



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

OFFICIAL
 MINUTES

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **6TH DAY OF JUNE, 2007** AT 9:30 A.M.

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

Commissioner Adams left at 11:51 a.m.

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

Item 651 was pulled for discussion and on a Y-5 roll call, the balanced of the Consent Agenda was adopted.

COMMUNICATIONS	Disposition:
633 Request of Karl Chromy to address Council regarding problems with Water Bureau and City Hall security (Communications)	PLACED ON FILE
634 Request of Nathan Jimenez to address Council regarding preservation of the 1307 Broadway Building (Communications)	PLACED ON FILE
TIME CERTAINS	
635 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM - Amend an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Port of Portland related to Portland International Airport and increase allowable compensation up to \$819,804 to reimburse the City for costs related to a 34-month joint planning process titled Airport Futures (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter; amend Contract No. 52355) Motion to amend the Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Portland to memorialize the membership of the Airport Futures Planning Advisory Group: Moved by Commissioner Leonard and seconded by Commissioner Adams. (Y-5)	PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM
636 TIME CERTAIN: 10:30 AM - Accept the Arts & Economic Prosperity III Report (Report introduced by Mayor Potter and Commissioner Adams) (Y-4; Adams absent)	ACCEPTED
CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION Mayor Tom Potter City Attorney	

June 6, 2007

<p>*637 Authorize the City Attorney to enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with Local Government Personnel Institute for expert legal advice, consultation and legal services (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p>181010</p>
<p>*638 Amend Legal Services Agreement with James Deason for outside counsel (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 36817) (Y-5)</p>	<p>181011</p>
<p>639 Authorize City Attorney to commence legal proceedings against Locating, Inc., if necessary, for damage to City property (Resolution) (Y-5)</p>	<p>36509</p>
<p>Office of Management and Finance – Business Operations</p>	
<p>640 Amend contract with David L. Tucker for Risk Management computer consulting services to extend termination date and increase hourly rate (Second Reading Agenda 605; amend Contract No. 34304) (Y-5)</p>	<p>181012</p>
<p>641 Amend contract with WaterLeaf Architecture to provide additional architectural consultant services for The Justice Center remodel project (Second Reading Agenda 606; amend Contract No. 34437) (Y-5)</p>	<p>181013</p>
<p>Office of Management and Finance – Human Resources</p>	
<p>*642 Create a new Nonrepresented classification of SAP Architect and establish a compensation rate for this classification (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p>181014</p>
<p>643 Change the salary range of the Nonrepresented classification of Benefits Supervisor (Second Reading Agenda 608) (Y-5)</p>	<p>181015</p>
<p>Police Bureau</p>	
<p>*644 Authorize a Metropolitan Explosive Disposal Unit Agreement with law enforcement agencies in the Oregon Counties of Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington and the Washington County of Clark to participate in and fund activities (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p>181016</p>
<p>Commissioner Sam Adams</p>	
<p>Bureau of Environmental Services</p>	
<p>645 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with City of Gresham to coordinate water quality monitoring of the Columbia Slough (Ordinance)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>646 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Gresham to provide laboratory analytical services (Ordinance)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM</p>

June 6, 2007

<p>647 Authorize Grant Agreements and Intergovernmental Agreements with seventeen non-profit and public entities related to the Community Watershed Stewardship Program (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p align="center">Office of Transportation</p>	
<p>*648 Grant revocable permit to Restaurant Services Inc. to close SW Stark St. between 10th Ave and 11th Ave on June 17, 2007 (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">181017</p>
<p>*649 Accept a grant from and authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Oregon Department of Transportation in the amount of \$142,200 for bikeway signing (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">181018</p>
<p>650 Grant revocable permit to NECA/Mississippi Business Association to close N Mississippi Ave between Fremont St and Skidmore St and N Shaver St between Michigan Ave and Albina Ave and N Failing St between Mississippi and Albina Ave Alley on July 14, 2007 (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>651 Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Oregon Department of Transportation for the US 30: NW 112th Ave - NW 105th Ave project for additional work and to clarify maintenance responsibility for the speed reader boards (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 52384)</p>	<p align="center">REFERRED TO COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC UTILITIES</p>
<p>652 Extend contract with TriMet through September 1, 2009 for Fareless Square Extension (Second Reading Agenda 614; amend Contract No. 51564) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">181019</p>
<p>653 Grant revocable permit to PREM Group to close NW Couch Street between 11th Avenue and 12th Avenue on July 26, 2007 (Second Reading Agenda 615) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">181020</p>
<p>654 Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Oregon Department of Transportation for NW Davis St to SW Market St-Naito Local Public Agency Certification Supplemental Project Agreement (Second Reading Agenda 616; amend Contract No. 50661) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">181021</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Randy Leonard</p>	
<p align="center">Water Bureau</p>	
<p>655 Authorize a contract with CH2M Hill, Inc., Brown and Caldwell and Black and Veatch Construction, Inc. for on-call services for Water Bureau Capital Improvement Program (Second Reading Agenda 619) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">181022</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p>	
<p>*656 Provide grant to Miracles Club to secure real property (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">181023</p>

June 6, 2007

Office of Sustainable Development		
*657	Accept a \$150,000 grant from Portland General Electric to develop and implement a program to assist small businesses in conserving energy, water, other resources and improve sustainability practices (Ordinance) (Y-5)	181024
658	Authorize the Office of Sustainable Development to enter into agreements to receive and utilize goods, money and services to support activities to encourage economic development consistent with City sustainability goals (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM
Commissioner Erik Sten		
Bureau of Housing and Community Development		
*659	Amend subrecipient contract with Cascade AIDS Project by \$27,300 for the Supportive Housing Program and provide for payment (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 36960) (Y-5)	181025
Fire and Rescue		
*660	Accept donation from Don Benson of one DBI SALA Modular Davit Rescue System to Portland Fire & Rescue (Ordinance) (Y-5)	181026
661	Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue for occupational health nurse services (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM
REGULAR AGENDA		
Mayor Tom Potter		
Office of Management and Finance – Business Operations		
662	Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Oregon Department of Transportation for Union Station Facility Improvements (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 52633)	PASSED TO SECOND READING JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM
663	Declare surplus property located at 3620 NE Martin Luther King Jr Boulevard (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM
Office of Management and Finance – Human Resources		
*664	Approve cost of living adjustments to pay rates for nonrepresented classifications and Elected Officials, specify the effect upon employees in the classifications involved effective July 1, 2007, and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4; Adams absent)	181027
Office of Management and Finance – Purchases		

June 6, 2007

665 Accept bid of James W. Fowler Company for the Columbia Blvd Wastewater Treatment Plant Co-Generation Facility project for \$4,274,795 (Purchasing Report – Bid No. 107062)	CONTINUED TO JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM
<p style="text-align: center;">City Auditor Gary Blackmer</p> 666 Assess property for sidewalk repair by the Bureau of Maintenance (Second Reading Agenda 632; Y1062) (Y-4; Adams absent)	<p style="text-align: center;">181028</p>

At 12:15 p.m., Council recessed.

June 6, 2007

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **6TH DAY OF JUNE, 2007** AT 2:00 P.M.

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

Commissioner Leonard arrived at 2:07 p.m.

At 3:05 p.m., Council recessed
At 3:33 p.m., Council reconvened.

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

Commissioner Sten arrived at 3:36 p.m. City business.

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

		Disposition:
667	TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM - Create a local improvement district to construct street and bridge improvements from the Columbia Slough to Alderwood Road in the NE 92 nd Drive Local Improvement District (Previous Agenda 518; Hearing; Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Adams; C-10020) Motion to adopt the package of amendments: Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-4, Sten absent) Motion to overrule the remonstrances: Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-4)	PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM
668	TIME CERTAIN: 2:30 PM - Adopt the South Corridor Phase II: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Refinement Study (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Adams) (Y-4)	36510
*669	Amend the Intergovernmental Grant Agreement with TriMet for City financial contributions to fund the preliminary engineering, final design and construction of the South Corridor Project (Ordinance introduced by Commissioner Adams; amend Contract No. 52300) (Y-4)	181029
670	TIME CERTAIN: 3:30 PM - Recognize contributions of Portland military service men and women and support various reintegration efforts in support of returning veterans (Resolution introduced by Mayor Potter, Commissioners Adams, Leonard, Saltzman, and Sten) (Y-5)	36511

At 5:07 p.m., Council recessed.

June 7, 2007

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,
OREGON WAS HELD THIS **7TH DAY OF JUNE, 2007** AT 2:00 P.M.

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

Mayor Potter left at 3:36 p.m.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Kathryn
Beaumont, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and Ron Willis, Sergeant at Arms.

<p>671 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM - Tentatively uphold appeal of Northwest District Neighborhood Association and reverse the Landmark Commission decision to approve the application of William De Bellis, Donald Singer, Singer Thurman LLC, GFV Enterprises LLC and 2311-2317 NW Irving Street LLC for the Irving Street Parking Garage at 2311-2317 NW Irving Street (Hearing; Previous Agenda 386; LU 06-132367 HDZM)</p> <p>Motion to accept applicant's withdrawal of their application and, based on that withdrawal, to terminate these appeal proceedings without a final decision on the appeal: Moved by Commissioner Sten and seconded by Commissioner Adams.</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p>Disposition:</p> <p>APPLICATION WITHDRAWN</p>
<p>672 TIME CERTAIN: 3:00 PM - Amend and clarify provisions of the Campaign Finance Fund (Ordinance introduced by Auditor Blackmer; amend Code Chapter 2.10)</p> <p>Motion to accept amendment that the Auditor's Office will develop administrative rules for the reimbursement of automobile use strictly for campaign purposes: Moved by Commissioner Leonard and seconded by Commissioner Adams. (Y-4, Potter absent)</p> <p>Motion to accept amendment to add number 11 to page 19, that public funds could not be used for salary or payment to a family member defined means any of the persons, candidate's spouse, domestic partner, parent, grandchildren, sibling, aunt, uncle, niece, nephew, step relatives, sister-in-law, brother-in-law, grand parents in law, and equivalent relatives of the candidates' domestic partner: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-4; Potter absent)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED JUNE 13, 2007 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>REGULAR AGENDA</p> <p>Commissioner Sam Adams</p>	

June 7, 2007

***673** Extend moratorium on development within commercial and industrial zones on Hayden Island (Second Reading Agenda 597; amend Ordinance No. 180475)

Motion to add an emergency clause Section 2 to read The Council declares that an emergency exists because new development in Commercial Industrial Zone areas of Hayden Island will negatively affect the transportation facilities serving Hayden Island and may compromise the outcome of the correction program and studies under way to determine needed transportation improvements to these facilities; therefore this ordinance shall be in full force and effect on and after its date of passage: Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-5)

(Y-5)

181030
AS AMENDED

At 3:41 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love
Clerk of the Council

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

June 6, 2007
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.

Captions paid for by the city of Portland [the following text is the by-product of the closed captioning of this program. The text has not been proofread and should not be considered a final transcript.]

JUNE 6, 2007 9:30 AM

Potter: Each week I ask the question to the people in this room how are the children? And the reason we ask that question is we know that, when our children are well, when they're well educated, have a roof over their head and caring adults in their lives, that our larger community is well, too. So what we do is we invite people in to talk to us about issues that affect children and young people. And this morning we have three students from hosford middle school, and all are involved with project citizen, which I think they'll explain. Savannah, mallory, and jordan, could you please come forward? Just have to tell you that I also went to hosford. Are there still dinosaurs roaming around there? [laughter] go ahead and start, folks. State your name when you speak.

Mallory Dawson: Hi. My name's mallory. We're eighth graders at hosford middle school who have been studying the curriculum of project citizen, which is part of the classroom law project.

Savannah Baber: I'm savannah.

Jordan Guyer: I'm jordan.

Dawson: My friend and classmate once got into a car accident because a stop sign was covered 80% by a tree. This is a memory she'll have of it forever and wants to help make a difference just like all of us standing before you today. Hosford is located in the heart of innercity southeast Portland. There are many business districts, schools, parks, and residential areas around us, also a lot of pedestrians, buses, children, and lots of trees. Stop signs being covered by trees became aware to us when trees in our neighborhood began blooming this spring. 20% of walk signs are covered by trees in our neighborhood. All traffic devices must be visible by at least 100 feet away.

This seems sufficient, but hardly anyone knows or pays attention to this rule. The results of a neighborhood survey show that citizens who live nearby agree it's a problem that needs to be solved.

Baber: After much thought about the issue, our class decided that the best way to solve the problem would be striping stop sign poles like candy canes. This solution has been used effectively in tigar and seattle -- tigar already. The tape should be viewed through shrubbery, at night, and from far away. After extensive research, we found no state or city law prohibiting striping stop signs in our neighborhood. Because of it, it would be, in one word, ideal.

Guyer: Striping stop signs would make it ideal for the public. We got community support by presenting to the hosford abernathy neighborhood association. They wrote is a notarized letter of support. Now we are presenting our proposition to you all hoping for your support. We propose that the city stripes the 20% of stop signs covered by trees within walking distance of hosford middle school. At the end of summer, we could hand out surveys and see how effective it was. Then, if it is an effective overall solution, the city could stripe more stop signs around Portland.

Potter: Excellent.

Adams: Sounds good.

Potter: Questions or statements from the commissioners?

June 6, 2007

Adams: Well, as transportation commissioner, I look forward to hearing more from you, and I think it sounds like a really good idea that we should pilot around hosford/abernathy and see how it goes. I really appreciate all your work for traffic and pedestrian safety. It's great.

Potter: I understand you won an award with this project in salem.

Dawson: Yeah. We -- we came in first in the state of all the schools who did "project citizen."

Potter: Excellent. Thank you very much for coming in this morning. We really appreciate it. Could we give these young folks a hand? [applause]

Potter: And you don't have to stay around for the rest of the meeting. It's kind of boring. [laughter]

Potter: Please call the roll.

[roll call]

Potter: I'd like to remind folks that prior to offering public testimony to city council, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent. Please read the first communication.

Item 633.

Mr. Chromy called. He will not be able to make it.

Potter: Ok.

Item 634.

Potter: Could you read the name once again?

Moore-Love: Nathan jimenez.

Potter: Guess he's a "no show", too. Move to the consent agenda. Any commissioners wish to pull any items from the consent agenda? Any members of this audience with issue to pull any items from the consent agenda? If.

Moore-Love: Commissioner Adams had 651 to pull.

Adams: Right. I need to refer back item number 651 to my office.

Potter: Hearing no objection, so moved. Please call the vote.

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

Potter: please read the next item.

Item 635.

Potter: Staff? Good morning, mary.

*****: Good morning.

*****: Hi, gil.

Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning: Good morning, mayor and council. Gil kelly, director of the bureau of planning. With me to my left is mary maxwell from the port of Portland and to my right is jay sugnet from the planning bureau. He's the planning's project manager on this. And his counterpart, chris cornich, is here as well. I want to introduce this just briefly and introduce the others who will give you very brief presentations before opening for testimony. This is one in a series now of meetings that began actually in 2000 when the city council passed a resolution that signaled a shift away in terms of the airport long-term planning from a conditional use master plan to a legislative plan based on a true long-term master plan prepared by the port. The legislative process to be conducted by the city. We followed that up in 2004 with the specifics about what that would look like through an intergovernmental agreement that was negotiated between the port and the city and the community. We had active community involvement in that 2004 i.g.a. We're here today to and that, specifically to receive funds from the port to pay for staff and expenses necessary to prepare that legislative plan, and that's the action that's really in front of the council today is to adopt the amount to that 2004 i.g.a. Those would then go on to the port commission for adoption as well. This has been a negotiated arrangement all the way through between the port and the city, and we look forward to the continued partnership in this arena to actually develop a long-term master plan therefore for the port. The port, as you will hear from the others, has a regional role extending

June 6, 2007

even beyond the metro area, but we have all along tried to incorporate concerns and involvement by regional members, including clark county and east Multnomah county cities as well as Portland neighborhoods and other community representatives. In my discussions with various council members leading up to today's hearing, I understand much of your discussion today may focus on one feature of this partnership, which is the advisory group, which will be asked to advise me and my counterparts at the port and also advise the planning commission and council as this plan is developed. And i'll just say at the opening, i'm sure we'll come back to this after testimony, that we have strived to create a group there that, in its advisory role, is both a manageable size -- we're at about 25 members now, which is kind of at the limit of workability for actual working sessions -- but also accommodates a balance of local and regional interests and of business, government, neighborhood, and other community interests. So we can discuss that as we go forward. I know that will be a topic of discussion in today's hearings. I did want to save, though, that as part of that advisory group, we're very pleased to have the mayor having appointed as well as director bill wyatt from the port -- has appointed bill blossomer to be the chair, and he is here today and will address you briefly. Bill is quite well-known and respected, and we're very, very pleased that bill's agreed to be chair of that advisory group. And that the vice chair, dave smith, is from vancouver. So we're really making this a regional effort. Dave could unfortunately not be here today but has had a long-term involvement in airport issues leading up to this appointment as vice chair. So we're very, very pleased about that. With that, i'd like to turn it over to mary. Mary can give you the port's perspective on these amendments to the agreement, and then we'll give you the presentation.

Mary Maxwell, Director of Aviation for Port of Portland: I'm mary maxwell. I'm the director of aviation for the port of Portland. And when you think about p.d.x.. PDX really is a regional asset. We provide the critical market access to our community both in Oregon and southwest Washington. I'm really pleased and I want to thank you for your participation and efforts in helping us recruit international service that is so vital to this community. We are very proud of the international service that we have, the direct nonstop service to asia, europe, mexico, and we just inaugurated an additional nonstop to mexico city from p.d.x. Just this last weekend. We appreciate all the support that we have had from the mayor and the commissioners in helping us recruit and retain this level of service. We also have nonstop service to the top 29 of our 30 domestic markets. This type of service is really important that our community, and it's really driven by the demand of the passengers in this area for this type of service. Without their demand and their use of the service, it would not exist. 2006 was a record year for p.d.x. We exceeded 14 million passengers. This was the first time since prior to 2001 that we had a record year. We had over 280,000 tons of cargo shipped out of p.d.x. As I said, we're a community asset, but we also feel a responsibility to our community to provide not only high-quality air service but customer service. We were pleased last year to be recognized by "conde nast traveler magazine" as the best u.s. Airport in the country. But national recognition goes beyond just customer service and air service. We're also nationally recognized for our efforts in the environment. We have been recognized for our sustainability efforts, for our recycle efforts, and many other environmental initiatives that we support. The last 15 years at p.d.x. Have been busy. We've virtually rebuilt the entire terminal building. In the next five years, we will spend over a half a billion dollars in improvements to the airport. These improvements will include a new parking garage, expansion of the roadway in and out of the terminal building area, installing an in-line baggage screening system to improve security, and in addition to that we will do an extensive expansion of our de-icing handling system as part of our environmental efforts. So you can imagine that master plan updates are important to an airport so that we can plan these extensive capital investments at the right time and over the right period of time. Development is driven by regional demand. We do not have a philosophy of build it and they will come. We build based on demand. Based on the level of investment that's required at airports -- and you can imagine, with a half a billion dollars being spent in the next five years, the airlines

June 6, 2007

who pay for this infrastructure are concerned about the cost at the airport. There's hardly a day that goes by that I'm not talking to the airlines about the airport's cost structure. So we don't intend to build it before it's needed, and we build based on demand. So flexibility in the future is key to us. As part of the conditional use master plan, which was approved for p.d.x. In 2000, the port created a p.d.x. Land use advisory committee, otherwise known as luac. I've personally been a part of this group for the past two years, reviewing numerous of the follow-on studies that were initiated as a response to the 2000 master plan. They've also reviewed all the major developments in the last seven years. Luac was also very instrumental in defining the public involvement program for this next planning phase. We also invited air, the airport issues roundtable, snac, and the columbia slough watershed council to share their perspective about involvement and participation in the process. I'm pleased to say luac endorsed the planning advisory group in the public-involvement approach that the staff will outline for you in more detail. I do, however, understand that there is some concern about some of the composition to the committee, and we would be glad to engage in that discussion with you, and we look forward to working with you on a solution to bring the right mix and participation to that committee. I'd just like to say that the port and the city staff that are going to be involved in this project are excited. They're ready to go. We've been working on the scope and the outline and the planning for this for quite some time. At this point, I would like to just quickly recognize and so you can see some of the faces of the some of the people working on this project -- I'd like to have the city of Portland staff stand that's going to be working on the project. Thank you. And the port of Portland staff that's here that's going to be involved in the project. So these are faces that hopefully you will be seeing a lot of. We intend to come back to the commission frequently to give updates on the project, and we invite your participation and involvement. It is our intention the first planning advisory committee meeting is hopefully set for June 26th. We're ready to get going on this project. It's going to be a three-year project. There's a lot of energy and excitement about moving ahead. We want this to be a very open and participatory process, and it is probably the most open and participatory process the port has ever undertaken, and we appreciate the city's involvement and commitment to that. I'd like to introduce port commissioner Mary Olson, who will be representing the port commission on the planning advisory committee. And she would like to offer a few comments.

Mary Olson, Vice Chair, Port of Portland Commission: Good morning. My name is Mary Olson. I'm the vice chairman of the port of Portland commission. I'm representing Bill Wyatt, who today is in Asia meeting with carriers about additional service to our region. As we, both the city and the port, embark on this groundbreaking collaborative effort, our goals are aligned. That is to develop an airport futures plan that addresses the city's needs as well as the operational needs of the airport. I assure you of the port's commitment to public involvement as you know this joint planning process with the city has extensive public involvement associated with it. Public involvement is something the port takes very seriously. On Monday, the port invited over 50 community leaders to participate in discussions regarding the port's long-term strategic plan. P.d.x. Recently completed an update to its noise abatement plan. The public participation in this process was significant and effective. As a result of public input, both by the public who served directly on the formal committee as well as the public that participated from the audience, the port addressed concerns regarding regional cargo feeders, even though the process, the f.a.a. Part 150 noise abatement process, did not address this issue. I want to emphasize that the port futures plan on which we are about to embark is a joint planning effort between the city and the port. As commissioners, we all bring different areas of expertise. Law, business, labor, et cetera. I'm considered the finance person. As such, when staff brings projects to the commission, they know to somehow work in the cost. And while cost is not the sole deciding factor, it certainly is an important factor. We are expecting to spend four and a half million dollars on this project. The city reimbursement portion being a pretty small portion of that in terms of \$820,000. Certainly the

June 6, 2007

public involvement increases costs, but we, the port, are more than willing to bear those costs because we know, in the end, the results plan will be better for it. Today you are about to hear differing views regarding the size and composition of the pay. I represent the commissioners on the part 150 noise abatement study. This is a group similar in size to the p.a.g. If this group had been any larger, I seriously doubt that the issue of the regional cargo feeders would have been addressed. It was because, over time, we came to know one another and had time for each of us to express our views that we listened. We listened to each other and we listened to the public who were the ones who initially raise this issue. It was actually the public sitting in the audience who came to our meetings and said, hey, we have a problem with the cargo feeders. We decided as a group that, even though we could not address this issue directly in the part 150, because this issue was not mandated in the part 150, we suspended our efforts in concluding the part 150 to address the public concerns. Therefore, the size and composition of p.a.g. needs to ensure that this type of dialogue and this type of bonding is allowed to happen. It also needs to include a regional view as p.d.x. serves a large region of Oregon, not just Portland. Additional participation in this process will be available to through p.a.g.'s subcommittees, which will allow additional stakeholders to share their perspectives in a more focused way. These subcommittees will report back to the p.a.g. The city work plan before you and the coaches of work and public involvement program for the larger effort is based on the 2004 intergovernmental agreement. Over 43 meetings will have been held prior to the kickoff, which we hope to have on June 26th. There has been extensive citizen comments to date on the p.a.g. And the public involvement plan. Both the city and citizens participated in the aviation consultant and facilitator selection panels. I would urge the council, as I will urge the port commission, to honor Luac's endorsement of the process and allow this groundbreaking effort to get under way. Thank you very much.

Potter: Thank you.

Adams: I have a couple of questions. Are you done with your presentation? Mm-hmm.

Potter: We still have a couple of other folks to speak.

Adams: Thank you. I appreciate the presentation. I wanted to clarify the intent of this. Are we -- I mean, in the attachments, it talks about the group will advise the port on the master plan on the city's legislative land use process related to the port -- airport -- and so the advisory committee sort of has two rolls, one to advise the port commission because the master plan does not come to the city council and one to advise the land use agreement. That is correct?

Jay Sugnet, Bureau of Planning: Commissioner, excuse me. Staff does have a very quick presentation. I think we'll answer the question as part of that.

Adams: My question to you is, are you asking us at anytime in the upcoming process, to consider the third runway issue?

Maxwell: The third runway issue would be part of the master plan, look at the need for facilities over the long-term at p.d.x. So it is part of the master planning process.

Adams: Is it part of what you're asking us to consider or bless?

Maxwell: Well, we wouldn't be asking for you to consider anything at this time except allowing us to start the joint planning process and the master planning study and the joint land use process.

Adams: Knowing in the future is -- the process we're agreeing jointly to manage today, into the future, by the end of that process or anytime during that process, are you going to be asking the Portland city council to opine or consider whether or not the airport should build a third runway?

Maxwell: The legislative process here is really two different paths. The port commission and the f.a.a. Have the approval over the master planning process. You have approval over the land use designation process. That's not to say that -- we will certainly intend to be back to you on numerous occasions to present where we are with both the master planning and the land use process and to seek your input and your involvement in that discussion.

*******:** But --

June 6, 2007

Olson: I think what the commissioner is asking is are you committing -- if we bring a master plan to you that includes consideration of a third runway, that master plan would have all kinds of conditions that, if this, this, this, and this happened, then, yes, there would need to be a third runway. That could very well be in the master plan. But -- but if and when that third runway were required, i'd have to ask -- you can't just build it. We'd have to come back to the commission with a specific request to do that. But this master plan is a long-range look out, 20 years. You know, the only thing we know for certain is that it won't work out the way that we plan it out.

Adams: I just -- and i'll pause in my questions on that particular issue now and see if it's answered through some of the subsequent presentations. What i'm concerned about is, when we're no longer here in these positions and you're no longer in your positions because of the long-term nature of this plan, I want to make it really clear up front, as part of -- and make it part of this conversation for the legislative record that either this planning process includes consideration of a third runway or not so that future councils won't be in sort of the position that it's not clear that the third runway -- I don't want it to be misinterpreted by future councils or future port managers that, because the third runway shows up as an illustration in the port master plan that we have somehow blessed it or considered it, because it's my understanding that we're not going to be considering or giving any kind of blessing or denial the third runway.

Maxwell: Absolutely. No one is approving through this planning process the future of the third runway. And let me kind of explain what we do. Part of our requirements with the f.a.a. Is we have to periodic: Update the master plan. You know, five years after this master plan is completed, we will be back taking another look at the master plan, looking again at forecasts for traffic. We will be looking at technology enhancements, and we will continue to evaluate the timeframe for all improvements at the airport based on demand, technology, and a whole variety of factors.

Adams: What I hear you saying so far -- and we can have more conversation in the future with testifiers -- is that we are not going to be making a judgment on the third one. We the city council are not going to be making a judgment on the third runway. And if, in the future, the port wants to build a third runway, even after this is done, they would still have to come back to the city council and have us consider it yes or no. That's what i've heard.

Leonard: I need to throw a cautionary note out here just so that we all understand what we're doing. I mean, we are working on a master plan, and absolutely I fully expect and anticipate the discussion of a third runway within the master plan. And if this advisory group recommends to the council a master plan that includes a third runway, basically the council has adopted a map for the future, although it has not technically approved the land use amendments that would be technically required for the actual construction. It certainly would give the benefit of the doubt for future.

Maxwell: Well, keeping in mind --

Leonard: That's exactly what you were doing here.

Maxwell: The master plan is a guide to the future. It is not a permission to build.

Adams: Ok. So I appreciate -- this is my concern. So if you could answer whether my summary, which is on tape and on record, is accurate, that would be great.

Kelley: I think the way you put it -- gil kelly, planning director. I think the way you put it, commissioner, is exactly our understanding. That is to say, well, the master plan which the port refers to is kind their internal strategic plan in a way. If they determine there's a need for the third runway in the future, they would have to come back and am remonstrate whatever approvals they get today, and that would --

Adams: They could not build it without coming back to the Portland city council.

Kelley: Correct.

Leonard: But I think it's a little misleading for people to think that this process won't include consideration of a third runway. It absolutely will. I absolutely anticipate it to be part of the discussion, and I absolutely anticipate that the recommendation will come back with some form of a

June 6, 2007

third runway. So a future council that was handed a book 15 years from now that included what this group did will be a recommendation potentially for a third runway, and certainly it's not technically binding on future councils. I would think that a future council that didn't want to revisit the entire issue would be guided by the plan that's going to be developed out of this process, including the recommendation to build a third runway, the upshot being that we want to make sure we're considering all of these factors carefully through this planning process, because it does carry a lot of weight when it's done.

