [cell phone ringing] on other events. Thank you very much.

Potter: Thank you. I think that's all of the people who signed up.

*******:** Right.

Potter: Ok. It's now council discussion time. And at some point I have to ask for a motion to accept or return the noise review board.

Adams: Just because it's been a long, can you refresh our memory about who the appellant is and what a vote means here again?

Kathryn Beaumont, Sr. Deputy City Attorney: The appellant is global events group. You have a decision from the noise review board to allow a 10:00 a.m. Start time. The question before you is whether to uphold that condition of the noise review board's decision to modify it, to reverse it, or to remanded it back to the review board. That's the authority given to you.

Leonard: Somebody please turn off their phone.

Adams: Ok. Is it allowable to ask a clarifying question of the chair of the noise review board?

Potter: Certainly.

Adams: Thank you for your indulgence and thanks for volunteering on a very and all of you on a very, very difficult board. The noise review board. You mentioned in your testimony, I was writing down, that you were sort of following previous council policy?

Jocelyn Cox: In 1989 resolution from the city council, which has been mentioned often here today, does state that no variances car shall be on the track prior to 10:00 a.m. On Sunday mornings. The object, I believe -- I was not on the board at that time, although I came shortly after and have some memory of the discussions of the resolution following pretty closely to its having been made. I believe the point was simply to be sure that Sunday had some little window of quiet for the neighborhood.

Adams: Right.

Paul Van Orden: Our use of allowing some warmup time beginning at 9:00 a.m. Was president indicated on the thought that those cars which were on the track at that time, which we were allowing were not variances or would meet the code. So in other words, if a car goes out on the track and he runs around --

Adams: It's in violation.

*******:** Violating the noise code, he is ok. Right?

Adams: Last year, what was the noise control? What was the board's position on last year's request?

*******:** Last year we also said 10:00 a.m.

Adams: Ok.

*******:** For a start time and this is what was overturned by city council.

Adams: Thanks for the refresher. And if I got to ask a technical question of Paul, in terms of the what's, again, refresh our memories, want to make sure we have a good factual basis here, what's allowed without a variance versus what would be allowed with this variance, can you just walk us through again what the difference is?

April 20, 2006

Van Orden: Yes. At the track, at 50-foot from the edge of the track vehicles are measured and if they meet 103 decibels they are in compliance. If they are over 103 then technically you need a variance. Jocelyn is referring to vehicles historically before 10:00 it would meet that 103 decibel level or lower. Those are something we wouldn't have a dialogue about a variance.

Adams: How loud they are allowed to go? When you measured it how loud were they last year?

Van Orden: Last year we gave them --

Adams: On the warmup.

Van Orden: This is a challenge because we are opening up another pandora's box because there's another council decision many years ago around champ car that in support of champ car, something I should have brought up in my presentation, in support of champ car years ago council said, we are not going to put a specific decibel limit on champ car. We are still going to have to go through the variance process but the reason why we did that to support the race sanctioning body was that the sanction body would not entertain coming to Portland if a specific decibel level was -- decibel level was required because f. A car was pulled out of Portland for exceeding the black flag level here it would impact their sticks in the entire race -- statistics for the entire year, the race calculations for the year so council did --

Leonard: What year was that?

Van Orden: I don't remember the exact year.

Leonard: Was it after the 1989?

Van Orden: No. It was part of 1989.

*******:** It was about that same time.

Leonard: Is it possible that was passed fully cognizant of the 10:00 a.m. Sunday start time? In other words, those two aren't necessarily consistent.

Van Orden: Well, they are consistent in the sense that historically, it hasn't been an issue to have cars start before 10:00 a.m. This unique issue with the champ car was a matter in the sense that the cars at champ car, if they start at 10:00 a.m. That doesn't matter, we just can't have a specific decibel level. So interestingly enough, in the last few years when the noise review board has reviewed champ car they have for several years used a configuration of engine that does not require them to come anywhere close to 115 decibels which is the top level it will allow race cars to operate at p.i.r. At 50 feet from the track for one single variance out of the four variances that the noise review board can administer. I'm offering a lot of detail here --

Adams: Are you saying the car, the cars are quiet -- the cars are quiet enough to be within the --

Van Orden: Not compliance. But they don't need the 115 variance we had historically given them. We gave them 115 decibel variance out of four variances. One is 115 at 50 feet, two are 112, and one is 110 going back to the resolution for 1989. That was also spell would out the resolution that the members of the noise review board would only be empowered to issue variances with those specific decibel limits. And so interestingly enough, champ car --

Leonard: That was within the 1989 ordinance?

Van Orden: Yes. 1989 resolution.

Leonard: Including the 10:00 a.m. Start time on sunday?

Van Orden: Yes.

Leonard: That goes back to my point. These are not conflicting policies.

Van Orden: No, no. No. I don't think they are conflicting.

Leonard: Not only are they not conflicting they are within the same resolution.

Van Orden: Right.

Adams: But if the what you are talking about in terms of the council action prior to 1989, wasn't the five years prior to 1989 start time at 9:00 a.m.?

Van Orden: That I don't recall.

April 20, 2006

Adams: I thought I heard. Maybe I misheard the testimony. Ok. So are these cars -- I understand the champ car does not want any top end on the variance. As a matter of whatever business. Do these cars violate --

Van Orden: They do violate the 103.

Adams: What did they operate at when you measured them?

Van Orden: About 110 to 111 top level at the track side monitoring locations.

Adams: So the, if they were under 103 or under they would not need a variance. Technically. But they are operating at 1 hundred something up to 110 in.

Van Orden: Right. So they do need a variance.

Adams: And as a matter of request champ car does not want any variances so this is not a variance up to a decibel. This is an open-ended variance?

Van Orden: Right. But to keep it consistent with the four the board can issue they always choose one of the most appropriately applies to where the technical readings are coming in the year before.

Adams: And lay terms how would you describe the difference between noise at 103 versus noise at 110?

