



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**

**OFFICIAL  
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **9TH DAY OF JULY, 2008** AT 9:30 A.M.

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

Commissioner Adams and Leonard arrived at 9:38 a.m.

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

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

<b>COMMUNICATIONS</b>		<b>Disposition:</b>
<b>957</b>	Request of Lee Pate to address Council regarding the sit/lie camping law (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>958</b>	Request of Lee Iacuzzi to address Council regarding gender discrimination (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>959</b>	Request of Douglas Peterson to address Council regarding Petersons lease at 10th and Yamhill Garage (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>960</b>	Request of David G. Gwyther to address Council regarding Petersons Store (Communication)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>
<b>TIME CERTAINS</b>		
<b>961</b>	<b>TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM</b> – Willamette River Combined Sewer Overflow program update (Presentation introduced by Commissioner Adams)	<b>PLACED ON FILE</b>

**July 9, 2008**

<p><b>962</b>    <b>TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM</b> – Adopt the Sgt. Jerome Sears United States Army Reserve Center Reuse Master Plan and recommend redevelopment of the site for a mixed-income, rental and ownership housing development that includes permanent supportive housing for homeless single adults and homeless families with special needs and designate Community Partners for Affordable Housing as the preferred developer of the Sears site (Previous Agenda 877; Resolution introduced by Mayor Potter and Commissioner Fish)</p> <p><b>Motion to amend the resolution to correct data on homelessness and low-income housing:</b> Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman. (Y-5)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p align="center"><b>36617</b> AS AMENDED</p>	
<p align="center"><b>CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</b></p> <p align="center"><b>Mayor Tom Potter</b></p> <p align="center"><b>City Attorney</b></p> <p><b>963</b>    Authorize the City Attorney to file an amicus brief in Portland General Electric Company, et al. v. Kenneth Hick et al., CA A136650 (Resolution)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>		<p align="center"><b>36616</b></p>
<p><b>*964</b>    Amend contract with Beery Elsner Hammond LLP for outside legal counsel (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 36468)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p align="center"><b>182018</b></p>	
<p align="center"><b>Office of Management and Finance – Financial Services/Business Operations</b></p> <p><b>965</b>    Amend Intergovernmental Agreement between Portland Development Commission and the Office of Management and Finance for the management and operation of the Station Place Garage (Second Reading Agenda 924; amend Contract)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>		<p align="center"><b>182019</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>Office of Management and Finance – Human Resources</b></p> <p><b>*966</b>    Adjust four pay ranges in the pay plan for Nonrepresented classifications (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>		<p align="center"><b>182020</b></p>
<p><b>967</b>    Change the salary range of the Nonrepresented classification of Housing and Community Development Operations Manager (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 16, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>	
<p><b>968</b>    Change the salary range of the Nonrepresented classification of Assistant Human Resources Director (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 16, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>	
<p><b>969</b>    Establish an interim compensation rate for the existing classification of Claims Technician which has been substantially revised (Second Reading Agenda 925)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p align="center"><b>182021</b></p>	

July 9, 2008

**Commissioner Sam Adams**

**Bureau of Environmental Services**

<p><b>*970</b> Accept subrecipient grant award from the Johnson Creek Watershed Council originating from the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board in the amount of \$128,477 for Errol Creek Confluence Restoration (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182022</b></p>
<p><b>971</b> Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University to plan and implement stewardship activities (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 16, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>972</b> Authorize contracts to supply engineering, project management and project support personnel for Bureau of Environmental Services construction projects (Ordinance)</p>	<p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 16, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>973</b> Authorize grant agreement between City of Portland and GroundWork Portland for brownfield identification and remediation for use as parks, open space and community space (Second Reading Agenda 934) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182023</b></p>
<p><b>Office of Transportation</b></p>	
<p><b>*974</b> Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland Development Commission to provide Urban Renewal Funds for completion of the construction of the N Killingsworth Street Phase 1B Project (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 53054) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182024</b></p>
<p><b>*975</b> Amend Lease Agreement with Ariste Lofts, LLC to reflect change in ownership to 862 S Catalina Investments to rent space under the Burnside Bridge in the vicinity of SE 3rd Ave and E Burnside St (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 179586) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182025</b></p>
<p><b>*976</b> Authorize contract with Bicycle Transportation Alliance for \$272,500 for education and encouragement services through the City of Portland Safer Routes to School program (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182026</b></p>
<p><b>*977</b> Grant revocable permit to Willamette Week to close NW Quimby St between 22nd Ave and 23rd Ave on July 23, 2008 (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182027</b></p>
<p><b>*978</b> Grant revocable permit to TriMet to close SW 5th Ave and SW 6th Ave between SW Washington St and SW Taylor St on July 19, 2008 (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182028</b></p>

**July 9, 2008**

<p><b>979</b> Grant revocable permit to Brewery Blocks Owners Association to close NW Couch St between 11th Ave and 12th Ave on August 13, 2008 (Second Reading Agenda 938)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182029</b></p>
<p><b>980</b> Grant revocable permit to Jake's Famous Crawfish to close SW Stark St between SW 12th Ave and SW 13th Ave on August 25, 2008 (Second Reading Agenda 939)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182030</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Nick Fish</b></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Bureau of Housing and Community Development</b></p>	
<p><b>*981</b> Authorize 21 subrecipient contracts totaling \$3,532,430 to provide services to further the goals of the Bureau of Housing and Community Development through its Economic Opportunity Initiative and provide for payment (Ordinance)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182031</b></p>
<p><b>*982</b> Authorize subrecipient contracts totaling \$10,807,150 to provide services to further the goals of the Bureau of Housing and Community Development through the 10-year Plan to End Homelessness and provide for payment (Ordinance)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182032</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Fire and Rescue</b></p>	
<p><b>983</b> Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Tualatin Valley Fire &amp; Rescue for occupational health nurse services (Second Reading Agenda 941)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182033</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>REGULAR AGENDA</b></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Mayor Tom Potter</b></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Office of Emergency Management</b></p>	
<p><b>*984</b> Authorize grant application to U.S. Department of Homeland Security for \$1,000,000 for construction or renovation of State, local or tribal government principal Emergency Operations Center (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Fish absent)</p>	<p><b>182034</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Office of Management and Finance – Business Operations</b></p>	
<p><b>*985</b> Pay claims of Debra J Darco (Ordinance)  (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>182037</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Office of Management and Finance – Human Resources</b></p>	
<p><b>*986</b> Create a new Senior Financial Analyst position in the Bureau of Human Resources (Ordinance)  (Y-4; Fish absent)</p>	<p><b>182035</b></p>

July 9, 2008

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Sam Adams</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Office of Transportation</b></p> <p><b>987</b> Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the State of Oregon to accept a \$75,000 Transportation Growth Management grant to partially fund an update of Portland Bicycle Master Plan (Second Reading Agenda 952)  (Y-4; Fish absent)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>182036</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Commissioner Randy Leonard</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Water Bureau</b></p> <p><b>988</b> Amend Portland Water Bureau Customer Service Administrative Rules (Resolution)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTINUED TO JULY 16, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>989</b> Amend Code to clarify duties and responsibilities of the Portland Water Bureau (Ordinance; amend Titles 3, 17 and 21)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 16, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>990</b> Repeal ordinances that gave authority to the Portland Water Bureau Chief Engineer to approve, accept, release or dispose of easements and other real property interests (Ordinance; repeal Ordinance Nos. 172920 and 172921)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 16, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>City Auditor Gary Blackmer</b></p> <p><b>991</b> Change filing deadline date for documents to be included on the Council Agenda (Ordinance; amend Code Section 3.02.030)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>REFERRED TO OFFICE OF THE CITY AUDITOR</b></p>

At 12:17 p.m., Council recessed.

**July 9, 2008**

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND,  
OREGON WAS HELD THIS **9TH DAY OF JULY, 2008** AT 2:00 P.M.

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

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

<p><b>992</b>    <b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Support a Replacement Bridge Crossing with Light Rail Transit as the Locally Preferred Alternative for the Columbia River Crossing Project (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Adams)</p> <p><b>Motion to correct clerical errors and add Exhibit A, PR1 bullet to investigate potential for tolling I-205:</b> Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-5)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p><b>Disposition:</b></p> <p><b>36618</b> AS AMENDED</p>
---	---

At 6:28 p.m., Council recessed.

July 10, 2008

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **10TH DAY OF JULY, 2008** AT 2:00 P.M.

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

Mayor Potter was excused to leave at 2:45 p.m.

At 2:45 p.m., Council recessed.  
At 3:05 p.m., Council reconvened.

Commissioner Adams arrived at 3:12 p.m.

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

<p><b>993</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM</b> – Amend Portland Comprehensive Plan map and Zoning Map for properties along and adjacent to Killingsworth St between NE 14<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> Aves (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter)</p> <p><b>Motion to remove “amend Title 33” from title:</b> Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-5)</p>	<p><b>Disposition:</b></p> <p><b>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED JULY 16, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</b></p>
<p><b>994</b> <b>TIME CERTAIN: 3:00 PM</b> – Declare intent to terminate local improvement district formation proceedings to construct street improvements in the SW 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Buddington Street Local Improvement District (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Adams; C-10028)</p> <p><b>Motion to terminate the 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Buddington Street Local Improvement District:</b> Moved by Commissioner Adams and seconded by Commissioner Fish. (Y-4; Potter absent)</p> <p>(Y-4; Potter absent)</p>	<p><b>36619</b></p>
<p><b>995</b> Declare intent to initiate local improvement district formation proceedings to construct street improvements in the SW 53rd Avenue and Buddington Street Local Improvement District (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Adams; C-10029)</p> <p>(N-4; Potter absent)</p>	<p><b>FAILED TO PASS</b></p>

At 4:21 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER  
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love  
Clerk of the Council

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

July 9, 2008

## 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.

**JULY 9, 2008            9:30 AM**

**Potter:** Ann is from madrid and this is her first trip to the united states. Both are staying with host families. They're both interested in becoming lawyers and this morning, they're job shadowing with deputy district attorney shane, and they thought they'd like to see city council in action and I have a hunch you're going to see some interesting action this morning.

**Fish:** Mayor, may I add a note to that?

**Potter:** Please.

**Fish:** I'd like to welcome you on behalf of my family. My wife's family hails from cordova and my mother-in-law is maria carmen gomez, but we travel to spain every year to see family and we hope you'll swing by the office later so we can visit. [gavel pounded]

**Potter:** The council is open. Could you 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 lobbyist entity they're authorized to represent. Also, the folks holding the signs, you can hold them over your head -- don't obstruct the folks behind you. Please read the first communication.

**Item 957.**

**Potter:** Call the next name.

**Item 958.**

**Potter:** Please read the next.

**Item 959.**

**Potter:** Come forward, mr. Peterson.

**Douglas Peterson:** Thank you for allowing me to appear before you.

**Potter:** Mr. Peterson, you have three minutes, and please state your name for the record.

**Peterson:** Douglas peterson. Thank you very much. I own three convenience stores, 24-hour stores in downtown Portland. I've been in business for 23 years. Last year our sales were \$2,800,000, and we had lost our lease at our morrison store and I feel very aggrieved, I feel devastated, I feel I am a good merchant, I think there are perspectives out there that are not true -- perceptions and certainly not my customers' perceptions. I've had them sign petitions and I have over 2600 signatures, many with comments which I would urge you to read. Very interesting comments. Landmark location, an asset to the community. Staple. Needed, a needed institution. Part of Portland, part of the community, vital to liveable downtown. Resource to the neighborhood. Downtown needs 24-hour convenience stores. When people live in apartments with no cars. Only 24-hour store in the neighborhood. Feel safer waiting for max because there's a man's store there. It's on my commute. Close to school. Good employees. Friendly employees. Need for small business. And it goes on and on. And the perception is that i'm causing the homeless problem and the riff-raff in the neighborhood. And frankly, if you go, you see them everywhere, where there's high-traffic pattern. And there's a max stop at the end of the fairless square. Every third train is a yellow train, people getting off the train and people waiting for the train. My stores are busy.



**July 9, 2008**

Customers lined up, usually one after the other all day long and evening long and being checked out and it's a good place to panhandle. And it's difficult for business owners to control people on the street, which is perceived as public property. And you good to mcdonald's, rite-aid, starbucks, pioneer square. Anyplace there's traffic and you find these people. And I feel i'm not the attracter, it's the general traffic. There's a study that was done for tri-met and the study was of the new bus mall and what they expected to have there. Encourage property owners to open more urban-centric enterprises. The same study for tri-met said the need for vendor carts, sidewalk cafés, as well as 24-hour convenience stores on the new mall. I have facts and figures here. There's a packet that i'll share. And an interesting thing is lottery. The lottery, 18% of the lottery sales is what actually goes to various government issues and i've contributed over the last years, this is through the lottery mission. \$80,887 has gone -- 7 and a half to watershed and that's what my stores have contributed for the lottery and that 18% share is distributed.