Kelley: Well, my -- I understand what you're saying, but I think my understanding is we want to have a very open process here. So whatever the port's thinking in terms of their very long-term, including a third runway -- we want that to be able to be reviewed and discussed.

Leonard: Absolutely.

Kelley: But the decision coming forward will not include permission for a third runway.

Leonard: Gil, but it will include a recommendation in the plan that would be --

Kelley: Well, the port's own strategic plan or master plan, if you will, may do that.

Leonard: I'm talking about this.

Kelley: No. That is not going to come forward for part of the city's approval.

Leonard: This group that's going -- this advisory group, the airport futures plan and budget group will consider a third runway?

Kelley: I think they want to be able to talk about the need of it to help inform the court.

Adams: I'm not on the advisory group. That's not what I'm asking questions about now. I'm asking questions about what will be before the city council through this, and I am concerned that, if it shows up in the master plan, that future councils somehow think that it had the blessing, the tacit approval or -- and I think that's your concern, the tacit approval of a city council. Are we going to be approving or considering in any way the port's master plan?

Adams: No. You will not be. It will be part of the background information that shows you the evolution of smaller recommendation that will be before the council. Just because there's something in the long-term port's master plan doesn't indicate your preapproval of anything. That's an open issue.

Adams: Is there any way -- 'cause there's been some concerns expressed -- and I want to give you all a chance on this issue to address them that somehow, if the land-use decisions that we're making will allow a certain amount of expansion to port usage that it will automatically trigger either the f.a.a. Or it'll automatically require the port, through some other means, to build a third runway? Sort of the scenario glibly titled sort of the third runway through the back door.

Adams: Yeah. I think that's what's contemplated here is expansion of the terminal facility. We will keep our eye on that issue, commissioner Adams. That's certainly not what any of us are contemplating. There's a way to be very explicit about that with the committee, with the port, and with yourself.

Maxwell: Finally, to add, the complexity of building new runways in today's environment -- I'm sure in the future environment -- with the process that has to be gone through to get and prove value to build a third runway, extensive environmental studies, approval from the faa, funding from the airlines and the f.a.a -- it's a very lengthy, detailed process that certainly would not suddenly the port start turning dirt very quickly to build a third runway without going through an extensive public involvement, public review process as part of the environmental assessment, environmental impact statement that would have to happen for that third runway. But, again, the master plan is updated every five to seven years, and it would continue to be looked at in terms of the appropriate timing or need for that, and we have all the expectation that the third runway is a long way off, because we will continue to see technological improvements that will allow us to handle more and more aircraft within the current configuration of the airport.

Adams: I appreciate your indulgence. It's just a hot-button issue.

June 6, 2007

Maxwell: Absolutely.

Adams: I just want to know -- we're going to talk about the composition of the committee later, but I just want to know whether it's part of our consideration, meaning the city council, through this process or not. And what I've heard you say, it is not part of our consideration. Therefore we will not be passing any judgment on the third runway issue and that there isn't any way for the port to sort inform a back door manner build a runway without coming back to the city council.

Maxwell: That's correct.

Adams: Thank you.

Leonard: But, again, I need to be clear here. I'm looking at the ordinance that we're going to vote on here in a little bit, and item 3 says, in the winter of 2002, the city and the port signed an intergovernmental agreement specifying a general time line for short-term and long-term planning efforts that would culminate in an adopted legislative land use process and designation for Portland international airport. And in the very next paragraph, in 2004, the bureau of planning, together with the port, city bureaus, and group of citizens representing air traffic issues, roundtable, and other interest groups developed a second agreement over a 12-month period. So, again, commissioner Adams said we won't be giving any blessing tight. And don't think that, by my saying this, I'm suggesting that I wouldn't support a third runway. I'm not. But I want to be real clear in the context of the questions commissioner Adams is raising that the intent of this is to develop a master plan that includes potentially a third runway, and these issues will be fleshed out, good and bad, during this process, and certainly we won't be voting to accept a report that decides that a third runway goes in, but we will be voting to accept a report that very well could include a recommendation for a third runway out of this, and I would think that would heavily impact future councils, as it should. I would expect that it would be. I think you would agree, if we all go through this and do our best and come up with recommendations, we certainly wouldn't want somebody in the future to redo all of what we're doing now. That's the whole point of doing it the way we are and attempting to tweak it to be as collaborative as possible so it's a solid document and a solid set of recommendations. I mean --

Kelley: The only thing I would say, commissioner Leonard, to clarify is that we will not ask the council to adopt the port's master plan. We will be asking you to adopt a legislative plan on behalf of city that does not include the third runway. It may include a number of other features and elements that would be permitted should the third runway, which may exist in the long-term master plan, become a reality in terms of the port's need for it. That would have to come back through a new legislative process.

Leonard: But the master plan the port adopts out of this process will include this group that's going to flesh these issues. Correct?

Kelley: Yes. That group will be advising the port, yes.

Leonard: And so the group that we're making hard to make sure is balanced for the very reasons I'm saying --

Kelley: Sure.

Leonard: -- because the recommendation will carry such weight, whether the council technically adopts it or not, we are voting on this that creating this group that will create that plan, and I would think that future councils rightfully should be heavily influenced by all these decisions and sign off on the composition, because we're going to flesh that out here and make sure that we're starting all on an even kind of keel. So I understand the technical part of what you're saying, but I wouldn't want beam to think that somehow there's going to be a whole brand-new process to approve a third runway, because I'm pretty sure the port's going to come in and go, look at, future council, here's a master plan that included your people appointed by the mayor and council and included our people and here is what was recommended and there's no need to revisit this issue, which I would think would be an appropriate thing to say.

June 6, 2007

Kelley: I doubt we're going to get that clear of a statement at the end.

[laughter]

Kelley: I think what would your more likely to hear is that this group will have a whole lot of cautions about the third runway, and that will be subject to legislative process.

Leonard: It could say we recommend a third runway under these conditions.

Kelley: It's always possible.

Leonard: That's why, up front, you want to make sure it's as balanced as possible.

Adams: I would agree with commissioner Leonard. My concern was just again what's coming back to us for this moment. We'll get into the composition later.

Sugnet: I'd like to invite Chris Corich to help clarify what it is we're doing, what the two deliverables are. And this is hopefully a very short power point.

Sugnet: I'm the project manager for airport futures. With me today is Chris Corich, general manager of long-range planning at the airport. I think the previous presenters gave you a pretty good overview of the process to date, so I will skip through these pretty quickly. But I did want to emphasize that the collaborative process that's outlined in the 2004 i.g.a., the fact that we did have a lot of community helpers with that, the two deliverables, which I think a lot of the questions are so far, Chris is going to talk about what the master plan will do, and I'm going to talk more about the city's land use plan and what we anticipate council to be hearing at the end of this process. So it is two distinct processes envisioned in 2004. Basically we see the planning advisory group as sort of the glue that holds us all together. And as stated, we hope to start we soon and bring something back to you in the spring of 2010. So I'll turn you had over to Chris.

Chris Corich: My name's Chris Corich. I'm the general manager of long-range planning. This is a great picture. It shows the airport in the middle and the city of Portland in the south. Clearly we are a part of the city and surrounded by industrial and residential land uses. But of course to the north of that is the city of Vancouver, and it speaks to the idea that it is a regional facility, and I think you all appreciate the context of this. A comment that was made by commissioner Leonard was, considering everything carefully as we go forward in this master plan and the limit of the airport that you see highlighted there is about 3200 acres. As we go forward making long range plans and making major investments, we want to make sure we don't put something in the wrong place. Go ahead to the next slide. It is critical. We have limited space. It guides our investment and operational decisions. Now, coming out of the 2000 plan, we had two alternatives that were left on the table. As we work with the community and the intergovernmental agreements, we did make an agreement that we would start this master-planning process with those two alternatives. One of the things that was done -- and I'll show you pictures of those in a moment, but one of the things that was done to conclude that plan was we had a regional air transportation demand task force, and commissioner Hales at the time was a commissioner of that task force. They looked at some of the assumptions that went into the plan, and their conclusion was we needed to plan for growth at p.d.x., keep our options open, and we needed to grow smarter. Those factors were incorporated in the master plan that we concluded, and they're certainly going to be part of this master plan as we go forward. This is what we call the centralized alternative that came out of that last master plan. It's called centralized because all passenger development is in the central area essentially surrounding where the existing terminal is. We'd have some expansion to the east, and we'd build a satellite concourse to the west. And to the north is the river and Vancouver and Washington, and to the south is the city of Portland. It does include a third parallel runway as a concept, again because we need to know if we need to plan new facilities in the future. That runway is going to be critical. We can't just put that willy-nilly anywhere. In terms of planning, we think we need about a half million takeoffs and landings before we would ever need such a facility. Seattle has twice as many passengers as we have, and they have about 320,000 takeoffs and landings. We have about 260,000 now. San Francisco has three times as many passengers as we have, and I think they have 370,000

June 6, 2007

takeoffs and landings. So the kind of magnitude, the kind of growth that this community would have to see before you're going to need a facility like that, a third runway, again, half a million. That's the size of detroit or minneapolis. It's very huge. It's not something that's eminent, and the planning process to build something like that will include a huge nepa process, that will be there even if we are not. And it's not something that goes easily as you go forward. So the f.a.a. cannot mandate that we put it in, and it's something that we think it's prudent to plan for, and that's what we intend to do. This is centralized.

Adams: Before you go that a different topic on that issue -- and sorry to harp, but I want to air the issue out as much as possible for the record. Based on your growth trends now, what year would you see needing to consider actively a third runway?

Corich: Actively consider, it could be at least 20 years out based on any reasonable -- probably longer than that what we see, seattle, san francisco both much larger airports, we see larger airplanes coming and going. We are -- our highest operations number was 322,000. We have dropped since 9/11 to 260,000. It's going in the other direction. Planes are fuller. I know, mary, you've been on a plane recently. It was probably full. And the planes are getting larger. So this is not something that's coming down the road anytime soon, but it is something we need to plan for. So it's a very, very long-term need, nothing eminent. But we do think it's prudent to plan for. The other thing in that plan was called decentralized. Essentially it would create a separate terminal facility to the south where the military is today and that possible third parallel runway is shown here south of that, so it would fit on the airport property that we own today, although some acquisition was needed. The decentralized terminal seems to work better. It allowed us to divide the passenger load-up between two facilities, and so those two alternatives were left on the table, and those are what we'd move forward with as we do the plan.

Sugnet: City land use plans, though, the two processes parallel but integrated, so currently the airport operates as a conditional use in an industrial zone and has to meet certain criteria in the code every eight to 10 years, and this really is not -- the system doesn't work well. It's frustrating for the port. It's more of a paper exercise. It's from us stating to the city. It's kind of a drain on the general fund. Most importantly, the community wasn't satisfied because their issues were not being considered. The criteria was very limited. So our hope is to create a plan that provides the port with some flexibility that mary talked about and allows the city to conduct this legislative process, to examine the portion in the complex issues but also, more importantly, have community have a greater say in influencing conditions out at the airport. So what we hope to bring to council will be an amended comprehensive plan and a zoning code, so likely a new plan district. We're kind of following the model of ohsu where we transition from conditional use to a plan district. There will be city review process cease and approval processes, and these are going to be based on the impacts of the development as opposed to an arbitrary time line. So if there is increased growth or increased impacts, then we'll be able to set up the reviews that are appropriate. So certainly, for a third runway, that would imply coming back through another legislative process. Finally the negotiated agreement. This is, I think, a cornerstone for the community and the city and the port is how do we memorialize all these promises made during the planning process and make sure that they get implemented over time. I wanted to give you a very quick overview of the public involvement program, and these are directly from the 2004 i.g.a. A balanced and fair public involvement process ensures that stakeholders are fully informed, but the key here is really -- you know -- influencing the decision making, giving the community that opportunity. And the planning process that we have envisioned over the next 34 months is pretty extensive. There are going to be 19 planning advisory group meetings, 14 public meetings, both north of the river and south of the columbia, five planning commission, four city council, six port commission. There would be ongoing outreach to pretty much anyone who wants to hear us talk about this project. And wanted to emphasize that the planning advisory group really is not the only game in town here. We're trying to create a process

June 6, 2007

where we can bring people to us or go out to the community instead of requiring people to come to us. Mary Olson mentioned there are subcommittees that will be open to pretty much anyone who wishes to participate. They will be thoroughly discussing issues and bringing those back to the advisory group. There will also be a technical advisory group so not just agencies, city, government agencies but also any interest group that has a technical expertise so that we'll be bringing them along and pulling them into discussion when appropriate. And just the diagram helps clarify sort of what Portland planning commission will be hearing versus city council and city council versus port commission and the f.a.a.

Adams: Can I ask a clarifying question?

Sugnet: Sure.

Adams: On the process, you talked about the narrow approval criteria that exists right now for the conditional use process. Can you give me an example? And if you can't, that's fine, but do you have an example or can you tell me more about the narrow criterion and example where one or more stakeholders were sort of left unsatisfied with the existing process?

Sugnet: A good example is there's a criteria that the port must have a noise abatement plan, and the port submitted a noise abatement plan and the hearings officer said, check. You've met this. And it was very frustrating for the community because they felt that the criteria should say more than just requiring that a document exist. So does that help?

Adams: That does. And then in terms of how the committee will work -- and I've found asking this very practical housekeeping question up front to be useful, and that is, is the committee going to work on a consensus basis, a majority basis? What do you envision as the person leading the staffing for the committee what do you envision as the decision-making process?

Sugnet: Well, could I defer that to Bill Blosser, our future chair? Because we tried to leave this as open as possible and have the chair sort of help us determine how the decision is going to be made and also leave a lot of it to the p.a.g. Once they're formed, 'cause we want them to finally decide.

Adams: Thank you.

Sugnet: So this was alluded to also in over 43 stakeholder meetings to design the process that we have, and we've been doing this since 2000. The community has been involved significantly. I won't go through the full list, but we did go to -- we even went to planning commission. We asked for the planning commissioners, because they're going to be the ones really getting into the details of this project. But we've also been going out and talking to regional elected officials, and I just can't overemphasize how much we have been going out and talking to folks about this process. And I'm going to turn it over to Chris to just talk about the key changes that have been made since we brought this to the community and the land use advisory committee back in November.

Corich: Thank you. We have -- again, we've shopped this around more extensively than any project in my recent memory, and some changes include reducing the time line. We originally thought it would take four years but realized you couldn't keep people engaged approximate. We need to be more efficient with their time and our time to get to an outcome. We've included edits and comments on the facilitator and work from citizens as well as LUAC, so we've shopped that around and included their input there. They were on the selection panel for both of those consultants. The public involvement program has fingerprints of a number of people all over it. We really have tried to get the input. We didn't go in and do this in a vacuum. Not just the p.a.g. For public involvement. Even with a great reputation, there are a lot of people in the city, and we want to give them a chance to have their input. In terms of size, we started out with 44 members. If you have a two-hour meeting and have 44 people, you get about a minute and a half to speak, and that leaves no time, so we did reduce that size to 25. That's still a pretty large group. We felt like that was workable. We added five slots for the community side, one environmental, two Portland neighborhood, and one Clark County and East County representative. So we tried to respond to the desire to have more representation in that group. We've added airport issues. Roundtable is one of the

June 6, 2007

neighborhood coalition representatives. We've more clearly defined the technical advisory pool where city staff and other government agencies that have expertise can be involved in the process and help information our planning as we move forward. We've opened the subcommittees to stakeholders, a way to really, and the planning advisory group that a wider body of people. It does have center of members from the p.a.g., but they can bring in other expertise, and we think that helps widen things out. In the end, it's not about voting. The group is advisory to both the city council and to the port commission. I mean, in the end, the votes that count will be the votes that you cast and the votes that the port commission casts. But we will have failed if, when we get to the end of this process, you don't know how these people feel. I'm very confident you will know how they feel, whether they've done it by consensus or voting or whatever. I would also add and make a standing invitation to any of you we can get airport tours and tower briefings with the f.a.a., and we'd be happy to do that. I know commissioner Adams has been at the airport. I hope that was time well spent for you.

Leonard: I wanted to follow up on one thing. You said the recommendations would be advisory to the port and the city, so I just want to clearly understand what it is that we're going to be advised and what the format is. I thought I heard earlier that these recommendations would go to the port to be part of their future plan. What is it that will be asked to approve or consider as a result of this process?

Corich: In the end, the port of Portland commission, I as staff, will deliver to the port commission a master plan, and we will ask them to endorse that and send it up to the f.a.a. I can put anything in that plan based on the input that we get from citizens and other sources and based on my judgment. In the end, they can vote -- commissioner Olson and her replacement they are going to vote or disapprove that.

Leonard: That's not my question.

Corich: Then I'm not understanding.

Leonard: You said in your testimony just now that this group will make an advisory recommendation to both the city council and the port commission, and I'm asking you what the form or format is that we will be advised from. Is it a report, a document, a --

Corich: I'm not sure I have an answer for you. There will be a body of a record of their discussions in the form of minutes and things. There may be a final report that comes from them that is appended to the master plan or to the land use but I don't think I have an answer for you.

Leonard: Did you misspeak when you said it is advisory to the council?

Corich: Well, no. I think it will be answered. I just can't describe the vehicle. They're going to come before you.

Leonard: That's actually what I was trying to figure out. There will be something that we will consider as a result of this process.

Corich: As I said, you should be informed. You should understand what this advisory group has said and the input they've given us. If we don't do that -- and I can't tell you exactly how -- we will have failed. That's what I can tell you today. I'm less confident describing exactly is it a report. Will we actually include it in the master plan document if and how they would do that in the legislative process. But, again, you need to know what they have said and what others have said.

Leonard: That's why I didn't really accept when it was said earlier this is a group that will make recommendations that port, because I don't buy that. There will be something that comes to us.

Kelley: Commissioner, if I could help you a little bit here, when you were out of the room briefly, Jay showed this slide that's on your screen now. It basically shows that this group will be charged with recommending things on two tracks. They're both to the port in terms of its master plan and to the planning commission and council. The things that come to the planning commission and council, they will submit their own form letter that goes along with, but what will be transmitted to planning commission and council will be comprehensive plan amendment, zoning code

June 6, 2007

amendments, a bundle of agreements that should be memorialized around things that aren't strictly put in the zoning code for "good neighbor" policy. That flow goes along that line to the city, to the planning commission and council.

Leonard: Those two tracks that start emanate from the same body of recommendations that will happen at the end of this process?

Kelley: Yes.

Leonard: So, in fact, if there is, for instance -- and i'm not at all suggesting I wouldn't support a third rung way, but it is an issue of concern. But if that report contained to the port commission a future plan that would include a third runway, what you're saying is they would take that same information and make sure it was put in the proper format to make recommendations to the Portland planning commission for the technical aspect of land use approval --

Kelley: Right.

Leonard: -- that would have to be considered to make that happen.

Kelley: Yes. For example, I would imagine it would say something like this. If they ever got to the point where they would say at some point in the future a third runway may be warranted, it what it would say would be, that may be the case but only after the port reaches 500,000 trips and you go through this future process.

Leonard: I understand all that. I'm just trying to figure out logistically what happens the day the gavel drops and the reports stop. Thank you.

Sugnet: The next week, the port commission will be also considering this same i.g.a., and we have our first p.a.g. Meeting scheduled for the end of this month, june 26th, and we're also doing a tour out at the airport, an all-day event for the advisory group on july 14th. We'll come back to council, as mentioned, four times throughout this process. We're trying to make sure that we come back to the decision makers as we make key decisions in the process, that folks have an opportunity to provide input. And then, as I mentioned, adoption of the land use plan and the p.d.x. Master plan in the winter splish spring of 2010. So just to be very clear, the action requested of council today, amend the 2004 i.g.a. There are a number of provisions in there for merrily to and. The work program, which is the justification for the \$820,000 we're requesting from the port to pay for city staff, and that's princely two bureau planning staff as well as additional support for the office of transportation. There are some minor provisions in there about extending the term and also for setting up the joint web site. The legal issues surrounding that. And of course we all can refer back on the planning advisory group, but this is not a formal action that we're requesting at this time.

Sugnet: Before you open it up for public testimony, we'd like to offer bill blosser a few minutes.

Saltzman: Did you have a power point that showed the members of the committee?

Sugnet: Yes.

Saltzman: Were you saving that for later? Ok.

*******:** I had a feeling it might come up.

Bill Blosser, Chair: Mayor and commissioners, thank you for the chance to say a few words. My words, I just wanted to basically limit to commissioner Adams' question about how is this committee going to operate, and my vice chair, dave smith, and I have gotten together and discussed this at some length as well as we've discussed it with staff, and my very strong feeling is two things have to happen. And I sort of see my job as chair is to make these happen. One is that every voice on that public -- on that p.a.g. Gets heard and is respected and is fully considered. So we're not going by any way that operate in a way that everybody doesn't get heard and have a chance to express their view. Secondly, my recommendation and my vice chair's recommendation will be that we do operate by consensus. At least we go in with that being our operating mode. If we are unable to reach consensus, then my recommendation will be to them that we present you with both opinions. Clearly and unvarnished. Ultimately. You have to make the decision. By the same token, we are not a legally constituted group where a vote by 12-11 makes a hill of beans. I

June 6, 2007

can foresee a situation where eight people strongly feel one way and 18 feel a different way, and you may evaluate those and say, gee, the eight are right and the 18 are wrong. So I want us to be giving you unvarnished advice from the eight and the 18 so you can clearly see what the debate is and you can make the decision. So i'm expecting that that's the way welcome to you, and we will have a written report to answer commissioner Leonard. We're not going to just come up and babble in front of you. You will have it in writing and have our best attempt to succinctly state what our opinion is, what our advice is to you. And so I can very well foresee, 'cause i've been involved in a lot of these, that we may have 30 recommendations we want to make, and we may have 25 where we have 100% consensus, and you can be very happy and we can all smile and say, great recommendation, and there may be five where we don't. And those may be five where we're divided three ways or four ways or we're maybe divided two ways, and it may be, like I said, 18 to eight, and I will tell you what the 18 said and what the eight said, and you guys can decide what's the right decision.

Adams: That's a great answer, and I really appreciate that, bill. Leave the babbling to us. We do that really well here.

*****: [laughter]

Blosser: Committees like these are good at babbling, too. Anyway, that's basically the way I foresee us operating. So it's really not a question of how many votes there are for a particular interest on the group. We could pack it with a whole bunch of people with one interest, but still i'm going to come to you and tell you what the various interests said, because you may decide the interest for the one vote was the right one and the rest of the people were nuts. So we'll leave it to you. You get paid the big bucks.

Adams: Thank you for agreeing to do this. This is a really tough job.

Blosser: It will be fun and interesting, and we'll try and keep it fun.

*****: [laughter]

Adams: Thanks, bill.

Potter: May we have public testimony? How many folks have signed up?

Moore-Love: We have 14 people signed up.

Potter: Thanks for being here, folks. State your name for the record. You each have three minutes.

Fred Stovel: Good morning, mr. Mayor and city council. My name is fred stovel. I am the present chair of the airport issues roundtable. I live at 3125 northeast 52nd. I've been at this now for 10 years, and i've been at all the processes mentioned in paragraphs 1 through 6 of the ordinance that's before you. Other citizens have been waiting for this process to start since july of '05. So in december, when we got the details of the streamlined process that was briefed to you to take it from multiple interest groups down to 18, including the chair, we were kind of surprised by the lack of public involvement in the fact that this process was streamlined, and we -- several of us -- were at the table in the writing of the i.g.a., and so we had some preconceived notions of what was expected in the public involvement process. Now, we tried to make this thing work by suggesting multiple modifications, and some of those have been briefed to you. They added five to the community side of this three-part public advisory group. They added, as you saw, clark county's county and a couple more Portland neighborhoods. But they held the line at that 11 when other groups suggested that, as the city land use part of this joint process, there was not enough city representation. And so we were stopped with 11. We're happy that there was more flexibility in the way that we saw the p.a.g. operating, and we did argue for that, because there were very stringent bureaucratic rules that would limit the p.a.g.'s ability and the ability of the subcommittees to be self selecting and to bring in more people. It looks like a significant compromise, but when you look at community, it's -- there's nonPortland interest balancing, so to speak, all the Portland interests. And even if it's by consensus, the number of voices at the table have to be able to represent Portland interests. People

June 6, 2007

who will be at that table for two years, people that come and go as part of subcommittees or testify from the community at open houses and other groups which have been, in the past, more public relations than public involvement. You really have to, as a city, look at the city interests and see whether or not or not this thing is balanced. All these other discussions about how the third runway would come about and all that are very technical issues that people are going to have to grapple with over time. We've already testified on the conditional use about how that operates. So we urge you add at least five more, two environmental, two city, and put air back into this mix. Thank you.

Brett Van den Heuvel: Mayor Potter, commissioners, my name is brett van den heuvel. I work for an organization that works to protect water quality in the columbia basin. I want to echo some of these comments. Focusing specifically on water quality, there's currently no representative on the current advisory group that represents a water quality advocacy group, no balance in that respect, and so we recommend that the advisory group should have at least one member that represents water quality advocacy organizations. There are several reasons why this is important in addition to other neighborhood and air and environmental groups that should also be on there. The citizens of Portland and the region have consistently demonstrated at the port for water quality. Obviously water quality of the columbia river is the linchpin of our region's economic and other interests. Due to the location of the airport, the large size of the facility, the chemicals used, the tremendous amount of storm water that comes off of it, proposed expansion, it's extremely important to have a group there advocating for water quality issues. Recently, there's been a lot of discussion about the de-icing storm water, the expansion of the airport. Just looking at the map that was shown earlier shows the importance of the airport on the columbia river and the columbia slough. We believe that the advisory group requires balance, that represents the values of the citizens of the region. The columbia slough watershed council, although they are important organization and do quality work, we don't believe they're a water quality advocacy organization. We recommend somebody who specifically focuses on this. Columbia river keeper has a regional perspective, so to sum up quickly, we recommend at least two environmental groups, one being a water quality advocacy organization as representatives on the advisory group. Thank you.

Bonny McKnight: Mayor Potter, members of the council, my name's bonny mcknight. I live at 1617 northeast 140th in Portland, and i'm testifying today as a member of the i.g.a. Committee which began the process you're continuing. I participated in that committee because I felt the transition from a conditional use master plan process for guiding authority impacts to an undefined replacement entity was first and foremost a land use issue. I continue to believe that is true, and I believe that requires parity in the p.a.g. Membership. During the intense work of the i.g.a. Committee, two major concerns were identified for me, the environmental needs of the airport area and the land use process guarantees of citizen participation. The first was how all of the strong environmental protections offered by the city could continue to be a filter for the unique needs of operating the airport. Representatives of the port assured us that they, too, respected the environmental features of the area and did not intend to weaken their protection. However, when the metro council conducted a public process to continue goal 5 environmental protections for the entire region, the port negotiated an exemption from all metro goal 5 rules by convincing individual counselors outside the public process to amend the final resolution and provide an exemption. I'm concerned that this lack of public visibility not continue as airport futures process is guided by the p.a.g., and that makes the makeup of the p.a.g. The essential foundation for the next several years. With all of its flaws, the conditional use master plan process guarantees that impact neighborhoods will have public opportunities to identify and help resolve problems about the use of the facility or institution they must live with. They're not only guaranteed the right to testify about those issues but they are guaranteed access to a hearings officer as their elected city council and even to the land use court of appeals if they feel a defined public interest was not adequately addressed. I ask that

June 6, 2007

you as the elected body protecting public good for every resident of the city support expansion of the p.a.g. To better represent these voices as the airport uses effort goes forward. The p.a.g. Balance needs more general voices. That includes coalitions, selected representatives, and airport issues roundtable representative, a representative from citywide land use groups, and other representatives from community interest groups focusing on the environment or other public concerns. I hope you, acting as the only elected body having direct policy-making responsibility for airport futures, bring a greater community presence to this effort by increasing membership of the p.a.g. To better reflect the full range of community interest impacted by activities of the airport and to achieve parity on the p.a.g. Committee. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you.

Potter: Thanks for being here, folks. When you speak, state your name for the record.

