

**PORTLAND CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SUMMARY MINUTES  
MARCH 9, 1993**

Members Present: Richard Cooley, Rick Michaelson, Vivian Parker, Jean DeMaster, Margaret Kirkpatrick, Joan Brown-Kline, Paul Schuback and Doug Van Dyk  
Member Absent: Bruce Fong

Staff Present: Bob Stacey, Tom Dixon, Al Burns, Jim Claypool and Linda Birth

Richard Cooley, President, called the meeting to order at 12:00 noon at the Portland Building in Meeting Room C, 1120 SW Fifth Avenue.

**Reports:**

**1. Director of Planning, Bob Stacey:**

- Regional Rail Summit and Visual Preference Survey. Stacey reported that the Third Annual Regional Rail Summit was held on Saturday, March 6 and Anton Nelessen, the consultant who conducted the Visual Preference Survey for Portland metro area, reported on the results of the survey. He notes that human scale designs, either residential or commercial, are far more favored by Portland residents than auto-dominated development styles. He will prepare a written report and recommendations within 30 days and the Planning Commission will have an opportunity to review this report.
- City Council briefing of Albina Community Plan. Stacey noted that after the briefing, City Council asked the Planning Commission to participate in Council work sessions and help Council set the stage for public hearings by describing some of the same conclusions described at the briefing. The first City Council hearing is May 5. Stacey suggested that a sub-committee of the Commission would be the best way to prepare this material.

The Commission agreed and Michaelson suggested that City Council organize their sessions in sections, similar to the way the Planning Commission did, i.e., policy issues at one hearing and map issues at another.

- Portland Environmental Zoning. Stacey presented and explained narrative, entitled Environmental Zoning in the City of Portland, describing how and why the City protects natural resources and some of the regulations used (attached). Stacey also referred to a large scale, colored map of the City showing existing and proposed environmental zoning. Stacey noted that this information is useful for the Commission in assessing the overall impact of environmental zoning.

**2. Portland Development Commission, Larry Dully:**

- Urban Renewal Legislation. Dully noted that legislation is proposed that would allow for a local vote to amend the State Constitution enabling each community with an urban renewal program to decide if they want to vote for costs outside the \$10 limit on local government. The urban renewal law has been approved by the Oregon Senate and is now before the Oregon House for consideration. The bill will be before the voters in a special election in

June. It has to pass statewide and if it does, Portland's first opportunity to consider it would be in September. He noted that Portland has \$90 million in urban renewal debt that has to be paid for out of the general fund beginning 1995 if there is no local solution.

**Issues of Interest from Commissioners:**

•**Regulatory Review Report.** (Staff: Bob Stacey) Due to time constraints, the draft Planning Commission Report to City Council on Regulatory Review was deferred to March 23, 1993, without any discussion. (Not included with the agenda, but distributed to the Commission prior to the hearing was a draft letter addressed to Mayor Katz and City Commissioners, dated March 1, 1993, with a recommended process matrix. This letter and attached matrix will be included in the March 23, 1993, Planning Commission agenda.)

**Consent Agenda:**

1. **Vacation of N. Burr, Bellingham & Moltzen (LUR 92-00861 VA)**  
(Staff: Tom Dixon)

**Motion:** Without discussion, the Commission voted 8 to 0 to grant approval of the vacation request with one condition, as recommended by the staff report dated February 19, 1993.  
(Fong absent)

2. **Vacation of NW Springville Road (LUR 91-00853 VA)**  
(Staff: Tom Dixon)

**Motion:** Without discussion, the Commission voted 8 to 0 to grant approval of the vacation request with one condition, as recommended by the staff report dated February 24, 1993.  
(Fong absent)

**Briefing Items:**

- Historic Resource Protection for Goal 5 Compliance**  
(Staff: Duncan Brown)

Due to time constraints, Brown agreed to write a memo to the Commission explaining the project status, but noted that the public hearing is scheduled for April 13.

**Action Items:**

1. **Fanno Creek & Tributaries Conservation Plan**  
(Staff: Al Burns)

Burns presented a large scale colored map of the Fanno Creek Watershed showing areas to be protected. Burns continued with a summary of the report, proposed regulations and staff response to comments, as contained in the memorandum to the Commission, dated February 25, 1993, included in the agenda. Burns then presented and explained a summary sheet explaining the differences between the existing and proposed environmental code (attached). He noted that the biggest change from the existing regulations is a switch to more clear and objective standards for review of environmental projects. Another major change is with transition areas; projects within the first 25 feet of an environmental zone will no longer go through a Type II review if they meet the standards. Also, the procedure type has been

reduced from a III to a II for the extension or provision of services through protection zones in the SW Hills and Fanno Creek Watershed.