**Potter:** Your time is up, sir.

**Peterson:** Thank you very much. I appreciate any help I can have.

**Potter:** If you wish to leave the signatures, please leave them in the council clerk.

**Peterson:** Thank you. And can I leave the packet for each of you?

**Potter:** Yes.

**Peterson:** Thank you very much.

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

**Potter:** Please read the next name.

**Item 960.**

**Potter:** Please come forward.

**David G. Gwyther:** I'm a lobbyist for peterson's --

**Potter:** Can you sit down, sir? Thank you.

**Gwyther:** I would like to concede two of my minutes if possible, to mr. Peterson.

**Potter:** No.

**Gwyther:** Ok. I was called -- I came into the newspaper stand, i've been living in downtown Portland for 25 years. I read a lot of newspapers and a noticed that he had a problem, and I thought I might be able to help him in interacting with city government and various agencies. So I came in and presented myself. I used to own a store in downtown eugene. It was urban removal as we called it in those days. They left an hole in the area where the building was for close to 15 years that was fenced in and became filled with water. That was not a good example of good urban planning. Now, I know that the city has plans to renew that whole district and to upgrade the parking structure. Those plans can be implemented once you have the funds. Mr. Peterson would like to work with the city and various agencies to make those plans come true. There's things we can do with a parking garage in terms of getting in and out of the parking garage. The architecture of the parking garage itself lends itself to the kinds of activities that some see as being destructive to the downtown. And the stairwells, etc., that's something that mr. Peterson doesn't have a lot of control over. We're looking into getting additional security at night. The security -- there's a tremendous amount because the security guards drink coffee, stop in, we have black and white basically parked outside during the max hours. Looking at a 12 to 5 gap there. Possibly a drive-by security would work. He's installed a video monitoring system. That has worked in other industries, like the cab industry. So that those who are misbelieving know that they're on video camera and can possibly self-correct. I know there are issues involved in downtown. Downtown is probably going through the biggest rebuilding program in the history of Portland. Going from hotels that used to rent for \$600 -- \$60 a night to hotels renting for \$400 a night. That new one on top of the macy's is going to be upscale. And I know that the council wants to encourage that, but you have to have the convenience store that is available to people who work odd hours. Myself, I had a paper route when I was young. I get up 5:00 in the morning and sometimes I want to read the

**July 9, 2008**

paper. I don't have to wait for starbucks to open up. It's a convenience for people in downtown Portland. We'd ask for a six-month extension.

**Potter:** Thank you. That's it?

**Gwyther:** That's it.

**Potter:** You're excused. Is that all of the communications?

**Moore-Love:** That's all.

**Potter:** Ok. Move to the consent agenda. Ask does any commissioner wish to pull any item from the consent agenda? Before we move to the consent agenda, there's one other individual who wishes to make a statement. Mr. Robert king, could you please come forward. President of the Portland police association.

**Robert King, Bureau of Police:** I'm here to testify to -- give you information about some of the conditions in the Portland police bureau. I'm here to give you the lay of the land as to how things stand with the police officers. I've been a police officer for 19 years in Portland and I can tell that you i've never seen morale as low as it is at present. It's a combination of several things gotten us to this stage. First, it's staffing. Cities of Portland's size have on average 2.5 officers. In Portland, we're well below that. We need to hire officers to approach appropriate staffing levels. When we try to follow a Portland policing model, that's officer-intensive. We're out there trying to do too much with too few officers. We have 380 officers today assigned to routine street duties and approaching a population of 600,000. Our officers are tired and worn out. The second issue is pay. Every officer working for you today knows about the recent seattle police settlement. That has seattle police officers receiving a raise of at least 25% over a four-year contract. That will put them at \$64,000. And its top pay at \$90,000. Portland will be more than \$20,000 below these numbers. There's several wage settlements in the country along the same range. Long beach, 24%. San francisco, honolulu, 24% and all over four years. Phoenix a 13% raise over two years. Until recently, Portland was the highest paid but this is no longer true. We can't recruit -- we've lowered our educational requirements and facing a recruiting crisis in the near future. Lastly, we have serious working conditions that have arisen. We learned two weeks ago that the bureau was adopting what it called optimal staffing. Which translated into denying -- denying officers vacations. Already limited that they can take off during the summer. The police bureau didn't involve us in the discussions and we only found out about it when the officers started to calling at the union. Things like sleep deprivation. Fixing the court's scheduling system. Dealing with the parking problem for central precinct. All of that to say that we need your support. We know that you're working on the vacation issue and we appreciate your efforts on that front. We hope that signals a new willingness to listen, care and act to help us support the critical police services that Portlanders deserve. Your officers are committed and brave and professional and they need your support. There are problems in the police bureau and I hope you work with me to solve some of them. Thank you.

**Potter:** Back to the consent agenda. Do any commissioners wish to pull any items from the consent agenda? Any member of this audience wish to pull any particular item from this consent agenda? Please call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Please read the 9:30 time certain.

**Item 961.**

**Potter:** Commissioner Adams.

**Adams:** Thank you. We -- as the initiation of my tenure as commissioner of environmental services, we committed ourselves to provide regular updates to the city council concerning the \$1.4 billion project to prevent sewer overflows into the willamette river and today we're going to be getting just such an update. So we will begin with b.e.s. Director.

**July 9, 2008**

**Dean Marriott, Director, Bureau of Environmental Services:** Thank you very much. Good morning. I'm dean marriott, environmental services director. With me is paul, our chief engineer in charge of the tunnel project. As the commissioner indicated we've committed to come before you at least twice a year to give you an update on the status of cleaning up the willamette and today is one of those events. Just to refresh your recollection on the time line, we began this odyssey back in 1991 and this is when we signed a 20-year agreement to commit the city to spend the resources and do the work necessary to finish the job of cleaning up the willamette river and the columbia slough. And we are approaching the conclusion it. And a lot of people are interested in how we stack up with how the other cities in the country are doing. This is a representative sample. There are literally hundreds wrestling with how to proceed. There are over 800 cities dealing with this problem. One of the nice things about this chart, as you can see, we'll be finished well before most of the major cities of the country dealing with it. Just to refresh your recollection again on the three legs of the stool that we have embarked on, the first is the cornerstone project. That's taking stormwater out of the combined system. After all, i'm sure as you recall, it's not that we don't have adequate sewage treatment capacity for handling the normal waste flow. It's the rain that fills up the collection system that's the problem. We embarked on getting that out as we could. Most of them are finished but the did you know spout disconnection continues. The other leg is the columbia slough projects. Those were done early and you can recall commissioner Saltzman walking in the tunnel. The columbia slough has been essentially free from combined sewer overflows since about the year 2000 so we've seen a dramatic improvement. And the third leg is the willamette river projects. You're familiar with the completion of the west side tunnel project and we're here to report to you on the progress on the east side project which is the last major element of the program. The next -- next you'll see the slide which we like to show which shows the progress on the removal and treatment of combined sewer overflows. If you go back to the 1970s, the city discharged about 10 billion-gallons a year. When we signed an order back in the early '90s, we had cut that to 6 billion and since then, it has been down steady. Made reductions since the early '90s, about 2 billion and that will be controlled when the east side tunnel comes online. We'll still have discharge under the heavy rain events and that's permissible under federal and state guidelines. We started with 55 combined sewer overflows outfalls into the slough and river. And the first thing we did -- slough. December of 2000, we completed. That seven of the outfalls on the river were taken out of service in december of 2001. The west side tunnel involved the control of 16 outfalls on the west side of the willamette. Those were controlled by december. Right on schedule. And the final leg of this marathon is slated for december of 2011 which will mark the control of the remaining 19 outfalls to the willamette. Now i'm going to turn it over to paul, who will give you specifics about the east side tunnel operation.

**Paul Gribbon, Bureau of Environmental Services:** Good morning. I'm paul, chief engineer in charge of the tunnel program. That gives an overview of the route of the tunnel. The part in red is the part completed. Overall, six miles long. And we're approaching the halfway point by october. The project status, the tunnel boring machine is across the street from the rose garden. It's broken out of the steel bridge shaft and on its way. The next stop will be the river street shaft. Which will be october and then go on. Currently, the contract itself, we're beyond 50% complete. We're two months ahead of schedule and the production of the tunnel, it continues to exceed our expectations. We had to add additional segment, manufacturing for the tunnel lining itself to keep up with the progress of the t.b.m. We did have a serious injury in the tunnel about a month back. There was immediate work stoppage. Changes were made to the contractor's procedure. The worker is back on modified duty and will be back to regular duty as soon as possible. This is our current project expenditure. The dashed blue line is the cumulative cost flow curve that we anticipated back in 2006. The green line is our actual cost to date. And you can see we're trending under where we originally expected to be as far as cost is concerned. The orange is looking from today forward to

**July 9, 2008**

the end where we expect to be along the route. So we do expect, if everything holds, that we're going to come in under the original contract amount. As far as local business participation. In the first 27 months, there's 170 local subcontracts awarded. So far, we've contracted over \$23 million in m.w.s.b. contracts. The contract's goal was 26 so now they're way ahead of where they expected and living up to their commitment for us. We've got over \$13 million in other local subcontracts. Risk management will continue to be an important part of what we do. We meet quarterly to review. As we pass major milestones, including mining under the banfield interchange, we cross them off. We add new ones as we see them coming. And there will be an outside financial audit soon. The procurement process is about to begin. We still have a lot of work to do. Keeping all of the businesses in operation. It's one of our central focuses. Unfortunately, we like to be able to slowly come to the end, but it's not going to happen. We have several other projects that have to come in about the same time. Additional work at the pump station. All have to come together before we can tie in the outfalls on the east side. All of those are currently on schedule but we do have a fair amount of work to do. And we have one more conduit, the balch conduit. It's continual communication with the central east side businesses and meetings and starting to implement our community benefit project lists. With that, that's all we have, but we do have a report from the east side review committee from bill martin, who is the acting chair.

**Marriott:** You can take questions if you would like or we can come back after you hear from bill.

**Adams:** Come back after we hear from bill.

**Marriott:** Ok.

**Bill Martinak:** Good morning, mr. Mayor and commissioners. I'm bill martin. I'm the acting chairman. I've been before you before with two of the three previous report to the council and due to the retirement of mr. Wilson, i've been asked to follow on and serve as the chair. So he set high standards for me to follow so I feel like a small college player trying to take over for michael jordan. I'll do the best I can. Bear with me. The review committee was initially appointed by the council in 2006 and our charges at that time were to meet on at least a quarterly basis, which we've exceeded that. We're basically meeting on about a bimonthly schedule. We're set to monitor the environmental services efforts on the project and the relationship with the general contractor, k.b.b. Also, we were asked to provide a forum for discussion of any pertinent issues that came up as the project progressed. And also to communicate with the city council on a regularly scheduled biyearly -- every six months, we're before you. To date, we have held 17 meetings, and we have a very dedicated group of committee members that extend time at each meeting reviewing the reports that are put out on a monthly basis by the general contractor. And so we spend quite a bit of time reviewing all of the various aspects of the project. Work progress, since our last report, which was in october of 2007, the project has continued along the critical path, which is the main shaft construction. Last summer, there was an impact occurrence that happened with a seal failure and that has been mitigated and the schedule has recovered since then and actually, as paul said, has become slightly ahead of schedule. At this point in time, the project is approximately 48% complete, and is scheduled at this point in time to finish approximately eight weeks ahead of schedule. So the project is proceeding in a timely manner. Also, mentioned there was an accident in the tunnel, and so we discussed that at our last meeting and the steps that have been taken to provide some remedial training for the crews down there to address the causes of that injury. And also to retrain some of the workers down there to prevent any accidents in the future. Also, the contractor has an extremely dedicated quality control program in place, which is tracking what's being built and also tracking the segment construction that will be used in the rest of the tunnel and everything there points that quality is a very, very high aspect of what the contractor is providing for the city of Portland. Also, as paul mentioned, the subcontracting and diversity requirements are being met well ahead of schedule on the contract. There have been over \$23 million in subcontracts

**July 9, 2008**

that have been awarded to local small my north and emerging businesses and -- minority businesses and the training program with the 20% goal is being exceeded at this time. So the general contractor's doing an outstanding job of meeting those requirements for the city of Portland. At this time, approximately 85 -- excuse me, \$185 million of the budget has been extended and with the graph that was presented earlier, shows that it's very close tracking to the original budget for the project. The overall general impression from the committee is that the project is exceeding or -- succeeding in all of its expect aces, moving very smoothly with very small impact outside of what was planned to be a major impact to the east side area of Portland. And that the contractors working diligently with the east side neighborhoods to make sure that any impacts to the neighboring businesses and the traveling public there are kept to an absolute minimum. And from what we're seeing as a committee, they're doing an outstanding job for the complexity of the project. And the area that they have to work in over there. All of the area shaft sites are -- have extremely small footprints, and in order to get their work done there, they've done an extremely good job of scheduling and making sure that there is a -- as small of an impact as possible on the east side neighborhoods they're working in. We will continue to meet. We will probably schedule another tour of the project later this summer or early in the fall to track the progress and then also be scheduling to come back before you again in about another six months with another updated report to you of the committee's actions and activities.

**Adams:** I want to thank you for volunteering your time to this effort of oversight. Citizen independent oversight of the project. I know it takes a lot of time and effort and concentration away from you and your fellow committees' livelihoods and families. So thank you. I appreciate that. Just to summarize, the project is meeting or exceeding its goals of success laid out for it, with the exception of the injury, and we are on time and ahead of budget.

**Martinak:** That's correct, at this time. So if I --

**Adams:** Knock on wood.

**Martinak:** The contractor and the bureau of environmental services together are performing admirably on the project. We'd also hope that you will take some time to recognize the contribution that mr. Wilson has made up to this point. Basically, he -- with his organizational skills and just his drive to make sure that the committee has laid a good foundation for the committee, made sure that we're well organized, that our meetings have run smoothly and just would like to ask you to commend tuck for all of the time and effort he's put in. He put in a lot of time above and beyond just the meetings in organizing our reports and making sure that the meetings were scheduled and held, so he's just done an outstanding job, and I have been privileged to serve with tuck and hope that I can carry on the work of the committee.

**Adams:** I'm sure you will. Thanks, bill.

**Potter:** Thank you. Anyone signed up to testify in this matter?

**Moore-Love:** It's listed as a presentation.

**Potter:** Ok. The presentation. There's no council --

**Saltzman:** I did have a question.

**Potter:** You have some questions? Dean, can you stay around for a couple of seconds? We have questions from the commissioners.

**Saltzman:** That was a great presentation. I guess -- and having had dinner last night with the mayor of atlanta, very well versed with issues around sewers and parks. I guess I want to ask you where are we on the -- what is the process currently that exists with the location of the sellwood pump station?