Van Orden: You are approaching just from a layperson's terms being almost twice as loud. So a layperson every time we talk about 10 decibels difference, you increase or decrease, an arrange person would say that's twice as loud.

Adams: I thought it was something like that. Exponential. Thanks.

Saltzman: I would like to ask paul because you are probably -- maybe you can answer this question, too. What is the airport decibel contour that goes throughout kenton neighborhood?

Van Orden: You know, off the top of my head I don't know the exact number but they are outside of the contour for many of the planning elements at the city so they move a little further out, not that there's not a significant impact but the contours for the airport uses statistical motion detector that averages out the exact on the neighbor. Is it 65? [inaudible] ok.

[from audience]: 65 is the cutoff for planning elements so not officially a contour in kenton.

Saltzman: Thanks.

Adams: Thank you. Thank you very much.

*******:** You are welcome.

Saltzman: I guess just to start things off here in terms of reaching a decision, three options I think we can grant the variance. Or we can basically not grant it and I guess if we don't grant it, we are basically calling the card and foreshadowing the negotiations we are going to be having with champ car for a contract that would ensue in the 2008 and on seasons. If we choose to grant the variance I am committing I will raise this issue in the context of the contract negotiations that a 10:00 a.m. Start time has to be part of any future contracts we have with them beyond this season and next. With the possibility of even getting something in place for next season. Or we can choose to call that card now by just upholding the 10:00 a.m. Variance for -- sorry to put you on the spot, as parks commissioner would you be willing if you are reelected to be personally involved with those negotiates?

Saltzman: Yeah, I am personally.

Leonard: That sounds like a threat. [laughter]

Adams: No. If you are --

Potter: Your mind up or whatever what?

Saltzman: What's more important if the mayor keeps me as parks commissioner then I would be in the position of negotiating this agreement. I have met with --

Adams: A personal commitment.

Saltzman: I have met with joe who heads champ car and we have had conversations about the future contract. And, you know, the negotiations are at a sort of the lofty level at this point that they want to be here, we want them to be here, we want to figure out ways that we can derive more

April 20, 2006

revenue from the event. But I don't think we have actually, we have never discussed the start time. I have never had that discussion with them and I guess that would be my commitment that that would be a bottom line condition realizing that could cost us the champ car race. But I am prepared if that's where we want to go is to put that in as an absolute condition for future races, which would be possibly getting a 2007 or beyond -- and beyond.

Potter: You know, I look at it slightly different. I am wondering why p.i.r. is where it's at. [light clapping] no, no clapping. If you want to raise your hands that is fine. I am looking at the neighborhoods that 5,000 homes are in that area. It's of great concern to me. We are concerned about champ car, but what is the relative value of 5,000 homes in that area? And that this is a recurring event throughout the summer. And I look to see where p.i.r. is positioned to kenton, portsmouth, piedmont, hayden island, linnton, it looks really close. I was wondering if there's a way as parks commissioner that perhaps you could look towards trying to find some space somewhere where the noise would not bother an industrial area, where we could find a new home for p.i.r. and, as been suggested by some. Folks, maybe convert the p.i.r. facility to something else that we could also recoup money from but place the racing in an area that is less contentious than here and less disruptive to our neighborhoods.

Leonard: I don't know if you recall, mayor, but I raised that exact point a year ago in this discussion and asked that we look at rivergate which is precisely what you are describing. Because there are, and I haven't been out there in a while so I don't know if this is still as accurate as it was last time I was out there but there were vast tracts of open space in rivergate, and I don't know, parks took me up on that and looked or not, but my suggestion then and sounds like you agree, mayor, is to look the at possibility of utilizing the current p.i.r. for some type of really appropriate use given its proximity to i-5, it's an excellent location, but rivergate, as you know, has had a huge infrastructure development done out there, including the expansion marine drive, the sewer system out there, the infrastructure exists. I would be very excited to see some momentum behind that suggestion.

Adams: I want to weigh in on that particular conversation. And, again, I need to state for the record my, the fact that I live in kenton, the last row of houses before the industrial land for which afterwards is the raceway. When I look back through the record of council discussion of the Portland international raceway it always has included at least the last 20 years I was able to look at the idea of moving it. And here we are, so this is a new council, a new mayor, and a new parks commissioner and I am on it. I just want to make sure that as we look at that, rivergate has its pluses and minuses, too. Race tracks should be far, far away from, as many people as possible. But people live on hayden island and maybe you are right, maybe there's land out there. It's zoned industrial. There's a whole different kind of conversation that would happen then. I think if you are going to look at moving this you are going to look at moving it somewhere else in the region. What I don't want is to not deal with the issues of the noise that we face day in and day out by false hope that it could move. And I know that your intentions up here are absolutely sincere and I no he that there have been sincere intentions in the past. So while moving it would be great, the reason that I took the initiative on the noise reduction tarot for north Portland was to not go down those faults, the paths of false hope but deal with the issues of noise day in and day out and my neighborhood in the neighborhoods of north Portland. On this particular issue, I just wan to be really clear. There's a lot of noise that comes out of Portland international raceway. And most all the noise out of Portland international raceway does nothing economically for anybody. Except a very small group of people. And I know and I know how voting no on this would feel like chipping away at the problem and I know many of you personally. But at the same time, we have a better chance of getting the noise that doesn't do anything for the region out of Portland international raceway. And I think that's a rational approach to the future of p.i.r. There is noise almost every night in the summer. And there shouldn't be in my opinion. I want to remove more noise. I think you said it well. It's so very obnoxious so very often. I am just, I don't think that this is the race to take our

April 20, 2006

frustrations out on because we do get a return. I think there's plenty of other races that I feel make a lot of noise, motorcycles are one of them, that don't produce significant income for p.i.r. But I do think that if commissioner -- the other sort of thing I want to say, if the parks commissioner is willing to be personally involved in the negotiations, then, I think we have a better chance. One, I think the champ car needs to know that we appreciate the opportunity but they also need to know at the same time unlike other race tracks that they deal with this one is in the middle of a neighborhood and they have got to be sensitive to that. It's not an anti-business thing as I have heard it characterized back us to the fact we race so many concerns about this. It is trying to make more peace in a neighborhood that deserves it.