The following presented oral testimony in support of the proposed Fanno Creek and Tributaries Natural Resources Conservation Plan; related amendments to Comp Plan Goal 8, Environment; and related amendments to Zoning Code Chapter 33.430, Environmental Zones. Public testimony noted the critical need for protection measures to preserve

remaining resources, to preserve the quality of air and water, to preserve old growth forests and prevent illegal tree cutting, to protect stream beds and riparian areas, and to preserve fish and wildlife:

- Katie Bretsch, Bureau of Environmental Services (Presented written testimony, attached)
- John Alland, Vice President, Crestwood Neighborhood Assoc., 10463 SW 53rd (Presented maps of Crestwood Neighborhood showing the neighborhood boundary, properties within the neighborhood that are proposed for protection with the Plan, and property owners within the protected area that are supportive of the Plan and its protection measures. Alland also presented a petition with 120 signatures, attached.)
- Dorothy Gage, Ash Creek Neighborhood Assoc., 7688 SW Capitol Highway (Presented written testimony, attached)
- Cheryl Dexter, 12515 SW 55th Place (Presented photos (before and after) of the property behind her that had been clear cut over the weekend without permits.)
- Kay Durtschi, Southwest Neighborhoods Information, Inc., 2230 SW Caldw
- Jeremy Grand, 3707 SW Coronado
- E.L. Ned Devereaux III, Chair, Far Southwest Neighborhood Assoc., 5002 SW Vacuna (Presented written testimony after the hearing, attached)
- Raissa Moore, 3150 SW Bertha Boulevard (Presented photos of property behind her where concrete had been dumped down a slope.)
- Gene Lawhorn, Labor Coalition for Environmental Responsibility, 10334 NE Portland
- David Coupe, Defenders of the Urban Forest, 1332 SE 44th
- Ed Sullivan, Ash Creek and Crestwood Neighborhood Associations, 111 SW Fifth, #3200
- Paul Roland, Defenders of the Urban Forest, 3116 SE Clinton
- E. Callison Petillo, 6039 SW Knightsbridge Drive (Presented written testimony, attached)
- Dan Heagerty, Fans of Fanno Creek, 6836 SW Raleighwood Way
- Arnold Rochlin, Friends of Forest Park, PO Box 83645
- Jeffrey Gottfried, 7040 SW 84th (Presented Mayfly Nymphs that survive only in pristine water found in headwaters of Fanno Creek, Woods Creek and tributaries.)
- Linda Bauer, 6232 SE 158th (Presented photos of a site at SE 102nd & Powell that had been clear cut.)
- Mark Foster, 4250 SW Dosch Road (Resubmitted written testimony presented earlier at December 8, 1992 hearing, attached.)
- Michael Carlson, Portland Audubon Society, 5151 NW Cornell

The following presented oral and written testimony (attached) noting specific concerns and objections to proposed amendments to the environmental zone regulations and procedures, and included specific recommendations for changes to the regulations. Some testimony also identified concerns relative to the importance of accurate mapping and site-specific issues:

- Tim Ramis, O'Donnell, Ramis, Crew & Corrigan, 1727 NW Hoyt
- Tom Wright, Mackenzie Engineering, PO Box 69039
- Richard Roy, Southwest Boundary Street Citizen's Committee, 2420 SW Boundary
- John Harville, Southwest Boundary Street Citizen's Committee, 2430 SW Boundary
- John LeCavalier, President, Fans of Fanno Creek, PO Box 25835
- Paul Fishman, Land Use Committee, Crestwood Neighborhood Assoc., 5260 SW Alfred
- Linda Bauer, Environmental Subcommittee of Southeast Uplift Land Use and Transportation Committee, 3534 SE Main

- Ryan O'Brien, Land Development Consultants, 233 SE Washington, Hillsboro

The following presented oral testimony in opposition to the proposed Fanno Creek Plan and related amendments to the environmental zone regulations, noting concerns relative to property takings because regulations are too restrictive and prohibit development; existing review process being expensive, cumbersome and vague; and difficulty in determining zoning boundaries and what is allowed in each zone:

- Patrick Conley, America First • Politicians Last, 11219 SW 16th
- Ken Paulsen, 5638 SW Haines
- Stuart Miller, 6049 SW Pendleton Court

The following presented written testimony (attached) noting specific concerns and objections to proposed amendments to the environmental zone regulations and procedures, and included specific recommendations for changes to the regulations.