Alison Stoll: My name is alison stoll. I am the executive director of central northeast neighbors. We are located at 4415 northeast 87th avenue, co-located with fire station 12. Thank you for allowing us to be here and thank you, commissioner Saltzman, for pointing out that we didn't have an overhead of the full composition of the package. I think that that's very important to keep in mind. Central northeast neighbors is a coalition of eight neighborhoods bounded roughly by the columbia river, i-84, 205, and northeast 33rd avenue. The Portland airport is located within our coalition. I am before you today on behalf of central northeast neighbors to ask that you support a balanced p.a.g. With balanced reputation. With the present composition of the -- composition of the p.a.g., there is not a balance. We would ask council to add at least two more neighborhood representatives from the Portland area around the airport, one representative from air separate from the coalition representatives, because at our last coalition board meeting, our board felt that we deserved our own seat and air needed a seat for itself. And two more environmental representatives because, as the columbia river keeper pointed out to you, the environment around the airport is very important. We have the columbia slough and the river. It's very important. I would disagree with the port's recommendation not to add people to the p.a.g. A good facilitator can handle adding five to eight more people. I know that i've facilitated plenty of meetings with 30 to 50 people, and everyone had a chance to be heard. If parity is a problem, then perhaps some seats to be removed to make the balance. When we think the airport, we think of travel and commerce. While environmental impact certainly includes regional growth, remember that impacts to the neighbors include the neighbors surrounding the airport include noise, both ground and air, environmental, traffic, including bringing the 280,000 tons of goods and materials over our roads, and a portion of the 14 million people who travel in and out of the airport. Thank you.

Robin Denbury: My name is robin denbury, and i'm a past member of the concordia neighborhood. I've been involved with this issue a couple of years since I started getting woken up in the night at 2:30 in the morning, 5:30 in the morning, 5:45. There's a broad base coalition of folks concerned about the composition of the p.a.g., and that's environmental groups like columbia river keepers, audubon society, it also includes neighborhoods, northeast coalition of neighborhoods, all the neighborhood positions have endorsed a position saying there needs to be broader representation. I just went to a woodlawn neighborhood association, and I had 10 people asking me -- I was there for a different topic -- asking me what's going on with the airport. Your the planes flying over our house? What's going on with the master plan presentation? Why is it imbalanced? Just concerns in general about concerns over the airport. My goal is balance. The ability to build a third runway when a trigger or position is reached and to remove city land authority within the board district. I may be incremental, but it begins today. It's all about the vote. Even if there is consensus for most of the issues, there will be controversial issues where there will need to be a majority vote, and when that happens, the majority vote is going to carry significant weight for when it comes back before the council. Especially because council cannot vote on the master plan piece of this, it's important today to have balance within the committee in order to represent Portland's interests. At

June 6, 2007

present, those supporting the port's objectives have a six to seven seat majority. I would like to see at least five seats added to achieve balance. I'm asking two seats for more environmental groups, two more seats for neighborhoods, particularly those directly impacted like northeast coalition neighborhoods and central northeast neighbors, and also a seat for the airport issues roundtable that's been engaged in this issue for a long period of time. I would appreciate council directing the bureau of planning to add those five seats so that it gets us close to a balance. I also just want to quickly mention that oni is not funded in the proposed budget, and so public-involvement piece will not have oni participation unless that is changed. In general, we need to take a regional approach in an effort to take the pressure off of p.d.x. But if we're going to do this process, a minority vote could be accepted by council on land-use issues are but it's going to be hard to do. The key thing is to create balance right now by making a change to the composition. Thank you.

Erwin Bergman: My comments likewise address inadequate representation on p.a.g. by city of Portland neighborhood coalitions bordering p.d.x. Niece neighborhoods will be highly burdened with extensive adverse impact degrading the quality of life. Adverse impacts will not only be from the aircraft operation but from a whole host of ground-based activities connected with p.d.x., specifically movements of materials, goods, and peoples to and from p.d.x. I'm therefore asking council to support my recommendation to add four additional positions to the p.a.g. In support of neighborhood coalitions abutting and most impacted by p.d.x. Insufficient emphasis would otherwise be likely placed on the critical impact avoidance hierarchy. Avoid, minimize, mitigate. At the same time and reflecting p.d.x.'s confessed goal of obtaining a long-term or permanent operating city license unencumbered by periodic reviews and revisions, it would likely eliminate chances for neighbors to redress. Plans only updating the prior 2000 plan, the legislative process will attempt to create essentially, from scratch, specific operating parameters for p.d.x. Reflecting the city's objectives, a much larger undertaking. The four positions that i'm asking for, two of these should be -- provide support to neighborhood coalitions mostly impacted by -- from p.d.x. One would be central northeast neighbors. The other could be a neighborhood coalition, either east or west of the airport or to the southeast. A.i.r. Should likewise be provided with a p.a.g. Seat. It has for many years represented all our Portland communities and with p.d.x. On literally all land issues. One should be a p.a.g. Member that manages natural issues including habitat. The 11 committee members that I den -- that are identified, only four of those are representing city of Portland neighborhoods, and I believe that and we believe that only those four have good legal standing as stakeholders. We do not believe that on a city of Portland land-use issues Washington representatives and gresham representatives on the p.a.g. Have stakeholder status. On the 25 p.a.g. Seats identified as optimum, we believe that the additional four would likewise be in the optimum range. Who is to say what is, what is not optimum? All we know is too little will provide insufficient input. Too much will become cumbersome. We appreciate your endorsement of my recommendation. Thank you very much.

Potter: Sir, did you state your name for the ready?

Bergman: Erwin bergman. I apologize if I didn't.

Potter: Thanks, folks.

George Bruender: My name is george bruender. 2414 northeast hyland. I am the land-use chair for necn, northeast coalition of neighborhoods represents 12 inner northeast neighborhoods. I'm also the land use chairman for concordia neighborhood. And the northeast neighborhoods, the residents are basically happy with the urban airport, the close proximity. Who could argue about that? But we want to be assured that our participation on this futures advisory group -- our participation in this process will be given equal weight with all the other players, and we've had somewhat of a history in concordia. We've also talked about two major runways, the north and south one. There's actually been a third one in operation. We call it the east/west. It's been called the cross winds runway. It was used for adverse weather conditions. About 10 years ago, there was

June 6, 2007

a major change in the use of that runway, and it became a major route for the box haulers, the air cargo haulers, and we knew that at concordia because the planes flew over us regularly day in and day out. We've been in negotiations with the port of Portland and p.d.x. For the past two years directly as a neighborhood association and with the help of commissioner Adams' office to expedite that and to get some of that traffic dispersed a little bit. As I said, the change took place 10 years ago, and my initial question was: Was there any approval from the public? Was there any public involvement? I approached the city. The city got back to me and said, no. We find no record. There's no written record. There's no hard copy. P.d.x. Said we'll get back to you. This was two years ago. When I see chris corich, he says, we're working on it. I take for granted that there was probably no public involvement. As neighborhoods, we're concerned about getting strong reputation at this time. So if the fourth runway comes down the line, it's going to affect our liveability and safety in our neighborhoods, and that's why we're asking an equal reputation with a lot of the other players. For example, business has six people. We have four. You know, that could be equalized. Four and four, five and five, six and six, whatever it ends up working out. A couple people talked about this being a regional plan. We would like to see region expanded even further to include i-5 corridor. We would also be interested in seeing talk about other kinds of transportation, not just air. Ok. Thank you.

Eric Meyer: My name's eric meyer. I reside at 6837 northeast alameda. And i'm a resident of the roseway neighborhood. I've been involved in airport issues since 1998 initially generated by concerns over the impact that our neighborhood of low-flying cargo feeders or box haulers. I was a citizen member of the part 150 noise plan representing air. I also participated in the negotiations between the port, the f.d.a., the airline, city noise office, and our neighborhood. After all the work, endless discussions, community meetings, public relations, we're still waiting upon the agreed-upon changes from both of those endeavors. Today i'd like to express my concern about the city's ability to represent its interests in this new p.d.x. Planning cycle. During the year and a half I spent trying to help with the noise plan, I became very concerned when, near the end of our meetings, support injected in the 150, what I thought to be a dangerous president in terms of land use measures. I knew that when the noise gets to a certain level, the f.a.a. Can pay to insulate and buy out affected property, but below that the port was proposing requiring warnings to potential home buyers that the houses they wanted to buy could be located in noisy aircraft areas. This criterion would be based not on the official noise level but by using noise complaints as a generating factor. I live five miles away, and I still get rattled out of bed by box haulers. I'm a no-recognize noise zone. It seemed to be shaping up at the time that, if you complained about noise, your neighborhood could be labeled a problem area. Realtors could be forced to disclose this, and property values would be changed, and I don't think that would go for the better. I thought this was a totally one-sided land-use decision that the city needed to look at, and some of you in city government may remember my frantic telephone calls at the time. And thankfully the proposal was eventually dropped. This experience illuminated to me that the city needs more expertise and more opportunity to deal with issues emanating and dealing with the port and the f.a.a. I like the people on the port, but I have to disagree with something that was said which is if there were more citizens on the 150, more seats, that the box hauler thing wouldn't have come up. I was on the 150, and I was a broken record about the box hauling. Public testimony became involved. But if there wasn't somebody on that committee that was bringing that up time after time, that wouldn't have ever entered in the 150 process. It was also evident in the part 150 that the citizens of vancouver and clark county wanted a different outcome than Portland citizens. They strongly put forward a plan to put more flights over our side of the river to avoid more noise on the north shore. Now, these are legitimate issues needing to be discussed, but sometimes Portland neighborhoods get outgunned due to lack of participation and representation. I'm urging you to add enough city voices to this advisory committee so that average citizens, those who have to deal with impacts generated by aviation, can

June 6, 2007

feel that they aren't being sacrificed to outcomes that the city could have prevented with some minimal oversight. Thank you.

John Weigant: I was air's first chair and have been involved in these issues for nearly a decade. As a former urban planner, I had a specialty in projecting the future. I'm not here to tell you what I want, rather I am here to forecast the future and suggest changes for the future that I believe you want. Also I am deeply concerned about the pag, but time will not allow me to talk about that. Rather, I would like to talk about the amendment that is before you. One of the paragraphs of this amendment, the conditional use permit extension, should be deleted. Another should be modified. Paragraph 5, the conditional use permit extension inserts a new section into the i.g.a . It should be rejected. It is completely unneeded, since it says only that if the planning process is substantially complete, the port will, upon the city -- the city will, upon port application, entertain an extension. But you'll do that even if it's not in the i.g.a . Adding such language implies the city will tolerate further delay after project that's already at least a year behind schedule. The paragraph has no provision if the planning process is not substantially complete. So please delete paragraph 5 and let normal city procedures govern the c.u.p. Process. Paragraph 3, the website collaboration, needs a clarification added. This section is mostly boilerplate, but it enables a potential problem. The language gives essentially total control of the website to the port. A systems princess organizations are controlled by their information flows. The website will be the major Information flow for the process to you, the p.a.g., and the public. Total control of this flow by any involved process can give the appearance of bias, even if none exists. The problem can be nipped by adding a benign subparagraph to the others of the i.g.a. Section 3c, that paragraph being 5, content and structure of the website will be subject to review and comment by a subcommittee of the p.a.g. The rest of my testimony is submitted, but commissioners Adams and Leonard I believe I can answer your questions about the role of the third runway and resulting master plan, but not necessarily the land use plan. There is the distinct possibility these two products may produce incompatible results, and I leave that to you to resolve. I refer to you the language of the current i.g.a., attachment 1, the city work plan, paragraph 7b4 that talks about the alternatives analysis. May I continue to answer your question? I still have some time.

Potter: Sir, you are over.

Weigant: Oh, ok.

Potter: Your 30 seconds --

Weigant: Ok. 30 seconds?

Potter: Over. Thank you.

Potter: Thanks for being here, folks. When you speak, state your name for the record. You each have three minutes.

Paul Van Orden: Paul van orden, resident of northeast Portland. Mayor Potter, members of Council. Today I am not appearing before you as my usual role as the city's noise control officer. Today i'm here representing o.n.i. As an appointed person to the luac committee. I was committed by past director jimmy brown. The perspective I wanted to offer today is a simple perspective that I reached from my 11 years in the city of Portland and 16 years in environmental enforcement work. And that's the perspective of a committee of this nature involving the large number of citizens that it will have some turnover, where it will have citizenning stepping down from the process and in that process we want to ensure that there is buy-in from the community, that they feel there is voice is heard. And I feel in looking at the composition, and I offered this same perspective during the luac process, especially in the last two meetings, that we would be well served as a community to have the committee committee slightly overbalanced with more citizen representatives than port representatives. So I did a quick tally at our last meetings and offered that the original makeup we were discussing was too heavily centered toward the port, so what I wanted to offer today, from my professional experience in working with the community and communities back on the east coast, we

June 6, 2007

would be well-served in adding two more environmental constituents, two more neighborhood constituents and in particular on that note, I would lean towards the neighborhoods that are most heavily impacted, so cnn and necn, and then in terms of just the -- the amount of involvement the communities had on airport issues, I would say it's not logical to have a civic representative one of the categories they have in the process. I would say we replace that particular constituent with someone from air, just based on the long-term history working with the community and their knowledge of the issue. And so I just wanted to offer that as my experience drawing on two years on the luac, and as the youngest member originally almost 10, 11 years ago on the original noise abatement advisory committee. Thank you.

Corky Collier: Corky collier, executive director of the columbia corridor association. Good morning. I'm feeling a little like the odd man out. I'm here to support the current plan. I support the funding as well as the current outreach plan. I think city staff has gone to great lengths to create a good plan that not only allows for public input, but actually solicits it. I'm real pleased with what they've done. As an example, they're asking to come to our organization, once a month, I had to hold them back and say have it once a quarter. It's my understanding that recently city council staff had recommended that columbia corridor association actually be the business association Representative on the p.a.g. And then later came back and said, maybe that seat is better represented by labor interests. I agreed with that for a couple reasons. One, I liked the public input process they've created. But most importantly, I felt it's important to the p.a.g. To keep it at a reasonable size. If you'll listen to the chair's comments that he also agrees a little smaller size, 25 is pretty big, will allow a also more dialogue, or meaningful dialogue. We still have a lot of public input. We're still going to focus on a consensus basis and give you information when consensus basis isn't used. Based on that, while would I have loved to serve on p.a.g., it was best to not do so in order to keep the sizemore reasonable. I like what the port has done, I think they've got a great process. I hope you support the funding and I hope you support the current outreach plan. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you.

Sean Loughran: Mayor and council, i'm sean loughran, I work for the city of vancouver out of the city manager's office. I participated in this process along with laura hudson, the long-range planning manager. I want to say and compliment you on adopting a joint approach to this planning effort. I know it's complicated. I appreciate the great pains that you are going to to understand exactly what it is That you're deciding and what's being decided by this community. I particularly want to thank you for including vancouver and clark county as part of that community. Like the i-5 columbia river crossing, like the columbia river itself, Portland international airport is a regional transportation facility, southwest Washington sees Portland international airport as its airport as much as it sees it as Portland's airport. Vancouver certainly shares in the benefits of international air surface. It also shares in the cost of international service, and that's why we feel we are a key stakeholder in this process. We greatly appreciate the opportunity, I have appointed the vice chair, and have members both from city of vancouver staff, from city of vancouver neighborhoods, and from clark county participate in this process. There was an exhibit earlier that shows the airport layout and principally the area to the south. I think if the airport was more asked you'd see how much of vancouver is in close proximity to the airport. I know mayor pollard is fond of saying the airport is closer to his office than it is to yours. But certainly a lot of air traffic goes over downtown vancouver. While I participated directly in the aviation consultant selection process, laura hudson participated in the review and development of the airport Futures work plans as part of the land use advisory committee. We strongly believe the proposed planning advisory group structure is well suited to the task at hand, it's designed with the intent of making the chair and the vice chair successful in their mission given its size. It was something that was put together with a great amount of thought, it certainly wasn't arbitrary, that the representatives chosen in the number of

June 6, 2007

people chosen has a specific intent. I think as you keep in mind that the planning advisory committee, while it's a very important part of the process, it's only one component and it's well supported by an extensive public involvement effort. And great opportunities for other people to be involved. I think you should also be aware that expanding the committee could be a slippery slope if a number of representatives or -- are added from Portland and other interest groups, I think clark county and the city of vancouver would be expected to offer the same opportunity to appoint additional members, and again, I think we come to a committee that becomes unmanageable. Thank you.

Veronica Rinard: For the record, i'm veronica, the director of community relations for the Portland Oregon visitors association. We're very pleased to see this joint planning process between the port and the city. As you know, the airport is critically important to our regional tourism industry. We're very proud of our Airport's ranking as the top airport in the nation, and also for its recognition for sustainable practices, both of those certainly help us to market the city. And we want to see that quality maintained. I've been participating on the land use advisory committee for about the past year. Since I took the position of community relations. And we looked very extensively at the work plan over three meetings. One of the things that we looked into was the public advisory group we originally looked at 44 members, but there was a lot of discussion through a lot of concern that that large after group would really be too unwieldy. With further discussion we came up with the p.a.g. Of 25 members, which provides for a balanced representation of stakeholders, but also maintains a workable size. We also had discussion about representatives on the public advisory group going back out to their community groups and their constituency groups, sharing information and receiving input so they were bringing a wider perspective to the group. We also felt that in was an adequate number of public meetings planned throughout the schedule. I think if I remember correctly it was 19, to allow for even more broad community input. So i'll keep my comments brief and just end by urging consideration of caution in creating a group that would be too big to be efficient and Effective and to also recognize the work that luac has already put in in looking into this plan and this public advisory group and the considerations that we made in approving the 25 size. Thank you.

Linda Robinson: My name is linda robinson, I live in outer east Portland. I've been involved with work and this issue for 12 years or more. My first involvement with the port was with a deicing issue, and -- in the mid 1990's. My experience then with their public involvement process and their openness was left a lot to be desired. They've made a lot of improvement in the 12 years since that first experience. But they still have a ways to go. And my involvement with the i.g.a. Committee, we worked very hard to come up with a process that would assure more public involvement than they had in the last master plan. And the idea of the p.a.g. And having this land use process going on and having a single tag was so the master plan didn't get ahead of the process, so people got involved with one knew what was going on with the other. We felt it was very important to have this single advising both groups. The luac, i've been a member of as well, there was -- the last meeting was february, a lot of the changes have happened since then, I do thank the port for add something additional positions and even more important for opening up the subcommittee process. What they presented to the luac In february and continued to have on the -- in the work plan until the last month or two was that the subcommittees could be only made up of p.a.g. Members and nobody else could be on them. That has changed, they've opened it up so others can be on them as long as a p.a.g. Members are the core of those subcommittees. That I think will make the public involvement process much better. So one of the concerns, another concern of the citizens who have been involved with a conditional use permit, the i.g.a. Committee where we spent six or eight months coming up with an i.g.a. And the luac is that it's really important that the city not allow the port to dominate this process. This needs to be truly a joint process and I just want to make sure that the city is committed to making it, so -- because I think this land use planning process is really

June 6, 2007

going to be critical. We know what the results might be of the master plan process with some refinements, though I think it will be better than the last plan, because there will be more emphasis on how to grow within the existing infrastructure rather than relying strictly on new infrastructure. So I think that looks like an improvement. But the land use process and making a process so when the proposal for another runway comes that we'd have a lot of public involvement that -- involvement that we need environmental concerns, Transportation concerns, noise concerns, this is really I think the core of this. That's why we feel there needs to be plenty much Portland representatives. This is a Portland land use process. The last I heard air was not on it. I see today they presented that air has a member position, so that pleases me. It would be nice to see a couple of more interest groups represented on that if we can. I was pleased to see that consensus model will be used with the p.a.g.

Potter: Do we have spare copies to give the council members of the --

Leonard: I have something I can hand out here that includes that.

Kelley: Can I mention a couple of things to frame the discussion here? First of all, I want you to know, one thing about process, and then maybe about the substance. On the process side, you should realize the item before you today does not specify the composition of the p.a.g. It has a work program and acceptance of the money from the port. The work program only anticipates this planning advisory group and anticipates that I along with my counterpart at the port will appoint the members. So processwise you could document the stuff today and make further suggestions and directions to me that I would then have to negotiate with my Counterparts at the port in terms of membership. Because the agreements today do not specify the membership. So I could take the action before you today and then follow up on the membership thing. I'm always of course in many cases we do this and we never bring it to council. One process might be that you ask the mayor and perhaps one other of the council to confer with myself and mary and the executive director of the port and bill blowser after today so that we can still hold to our June 26th kickoff, which has been pretty well advertised and known. And that we come up with a satisfactory answer on the composition, and then we'll report back to council. But that would allow us then to go forward. Because I think we're close. I do want to say I've had conversations on the substance now with the port about adding an official slot for air, recognizing their long history, which would allow -- which would open up another slot since we anticipated an air representative might take one of the community slots by adding a spot for air. We specially have a -- essentially have a composition that looks like this in our current thinking. By adding air we'd have a total of 26 members, which is pushing the envelope for workable meetings. We can always go to a much larger group and change our format this, would no longer be the working steering committee, It would be a kind of convention. I think to have a real working committee we want that to be the center of the wheel. It's not the beginning and the end of the public involvement. We're going to have extensive public involvement. But the composition as it stands as we add the air slot are essentially six -- the chair and vice chair do not vote. They're essentially there to facilitate the discussion. Beyond them, there will be six members for governmental agencies. Which we don't expect to be fully aligned. There would be six representatives for industry, labor, commerce, and then there would be 12 for a variety of community interests. And again, all of those are regional in scope, so our motion is to have a balance. So I do have a little bit of concern with the testimony that's unbalanced. It's actually strictly balanced if you look at it in the most sort of strict objective terms. I think what you've been asked for is additional membership, additional representation from the community. It's not that it's unbalanced to start with. So we've got this balance between regional, local perspective and balance between the groups of interest. Not that any of those always are expected to align neatly. If you would like to add others, in the environmental and neighborhood category, I just need to you know that's fine, but that's a discussion I need to have with the port because we are doing this as a partnership.

June 6, 2007

Leonard: The council gets to vote on this.

Kelley: Correct, but the port commission --.

Leonard: We get to agree.

Kelley: But the port commission will get to vote as well.

Leonard: That's fine.

Leonard: We don't --

Kelley: I'm not suggesting you can't give me advice or you can't do something else, but --

Leonard: Thank you for the offer to give you advice. That's kind of our role.

Kelley: I understand that. I'm trying to give you the framework that I also have to negotiate these things with the port. That's the basic composition. I think we have handed out to you what we have so far thought about in terms of slots. We have not tried to handpick members, by the way. We have asked the various constituencies to nominate their own members. So that were not trying to get down into the weeds and say who should represent whom. Were essentially allowing groups to come forward with their own nominations.

Leonard: Mayor potter.

Potter: Questions?

Saltzman: The civic organization slot I think Irwin or fred suggested perhaps error take that slot and I think in a previous I'd had with you I think you indicated that city club didn't have strong interest or perhaps league of women voters.

Kelley: That would be fine.

Leonard: Mayor Potter?

Potter: Yes.

Leonard: I'd like to move to amend the intergovernmental agreement between the city of Portland to memorialize the membership of the airport futures planning advisory group as follows and as articulated in the handout. Carla the chair, the appoint by the Portland mayor, the port commission president, the vice chair would be appoint by vancouver mayor and the port commission president, city of Portland planning commission member would be nominated by the Portland mayor, representative of the city of vancouver nominated by the vancouver mayor. Port of Portland commission member nominated by the port of Portland commission. Representative of the Oregon department of environmental quality nominated by the DEQ. The federal aviation administration nominated by f.a.a. air traffic control, metro would be nominated by the metro president. Airline industry would be by invitation by the port and the city. Tourism industry would be by invitation by the port and city. A tenant at Portland international airport would be at the invitation by the port and the city. Business association invitation by the port and city. And military representative invited by the port and city. Large business that uses Portland international airport would be invited by the port and city. Four members representing environmental interests recommended by the coalition for a livable future. Six representatives of Portland neighborhoods recommended by the office of neighborhood involvement. Two representatives of the clark county neighborhoods recommended by the vancouver mayor and the clark county commissioners. Representatives of the east county area impacted by primary jet departure arrival path recommended by east county mayors and finally, a representative from the airport issues round table air recommended by air. I need to get a second before I talk about this.

Adams: Second.

Leonard: The changes that will be the point of discussion are in the environmental representatives I have recommended we go from two members to four members. The neighborhood interest go from four members to six members. And the addition of the air representative. So there are five additional recommended -- what is the substance of this --

Adams: What did you do with the civic one?

Leonard: The civic one is on there I believe.

June 6, 2007

Kelley: I don't see it I think the air substitutes it.

Sugnet: Added five and took away one.

Leonard: So I think that change was agreed to anyway. As I understood it. So the substance of the changes -- the two members represent environmental interests and two more -- two more members representing environmentalists, two more representing neighborhoods. And if I could speak to it, I think the Portland international airport is a treasure. It is truly anybody who's not any traveling at all is very unique in the -- in its proximity to the large city that it serves, the city of Portland. As most people know, when you go to -- whether it's sea-tac or Washington, d.c., or new york, or even san francisco, you travel miles and miles and miles to get to the city from the airport. So we I hope everybody treasures the proximity of p.d.x., because it is a great asset. It's wonderful to get literally on light rail and drop off the airport. I think they do a fabulous job at the airport. And I want to make sure that as This process goes forward we don't start off with people having a negative impact -- impression of what this process is going to produce. That would be a huge mistake. Because I honestly believe, and i've always lived by this, that reasonable people that are sitting at a table that - - where they're all equals, generally come up with the same conclusions. After a while when you develop relationships and begin discussing issues, kind of a partisanship goes away, and the ideas become more important than whose idea it is. And it would be a huge misstep I think to start that off with some in the community thinking that the deck is stacked. Whether it is or not is a separate issue. But in my view, there is an impression of that. And it colors the process. At the end of the day I will tell you that i, and i'm sure my colleagues want the Portland international airport to be as successful in the future win creased demands as it has been up to now. I think it's the best airport i've ever been in. And I lovett work they do up there. I love how it's part of the community. But because of that, it's very sensitive because it's part of the community. That's what makes it different. It's good, but there are challenges because obviously when the proximity is as close and it abut neighborhoods as it Does, the impact of the noise is greater than in in san francisco or in boston, or in seattle. So we have to balance those interests in a way that makes people feel like at least at the end of the day they've been heard and heard earnestly and honestly. And my intent with this amendment is just to do that. Not to assure a certain outcome at all, and i've told those that I committed to making some amendment to that at the end of the day any side that's unreasonable will be flushed out by this council. If anybody thinks they'll roll a position, whether the composition stays the way it is, the fear of the business interests come in with one recommendation happening, or if the changes and the neighborhood folks think, now we can go in and enroll, let me alert you, it won't happen. Because we will sniff that out and sort through what we consider to be unfairness or inequities, what is better, however, is to have a consensus report where everybody says, this balances a number of interests and we feel good about the process, we feel good about what we're bringing to you, and with can support it. And that's my only goal in making this recommendation. Thank you.

Saltzman: I guess i'd like to also throw out an alternative for consideration too. Appreciate the points commissioner Leonard made, but i'm still struck about the need, I know there's been a lot of work that's gone into the composition of the public advisory group. And I want to respect a lot of that work, but I also want to maintain a sensitivity to the balance vis-a-vis clark county and vancouver and also with the port commission who is our partner. I would -- mr. Leonard has an amendment, if it is not accepted I would offer this one that would actually add two neighborhood association members one environmental member and then it would delete categories from sort of the commercial side and the community side. There hasn't been interest for the league and city club, and with all due represent to veronica, I would delete the tourism industry on the other side. So it would be a net addition of one person to this committee. So it would go from 25 to 26. I have a lot of respect for the tourism industry --

June 6, 2007

Sten: Add two neighborhoods, one environmental -- we're assuming the air addition has been made?

Adams: Erwin bergman is air --

Sten: Yes Erwin gets a spot. Your handout is --

Kelley: In place of the civic we would trade that for an air slot.

Sten: That's what you were already going to do.

Adams: My understanding is d.e.q. Would prefer to be a technical participant. Did I misunderstand that through the rumor mill? And does not ask for a voting seat on the government slot?

Sugnet: That's correct.

Sten: We could eliminate that one.

Sugnet: We're still filling a lot of these positions. It's a moving target at this point. So it's going to be challenging to phil mickelson out who should be at the table. Part of what we're trying to bring forward to you is this is the composition we have to date. We know there's holes that we have to fill. I want to say trust us, at least help us give us some direction.

Leonard: We have a responsibility to respond to the folks that live in Portland. When they come to us we have to take that responsibility.

Kelley: We're still hoping that we ---- we're still hoping to find a governmental representatives for the natural resources perspective.

Adams: Your preference would be to keep the government regulator on?

Leonard: I'm just trying to understand this amendment, because I could -- I could potentially drop mine -- .

Sten: I want to ask a question. To be very blunt about this, this is the whole way this is going to work. The side of not adding people has made the argument today that the committee gets getting too big. I think dan's point of -- reengineering it a little bit so you add only one, it's pretty impossible to argue that one more person would make it too big. So I just want to ask you bluntly, do you really think the Issue is it's too big, or do you actually -- are you using that as a counter to what the other side is saying, which is we want more of a vote? The other side is saying we want more seats. And you're saying we just -- we don't care about that, we just want the committee not to be too big.