Saltzman: We are going to have a report from the citizens committee on a broader noise reduction strategy that could look at other p.i.r. events that have less economic return to the city as possible areas to reduce noise? That could be among the recommendations.

Adams: Could be. Could be. It could also be there's a lot of other noise factors in the neighborhood as well that I think we can get on top of. So in the course of a month or course of a year of living in north Portland we offer a quieter neighborhood.

Saltzman: I against to respond to the mayor's request to me to look at other sites that's something that is a larger question. I am certainly happy to look at that although I do think rivergate is considered part of the industrial sanctuary. That would be an issue as would the cost of relocating and rebuilding at p.i.r. I am certainly happy to do such an event although I tend to agree with commissioner Adams that would leave a new racetrack to be somewhere else.

Adams: No one has ever said it this plainly and I guess someone has to. That is right now p.i.r. is operated as an enterprise fund which means it has to have, you know, large and small events in order to cover its cost. We as a city could provide money to p.i.r. so it could exist with fewer noise makers. That is also an option that should be put on the table for discussion. And again if we can find somewhere to move this, great. I don't want all our hope to go towards that and it doesn't happen and we are still left with the status quo noisy neighborhood. Are you making a motion? I thought?

Saltzman: I was framing the debate. And as I said, I think although this discussion is helpful, I think what I am leaning towards is supporting the variance request this time but with the absolute condition that city council supports and backs me up, whoever the parks commissioner is in discussions of future races at p.i.r. with champ car, that 10:00 start date has to be, is the ground rule for starting the contract negotiations.

Adams: Second.

Beaumont: If I could perhaps rephrase.

Potter: Please.

Saltzman: Pose that as a motion.

Beaumont: Well, I understand the gist of the motion would be to uphold the appeal and to modify the noise review board's decision by modifying the condition to allow a 9:00 a.m. start time as requested rather than the 10:00 a.m. start time. The noise review board imposed. Is that correct?

Saltzman: That would be the technical aspect of the motion. The other part is and I think would be helpful to have the council go on record is that the parks commissioner and the contract negotiations with champ car about future races, put in a 10:00 a.m. Time certain start date on sunday as our condition and that would be helpful to go on record in support of that as well.

Beaumont: All right. I would see that more as a council directive or council policy position rather than as a specific condition for this variance.

Potter: Does everybody understand the motion now? Sue, call the roll.

Adams: Couple of other thoughts. Because I am concerned that we can't get rid of it, it is about co-existence, I think less hours for noise is the direction that we need to go. I think that it would be more palatable to the neighborhood if we could also get more benefit from having p.i.r. producing all this noise in our neighborhood. Hayden island, kenton, piedmont, portsmouth, bridgeton, we are

April 20, 2006

the ones that live with it the most. I also say this, though, to everyone else who comes in to talk about issues that in their neighborhood are bugging them as well. I mean, northwest Portland has p.g.e. Park, wilkes, concordia, hayden island have airport noise, anyone that lives next to an arterial, laird hill has the tram. I work really hard to try to lessen the impact on any particular neighborhood of any sort of city wide facility, venue, street, what have you. It's really complicated and hard sometimes. But I do think when I look at other neighborhoods across the city and you know that I live in this neighborhood, so my views are informed by that this neighborhood is and wilkes and concordia and hayden island directly you were the path of the airport as well, that these neighborhoods are the noisiest neighborhoods in the city. And that's why I think a comprehensive and strategic approach to reduce the overall incidence of noise in these neighborhoods is the way to go. And it's novel. We have never done it before. I don't know if it will work. But I am definitely committed to doing that. You have my word on that. So I am going to vote for this with the conditions attached. I think it represents progress in our discussions of trying to reduce the impact of this event on the neighborhood. Aye.

Leonard: Well, again, I am glad that the mayor raised the issue of relocation. And I would, in response to commissioner Saltzman's concern that in rivergate we would use precious industrial sanctuary for this. Obviously, we would trade this existing site for that. And this site that's available arguably -- in my view, would be more valuable than anything out in rivergate. It abuts i-5. I would think this would be a much more attractive site and thus may generate more dollars than what the replacement site would be so I would really, as strongly as I could, encourage commissioner Saltzman to pursue that. This came up a year ago I voted no. And it came back with some conditions that, as I recall, included addressing some of the very issues that I have heard this council say they want to address today. And I voted yes. I try often not to change my mind but it was a -- unless there's a compelling reason but I felt the compelling reason at that time was there was a rational effort to address this. And I appreciate the champ cars and I appreciate the business they bring. But not all of the responses to the question I asked did I appreciate. Some of the responses not all of them, were basically the rule says what the rule says and we have to comply with that, notwithstanding what an elected majority of the council may have done in 1989 and that does not sit well with me. If we want different outcomes, we have to behave differently. It's kind of an axiom of our life and it disrupts some apple carts often. But this is an example of that. I foresee a us sitting back in a year and having this same discussion and some of us saying, well, I give you one more year and then everybody doing ok, next year we will see you and over and over. The only way I think we are going to change that is to change how we are coming down on this issue. And as I have done often in my life, I often regret not listening to my initial instinct and my initial instinct a year ago was to vote no. I did and I changed my mind. I shouldn't have. And so I fall back to my original reaction, which is, you know, Portland is a community first. It is a neighborhood first. Neighborhood by neighborhood. And to me, I am a person that is just personally very sensitive to a lot of noise in my neighborhood. I am the guy in the neighborhood that will new york on the person's door at 12:00 at night and ask them if they heard their dog barking and they will say yes and I will say, so did i. Isn't that interesting that I heard it, too? Right there. Right next door to you. So these kinds of issues affect me in a personal level because I really do believe, as the man said, a man's home is his castle, and in 2006, a woman's home is her castle as well. And I feel very strongly about that. In that balance of trying to find right opportunities for champ cars but also balancing that and respecting the decision, by the way, of a prior council in 1989. And that's I think what I am doing is giving that council that debate, those balancing acts that they apparently entered into cognizant of all these things we are trying to figure out again in 2006. So for those reasons, I vote no.