**Marriott:** The sellwood pump station is one of those facilities although not mentioned specifically on the slide, it's one of those other facilities that is necessary for this all to work. We have picked a preferred location for the sellwood pump station. It's necessary to control the outfall there that happens at the Portland rowing club. We're negotiating with the Portland rowing club that owns the

**July 9, 2008**

land in order to site the facility. We're creating a citizens' advisory committee to assist us with the issues of building any kind of a facility. The appearance of the facility, how the facility would be built, what construction techniques, hours of construction, routing of construction, equipment and so on. And so we're engaged right now with putting together that committee. There are some issues associated with neighbors to the site who would prefer that property to remain open space as opposed to having anything built on it. We're doing the best we can to address their questions. I'm not sure we'll be able to --

**Saltzman:** I guess there was some concern that they had never been contacted because they live in condominiums that were gated or whatever. They were not able to have flyers put under their doors. The building manager never delivered -- I think there's some currency that they learned about this, at least as it's been presented to me.

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

**Saltzman:** They feel like they didn't have a chance to have proper input.

**Marriott:** Yes, I've met with several people who live in the condominium complex. I spent over an hour with them listening to their concerns. You're right, the initiate communication with the individual owners of the condominium residences -- we contacted the manager of the complex. They did not circulate the notices, so we went back and made the individual outreach to each condominium owner many that happened after the public meeting so they did not get notice to the public meeting. Some of them feel that that substantially disadvantaged them. I tried to assure them in the meeting I had with them, while they did miss an interesting public meeting, we don't have public meetings in order to say where to site facilities like pump stations. I wanted to assure them that their concerns were being taken seriously, we realize a public facility like a pumping station being built near your home is something that we take seriously and I can appreciate their concerns. I'm hopeful we'll be able to work through this in the next few months.

**Saltzman:** One of the things I've told dean and the bureau, in addition to putting together the citizen committee oversight, that they're also going to -- because we did screw up on the notification to the multi-plex that if the citizen oversight wants additional public hearing with additional notification, we will. Really putting the citizens in charge of this. We have a certain area of town we have to locate this thing in and no matter where we locate it, there will be people upset. But putting citizens in charge of the process for coming up with the best recommendation back to us, I thought was really important. That's what we have under way. It will be up to the citizen oversight committee to decide. Up to them to decide what any additional public outreach will be.

**Marriott:** Thanks for reminding me about that. Also when we met with commissioner Adams. He requested that we go back to the designers so see if we can maximize the amount of the facility put underground and not visible from any location and we're working with the designers to do that.

**Potter:** Thank you. Further questions? Thank you.

**Marriott:** I just wanted to mention again that we'll have a tour opportunity for members of the public and members of the council this fall and we expect to be back for our next report in January. And look forward to that.

**Potter:** Thank you.

**Adams:** Good work, Paul.

**Potter:** No council action required. Move to the 10:00 a.m. Time certain.

**Item 962.**

**Potter:** This hearing is going to follow the -- this particular order. First hear from the Portland development commission and then the housing development center, then the community partners for affordable housing and Carlton Architecture. And then we'll open it up to public testimony. Commissioner Fish, did you wish to make a statement before we begin?

**Fish:** Yes, thank you Mayor. We have an amended resolution before the council this morning. The amended resolution does not make any substantive changes but does correct some data. Thankfully,

**July 9, 2008**

we don't have 4,000 people sleeping on the street every night. However, they are without permanent homes and sleep in cars and emergency shelters and about 1400 people do, in fact, sleep on the street every night. And we made corrections for the housing data who make minimum wage. There are no substantive changes in the resolution. Mayor, as you know, two weeks ago, a resolution that you and I cosponsored was placed before the council for consideration on the master plan for the sergeant jerome sears united states army reserve center at the request of commissioner Leonard. We set it over for two weeks to undertake a process of alternative sites. We've ask a number of people to make brief presentations to council to reframe the issue in terms of the process that led to this hearing. To give you an update on the search that was undertaken and the results of that search and to tell you a little bit more about the proposed project and then we are looking forward to hearing from some of the concerned citizens and neighbors from southwest Portland are here to testify.

**Potter:** Please proceed.

**Keith Witcosky, Portland Development Commission:** Keith, Portland development commission. You heard from commissioner fish in terms of what's occurred in the last few weeks and I wanted to remind you, we're going to be doing on september 15th is submitting a report to the federal government based on council's recommendations for two sites in Portland on how to reuse the bases. Back in april, the site in north Portland, recommending for the Oregon national guard, the site to the south as it stands to the resolution today, we're looking at, potentially, housing. When the federal government gets the material, they're going to look at two burdens of proof, whatever you want to call it -- burden of proofs. The site to the north doesn't address it at all. They're going to be looking at what kind of return on their investment versus the public benefit that's going to be generated. If they can't achieve the housing goals, they want to make money off of it. They're examining those pieces as well. The site to the south, looking at a appraised value of probably \$3 million as we discussed before. You've got the -- pdot and you have the community housing appropriate proposal that could get 50% and incorporate the housing goals in the federal government regulations. That's all I wanted to say. I wanted to hand it over to philip to talk about the work they've done in conjunction with the community and others to take a hard look in a short period of time of what sites are available in the area.

**Potter:** Before you begin that, I understand we have two letters of conveyance from federal agencies. Can you explain how that came about and what they mean?

**Witcosky:** I'll try and if I fail, david will hopefully correct me. We've got -- you know what, i'm going to have david do it rather than confuse the situation at all.

**David Sheern:** As i've mentioned before, this is a complicated process. My name is david with the Portland development commission. We have two public benefit conveyances; one from -- i'm sorry, three. Two for education from west side christian high school and Portland community college. West side christian high school has approval of 100% discount and pcc, 80%. And to fema, to the city of Portland and received approval for 100% discount. There are several public mechanism conveyance.

**Phillip Delco:** Philip, housing development center. We're development consultants to affordable housing developers. We've worked in the Portland area for 14 years. Developed over 2,000 units of new and rehabilitated housing. One of our services is to do initial site search and feasibility to see whether or not a site would be appropriate to further pursue as an affordable housing site. We were asked by the bureau of housing community development to take a look at eight properties suggested to us and determine whether or not any of these were worth a further look as a possible replacement site for housing. I wanted to talk a little bit about what kind of criteria we're generally looking at when we look at an affordable housing site. One of the principle ones is to get an appropriate project size. Because of the funding, the public funding which is often available to us, principally low-income tax credits, we need to get a project of such a size that will maximize the

**July 9, 2008**

amount of tax credit equity that can generate from an investor. At the same time, we're looking to minimize our overall development costs per unit and our long-term operating cost. So in general, we're looking at a project size that's somewhere around 40 or 50 units, is kind of the minimum that we're looking at at that break-even point. We're also trying to find a site that is permissibly zoned. And for the most part, that means a residentially zoned site that can allow one unit for every thousand square feet. We also look at commercial sites and erex sites as well. We want to make sure we site a project in a neighborhood that is appropriately -- that has an appropriate neighborhood scale. So in general, we're looking at the sites along major transportation corridors. And not looking to place sites -- projects in areas that are zoned for single family at a low density and scale. Land acquisition costs are a very critical component of this and in general, we're looking for -- we're looking for sites that we can purchase at no more than \$25,000 to \$35,000 per unit for acquisition costs. Some of the other things that we generally look at, we need to get close proximity to neighborhood retail and employment opportunities for the people that are going to live there. Access to community services is always an important criteria because the public funding entities are expecting us to be able to demonstrate that the future residents are going to have easy access to community services. Access to public transportation, again, located along a major transit corridor is a key criteria. And more than anything, we need to find a willing seller. And willing seller means not only someone who wants to sell us their property but is generally willing to wait a number of months because of the time frame it takes us to line up public financing for site acquisition. Our clients don't have the kind of working capital that a private developer can plunk down to buy a site. We've actually been engaged in a site search in southwest Portland and southeast Washington county for about two years now. And in the midst of the housing boom, we've had a hard time finding large sites that would accommodate a good affordable housing project in this area that are not already in high demand by private developers. It's difficult to find appropriately-zoned land in this part of the city. And the high market values and demand means that we're often beat out in our competition for these sites. That means we're often left with the most challenging and difficult sites to develop. Sites that have wetlands and brownfields and passed over by the private market. Like I say, we took a quick look, by no means, exhaustive. We were asked to do this in two weeks and it's not the kind of detailed look we would take if we were looking to actually pursue a site but kind of the initial feasibility we would do in order to determine whether or not a site was worth pursuing. For the most part, the sites that were given to us were either too small. We couldn't build more than 20 units on most any of them. So it doesn't meet our criteria for getting a site that was large and dense enough to be cost effective. Many of the sites were zoned r-7. Meaning you could develop one unit for every 7,000 square feet. And some were quite large, over three or four acres, it meant our site acquisition costs could can anywhere from \$80,000 to \$100,000 per unit. Which wouldn't make it feasible as an affordable housing site. I can -- if any one has any questions about any of the work we did, I can do that. But that's pretty much the extent of my comments right now.

**Fish:** I have one question. You identified a range of nonprofits and agencies that assisted you in this search. We also got feedback from community member, correct? To identify sites and they were included in your analysis.

**Delco:** Yes, that's right.

**Sheila Greenlaw-Fink:** Sheila with community partners for affordable housing. I'll keep it brief. Just to reiterate. And he had a beautiful map that showed these sites, we really did look at every one. We tend to know what's on the market, which is almost nothing and we also know a lot about what's out there that isn't on the market and try to get it. We try a lot of times doing that too. We've talked to churches and school districts.

**Delco:** There are sites that are small, as philip maybe didn't say, a quarter or a third of an acre. There were a few large ones. Like smith schools, and it's a single family zone. The sites, the last



**July 9, 2008**

two we submitted purchase offers through a qualified broker we work with. We were outbid by 25% to 50% by private developers that were doing high-end senior care facilities. The opportunities like the sears armory just aren't out there. What we did over the last two weeks is to supplement and not in as in depth. Where developers looking for land all the time. In southwest Portland, particularly, there is little buildable land. We look at in-fill. The watershed was built on 6.5 acres. Vacant for decades and nobody was looking at it. We'll look at sites like that. Private developers won't go through that overlay of working with 13 different agencies, state, local and federal. We're used to it. We're happy to do it when we can. We invest a lot of time. We have no money, we do it because it's our mission and it's a long process that's barely started. We've invested a lot because we do think it's a good place for housing. And whether you agree with that as a policy matter, we have need and this is a way to address it. The sort of wisdom and capacity to break up the site, it would make your decision easier if -- would it be possible to do so? I think philip has explained in some part regulatory procedures would make that not feasible. So we did also look at that seriously. We do have smaller projects. In the past, we've done rehabs and reconstruction. The cost per unit is high when we do that. With the watershed, it made sense to go up four stories. So the 110-unit proposal we recommend you consider is a good one. It allows those incomes, to not put too many homeless in any one place and mix them in a community that supports internally and externally and serves folks and plenty already live in the community. I guess one of the things we'd like to remind people, we're not putting in someone else. These are the people who serve you your latte in the morning, the folks who work in banks, the folks who live in our units, 85% work one or more jobs. They are not different and not scary, frightening or presenting safety concerns; certainly not in a well managed community or in a neighborhood that works together with the landlords and owners as a unified community. I know that Multnomah is one of those because I live and work in the area. Hillsdale as well. We're happy to have opportunity to work in Portland to address these issues. We don't have an inventory of units that help those folks closed out of the market. I know there's a lot of concern and skepticism whenever a development is proposed in a neighborhood. Things like measure 49 bring out the strongest feelings we have. There's -- people have deeply held values, concerns and love their homes and want to maintain the quality of life that we enjoy in Portland. We understand that because as a community-based developer, we're there for the long run. We live, work and do business in the neighborhoods we serve. We're available to the people that are our neighbors and we consider ourselves, you know, as owners in maybe a different light than sometimes private developers do. We're community owners. In terms of how we integrate that, the watershed was a good example. We tend to do multi-community -- they rightfully wanted to keep a process that was, I guess had the integrity of working -- we did that with the watershed probably before we had site control. Again, we have a lot of good mechanisms and a great architectural firm embedded with the same values of figuring out how to take all of the ideas and use every one we can without compromising the overall design. You do get a lot of idea that's tend to compete with each other. So we appreciate that all that you, the community and everybody involved has put into this difficult process over the past year -- david would know. More than a year, i'm sure. And so we know it's not an easy decision, but we think it's a great opportunity and we appreciate the time.

**Fish:** Mayor, if I could just note. Sheila; we had three applications for housing on this site. One was submitted by the housing authority of Portland. I formerly served as the chair. I will tell you that what caused me as one commissioner to give you the edge over the other proposal, was the feedback I got in southwest Portland from people who are both your neighbors and people involved with your various development. The feedback I got was uniformly positive about the relationship they had with community partners and I think that the partnership with neighborhood house which is just up the street and also has strong roots in the community is important. I want you to know from my point of view, that was a tipping point in evaluating among the different housing

**July 9, 2008**

proposals. But in terms of your values, I have to say after spending time in hillsdale and meeting with the business and neighborhood association, something that blew me away, when you had a choice of branding your new project there, the watershed, and you could have put watershed as a signage, whatever you wanted, you chose an iconic sign that simply identified it as hillsdale. Which gives it the same kind of standing as in my neighborhood, which is hollywood. In terms of symbolic gestures, I think that speaks volumes about the relationship I want to have with your community partners.

**Potter:** Other questions?

**Adams:** You've answered this with some detail and citing actual experience and local to the neighborhood as commissioner fish pointed out, which I think is important. I know there are a lot of neighbors that are concerned that this will lead to a degradation of their neighborhood and potential reduction in their property values and a certain concern about some threat. And I just want to give you a chance to respond directly to those concerns.