Mary Maxwell: From our viewpoint, we want to hear the variety of perspectives out there in the community. And I appreciate the involvement of the citizens that are here. These are all very active people that we know quite well that participate in our processes. I believe that it -- we could expand the committee by a couple. I don't think you start reaching when you add five or seven that you're going to get the appropriate balance, and the committee does begin to get too large. Would I suggest that the tourism community is an important part of our community and they have a perspective that should be at the table.

Adams: On that score i'm open to the discussion on council, but having the user airport, the user of airplane service I think is an important perspective to have as part of the mix.

Sten: If you were to take dan's suggestion of two neighborhood and environmental and one environmental rather than two and two as a little compromise, would you then prefer to have it be a 28-person committee and keep the tourism on there, or pull the one off?

Maxwell: That's the -- getting down to those choices. Yes. We could work together, gil and i, to come up with adding two or three positions to the committee that would gain some more neighborhood and environmental representation. And would I certainly be willing to explore that. But I think we do need to keep the business and the tourism side there as a balance.

Sten: We're agreed on changing the civic organization to air, or -- or that air will be the civic organization.

Maxwell: Yes.

June 6, 2007

Kelley: Correct. And I would say with the business association as courtney testified, we'd like the option of having either business or labor represented for that slot.

Leonard: Which one is that?

Kelley: On your list commissioner Leonard, business association. And we would say business or labor association.

Leonard: Business or labor.

Adams: I guess back to commissioner Saltzman's -- I don't know which one we should use.

Saltzman: We're talking about maybe commissioner Leonard's proposal versus a net add of two neighborhoods -- not a net add, an addition of two neighborhoods and one environmental group.

Maxwell: I would request the opportunity for gil and I to meet together, maybe with the mayor, commissioner Leonard or one of the other of you to talk about the composition, to take into consideration. Once we add additional Portland neighborhoods, what does that do to the balances with vancouver? And have a little more in-depth discussion about what we're trying to achieve.

Adams: This is a nonemergency?

Potter: It would be coming back.

Maxwell: Not to be out of order here, but we would like to move ahead with the i.g.a. And have your approval to pay you \$800,000 for the staff time.

Adams: It's a nonemergency, so we can't vote today anyway.

Leonard: We can vote on the amendment.

Adams: Correct. When would you propose to come back --

Maxwell: We had planned to go to our commissioner to get approval on the i.g.a. next wednesday.

Adams: We're not voting on this any earlier than next wednesday.

Leonard: But we're going to vote on the amendment. If you want to bring back next wednesday suggestions, we're happy to look.

Sten: To me this is something that lots of people on all sides spend a lot of time thinking about. And so I guess i'm not against necessarily sending it back out, but did I ask the question, it sounds like your concern is really the number of votes that potentially line on up each side.

*****: It's --

Kelley & Maxwell: It's number and balance.

Kelley: It sounds like what we're hearing is maybe reconciliation -- two more neighborhood and one more environmental slot. And we have the option of either adding or detracting from some of the other members.

Leonard: No, we're voting on --

Sten: I just think you can't add more members on top of those three and have any adherence to your own argument. I don't buy your argument, to be blunt, the difference between 25-30 is meaningful. I'm not big that 25 and 30. But you are making that case and I want to honor that. So to honor your own argument, we say we want to add three more people, you really can only change slots. You can't come back and say, I want three more business now, because you're really not arguing that the community is too big. If that's what you want, you ought to say it, not --

Maxwell: My concern also is the balance with vancouver.

Saltzman: That's the point that's resonating with me. To me adding two neighborhoods and one environmental is trying to keep within that balance. We may hear from mayor pollard to the contrary, or the port may hear the contrary, but that's --

Sten: Right now there's four Portland neighborhoods and two vancouver --

*****: Correct.

Sten: If you're going to have six you should have three, you'd have the same balance.

Kelley: I guess erik to respond -- commissioner Sten, adding three total is probably something in our perspective we can manage. All I was saying was that we would then -- I understand the

June 6, 2007

direction you're going in terms of what that membership should be. And we might just want to preserve the idea of whether we strictly add those three or whether we detract some others to keep the number down. I think we're in the same range. Adding more than three net --

Leonard: We're voting on an amendment where i've read so far who the members of the committee are, including the additions, i'm inclined to agree with commissioner Saltzman to modify my amendment, which I consider a friendly suggestion on his part, to have there be three environmental representatives rather than two. And then also your suggestion gil to change the business end association representative to business four labor association representative. With the approval of commissioner Saltzman, that's the amendment that we will be voting on, which articulates who the members of the airport future planning advisory group are.

Saltzman: That would also add two neighborhood ones.

Leonard: I was talking about the difference between my amendment and what you suggested. You said --

Adams: Audit [inaudible]

Adams: I love metro, I deal with them every day on transportation issues, surface transportation issues, what's -- besides an interest in the other regional government, what's the actual statutory interest in this? Do they have to approve this?

Kelley: No.

Adams: Ok.

Leonard: They manage the convention center and those kinds of things. So there's a relationship between tourism and the airport.

Adams: If we took off metro because the tourism industry is represented --

Leonard: I was arguing why they made sense for them to be there. Tourism and convention center. The airport is absolutely critical in that.

Sten: There's nothing stopping, which is fairly common, another amendment coming back in next week should somebody be able to fix this fine piece of surgery that just went on.

Potter: Let's hear what the new numbers are just to make sure the total -- what would be the total changes involved in this?

Leonard: Because the amendment that I stated now reflects com saltzman's suggestion, there would be an addition of three people. Commissioner Adams mentioned to maintain a balance we'd probably should have the tourism industry or the metro representative not represent it. So i'm open to --

Adams: If we could amend your amendment that bragdon would nominate someone from the tourism industry, that would split the difference.

Leonard: So it would be metro nominating tourism industry.

Potter: Does that still reflect metro having a voice?

Adams: Yeah, because he's not going to serve, he's going to nominate someone.

Saltzman: That's in lieu of the tourism position?

Leonard: In order to keep the size down. That would reduce the size down to 27.

Adams: Metro's interest in this issue --

Sten: What's the problem having 28?

Leonard: Some people have done a subjective count and there's a balance that was achieved with my amendment that doesn't happen with commissioner Saltzman's amendment, reducing by one does.

Kelley: I would politely suggest, we're looking to metro to represent a number of interests of theirs, including the regional transportation model.

Leonard: They can nominate whoever they want.

Kelley: Yeah. I'm just saying I think their interests are broader than the tourism piece.

June 6, 2007

Adams: Someone like carol polland knows transportation, knows the industry, has a facility out there. There's getting to more --

Sten: With all due respect, I think your math that is out there is assuming the chair and vice chair vote, which they do not. So you have 14 community members and 12 government and business. And I don't buy --

Leonard: That's right. I think that's --

Sten: I think somebody is trying to get to 15 assuming the chair and vice chair vote. If they do not vote --

Kelley: They don't vote.

Sten: If the issue is on balance, I don't think these community members will agree either. They're not going to agree on everything.

Leonard: I think you're right.

Sten: If we're the government to agree with each other and those six then to agree with the six business interests, one of whom is labor, so those 12 lined up, and then the 14 community members could agree, neither scenario which is going happen, you'd have the votes. I don't think you need to get rid of one of them.

Leonard: Should I restate the amendment?

Kelley: That would be helpful.

Sten: You should move the amendment to your amendment.

Leonard: I've accepted it as a friendly amendment. But the amendment on the table that we will be voting on would be an amendment to the intergovernmental agreement between the city of Portland and the port of Portland to memorialize the membership of the airport future planning advisory group as follows. The chair to be appointed by the Portland mayor and port commission president, the vice chair to be appointed by the Vancouver Mayor and port commission president. City of Portland planning commission member nominated by the portland mayor. Representative city of vancouver represented by the vancouver mayor. Port of Portland commission member nominated by the port of Portland commission. A representative of the Oregon d.e.q. nominated by the d.e.q. Federal aviation administration nominated by the f.a.a. Traffic control. Metro nominated by the metro president. The airline industry by invitation of the port and the city. The tourism industry by invitation of the port and the city. A tenant at Portland international airport invite the by the port or the city. A business or labor association, and that's a change, that should be added to the handout, business or labor association, invite the by the port and the city. The military invite the by the port and the city. A large business that uses Portland international airport invite the by the port of the city. Three members which is the -- I had four in the handout that will read three members representing environmental interests recommended by a coalition for livable future. Six representatives of Portland neighborhoods recommended by office of neighborhood involvement. Two representatives of clark county neighborhoods represented by the vancouver mayor and clark county commissioners. Representative of east county area impacted by primary jet departure arrival path, recommended by the east county mayors, and finally, a representative from the airport issues round table recommended by air.

Saltzman: I guess just one clarification on your change to the clark county.

Leonard: I didn't change clark county.

Saltzman: I think you said two representatives of clark county neighborhoods. Whereas the earlier version said one vancouver neighborhood and one clark county neighborhood recommended by the mayor and the county chair respectively. I'm wondering if that's an important semantical difference.

*******:** I think that is important.

Saltzman: We would say one vancouver neighborhood and one clark county neighborhood. Recommended by vancouver mayor and clark county board of commissioners respectively.

June 6, 2007

Leonard: We'll keep the language two representatives of clark county neighborhoods, comma, one -- one vancouver neighborhood recommended by the mayor. And one clark county neighborhood member recommended by the clark county commissioners. Do you have that, Karla? Ok.

Kelley: One other clarification. Back to the d.e.q. Conversation if we could see d.e.q. Or other natural resource agency. That would give us the flexibility.

Leonard: Or natural resource agency. Ok. Did you get that, Karla?

Moore: Under the d.e.q. One?

Leonard: Representative of the Oregon department of equality, d.e.q. Or natural resource agency. Or other natural resource -- or other natural resource agency.

Potter: Ok. Call the vote.

Adams: Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Sten:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. [gavel pounded]

Saltzman: I have one other issue to raise that. Was john weigant's point about the website. In fact, you alluded to some legal issue on website that I guess he offered an amendment to the i.g.a. That would simply say that the content and the structure of the website will be subject for review and comment by a subcommittee of the public advisory group. Is that something we can live with?

Sugnet: I think so. I would like to leave it up to the members of the planning advisory group to decide if they're willing to take on that responsibility. As opposed to staff assigning another responsibility.

Saltzman: Without -- would the website be jointly managed in terms of content -- .

Sugnet: It's a joint website. The port is hosting the website, but content has to be agreed to before it's posted by both project managers from the city and the port. And the p.a.g. Will have input. We have a subcommittee to talk about public involvement, and that sounds like a great role for them. I think -- I don't think you need to amend the i.g.a. . We'll write that in.

Saltzman: Great.

Potter: None emergency, moves to a second reading. Thank you. Please read the 10:30 time certain.

Item 636.

Potter: Commissioner Adams stepped out, but will you please come forward?

Eloise Damrosch, Executive Director, Regional Arts and Culture Commission: I like this title, it entitles arts and economic prosperity are hand in hand. With me is jeff hawthorne, community affairs. I'm eloise. We all know arts and culture play a vital role in our community on all levels. We've talked about it with you for a long time. And we know those argumenting, what we have now are some real numbers to go behind that argument and support it. R. A.c. And northwest business for the cultural arts are the local partners for this project, which was -- study, which was coordinated naturally -- nationally in 156 communities across the country. We surveyed 111 of our leading arts and culture organizations in the tri-county region, and interviewed 905 audience members. Woe looked at the broader community, not only the arts organizations the racc currently supports, but also the broader cultural assets as well, such as the Oregon zoo and omsi and the children's museum. We sent the data to Washington to be analyzed by economists using a nobel prize-winning input-output model customized for the Portland metropolitan area and this is what they found. The local nonprofit arts and culture community, including clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington county, is a \$308 million sector. Here's how we got that number. Our tri-county arts and cultural organization spent a total of 166.7 million last year. Their audiences spent more than \$151 million when they went to arts and culture events, and that's on top of the price of the tickets. That spending combined produced a direct economic impact of more than \$318 million. If we look at the direct spending by arts organizations to are -- for a moment, there's some interesting ripple effects in our community you should know about. When residents and visitors purchase tickets to only circumstance Portland center stage, the jazz festival, and thousands of other arts and culture events each year, they create working capital for these organizations. Contributions from

June 6, 2007

businesses, individuals, and governments also create that working capital a. Total of \$166.7 million last year. That is respent by orthopedics organizations on payroll as well as services and supplies from hundreds of local businesses. Cans of paint, fabric for costumes, legal assistance, all that sort of thing.

Leonard: Did commissioner Adams pose for new.

Damrosch: There is a ripple effect for smaller economic impact behind the first time a dollar is spent. Audiences too spend a lot of money in the community. When patrons attend an arts and culture event, they often buy dinner at a restaurant, they park in a garage, they spend a night in a hotel, they pay the baby-sitter, for an average of \$19.61 in event related spending Above and beyond the cost of the ticket. Visitors spend even more, an average of \$38.53 per person.

Leonard: I'd like to know where they eat.

Damrosch: It's an average. In the report you can see all the numbers.

Leonard: Ok.

*******:** You're right. You wouldn't want to stay there.

Saltzman: And pay a baby-sitter too.

Leonard: Exactly.

Damrosch: All this activity supports more than 10,000 full-time equivalent jobs in the community, providing more than 206 million in household income, and generating more than \$27 million in state and local revenues in taxes and fees. Another thing that's worth noting, because these organizations are so routed in this community, these are jobs and revenues that stay here. These jobs cannot be relocated. In the Portland metropolitan area alone in fiscal year 2006, the city along with clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties, together invested \$4.2 million in the nonprofit arts and culture sector. The economic activity generated by these organizations resulted in \$13.3 million in taxes and fees for those local governments combined. Which equals a 3-1 return on investment.

Leonard: how come I didn't make it in the picture.

Damrosch: You're there.

Leonard: Where? So the original is in my office. I know you're there.

Sten: You were airbrushed out For the t.v. Audience. Not all art belongs on television.

Damrosch: So in conclusion, nonprofit arts and culture organizations spent one \$166 million last year. \$4.7 million residents and \$1.5 -- 1.5 million visitors spent a combined \$151 million on event related purchases above and beyond the cost of tickets. Creating a \$318 million industry last year. Local citizens donated more than 648,000 volunteer hours last year. Would no arts and culture make our neighborhoods more livable, attracting businesses, tourists and creative workers to our community. Arts and culture are becoming increasingly important in developing well-rounded thinkers for our work force as well. This report shows conclusionively the nonprofit arts and culture community is a net contributor to the economy generating tourism, spurring business development, supporting jobs, and providing government revenues. Arts and culture are an economic driver. We would be happy to answer any other questions about your study.

Potter: We're concerned about the drop in revenue of some of our larger events, ballet and symphony, the opera. Is there a plan in place to begin to -- it seems like a lot of the money that was there prior to 9-11 is not there now. Is there -- do you folks have a business plan in place or to work with these groups to begin To rebuild those organizations?

Damrosch: Yes on a variety of fronts. We have spoken with you before about -- from the public funding side, we're at about 2%-3% of public funding. And we're shooting for a minimum of 5%, which is kind of the national norm. On the one hand we're hoping together all of our government sources will gradually build back to some of the levels we were before. Because prior to actually prior to the property tax limitation measures we were funding arts and culture organizations much better. Our work for art program is going to grow the individual and business support through the

June 6, 2007

work force giving program, and we also have a program in place called the cultural leadership program where we work -- we have a consultant, we pay for it through a foundation grant, that actually work with these organizations at the management level to correct any kind of issues that they have and help them grow their organizations from within. So it's a multipronged approach.

Jeff Hawthorne: I'd just like to add that it is true that arts and cultural organizations everywhere have lost market share of the total philanthropic contributions as more contributions from public and private source go to education and social service. Arts have lost that market share. You used to receive about 8.2% of their budgets from -- they used to receive 8.2% of the philanthropic dollar before 9-11, now they're receiving 5.2%. So we do intoned work with George Thorn and work with our arts organizations to see if we can address the income side of the equation and we'll also have to encourage them to consider their output. They may have to rescale their services given this new income model.

Jesse Beason: In particular, the similar 503-i has a structural system, they have a number of musicians they have to support in order to be a symphony, so they have a lot of direct costs on -- that are unavoidable. For the similar for any particular, they're facing a huge structural deficit in their organization and there's certain lay lot of concern in the community about whether Oregon will continue to have a symphony in the future.

Damrosch: We're also hoping to use the numbers from this study to make the argument that this is really an important viable part of our economy, and increasingly so as more and more young people move here. So having some hard numbers about how viable it is, even with the challenges, is I think going to be part of our basket tricks.

Potter: I just want to offer my assistance in terms of some of these draws to Portland. The opera and symphony and ballet. I think that's what's needed, I don't think the amount of gap in funding for these performing arts, the public sector could never fill it in. It's way too large. So it's going to have to come from the private sector and the business community, but within this region we have large companies that are not located in Portland, but directly benefit from these organizations and I think we need to make a concerted effort so we don't lose these really important --

Hawthorne: You'll see a funding composition for our arts organizations on page 6. It shows corporate support is about 4%. So surely with this information one of our goals is to increase such corporation and small businesses are investing in our local arts and culture assets.

Potter: I assume this is a national trend as well.

Hawthorne: Yes.

Potter: What happened? Right now we're better off as a state, as a country, than we were in 2001, yet the corporations aren't giving. What's going on?

Hawthorne: And it's not just to the arts that corporations aren't giving. They're more concerned about the bottom line and their profits than ever before. Where there is growth and corporate giving -- businesses rooted in the community are giving more. Larger corporations that are consolidating and trying to generate more profits have eliminated their philanthropic programs. If they're doing anything, they're doing marketing sponsorships. But that's not the same.

Leonard: [inaudible] Fred Meyer, for example, no disrespect intended, but it was a locally owned and operated wonderful chain of stores that reflected the community very much for years, and then when it was bought out by Kroger's, whoever did that, it's changed.

Damrosch: That's right. And I think especially in a community like Portland, where we don't have a lot of Fortune 500 companies, it's hard, because the decision makers aren't here.

Potter: On the other hand, the museum raises \$40 million.

Hawthorne: The capacity is there.

Potter: The capacity is there. I'm just concerned that we're not doing enough to tap into that capacity. I want to work with Commissioner Adams and you folks. I think this is important for our -- not our city, but for our region. I think if folks who have business necessary Hillsboro or

June 6, 2007

beaverton bring their folks to our opera, to all these other amenities, I think they should have some social responsibility to help fund some of this. And I think there's some interest within at least the Portland business community to start working towards a bigger effort on businesses. To me it's their responsibility.

Damrosch: We have an increasingly strong relationship with northwest business for culture and the arts. And I think that's the place to start and really completely agree with you, and I appreciate your offer of support. Because I think that's the answer.

Potter: I was reading a quote in the paper the other day by a suburban mayor who was showing a Business property in hillsboro with the amenities in Portland. And I thought, come on --

Damrosch: That's why we became the regional arts and culture council 12 years ago.

Potter: Don't feel the other regions, parts of the region are paying their share. Portland pays more than the other communities who are doing very well right now.

Damrosch: We appreciate any help.

Potter: Ok. Enough said. I don't want to see these treasures go.

Damrosch: Thank you.

Potter: Other questions? This is a report. We need a motion to accept.

Leonard: I move to accept it.

Potter: Do we have any testimony here?

Moore: No one signed up.

Sten: I second the motion.

Potter: Please call the vote.

Leonard: Very much appreciate your work. This is -- I totally agree with the mayor's remarks and comments about this community steps up.

Saltzman: Good job. Aye.

Sten: Aye.

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] thank you, folks, investment

Item 662.

Jim Coker: My name is jim coker, with the office of management finance facilities services. This ordinance amends our agreement with the Oregon department of transportation and this is a request by odot for -- to delete their costs for the civil rights services related to this project. The work is still being performed by odot. They are just deleting the cost to us.

Saltzman: Which service are they delete something.

Coker: The civil rights service they are providing.

*******:** Similar to what we would have for mwsb services.

Saltzman: They're not charging us but they're still doing it?

Coker: That's right. It's related to the certified local agency agreement apparently odot and this -- you probably will see a few other amendments like this one that's coming through, apparently odot and pdot felt that how other agreement was other entities was structured, they weren't charging for these services elsewhere and they felt like that was a penalty to the city of Portland so they agreed to eliminate it.

Potter: Other questions? Do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Moore: I did not have a sign-up sheet.

Potter: This is a nonemergency, moves to second reading. Thank you. Please read item 663.

Item 663.

Diana Holuka, Office of Management and Finance: Office of management and finance facility services. This is close to a housekeeping thing in my opinion. For about -- more than 20 and probably close to 25 years there's been an off-street parking lot on mlk north of fremont. And my bureau fell heir to it over the years. It was originally created when some of the very first improvements to mlk were being done. I was created to provide off-street parking to create on-

June 6, 2007

street parking for businesses and customers in the area. P.d.c. Is now developing some adjacent properties and would like to incorporate this park nothing that redevelopment. It will still remain open to the public. And it will also serve nearby businesses. So this ordinance is to simply transfer the property to p.d.c.

Potter: Questions? Anybody sign up to testify?

Moore: I did not have a sign-up sheet.

Potter: Nonemergency, moves to a second reading. Thank you. Item 664.

Item 664.

David Rhys, Bureau of Human Resources: David rhys, i'm from the bureau of human resources office of finance -- office of management and finance. This is the cost of living increase for nonrepresented employee. If approved by council it would create a \$2.7% increase -- 2.7% increase for nonrepresented employee, similar to the current contracts for collective bargaining groups there. Are two groups that do not have collective bargaining agreements in place for July 1, 2007. Firefighters and seasonal maintenance workers. For all others, 2.7% is the increase that they would be getting. This would affect nonrepresented employees. I'm here for any questions you may have.

Saltzman: That includes us?

Rhys: It does include elected Officials.

Potter: Is there an opportunity between now and July first if you choose not to take --

Rhys: For elected officials, in the past we have put some language that gives you the flexibility to freeze your current salary and not receive the increase. Upon passage of this I would be in communication with each of you through your offices. If you choose to do that that would be at your discretion individually to decide not to accept the increase.

Leonard: Could I have the raise anybody else declines?

Rhys: You'd need to come back with an ordinance.

Potter: You don't get it for free, buddy.

Leonard: If it means taking the pager home again, I don't want it.

Saltzman: Bring an ordinance.

Leonard: Ok. Right.

Potter: This is an emergency ordinance. Is there anybody signed up to testify?

Moore: No one signed up.

Potter: Please call the vote.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] item 665.

Item 665.

Potter: Commissioner Adams has asked to have this withdrawn to his office.

Moore: I should read it into the record.

Potter: Hearing no objections, this will be returned to commissioner Adams' office. Please read item 666.

Item 666.

Potter: Second reading, vote only.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] we're recessed until 2:00 p.m. today.

At 12:15 p.m., Council recessed.

June 6, 2007
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 program. The text has not been proofread and should not be considered a final transcript.] Captions paid for by the city of Portland

JUNE 6, 2007

2:00 PM

Item 667.

Potter: Andrew?

Andrew Aebi, Local Improvement District Administrator: Thank you, mayor Potter. Andrew Aebi, local improvement district administrator. Karla, I'm just going to run through a brief power point presentation. I just wanted to quickly recap where we were the last time on the I.I.D., actually where we started with the I.I.D. And where we are now. We originally brought the I.I.D formation ordinance for council consideration we had a trip volume assessment methodology with a consistent rate per trip of \$235.57 per assessable trip for all properties within the I.I.D. We came back a month later on March 28th, and there was a proposal to substitute a square footage assessment methodology for the trip volume methodology. When we returned on May 9th, there was a remonstrance filed against the square footage methodology that would have defeated Council jurisdiction to form the I.I.D. Council reinstated the trip volume methodology on May 9th but also introduced a split rate trip assessment formula where developing properties, as of January 1st, 2007, would be an estimated assessment rate of \$270.90 per trip and nondeveloping properties, the remaining properties, would have an estimated assessment rate of \$207.55 per assessable trip. So it worked out to a 15% premium for developing properties and 11% reduction for nondeveloping properties. Mr. Phillips, counsel to international paper, was kind enough to copy me on a proposal he made to the port on May 24th, following the May 9th hearing, and his proposal was to increase the premium for the developing properties more than 15%, the effect of which would have been to increase the per-trip assessable rate to \$340.70 and to then reduce the trip rate for other properties to \$152.20 per property that is not developing. I would note this amendment was proposed to the port of Portland. It was not proposed to me or to other city staff per se. The amount of the increase, had the port accepted this proposal, would have increased the premium from \$128,000 overall to the port, would have increased it to \$381,000 to the port for pretty close to a tripling of what the proposed increase was. And I did receive a copy after response from the port of Portland on June 1st indicating the port would not be supportive of that approach. I'll hand out for you council members a copy of both the presentation I'm giving you right now as well as a copy of the letter to the port. I should say letter from the port. So just in terms of comparing the remonstrances, remonstrances are due one week before the council hearing by city code. Most of the remonstrances that were originally submitted were resubmitted again despite the premium that was introduced. So in terms of the estimated cost, the estimated cost, when we measure the remonstrances based on estimated costs, the remonstrance levels decreased from about 31% down to 23%. In terms of measuring it by area, which is actually what charter goes by in terms of determining whether council loses jurisdiction to form the I.I.D., you can see that we're well below that threshold by charter. So therefore council retains jurisdiction to either form or not form the I.I.D. This is a map of the remonstrances received since the last council hearing and which were received by the deadlines. And then moving on, this is my final slide here, but if we simply analyze

June 6, 2007

all the cumulative remonstrances, the only remonstrance that's been formally withdrawn and counted as withdrawn is the port remonstrance that was withdrawn at the last council hearing. In terms of measuring the cumulative remonstrance level, it's 29% of the estimated cost, 17% of the total area, and 18.1% of a assessable area, just under half of the 60% threshold specified by charter. One piece of information I wanted to provide for council in terms of ultimately making its decision is, if you look at the remonstrances and take a look at what the sample financing cost would be based on today's rates, subject to change, among the remonstrating properties, the single property financing cost over 20 years would range from \$28 a month to \$1052. Some of the remonstrating property owners own multiple properties. If you look at that effect on their combined estimated assessments, that ranges from about \$169 per month at the low end of about \$1684 a month on the high end. So, in conclusion, council retains jurisdiction over l.i.d. formation. The staff recommendation is to pass the ordinance to a second reading one week from today on june 13th and also to approve the ordinance on june 13th. Having said that, council certainly has the prerogative to further amend the ordinance should it wish to. So what I would like to simply provide for council are the package of amendments today. We can consider those after the testimony. But what the amendments would do is to incorporate the most recent round of remonstrances and also clarify the findings of special benefit. Some of the findings of special benefit in the ordinance as it stands today refer to the original finding of special benefit without that split rate assessment methodology and what the amendment does is to ensure that all the references incorporate the financial relief to the nondeveloping properties. So i'll pass that amendment out now, but we'll come back for a couple housekeeping items after we take the property owner testimony. Any next question comes from council?

Potter: How many folks have signed up?

Moore-Love: Nine people signed up.

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

Terry Oftedal: good afternoon. My name is terry oftedal, the director of operations from yo cream international. We are in the 92nd l.i.d. District. I would just like to testify that yo cream finds acceptable this assessment methodology approved on adoption on may 9th by the council, and we remain firmly committed behind this project and want to see it happen for all the reasons we've stated before. Basically life safety for giving us a second egress, improved options for in and out for trucks and for our personnel commuting. And we'd like to see it moving forward. I'd like to say that i'm not the only one on our street, 87th avenue, that has this feeling. Other people that aren't here today have also told me that they're in support. So I just want to mention that there are others who could testify if needed. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you.

John Tesler: Mayor and commissioners, john tessler, controller of ventura foods. Excuse me. Ventura foods has filed a remonstrance against the l.i.d. improvement. Some of the objections are that this improvement will not provide any special benefit to our company or our property is it stated. I think that it might -- the improvement, if it is finished and done, would provide a much broader area and maybe it needs to be expanded to a larger area in this l.i.d. Another point is we believe the city trip methodology is not fair or accurate for the following reasons. It does not result in a reasonable apportionment of the proposed assessment. There is no evidence showing that the methodology is based on special benefit to the properties within the district. And the trip volume compares floor area ratio as projected on undeveloped parcels, which results in an unreasonable allocation of cost between both the undeveloped properties and the developed properties. Another thing that the l.i.d. would adversely affect our business, increase traffic, so that would not be a benefit. Businesses are -- it's tough doing business in the city of Portland, so we'd like to see a fair allocation on this cost. That's all I have.

June 6, 2007

Potter: Thank you.