Saltzman: Well, I am going to support my motion and I guess I primarily think that we did start something last year in the consideration of the variance last year and that was the formation of this committee. And I guess we would all like it to be done now but we also recognize I guess there's a

April 20, 2006

certainly amount of process that has to occur and it's not done yet. But I do think that we need to look at more comprehensive ways and more cost effective ways to reduce noise at p.i.r. I certainly can make a commitment to look at other options to relocate p.i.r. But I don't think that's going to be an easy task. But I can make that commitment. And I will make the commitment as I have to make this a bottom line condition for future contract with champ car to race at p.i.r. and Portland.

However, I do think this is one event that does have a significant economic impact on the city of Portland. It showcases the city of Portland. Provides revenues to hotels and concessionaires and I do think that this one variance for this one event is worth it. But we do have to tackle our larger issue of too much noise in north Portland. With that I absolutely agree. So you have my commitment to make this a bottom line condition for contract, look at alternative is for p.i.r. and support the variance for 9:00 a.m. On June 16. Aye.

Potter: I think we have a problem here. Last year I voted yes. I am going to vote no this year. And the reason I am doing that is because I think last year, I gave the edge to champ car and gave them the chance to change things. But this year, my actual concern is much larger and that is, the siting of p.i.r. and the impact it has on that community too often. And I'm concerned that -- I actually like commissioner Leonard's idea of treating industrial area and -- trading industrial area and if we are going to have an international raceway put it some place where it does the least harm to the residents of Portland. I think that they have to be a consideration and a top consideration. So I know how this will be played in the papers but that's ok. We make decisions based on our consciences and what we think of in the best interests of our community and I cannot in good conscience, once again, approve this. And it may seem like an hour to the champ car folks and I understand where they are coming from. I understand the effects of how you broadcast nationally, but I think we have got 5,000 households we should be taking into consideration. So I will work, my commitment is to work with you, commissioner, and any of the other commissioners who wish to see what we could do to relocate p.i.r. So that we can demonstrate if that's something that Portland wishes to have and we find the location that has at least impact. But in the meantime, I think that all we will do today is only moderate one hour one day of a year. And I think it needs a permanent long-term solution and certainly, commissioner Adams, I don't want to create any false hopes but I do want to create the sense that this council is willing to find other solutions to this that are actually long term solutions and don't have to be immediately 80ed each year at city council. So my commitment is to work to try to find an alternative site for this but I think that given a year to rectify this particular issue, and with no solution, and when I asked, will we be facing this again next year, the obvious answer is, yes, we will, because nothing will have changed. So I vote no. City attorney, could you advise us what we do in this situation?

Beaumont: Well, the motion fails on a 2-2 vote. You need three votes to take action on this appeal. You can either try for another motion that will receive three votes. Or you could continue it until commissioner Sten is here.

Leonard: Doesn't the no vote sustain the action of the vote now sustain the action of the appeal board?

Beaumont: When you tie 2-2 on a motion there's no action taken. It takes three votes to take action by the council.

Leonard: I mean doesn't the effect --

Potter: The noise board ruling stand?

Beaumont: No. It stands only if it receives three votes from the council.

Potter: What do we have standing?

Beaumont: Well, you have the noise review board decision. You have this appeal. You need to take action.

Leonard: We have an ordinance that says no --

Beaumont: You have a resolution.

Leonard: Resolution that says no warmup time before 10:00 a.m.

April 20, 2006

Beaumont: You do have that resolution that it is a council resolution. You can choose to modify it, change it.

Leonard: But if we do nothing that resolution controls, does it not?

Beaumont: No. What you have before you is a specific decision and a specific appeal.

Leonard: What if we do nothing?

Beaumont: In a land use appeal if you tied on a 2-2 vote there would not be any action.

Leonard: What if we do nothing can they start warmup at 9:00 a.m.?

Beaumont: No. I mean, you would have the noise review board decision.

Saltzman: In the interest of clearing up ambiguity I will now make a motion to uphold the noise review board.

Leonard: Second.

Potter: Call the vote.

Adams: So and the noise review board was to --

Leonard: Deny.

Beaumont: Grant the variance with the nine a.m. start time. 10:00 a.m.

Leonard: Deny the variance.

Adams: Deny the variance of a 9:00 a.m. Start?

Beaumont: I am sorry. The copy of the decision that I received says the variance was approved with conditions and the condition was a 9:00 a.m. start time. Did you mean it to say -- I am sorry. 10:00 a.m. start time. So I guess your decision would be to deny the appeal and uphold the noise review board decision.

Saltzman: That's my motion.

Potter: That's what you seconded?

Leonard: Yes.

Potter: Call the vote.

Adams: A yes vote is to approve the denial.

Beaumont: The yes vote is to -- the effect of a yes vote they can't start before 10:00. Based on the motion the commissioner Saltzman made.

Adams: A yes vote is they only start at 10:00 a.m.?

Beaumont: Correct.

Adams: Ok. Hmm.

Leonard: And it's going to pass if that helps. [laughter]

Potter: Do we need to help you?

Adams: Hmm. Aye.

Leonard: Aye.

Saltzman: Well, my commitment in the last motion still remain to pursue alternative locations for p.i.r. and also to puts it in the contract negotiations with champ car. So this is just bringing that issue to a head this year. And I will support this motion. Aye.

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] please read the next item.

Item 501.

Potter: Before staff begins its report, a substituted exhibit needs to be introduced into the record. I need a motion to accept the staff's revised substitute exhibit a dated april 6, which will be discussing today.

Leonard: So moved.

Adams: Second.

Potter: Please call the vote.

Adams: Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye.