**Greenlaw-Fink:** We're happy to provide the real data on whether property values decline whenever public housing is built. Typically they don't. Olson woods, which we put in the tigar area, Washington square area is a better example. Searches of tax values would show you that that's not the case. It's a fear that folks have. Like the sewer projects will affect their quality of life and property value. There's no way to dispel their fear in advance. The fact is we don't reduce property values. In hillsdale, they wanted a way to bridge the east and west. I would like to invite you next wednesday to salvador mollies. If you can help, we can put that in, so there's things I think can be added when projects like this are done if we work together. Commissioner fish did a good job of talking about that many to negotiate, to be a go-between and we're required to do street and sidewalk improvements. Traffic safety issues. And crime doesn't increase in our neighborhoods. In fact, we help through neighborhood watch and a variety of things to make sure that crime doesn't have a foothold. We have strong property managers who address those concerns on a daily basis.

**Fish:** I want to say to sam i'm glad he raised the issue. When we hear from citizens later on, have a chance to talk about a dozen issues that we heard on monday when we had a community forum, that I believe we can working with a team address working to the satisfaction of the property owners. And the experience we had at the new columbia on the home ownership piece. As you know, as a champion of that project, there was a lot of concern, that there be no market for the homes for sale. Not only did it turn out there was a huge market, the problem we have now is the resale we have makes them unaffordable. If we do this mixed use development right, it's a win-win.

**Potter:** I had a question about pedestrian access to that site. I heard a lot of folks talk about the fact that there were no sidewalks in a number of areas, dangerous for folks to walk to and from there. And obviously a lot of folks take public transportation. Can you tell us what your plans are to assure safe pedestrian access?

**Greenlaw-Fink:** We did have a lovely walk a night or two ago going through those neighborhoods. I live and use the dog park and bike in the area. I'm well aware of when you have roads like Multnomah boulevard right next to the traffic. We have what we can afford to pay for as a community, and it's true in much the southwest Portland, we can't address all of those concerns, we can't address them in front of the site and I can say that our historical pattern is be successful in working with the neighborhood in achieving -- properties. We worked to get that done as a separate matter, additional sidewalks, same with Washington square. We had sidewalks but they didn't connect to anything. That's frustrating. They need to connect. We need to work with you and others in the community to look at Multnomah boulevard as a whole. We suggested some things we thought the neighborhood might like. Like not opening up 27th for -- to go through. But maybe to make it easier for folks in that neighborhood to get down to Multnomah boulevard. It's a challenge to get down to transit. We would like tri-met to reconsider their routing. It's challenging. We can't make promises except that we have always put ourselves in the fray to work with the

**July 9, 2008**

public sector whenever there are funding opportunities surrounding our site. You guys in the last budget cycle approved things. Maybe it was the specter of seeing senior citizens trying to cross that highway, but we did appreciate that we could be part of that.

**Fish:** If I could add. I've made a commitment as the housing commissioner that I would work with our friends at tri-met and pdot. Because this project will not be developed until 2012. To make sure we have safe routes for the children so they can walk safety. And there are improvements called for along Multnomah boulevard. The benefit of the time line is that we can work with the adjacent property owners to come up with solutions.

**Potter:** Other questions? Thank you, folks.

**Fish:** We have one other person.

**Potter:** Bill hart? Come forward.

**Bill Hart:** Good morning, mayor Potter and the commissioners. My name is bill hart, founder of the firm carlton hart architecture. We've had the honor of providing design we've been working with several years. They've received national acclaim for their commitment to liveability working on difficult sites. We have a history of working with neighborhoods to create liveable environments for the entire community the we're in the early phase of planning this project and we plan to continue our dialogue with the neighborhood. To provide a forum to review the input they suggest. The dialogue has begun. We've heard their concerns and anticipate we'll hear more. Our goal is to work as a team. To resolve the concerns, for this and future generations.

**Potter:** If I --

**Fish:** If I could comment, that we made a list from the community meeting we had the other night, of about 24 issues raised by concerned citizens, and property owners, and I think based on my conversation with you, we concluded there were no issues raised that we could not address through the planning process and through additional conversation conversations with the neighbors, do you concur?

**Hart:** I agree.

**Fish:** And some like traffic calming and public transportation options are clearly going to require interagency cooperation. We're going to have to bring other partners to the table. But I was struck by how thoughtful the concerns were and particularly around the design elements within the boundaries of the property. Are you committing as part of this process and to the shurette process to work with concerned citizens to modify the design if we were to go forward to address the concerns?

**Hart:** Yes, yes, we would and that's the approach that ceqa would use as well to respond to the neighbors' concerns.

**Potter:** Other questions? Thank you. How many folks are signed up to testify?

**Moore-Love:** 13.

**Potter:** 13? Ok, please try to keep your comments brief. We have a full agenda for the city council. Please call the first three. Thanks for being here, when you speak, please state your name for the record. Try to keep your remarks brief. No longer than three minutes.

**Steve Reiff:** I'm a parent at west christian high school. The west side christian high school community has had the pleasure of working alongside Portland and Multnomah, we've listened to the mandates of the process, to sustain a significant program for the homeless and absorbed the various opinions Multnomah residents. We wish to briefly reiterate a couple brief components that should not be overlooked. West side was approved for 100% public benefit conveyance. It's existed for almost a year now and has no strings attached by h.u.d. Even though, we did not expect to receive the property for nothing. Since we have offered fair value back to the city in the form of funding, the city own home mentoring program, in cooperation with the luis palau association. Our proposal has touched the lives of 1200 recently homeless families in Portland. In a private-public partnership of resources to address this issue for the next decade. We had heard no public statement

**July 9, 2008**

about the property's value. Our commitment to representing the value still stands. If the top priority is not to support the homeless mentoring initiative. Our proposal shares a commitment with the Multnomah village residents for sustainable reuse. Modest traffic impacts and greatly improve green space and landscaping. Our campus would be available for public use as appropriate. West side wants to thank all parties and in the end we respect that you make the best all-around decision. Thank you.

**Martin Waugh:** My name is martin. I'm a resident in the neighborhood. Commissioners and mayor, first i've got to say i'm dismayed that the concerns of the neighborhoods can be characterized at property value and crime. Many things do not support that conclusion. Let me restate our concerns. We believe we have to have safe access to that site, both for traffic and pedestrians along Multnomah boulevard. And that might include travel signals, speed reduction, sidewalks and so forth. Second, parking must be provided for this site, regardless of who occupies it. Any neighborhood streets cannot absorb more parking as we saw the other day. Finally, we cannot add more traffic to those neighborhood streets either. They're not improved. Several are gravel. If, in fact, a road does get punched through, I know no proposals contain that right now, but this is today, and this is four years later we're talking about seeing it happen. Things change. If the road does get punched through, we're going to be changes essentially a gravel cul-de-sac into a driveway to 120 homes many that's going to severely impact that neighborhood. Finally, I appreciate the concerns about the schools and bringing new people in to support the schools, I just don't understand the argument that we should be building housing to support the schools, rather than building school to support the community. The schools have been there. The housing have been there. Why don't we have children support them. We have torn down houses. We've built new houses. Where did the children go? The demographics have changed. If we don't make it a nice place for children or families with children to live, we won't have the children there. No matter how many homes are built. Those are our concerns. They remain our concerns and we remain committed to working with whatever proposal does exceed. Thank you.

**Paul Yarborough:** My name is paul. Backing up on the property. I would second the motion on what martin has said to you. I have questions and haven't heard any information presented on it. It's my understanding that you would have, if you go for the emergency services center transportation water bureau approach, you'll get the site for nothing. That if you use it for housing, you have to pay something and it's not clear to me just how much you would have to pay and if you took what you would have to pay and used it to find property elsewhere would that change what could be accomplished? That information hasn't been presented as far as I know. It seems to me that you have dropped in your lap, in effect, an opportunity to take care of the emergency services and city functions and I haven't heard anything about whether they're on any kind of a search for alternative sites. My thought is it will be harder for them than it would be to find a site that's acceptable for housing next to a neighborhood. So i'm not sure what the city is doing, but we think that the west side emergency services type of center is an important thing. And I hope that isn't off the table. Meanwhile, i'll back up. If you do anything -- whatever you do, we want to have a voice in it and since i'm backing up on whatever happens there, i'm especially interested that it not interfere with my piece of mind and right to a nice quiet existence. And I have a nice fence and a lot of planting i've put in so that I don't have to look at the armory, but if we're going to have two and three-story buildings backing right up against this, that will be very important. Right now there's a 50-foot -- roughly a 50-foot buffer strip behind my house that separates me from the armory and I would hope any design would maintain the sensitivity that that implies on the part of the armory. And the last things, I don't know who sergeant sears is. Whether he was a war hero or what he was. But what's going to be done with his thing regardless of what happens with this.

**Potter:** Thank you. Thanks for being here. When you speak, state your name for the record. Please try to keep your remarks brief. Three minutes.

**July 9, 2008**

**John Hinds:** Good morning, mr. Mayor, commissioners. My name is john. I'm a resident on moss street behind the armory reserve. I'd like to comment, commissioner fish, thank you very much for coming to our neighborhood monday evening and spending time walking through the neighborhood and gets firsthand information and listening as we presented our concerns with you. My purpose this morning is to speak to you about my concerns regarding the tax pair and financial obligations that the low-income housing presents to us as compared to the pdot proposal. We have a wonderful structure in the army reserve that can serve our community by allowing the pdot to go into place. As my wife pointed out to me, if we have a major catastrophe, we're going to have a lot of people homeless and we need to support those folks. You have a neighborhood that's willing to work in conjunction with pdot and we recognize there will be trucks at 3:00 in the morning that are starting up as they deal with snow and ice removal. We understand we have thousands of students at wilson, jackson, marquam, capitol hill that will need the response of emergency services, so i'd like to bring that to your attention. My family's feelings are if that is supported, that addresses a lot of the financial obligations that we have as a city. Thank you.

**Karyn Munford:** My name is karen. At the june 25th council meeting, many Multnomah residents came out in support of the emergency shelter to be built on the sears property. Our testimonials were postponed to give us time to search and identify alternative sites for affordable housing in order to place the emergency site on the sears site and receive the property at no cost as per fema. At the meeting, the neighbors were given a directive to which all present, council agreed. Commissioner Leonard said they need to see, quote, a clear incentive on the part of the residents of the Multnomah to try and identify in the next few days a site that ranges from 10 to 20 units to the four-acre complex on the west side. And commissioner Adams summarized that, quote, take two weeks headed by commissioner fish to look at -- for an alternative site for homeless proposals to meet the federally required replacement, on the west side, and commissioner fish agreed. I'm pleased to tell you that in conjunction with Portland's bureaus, we have identified several properties. In fact, I have just identified a similar sized property that wasn't on the list to the bureaus in charge just this morning that has sidewalks and is on the bus line. The neighbors have spent countless hours and energy and the goal and conditions have been met. I have trust that the attained goals will be honored and as further directive, the council will keep their word and the emergency center will be placed at the sears site.

**Michael Henderson:** Michael. I want to echo comments. I appreciate commissioner fish coming out monday. My name is michael. My wife and son tyler live on southwest 27th avenue. We lived in Portland just four years. We've come to treasure the city for its quality and liveability. As a family that lives in this area that would be greatly affected by its future use, I would like to express my support for the Portland emergency response center. The housing proposal presented could potentially alter the landscape due to increased housing density and increased traffic. Both in our neighborhood and Multnomah boulevard, which is effectively an on and off ramp for i-5. Further, if 25th and 27th avenue were punched through it would overwhelm the narrow streets of the neighborhood. These streets were paved by the residents and not designed for an increase in traffic or increased parking that would result in an opening of 25th or 27th avenue. I fear this increase in traffic could discourage biking and walking in our neighborhood. Trends that could interfere with the quality of life in our neighborhood. Are we willing to risk not having a robust emergency response center that houses critical resources of pdot in the event of a severe natural disaster? This solution would result in the least traffic and safety impact and would provide an important resource for Portland's west side and the community in time of need. Thank you.

**Fish:** I'd like to acknowledge, I think it's your daughter --

**Henderson:** Son, actually. He's got long hair.

**Fish:** Was it the daughter who set up the -- lemonade stand. We appreciated their hospitality.

**Leonard:** Did they have a business license?

**July 9, 2008**

**Henderson:** I can neither confirm or deny that.

**Leonard:** Good answer.

**Fish:** I will point out that someone offered to buy me a 25-cent lemonade. But under the strict rules, I could not accept that.

**Potter:** Folks? Read the names again.

**Fish:** That was a nice walk. We do appreciate your coming out.

**Robert Munford:** I'm robbie and I wanted to let you know that I believe that the emergency center makes the most sense. It's free public land that should remain a public entity and not for private development. It's ready to use in an ideal location next to qwest. It's the most economically and environmentally sound option that will benefit the most people. Thank you very much.

**Valerie Morrow:** Good morning. My name is valerie. And I feel honored to be here, even though I feel so nervous. As a mother of -- of an almost 21-year-old with autism, I embrace the need for affordable housing for those who found themselves disabled and disenfranchised. Not only as a green builder but as an organization that is consistently equalizes and respects the integrity of all of our community members. I applaud the inroads they have made in our city. More than likely, I will return to city hall to advocate for a housing complex where my son as an autistic. If any sort of massive housing were built, whether it be a million-dollar condo unit or this affordable housing unit, the negative impact would be tremendous. The pedestrian and vehicular traffic would be -- vehicular traffic would be a nightmare. Our freeway where I used to live was down for three months due to aging overpasses and our husband, a physician, left on a motorcycle using an old country road that only went one way. Finally, the proposal to utilize the sears armory facility for a much needed response center is clearly the most cost effective and beneficial for all southwest neighborhood citizens. The savings can be better utilized for affordable housing which we welcome but in a more appropriate setting for safety reasons. Our family chose to move to Portland because it's got forward-looking citizens who work daily to uphold citizens' rights in the pursuit of happiness in a nice affordable home.