John Hoglund: I'm John Hoglund, president of Aerocraft North. I'd just like to speak once more to say that we have again filed a remonstrance. We, too, see no special benefit to our company at all. We believe that the increased traffic on 92nd, were the I.I.D. To go through, would negatively impact our business. I may be possibly the smallest business represented and so, as a Portland small business, I would just appeal that the financial impact on us will be significant. I also agree that the assessment methodology being used in this case is both very rare and puts an undue burden on the preexisting owners. I won't go into the detail. You guys are aware of how it's done. But I do believe that the methodology, the square footage methodology we came back with in our original amendment is much more typical and much more fair, and I would ask you guys to consider the proposal that was given to the port as another potentially viable option. Our belief our counsel still representing the south side businesses will get into more detail on that. I'd like to see the costs shifted to where the desire for the I.I.D. is, and I don't believe that's on the bulk of the south side business owners. I would much rather see the project not go through at all. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you, folks. Thanks for being here, folks. Please state your name for the record. You each have three minutes.

Dean Phillips: Dean Phillips appearing on behalf of international paper, and I'm sure we've worn out our welcome by this time, but we still do have some issues with this I.I.D. First of all, I would like to say that Mr. Aebi has worked diligently to try and resolve this matter, although the last -- at the last hearing, the proposal that was clearly negotiated between the city and the port did not involve our participation. We did not have an opportunity to participate in those discussions. And because of that, we attempted to get a settlement conference. Mr. Aebi did arrange that with the port. And while the port continues to take the position that they are not really one of the forming entities on this I.I.D., this is -- it's clear that this I.I.D. is for the benefit of the port and will benefit them more than the southern property owners. For that reason, we have remonstrated. What we are asking today is one more opportunity to try and have the council take a look at this. And what we proposed was an essentially split the baby between the \$655,000 that we had originally proposed on the basis of the square footage proposal to be shifted to the northern property owners. Largely that is the port, and that's why we've been dealing with the port. Versus the \$128,000 that the modified trip-volume methodology with the multiplier had shifted to the port. If you look at the difference between that, the dollars that we were looking at is \$653,000, and what we had proposed -- and we believe that we would resolve this issue and get everybody in support of the I.I.D. if we could reach that. Unfortunately, the port was not willing to go that further distance, and so here we are today. We're asking the council to consider our revised methodology. What it is, for purposes of settlement, we've agreed to continue with the trip methodology with just a heavier multiplier for the undeveloped parcels. Once again, it's very clear from the map that we have submitted with our letter -- our letter is dated today, I believe. All the councilors have a copy. It's very clear that, on the north side, the large part of the improvements are to improve the streets on the north side of the slough. The black, the highlighted area in black, is on the north side of the slough. That is really where all the benefit is going for these improvements on the north side of the slough. So we would ask for a fairer allocation of the assessment and obviously the hope is that we can resolve it through this revised assessment rather than continue the controversy. Thank you.

Cini Apostol: Hello. My name is Cini Apostol. I'm a third-party property manager representing the Realty Associates Fund in Gulsong. We represent the second largest landowner in the southern area, have one of the largest impacts financially. The first thing I think that's clear to all of us is that this I.I.D. improvement would not be happening if the development on the port property were not -- is not happening so soon. The push for this has been the development of the north side. No push on the south side whatsoever with properties like ours that have been in place since 1979 who have no impact, no benefits by this improvement. The other thing is I'd like to address some of the things

June 6, 2007

andrew addressed. He talked about the ratios and the number of our representation of 29% and 16%. He didn't talk about the financial impact to the southern side, which is close to 50% of this entire assessment. He talked about the split the baby method that dean referenced as a 298% increase to the port. He didn't talk about that between the square footage approach that we feel is a fair and commonly used approach to this new approach the increase to my client is 320%. So, yeah, 298 sounds bad, but 320 is even worse to us. So if you want to throw statistics and numbers out there, we can all make it look however we want by selectively choosing what numbers to represent. The bottom line is that the port supports this. The port has pushed it through. The port's been very unwilling to work with us despite many efforts on a joint group to accommodate an equitable compromise, and they are going to reap the rewards. They have the special benefit. We have none. The \$1684 a month assessment that's to my property, it's 18 cents a square foot increase in cost to my tenants. That's lost profitability to my client by 18 cents a square foot. That's a big deal. When you're a 1979 property competing with brand-new development, 18 cents is huge. So I ask you to look at who's getting the special benefit and look at what is fair to assess, because I do not believe the absorption of 50% of the cost by the southern property owners is fair. Thank you for your time.

Todd Thompson: My name's todd thompson, and i'm the general manager for the Portland operations of international paper. This is my fourth time before city council along with the other business owners to oppose or reach a fairer allocation method regarding 92nd l.i.d. Needless to say, the last hearing on the subject approved a methodology that was not discussed in the spirit of cooperation by the city, the port, and the affected property owners, and we feel it is unfair. Since that hearing, we have tried to engage with the city and the port to propose a further compromise, which the south slough property owners actually reluctantly support. Unfortunately we have been rejected and cut out of the process the city council encouraged us to engage in from the beginning of this l.i.d. To restate our position, there is no special benefit in terms of freight movement for international paper with this extension of 92nd drive that alderwood. The increased traffic volume will actually hinder our business delivery system and mobility and create excessive additional traffic. It will reduce our productively and our efficiency. Although we are still opposed to the l.i.d. regardless of cost, international paper has been willing to compromise and support the l.i.d. on the basis of the city of Portland's prior approved modified square footage methodology on march 28th. Not only was this assessment method more fair, but it doesn't have the flawed assumptions that plague the trip-volume methodology. Additionally, in the spirit of cooperation, we approached the city and the port trying to at least achieve a middle ground dollar-wise or financially between the two methods. However, the port has decided to not act as partners and wants to follow the trip methodology that we have argued against from the beginning. The port has continually said they have enough access points and are just willing to go along for the good of the community. Only yo cream has come before the counsel looking to pass this l.i.d. before. We have regularly had eight to 10 other companies disputing this project and remonstrating. This majority of the south slough business owners has continually stated that the project has no benefit and is in fact a hinderance. The port says they are doing this for our benefit. Yet we don't want it. Who do you think you should believe here? Obviously there is indeed great special benefit for the port, and they favor this methodology because they are paying a greatly discounted rate to get it. Approving this l.i.d. with the trip methodology proposed does exactly that for them while harming the majority of the other small to medium businesses. Thank you for your time and your consideration.

Gary Spector:good afternoon, mr. Mayor and commissioners. My name's gary specter. I am the owner of the property specter wilson properties. This is my first visit to the council. My attorney, tim parks, was here. I couldn't make it to the other meetings. But this time I was able to be here, and I wanted to lend support to the owners on the south side. I really couldn't do a better job than those who have spoken already in stating our case, but just to summarize, we feel that we are being

June 6, 2007

unfairly charged for something that we really neither want nor need. And in addition to that, assuming that we are willing to compromise and participate, the method of assessment is unfairly weighted on those who don't get the bulk of the benefit. And so I just want to lend my support to our group and thank you very much for your consideration.

Tanya Fondren: Hello again. I'm tanya fondren, national storage center. We're on marx drive at the very end of the road on marx drive and the further, by the way, away from 92nd. We do not feel that there's any benefit to our company whatsoever having this project completed. And pretty much to reiterate what everyone else has said against this plan, we see no benefit. The costs certainly outweigh whatever minor benefit could be there and we're a small business. We don't bring in a whole lot of money, so this is adding 2% to the valuation of our property. So we did agree with the square footage again in the spirit of fairness, and we would go along with splitting the baby, so to speak, but we're absolutely not in agreement with this system as it stands with the port, that the port and city put together. And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

Lise Glancy: Lise Glancy from the port of Portland. As stated in previous comments to council, we did not propose or push for the l.i.d. It wasn't designed to benefit our properties. It was designed to provide secondary emergency access to the south of slough property owners. Nonetheless, the port has supported the l.i.d. Methodology as proposed in its third iteration we are more than willing to pay our fair share, but it must be a fair share reflecting the special benefit of the improvement. And I see in some of the remonstrances that we've been accused of being not community minded or showing bad faith, and I would just say that nothing could be further from the truth. We met twice with the south of the slough property owners. The first meeting, the stated goal was to shift much of the cost to the port. At the second meeting, it was proposed to renegotiate a higher assessment for the port from the approved -- the methodology approve by city council on may 9th it as a tripling of basically the trip assessment the, and we declined to accept that. I don't think we're operating in bad faith. We met with them, had several telephone calls and e-mails back and forth. On the push for the l.i.d. from the north side, I think we need to be clear that initially, when this project first came out at a much higher price tag, the port approved to oppose the l.i.d. We only signed onto the l.i.d. after the city had gone through extensive value engineering. The port has a lot of experience in road improvements. They're expensive. North marine drive started a 6 million-dollar project in 1999 and escalated to a 24 million-dollar project over eight years. We can argue about how to slice the pie for years, but frankly, from the port's perspective, we'd rather splice a \$2.4 million pie, which reflects the \$1.5 million value engineer in savings, than slice a much bigger pie, and I think we're -- we could delay this certainly, and I think that's been suggested, but I think the south of slough property owners and others paying the lion's share are just going to see a bigger price tag, and so I urge council to proceed with the l.i.d.

Potter: Thank you, folks. Discussion. This is a nonemergency and moves to a second reading. Is there further discussion?

Saltzman: Is it possible to table an l.i.d.?

Aebi: Commissioner Saltzman, what do you mean by table the l.i.d.?

Saltzman: Kill it.

Aebi: Yes.

Saltzman: Ok. That's what i'd like to do. With the exception of the gentleman from yo cream -- and I appreciate your points of view -- I don't see anybody else who really wants this. So i'd say just kill it.

Aebi: My only suggestion, commissioner, was just to move it to a second reading and if it's your ultimate decision to kill it, you can certainly do that at the second reading next week if you so choose.

Adams: That was my suggestion as well. Let's vote on it next week. Move it forward or not move it forward, but let's vote on it.

June 6, 2007

Aebi: So the proposal is to do two things. One is to adopt the amendment, and that would be the first motion if a member of council wanted to move that motion, and the second motion would be to overrule the remonstrances to preserve council's ability to make a decision next week.

Adams: We have to do that now?

Aebi: Yes.

Adams: So I move the amendment.

Leonard: Second

Saltzman: Of one amendment or two amendments?

Aebi: This is the first amendment to adopt the package of amendments for you.

Saltzman: Ok.

Adams: It's been moved and seconded. Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye.

Aebi: The second motion would be to overrule the remonstrances and pass it to second reading next week.

Adams: That is a motion or just do it? So moved.

Leonard: Second.

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

Saltzman: Well, I guess i've signaled my intent next week, but i'm willing to get it there. Aye.

Potter: Aye. So at the second reading, it will be --

Adams: That means we vote next week.

Potter: At the second reading on the 13th where we vote, that will be on the 13th, and it will only be a vote. There will be no additional testimony.

Correct. It will be on the morning session's regular agenda.

Potter: And so it will be -- well, you folks can see what time it will appear on the regular agenda.

Ok. Please call the next item. 2:30 time certain.

Item 668.

Potter: Commissioner Adams?

Adams: Thank you, mayor. I'm pleased today to have this on the council agenda. It's a significant step forward in our efforts to connect the great city of milwaukie through southeast Portland to downtown, and a key partner on this project has been metro, and a key advocate at metro has been the very wonderful counselor, robert liberty, who is here today to give us some introductory remarks before we -- along with steve iwata from Portland office of transportation, always just in time before we actually vote on the item. So counselor liberty.

Robert Liberty: I serve on the metro council. I represent most of southeast Portland, part of southwest portland and a part of southwest Portland through which this project will pass. Metro's a lead agency on the supplemental draft environmental impact statement and is glad to have the city of Portland, tri-met, and many others at partners in this effort, because it's really -- this project represents a set of opportunities that are important for our region. One is to connect three very important institutions, two that have a central part of their mission science education. Oregon museum of science and industry and Oregon health and science university. And two of those institutions -- those two institutions are both going through a master planning process now, so the design and construction of this project is, I think, very important to the success as regional institutions and of course will also connect it with the state's largest public university, Portland state university. It's also a part of the central city streetcar circulator project, because the bridge for this project will also carry the streetcar. At streetcar circulator, by having that connection will carry a lot more traffic through downtown and to the east side connecting as well omsi up the east side and these other institutions, ohsu and Portland state university. We know from research that it will be essential to build that bridge to serve both projects for the success obviously of the streetcar as well as Portland-milwaukie light rail. And then of course this is a project that neighborhoods in southeast Portland have been seeking for a long time. Throughout the region, there's occasional

June 6, 2007

resistance. Of course that's decreasing now to light rail. But these neighborhoods are ones that wanted light rail, wanted it sooner, wanted it years ago. And moving forward with the draft environmental impact statement will bring the reality much closer. It will be important for the continued vitality of those neighborhoods. Finally, as commissioner Adams alluded in his opening comments, this is very important in milwaukie. And my colleague, bryan newman, is not here today. He's been a champion of this project. And I think you know that milwaukie downtown has been experiencing a renaissance, and this is a way of continuing that renaissance. And having success with development of town centers around the region is a way of also building up and completing our vision for the future of the region, a 2040 growth concept. So those are four opportunities not to be missed why we need to go forward with the project. Thank you for the opportunity to offer these remarks.

Adams: Thank you, counselor. Steve, do you want to give the council an overview of what we're talking here and what this action means and doesn't mean?

Iwata: Yes, please. I have a short power point presentation.

Adams: It's only an hour long.

Steve Iwata, Office of Transportation: Good afternoon. I'm steven iwata with the Portland office of transportation, and i'm here to discuss the resolution here before you this afternoon regarding the south corridor, phase two, Portland-Milwaukie light rail project. Counselor liberty provided a great overview of the process and the project. The purpose here today is that we're starting the supplemental draft environmental impact statement. The original e.i.s. was completed in 1998 and was endorsed by the city council at that time. But since it's been since 1998, metro is restarting the effort, and the first step is this refinement study that we're asking the council to adopt. Just a kind of quick overview, in terms of this process, metro started this process in early fall of last year, 2006. October, 2006. And they're now completing this effort. And they're defining the options that would be studied for the e.i.s. The draft environmental impact statement would be completed by spring of 2008 with a new locally alternative decision by July and we'll be back to City Council. In many ways, for today, we're just trying to give the city council a heads up as to what we're going to be processing over the next year or so, what options we're going to study and what are the issues. There are so many complex issues that impact the city that could result in some changes to the comprehensive plan, so we just wanted to provide that heads up today. At the end of the supplemental draft e.i.s. and the l.p.a. will be the next phase, which is preliminary engineering and the final environmental impact statement. At that point, tri-met would be the project manager, and it's anticipated that it will be completed by the summer of 2009. And that's a key benchmark for the city as well and, as part of that effort, a financial plan would need to be developed and adopted as well for funding this project. And once that's in place, they'll proceed to final engineering, and that should be completed in about summer of 2011. In terms of the history of this project, this is for me personally almost a 20-year effort. I've been involved in the mcloughlin corridor since the early 80's. Some key benchmarks. In 1986 Council adopted an odot project for the mcloughlin boulevard project that called for some improvements to the highway, which resulted in the improvements at the tacoma overpass as well as improvements in milwaukie at the 224 interchange. But it also identified the need for light rail improvements in this corridor. A key element with that is to preserve the quality of mcloughlin where the trees lined the street and was recognized that, in order to preserve that quality, light rail transit was a key element of the corridor strategy. In 1993, metro started system planning that resulted in looking at alternatives and resulted in a draft environmental impact statement, as I stated before, in 1998 and an l.p.a. Decision. Unfortunately, in 1998, there were two funding measures that were defeated, and the outcome of that was a more incremental approach where we started with the interstate max and completed the e.i.s. for that in 1999 and proceeded with construction. And that service will open up in 2004. After that also the south corridor of phase one, mall 205, i-205 and the Portland mall was completed, and we came to

June 6, 2007

council with the endorsement of that idea of a phase one and phase two, and it was a resolution back in 2002. So basically, for the milwaukie quarter, there isn't major changes in most of the southeast Portland, and so the real focus of this effort on the part of the city of Portland is the river crossing. Some quick policy reviews. The central city plan calls for the central city to be the heart of the economy for the metro area and that light rail transit is the link to the surrounding communities and to our neighborhoods and also called for a trolley line, a trolley system that linked all the central city area. So we have the radial system but most importantly now we have the streetcar concept with the idea that streetcar would use the light rail bridge to connect the east side and the west side.

As part of the transportation system plan the council adopted, it identified that transit could be -- should be the preferred form of travel to major destinations, including the central city. The marquam hill plan adopted in 2002 supported the idea of a tram that would link the marquam hill with north macadam and linkage to the regional transportation system. The waterfront plan also supported a multimodal transportation system and calls for a 30% mode split for all trips to and in and out of south waterfront and -- by 2019. And recently, at the end of 2006, the council adopted the central eastside industrial zoning study that increased the potential for industrial office within the central city eastside, and transit would play an important role of providing access to those jobs. And so where we are right now is that we've completed a refinement study, amount metro identified a series of options. The red line here is the adopted alignment that was adopted in 2003 that connects the Portland mall that's under construction, comes down lincoln, down river place and across the river to omsi and along the union pacific mainline railroad. The option to develop what's called mead and porter that would connect basically the middle of the campus of Oregon health sciences university to omsi on the east side and porter and division open the east side, and it also had an option along the ross island bridge that went either down to river -- to south waterfront or went over the district as well as an option that went over the district on naito parkway.

Leonard: Can I ask about that? We're going to choose one of those options? You're not planning --

Iwata: Today we're --

Leonard: All four?

Iwata: For today, we're going to be looking -- i'll get to that. I'll respond to that question in a couple slides. Some key changes have occurred since 1998, and principal on the west side is ownership of property to the Oregon health sciences university including donation of the 19 acres that they're planning for their new campus. This is a proposed concept at this point in time, and the idea -- also a major change is the tram that will be connecting the hill with the south waterfront area.

Adams: What is that on the right?

Iwata: This is something I found on google.

Adams: Is that bob miller?

Adams: Ride the tram, bob miller in the mornings. Pill hill area, rapid transit. How nice for him.

Iwata: Yep. [laughter]

Iwata: Also key elements regarding the light rail decision is not just a connection to tram but also the connection to the streetcar and the potential for buses to use the light rail bridge as well. So this is one of the key issues on the south waterfront side is that we have an adopted street plan that's on the right, and that street plan did not factor in the light rail south of the marquam bridge or the streetcar coming over on the century side. And so the current proposal by Oregon health sciences center is not consistent with that street plan. What we're looking at potentially is a change to that street plan to accommodate the campus planning by Oregon health science center but also the introduction of light rail transit from the east side, which would include streetcar, pedestrian bikes, and potentially buses coming over the bridge. On the east side, there are some issues as well. So omsi has just brought the property, 60 acres to the south of them, the old station I site, and they're

June 6, 2007

also going through a master planning process, and they've approached pdot to request a potential permanent realignment of water avenue. Bes did a temporary reroute of water avenue for the eis/cho project. They think that worked better overall for the district. They've asked us to kind of coordinate a re-examination of realignment the of that street in conjunction with the light rail project and with the streetcar as well as circulation access issues in the district. Portland opera has bought the old kp tv site, and they have the property just behind there, the surface lot, and they're also thinking about development plans for their property as well. And a major issue for us would be Portland spirit that has property along the river that could be impacted by the river crossing as well at Oregon pacific railroad that will require some kind of light rail crossing of their tracks. Like I said, light rail and buses would be part of a analysis as well as, for this area, traffic analysis with the potential realignment of water avenue. So where we are right now, commissioner Leonard, is we're looking at defining the options for the supplemental draft e.i.s. So one option for sure will be the adopt alignment from 2003, the l.p.a. But because of the complex issues on both sides of the river, we're looking at a band that is roughly on the west side, meade, over to sherman street on the east side and at the northern boundary and at the southern boundary roughly porter to division looking at a range of potential on hundreds that could fit within that band. Master planning by Oregon health science center but also the future development plans by zydell and the same true on the east side how the light rail best fits the master planning for omsi as with as some of the development plans for Portland opera as well as the other property in that area. We're recommending that we eliminate the ross island bridge option and the naito parkway options that are basically into the south Portland neighborhood area.

Leonard: You're only talking about one connection? You're just looking at different option?

Iwata: Looking at -- yeah. Several -- well, we're looking at a range of options that --

Adams: Only going to build one bridge. Right?

Leonard: Are you building one or four bridges?

Iwata: Oh. Just one bridge.

Leonard: Thank you.

Iwata: Part of the resolution is a series of directives back to staff that we work in collaboration with our key stakeholders, clay natural and tri-met and also with the property owners in that district, that we look at a process in integrating light rail, streetcar, buses, bikes, and pedestrian facilities with the development plans with Oregon health sciences center and zydell which could include a change to the waterfront plan, so that would be a potential comp plan change if we do that. There also is a directive to work with omsi as well as the other property owners to look at the feasibility of realignment of the water avenue as well as the light-rail connections. So this is kind of a very simple graphic which is kind of where we are in summary. We started with metro with a series of crossings, and the idea is to focus in terms of defining options for the sdis, and so where we are right now is this band on south of the marquam bridge by july. We will have a definition of the band for e.i.s. With the idea that we'll have some flexibility of mixing and matching in that band. And by a year from now, we will have a recommendations single light rail bring option before city council. And then there's kind of a thick line that there's still some analysis that will have to be done and, by the end of preliminary engineering, we would have design specifics of the bridge crossing, the cost in preparation for the financial plan. So that's a quick summary overview, and any questions?

Saltzman: The l.p.a. Will then include the specific choice?

Iwata: Yes. A recommendation for a light rail bridge across the river.

Saltzman: But it will choose between the options?

Iwata: Yes.

Saltzman: It will actually pick the one and say "this is it?"

Iwata: Yes.

June 6, 2007

Saltzman: Ok.

Adams: Go ahead.

Potter: Is there anybody signed up to testify?

Adams: I want to thank you for all your great work on this and all the other experience you have on the many projects that you have been involved with over the years is really bearing really good fruit on this. Thank you.

Iwata: Thank you.

Potter: Do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Moore-Love: One person. Mary williams.

*******:** Mark.

Moore-Love: Oh, i'm sorry.

Potter: Please state your name.

Mark Williams: Mayor Potter, commissioners, i'm mark williams from ohsu.

*******:** Mark?

Williams: It's mark.

*******:** Oh.

Williams: I have no important announcements to make. [laughter]

Williams: Here to support the resolution that's been presented before you today. I also want to thank mr. Iwata, the staff of the city and pdot in particular who have been very good about reaching out to us to talk with us as we go forward on this. Ohsu is extremely supportive of light rail coming to the district. As you know, we have about 12,000 employees altogether. About 11,000 of those employees are up on marquam hill, 1000 currently working every day at the waterfront with many thousands more to come. In addition, in terms of total trip count, that first building on the waterfront is generating about 18,000 trips a week. So we've got a real chance, we think, to really kind of create another transportation hub for the city that's a little bit south of what's presently downtown but will probably eventually be part of downtown. From where we sit, we're very appreciative that the resolution includes language to evaluate the light rail transit design option so as to provide those connections with the aerial tram and the streetcar that are so vital in moving folks around down there. And I think we appreciate the interbureau collaboration that the resolution directs and look forward to working with everyone.

Moore-Love: One more person.

Potter: Please state your name your name.

Bob Durgan: Bob durgan, anderson construction, representing c.r.c. Realty, and we wholly support this plan. There's a little history that goes before mark. When I started working for z.r.c. And was on the citizen advisory committee I got a call from matt brown one day saying, we want to talk to you as we're finalizing this report. We need light rail in the district in order to get 30% trip modality into the district, and will zydell support that? Asked the history. For a long time, that's the question we wanted answered, and we would like it to be answered sooner than later. One of the major reason is that we're in the middle of this d.e.q. Cleanup. There's elevation changes or caps, whole other things, and 100 sheep still doesn't get anything done and really has a lot of impact to construction. And that's my job, getting the permit for construction, so I have to meet the real world of construction. The saner we understand the relationship between the streetcar, the street grid, and the elevations that district works on, then we can get our d.e.q. Stuff, our riverbank stuff that impacts the greenway because, fit comes over 10 feet higher or 10 feet lower, it's very critical for this district to get to the next steps to have this thing defined sooner than later. Not only do we support it. We've been asking for it, and we'd like it to happen faster, if possible.

Potter: Thank you. Is that it? Discussion?

Adams: Counselor liberty?

June 6, 2007

Liberty: Just an addendum, because there's a lot of focus on these very important institutions and the bridges themselves. You're interested in this neighborhood building, and the stops in Portland are going to be important to be planned thoughtfully and properly so that development the occurs in a way to compliments and implements goals you have for those neighborhoods, we all have for those parts of those citizens who live in that part of the city. I think it's easy to focus on the vehicle and the tracks and forget that the stations are perhaps the most important, whether in the south waterfront or connecting to Oregon health science university or p.s.u. This is really a core community building as well, and I know you have an interest in this that we share and that that will be part of this effort as well. Thank you for allowing me a little extra comment.

Potter: Discussion. Please call the vote.

Adams: I think one of the -- i'd like to thank ohsu and tri-met as partners in this very important partners, in addition to pdot and metro. One of the challenges we have, just to preview for the council, is that we have to get the light rail bridge a certain amount of height over the center of the river but, at the same time, it's the least or I think a lot of people's lowest preference that you sort of viaduct is over south waterfront. As low to the ground over south waterfront, but not too steep on light rail, but we have to have it so high above the middle of the channel. This is going to be a technological challenge, very significant technological challenge, but I think we're uptight, and the options that we've narrowed it down to, I think, now allow us to go to that next phase of figuring out what it's going to take. Aye.

Leonard: It's pretty exciting to be able to vote for this. I see daily, twice a day, the construction that's going on on i-205 with the connection there, and that itself has created new vibrancy in the community out east. There's a lot of excitement, the stop that's going to occur there at 92nd and foster really generating a lot of activity in terms of how property is going to be utilized right in that area. So this of course is a different line, but I expect the same kind of excitement to occur as work begins on that, and it's really very humbling to be in a position to support this at this point, 'cause this is going to be something that serves this region for centuries to come, the infrastructure that allows Portland to become a better place than it is today. So i'm really pleased to support this. Aye.

Saltzman: I want to thank metro and tri-met, ohsu, and city of Portland for all their work. There is, as commissioner Leonard says, a momentous occasion, and I look forward to an even more momentous occasion when you come back to us with locally preferred. The south waterfront campus. I share the excitement with counselor liberty about revitalizing milwaukie, inner south neighborhoods as well as connecting important institutions of education and learning. Aye.

Potter: And of course with a million more people moving into the region in the next 20 years, I think this will provide one more option for folks to get around it. It does not require igniting a gasoline engine. I vote aye. Please read the next item.

Item 669.

Potter: Anybody to speak to this issue?

Adams: The companion measure. The resolution.

Moore-Love: There was no formal presentation for this.

Potter: Was there any sign-up sheet?

Moore-Love: I did not have anyone.

Potter: Anybody here who wishes to speak to this issue? Emergency vote. Please call the vote.

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

Potter: We are a tad early on the other one, so we'll be back at 3:30 to do a lot of that.

Leonard: How is it you didn't fill up every minute with somebody talking about something? [recess taken.]

At 3:05 p.m., Council recessed

At 3:33 p.m., Council reconvened.

June 6, 2007

Potter: City council will come to order. Karla, please call the roll.

[roll call]

Potter: Please read the 3:30 time certain.

Item 670.

Potter: Commissioner Adams.

Adams: This is the second resolution of support that the Portland city council has considered in the last two years offering our wishes for the military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other places around the world our support. Today we're going to be focusing on the veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan and good work that's under way by a variety of jurisdictions to support those veterans reintegrating into our community, and it's important that we do this. This council is on record opposing the way -- the fact that we are at war in Iraq and the reason and the methods that we went there, but we are also on record very supportive of the men and women who are serving in these wars and in these conflicts, and today is another tangible way that we can offer that support. There are 18,000 Oregonians who have served or are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have 5000 of those troops from the Oregon National Guard. And although the federal government has the primary responsibility for the welfare of our nation's veterans and communities, we are seeking to be a good partner. Today you're going to hear about a number of good programs including the Oregon National Guard Veterans Reintegration Program which is serving as a model on the national level. Today is a very -- by happenstance, this is the 63rd anniversary of D-Day from World War II, and we have a number of panels today and then consideration of the resolution before us. Our first panel is Bob Durston who will lead us off who's done the key staff work on this effort followed by Kimberly Mark-Villa followed by Sergeant Jacques. Is that how you pronounce your name, sir?

*****: Jacques.

Adams: I'm not very good with my French.

Bob Durston: I realize you guys have been in council all day. Thank you for bearing with us. We will keep our comments as brief as possible. In starting this project, I had a wonderful opportunity of meeting a lot of wonderful men and women who have served in the military both in Iraq and Afghanistan but also before that. There's just a lot of good veterans in this community. And what I also found out is there's a lot of both military people and civilians doing a lot of wonderful things to help veterans returning from the two wars that we're currently in and reintegrating into our community. It's not an easy process to go from a war zone back into a community. But the one thing I'm certain about, as a community, we can help that effort. We can help these men and women come back to our community, and we will all be better for it. Unfortunately my prior experience with some veterans was when I was the director at transition projects, and quite frankly there were far too many homeless people who were also veterans. It was a shame in the country that that occurred, and I think we can do better. I know Portland can certainly do better. With that, I'm going to turn you over to the people who know a lot more about the subject than I.