Potter: Folks, please introduce yourself and my notes reflect that you are going to be brief and to the point.

April 20, 2006

Betsy Ames, Bureau of Planning: Indeed. My name is Betsy Ames with the Bureau of Planning. With me is Marguerite. We were here several weeks ago for the hearing on the Linnton Hillside study and Marguerite will provide you an update on our discussions with the community since then and the revised substitute exhibit.

Marguerite Feursanger, Bureau of Planning: The planning commission includes three recommendations to reduce the comprehensive plan designation, to rezone publicly owned properties from residential to open space and thirdly to establish minimum lot areas for most hillside properties. The first two recommendations have broad support in the community. At the hearing the March 15 hearing, you heard a lot of testimony about the third option.

Recommendation, excuse me. And I just want to explain it very briefly. This is an example of lots and two ownerships, ownership a consists of four lots. Each 6,000 square feet for a total of 24,000 square feet. And ownership b, just one lot, 6,000 square feet. Under today's rules, owner a could develop a house on each lot, four houses. Owner b, one house on the lot. Our proposed rules to increase the minimum lot size from 6,000 to 10,000, that is shown on the bottom. And owner a has their density reduced from four houses to two houses because 24,000 square feet can accommodate two houses and ownership b remains the same and those are those small lots that the Bureau of Planning would like to maintain buildability. Again the issues raised in testimony, Linnton neighborhood residents voice concern about inadequate public services. They also advocated for stronger regulations that do not allow development of those small lots. On the other hand, you heard testimony from property owners who voiced concern that they would not be able to build on their property. In addition there was also some testimony about concern about how building permits are reviewed by the city. And after testimony, you directed staff to hold a community meeting to discuss the recommendations and clarify any disagreements and you encouraged all parts, that's the Bureau of Planning, community members as well as property owners to explore compromise. So we did that. We held a community meeting April 6. We had mailed written notice to all residents in the Linnton neighborhood. We held the meeting in the evening in Linnton. About 40 to 50 people attended. And we came with some compromises and essentially two things. And they are included in your packet. You have a revised substitute exhibit a and there's two shaded areas that represent those changes. One is a change of the date. And in the regulation and another limits, eliminates an option of a duplex or attached house on corner lots. The first change was requested by the Linnton neighborhood association. And accepted by staff. And the second change was suggested by Bureau of Planning staff and accepted by the neighborhood. So in addition to regulatory compromises, the Bureau of Planning is suggesting or is holding a training session scheduled for Linnton residents on how to access the city's building permit and land use review online system. The Bureau of Development Services staff have worked really hard to get this information out to folks and we have offered to have that training. We have about 10 people signed up. Another option would be Bureau of Planning staff would be willing to convene a meeting with Linnton representatives as well as city technical staff to talk about the building permit process and the particular issues of Linnton. And if there's interest on council, we would do that. Just to remind you, the recommendations here for the Linnton Hillside study, we recommend that you amend the development standards as proposed by staff and the revised substitute exhibit a dated April 6 and also adopt Linnton Hillside recommended plan and its appendices and amend the planning map. The Portland zoning code and map as shown in the Linnton Hillside plan and the revised substitute a and just one thing that ordinance I gave you just a sample of the ordinance and on the third page, there's a couple of highlighted changes that are necessary. One basically reflects that we are amending the exhibit a. And then item I is not needed any longer many it's just simply a detail we were trying to coordinate other code packages and that's not possible anymore. So we would just like that struck in the ordinance. And that's it. If you have questions for me I would be happy to address them.

Saltzman: Did this community meeting invite property owners?

*******:** The notice was sent to all property owners in Linnton.

April 20, 2006

Potter: Thank you. Any further questions? Thank you, folks. We have invited the linnton neighborhood president to address the council. Is pat wagner here? Hi. Thanks for being here, pat.

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

Potter: Please state your name for the record and tell us what you would like us to know.

Pat Wagner, President, Linnton Neighborhood Association: Ok. My name is pat wagner, president of the linnton neighborhood association. The bureau of planning has convinced the majority of the people of linnton that the problems we are experiencing regarding linnton's frail fragile hillside and public services cannot be fixed by zoning. Representatives of the mayor's office have assured us the bureaus involved can work with us to resolve linnton's issues. The people of linnton are relying on the city's words to have the bureau's work with us. The linnton neighborhood association voted to not oppose the bureau's plan for linnton. Thank you.

Potter: My note here says that the neighborhood voted unanimously with one abstention.

Wagner: Yes.

Potter: And to support this recommendation. Person who abstained may testify at council. Is that person here? Would you like to testify? Thank you, pat. Would you like to come forward?

Darise Weller: My name is darise weller. I live on germantown road and I guess that the community meeting I missed an opportunity to speak on my issue, too, but as I read this, this was topic of discussion was to be talking about stand alone properties and I didn't realize that I could also include in my discussion, and make my point and have it involved in the recommendations, too. So I am here now speaking in support of maintaining the zoning that was decided on by the neighborhood association namely r-5 for my property or at least the very least a compromise that I will propose. The neighborhood plan designates my property r-5 and the city's proposal is r-10. From personal perspective this means I cannot subdivide my property which was previously subdividable by joining all my lots into one property will have 19,300 square feet and you need 20,000 square feet to divide under the proposal by the city so I am 700 feet short. I have two lots that equal 7,500 square feet and two lots that my property is located on that are 11,800 feet. At this community meeting, it was suggested by marguerite bureau of planning that I could possibly ask for a partition to divide my property. Using a rounding up guideline since I would have only -- since I would only be 700 feet short of subdividing. After I further studied this option I found it would be very expensive process, many thousands of dollars and after spending that money, initiating the process my quest could be denied. I have access to all the necessary infrastructures that many of the stand alone properties do not have. Such as access to emergency services, which is one of the major concerns of my neighborhood. I will have r-5 and r-2 property on two sides of my property so my request is not inconsistent with the neighboring properties. The city's proposal clearly reduces the value of my property making it a measure 37 claim and my compromise does not lessen that claim for value for measure 37. To retain the value of my property it would be my best interest to have my property r-5 as the neighborhood plan has already approved but if that cannot be possibly be done I would propose a compromise of changing my two lots that comprise 7,500 square feet to r-7. There by making a buildable lot. This would achieve the city's goals of reducing density, and allow me the end result of their suggested partitioning using the rounding up to subdivide and save me the exorbitant costs of the process. It is my dream -- my property is my dream of my funds for my retirement. And isn't that just as important as somebody's dream to build a house on a small stand alone property? I mean, they can even sell their dream to somebody else. So even though they don't have access to the infrastructure that my property has, is that really fair treatment?