**Kay Durtschi:** My name is kay and i've been before you before but I want to recap a couple of things that maybe you've forgotten about. First of all, turning point was put together by hal, we did work with them monthly of the development of that site. That includes three other low-income housing units in our neighborhood already. I think it's time to spread the siting of these sites around the neighborhood. Around southwest, not just all in one neighborhood. The one -- neighborhood. The one thing I think hasn't been addressed at all is lack of jobs that would available for these people who would come into our neighborhood and the accessibility to get the jobs means they have to go downtown and back out again in that circular system that we have for our transportation. The transportation is not easy in southwest unless you're going straight down barbur or maybe through hillsdale and out through barbur and on to downtown. We did have a shurette. I would like a list of all the properties that the people have come up with. Because i've turned in two or three myself and i've not heard any one of them referred to as possible sites for the low-income housing. I think we as neighbors deserve to have that list. And I think mr. Fish, you said it would be available today but I don't see it yet. So thank you for letting me remind you of that. When we talk about safety in southwest, we're not talking just about transportation safety. We're talking about safety for all of the units that would be housed in that location and that would include water as well as transportation. And the homeless people too. We gave up -- the transportation bureau, we gave up a large site to put turning point in that has never been replaced in southwest so I think that should be taken into consideration because where turning point is now, used to be a center for transportation issues and for emergency services and we gave that away and it's never been replaced. We would appreciate having that back again. Remember, safety for all of southwest, not just the immediate neighborhood when they talk about it. We need all the different factors involved in that. Thank you.

**July 9, 2008**

**Potter:** Thank you. State your name when you speak. Please try to keep your remarks limited. No longer than three minutes. Anyone can begin.

**Randy Bonella:** My name is Randy. I'm the Multnomah neighborhood association chair. With the limited time we have, I'm not going to rehash our position. I think it's probably been more eloquently stated by my neighbors and associates. I think we've made it clear today and over the past couple of months of what our preferences would be, the emergency services. We do fully recognize the need for affordable housing and the need for emergency preparedness and the need for West Side Christian High School for a permanent home. We'd like to welcome all three of these into our neighborhood. I think it would be valuable to us regardless of who is chosen for that site, we could work with all three to potentially have all capabilities brought to our area. Let's see. We want to thank Commissioner Fish and your staff for joining us on our tour of the neighborhood and get a firsthand view of our issues regardless of the people chosen for the site. Those issues are fairly universal. Those issues still remain. From the last meeting, we took Commissioner Leonard's request to heart. We mobilized a large contingent to identify housing. Closer to services and a safer location. While not experts, we took this request seriously. We were able to identify several sites in the neighborhood and provided those to Commissioner Fish and his staff and PDOT and the water bureau. We understood we had the option to look outside our boundaries. We -- boundaries. We chose not to do that. We're not interested in pushing this issue on to somebody else. So the neighbors looked in our neighborhood, looked where we live and looked at what we could support. My wife and I moved into the area 14 years ago and as it was one of the more affordable housing areas in the city of Portland at the time. Today, it's one of the least affordable because of the location to downtown Portland. We've seen four apartment complexes converted to condos. While we recognize that these are affordable purchase units, we've also lost a great deal of affordable rentals, you know. We -- rental units. We enjoy where we live and we would like to see a win-win here. We'd like to see emergency response brought to the west side of Portland so we can deal with emergencies as needed and we'd like to welcome West Side Christian High School. I know my time is up and I -- a couple of thank-yous here. One is I want to thank the city commission for the added time for the neighborhood. I know one of the issues we had in some of the process, it was to make sure that our voices were heard and we thank you for the extra time to do that. I also wanted to publicly thank West Side Christian High School for the effort they put in. They attended every single neighborhood meeting for the last year. Without prompting by us, very active. And thank neighborhood house and their strong support of our neighborhood and we've had good viable --

**Potter:** Sir, you're going to have to wind it down.

**Bonella:** I'm done.

**Julie Massa:** My name is Julie and I'm the Portland policy coordinator for the Oregon Opportunity Network. Hardworking families and people with disabilities and homeless need opportunities to succeed in school and life and we believe this success is tied to having a stable home. You've heard about the lack of opportunities from the developers here today and we know you have to balance many interests. Our network urges you to choose the affordable housing option and I want to thank the neighbors for allowing me to participate in the walk. And it was rigorous and wonderful and thank you for allowing me to be a part of your community for the evening.

**Lorna Ludwick:** I'm Lorna. I live across the street from the Sears Armory. I wanted to thank Commissioner Fish for being there and I know Sam Adams has been there. He knows what it's like. I'm more for the emergency services because we do not have anything in that area or in the southwest and that would be convenient because if anything comes up, they can go to Barbur or Capital Highway or use Multnomah Boulevard to get around in. You already have a stable building. You have it fenced. You don't have to worry about putting up anything for safety. It would be an ideal location for it. And we're all used to the equipment. So if you put in housing, you have the

**July 9, 2008**

safety issue of Multnomah boulevard. You have to put in sidewalks. You also would have to bus the children to the school. You'd have to decide which school. Riki is the only one with less children in it. You'd have to bus them there. And this is something that the city is going to have to think about if they put in affordable housing. And i'm for emergency services. We need it out there.

**Potter:** Thank you.

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

**Potter:** Council discussion? Interested in what was determined about looking for another site for the emergency management function.

**Adams:** I've given the task to Suzanne who is working with the water bureau and she's from the Portland office of transportation working with the water bureau and Carmen to look at other sites and they're going to put together a process and time line and return to council with resolution in the next couple of weeks that will commit the city council to look for a west side site for staging of emergency and inclement weather operations.

**Fish:** Mayor, just to be clear, the earliest time this site would be available for any purpose would be 2012 and I think if the council commits to finding alternative sites for the emergency management use, we have the potential to do that on an expedited basis and the chief who runs the Portland fire and rescue has advised me if we're successful in co-locating with Tualatin valley.

**Potter:** Sufficient property for storage of emergency materials?

**Fish:** I think it's a contender. Not qualified to address that.

**Potter:** It's a resolution. Please call the vote.

**Fish:** If I -- procedurally, mayor, we have an amended resolution. If we could amend the resolution first.

**Potter:** Do I hear a motion to amend the resolution?

**Adams:** So moved.

**Saltzman:** Second.

**Potter:** Call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye.

**Leonard:** Well, this is the amendment?

**Fish:** Just amend --

**Leonard:** Reserve my remarks for the final vote. Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Please call the vote on the resolution.

**Adams:** I want to thank the residents of southwest who've engaged in this process and given it fair consideration. We hear these kind of concerns no matter where we contemplate, other agencies or partner agencies seek to place, and I appreciate the comments. I'm going to support this resolution because I believe that this is best served for the purposes in this resolution. It's important to have a staging area on the west side for emergency operations and bad weather and part of my support for this conversation -- is based on conversations that I had with my colleagues that we would look forward and looking for and identifying that site over the course of the next months. I'm very impressed with the work of the provider, the potential developer, for this site. This is one of the highest quality developers of this kind of facility that we get to work with in the city so you're very lucky. I live in north Portland where we have a lot of this kind of development and they're varying qualities of developers and operators so I feel very pleased that in this particular neighborhood you're getting one of the best of the best. And finally I'm also going to support this because I think commissioner Fish has done in a short time on the council a very thorough job of outreach and I know that he's passionately committed to making this work in a way that not only provides the services and housing opportunities but that it works for the neighborhood and actually brings up the neighborhood, improves the neighborhood and all the issues that we've discussed. So, for those



**July 9, 2008**

reasons, i'm going to vote aye, and I want to thank you for your testimony and for your engagement in this process, and hopefully it will continue. Aye.

**Fish:** First I want to thank the mayor elect for his kind comment and also to echo what he said about the process we've gone through, and I would not compliment all the neighbors who are here today, everybody who testified this morning who was also part of the group that welcomed my staff, mary carol, and a team of people to the site on monday. It was extremely helpful for this commissioner to actually see the issues that you had identified through your eyes and to walk through the neighborhood. One of my regrets 11 years ago when I moved to this community, I wasn't aware of this neighborhood. It's a beautiful area to the north of this facility and what we're planning. I was impressed when we got together and had the conversation after the walk-through with the kinds of concerns that you raised, all of which, in my judgment, we can address in a responsible fashion as we go forward over the next four years with the planning process. And I want to be very clear the earliest time this site would be available for development the would be 2012, and that assuming the department of defense agrees with our recommendation. Our recommendation is not binding on the department of defense in this process. I, too, want to begin by thanking the concerned citizens and neighborhood residents who have helped me understand this issue better and who have raised their concerns in a way that I think is not only constructive but ensures we'll have the best possible development going forward. You have my personal commitment, as the housing commissioner, that we will address the serious issues you've raised of traffic and sidewalks and parking, the look and feel of the place. Mr. Yarbrough mentioned the setback. I had the pleasure of walking through his backyard on my tour. I was only sorry I couldn't stop and drink the glass of wine he had left for me. But clearly he has a very desirable piece of property that abuts the site, and his recommendation that we think about some setbacks and maybe even a tapered look so that his sight lines are not disturbed and that he doesn't have the crowding up against his property I think is very well-taken, as were many of the other concerns that were raised.

We made a list of 24 different issues that were raised during our community forum, and I have assurances from cepa and their architect that we will work with you on each and every one of those concerns during the next four years of the planning process. This is a unique opportunity. It's not often that we have a four-acre site that is appropriately zoned for a mixed-use development that is before us where we can get the property at a significant discount. We have a very strong proposal from a community developer with an excellent track record of working with the community. I am committing, as part of this process, as commissioner Adams noted, to work on an expedited basis to find an emergency services facility in southwest Portland and am confident that, if the council works together, we can have a site identified and up and running well before this site is available for development. Again, I want to thank the concerned resident whose showed up today and who extended great hospital to me on monday. As I said, that was not my first or last trip to your neighborhood. I am personally committed, as commissioner and mayer -- mayor elect Adams said to seeing this project through to conclusion. Finally I want to thank the city and p.d.c. People who have provided, I think, exemplary services. Maryann my staff and to danielle who has also done great work. It's a privilege to be your colleague in this enterprise, and i'm pleased to vote aye.

**Leonard:** It strikes me, as i've sat through more of these discussions about land use and housing, how we have become victims of our own success in Oregon in general but Portland in particular. People move here now because they read about our land-use system and that we preserve farm land and forest and open space. And people are attracted to that, so they move here. And what you discover, when you then are part of what makes this system work, is we have this very unique statute that was passed in the early '70s by the Oregon legislature that creates urban growth boundaries, which sounded great at the time and, to hear it, still sounds great. The impact of it is what we're, for instance, discussing today. Before the land use system was adopted in the '70s, as neighborhoods deteriorated in Portland, for instance the one I grew up in in northeast Portland,

**July 9, 2008**

people started moving east into then unincorporated Multnomah county, young families moving out to gateway, rockwood, and they were areas that people felt as though they had more space and freedom and new houses. As those neighborhoods filled up and became more expensive, they started moving even further east. When the urban growth boundary was developed, people in my neighborhood discovered, well, these are pretty nice houses here in irvington and, in the '80s and '90s, thought, well, maybe we'll try to reclaim these. They fixed the houses up. Crime went down. Housing prices went up. And people then started moving out to what caused to be the suburban part of Portland because they couldn't afford to live in the innercity anymore. And now we find that demographics of our city completely, as a direct result of the urban growth boundary and land-use planning, has flip-flopped. Crime is now rampant in the eastern parts of the city. School districts in Portland, Portland school districts -- we have five school districts in Portland -- are not all losing kids. Only Portland public schools are losing kids. David douglas has kids sit can on former ball fields and in trailers because they don't have enough space in the classrooms. Parkrose schools have kids sitting out in trailers because they don't have enough room in the classrooms whereas Portland school district is closing down schools because there aren't enough kids in the classrooms. People who can afford to live in the innercity now traditionally don't have as many children as people who can. And the people who live outside the core area of the city are struggling to try to have enough opportunities for their kids in school to get the attention they need and to get the education they need to move on. So that brings us to this site. This site is very much related to that dynamic. To the extent that we're trying to address the issue of how can we make Portland public schools viable once again and a place that is a magnet for people with families, you have to understand the economics. And the economics are such that people cannot afford to live in traditional housing in even my old neighborhood. My parents, as i've told people many times, could no more afford to move into the neighborhood I grew up in today and would be part of the david douglas community most likely. So we have this conundrum. We have neighborhoods who are feeling afraid because of the change that some of this brings, and I understand. Since i've been on the council, a guiding principle for me has been the old english common law maximum with a person's home is their castle, and it guides my votes. I have consistently voted against giving the Portland speedway variances every time they want to come in to ask for a variance to do a loud speed race. I vote no because it impacts the neighbors. When I got on the council, people were upset about the look of these skinny houses that are going in. I passed a series of changes to the minimum standards for houses to design standards so that people felt better about them going into their neighborhoods. But at some point, you have this conflict that even I can't get out of, notwithstanding the principle of a person's home is their castle. People don't like to have their existing house threatened in their view, but then you have other people who don't have a castle, who have no opportunity for a castle, who can't actually participate in what it is that we all celebrate here in Portland that attracts people here because of the economics. This is an attempt to find that balance. It's not perfect and won't be perfect. It probably can't be perfect. But I think that what we have here today really is a great example of a balancing act that commissioner fish, in really his first controversial issue being undertaken since arriving on the council, has requitted himself well. You can do no more and expect no more of a publish official than what you've seen commissioner fish do. Listen, walk, feel it, smell it, understand it from your perspective and do everything in his power to try to make sure it's done in away that's reason full of all the legitimate concerns the neighbors have. On the other hand, as I said at the last hearing, i've been impressed by the -- as emotional as some people feel and as strong as some people feel about this issue, really a very community-spirited discussion about the concerns and not really personal attacks on people who may be promoting this project or people who may be living in the project after it's done. I agree with the neighborhood that we need to address the issue of having a center where pdot and the water bureau can respond in emergencies. We have to have that. That's motivated a lot of this

**July 9, 2008**

discussion up to this point, and the creativity that's come from that I think is going to pay off in that the mayor and I will, I think, ultimately be successful and pleased with the outcome given the debate and the concerns we have raised in terms of having that emergency response center. I appreciate and honor the work commissioner fish has done on this project. I appreciate and very much respect the concerns raised and, on balance, I think that this is a proposal that deserves to be supported and deserves also to be guided by the legitimate concerns the neighbors have as we move along from that point. Aye.