Kimberly Mark-Villela: My name is Kimberly Mark-Villela. You all know me as the liquor licensing program coordinator and Knox neighbor involvement. Many of you may not realize that I'm a retired U.S. Army National Guard with the 1042nd Air Ambulance Medical Company in Salem. I'm here today because I believe that the veterans are -- excuse me. The veterans' resolution is the first step in bringing the community together for a positive on a negative subject. For so long, people have focused on a topic of should we be in Iraq, and those soldiers in other countries and wars like Somalia, Bosnia, Panama seem to be under the radar these days. Every soldier commits to their job whether they're a National Guard reserve or active duty. We, like police officers and firefighters, swear an oath to protect and defend the state of Oregon and the United States of America. 20 years ago, you would not have ever had a single mother of three sitting in front of you saying "I'm a combat veteran." I was told recently that the city currently employs 41 veterans, but I

June 6, 2007

know there are actually more veterans working for the city of Portland because, over my 22 years of military service, i've worked with many soldiers who were city employees and veterans of other wars. The military has never contacted me for any postdeployment follow-up and, yes, in my opinion, it should be the government's responsibility to do so before that ridiculous two-year drop rate disappears for benefits. War isn't like that commercial what happens in vegas stays in vegas. It comes home with us. For some, it can destroy their lives, and I assure you, though it was a good thing the government extended benefits to guard and reserve, most of us don't hit the point of asking for help for many years. So i've come to find out from my counselor. You're going to hear some things about me today that are going to surprise you. I won't lie to you. I came home with problems. I just didn't tell anyone because, like any other bad experience in my life, I figured it would fade in time and I would move on. Only this issue hasn't followed that path in my life. It got worse. The more I tried to push it away or ignore it or find ways to control it, they just got worse. Some nights my memories are my nightmares. I wake up and, like right now, I can't breathe. My heart's racing. I sweat. I cry. And I want to scream, but I can't. This is just a tiny part of what I go through still today four years later. And there is so much more to it than that. Those at the v.a. denied me assistance because my two years of benefits expired by the time I contacted them. I'm thankful to a nurse at the v.a. hospital named joe smith -- and yes, that's actually his -- who on more than one occasion listened to me in tears on the phone while I sat in my car or at my desk during work, after work totally a mess, wondering if I was actually going crazy. He was a voice in the darkness that held me together on more than one occasion. Thank to joe's referrals, i'll learning how to deal with this. If I could go back and change one thing, I would have told someone when I first came home, but the military is not an organization that promotes reporting personal problems. Problems are a sign of weakness and, being a woman, there is no way I would have spoken up at that time or probably even now. But being retired, I feel ok with doing that. There are many challenges facing veterans from the time they find out they're being deployed to returning home and back to their lives. It's our job to help that transition both ways. Other people will speak to you today about some of those challenges such as physical injuries, ptsd, t.b.i. Please, please listen very carefully to them. I had never heard of ptsd before I called the v.a. a year and a half ago. Know the cost of dealing with these issues long-term will impact the city, county, and state for decades. I was two seconds away from walking away from my life five months ago. I couldn't deal with it any more. I would have most likely ended up homeless or on the streets or possible dead and using public resources in some way or another but not intentionally. You have to know today that the city of Portland is already covering some of those expenses, because the people who sent me there so far have taken over a year and a half to decide whether i'm actually lying about my issues, because I didn't report them when I came home. I've provided you a memo that concentrates mainly on city employees but could partially be expanded to cover all veterans in the city of Portland. I believe it's time for the city to have one person or a program that coordinates all the paperwork, meetings, resources, referrals for employee soldiers and their families before they leave and when they return. This resolution should be the beginning of our commitment to the underserved and very underrepresented community. My fear is that we haven't learned from the past regarding veterans being terminated, penalized, for exhibiting symptoms of a disorder. Sometimes these people end up in jail. Sometimes they end up homeless or they come home with an injury where they could be retrained for another position but won't. I've had a hard time readjusting, and i'm a strong and independent person before I left, and now i'm fighting very hard to find that person again. Please understand the bottom line here. If we don't start helping early, it will cost us so much more socially and financially for decades than it has in the past. We owe it to the whole community to help all veterans past and present. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you, kimberly, very much.

June 6, 2007

Sergeant First Class Jaques: Thank you very much for having us here. I'm sergeant first class jacques with the Oregon national guard reintegration team. First of all, I saw a couple of vietnam veterans in the audience. I'd like to say welcome home to them. They didn't get it, and that's one of the reasons our team started. I'll give you a quick synopsis of what happened and with me personally and look at my watch and make sure i'm not going too far over. There was a few of us sent back home a little early. There are some guys in iraq that didn't want us there anymore. While we were back licking our wounds, the thing that really hit me the hardest was my machine gunner lost -- almost lost his arm and lost -- you know -- the movement of it and whatnot. We were trying to get him down to the corvallis area to get treatment, and there were no -- supposedly no doctors that would accept tri care. So we started putting our nose to the dirt and looking around and ran into dr. Mullins, samaritan health group, and he said not only do we accept tri care, everyone of my hospitals, is a member of the welcome home committee for you guys. He's a vietnam veteran. Too bad it was too late to get him back, but that was a big motivator for me, and we've had a lot of backing from our superiors, general caldwell and so forth. I can tell you these soldiers I served with over there, they have a lot to offer. They had responsibility in their hands that would not be given to them in the civilian sector. Literally, if they made a decision, it would impact the entire war down to the lowest private. They're coming back into your communities, and they can handle that kind of responsibility, and it's our job on the reintegration team to put them in those positions to help them out when they need help. It was very surreal to come home. You go from combat to nothing at peacetime. Our military is at war. Our country is not. I'll tell you that flat out. That's what I got when I came back. It's wonderful being home. Don't get me wrong. What we offer is we are a 411 for when these soldiers call. They won't spend two hours on the phone and then end up talking to the same person they talked to before with the v.a. And whatnot. There's many people in the v.a. that are there to help. We are an accurate referral system, a 411 for them. These soldiers don't want their hands held. I don't want my hands held. I just want to know the direction where to go. I treat them just like I treated my soldiers in iraq, and I always have. Give them a direction to go, and they will execute. And they are a tremendous group of people right now coming home to your communities. We help them help themselves. It is a big thing. And that's the biggest thing we can do. I have seen a lot of issues with ptsd and whatnot. There are people out there that we've made contacts with there that are there to help them. After this meeting, i'm sure i'll meet a few more. Returning veterans northwest, dr. Sardo, rose health care system, white city. We've hit them all, and they all provide a specific thing for how bad issues might be and whatnot, and just getting them in the right way so they don't spend that two hours on the phone and then hang up the phone for 40 years, 'cause we've helped out some vietnam veterans, too, that are now getting the help they should have got 40 years ago or 38 years ago. And truly -- i'm sure you'll hear it again -- we can help them now with these things, and there's a lot of people that want to help contribute to them coming home and whatnot or you'll definitely pay for it 10 years from now tenfold or 40 years from now, 60 years from now. I don't want to go over my time limit here. I also am going to stand in for sergeant first class moss and j.d. Bachum. They run the career transition program, which is in a sense the jobs program. They started off this program. It's been absolutely amazing the amount of people that want to hire these veterans coming back. They're used to -- they started it off and there was over 700 job openings on the web site. After a while, all of us sat down and said, let's take a look at these. Well, working 38 hours a week for minimum wage, are we really doing them a favor? Those jobs came off, and all that is available on there now are career openings. A family wage job with benefits. There's over 200 positions throughout the state. It fluctuates 100. Platt electric has been wonderful at hiring soldiers throughout the state. We go ahead -- one of the things we do it's a career fair on steroids. We bring in all the service organizations out of the community, and then all the employers that wish to hire these veterans, and it's amazing. The last one we did, I think we're sitting at over 34 people got hired off the drill floor, and people were filing claims or

June 6, 2007

getting enrolled with the v.a., setting up times to meet with our county veterans service officers. And I have to say which of the people that have really hit it in the cities have been the vet centers, Portland, salem, eugene, grants pass. They've been wonderful. We've used them extensively. And they have saved people's lives. No doubt. Back to the career stuff, they're always looking for guys. We have their information in the back that you can may contact with sergeant first class moss and j.d.bachum, and we also have our information back there. I don't want to take too much of your time. We'll be available for questions in the back of the room if you guys have any. Thank you very much for your time.

Adams: Next panel is going to provide us with some additional overview challenges facing returning verterans. Dr. Jim Sardo and Mandy Martin.

Mandy Martin: Mandy Martin, operation Iraqi freedom and enduring freedom outreach coordinator for the Portland vets center.

Dr. Jim Sardo: Thanks you for the opportunity. In addition to being a clinical psychologist for the Portland VA, I'm currently the program director for the ptsd services and substance abuse treatment program. I've also had the rare privilege of serving twice in iraq as a clinical psychologist as a member of the united states air force reserve working as a combat stress specialist. I have a couple of notions I want to impart to you as kind of an overview of this population. First is that the men and women who serve in our military are remarkable. They are generous, courageous, patriotic. Our military has recognized the tasks ahead of them. There are certain things it does to prepare them for the task. The strenuousness, the heat, the long hours they're prepared for. It trains them technically to do their jobs. We're probably the most proficient military fighting force in the world. That's changed and that keeps updating as the war changes and the demands change our military keeps adapting the training to prepare them. You can equip them. Our military has been adapting the equipment. You can begin to train them as to what the psychological demands will be and train their families. They're faced with life and death situations, they're faced with personal injury, loss and injury of their fellow unit members, catastrophic losses amongst the civilians they work with. And what has to follow is a series of adaptations. We expect our members to be able to adapt to being away from their families and support systems, to adapt to extreme danger, levels of threat that on a good day for people who have the safest jobs might simply be a mortar rocket round coming in their sleeping room at night where they bed down. Or being shot at, and when they come home at night to rest, having a mortar rocket round come in. Living with that level of threat folks adapt. And they do. And our military has shown itself to be resilient and courageous. You have to learn to keep your emotions at a distance there. If you're overwhelmed you can't function for 12 to 15 to 18 months. So you put all that stuff at arm's length. Finally you have to learn that in response to anything that's challenging or threatening you can exert an immediate highly assertive even violent response. Anger is an adaptable change folks make there. At the end of 12 to 18 months folks come home and we've done a better job, the v.a., the military are collaborating on how we screen folks who may need help. Unfortunately as was referred to earlier, I think our military members come home at the end of their deployments much like a marathon runner comes 100 yards away from the finish line and knows they could easily walk across the finish line and finish the race. But use to it run across any way. Our folks look at the screening process and say, it will feel like quitting early if I say I need help. And so they walk across the finish line and when they're asked if they're ok they say, i'm ok, everything is fine, I did my job, I feel good. And it's not until six months a year, or was referred to earlier, two or three years down the road that it becomes clear that those adaptations we ask them to make don't just turn off when they come home. Keeping their emotion, being quick to anger and respond, feeling as if the world will be highly threatening and even potentially life threatening at any moment doesn't just turn off that. Begins to interfere with their efforts to go back to school, reengage with their families, to get back to work. At the v.a. we see some folks, those folks who the Oregon reintegration team brings in to us, they track them

June 6, 2007

down, they hunt through the woods, they bring them in wherever they find them. Those folks who are willing to say, I need help. But unfortunately I think there's a significant majority, probably two-thirds of folks have not yet sought any v.a. services in Oregon. Who have returned. Our response as a community has to be aware of those men and women who have served. This is a country that a small percentage has ended up serving in this war. This is not a country at war. In the traditional sense. This war is being fought by a relatively restricted number of people. As a community we need to be vigilant, aware, we need to be looking out for the best interest of these men and women who serve. And thank you for the opportunity.

Mandy Martin: I'd like to expand on the comments about the community and how I believe how important it is for those individuals such as the reintegration team to be out there also educating the community on what is indeed available for these returns veterans. A lot of these individuals don't stay in the military, and therefore they lose that support system. And that knowledge of a lot of the things that are available to them. My job as an operation iraqi freedom and enduring freedom outreach coordinator is to indeed be out in the communities, speaking with our returning veterans, talking to them about readjustment. Community resources, v.a. Resources, state resources, I too am in a member of operation iraqi freedom, and one of the most immediate things that I notice when I came back, or people noticed for me, is that I had changed. But from that and from those individuals voicing those changes to me, I was able to steer my life in a direction that has been so incredibly positive. I was fortunate enough to be surrounded by my benefit. Before I left at the worked at the v.a. Medical center, and therefore those who were at the medical center were informing me of what my benefits were. And that wasn't happening immediately after I returned from the first phase. And I knew that this was going to be a struggle, and that hopefully i'll have an opportunity to assist our returning veterans somehow, some way, and the position within the vet center just miraculously opened, and now I have the privilege of steering my life in a direction and helping these guys come back. I knew immediately that I had more to offer than what I was specifically hired to do at the v.a. And to be able to utilize my voice as a returning veteran to help these folks come back has been incredibly rewarding for me, and hopefully rewarding for our veterans. The services at the vet center are not time limited. We do not have that two-year time limit for readjustment counselling. We have vietnam veterans coming through our doors for the first time. This conflict is affecting them in many ways. They are sending their sons and daughters off to a war as well. So I very much care for those individuals who have gone beyond their two years, and have been unable or were unaware of the services that were available to them. I very much hope to be able to get our voice out there as much as we possibly can to let everybody know that the services of the vet center are available to all returning veterans, and my focus is to serve the veteran as a whole, assistance with jobs, assistance with emergency financial assistance, education, all of that. It's not just a matter of serving the ptsd issue, it's the issue of serving the whole veteran. I thank you for having us here today to listen to our stories.

Adams: Thank you. Our third panel is going to highlight the community-based efforts, some of the community-based efforts underway, kara levine, jeff rogers, and lieutenant sara westberg. Welcome.

Carol Levine: Carol levine. I am here to represent the returning veterans resource project northwest. We're a group licensed mental health professionals in the Portland area who are offering free and confidential counseling to returning veterans and family members coming back now from iraq and afghanistan. We are poignantly aware of the difficulties that veterans face as they return to civilian life and feel very strongly it's our responsibility as a community to provide a healing and supportive environment for them. So we organized as group in february of 2005 and created a web-based directory which now has probably 40 or more therapies on it. Some work specifically with couples and families, others with children, and we've all experienced working with grief and trauma. We have -- see ourselves as an alternative to v.a. And vet center services. We've worked

June 6, 2007

closely with the veterans administration and the vet center. They have provided some trainings for us, and they continue to refer people to us as needed. We also seem to have become a focal point for other people in the community who are interested in providing services. If you look at the resource page, we have on our website, there are -- we have a yoga class available free for veterans, there is a chiropractor, we have several massage therapists, and we're continuing to expand in that direction, adding an acupuncture and the like. We expect to be in this for the long haul. We know it's a difficult time, and a difficult transition, and that's what we do.

Sara Westbrook: I'm Sara Westbrook, a lieutenant with the police bureau, our crisis intervention team coordinator. Today I'm just going to tell you about what we're doing to try to prepare for the returning veterans from the current wars. The crisis intervention team is a 40-hour training. All of our police officers are sergeant and our detectives are attending the training. We figured it will take a little over two years for everyone to get through. We decided to be proactive about this issue in that we want to be as prepared as we could as an agency and a community for people returning for more. So part of our training has always been about PTSD and we're specifically carving out time that's about what are we going to be seeing in the veterans that are returning from our current war. Health professionals and we make a point of not learning too much so we think we're therapist, but learning enough so we're able to recognize what's happening and then direct people in the appropriate way. We also had sergeants come to our sergeants academy and speak about this issue. So that we're trying to be as prepared as we can so everyone working the street, our eyes and ears are paying attention. But -- to see what's happening. We often have someone in our class who has served or a spouse has served. This issue is near and dear to the people of our organization, and we want to do whatever we can to be prepared and to help.

Jeff Rogers: Mayor and commissioner, Jeff Rogers, working as a mental health counselor. In my private practice I see a number of veterans, some of whom are referred to me through Carol's project. I've also had the opportunity to do volunteer work at the vet center, and you heard from Mandi Martin who does great work there. And Dr. Sardo gave me the opportunity to volunteer time at the V.A. And working with veterans there as well. I want to highlight one thing. Looking at the population of people that I've seen in each of those places and others in each of those places are seeing, at the moment there is still a much larger number of Vietnam and even some Korea and World War 2 veterans -- seeking treatment for PTSD than so far Iraq and Afghanistan veterans. Lots of reasons for that, and we've heard some of the reluctance of Iraqi and Afghanistan veterans to come forward. But I want to highlight some differences in the conditions that existed in the Vietnam era and what exists now because I think they illustrate how important what you are doing is. I want to mention three major differences that I see between the Vietnam era when I and others came back from that war, and what I see today. I'll label them honor, awareness, and resources. And your resolution is helping in all of these. As you know, when Vietnam veterans came back, they were at best ignored by the country and communities and at worst scorned, spat upon, and worse. The fact that you are having these hearings and that the city of Portland is recognizing all veterans, including the current veterans, is a wonderful thing. It would never have happened 35, 40 years ago. So just the fact you are speaking out is reflecting the huge change in public attitude where no matter what one thinks of the war, people now are fully in support of and honoring veterans. And that's a wonderful change. It doesn't make it easy -- it doesn't make it easy, but many of the Vietnam veterans are coming for treatment for the first time after 35 or 40 years. And that brings me to the second factor which I'll call awareness. One of the reasons so Vietnam veterans didn't come in, Vietnam and earlier wars didn't come in, there was not much awareness. PTSD as a clinical diagnosis wasn't even on the books until early 1980's. So there was very little formal treatment for PTSD, let alone any real recognition. Vietnam veterans and earlier veterans really didn't understand what was going on with them. And we have heard already from some more recent veterans how difficult it is for them to understand what's going on even though there is increasing awareness of it. Your hearings, your

June 6, 2007

resolution are a significant step in adding to the increasing awareness that ptsd is a normal reaction to a very abnormal situation. And it is honorable to come for treatment and appropriate. So that is another important aspect of it. Finally, I think a third difference between the vietnam era and now is resources. This hearing is illustrating the wide range of resources that are available now in the areas not only of mental health counseling, but in employment, and housing, and benefits, and so forth. The real difficulty is there's so much available and it's so complex a system, it's hard for people to access it and find their way through it. And your bringing this hearing together and bob's work in putting these panels together is another important step in highlighting the wide range of resources that are available and how people can find them. We've already heard some of the clearinghouses that veterans can go through. And I also want to mention veterans and their families. Not just the veterans themselves, but the families they're sacrificing and the families have major emotional and psychological as well as financial and other issues. So I think in all those ways your resolution is helping greatly as another step in honoring veterans, in making them and all of us aware of the need and of highlighting the resources that are available. So I want to thank all of you for your work on this.

Potter: Thank you.

Adams: Our next panel is -- our fourth panel is going to highlight business partners. R.j.cervantes and david roy, and deborah imcy.

RJ Cervantes: Mayor Potter and city commissioners, my name is r.j. And I represent the Portland business alliance. Thank you for allowing me to speak today. On behalf of the Portland business alliance's members and staff, I speak in support this much important and necessary resolution. Yesterday our executive committee met and discussed a resolution which they unanimously endorsed. They asked me to come here today and support the city of Portland in its efforts in helping local veterans. The Portland business alliance is determined to find areas of partnership with the city and with other local organizations to help returning veterans reintegrate into our community. As is mentioned in the resolution, and was mentioned in the previous testimonies, more than 18,000 Oregonians have served in both iraq and afghanistan since the beginning of hostilities. 5,000 of those troops are citizen soldiers from the Oregon national guard. These individuals freely volunteered and they should be welcomed back as the fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, and neighbors that they are to us. Many of these soldiers developed excellent work force skills, management expertise, and other tools that can be quickly integrated into many Oregon's industries. This city and this state only stand to benefit by reaching out to these veterans and ensuring they have every opportunity to connect with the right organizations that help them reintegrate. The Portland business alliance also recognizes some of Oregon's son and daughters made the ultimate sacrifice in the places they were called to serve. Thousands of miles away from the battlefields of iraq and afghanistan, some of these soldiers left families and friends that are a part of our communities. We should hold true to the memory of Oregon's fallen soldiers by reaching out to their families and friends and making sure that they'll always have a strong community that they can turn to when they need to. We should also honor them by ensuring that their comrade who's made it back from iraq and afghanistan have every opportunity to come back to Oregon, find a job with the living wage and feel like they too are a vital part of this community. Taking care of those who served and helping those who lost loved ones is something that we feel everyone can rally to. We urge the passage of this resolution and we look forward to the community summit where interested partners can come together and learn more about how we can join efforts and make a difference. Thank you for inviting me today and a big thank you to the other panelists.

David Roy: David roy from knowledge learning corporation. Good afternoon and thank you. I am here to state our support of Oregon national guard and our appreciation of the sacrifices made by all u.s. Military personnel. With 1,000 Oregon employees and 42,000 employees nationally, and with

June 6, 2007

200,000 children in our care at our child care centers, knowledge learning corporation is well aware many, many families are affected by deployment. And we are pleased that the city of Portland is addressing the issue of reintegration. We are also pleased to have been asked to be part of this process and to participate in the summit meeting planned for later this year. Thank you.

Deborah Imse: My name is Deborah, I'm the executive director for Metro Multifamily Housing Association. The Metro Multifamily Housing Association is very supportive of the resolution before you. Several members of our association are interested in helping with the reintegration effort by connecting returning veterans with appropriate housing when necessary. The concept has been discussed in general terms and we look forward to coordinating with Sergeant Jacques and the Oregon National Guard Veterans Reintegration Program to set up a pilot program. We also look forward to sitting down with other members of this community for the upcoming summit. I want to thank you, Mayor, and Commissioners, for taking the time to support our returning veterans and Bob for working with us on this important issue. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you. We're going to hear from representatives of Portland State University who are playing a key role in this issue. Sergeant Hire, Jake Meeks, and the honorable Mike Burton.

Sergeant Benjamin Hier: Good afternoon Mayor, Commissioners. I'm Sergeant Hire, actually – Bem today. I'm here not on behalf of Portland State University, but on behalf of a concerned veteran. I'm an Afghanistan veteran who had to come home early because they didn't want me over there no more. So the Veterans Resource Center, what are they about? They haven't been established yet, but we're working on that right now. How it started is some of us were walking around, some of the universities, I noticed all these centers that are available to other individuals, ethnic cultures, minorities, and we realized there's nothing available for veterans at universities and/or colleges. There's no place to go. Yeah, we have the Vet Centers, you going up to, and other place, but as you have heard by numerous people a lot of people -- a lot of veterans don't want to talk about their issues. And I'm not just talking about veterans, I'm talking about their families who live through this, breathe this, every day. My wife had to live through, a lot of these other members may have spouse or children that had to live through this with them. It's not just, we're trying to -- Veterans Resource Centers are not just trying to serve veterans, but their families also. Families are very important, and that play a vital role in my life. With that said, we're trying to get help for these individuals with all these other resources available. And it's -- sometimes when you go to university you ask, well, where is this available to me? Who do I go to? You get the answer from some people, I don't know. Or, go to this person, and then they may be able to help you. By having a resource center you eliminate the middleman or as I say, the middle person, and you get them directed into the right path. So what's the center going to be about? It's going to be about having contact information, having direct lines of contact with people, individuals such as Dr. Sardo of the PTSD Unit, the Vet Centers, and where -- who are these centers going to go after? Student veterans and their families. Somebody who is interested in the school, wants to attend that university and they come in, we'll be there to help them out. So that's what we're trying to accomplish here, is helping veterans and their families out. Now they don't have to be a veteran. They can be a service member. So we're not trying to specify just to any particular veteran. With the issues, everybody is talk about just about Afghanistan and Iraq. Well, we're not trying to meet the needs just specifically of Afghanistan and Iraq. You do have members that are going to -- these universities from active duty that were off active duty. Kosovo, Bosnia, so we're trying to meet their needs. And biggest downfalls I can see right now from my endeavors is trying to get space and funding. It's the two biggest things. I can say it's not a matter of if any more that these centers are going to come up, it's a matter of when and where. And we do have support of Representative Chip Shields is also a P.S.U. Alumni too. We also have support of General Caldwell of the Oregon Army National Guard, and the Oregon Department of Veterans Affairs Director Jim Willis. And I'm not asking for sympathy

June 6, 2007

and not asking for anything, just help. I signed up to do a job, and I did it, and came back, and I came back in one piece, but with an injury. Thank you for having me here today.

Adams: Thank you.

Jacob Meeks: My name is Jacob Meeks, I'm a veteran of Afghanistan, I run a veterans group at Portland State University. So I've kind of dealt a lot with the veterans coming back. The basic thing with us coming into a university. When I left people have talking about falling off the face of the earth, the veteran doesn't want to talk to anybody. I was one of those people. I got out of my four years of active duty and I said, I don't want anything to do with the military. I want to be left alone. I tried to be as a student I tried to be a kid again. Then I figured out I wasn't. Because I had served this time and I had seen these things and I had done these things. And I couldn't really fit into the university life. Where we're coming at with this veterans resource center is it not only gives them this connection to these outside resources which is very helpful because it is a big bureaucracy we have to navigate. It also gives veterans recognition on campus. They come to a college campus and say hey, these people have recognized our service, they have a center and hopefully veteran staff who can help other veterans the way Mandy and Sgt Jacques does. Especially at the university system, because you're going to get people like me who don't want to talk to anybody. But they'll end up coming in, because they might have to. Just for the university requirements. We can catch them then. If we don't catch them, if we don't help them, a lot of things can happen. I deal with it all the time. I spoke to a young man the other day he had two tours in Iraq, he was a marine. I'm not a clinical physician, but I would say if I had to diagnose him I would say he had -- he experienced all the symptoms of PTSD. This is an individual I dealt with and he would talk to me, and he trusted me, and he had, that but he couldn't reintegrate back into the community. He volunteered to go back over for his third tour. Now when he comes back, we have to deal with more problems. It keeps building up. Things like this resource center, things like the Portland vet center, things like the reintegration program, they're vital. We might come asking for support with these things so we can have the community. I think it was something Mr. Adams said in the beginning, it's a federal-based thing, helping the veterans, but really it's a community process to reintegrate the people who served for this country. It's all of us together and this is one piece of that. So thank you very much for having me today.

Mike Burton: My name is Mike Burton, I want to thank you for the time you're giving us. I'm vice provost at Portland State University and executive director of the school of extended studies, and we're very proud of the fact that Jake is going to be graduating this year.

Adams: Congratulations.

Burton: I'm also a veteran, having served 38 years. And retired from the Air Force. I had combat tours in the Congo, Laos and Vietnam, and I was one of the lucky ones. I came back alive, I came back in one piece. So I'm here wearing both my P.S.U. hat and veterans hat. I'd like to thank Bob for his work. One of the first and foremost and easiest things one learns in military training is you never, ever leave anyone behind. I say it's easy to learn because I don't think it's so much of a military ethos as an American ethos. What you're discussing today in this resolution I think is much in that same spirit. I appreciate the council addressing the issue and helping veterans. Portland State University has a proud history that begins with its role in 1946 as an extension program for returning G.I.'s. There were those in Congress that said a college education program for G.I.'s probably wouldn't work and was a waste of money. Those G.I.'s proved the skeptics wrong. The education they got was part of what made them the Greatest Generation. We've had mixed results on how we have treated our veterans. When I came back from Vietnam, I wasn't made to feel exactly welcome. In fact, I recall first time I ran for public office, my campaign staff was worried about how to explain my military service and wondered if there was some way to ignore it. I chose not to, which may be a reason why I lost that election, but I hope it wasn't. I took advantage of my G.I. Benefits in the 1970's, I got a masters and did my doctoral work with my veterans educational

June 6, 2007

benefits. In those times 90% or more of the eligible veterans used education benefits. Today that number is much smaller. Why no one is exactly certain, but we do know the percentage is unfortunate because there are those far more opportunities than those people who are taking advantage of them. Portland state is working with these gentlemen here to expand services that we provide veterans. There are presently 500 students enrolled at Portland state who receive some form of veterans benefits. I think that number should be higher. There are most likely individuals who recent rolled at p.s.u. And in higher education elsewhere who may not be aware or may not be taking advantage of benefits due to the number of reasons, and I think jeff mentioned some of those.