Potter: Does the community have any exception to that?

Wagner: The community linnton neighborhood association plan calls for r-5. On darise weller's property in that area.

Potter: Maybe we should ask -- go ahead.

April 20, 2006

Saltzman: Ok. If I understood the testimony correctly, she is requesting two of her lots go to r-7 and that that would allow her to therefore have a 20,000 square foot property? Which could be subdivided?

Weller: No. I am sorry. Actually, I would like it to go to r-5. That's my best interest financially for it to go to r-5. However, I am proposing a compromise that my two lots that are 7,500 square feet which are, you know, currently buildable on, would be r-7 which would still make them currently buildable and then just changing that zoning to r-7 rather than having to me go through the process of partitioning the property and all the time and money involved in that.

Potter: I have some folks from planning come up.

Feursanger: If you are interested I have a map that shows darise's property.

Potter: Yes.

Feursanger: Darise's property consists of, when she says three lots, it's this lot right here which actually as a little dashed line. That's the historical lot line. And two other lots, these are the small lots that I believe darise is suggesting be rezoned to r-7. Currently, the entire area is zoned for r-10.

And I acknowledge the neighborhood plan does call for this particular site, the neighborhood plan does not do much upzoning. The plan was more about reducing the zoning on the hillside site. It makes an exception for this site and another in harborton. Bureau of planning staff's perspective r-5 density -- r-5 is a high density single dwelling zone that it's not appropriate for steeply sloping site, and our goal here is to reduce the number of houses. Darise's property if you look at this map, all those light blue lots are the large ownerships that our regulations are intending to affect to reduce the number of houses. And darise's situation may be a little different in that she is just 700 square feet shy of getting two houses and I suggested to her this alternative process which is our land division process. We are not recommending a change in that process. If she goes through and creates new lots through a land division she has this ability to get two lots because of that grounding provision. However, you know, I believe that that's a good solution although it is expensive for her.

Only because it's a good test of the adequacy of services. The city bureau staff have more time to devote than they would to a building permit to review the particulars of the properties. So it looks like you have a couple of options you can, go with the staff proposal to keep the property r-10, or to rezone the whole thing just this one site, r-5, and darise was saying the adjacent -- if you have been out on highway 30, this property right here is the recently developed cascade condominium development, 42 units. And when our plan got underway this was under construction. This is the only site I believe in linnton that's zoned for multidwelling housing. It's pretty dense and darise is right next to it. However, this wasn't under development at planning we probably would have looked at down zoning that. So the other option is as darise was suggesting a compromise was to keep this lot r-10 and this r-7, and my initial reaction to that is that it represents a spot zoning. They are all residential zones but it's this r-7 in the midst of r-10.

Potter: R-7 lots are to build one house on the lot? Not multiple units?

Feursanger: Yes. If this, the two small lots were zoned r-7, she could build one house there and then one house on the larger lot and would not need to go through the land division review process.

Potter: One house there or one house on each of those other two properties?

Feursanger: She's got the four lots. One house here on these two small ones and one house on this larger. And she has an existing house right there.

Potter: Darise?

Feursanger: The maximum would be two under a land division or under darise's proposed compromise of the r-10, r-7.

Potter: Darise, is that acceptable to you?

Weller: To change it to r-7, yes.

Potter: Folks, you have a problem doing that? That sounds reasonable us to. What do we have to do to make that happen?

April 20, 2006

Feursanger: You have to amend the comprehensive plan map and the zoning map to reflect that change. So your motion to amend would include what I have said previously, if you got all that. And then just to add this particular site, if you have an address. If we don't have a map, is it difficult? If we don't have the map?

Kathryn Beaumont, Sr. Deputy City Attorney: On the record?

Feursanger: Yes.

Beaumont: I think if you can clearly describe I think it's understood clearly what property we are talking about for the, to receive the r-7 zoning.

*******:** Can we offer this property by lots, by address? And her name?

Leonard: Could you hear me?

Beaumont: I think so. You would like to have the property clearly identified.

Leonard: She is the owner of record so that would show up on the deed as identity.

Feursanger: It was suggested that you take the rest of the testimony. I believe there's other testifiers and we can make up a map during that time.

Leonard: Very good.

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

Adams: Betsy's drawing skills coming to good use.

Potter: There are people signed up to testify?

Parsons: Yes, we do have several.

Potter: Please call them.

Parsons: Kerrigan gray, kyrian gray, sally woolley.

Potter: Were there three people called?

Potter: Yes. Kerrigan, kyrian, and sally.

Potter: Please state your name for the record and you each have three minutes.

Kerrigan Gray: Start? My name is kerrigan gray. I live at 9511 n.w. Harbor boulevard in linnton. Mayor Potter, council members I am representing the linnton neighborhood association land use committee today. Since the last council consideration of the recommended code changes proposed by the planning bureau, linnton land use committee members have met twice with the planning bureau to discuss the hillside plan proposals. The neighborhood association after a presentation by the bureau of planning on their recommendation held a meeting and voted to support the planning bureau linnton hillside plan recommended to council. Which you have now amended again. But anyway. You get the idea. A key goal of the hillside portion of the neighborhood plan is to address the serious public safety and health short comings of our neighborhood public services infrastructure which are strained further by each large increase in residential density. The linnton neighborhood association will continue to work with the planning bureau and other city agencies to groove the conditions for all areas of our neighborhood. We will revisit these issues with council in the future with code recommendations that work toward the overall goals we have outlined in our improvement philosophy. The linnton neighborhood plan. We also want to acknowledge and appreciate the countless hours and energy put forth by many, many people in linnton, in Portland, in the city, and the city agencies, over the past two decades in bringing this part of our overall vision for linnton to you today for your approval. Thank you.