**Saltzman:** I'm deeply impressed with all the parties to this decision. I'm very impressed with the Multnomah neighborhood for the thorough process they conducted in coming to their preferred alternative. I think the letter that Randy Bonia sent us was about five or six pages long and really thoroughly outlined their concerns. I want to also say that, with respect to the emergency or west side location for emergency operations, I want to apologize for two weeks ago, saying it was something that was, to my mind, put together on the fly. Not on the fly but on the fly. [laughter] I have since been educated about the long-standing, particularly in pdot -- their long-standing look and water bureau for a west side location, so I wanted to apologize particularly for characterizing it as on the fly. I really respect the westside christian high school, and I can taste the disappointment with this decision, because this solution for you was virtually ideal, and I taste that disappointment, but I really do respect your participation in this process throughout. And I hope we can work with you to come up with another location. It may not be as ideal as this one would have been, but it's something that will work, and we'd love to have your high school in Portland. Finally, I want to say that I'm excited. I think what comes down to me is what's the highest and best use of this property consistent with all the conditions about how it should be used by the federal government, and I do think that the community partners for affordable housing, the host and neighborhood proposal to me is the clear highest public benefit for what we need at this time in the city. I have a lot of respect for everybody and how they conducted themselves, and I want to thank commissioner fish for his leadership as well in getting us to this point. I'm pleased to vote aye.

**Potter:** I want to thank the applicants who submitted proposals for the use of the Jerome Sears property. It's a good piece of property, around obviously everybody gave it good thought and came up with excellent proposals. I really respect you for that. I think that often the council is faced with not just selecting either/or but selecting, as was stated earlier, what is the clearest and best use for a piece of property like this. And being the commissioner in charge of emergency management, one of the things I'm acutely aware of is that, on the west side of Portland, there is no place where we preposition supplies, a depot of sorts, in case of emergency that would assist pdot, water bureau, and all the other bureaus and functions of the city to respond to a major disaster. So this is something that's high on my radar, and I believe it's important to the community. All you have to do is look at what happens when there's a major, major disaster in the world or in our country and seeing that it's important those first few hours in how we respond to those things. So that is a very critical, important piece that I believe is going to be addressed by this council shortly. I also understand that just this morning the federal reserve, in the newspaper, mentioned the fact that 2009 appears to be headed towards a downturn in the economy and not just because of the price of gas but because of all the factors that go into creating that scenario. So what that usually means here in the city and other communities is that more people have fewer housing opportunities. And so I believe that, in this particular instance, the best and greater use of this property is for low-income and mixed housing. I look forward to working with the group on this even though I won't be here when it's completed. I think it's going to be an excellent piece of property for that, and I know that they will continue to work with the community, as commissioner fish will, to ensure that their concerns and issues are addressed in this piece of property. The one area that I'm concerned about is to ensure adequate public transportation and pedestrian access, because that's where, I believe, a lot of the community that will be housed there will need that as part of their means by which to get

**July 9, 2008**

to and from their work sites and so forth. I agree with the rest of the council that this is something whose use, I think, will definitely fit the long-term interest of our community. I vote aye. Please read item 984 on the regular agenda.

**Item 984.**

**Potter:** If you folks could please go outside for your conversations? Carmen and staff, could you please come forward? Carmen? Carmen merlot?

**Carmen Merlo, Director, Office of Emergency Management:** Good morning. I didn't expect to be up here, mr. Mayor, commissioners. We have the opportunity to apply for a grant from the department of homeland security. This is a brand-new grant program. Only \$14 million is available nationwide. We are applying for a \$1 million grant for the construction towards our new e.c.c. At this point, the application is due to emergency management in Oregon. They will take the prioritization of those applications they receive and then forward them to d.h.s. At this point, I don't think we have any other applicants in the state of Oregon that are competing for it. We do have, I know for sure, the city of vancouver that will be our competitors for that grant application. And i'm working with the water bureau obviously and pdot to submit the application by july 31st.

**Potter:** Questions from the commissioners? Thank you, carmen. Is anyone signed up to testify on this matter?

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

**Potter:** Is there anyone here who wishes to testify to this specific matter? It's an emergency. Please call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Please read item 985.

**Item 985.**

**Potter:** Is there no one here from o.m.f. to talk to this issue? Let's put this aside for a moment, and could someone please contact o.m.f. to have someone come over and discuss this? Please read item 986.

**Item 986.**

**David Rhys, Bureau of Human Resources:** Hello. I'm david rhys, class account manager from bureau of human resources, o.m.f. What you have before you is a request to create a new permanent position which would be responsible for complex, financial, technical, and statistical analysis relating to the city's health fund that involves supporting the health fund. Currently this position had been in the bureau -- i'm sorry. If the financial planning section of o.m.f. given the staff change, it was more appropriate to move it and to reclassify it as a lower level but make it full time. We're creating the position through this ordinance and through the budget modification process in the fall, we'll be moving the money that exists out of the health fund to fund the position. Any questions?

**Potter:** Questions from the commissioners? Thank you, david. Do we have a sign-up sheet for this?

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

**Potter:** Anyone who wishes to testify to this specific issue? It's an emergency. Please call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Please read item 987.

**Item 987.**

**Potter:** Second reading. Call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Please read item 988.

**Leonard:** Mayor?

**Potter:** Yes.

**Leonard:** Could we read 988, 989, and 990 together?

**Potter:** Yes. Please read those three.

**Items 988, 989, and 990.**

**July 9, 2008**

**Leonard:** We have our crack water bureau staff here to explain all of this.

**Michael Mock, Portland Water Bureau:** Good morning, mayor Potter, commissioners. Our being here today is the culmination of work that started --

**Potter:** Could you state your name?

**Mock:** I'm sorry. Michael Mock, senior management analyst with the Portland water bureau. We're here today as the culmination of work that started in November of 2006 when the city council transferred from the revenue bureau to the water bureau the customer service responsibilities for water, sewer, and storm water billing. So I started at that time working on what I thought would be a single piece of legislation to bring to you that would reflect that return. And here, about 20 months later, we've ended up with three pieces that you have before you today. It's a volume of work I couldn't have worked on alone. I want to thank Ann Conway for her historical knowledge despite her young age and sharp eye and Cindy Deitz for coordinating the input from the water bureau's engineering services group. In the process of reviewing the code, we discovered a number of inaccuracies. For example, Metro was referred to by its old name, Portland Metropolitan Area Local Government Boundary Mission. You can see why they shortened their name. It's not only that reference that was incorrect. It was also that it was out-of-date since Metro no longer approves properties outside the city of Portland to the water system. That approval is given by you, the council. We found the code contained an inaccurate description of the bureau of water works. We're using this opportunity to not only accurately define its structure and functions in code but also refer to it by the name by which it's most commonly known, the Portland water bureau. As word got around that we were reviewing some of the code language describing the role and responsibilities of the water bureau and relating in particular to water rates and charges, it became clear that it was a good time to look at Title 21 pertaining to water in its entirety. It was a good time to give a good housecleaning to removing archaic or vague language, correcting references to other code sections and, in general, making code reflect reality. Then the bureau of environmental services decided it was a good time for them to review Title 17 related to sewer user charges and giving it a housecleaning, too, but that wasn't an easy task, and I want to thank Dan Vizzini from B.E.S. I also want to acknowledge the I know put I received from customer service staff and its leadership team as well as in-depth advice received from the city attorneys. What you see in two of the three items before you is the result of tremendous collaboration that brings unity to city code and customer service policies related to the manner in which the city charges for water, sewer, and storm water services, makes adjustments, applies credits, and collects delinquencies. Uniform language in both Titles 17 and 21 removes doubt about when adjustments can be made and for how long. Three separate sections addressing who is responsible for paying the water and sewer bill have been combined into one. Vague references to "customer" are replaced by terms more appropriate to the responsible parties to which we're referring, those being ratepayer, water user, sewer user, property owner, account holder. One of the two items I just mentioned is a resolution amending customer service policies. As you know, a resolution goes into effect immediately upon your adoption. Because the policies reflect proposed language contained in the ordinance amending city code which will go to second reading next week, we'd like to ask that the resolution be carried forward until next week as well. In addition to amendments related to raising charges, the code changes to Title 21 include a number of amendments related to water delivery and the regulation of service. I'll mention a few of them. The decision making roles of the administrator and chief engineer are more clearly defined. For example, we are giving the water bureau administrator a role in the purchase or sale of real property, something that had been previously given solely to the chief engineer. Related to that, the third item before you today repeals the two ordinances pertaining to easements and real property, because the responsibilities delegated in them have been refined and added to code. We have added clarity to the process of adding new water service where a change in size or location is requested. We've proposed allowing a one-year extension of temporary irrigation

**July 9, 2008**

water use for a government agency project occurring within or adjacent to the city's right-of-way. We have proposed requiring property owners who have water service in a basement in the right-of-way to install a waterproof vault that separates metered water service from other building infrastructure, including electrical panels, wiring, and equipment. We have proposed language that's considerably more concise than what currently exists related to the distribution of water to individuals outside Portland city limits and to wholesalers by contract. How concise? Eight sections were reduced to two. We've clarified the city's authority to apportion water during periods of water shortages should they exist. We've repealed the section of code language that gave the commissioner in charge the authority to adopt rules. It's not because we don't like you, commissioner Leonard. It's just that that artie is generally given to the council as a whole and can be delegated to the bureau of directors and not given individually to a commissioner. In april of this year, the council granted rule making authority to the Portland water bureau administrator. Similarly, language related to rule enforcement has also been repealed because it was also added to code in april as well. And finally we are following b.e.s.'s example and adding language requiring water bureau employees who go onto private properties to read, test or inspect meters to wear official identification and produce it on request. From my introductory comments regarding the three items before you have been pretty general, I have with me here at the table principal engineer darren kipper and customer service director cathy cook available to answer any questions you might have and dan vizzini from b.e.s. is in the back available to help as well.

**Potter:** Michael, what does this mean to the average water user in terms of how it will affect them directly?

**Mock:** Well, one of the things that we've found is the code has been confusing in some cases in language between title 17 b.e.s. and sewer rates and adjustments, for example, and title 21 and adjustments. So what we're doing is eliminating those conflicts and making it easier for staff to understand that, when someone calls for -- applies for an adjustment that they know currently that the language says we'll go three years from the date that an error was recognized, and so we would find staff going back seven years perhaps from the current system to the old system and trying to determine where an error might have occurred to making it simpler for staff and also for our customers to know that, if you apply for an adjustment today, we'll go back into your record three years from today and review it for an adjustment.

**Potter:** Other questions? Mr. City attorney, they have asked to have this resolution, rather than voted on today, held over to next week. Is there any particular requirement for us to take in order to do that?

**Ben Walters, Sr. Deputy City Attorney:** No particular requirement. You could just hold it over for one week so that it could be considered with the ordinance. One question I did have: If the intent -- if the intended objective it to have the changes to the administrative rules as carried forth by the resolution coincide with the effective date of the emergency -- the nonemergency ordinance?

**Potter:** Right.

**Walters:** Then you might want to add a further resolved paragraph to the resolution saying that those changes take place orb take effect 30 days after passage, and I can work with staff to draft up a paragraph.

**Leonard:** Could you do that next week?

**Walters:** We would do that next week.

**Leonard:** Nice. Thank you. I just want to say I appreciate not only the hard work you guys have put forward on this but, mayor Potter, as you recall, we had quite a discussion when we transferred the customer service section over, and cathy cook has done just really a phenomenal job. I could not be more impressed with the work of darren. I am almost embarrassed to say this, but I am in my

**July 9, 2008**

31st year of working with the city. The water takes second to none of the bureaus i've worked with. I'm very proud of the work you do.

**Potter:** Did we have sign-up sheets for those three?

**Moore-Love:** We had one for all three, and one person signed up, veronica bernier.

**Leonard:** She was here.

**Veronica Bernier:** Good morning, council, mayor Potter, commissioner randy Leonard, commissioner dan Saltzman, and our newest commissioner, nick smith -- nick fish.

**Fish:** I've been called worse. Thank you.

**Bernier:** Sorry about that. And commissioner sam Adams back in your seat. Good. Looking well this morning. Good. It's nice to see you all here. This council works best when everybody's all here and present.

**Leonard:** That's not true.

**Bernier:** It's a good time of the year. It's nice and warm outside, and we're all enjoying the weather. The reason i'm up here basically to speak to the water issue is just to bring it into a little bit more public focus. We are all aware of the hot weather. We're all aware of the impact of it on our city. As regards the future, I would generally support these issues with just a few regards. Regarding the water, my uncle, bob bernier, was with the department of u.s. Naval services, the water department in san francisco city and county for over 21 years. He retired from the department of the navy water resource board, and he taught me a lot about water. That was hedging water system. You know we're on the bull run system. Regarding Multnomah county, we have a very different bureau, and you understand that. I would support this generally with just a few reminders.