- Martha Mitchell, Fishman Environmental Services, 434 NW Sixth, #304
- E.O. Burkholder, 3634 SW Logan
- Shoaib (Abe) Tareen, 6550 SW 63rd
- Jon Chandler, Common Ground: The Urban Land Council of Oregon/Home Builders Assoc., 15555 SW Bangy Road, Lake Oswego

The following presented written testimony in support of the Fanno Creek Plan and related amendments to Chapter 33.430, attached:

- Greg & Dorte Morse, 2737 SW English Court
- Molly O'Reilly, 1414 NW 53rd
- Lois & Eugene Anderson, 3910 SW Beaverton-Hillsdale Highway
- Thomas (Andy) Priebe, 10017 SW 52nd
- Sue Pflaum-Quartermann, 10330 SW 53rd
- Jane Sadler, 20189 NE Trunk Road, Dundee
- Matt DeHart, 3930 NE Wistaria Drive
- Carl Aldrich, 3439 NE Alameda
- Students from Oregon Episcopal School, 6300 SW Nicol Road
  - Suzanne Spencer, 1322 Stonehaven Drive, West Linn
  - Jennifer Lindquist
  - David Zocchi
  - Lindsey Blauer, 6390 SW Spruce, Beaverton
  - Mike Harwood, 1818 SE Ange Road, Vancouver, Washington
  - Rachael Baugher, 2809 SE 59th
  - Kari Lundgren, 2885 NW Luray Terrace
  - Lauren Fadel, 7485 SW Aloma Way, #6
  - Monica Millan, 24 Juarez, Lake Oswego
  - Meaghan Corwin, 11770 NW Damascus
  - Christine Hilderbrand, PO Box 490, Beavercreek
  - Gina Burnham, #3 Dover Way, Lake Oswego

The Commission discussed this issue and concurred that it was critical to take action to approve the Fanno Creek Plan in order to provide protection measures for the Fanno Creek Watershed, but were very concerned about issues raised in public testimony relative to site-specific concerns and relative to proposed amendments to Chapter 33.430. The Commission suggested that staff return on March 23 with responses to site-specific concerns. The Commission further suggested that the project to re-evaluate and amend the environmental zoning regulations should be a priority for the Bureau's work program.

Stacey noted that the last environmental project required to be undertaken by DLCD is the Skyline West area, which needs to be completed by June 30. After this project is complete, the work program and budget for FY 93/94 can devote a full time staff member to rewrite the entire environmental chapter. Stacey encouraged the Commission to approve the proposed Fanno Creek Plan and proposed amendments to Chapter 33.430 in order to protect remaining resources in the Fanno Creek Watershed. Stacey further noted that staff believes the proposed amendments to the regulations begin the streamlining process and represent a significant simplification and in some cases a de-regulation making them less strict and pro-development. He acknowledged that the regulations merit continuing review, and further acknowledged a commitment to allow for this continuing review. He further noted that there are pending land use applications waiting for action on these proposed amendments to allow a Type II review for extension of service lines across environmental protection zones.

The Commission took no action, continuing the hearing to March 23, 1993, requesting a response from staff relative to site-specific issues and relative to suggested changes to staff proposed amendments to Chapter 33.430. Public testimony was closed and action is anticipated on March 23.

## **2. Washington County Segment of Portland's Urban Services Boundary** (Staff: Jim Claypool)

Stacey noted that in February City Council heard a report from the Planning Bureau and the City Attorney on the status of the Westside Urban Services Boundary, noting that Beaverton had adopted an urban service boundary along the Multnomah/Washington County line. Portland filed an appeal with LUBA on the grounds that the two communities should reach agreement on a common boundary rather than one acting unilaterally to establish a boundary for the entire area. The City Attorney advised that Metro has statutory responsibility to resolve a dispute between two local governments over their planning responsibilities and that the clearest way to assure Metro's involvement and responsibility to resolve the issue is for Portland to adopt an urban services boundary to establish this indisputable difference. City Council agreed that the best way to proceed in this matter was to attempt to resolve by mediated dispute resolution and therefore initiated this matter for Planning Commission review. This is a technical consideration and further study needs to be undertaken to address the real concerns of area residents relative to the provision of services over the long term and relative to the structure of future government boundaries in the area. Metro has asked Beaverton, Portland, the Community Planning Organizations in the area and special service districts in the County to participate in a fact finding exercise to determine whether mediation could provide a basis for resolving the conflict. So far, everyone has agreed to

participate in fact finding. Portland is requesting mediation, but as yet, Beaverton has not agreed to mediation.