Kyrian Gray: My name is kyrian gray if and I am in favor of this hillside recommended plan. However, I am disappointed in the community involvement process. At the city council hearing on march 15, the planning bureau was directed to work with linnton representatives on a compromise to the planning bureau's change. Linnton representatives met with planning bureau representatives twice and there were many emails. I am disappointed that there was no compromise after many hours of work by both linnton and the city. An offer was made to have permitted work with linnton residents to explain why bes grants permits without concern for health and safety of residents. I am for responsible development and believe that building permits should be evaluated objectively within the context of the overall impact on the linnton hillside neighborhoods. I hope city council

April 20, 2006

will endorse the proper of having somebody from bes become familiar with the linnton hillside neighborhoods. In addition I hope that the linnton neighborhood association will continue to work with the city and return to city council a supplement to this adopted plan with meaningful additions for changes to the linnton hillside neighborhood. Thank you for your time.

Sally Wooley: I am sally woolley. Address 14336 s.w. 88th, tigard. I am a builder. I own a lot in linnton and I have been involved peripherally as the neighborhood association and the city has gone through this process. And I just want to say that it's really been something and I appreciate you and I appreciate the staff and the neighborhood. People are terrific.

Leonard: Would you write a letter to the editor? [laughter]

Potter: Mention randy's name in particular.

Saltzman: Just all of us.

Leonard: All of us. That would be nice to read.

Wooley: I can't be bought. Forget it. [laughter] I just want to say thank you and the process has been overall pretty good. And I know that there's more to do and I think I was going to say something important.

Adams: We distracted you. Our apologies.

Wooley: Oh. I do remember at the last time we came here that you guys said that you were real hesitant about property rights and taking property rights from people and so I think that that really made an impression on me. Thank you very much for doing that. I think it's fair and I urge you to go ahead and adopt this.

Adams: Thank you.

Potter: Thank you, folks. Are there others?

Parsons: Three more.

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

Norma Corristan: I am norma corristan. I will live in dundee, Oregon. I am a nonresident property owner in the linnton neighborhood. I have one of the smaller parcels and like the speaker before me, I wanted to thank you for your sensitivity to preserving the rights of those of us who have smaller parcels to continue to be able to use those. I also wanted to thank you for the process. I understand it takes a long time to do a process like this, but staff has an excellent recommended plan. They have kept me informed via mailings as to meetings, not all of which I have been able to attend but I have been able to attend some of them. And i, too, have enjoyed the process and I admire a city that takes the pains to keep everyone involved. And I look forward to actually upping my involvement in the development of this neighborhood. Thank you.

Ross Folberg: My name is ross folberg. I am a linnton resident. I urge you to pass what the planning department is currently put forward. And I urge you to make this effective immediately. There be no delay that somebody could slip something in the meantime. I would like to say that we put countless hours and volunteer basis on this effort. I am one of the newer people. I have only been work on this for about five years. And after your march 15 mandate for all of us to compromise, we, the linnton members and the linnton community, went out and met with people such as sally who testified against our plan the last time. And really worked hard to try to find a reasonable compromise. And worked hard to try to find a balance. I didn't feel such that as much of a willingness to come up with a reasonable compromise with the bureau of planning people. Their changes are too small changes. One is a date. One is adding a duplex issue and streets that aren't really, they are only streets on paper basically. It's part of the issue for that. And I found that fairly frustrating and the us on the volunteer basis spent hours and hours and felt like, you know, they were very willing to meet with us. They were very friendly. They were very willing to let us speak. And hear us but willingness to adjust their -- I found very willing willingness for them on their part to adjust their issues. And I think that's something in the future that maybe mayor Potter, being this is your group, you could have veronica try to address in some ways. I also found out

April 20, 2006

there was another, I think another big issue that needs to be addressed is that the, there's somewhat of a disconnect between the bureau of planning and the permit department. The bureau of planning I think feels that adjustments are exceptions, not the standard. And I think the permit department feels the opposite. One of the issues with linnton makes it very unique is that what's on paper, what the permit deposit has by looking at the city charts and the city maps, is drastically different than what is out there in reality. That there are many, many streets that don't exist. I mean there's a street that somebody wants to build a four plex on right now that as a stream running through the middle of it and the other access to the street has trees in excess of three foot in diameter. And that these things need to be addressed and just because on paper it says it's a street I think that some of our issues and some of our frustrations are that the -- I guess I am out of time. But that these aren't taken into account. So in some ways I think a large part of this is that disconnect that the planning department says these are exceptions and that's the issue. If that was true, I don't think we would have quite the issues we do. I think we would be much more -- I think the planning department's approach would be much more reasonable. But reality, the permit department is very different.

Potter: I will discuss it with the planning bureau.

Folberg: And the permit department.

Potter: Then discuss that with commissioner Leonard.

Folberg: Ok. It just seems like there's a major disconnect.

Leonard: You are going to keep going until I get in trouble.

Folberg: I think there are things.

Adams: Give him another three minutes.

Folberg: Thank you: I think there are things that like quite frankly, in some sense in the planning department's defense, with the people we dealt with, especially betsy, there were things that she I think really tried to do but there was kind of a road block because they maybe are under separate entities and I think, in fact, I think she had some frustration maybe. I mean, I can't speak for her feelings but it seemed like there was some frustration by the fact that of that disconnect. That there were things that, you know, it would be nice if the permit department would look at these issues a little more individually or, you know, look at the difference between what's on paper and what actually exists. I mean, on paper you may have a 50-foot road. In reality you may have 75 cords of fir trees. And like I said a creek in one case. And a stairway. There's an avenue that's actually a stairway.