As regards the diameter of the pipes that you see, the p.v.c. pipe coming through the kind of light blue aqua pipes, the ones we notice -- that I notice out near 22nd and glisan yesterday were about 26 to 30 inches in diameter and about a half inches margin maybe. It's a little big. I've seen these go in before. What happens is it shifts the water balance in the city just a little bit. So I would like to see the department of u.s. Seismic geological survey coordinate a little bit with the water services board in reworking this before it comes to a total vote. I think u.s. Geological survey has a lot to do with what's happening with water in the larger realm of things. That's one thing. The other thing is regarding the consumer intake the water during the summer months. There's no limit on it. People water their lawns as much as possible. I'd like to see that continue, to go on into the future with regard to commissioner Leonard's group. You indicated you only used tap water. I'm assuming you still support that.

**Leonard:** Slowly.

**Bernier:** Right. In my hotel, I have to run the tap water two minutes before I can drink it just to clear the pipes. So you get a general idea the water's different everywhere, and you need to -- we need to get a stable water board. Ok. That's all I have. Thanks.

**Potter:** Items 989 and 990 are a nonemergency and move to a second reading next week as does item 998 that will be heard next week as well. Please read item 991.

**Moore-Love:** Did you want to do the 985 item? Staff is here now.

**Item 985.**

**Potter:** Yes. Is there staff? Please have them come forward.

**David Jorling, Sr. Deputy City Attorney:** My name is david jorling. I'm in the city attorney's office. Please excuse my informal attire. With me is debra lytle, the claims adjustor that was on the case, and also marcia evans from the park bureau. I understand you have some questions about the settlement, so we're here to try to answer those, if possible.

**Potter:** Very briefly describe the nature of the settlement and the reason why you're recommending to the city to --

**Jorling:** Ok. This is a former city employee. I don't want to go into the medical aspect of her settlement since we're on public record here, but she had a compensable claim, and she also had a

**July 9, 2008**

denied claim and a number of other claims that were pending. It was suggested through risk management that we mediate this case in light of the significant exposure just on the accepted portion of her claim alone. So we had a mediated settlement with a workers comp judge from the hearings division of the workers compensation board, and we arrived at a settlement for \$87,000. Just by way of example, why that makes sense in this particular case is, on her accented claim, she would be entitled to vocational rehabilitation. Those typically run about \$40,000. And sometimes claimants want to have the money rather than the program, and that was once of her motives for this settlement. Another aspect of it is she would be entitled to permanent disability benefits if she had the accepted claim and the denied claim was ordered accepted in the amount of about \$67,000. And so it was thought that, given her motivation to settle and to have a lump sum settlement and our motivation to limit the city's exposure to a specific amount, we arrived at this mediated settlement, and both risk management and my recommendation and the park bureau's recommendation that is we accept the mediated settlement. The mediator was advised and claimant's attorney was advised of course that it was subject to city council approval.

**Potter:** Questions from the commissioners? Thank you, folks. That's all.

**Jorling:** Thank you very much.

**Potter:** Anyone signed up to testify on this matter?

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

**Potter:** Anyone who wishes to discuss this? Its an emergency call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Please read item 991.  
**Item 991.**

**Gary Blackmer, Auditor, City of Portland:** Good morning, mayor and commissioners. Gary blackmer, Portland city auditor. This agenda item is about agenda items. In accordance with the city charter, my office prepares the agenda and, in most other jurisdictions, however, the mayor or the executive prepares the agenda. And I think one of the issues around why my office does it in this form of government is to decentralize some of the authority because controlling the agenda can control the legislative process. So my office, being independent and impartial, works very hard to do all that's necessary to make sure that the agenda is done in a balanced and fairway. So we work with you and your staff and with your bureaus to put it all together in a thorough and accurate manner. I think the other important reason that my office has this responsibility is the agenda is one means of accountability. It allows the public to know what's happening in terms of council's deliberations. And to that degree, we really work hard to get that information out there in as full a manner as possible. So the more notice we can give to the public on the things that you're deciding upon, the more informed they can be and the more they can understand the issues that you face. So we work with you also to prepare an ordinance that kind of sets forth a framework so that we have a consistent and fair manner to manage that agenda. And what we would like to do is amend that code today to move the date back one day for accepting -- move forward one day for accepting items for the agenda. Currently it's 5:00 on thursdays. And we would like to move it to 5:00 on wednesdays. We are finding that, with the new responsibility of putting the council agenda items online has added a significant number of staff responsibilities, and many of the responsibilities are sequential, so it's difficult for us to perform all the tasks, to review the documents that are submitted to us and prepare the agenda with essentially one business day, from thursday at 5:00 to friday at 4:00 or 5:00. Because we do want to get you the materials in time that you can study them over the weekend in all your free time so that you're prepared to vote on it. Let me go through the process with each agenda. As items come in, Karla moore live love reviews each one to make sure the items are currently entered. We do this because we frequently find them missing or in error. So the city attorney's signature being present, whether code changes have been previously removed for consistency and accuracy, whether authorizing signatures from your office or the bureau head are present, whether the appropriate agenda date is on the form, whether the Portland policy documents



**July 9, 2008**

box is checked and there is reference to Portland policy documents and how that will be treated with this agenda item, whether the financial impact statement box is completed, whether this is to be placed on the consent or regular agenda, how it's formatted, if materials are attached to the materials we receive, whether the three original contracts with the correct contractor name and dollars amount and copies of the contractor attached to the distribution copies that you examine, because we do find that they're not always consistent either name or dollars amount and that titles are reworded to make sure they're clear and brief if we don't receive them in that format. If it's an emergency, we make sure the emergency clause is on the ordinance and that we receive the 10 copies that we distribute to you and to archives and other places. Once we've done all those checks, then we go through to assemble those documents into an agenda document with essentially a sequential listing. If someone comes in and says, I don't know if this is going to be on the agenda or not, we can't sequentially start our work, because the agenda has sequential numbers on it, and we can't skip a number. Many of our steps need to be held back until we really resolve the agenda. We go through a series of checks. Once we've got that rough draft of the agenda document. And the reason why we go through these checks is we don't want to force you to come back and vote again if the summary was not properly prepared. If it's a matter of a deadline or contentious issue, I think the last thing we want to do is have it come back again for another vote. So that's routinely what we've been doing over the years to prepare the agenda. On the back side of that sheet in bold, you'll see all the additional steps that we've been performing for the past year in order to get it online, and that requires us to obtain the electronic version of these documents and to make sure, if we don't have them, that we contact your offices to get the electronic versions. We have to put those in an order and in folders according to the agenda item number and make sure that we've got all the proper documents in there, and then we move those into the necessary place where we can link it up with the website. Before we do that, no, we have to scrub all these documents, because we actually get documents that have track changes on them, which you may be familiar with in microgovernment word or there's actually comments in it, and we need to make sure those are not in the online version of documents that is posted to the web. So we have software that we have to go through and make those corrections. Once that's done, then we start finalizing the format of the agenda, put the links in. We post it. We distribute -- we make available the 10 copies for your offices and others, around then we basically make it available on the web. So all that stuff we've been doing additionally, we've tried various ways to streamline it and simply can't. It's a matter of the sequences that we have to go through that we can't shorten any of those. We've tried to be very accommodating to your offices in accepting things and correcting things that we receive, but that becomes more and more difficult as these agendas get longer and we only have the same one day to process it. So what we would really need is additional time. Thursday afternoons are occasionally taken up with council sessions, so we don't necessarily have a half a day that we could provide -- moving it a half a day even. So really, from our standpoint, making it one day earlier, wednesday at 5:00 p.m., is the best way for us to manage the agenda, make it available to the public, and make sure it's done accurately and appropriately. So before you is that change to the code to make the filing deadline wednesday at 5:00.

**Potter:** Questions?

**Leonard:** Well, I certainly want to do whatever we can to make sure that the conditions you describe are addressed, but I have to tell you i'm also concerned that this is the first time i've heard that. Maybe you've talked to the others and i've missed you. I don't know. But it's the first time i've heard it. And i'm very committed, I hope you know -- as I have been since i've been here -- when you have an issue to work it through.

**Blackmer:** Mm-hmm.

**Leonard:** This isn't my preferred way of doing that is actually having an ordinance prepared and given to us, because it strikes me that there is the possibility of a variety of solutions to this beyond

**July 9, 2008**

shortening the deadline. I don't know how often that happens that ordinances are filed on thursdays. I know we have done it.

**Blackmer:** Meaning at the deadline?

**Leonard:** Yeah.

**Blackmer:** All the time. It's not just -- we have five offices and many bureaus that are submitting things. When we send a memo out to -- you know -- email it to you and your execs asking for comments on this proposal, we heard nothing.

**Leonard:** Well, that's different than what my staff has showed me. I'm looking at an email sent to you, gary. July 7th from ty to you.

**Blackmer:** Mm-hmm.

**Leonard:** An email exchange.

**Blackmer:** Right. No. This was two weeks earlier that we sent the email out.

**Leonard:** I'm just saying the first time my office was aware of it, as you know, he offered proposed solutions. I guess what i'm saying is I don't know how the rest of the council feels about this, but again I want to reiterate I don't want to just say to you no. I mean, you're identifying a problem. Every time you have identified a problem with me, I have tried my best to sit down and come up with a solution. Just off the top of my head, if bureaus are not focused, if this has an undue impact on you, I think the council would, I would hope, agree that we send directives to the bureaus where they know they have agenda items coming up they send them to you as soon as possible. That's probably not happening now because I don't think anybody was aware of the impact. There may be other ways that we can address this, and i'm very happy to talk with you about including it if it means staff.

**Blackmer:** From my perspective, I mean, if you've talked to your staff about issues around agenda items being incorrect or late, we have worked really hard with all your staffs --

**Leonard:** Yes.

**Blackmer:** -- to work around those problems.

**Leonard:** Your staff is great. There is no issue about that. I mean, your staff is excellent. The issue is, for me, not that we preserve the right to file at 5:00, because I think we can do a better job, hearing your concerns, filing earlier some issues that we know are coming. I don't think people have focused on it right now. The issue for me is those occasional times when something actually comes up. I remember, for instance, one year filing an ordinance by friday at 5:00, and we just made it to fund the women's emergency shelter. People were sleeping out on the street in the winter, and we were able to get it in by 5:00 and heard it the next wednesday.

**Blackmer:** You have other -- you have a four-fifths option, several options for extraordinary cases.

**Leonard:** That's exactly the kind of thing i'd love to sit down with you and work through, but I think there's a better way to approach this than just you developing a solution and coming in here. I think we should work together and see if we can't find a solution that works for all of us. Maybe you're right, maybe we end up disagreeing on this, but this feels a little bit like you've made up your mind, brought it in and said, this is the deal. I'm looking at the exchanges with my office, and you weren't real open to hearing any suggestions, and I don't think that's the best way to try to solve this. I want to solve it.

**Blackmer:** Right. And I have to say we did not get good responses from your offices.

**Leonard:** Including this exchange from ty?

**Blackmer:** Right. What we saw was actually an ignorance of what we do, to be honest.

**Leonard:** Gary, you have to come and explain it to us.

**Blackmer:** Your offices with everything with us regularly and understand all the problems that we encounter, so I --

**July 9, 2008**

**Leonard:** I don't think that that's -- I want to and they want to, but I don't think that's accurate. I think we need to sit down and hear that so we can work through this.

**Blackmer:** And I got from the execs no invitation to talk to them about it. All I got was essentially a decision that that's not acceptable to us.

**Leonard:** And i'm saying we don't work for the execs. They work for us.

**Blackmer:** Well, that was the venue I thought we'd hear something, and we didn't.

**Leonard:** I'm here to say that i'm committed, and I would -- i'm sure my colleagues are committed to making a direction that's different than what we have.

**Blackmer:** It's what we've encountered, and we basically said -- you know -- we've looked at all the ways we could produce this, and we really don't see a way that -- I mean, you can say that your bureaus need to get their things in as early as possible but you know that, over time, it's going to creep back. It's going to end up being the deadline is the deadline. So that initiative to be a good and healthy aide tore is health great for a while, but people change chairs and new people come along, and we end up essentially at the same place again. For me, in equity and appropriateness, we need to send a clear deadline. And we can't just say, it would be nice if you did this because it would make our life easier. We have tried really hard to do that and will continue to do that.

**Leonard:** I'm not going to beat what i've said to death, but that's not what i'm saying. You're not hearing what i'm saying.

**Blackmer:** I guess what i'm hearing -- I don't know how to approach city council except in a body like this to deal with these issues.

**Leonard:** Well, make an appointment. We talk all the time about things you're concerned with. I don't recall a time I haven't sat with you and said --

**Blackmer:** I've been waiting three or four weeks to see the mayor, three weeks with commissioner Adams. Other things come up that are higher priority. That's what I face with you: Get in line. My items tend to be low priority. I mean, I appreciate being able to walk into your office and, if you're available, being able to chat, but that's not the way that things normally work around here. So, from my standpoint, dealing with the whole council, the only avenue I have is execs, and basically i'm not invited to be there. When they were informed of this, they apparently discussed it at their meeting and told me that that was not acceptable. That's not -- I mean, without even inviting me to talk about all of the things we have to do. So I guess -- you know -- to turn it around, we were trying to have a discussion, and all we got was, that's not acceptable. So --

**Leonard:** I hear you, and i'm glad that you're bringing this up, 'cause it's not something I was a wear of.

**Saltzman:** Aren't bureaus required to have everything in to the commissioner in charge's office a week ahead of time?

**Blackmer:** That's what I understand. So that's a practice with a number of them.

**Saltzman:** I know I myself don't sign documents till thursday afternoon, and i'm willing certainly to voluntary commit to signing them on wednesday, and I could even support this. I mean, it is pretty amazing, the behind the scene glimpse of what goes on to get something on the agenda. But I think this could use a little more discussion. Like I said, i'm prepared to go there. I think there are some legitimate issues that I know ty shared in the email that sometimes we come out of a wednesday meeting and issues get discussed and we need some time to file something for the following week, especially if we have an afternoon council session. That just won't happen then.