Kirkpatrick asked when the fact finding exercise is expected to be completed.

Stacey responded noting that the parties will be interviewed during March by the fact finder, Larry Epstein, a Portland attorney hired by Metro to facilitate the process. A joint meeting of all participants will hopefully be scheduled in early April.

Claypool presented a large scale, colored map showing existing boundaries for Portland, Gresham, Beaverton, Tigard and Hillsboro; identified areas that have been annexed to Beaverton in the last ten years; and identified the area currently proposed for annexation by the City of Portland. The map also identified County lines and school district boundaries. Claypool continued with an introduction and summary of the proposal and the purpose of urban service boundaries, as outlined in the Report to the Planning Commission, dated February 26, 1993, included in the agenda.

Larry Shaw, Senior Assistant Counsel for Metro, noted that Metro has received a grant from DLCD and that a contract has been issued to Larry Epstein, an experienced land use attorney and formerly a land use planner, who will be the case mediator. Several individual meetings have been scheduled with all interested parties, including representatives from CPO 1 and CPO 3 and a joint meeting will be scheduled during the first week of April. Metro believes this dispute will undoubtedly create more litigation, but to hopefully avoid this, Metro will encourage the parties to attempt to seek mediation of whatever parts of the dispute that can be settled by agreement through a mediation process. Shaw clarified that the joint meeting in early April is not mediation, but rather a report and facilitation of a meeting by the case assessor to determine whether some mediation of one or more of the issues is feasible or not. The parties will determine that themselves. In this situation, Metro does have a regional coordination role under state law but Metro has never had to exercise that role in history and therefore Metro is learning, along with the parties, as this dispute between two comprehensive plans in the metro region unfolds. Shaw further noted that DLCD's role is two-fold in this case. They administer the grant money for the mediation project and they are also a party to the dispute. Their position is that both parties have to agree in order to comply with State Planning Goal 2.

Kirkpatrick asked if the fact finding exercise proceeds to mediation if representatives from the CPOs will be represented at the mediation table.

Shaw responded noting that this issue will be decided by all the parties, that being the purpose of the joint meeting. He further noted that it depends on the issue being discussed. The case assessor will facilitate and help the parties come to a determination on issues and parties to be involved.

The following presented oral testimony in opposition to the proposed urban services boundary and in opposition to annexation by the City of Portland, some with a preference for annexation to Beaverton and some with a preference to remain in unincorporated Washington County. Concerns and objections raised included a reduction in the level of police and fire services and at an increased cost; an increased cost for schools and park facilities, a decrease in political influence, an increased responsibility for Portland bond-funded projects; a 20 percent property tax rate increase; a mid-day hearing when most area residents cannot attend; and a lack of consideration for views of area residents. Most testimony also supported Oregon House Bill 2534, introduced by Representative Ted Calouri, which requires a vote by affected citizens before they can be annexed by a city.

- Charles Waltemath, 7130 SW Sylvan Court (Presented written testimony and petition with 31 signatures, attached)
- Kenneth Wolfgang, 7200 SW Sylvan Court (Presented written testimony and petition with 127 signatures, attached)
- Maurine Warneking, representing CPO 7, 4900 NW 140th (Presented written testimony and petition with 43 signatures and also presented personal written testimony, attached)
- James Thrower, 1581 NW Jennifer Place
- Patricia Haim, 10720 NW Lost Park Drive
- Rob Lewis, Cedar Mill School, 765 NW 114th, Cedar Mill
- Donald Benz, 2400 SW Benz Farm Court (Presented written testimony, attached)
- Leland Ascher, 9342 SW Washington

- David Avery, 10577 NW Lost Park Drive
- Jim McElhinny, Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District, 15707 SW Walker Road  
(Presented written testimony, attached)
- Peggy Lynch, CPO 3 & personal, 3840 SW 102nd, Beaverton
- Robert Noe, 2450 NW 119th
- Carol Gearin, Chair of Annexation Study Committee for CPO 1, 2420 NW 119th  
(Presented written testimony, attached)
- Linda Davis, Director of Community Development Department, City of Beaverton, PO Box 4755, Beaverton (Presented written testimony, attached, and also presented Beaverton's submittal to LUBA relative to the current appeal, LUBA No. 92-225. This record can be found in the case file.)
- Pam Bierly, Beaverton City Attorney representing Councilor Leslie Like, PO Box 4755, Beaverton (Presented written testimony, attached)
- Irma Trommlitz, 515 NW 112th
- John Schade, 4850 NW 140th
- Roger Gray, 11455 NW Kearney
- Gail Parker, CPO 1, 1950 NW 102nd (Presented written testimony, attached)

Deanna Mueller-Crispin, 8570 SW White Pine Lane, presented oral testimony in support of the urban services boundary noting that Portland is the leading agency in supporting land use and development policies that make sense as the area grows and incorporates more people. She further noted that area residents enjoy Portland services but do not currently pay for them. She supports a study of this urban service boundary being extended and feels that the provision of services can be provided more efficiently by Portland.