Potter: Commissioner Adams was kidding about the additional three minutes. [laughter] have you made -- did you want to conclude any statements, sir?

Folberg: Well, I just would certainly hope this is a good start. I mean that this move is definitely move in the right direction and that it is a tough decision. I mean, you have, there is a balance here between health and safety and between people's property rights. And everyone hates to take those away. But I think that ultimately, I think health and safety should always trump the dollar and the ability to make a profit. And I mean, you guys make rules. That's what you do for a living. And making rules always will restrict somebody. Whether it's saying that, you know, you can't drive so fast on the roads or saying you have to give up some of your money for taxes or saying you can't build certain things. And that's what rules do. And so somebody is always restricted with rules. And that's not an easy job. But --

Adams: No, it's not an easy job.

Folberg: But the decision should always -- in the end, what benefits health and safety, what benefits the community as a whole in the long term.

Adams: That's always --

Potter: That was the reason behind what the planning bureau took on. To acknowledge it was based on the health and safety of the residents. Thank you for your comments, sir.

Adams: Thanks.

Potter: Are there other -- ok.

April 20, 2006

Saltzman: Can we have sally testify again?

Pheema Cushman: I just have a question.

Potter: First state your name.

Cushman: My name is pheema cushman. I have lived in linnton for many, many years.

Potter: Could you please sit down or would you prefer to stand? Would you prefer to stand or would you prefer to sit?

Cushman: Prefer to sit.

Potter: Please have a seat.

Cushman: Thank you. I live in whitwood court. It's a part of linnton. Linnton has sewers installed some years ago. And they stopped before from they got to whitwood court. And the people on whitwood court were led to believe that they were still going to have sewers eventually. And that's been a long time ago. We have never gotten sewers there. And I would just like to know if you are planning on putting sewers in in the future.

Potter: Does anybody have an answer to that question? Would you care to come forward and respond to this lady's point.

Feursanger: Hello. We looked into the all of the services and --

Potter: State your name.

Feursanger: Marguerite. Planning bureau. Thank you. In whitwood court, are right. Sanitary sewer service is not available. We asked the bureau of development services to look at that, to look at the cost of the, of providing that. And --

Leonard: Environmental services?

Feursanger: Bureau of environmental services.

Leonard: You said development services.

Feursanger: Did i? Oh, jeez. Sorry. I am sorry. I don't recall the number figure but it was extremely expensive and currently the bureau of environmental services has no plans to extend the service. Mainly because it's on a steep slope. It's difficult to install. And it's a limited number of customers.

Potter: Did you get your question answered, ma'am?

Cushman: No. I don't think that's quite true. Whitwood court is not like linnton properties. It's not built up like that. It's not so steep. We have never had a landslide. At least not in my lifetime which is pretty good time. And I just don't think that it would be nearly as expensive to do there as it was in the city of linnton. With all the compacted areas in there. We are fairly open areas up there. And I just don't know why they can't do it.

Adams: I will be happy to look into it. It's not an issue that I know. Although I am in charge of the bureau of environmental services. If you would, I assume we have your contact information. If you would provide it to staff, then, I will get back to you with an answer.

Cushman: Ok.

Adams: Thank you.

Cushman: Thank you.

Potter: Any further discussion by the council? I want to acknowledge the linnton community's participation, the discussions and the collaboration with our city staff. I really appreciate that, folks. To be commended for that. I also want to acknowledge our city staff, marguerite and betsy for continuing to meet with the community. I think that this hopefully will set the stage for how we can work together as you move to discussions about linnton's waterfront. So did you folks wish to make a statement?

Betsy Ames, Planning Bureau: We do have a map with darise weller's property identified on it. We are suggesting you rezone her entire property rather than dividing it into r-10 and r-7, rezone the entire property r-7 with the comp plan designation of r-7 as well.

Leonard: How would we state that in an amendment?

April 20, 2006

Potter: Is darise's property, is that acceptable what they said? Ok. Do we need that as an amendment to the --?

Beaumont: I think what you have before you you have the substitute exhibit a, which staff has put before you; you have the amendments to the ordinance, which are shaded which staff has presented to you; and then staff can present, you can adopt the modified map that staff has hand colored to reflect the --

Feursanger: You call it an exhibit? Identify it?

Beaumont: How would you identify it? Margo reed?

Feursanger: Rezone map. Rezone amendment map.

Beaumont: You would adopt the hand-drawn rezone amendment map.

Potter: We have already voted on the exhibit a. To amend that.

Beaumont: Then it's just --

Potter: That's correct and it passed? Correct, sue? Now all we have is this amendment to the --

Beaumont: Ordinance.

Potter: Ordinance for the -- but it's the amendment to the zone map?

Beaumont: You have -- was this part of -- have they voted on this amendment?

Feursanger: They just said this they did that in the beginning.

Potter: We voted on the amendment a.

Beaumont: I will sorry. I have still with the noise variance. Only thing left would be to adopt the rezone map.

Potter: Ok. Do I hear a motion to adopt the rezone map?

Adams: So moved.

Saltzman: Second.

Potter: Please call the vote.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded]

Beaumont: This means the ordinance as amended passes to second reading. Next week.

Potter: Yes. Next week?

Beaumont: Next week.

Adams: I see. Then can we just, while everyone the in the room I want to thank staff, I want to thank your staff, mayor, and my own and especially the folks in linnton. I appreciate your patience. This I know was one of the trickier efforts because of the geography and everything else that looking at on a lot by lot basis was really necessary. And I know that was frustrating but thank you for hanging with us.

Leonard: And I second that. I really appreciate your work.

Saltzman: Me, too.

Potter: That makes four of us, actually. [laughter]

Leonard: Which today is unusual.

Potter: Which today is very unusual. Thank you, folks. Thank you, staff.

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

Potter: We are adjourned until next week, I do believe.

At 4:53 pm, Council adjourned.