We need to reach out to those men and women and they'll them the opportunities they have. We also need to connect to those just returning veterans and eligible troops on duty to let them know how they can use their benefits and show them the pathways to educational and training success. We need to retain the students as we can because of budgetary constraints, because of lack of adequate funding for higher education in this state p.s.u. Has only one-half total f.t.e. Too many students find themselves unable to complete their college degrees. While veterans generally have a higher success rate than other groups in successful completion, veterans are also faced with much more daunting issues in making that completion. The proposed veterans resource center at p.s.u. Will be a step towards helping meet those needs. It will serve as a focal point for contact through which student veterans can get advice and assistance through academic programs and a bridge for their families while making the transition to a new directions. Perhaps there's a way the city and psu can partner and making the resource center at p.s.u. a reality. I appreciate your endorsement of the proposal and look forward to working with you and your staff in a direction to accomplish that goal. I'll leave a copy of the proposed outline with the city with your clerk. I look forward to working with you. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you.

Adams: Our next panel is going to highlight some city efforts and local government partner efforts. Commissioner cogan and Councilor Robert Liberty who is no stranger either. We also have Eileen Argentina and Anna Kanwit. Commissioner Cogan, why don't you go first.

Jeff Cogan: Good afternoon. Jeff cogan from Multnomah County Commission. I'm not here to ask for money. I want to thank you for bringing this resolution forward and let you know Multnomah county is proud to be a partner in this. We will be having a companion resolution heard tomorrow morning. I just wanted to briefly say the concept of supporting our troops has become a political catch phrase. And it's often now a proxy for whether or not you support the war in iraq. But this is not about that. This is truly supporting our troops. As they're being reintegrated into our community. And as you've heard this afternoon, that's something we didn't do after vietnam and that caused tremendous suffering for the troops who are returning and also had severe consequences for this community and communities throughout the country. We have the opportunity now to learn from the mistake that we made 35 years ago, and i'm really happy that the city is going to be doing this, the county is going to be partnering, looking forward to working on the summit this resolution creates, and partnering together in the coming months after that on helping our veterans to reintegrate into the community connecting them with resources we have here. Thank you very much.

Roberty Liberty: Metro is glad to support this effort and contribute in a modest way by donating 50 family passes to the Oregon zoo. And in addition, 50 one-day pass to oxbow or blue lake park. After you're returning home there's no better way to reintegrate than experience with your family and a part of this wonderful northwest place i'm sure they're glad to be coming home to. And so congratulations to you for this effort and i'm glad to donate these passes not only of course on behalf of metro, but -- and the Oregon zoo, but my colleague brian newman, who is with me liaison to the zoo and all the members of the council. Thank you for your work on this. I think it's very important.

June 6, 2007

Eileen Argentina, Parks and Recreation: Service manager for Portland parks and recreation. We're all about promoting a healthy Portland, and this is an important part of this. I can think of no better way to recognize returning vets and help them reconnect to the community than by offering them a way to visit our facilities and take advantage of our many programs. We're delighted to offer 50 gift certificates for \$50 each to thank the returning vets and their families for their efforts and sacrifices. The gift certificates can be used for any activity or program offered through our community center and we have many of those. They can pick these up next door at the Portland building. Ranging from swimming to arts and music classes, kids programs, outdoor programs, and everything in between. If the recipients are not already established customers we hope this will be the beginning of a lifelong relationship between the vets and their families and their neighborhood community centers and parks. And we'll be working through bob durston to get these give certificates to the veterans administration. Thank you.

Anna Kanwit, Bureau of Human Resources: Anna Kanwit, operations manager for the bureau of human resources. We're extremely supportive of the resolution. We have in essence had kind of a piecemeal and not cohesive approach to our recruitments of veterans and to our transition of our returning employees from active duty. We look forward to developing a relationship with the veterans reintegration program to address a particular needs of veterans returning to the work force, including our own veterans who are coming back to employment. We do engage again in some outreach efforts in recruiting veterans, but what we hope to accomplish through the resolution is a more systematic and centralized approach to our recruitment of veterans. And finally kimberly, who you heard from earlier this afternoon, provided a list of suggestions concerning transition of city employees returning from active duty, and we are look at those in hopes of developing a package of information that bureaus can provide to our returning veterans to assist in a more -- in a successful transition back into the work community. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you all. Our final panel is leaders in the community of faith, reverend chuck curry, cindy flock, and geraldine foote.

Peter Neketin: I will be reading a testimony much geraldine foote. Her mother is very ill today and geraldine is unavoidably absent. She sends her apologies. Testimony of geraldine foote. St. Luke lutheran church peace and justice group. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I speak as a person of faith, the daughter of a veteran. And a mother of a 16-year-old son and as a teacher. As a teacher and mother, I grieve for young people who join the guard to help the communities or who enlist for an education and are instead sent to foreign soil returning damaged, physically and spiritually. As u.s. taxpayers, Portlanders have paid over \$528 million toward the iraq war. Money that could have gone for health care education and veterans care. We need to make equally significant investments for those families and returning veterans affected by this war. Previously she came before to you advocate for troops home resolution. The stance does not mean that she does not support our troops. I want them home, and I want them cared for when they get here. Touched by the loss of loved ones, and the suffering of those who have returned, concern for our veterans is the common ground where members of our congregation and communities can meet concerning this war. The numbers of recent vets with severe injuries including brain damage has increased over previous conflicts. The wounded-to-casualty ratio is the highest in history for this war. 16-1 compared to 2.6-1 during the vietnam war. The v.a. currently has a backlog of 400,000-600,000 disability claims pending. Veterans wait months, sometimes years. Meanwhile, 30% of our homeless are veterans. Ptsd disability claims through the v.a. increased 80% over five years from 1999-2004. We will need to respond fully to care for the 30-50% of iraq veterans with ptsd, traumatic brain injury, or other mental health issues. The regional department of veterans affairs network that includes Oregon reported the high eggs percentage in the nation of homeless veterans hospitalized for mental health reasons in 2004. 47.5%, which is 23% higher than the national average. Our region is fourth in the nation for admissions much homeless vets of substance abuse

June 6, 2007

problems as well at 60% nearly double the national average. Over 18,000 troops who have served in Iraq or Afghanistan list Oregon as home, including over 5,000 National Guard. The current escalation calls for 360 more Oregon guards to deploy this year. With these facts in mind, coupled with the real stories of friends and families, faith groups including St. Luke Lutheran, are beginning to establish emergency bridge funds to help veterans in need waiting for their claims to be processed. Congregations and faith leaders are educating ourselves about PTSD and how to help affected individuals by bringing in speakers with expertise in these areas. This current resolution promises to involve city staff fully in coordinating and facilitating the community response to increasing needs. It resolves the city will walk with us to advocate for full funding on the state and federal level walk with us to support and empower the many secular and faith groups beginning to step forward. Thank you for dedicating resources to this effort. And that concludes Geraldine Foote's testimony. I want to take only just a very brief moment of my own. I am not authorized to speak for my church, but I can speak to some extent for our veterans issues committee. I want to make you aware that many citizens want to find a way to be supportive of veterans. My own committee is comprised of such citizens. We hope the process which is underway here today will lead to opportunities for us to be helpful and supportive. Thank you, and bless you for taking this effort.

Reverend Chuck Curry: Members of the council, my name is Reverend Chuck Curry. I serve as the minister at Parkrose Community United Church of Christ and on the public policy committee of Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon. I'm here to support this resolution. 21 years ago I began working at a shelter in Portland called Baloney Joe's. Each day we served hundreds of individuals suffering from acute mental illness, people who had lost their jobs because of the declining timber industry, those battling alcohol and drug addictions and veterans who served our nation in the armed forces only to be abandoned to the streets. The National Coalition for Homeless Veterans reports that in addition to the complex set of factors affecting all homelessness, extreme shortage of affordable housing, livable income and access to health care, our large number of displaced and at-risk veterans lived with lingering effects of post-traumatic stress disorder and substance abuse compounded by a loving family and social support networks. No one should be homeless in the richest nation on earth. But Americans have a special burden to ensure that those who have served our nation are not left without services and support. Tragically after the Vietnam War, our veterans were simply cut loose and many ended up in newspaper shelters. Our shelter which received only limited government support operated counseling programs, medical center, a jobs program, and some housing services in Old Town. We were so unpopular in our work, the -- the mayor said in the 1980's he would rather weed his garden than visit the people of Baloney Joe's. As many as one-third of the people we served were Vietnam veterans. You would have thought the lesson would have been learned by the way Vietnam veterans were treated. The veterans from Iraq are already in shelters and we have seen the shameful way veterans in medical facilities like Walter Reed have been treated. While an estimated 500,000 veterans were homeless at some point in the year 2004, the VA had the resources to only tend to 100,000 of them. The General Assembly of the National Council of Churches adopted a statement last year that read in part, we urge our government to give meaningful support to U.S. troops that meaningful support includes bringing active and reserve forces home from this war. Providing soldiers still in harm's way with adequate armor to protect them from gunfire and explosive devices, giving earned benefits to veterans, especially injured veterans of this war. For which they served. And honoring the sacrifices made by those who have died in this war by making adequate provision for surviving family members and creating withdrawal plans to bring such sacrifices to an end. I believe the war is contrary to the will of God and that we are called to be peacemakers. We are also called to be a compassionate people, concerned with the least of these in society. I urge all Portlanders to do everything in our power to avoid the mistakes

June 6, 2007

of vietnam and welcome home our veterans with open arms as soon as possible. Thank you very much.

Adams: that concludes the invited testimony.

Potter: Do we have a sign-up sheet?

Moore: We have about three people left to speak.

Potter: When you speak, if you would state your name for the record we would appreciate it. You each have three minutes.

Gilbert Frey: Honorable mayor, shall I go first? Honorable mayor and council members, I want to thank harley particularly for mentioning that this meeting was happening and for asking me to come and support of him and so we're here in support of each other. For many years now i've worked toward the effort of trying to save our memorial, which is the coliseum, and the memorial coliseum, the rose garden is a separate thing. But earlier on I suggest we have a \$1 per ticket sales tax. Most of us aren't really wanting to suggest any increase taxes. Not a very popular idea. But the idea of funding for the memorial coliseum and getting the money to make sure that we have a first class place is a need and it seemed like the money hasn't been there so the place is deteriorated so there was a lot of concern that maybe it should be put into something else, torn down, and redeveloped. But it is a memorial, and it is a memorial to the veterans, and the city of Portland has been very fortunate. They've won the lottery, when they had a world's fair here they won the lottery 100 years ago and they started the rose festival. They won lottery when they drafted bill walden and now we just wouldn't lottery with this last pick. And the blazers are in a real wonderful period of prosperity at the moment, and today's paper says that tickets are now selling for \$66,000 for one seat for one season. That's in the paper today. \$66,000. I'd like to see a dollar per ticket come to the city and these veterans needs would be a good source, and there's about 2 million people that visit the coliseum and the rose garden each year, and that could be a real source of funding for all these needs for veterans. Thank you very much.

Harley Wedel: My name is harley wedel, i'm representing the veterans action committee. The reason why I wanted to speak to you is thank you very much for what you are proposing here and what you are doing. It's something that I would wish had been available when I returned from korea. You realize that's a war that we're still fighting. 57 years now, kind of interesting. But nevertheless, I hear many people talking about helping the veterans that are returning in healing. And personally I think one point of healing is some place to go and be quiet and consider the buddy or the pal, or the comrade that you went over with and did not return with. We have a number of veterans that are trying to reassimilate into the community. One of the things that I believe they should have is a place to -- i'm not going to say worship, but a place to where they can go and see that the city has honored their of efforts, their friends' efforts, and the once that did not return. And of course I am still speaking of the memorial coliseum, and the place was -- the place was dedicated for the remembrance of all veterans of all wars. Now, we only have the world war ii and korea, and there are other skirmishes that have happened, and I think they should all be represented in that building. Now, this is personal, of course, but we have a number of folks that we're talking about helping them heal. This is one method of helping them heal. Thank you.

Harvey Thorstad: I'm harvey, commander u.s. Navy, retired. Vietnam vet. President of the local chapter of veterans for peace. In a place for healing, we also started and maintained the peace park at the east end of the steel bridge, which is a contribution to the city. Very nice place to just come and meditate and rest. I'm speaking in support of this resolution. I applaud the efforts of those that brought it before the council and the council themselves. It's needed. I applaud the people that have spoken ahead for what they're doing. It needs more and what the council here is doing is leaning in that direction. I've heard over a third of the homeless on our own streets in Portland are vets. Hopefully this effort will also help that. The main effort of veterans for peace is not only the healing side for we deal with many vets, we meet them when they're out tabling, bannering and

June 6, 2007

attempting to stop the war. We're pushing for prevention that is stop the war. Support the troops by stopping the war, bringing them home. Just -- to close, I supports the amendment.

Potter: thank you, folks.

Moore: We have one more person, chris bernard.

Chris Bernard: Thank you for allowing me to speak. I'm not really prepared, yesterday I just heard about this. But I do applaud you in this resolution. It's a great way to make an awareness for the veterans. I want to talk -- I myself have been a reservist for the 304th rescue squadron in Portland my entire career, 20 years. I've also been employee for the city of Portland as firefighter for 10 years. I have been deployed and been involved in most operations since desert storm one, and of course in the last 10 years i've deployed and returned to work as a city employee. And some of the things a couple of things I want to point out, some of these are personal experience, but if I was sitting on your side of the table i'd be, what can we do to help these veterans? And I want to talk about someone mentioned there's 41, 41 city employees currently, veterans and guardsmen employed with the city. I am one of them. I an experience most recently, in fact a year ago today one of my deployments was to Tucson arizona. The emergency -- they need add temporary commander and was an emergency thing and I got deployed there for 30 days. My first (unintelligible) assignment, but kind of interesting. When I got down there it was davis mothen air force base, but more interesting was the city I was in, tuscon, and I was a stark contrast unfortunately to the city of Portland in terms of how I felt. In terms of military friendliness, or we're talking about just a couple of examples, and for instance, every movie theater I went into, there was always a general admission, seniors, and military. With a discount. Every menu I opened at the bottom, 10% discount for senior and military members. Every pool I went to, there was always a special consideration whether it was monetary discount or what not for military members. And that's an example, and there are other things but those are little things that tell me tuscon is a military friendly town. I challenge you to look for ways for Portland to be military friendly town. On the other thing, what -- how does a returning vet reintegrate into the city employment system? Another thing I noticed in tuscon, as a firefighter, I notice I found out the city of Portland is -- operates under the bear minimum federal guideline laws in terms of acts that require for instance that a returning vet reintegrate back into their job at the same pay level that they left. I found that in City of Portland fire department they give 5 shifts off of paid military leave for military people. Tucson fire department, 21 shifts off. I did some research, the next lowest amount of time off is a city close here, 7.5 shifts off. Most were 10-15 shifts off. The other thing, when I returned to work, the laws protect you financially. But they don't protect things that don't have a monetary assignment to them. For instance, I'm on the dive team at Portland fire fighter. That position doesn't have a pay attached to it. So when I left, i'm gone for a year, they filled my position. I came back, I had no rights to return to a nonpaid position. My point is there's many examples within your own bureaus and the city's that we could look at and go, you know, change a few things. Why are we just doing the bare minimum? For our service members? Why aren't we protecting these positions that are unpaid? I'm sure there's more examples but i'm glad to offer any answers and if you have any questions, please give me a contact. I'm sure anybody in your other bureaus will have information. Thank you.

Moore: My apologies. I skipped over chief patrick s corrie.

Chief Patrick S. Corrie USN (Ret): My name is patrick corrie. I am a retired chief petty officer from the navy. I like to thank this council for this opportunity to talk to them. This resolution says more about how we want to treat our receipt van -- veterans than simple lip service. I am a former marine sergeant with service in Vietnam and a retired cfg petty officer with 20 years of service. I have experienced several of the problems with today's veterans and servicemen currently face including a hostile public and apathetic v.a. The bureaucracy of inpatient, outpatient treatment, medical boards, referrals, review boards, contract doctors, medical appointments are common to a

June 6, 2007

lot of servicemen coming back. I never experienced so many -- I never experienced the isolation that so many vietnam veterans experienced because of my extended military service. I cannot emphasize how important treatment of ptsd is. The lack of physical scars or obvious injuries does not mean these veterans have no injuries. Traumatic brain injuries are a byproduct of service in iraq. Your recognition of this in the resolution is to be commended. An email I received from sue keil identified steve roberts as one of two city employees under military assignment in with the city of Portland. I have the privilege of working with steve. He is an outstanding worker, a citizen, a citizen airman with the air national guard with a wife and two daughters. Let me also recognize another outstanding city employee. Roberto Audre, who deployed with the second battalion 162nd regiment as a sergeant first class deploying to the sinai desert for over a year. He contributed to fulfilling this country's treaty obligations that were set up. During his deployment he missed his son's graduation becoming a marine subsequently served two tours in the gulf. These veterans have done all we have asked them to do. Your resolution recognizes their service and sacrifice. Thank you for not forgetting these veteran, letting them come back to a different country, one that welcomes them back and offers them opportunity. Again, thank you.

Potter: Further discussion? Call the vote.

Adams: I want to thank bob and jane on my staff as well for their work on this issue. I am very proud to serve on a council that this is our second resolution welcoming home the veterans from iraq and afghanistan. And this one takes it further than the first one and the summit we will have later in the year will allow us to go even further. I think the testimony of cindy flock summed it up well concerning the return of veterans from iraq and the families of veterans who lost their lives and are not returning, this indeed is our common ground. And my intent, although I was too young to be fully aware of the veto ram war, my intent of learning the war of the vietnam war back home and showing all the support that we can offer to our returning veterans from iraq and afghanistan and other conflicts around the world is something that we intend to pursue. So thank you all. Today, thanks to all the veterans that serve, that are city employees and those that have returned aye.

Leonard: The decisions that are made within the walls of the white house to go to war and the decisions by young men and women to enlist in the military to serve their community and country are two completely separate, unique decisions. I have always made that distinction in my life, including in the 1960's and '70's and returning vietnam veterans were coming home. I wish everybody in our community did. It is, it saddens me that some confuse the two. They honor very much the service of the men and women that were here today and in addition to all of those in the community. This country can and should do a better job of protecting men and women in the battle field, with armor that's appropriate for the weapons that are used against them. And, of course, after they come home the revelations of the treatment of our men and women at walter reed hospital and the examples we heard today of the v.a. are sad. And are not appropriate. And to the extent that this city can make up for those deficiencies, we should. And I appreciate chris bernard's observations today about what we as a council can do better. And I am quite certain, knowing everybody here as well as I do, that we will take those issues up to right any wrong that the city commits, albeit not knowingly to veterans who serve us and take a leave of absence from their work here in the city. So I appreciate it very much, commissioner Adams, bringing this forward today and the discussion. It is very heartening and we are very supportive of each and every one of you and will do whatever we need to do to make your transition here better or help you deal with issues that maybe you have been dealing with that we can help out. Aye.

Saltzman: Well, I want to thank bob -- there he is, over there -- for really putting a lot of leg work into this whole idea that we should have this resolution before us today. Commissioner Adams for actually writing it and putting it before us. I think Oregon does have an ambivalent attitude towards issues related to war and veterans. I think a lot of it may be the fact that we don't have large military bases like arizona, like Washington, california. I think that does include and sort of tends

June 6, 2007

to make military and veterans relatively more invisible here. And I think this resolution is a great way to express this city council's intent not to let that happen with the returning veterans from the war in Iraq and Afghanistan and the other conflicts, too. I think somebody brought up Bosnia and Kosovo and the Sinai Desert. All around the world we have people serving this country in many far flung corners of this world. So this is a great start. It's certainly not the end of it. It's just the beginning. But we need to do better and I am very pleased to hear of all the outreach activities that both National Guard and the Veterans Administration are aggressively engaged in. They sound like great things. And we want to support those. Aye.

Sten: Well, I want to thank Bob and all of you who came here today. This is really heartening and I think we have a chance to maybe do things differently. And if we may not always learn from the past and bigger scale of policy decisions that are made, I think we as this community can learn. It's very obvious what happened after other conflict, particularly Vietnam when we didn't help people reintegrate. I think the theme of this day I keep hearing is reintegration. It literally won't happen unless you reach into some places we are not comfortable with, and make some new partnerships and say some unpleasant things about how our veterans are treated and allow our people to have the problems they are going to have and get past the notion you have to put on a brave face and pretend like everybody is fine. I also think it's really important that people who disagree on some of the politics of war that have been in this country and this world for the last couple years come together. I was the sole sponsor of a resolution opposing going into Iraq four years ago. That measure failed. I also -- I thought it was a really purposeful and I believe cheap shot on many in the Administration's part to liken support for the troops to whether or not you support this war. I think that it's easy to argue and cheap shot on the other way to say the only way to support the troops is to not go to war. I purposely that day four years ago sparked the discussion whether our community thought we ought to be going to war before the war started and afterwards we would have to talk about helping the troops as they come back and as they are there. I think that's where we are now. I think it's critical if we are going to get to a place where a federal government who sends people to war doesn't abandon them later that both sides of the debate, whether we should be in the war at all come together and say regardless of what one might think about that, we ought to support those folks. I think that is the place that we need some hard advocacy. I don't want -- I am ready, willing, able as I think all of you are to make sure we will do everything in Portland. I think we can do a lot more than we have today to try to help our men and women feel welcomed, to give them the space that they need, the support they need to heal, to return to productive lives. I also think we need to be very aggressive and saying we do not have the resources in this community to do that and the federal government owes us a better and more responsible approach to trying to provide the health care, the housing, the job training that people need. And so if we can unite across political spectrums to make that case, I believe it will be successful. I have had the privilege of leading the Council's efforts on homelessness, and you don't have to go any farther than the streets of Portland to see what the ultimate result is of not helping people reintegrate and support veterans. Veterans are -- there's some dispute because some will self-identify and some won't. There's no doubt 15% and as much as a third of the people on the streets chronically homeless having homeless for at least a year and many more, are veterans. So that's the ultimate place for people headed if we are not supporting them. We have made great progress getting chronically home also people a place to live and off the street in the last two years. And interestingly enough, what seems to make the difference for people who are really probably as alienated as you can get is absolutely need a place to sleep. They need food, they may even need a blanket. Ultimately what we found in the last couple years is changing the approach is helping them feel that they are welcome and connecting them with the greater community and helping rebuild their psych and spirit. I think is probably the most important step. Because if people feel connected to do community, they will find ways to get healthy again. And that even despite some of our best efforts wasn't always happening. The point

June 6, 2007

i'm driving towards, of course, we need to give people that connection before they are chronically homeless for years and years and say to people now when they come back, let's make sure that you are eligible for the things, if you have a two-year window, let's help you get there and figure it identity, whether you think you need it or not, get yourself applied. Very strong point from the firefighter on some of those issues as the fire commissioner I will go back and take a look at those and see if we can't make some improvements. I agree with your analysis. I think we can work on each ever our bureaus. I think we can be spokes people and we can have the courage to work together, those of us on all sorts of different positions on what policy should be to say there's no doubt we should support men and women when they come back. I think this is a very, very important conversation. And I was just listening, you all had very thoughtful comments and I appreciate very much. I feel better educated and empowered to try to help some more. Thank you very much. Aye.

Moore: Potter.

Potter: Bob, thank you for your efforts. Commissioner Adams, thank you and your staff. And to all the folks who spoke here today, I really want to thank you. It is an education for the city council to hear what is being done and even more importantly, what is still remaining that needs to be done. I think if we want to honor our men and women who have served in the military and are serving, I think it's important that we provide them a place where they can feel welcome, where they can feel honored and where they can live their lives in a dignified way. At one of the community connect meetings of the last time, where we invite homeless folks down to the memorial coliseum and provide them meals and hair cuts and glasses and just a host of things that commissioner Sten and his office has put together, I make a point of going out and meeting the people who are coming in the front door. And I thought about the lack of dignity that this man had. He was a veteran. And he told me that, even though he lives in a hotel downtown, when he went to get his identification from the department of motor vehicles, his i.d. So that he could receive services and other things, the person at the department of motor vehicles gave him this i.d. And he looked down, and for the address it says underneath the burnside bridge. And I thought, what a terrible thing to do. This man really felt bad about that. And he talked about how he had served his country. And I think if we are going to do something for our folks because they are our folks, I think that we need to do it in a way that not only honors them but gives them the dignity that I believe they deserve. You folks demonstrated that today, dignity and I honor that and I will do what I can as the mayor to work with my fellow council members to make sure that Portland is a welcoming place for everyone and that when people return from far off places, that they feel good about coming back to Portland. Because we show them by our actions that we do honor them. Thank you all for being here today. I appreciate everything that was said. And I vote aye. [gavel pounded] thank you all for being here. We are recessed until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow.

At 5:07 p.m., Council recessed.

June 7, 2007
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]

JUNE 7, 2007 2:00 PM

[roll call]

Potter: Prior to offering public testimony to city council, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent.

Item 671.

*****: The parties have been in mediation since our last meeting. In the first part of the meeting today will be getting an update from the parties, so we're going to start with the applicant, and if the applicant could please come forward.

*****: Could I ask the nwda representative [inaudible]

*****: We had asked getting things together.

*****: After you.

Michael Harrison: Michael harrison, harrison consulting, 837 northwest 25th avenue. A neighbor and also representing nwda today.

Tim Ramis: Tim ramis on behalf of the applicant and the applicant's team in the mediation.

Harrison: The mediation process has been more productive than I imagined it would be. We were making great progress and I have to compliment richard singer, he was willing to talk, he said anything was on the table, and many things were I thought initially wouldn't be on the table. I was very heartened and impressed. We were making very good Progress, but the fact the mediation was going on in private and the fact that it had happened so quickly was a problem, for many in the neighborhood. And last monday night the nwda board decided they wanted to close the mediation process and resolve this application as quickly as possible and then resume mediation on the next application. Or future progress. The number of issues involving that. There is a lot of concern about the fact the most significant piece of implementation district plan that we've seen that's come along since the plan was adopted by the council in 2003 was this parking garage. There were many other issues in the neighborhood of concern that there hasn't been any apparent progress on. Though we are very thankful for the crosswalks. We want to move forward. And when we met to inform the applicant and the applicant's representatives of the board's decision, they suggested an approach to moving forward we thought was very positive. And surprise us greatly. We wanted to move forward in a more open process, what kind to mind was the river district steering committee process. There was a post plan process that focused in on implementation to try and see how we would go about getting a number of issues dealt with. We felt a process like that would be very important because there were issues that were very important in terms of mediation that richard and his parents were not capable of dealing with. They are not housing providers, but housing for people who work in the shops and neighborhoods and it's an issue. They aren't in the position to talk about transportation issues. We were concerned about the overall package of parking provision that had been in the northwest district plan had included things like transportation management association, that there's been no progress on. And dick -- richard can be a great leader in helping us address those, but he needs broader participation and we need broader participation in doing that.

June 7, 2007

So we talked about proceeding with the process, some kind of steering process. We would want some city staff involvement in that, we don't know how much yet. We want to -- we'll be meeting in the near future to talk about what the work program will be and we'd like to come back and present a proposal for a process to address implementation. Hopefully faster, more strategic proposal than the river district process was, which took several years. If the council should consider another approach today that would bring the matter to closure, I would like to address you again representing nwda, but I think i'd like to turn it over to tim ramis.

Ramis: Thank you. For the record, tim ramis on behalf of the applicant and the Applicant's mediation team. Despite early skepticism from many corners about how this process would work out, mediation process has been very productive, and very worthwhile I think for all the sides who participated. For this reason we join with the other members of the mediation team in requesting that the council continue to encourage the dialogue that we've engaged in with a slightly altered format and additional stakeholders as we would develop in a plan which would bring back to you. We were fortunate during this process to have as a mediator judy mowery, who -- and we very much wish to keep her involved in this dialogue. She did a fine job of keeping us focused on issues, keeping us focused on looking for solutions, and this kind of progress has been difficult to achieve in the past, and I think the progress we made is no little credit to judith's efforts. We were fortunate to have outstanding and well respected members of nwda as michael, whose resume you well know, the president of the organization, frank byrd, long-time resident dan anderson, and chair of the transportation committee of nwda, kim carlson, and we very much appreciate their efforts and the time they spent and particularly the way they presented the issues so they could be addressed. While the process was not ultimately completed, we did develop conceptual plan that is a very substantial modification Of the design which you saw during the hearing. It includes a significantly lower building, safer pedestrian situation, and has improved transition to the residential area, it has fewer spaces and it has increased setback. All of these things were achieved through the dialogue and we were at the time we stopped mediation, engaged in developing a list of additional parking-related matters that might be included in an overall package. Unfortunately just as we had made progress, the nwda board ordered its team to stand down from the mediation, and of course they had no choice but to do so. Beh but we it this work of building a good middle ground solution needs to continue and we plan to work with the team to come back with a proposal for a process to do that. A conversation aimed at developing a brand-new application that would be filed which we would withdraw the current application, or is it a conversation about modification of the current application. In that case we would need a continuance for some method of keeping that application alive during the conversation. As we expressed previously in the last meeting, we requested a continuance or some kind of remand to the landmarks commission, the council was not inclined to could that previously, we're asking we would reconsider that, because if we could go on the existing application we would probably save some time. Another wrinkle in that for consideration is that if there's a pending application it would at least retain council jurisdiction which might address some of the issues of how we fund the mediator. We would be open to a process whereby we kept the application alive in the short-term, work through the mediation when it was concluded, than withdraw the application and refile. So we're open and flexible on how we achieve it. But we would ask for your consideration on that. If it turns out the council's preference is that this matter be ended, we're preparing to submit today a withdrawal of our application so there would be no application, no issue before you, and I have a letter to that effect, and so we would ask you to consider what process you'd like to use.