Jeffrey Johnson, Tualatin Valley Fire and Rescue, 20665 SW Blanton, Aloha presented oral testimony neither in opposition nor in support of the proposed urban service boundary but explained that existing customers appear to be satisfied with the existing level and cost of fire and medical services and that we need to listen to area residents. He further noted that based on other experiences, service costs would double if Portland annexed this area, but because Beaverton is part of the coordinated agreement, costs would not change if Beaverton annexed this area.

Written testimony in opposition to the proposed urban services boundary and annexation to the City of Portland, attached:

- Joseph & Kathleen Carol Burger, 10475 NW Lost Park Drive
- Ken & Joann Cooper, 715 NW 114th
- Jeffrey McKie, Cedar Mill School Parent/Teacher Club, 11633 NW Vallevue Court
- Harry Rubin, 12005 NW Kathleen Drive
- David Shearer, 2175 NW 153rd Place, Beaverton
- Linda Jarrell, 1920 NW 110th Court
- Richard Bogue, 9429 SW Washington
- Lawrence Bogar, 7233 SW Canyon Drive
- MaryAnne Johnson, 555 NW 112th
- Marie Hines, 10485 NW Lee Court
- Margaret & LeRoy Hough, 10640 NW Lost Park Drive
- Loulie Gray, 11455 NW Kearney

- Richard & Katherine Abel, 1730 SW 90th
- Robert Werner, 5475 NW 137th
- Kurt & Juanita Urban, 2165 NW 107th
- Ann Kemnitzer, 13570 NW Lakeview Drive
- John & Delores Hutcheon, 14025 NW Laidlaw Road
- Brooke Frederick, 13835 NW Lakeview Drive
- Lynne & Gary Hubka, 3305 NW Bauerwoods Drive
- Doc Williams, 5675 NW 137th
- Kenneth Zinsli, St. Vincent Hospital & Medical Center, 9205 SW Barnes Road
- Susanne Carlson, 1975 NW 113th
- Brian & Raeann Jackson, 13640 NW Laidlaw Road
- C.K. Higdon, 4950 NW 140th
- Barbara Harold, 9080 NW Kearney
- Marcia Howard, 12600 NW Laidlaw Road
- Linda Polich, 2450 NW 119th
- Jon & Betty Anderson, 75 NW 99th
- Leigh & Elizabeth Clinton, 2300 NW 119th
- Lee & Joan Slaughter, 2240 NW 119th
- Victor Cummings & Cathie Clifford, 2340 NW 119th
- Petition with 150 signatures

Written testimony in support of the proposed urban services boundary and annexation to the City of Portland, attached:

- Roger Ellingson, 8515 SW Barnes Road
- Julie Draper, 2065 SW 75th
- Jim Pomeroy, 2100 SW 75th

Written testimony neither in opposition to nor in support of the proposed urban services boundary and annexation to the City of Portland, attached:

- Brent Curtis, Planning Manager, Washington County Dept of Land Use and Transportation, 155 N. First, Hillsboro
- Linda Gray, Washington Co. Committee for Citizen Involvement no address
- Kim McQuiston, Oak Hills Homeowners Assoc., 15630 NW Barkton, Beaverton

In response to a question from the Commission, regarding the option for the Planning Commission to adjourn to executive session to resolve this issue, Stacey reported that the City Attorney, Jeff Rogers, advises that while there may arguably be a basis for going into executive session in order to receive advice of counsel, he recommends that business be conducted in open session because there is no counsel available now. He further advises against the Commission discussing in great detail the legal basis for this action and the various implications of how it impacts the City's existing appeal or potential legal challenges of this action.

Van Dyk asked why Portland is continuing to pursue this if it appears that there is no interest for provision of services, now or in the future, by the City of Portland by an overwhelming majority of the residents.