Harrison: We'd prefer the application be withdrawn today. And that was the basis under which the board was willing to talk about continuing mediation.

Potter: You folks are agreeable to that?

Ramis: If the council is not willing to continue the matter, yes, we are.

June 7, 2007

Leonard: So when the board directed there be no more mediation, they indicated they would support further mediation if the application was withdrawn?

Harrison: They indicated they would support mediation on a new application. They didn't take a specific vote on that, but that was discussed and there was a lot of support for that idea.

Potter: I think we need some advice from our legal counsel.

Kathryn Beaumont: It seems to me you have been presented with a number of options for your consideration. The posture we're in right now is you've held an appeal hearing, you've taken a tentative vote to grant the appeal and reverse the hearings officer's decision. You have a set of findings that staff had filed with the council, which has met with some objection from nwda. So your options today could be to -- one option, the applicant is proposed is that you remand this matter to the landmarks commission and allow mediation to continue. You've heard from the neighborhood that that's not their preferred option. And we do have a statutory clock for making a final decision that is running, which I understand the applicant is willing to address. A second option that's been presented to you is to basically simply continue this matter before the council and allow some additional time for mediation. Again, we still have the problem, the statutory time clock. A third option is to -- if you don't want to pursue either of the first two would be to accept the applicant's offer to withdraw their application and the parties can continue to mediate, and they can file a new application, and that -- there's no statutory time constraints with that option. And finally, a fourth option available to you is to decide You want to make a final decision on this appeal and end it there and the parties can do whatever they want to do after that. So those are sort of four -- at least four options available to you today.

Potter: I am heartened by the folks you folks have actually sat down and talked and come to some agreements about a process you could both feel comfortable with. I would support the third option, which is to accept the applicant's proposal to withdraw the application. That seems to fit with what the nwda would also position the folks to go back in to mediation.

Harrison: We are committed to working with the applicant after this application is withdrawn. Understanding that that means there will be another proposal for parking garage that hopefully we can support.

Potter: In terms of us providing assistance on the mediation, is that technically allowable.

Beaumont: I can't answer your question. I don't know what kind of arrangement or funding is available through the neighborhood mediation office, or the neighborhood mediation program.

Adams: Just the legal aspect of it, there is -- if there is no application in the system, we can provide mediation without fear of tripping up either party, our future decision making. True? It's not the legal -- just asking the legal question, if we provide mediation, we'll figure Out a way to pay for it. That doesn't trip us up later if it turns into an application and therefore comes before land marks and us, does it?

Beaumont: No. I don't believe the fact the council would have authorized funding for continuing mediation would indicate any bias or predisposition one way or another on any future application. The one thing I would suggest is if the council is inclined to pursue the applicant's suggestion that they -- they're willing to withdraw their application, you need the applicant to formally offer to do that, and I believe they have a letter prepared --

Ramis: Yes, we do. Let me offer that.

Potter: I do hear a motion to accept the application to withdraw the --

Sten: So moved.

Adams: Second.

Beaumont: I would just rephrase -- suggest a refinement. It would be a motion to accept the applicant's withdrawal of their application and based on that withdraw to terminate these appeal proceedings without any final decision on the appeal.

Sten: I would accept that as a friendly amendment.

June 7, 2007

Adams: Second.

Potter: And I will make sure as the commissioner of the office of neighborhood involvement that we would provide the support for the mediation.

Ramis: Appreciate that very much.

Adams: We've long been interested in being able to Engage on transportation issues, but we'll look to you to how you would like to involve us or not.

Potter: I know you mentioned city resources. Obviously when you get to that point we need to be part of the discussion.

Harrison: We'd like to present to you a proposed work program that defines the level of resources we want. We are thinking modestly in this area.

Potter: The kind of talk I like. Further discussion? Please call the vote.

Adams: Thank you to both parties. Aye.

Leonard: Reasonable people always find reasonable solutions. So I appreciate how hard sometimes it is to achieve the goal of being reasonable. It's not easy, but you're certainly setting an example for I think neighborhoods throughout Portland to watch as this unfold. I hope you all keep that in mind too, that this -- we up here very much appreciate when you sit down and try to find middle group. Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Sten: Briefly, northwest Portland is a treasure and it wouldn't be without the singer family's investment, and it wouldn't be without the hard work and passion of all the activist. I think anything that's been marked by this many 3-2 votes at this many points in the process, and this many splits of opinion is probably not best answer for this treasured part of town. So I appreciate both sides' willingness to keep working until we get to something. I don't know that we'll ever get a consensus, but I believe we can get to something that works much better for everyone, so I appreciate it, and it's a pleasure to vote aye.

Potter: And I would ask that both sides continue this same level of commitment that you've demonstrated to this point, and I really want to thank the northwest district association and Dick Singer and his organization for the progress to date. I'm truly amazed. I vote aye. [gavel pounded] Thank you, folks. We're going to move ahead to the regular item. Item 673.

Item 673.

Potter: Hang on folks, could you continue your conversations outside, please? Thank you.

Adams: I'd like to make a motion to add an emergency clause to action section 2 to read "section 2 -- the council declares that an emergency exists because new development in commercial industrial zone areas of Hayden Island will negatively affect the transportation facilities serving Hayden Island and may compromise the outcome of the correction program and studies under way to determine needed transportation improvements to these facilities therefore this ordinance shall be in full force and effect on and after its date of passage." This has been vetted with all the stakeholders, and it just means instant implementation as opposed to waiting 30 days.

Leonard: Second.

Potter: Ok. Motion is made and seconded. Discussion? Please call the vote.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] it's a second reading. Vote only. Please call the vote.

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

Potter: Aye. [gavel pounded] we will take a 35-minute break and be back at 3:00 p.m. for the 3:00 p.m. Time certain.

At 2:24 p.m., Council recessed.

At 3:02 p.m., Council reconvened.

June 7, 2007

[roll call] [gavel pounded]

Potter: Prior to offering public testimony the city council or lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity he or she is authorized to represent. Please read the 3:00 p.m. Time Certain.

Item 672.

Gary Blackmer: Good afternoon. I'm Gary Blackmer, Portland city auditor. With me is Jessica Sweeney, one of the principle authors of the report prepared by the citizen campaign commission that proposes a number of code changes to improve the public campaign finance system. These revisions are based upon the report that was put together by the seven-member commission, and the report was presented -- was issued on April 13th and then presented to the council on April 26th. It contains a number of code changes that we thought would be very important in order to improve the system. And the report and the code changes have been available on the auditor's website for a while now. What the commission did based upon the presentation and discussion with council at the April 26th meeting was go back, look at the recommendation and see if they could accommodate the recommendations. In some cases they felt like they could better elaborate on the rationale for making the recommendation, but -- and recognize also that ultimately council makes the final call. And we provided -- the commission worked with my office to put together a document that lays out those issues raised by council, the changes they made and additional clarifications. And we also put together a document that matches each of the 28 recommendations put together by the commission to the specific code changes or references to rule changes that will be making in order to adapt those recommendations. So this was a major amount of work for this citizen commission. I want to extend my appreciation for this great group of the Portland public who produced a deep and excellent review of our public campaign finance system. He was a key -- he had the key role of translating the recommendations into the code with the assistance of Lindsay Reece from the city attorney's office. This is a first reading of the agenda item. It's a non-emergency item and would go to a second reading next week. And ultimately then it would take effect on July 13th. So at that point on July 13th, perspective candidates would operate under these rules that the -- that you contemplate changing in the code. We also have an amendment we forgot an "or" in one of our pages, 2.10.080c, which was pointed out to us by Amanda Fritz. So it's a one-word amendment, if you would be so kind as to --

Leonard: Which section again?

Blackmer: 2.10.080c. There was a clause with three phrases in it, and we didn't have -- and it was the disposition of the \$5 contributions and we just needed an "or" before -- before the last -- after the second one. So it looked like the person had to do all three things with the same \$5 as pointed out by Amanda Fritz. And not even I can stretch that money that far.

Sten: Amanda can do twice as much with \$5. Three times.

Blackmer: If you have any points you'd like to discuss, or issues, Jessica is here, I'm here.

Saltzman: I do want to offer an amendment in a minute. The independent expenditures issue, you do intend to tackle that issue and come back in the fall with recommendations?

Blackmer: Definitely. We actually are committing to bringing back -- I don't have the date, but the first -- we thought it would be good for -- because of scheduling to have the commission take a month or two off in the summertime, but September they would come back and begin work immediately on the independent expenditures and get something to council certainly before the holidays.

Saltzman: I appreciate all the feedback you got from us last time and incorporated a lot of that feedback. I guess the one where maybe we're still at odds is the one did I want to offer an amendment, if this is the right time.

Adams: I -- could I ask a few clarifying questions before we do that? To know what's in here and what's not in here? Can you just for my sanity, can you just walk through again how the process

June 7, 2007

would work and just the barest of terms for the legislative record with the amendments? Very quickly?

Blackmer: How the -- the new process for qualifying?

Adams: Correct.

Blackmer: Candidates would come in and file a declaration that they want to be a public campaign financing candidate. They would also provide a contribution expenditure report showing what they had if anything in terms of campaign funds. Those would be frozen. They would begin the process of collecting their qualifying contributions. They could only -- the only ones that would count as qualifying contributions are from registered voters in Portland. That -- because that is the source that we can use to confirm and validate that these are bona fide contributions based upon the signature that Multnomah county is willing to work with us on to validate. So it's getting a little ahead -- once they've gotten to the point of having 30% of their contributions, they need to bring them in to us. And they have a limited number of days to do that under this language here. So then that would tend to stagger those contributions -- qualifying contribution reports coming in to help us from avoiding a big influx at the very end. They would have essentially this year from July 13th until January 31st to get their thousand qualified contributions that have been validated.

Adams: And in they brought in, let's say, 300 signatures, but you found 10 of them were -- you couldn't verify 10 of them, do they have to get the un-- the ones that were thrown out in the next phase of the process, they're allowed to do that?

Blackmer: There's no penalties to my recollection because it's harder to know if someone is a registered voter or not. We felt like it wouldn't be fair to --

Adams: I agree. Just trying to make sure that was in there. So thanks.

Blackmer: And once I get the contributions in to us, we would validate it, and then we would. Basically they would sign agreements like they have in the past saying they would qualify -- they would comply with all the rules in terms of spending and contributions and reporting, and then actually during this process they're also using the four-star system to report their contributions. They'll also provide, if that is problematic in any way, they can give us a spreadsheet with the information on it. So then either we would do it directly through or star so the public could see who the contributors were, or we would post the spreadsheet so people could see. That would allow for people to be able to challenge a candidate also, because everyone would be able to see who's contributing if they saw their name there and they knew they hadn't given the \$5, they could raise that issue. So it provides an extra accountability that way. And it also I think -- it creates a little bit more attention to candidates because people will then be able to track how many contributing qualifying contributions that they had gotten and see what kind of progress they're making. So I think it will help candidates be able to get attention to what they're trying to accomplish and educate the public about what the system is about.

Adams: Is the deadline for get -- the ultimate deadline after they do the 30% --

Blackmer: January 31 is the ultimate deadline.

Adams: So the 30% deadline is just whenever they reach it.

Blackmer: Right.

Adams: It could be the -- a couple days before January 1, I guess, conceivably?

*******:** I think --

Adams: A couple days after that.

Blackmer: Exactly. I think to a certain degree if someone doesn't get their 30% until close to the deadline, they probably realize they're not going to make it.

Adams: You then verify the signatures after January 1st, and do they turn in exactly a thousand or 1500 for --

Blackmer: They can turn in more. There's no penalty for doing that. We don't -- to that degree, we don't think it's going to be easy to get 6,000 --

June 7, 2007

Adams: There's no maximum of \$5 contributors?

Blackmer: No. One of the features that we provided was that if candidates want to continue gathering \$5, they can actually have it put directly into the campaign finance fund rather than their own. So it's -- it can be a means of organizing.

Adams: When do they start getting money, then?

Blackmer: Right after we validate that they've met the threshold.

Adams: They get how much?

Blackmer: Depending on the dates, they get about a third. If it's relatively early on and then they get the two-thirds, I'd have to look, I think it's early march.

Adams: The prohibited expenses, because we had some -- probably maybe additional discussion today Under what's in the piece of paper before us, what are some of the changes on what cannot be used?

Blackmer: We have prohibited -- we had a number of areas. For example, legal fees, we deem that that would not be appropriate for spending, that campaign parties, the election parties --

Potter: What page is that on?

Adams: Is it 19.

*****: Recommendation 19.

*****: Ok.

Adams: Page 19?

Potter: 18 and 19.

Adams: Limitations on use of qualifying contributions. In watching what was happening with the funds, we thought it would be appropriate to put more limits on there. So, for example, we also set an accountant or other professional service fees in conjunction with arguing against penalties or decertification.

Adams: You pay those out of your pocket?

Blackmer: Right.

Adams: One way to defeat a candidate is to sue the hell out of them?

Adams: Did commissioner Saltzman --

Sten: [inaudible]

Adams: Commissioner Saltzman's argument ruled the day in your mind on number 78 so we can't - - number 8 so we can't buy fuel?

Blackmer: No. Mileage would be permissible, but leasing a vehicle would not.

Adams: It's a long day for me. It says number 8, under the limitations, it says certain vehicle related expenses including purchases, leases, rentals, repair, or fuel?

Jessica Sweeney: [inaudible]

Blackmer: Mileage would be ok.

Adams: Got it.

Sten: Does that mean if you own a car and had legitimate campaign -- if you don't own a car, they could rent a car and reimburse themselves for the campaign mileage?

Blackmer: They could.

Sten: Amanda raised the issue in an email. It discriminates against somebody who is not a car owner. Let's say you didn't own a car, you used flexcar, you couldn't reimburse yourself, but you could reimburse yourself from a travel --

Blackmer: You could you reimburse yourself for miles traveled in a flexcar. But I'm not sure how close those would match up. But I -- we were trying to accommodate the issue of not leasing or renting, just because we saw -- we understood commissioner Saltzman's concerns that we're -- in order to limit the vehicle usage just to campaign activities, mileage seemed to be the best way to do that as opposed to a leasing or renting, where it can be used for many other noncampaign activities. And it's not an easy thing to track.

June 7, 2007

Sten: It mainly is a hypothetical. Some might have different opinions about his car, but she does have one. Would there be any provision where the commission could hear a request for an exception on something like this? Is there -- i'm trying to get at some way of saying -- I get you don't want somebody to lease a car with campaign funds, but I Also think if somebody legitimately does not own a car, that's a legitimate -- that doesn't make their need any less legitimate than somebody who pays themselves mileage.

Blackmer: We don't have a clause --

Sten: There's nothing -- those are dangerous, i'm not necessarily saying we should.

Blackmer: The other option would be to move it from the code to the rules and that could be -- that gives my office more flexibility and interpretation. But I guess --

Sten: I think we want to get this stuff right. I do actually believe that anybody who's seriously together enough to qualify under this campaign and is a serious candidate to win this is probably capable of figuring out how to borrow a car for the cost of mileage from a campaign -- do snag works under this. I would be surprised at somebody who can navigate this far into the system can't figure out. I just want to be fair. I'm sure we'll have testimony on this.

Saltzman: I wanted to ask one other question. One of the issues we talked about last time was -- in order -- you become a cosigner of the account. I remember the response was the attorneys, state attorneys thought that put us on the line.

Blackmer: The only way would be to -- an "or" -- two people on the account. The city of Portland and the candidate. And -- in which case if the candidate started bouncing Checks the city could be liable for repaying. The attorneys went through different option and they didn't come up with any simple straightforward way of doing it. They didn't even come up with a complicated way of doing it. Would I have required us negotiating agreements with any bank that a candidate might have chosen to have an accountant to see if they could set up procedures to give us some guarantee. But it was a difficult system to set up.

Saltzman: Should I put my amendment out there now for testimony?

Potter: Go ahead.

Saltzman: I'm still hung up on the issues that -- of public funds being used to hire family members, so my amendment would actually add that to the list of prohibited -- limitations on the use of public funds. So it would say basically -- would it add number 11, we're look at page 19, that would say basically that the limitation is public funds could not be used for salary or payment to a family member and then my amendment also then goes on to define family member means any of the persons, candidate's spouse, domestic partner, parent, grandchildren, sibling, aunt, uncle, niece, nephew, step relatives, sister-in-law, brother-in-law, grand parties in law, and equivalent relatives of the candidates' domestic partner. And the reason i'm still hung up on this, I do think -- we certainly had a situation in the first debut of public financing where there was questionable payments made by a candidate to a relative. I think it's incumbent upon to us make sure this public financing will be vote order in 2010. I don't think we can afford to suffer another situation where the funds look -- may not in fact be an abuse but certainly looks to the public like questionable, and I it this area where this is most likely to happen is the employment or paying salary to relatives. So I think we should error on the -- err on the side of being above board. I think most of us who have been in campaigns, most people who know that family members don't need to be paid to do the job. They're going to get out there and work for you. So -- and I know last time there was discussion, legislators are allowed to hire spouses, I would point out there's been many examples where legislators have abused their office budgets, most recently representative kelley wirth, who resigned and in the process allocated some \$40,000 to her mother. So I think the legislature is not the model that we should be looking at. We should be looking at establishing our own above reproach position on this, and absolutely limit it I think it will serve us well.

June 7, 2007

Blackmer: In my discussions that the commission had, they recognized the viewpoint and they were more than happy to defer to council in terms of how you ultimately came down on it. I just had one question of clarification. Paying the relative could be paid for expenses, like mileage or things like that?

Saltzman: This is only for salary or payment in the terms of payment for services.

Adams: Refresh my memory can you pay yourself?

Blackmer: No. I think state law rules on that. No? Position you may want to clarify the payment issue.

Saltzman: If there's a second i'll make sure it's clarified.

Leonard: Second.

Saltzman: Ok.

Adams: Would you accept a friendly amendment, commissioner? You're missing some hyphens under brother-in-law and grandparents-in-law which could render this legislatively confusing.

Saltzman: I would add the hyphens in the right places and I would clarify that use for salary or.

Sten: Would you consider after payment, commissioner, other than reject mate reimbursable expense?

Saltzman: M-hmm.

Sten: It's see prohibited uses, so it would say --

Saltzman: Other than allowable reimbursement?

Blackmer: Sure. We can certainly enforce something like that. We may not know some -- an in law under another name, we'd have to depend upon members of the public to tell us.

Saltzman: It would say use for salary or payment other than reimbursable expenses. To a family member. Then would I add the hyphens. That would be the amendment -- i'm perfectly happy if you want to take testimony on it before we vote.

Potter: Anything else? Let's go ahead and take testimony. Who has signed up?

Moore: We have four people signed up.

Carol Cushman: I'm carol cushionman, representing the league of women voters of Portland. The league continues to support the campaign finance fund, including the proposed amendments which collar fight original goals. I'm not going to comment on the fresh amendment today because the -- [inaudible] a few more people than just my commenting on that would not have a prior checking in.

We encourage you to support the Portland system of public campaign finance, tightening the signature gathering requirement with the restrictions that a contributor is a city elector rather than a city resident narrows the pool of possible contributors. One of the goal was to broaden participation in the democratic process and -- in asking the contributors ricardo banuelos eligible to vote in the following election is consistent with that goal. Establishing a time line which verifies contributor is an elected -- elector after submission of signatures does allow for active voter registration to company -- accompany the signature collection. We're also encouraged to see there's a process for invalid Contributions which were collected in good faith. While not counting toward the required certification, these contributors will eliminate -- pardon me. Let me start over. We don't want invalid contributions to eliminate other otherwise qualified candidates, and we're concerned that using registration files could inadvertently mean you would have invalid signatures. So we're glad that you're allowing the process for that to go through. Also thank you for addressing the league's concern regarding early submission of qualifying contributions. The artificial december deadline may have excluded excellent and viable candidates. We appreciate the auditor's concern about workload caused by signature verification through voter registration records. The approach outlined in the proposed code language is a good solution. It should help alleviate the workload problems and at the same time allow candidates to gather support at their own pace. Please consider the need soon era they're than later for rules for special elections with their compressed time line. And it continues to be the bulk of the -- the hope that the you current council will support

June 7, 2007

the spirit of the campaign finance fund through the actions of your individual campaigns. Thank you.

Amanda Fritz: I'm amanda fritz, speak only for myself. I support most of the changes proposed. One of the purposes of this system is to help people who don't have a lot of personal funds or a lot of affluent friends to run and succeed in a bid for Portland city council. So the proposal to prohibit use of public money for vehicle rental is unfair and should be deleted. I was astonished to hear the suggestion that the reason for that prohibition is so there would be no opportunity to use the vehicle for noncampaign purposes. I don't think I did anything noncampaign purposeful for about six months. So I would suggest that certainly we don't want people buying a car, but there are legitimate needs both for the candidate, him or herself, and for campaign staff that you might need to hire a bus or other vehicle and that vehicle rentals should be an allowable expense. And so I ask you to change that prohibition. I also support commissioner Saltzman's amendment for prohibiting family members from benefiting from the campaign. There's another concern I want to raise. My understanding of the code language saying that the contributor information will be posted on the internet is that it will link to the state system of the or star, which gives the name and address of the contributor. I believe we need administrative rules that protect our donors. So that their signatures are not posted on the internet. I think in these days of voter -- of identity theft and fraud, that asking sometimes elderly people to have their personal information posted on the internet is extremely dangerous. And we not only want to protect public money, we want to protect these good people who are trying to do a good public purpose. So I would ask that as we move forward with the administrative rules, that there's certainly a way for people to go to the add terror's office to view the signatures, but would not be the capacity to post them on the internet. My understanding is that voter registration signatures are not available as public record, so I would ask that you make very certain that that doesn't happen with this system. Commend the since' campaign commission for the great work they've done, and ask them to start work immediately on rules for special elections. These -- the system will be most important when there is a quick election -- special election. And you could not collect -- the time line is all set up for the primary election of the even years. You couldn't collect a thousand signatures in three months even if it were a time line. So I would ask that once you have given the commission a little break, that immediately in addition to the independent expenditure rules, that they work on rules for a special election so that that's there in the code. Thank you.

James Lee: My name is james lee I reside on southeast Mitchell street. Thank you for hearing me today. I'm speaking solely for myself. I own two bicycles, one bus pass and no car and if I were running for City of Portland office I would consider my membership in car sharing to be a vital resource and certainly a legitimate expense. I'd like to point out as far as the language is concerned however that flexcar does not work on mileage they work on time and there are a variety of plans that you can use for that. So I suggest that the language be amended that to include the other forms of rental. But I would also like to point out the flexcar provides really excellent record keeping. So there could be really very little question whether something was legitimate or not. Thank you very much.

Potter: Thank you.

Moore: Our last person is janice thompson.

Janice Thompson: Good afternoon, janice thompson. Democracy reform Oregon is now our official name. I think last time I was here we were about to change it but we have now. Thanks again for the commission and the work of the auditor's office and on preparing this, the report and the resulting set of code changes. Overall really very much in support. I only want to touch on some of the topics that have come up and try to help shed some light. One, commissioner Adams, you mentioned, you had some concerns about this whole legal issue and what funds could be used for and not in terms of if there were legal issues that were, came up in terms of like the restrictions

June 7, 2007

on use of campaign funds for legal fees. Oh. Ok. All right. Well, in addition to being totally satisfied, I think that just an f.y.i. Is that state law looks like it's going to be changed to have the option for public officials to set up a legal defense fund if something came up. So I think there would be a whole another angle that could help in this situation dove tailing with the ordinance changes as written. Exactly. You know, I support the amendments related to family members. I guess I will just note for the record that part of the reason that the campaign commission, I think didn't go to where commissioner Saltzman is, is because there had been some indication from staff there were legal problems with going there and evidently those aren't the case. Another clarification in terms of this whole use, paying one self, state law actually was changed in 2005 so that candidates, under state law, which apply in this case, cannot be pay themselves for campaign services so that's again another f.y.i. In terms of how this dove tails and wing we are covered there. In terms of signatures, orstar is not set up to take any signatures. It's just for the campaign finance reporting. So I think the signature protection issues also are already covered there. Finally, I do agree the next steps are to take a look at special elections and the independent expenditures and I am very committed to work with the commission on those points over the summer.

Potter: Thank you. Commissioner?

Saltzman: I think mr. Lee left. But I thought he did have a good point about flexcars, compensation being based on time rather than mileage. And I thought we would add, suggest add the word "for time or mileage reimbursements" to reflected that. To number eight.

Leonard: The only thing I would point out is that if you use a flexcar and you are paying for time, you would still get reimbursed for the mileage.

Sten: Just make sure the rate is fair for flexcars.

Leonard: I mean if you just say for time, what is the rate? That could be anything, couldn't it?

Sten: Would there be any way technically to come up with something that would allow reimbursing flexcar so then you would actually literally have -- or if another competitor came up. If that option it was clear a legal use to pay yourself back for using flexcar, I think that does distinguish from --

Leonard: What i'm saying is if you drive a flexcar and you are paying by the hour and you drive 10 miles, you have the ability still to submit for a refund based on miles.

Sten: Because of the nature of the business and cost you more than you get in mileage is what they are getting at.

Leonard: Is that true? I don't know that.

Sten: You buy a membership you get so many hours. In general, flexcar per mile costs generally more, but it's way cheaper for people because by definition you driveway less. If you have a car you tend to drive a lot more than if you are using flexcar. So the -- i'm not explaining this very well.

Leonard: I hear you.

Sten: Mile for mile you spend a little more for flexcar than you do, than a reimbursement rate is on a typical --

Leonard: Is the reimbursement rate normally cover the cost of a standard rental vehicle?

Sten: We use the set government mileage rate. Right?

Blackmer: Yeah it would be more like about 50 or 55 cents right now.

Leonard: How does that stack up if you are renting a vehicle?

Blackmer: If you are doing 10 miles you get five and a half dollars back and even a flexcar would be a minimum of \$7 for an hour. Or if it was two hours, if you are going to a meeting, you would be paying a lot more.

Leonard: So we could have some language then that recognized that unique arrangement of a flexcar?

June 7, 2007

Blackmer: It's not a lease. But it is kind of a rental. So I guess commissioner Saltzman had the principal concerns around it. I'm not sure if you would accept short-term rental as ok, but leases are not. But then we would have to somehow define hourly rentals.

Saltzman: My concern is certainly not to deprive people of access to flexcars, mileage reimbursements. My concern is somebody leasing a convertible b.m.w. because they think they need that for all the parades they're going to be in. I'm coming at it from that end of the spectrum. So I would like to be able to accommodate the flexcar use and reasonable short-term, if there's something we could come up with between now and the second reading.

Blackmer: I think we could. Again, it comes down to the intent. I think as we discuss this we could come up with some language.

Adams: Just one vote I am fine having this worked out in administrative rules. Our legislative direction is, if you want to not have to read this yet again.

Sten: I'm fine with that, too.

Blackmer: Ok.

Adams: I don't know what you do to the ordinance to amend it so we can do that.

Leonard: I will call for the reimbursement of automobile use.

Adams: Right.

Blackmer: If we can maybe put together some language real quick, we could --

Leonard: About that? Develop rules, the auditor's office will develop rules for the reimbursement of automobile use strictly for campaign purposes.

Blackmer: Works for us.

Adams: Second.

Leonard: Call the roll.

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

Sten: Aye. [gavel pounded]

Adams: Gotcha on that one, didn't I?

Saltzman: I'd like to vote on this.

Leonard: Yes, sorry.

Saltzman: Family members as amended.

Leonard: We will vote on the amendment proposed by commissioner Saltzman. Karla, please call the roll.

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

Sten: Aye. [gavel pounded] further discussion on the ordinance?

Saltzman: This first reading. Right?

Leonard: Yes.

Saltzman: I want to do take amanda's suggestion to heart to thank the campaign commission for all their work.

Sweeney: You are very welcome. It was a pleasure.

Saltzman: You have done a lot of work and we are relying on you to do a lot more work. And have a good summer.

Leonard: Thank you. There's nothing else. This will pass to second reading. When is it heard again?

Leonard: That will --

Moore: That will come back june 13 in the morning session.

Leonard: June 13 at 9:30 a.m. There's nothing else the council stands adjourned. Thank you. [gavel pounded]

At 3:41 p.m., Council adjourned.

June 7, 2007