Stacey responded noting that he does not agree with the premise that there is overwhelming opposition. Beaverton's survey of public opinion shows that there is a remarkably divided opinion. Many say that there isn't a need for urban services beyond what is provided to the area now. This situation is bound to change. This area, according to Metro's projections, faces a 64 percent population increase over the next 20 years. That increase will put an enormous strain on the transportation and community planning systems and the livability of that community. Portland has several programs that address these issues that Washington County currently does not offer, including staffing resources for neighborhood district coalition boards, a neighborhood traffic management program, a bike program that offers alternatives to the automobile, a pedestrian program looking at future extensions of the sidewalk network and a community planning program to address land use and transportation issues and provide a vision for the future development of these neighborhoods. Also included in our planning processes, are measures such as an environmental zoning program. These will be important service needs for these communities as they continue to grow at a faster rate in the future. Area residents may still not choose Portland, but they should be able to make that choice when it is time. If Beaverton remains the only choice to them and Portland is excluded from offering services in that area, these residents will not have that choice. The urban service boundary is established with the ultimate intention of proposing annexation to the residents if they accept city services through annexation. Mediation needs to look at all the issues and needs of a growing area and figure out what the best way is over time to provide the services that will be needed in the area. It may even be a shared responsibility.

The Commission discussed this issue and concurred that the proposed urban service boundary line as drawn by staff may not be the best or most appropriate place to draw the line, but understood that approval of a line is necessary to facilitate mediation. The Commission felt it important to acknowledge the overwhelming testimony in opposition to the proposed urban service boundary from area residents, and felt that it was very important that the neighborhoods be involved and represented at the mediation table. Regional growth issues are also a major concern.

**Motion:** The Commission voted 7 to 1 to adopt the urban service boundary as proposed by staff in order to facilitate mediation and further expressed the importance of neighborhood representation at the mediation table. (Michaelson abstained because he did not hear the public testimony; Fong absent.)

### **3. North-South Transit Corridor Study** (Staff: Steve Dotterer and Stuart Gwin, PDOT)

Dotterer presented a memo to the Commission, dated February 28, 1993, outlining the project status and staff recommendations (attached). Dotterer summarized the recommendations from staff and from the Regional Technical Advisory Committee, i.e., that the north and south corridors be done concurrently; that the Milwaukie corridor be selected as the appropriate southern corridor into Clackamas County; that the I-5 north corridor be selected as the appropriate corridor into Vancouver and beyond; and that the portion of the line from

Gateway to the airport be kept in the second phase as a possible light rail line but not as a priority corridor.

The following public testimony was received:

- Bob Elliot, representing Southeast Uplift Land Use Committee, 2436 SE Tamarack, presented written testimony from Ellen Ryker expressing disappointment that southeast neighborhood associations were not notified of the Planning Commission hearing (attached).
- Bob Elliot, representing Hosford Abernethy Neighborhood Association, 2436 SE Tamarack, noted that the association recommends a preference for the Milwaukie/I-5 alignment, and supports the recommendations in the Metro report.
- Steve Rogers, Eliot Neighborhood Association, 533 NE Brazee, noted that the board supports the Milwaukie/I-5 corridor, primarily because of the proximity to the new Blazer Arena, Memorial Coliseum and the Convention Center.

Written testimony received supporting the I-205 Corridor (attached):

- Jim Cleary, Southeast Uplift, representing Dan Small, Chair of the Outer Southeast Coalition of Neighborhoods, 3534 SE Main

There was some Commission discussion regarding the notification of the Planning Commission hearing. Commission members were disappointed that southeast residents were not notified and did not have an opportunity to testify. Dotterrer noted that there has been some confusion because some of the hearings have been briefings and some have requested action from the hearing body. Dotterrer apologized and noted that there will be several more meetings/hearings with each City Council, JPACT, Metro Planning Committee and Metro Council.

Michaelson asked if the Outer Southeast Study was far enough along to have discussed light rail and transportation issues.

Stacey responded noting that light rail and station area planning are appropriate potential subjects for discussion and recommendations in the Outer Southeast Community Plan. Council and Metro's decision about future development in the I-205 corridor will influence how much work goes into the plan. If there is direction from Council and Metro that planning should continue for the I-205 corridor and that the alignment should be retained as a future priority for development, we will identify land use designations for this development.

**Motion:** The Commission voted 8 to 0 to approve the staff recommendations outlined in the February 28, 1993, memo to the Commission, requesting that staff notify all neighborhood associations of the Portland City Council hearing and other public hearings. (Fong absent)

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Birth  
Secretary  
April 5, 1993