**Blackmer:** Right. And we recognize --

**Saltzman:** There may be other avenues like the four-fifths or to suspend the rules, but there may be other obstacles to getting things on the agenda. I'm not sure where the rest of the council is but I will make the commitment right now that I will start filing my documents by 5:00 wednesday.

**Fish:** Gary, as the new guy here who hopes to have a new permanent exec in place within the next 48 hours, I would welcome a chance to have you come and educate my new exec and me about

**July 9, 2008**

these challenges, and then i'd like the opportunity to talk to my colleagues about ways we can address your concerns. I would just say, if there's a way that we can put this over so we could have that conversation, I think that would help.

**Blackmer:** Just to give you some context, other jurisdictions, when we've been able to identify their procedures on these things, it's two weeks, 10 days in advance. You know, this notion that thursday at 5:00 will produce something wednesday at 9:30 a.m. Is an incredibly short time line for an agenda to be prepared. So keep that in context as well.

**Leonard:** And I hear you, but honestly it's the first time i've heard that from you. And like I said, i'm not unsympathetic to concerns that you have on that, and i'm committed, if the council wants my office to be the point, to try to work with you and develop something. I'm committed to doing that. I don't think it's appropriate with you raising those concerns for us just to say, well, that's too bad. I'm sorry for the reception you've received up to now. That's not appropriate either. Now that i'm committed, i'm willing to sit down and talk.

**Blackmer:** We're trying to accommodate what council needs, but to a certain degree, it goes back to that. I understand there are exceptions when you've got a critical issue that needs to turn around and get right on the next agenda, but we also encounter cases where lack of planning on your part doesn't make it an emergency on our part.

**Leonard:** I have to tell you I feel really bad about that, because the staff is always accommodating. I have absolutely nothing but the highest praise. I feel bad that we've taken advantage of that without appreciating the impact. And so I apologize for that on my own part. I just didn't know.

**Adams:** Maybe working with our mayor and as the mayor elect, I actually would ask the council to have the two of us work with you on this issue in terms of this, because I think there are some other issues that we can talk about as well in terms of the care and support of the council. And i, too, want to acknowledge publicly the good folks sitting here and others who make our agenda making and public distribution of it happen. I know it's a very difficult job. I don't know if it's ok with council and mayor Potter. Maybe our offices can take the lead on working with you. When you're just -- to defend myself a little bit, when your request came in on this, both my chief of staff and I were out of the country for two weeks. If you wanted our input, it wasn't going to happen during those two weeks.

**Blackmer:** Mm-hmm.

**Potter:** I think you've made a good case for something to happen, some change that's necessary. So I think that, between the mayor elect and my office, we can hopefully resolve this issue to the council's satisfaction. I have to say -- and I want to tell you how Karla and sue are great when they're in this room, and they provide tremendous assistance to us, and I certainly appreciate what they do every day. I try to thank either one of them who's at the table because I truly appreciate what they do. So if that's sufficient, we could perhaps move to second reading. Otherwise, if we could pull it back for a week or two --

**Blackmer:** I'm willing to sit down and talk with you about these issues.

**Potter:** Is that ok with the rest of council?

**Adams:** Thank you.

**Potter:** Thank you very much. We're in recess until 2:00 p.m.

At 12:17 p.m., Council recessed.

July 9, 2008

## 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.

**JULY 9, 2008            2:00 PM**

[roll taken] [gavel pounded]

**Potter:** I would like to remind folks, prior to offering testimony to city council, the lobbyist must declare which entity they are authorized to represent. Please read the 2:00 p.m. Time certain.

**Item 992.**

**Potter:** Mr. Adams.

**Adams:** Thank you, mr. Mayor and members of the city council, and guests. I'll make some opening remarks, walk through the resolution that's before the city council, and we just have four people that have been invited to testify, and then we'll hold -- throw it open for public testimony followed by council consideration of the resolution. After 3.5 years of participating in the columbia river taskforce, I want to share with you my take on, on the issue, we're we're at, and I believe we're we need to go. Interstate 5 stretches 1382 miles from mexico to canada with just one draw bridge. Antiquate and had unsafe along its route. It's the draw bridge that many use almost every day to cross the, the columbia river. I believe after the study of the work, of the columbia river taskforce, that we need a replacement. But, it must be the right kind of new bridge, and it must be a bridge that Portland can be proud of in terms of design, construction, funding, and operation. It must, in my view, reduce automobile reliance. The new crossing must permanently reduce the vehicle miles traveled, which is Oregon's primary source of greenhouse gas emissions. We need congestion, price, electronic tolling, on both the i-5 and existing i-205 bridges paired with real options like light rail and better transit while aiding the speed and the movement of great. I believe these toast should be collected in perpetuity in part, to help fund the needed improvements that are, have long been identified south of the bridge on i-5 and i-205. I believe that, that this new bridge must, must be the result of new federal and state transportation funding. This project is designated on the national level as one of, one of six quarters of a future. That means new federal funding for the region that will not and must not compete against other local transportation funding requests. It means on a state level, the state government must come up with new transportation funding for this project that does not take away from the city's transportation requests and needs. This is the essential, given that Portland has a \$431 million safety maintenance. Transportation maintenance, and safety backlog, this bridge must, must be an inspired green post-card worthy design. It should be the world's most environmentally friendly bridge in terms of design, construction, and operations. Any bridge is an icon, and this one must be, must be, must aesthetically enhance the world class grant your of the columbia river and mount hood. And it must be sensitive to its neighbors by help to knit together the two halves of hayden island and downtown vancouver. This bridge must be built with local hands. This would be the largest public works project in the region ever. Portland is the nation's leading incubator of sustainable design and technologies making local firms well prepared to meet project expectations. Local companies, including emerging small businesses, minority and women-owned firms should earn as much of the project work as possible. Portland's vote today is

**July 9, 2008**

not the ultimate yes to begin building this bridge. The vote today will only approve moving the bridge project from one evaluation phase to the next. And it establishes the assumption, the starting assumption in the next evaluation phase that the existing bridge will be replaced with no more through travel lanes than exist right now, and that it must include light rail or there will be no new crossing. I want to thank the governors of Oregon and Washington. I want to thank our congressional delegation. I want to thank the agencies that have been involved with this and the local stakeholders for being responsive to, to Portland's concerns and our goals for this project. And I appreciate that these decision makers have provided us with assurance that our aspirations and concerns about this project and the next phase will be met with our satisfaction. But there is a bistate project, and this is a project that will go on for multiple years. So, the agreements that we have now with people and the positions that they have might change. And so, it is important to make sure that we are going to be treated well in the years ahead. And I want to just underscore that the city of Portland, although having political, sizable political leverage in the future, having talked to myself with the federal delegation and the governor's office, that nothing will move forward over our strenuous objections, over our objections. We also, in this region, have the jpac process, and metro has to sign off on this project. They have vetoes. Metro's decisions on this project will be guided by jpac, of which I sit on and other governments sit on. Metro can either take jpac's recommendation of a improper, but cannot, condition amend it. So, although we don't have statutory veto power in this process, which I did tried to achieve at the taskforce, I do feel confident that given the good working relationship between odot, the Oregon department of transportation, and the city of Portland, that, that, um, that our concerns and our goals will be addressed to our satisfaction in the future. But I want to be crystal clear. That if they are not, I will strongly oppose the final design of this project. If it fails to meet our goals. I would rather miss this round of federal funding and live with a, the significant challenges and vulnerabilities of the current bridge and have, have, than to have a bridge built poorly that will punish Portland for the next 100 years. Today, this resolution calls for the city council to support the locally preferred alternative that consists of a replacement bridge structure with no more than three travel lanes in each direction, and must include light rail. This congratulation further, excuse me, this resolution further states that it must be done consistent with the city's policies and goals, and we list them out. I mentioned most of them already, and that we assert our right to continue to comment on and shape the major decisions in the next phase, and that this resolution and action by city council today should not be interpreted as the city's final input or acceptance of the design and construction of the project given that we have a lot more details to work out and finalize. With that, if it's ok with you, mayor and city council, I would invite fred hansen from tri-met and matt derrick from the Oregon department of transportation. Matt, do you want to lead off?

**Matt Garrett, Oregon Department of Transportation:** Thank you, I appreciate it, mr. Mayor and commissioners. I truly appreciate this opportunity and the river to speaking with you for the last several days. I enjoyed it, and I thought it was very productive conversation. I completely subscribe to the comments of commissioner Adams, and I will tell you that, that the, the decision before you, as articulated, is a great opportunity. It's an opportunity that's taken over a decade to prepare. We position this. We stand on the shoulders of many people that came before us. People from the city of Portland. People from metro. The citizens of the Portland metro area. They have informed this process for well over a decade. We are now at a point to take advantage of an opportunity. An opportunity to secure light rail over into vancouver. This is a discussion that's been engaged for the last 13 years. We have now repositioned it to take advantage of this opportunity. An opportunity to secure the bridge that's safer. The interchange fixes that will come on both sides. We'll make this bridge much more efficient in its operations. And the economic implications goes without saying, it is the major west coast corridor with international implications. The issues of jobs. The opportunities. The issues of great mobility. And, and the

**July 9, 2008**

issues of making sure that commerce goods and services, as well as our citizenry, move in a safe and efficient manner. Are paramount. The environmental opportunities are significant. There will be reductions of co-2 emissions. There will be reductions of toxins. The water quality will be improved. The stormwater drains right into the river. We will fix all that up. The piers, in terms of the fish, in terms of the navigation will be improved. And there will be fewer cars traveling across this new bridge than there would be if we had done nothing. Tolls. We have a financial mechanism in place that we can reintroduce to the citizens. Of the metro area. In tolling. And it is your action that is will allow us to realize all these opportunities and more. But, it is our partnership that will allow us to get there. Mr. Adams spoke about the relationship between odot and the city of Portland. That is a very healthy relationship. I have shared with him, and with all you, I think, that at no time this relationship has, has been as healthy as it is right now. And there are tangible examples of the partnership and the relationship that we have. Whether it's 82nd. Whether it's m.l.k. or delta park or whether it's our work on the 205 Portland mall light rail project. We've been there as partners. It is the way that this region does business. It is the way that the Oregon department of transportation does business with the city of Portland. I would ask that you reflect on that attitude, that approach, that is the same attitude and approach we bring to the columbia river crossing. Take a step forward today, hopefully toll secure a significant milestone as we move through this journey. We have a long journey to go. There is no yes. There will be significant discussions. Robust dialogue to come on many, many issues. But, we will be at the table to answer those questions, to find solutions, and when all is said and done, deliver a bridge that not only the citizens of Portland, not only the state of Oregon, state of Washington, but this nation can be proud of. Mr. Mayor, with that, I am happy to answer any questions.

**Adams:** I have one. One, and probably more, but, but will you or odot forward a project to, to the federal government requesting funding over the objection of, of a majority on the Portland city council?

**Garrett:** No. That will be a failure of leadership. It would be a failure and put us in, I think, an awkward situation with our federal partners. We have to show consensus. So, as we work these issues, it is incumbent upon all of us to find consensus, to find remedies and solutions. We need to be, to bring back a decision we're we all embrace, that is significant at the federal level, and I would offer that's significant at the state level.

**Fred Hansen, TriMet General Manager:** Thank you, mr. Mayor, and commissioners. For the record, i'm fred hansen, general manager of tri-met. I come here in support of the resolution that, that has been submitted to you for consideration by commissioner Adams. Let me be precise in looking at it from my perspective, that is from the transit agency perspective. I served on all three of the broad bistate committees that have led up to the point that we are at today. My view has been consistent. I believe that, that the existing free-through lanes on the existing bridge are compromised in terms of the, of the efficiency of their operation, in terms of the safety. No shoulders, inability to be able to, able to respond to, to any kind of either a stall or an accident in an effective way that doesn't have a sporadic impact on the flow of vehicles. Number two, I believe that the lift span, the last on the i-5 corridor, one of the last anywhere on the interstate system in the united states is appropriate to be able to be replaced. And, and three, most importantly, and you have emphasized it yourself, commissioner Adams, and that is the importance of light rail as a part of this project. It is, to my view, absolutely critical and, and is, in fact, cannot have the project moved forward if it were not for whale being a part of that. And the issues that are yet to be resolved are issues that, I think, are very important. They resolve around the number of exemplary lanes. Those, to me, are important to be able to be insured that they are not there for additional capacity, but rather, are there for the efficient and, and safe operation of the merge lanes, but not for, for additional throughways, and although those decisions are not ripe yet, are ones that I think are critical. Let me just close by emphasizing two additional points. Many that are before you,

**July 9, 2008**

great and other factors, I will not address, but let me address two. That is, in terms of the construction of the project, as we have done in all our light rail projects. We expect that the, the green practices, in construction, and, and the results of that construction, whether it be from, from severescaping landscaping to recycling of materials, to use of biodiesel, in all the construction vehicles. Those, those issues are, are, and will be the forefront, and I believe, tremendously important in the construction of this project. Secondly, I do believe that, that all members of our community need to be able to participate in the economic benefit that comes from the construction, and as we have delivered on the interstate max alignment and as we are now, now delivering on the green line, I expect that, that the, the minority owned, women-owned, emerging businesses will play a significant role within the construction of this project, and that they will be local businesses who are able to participate using some of the techniques that I think that we have pioneered on the, on our light rail project. With that, I would be happy to answer any questions.

**Adams:** I just came back from, from stockholm, sweden, recently, we're one of the world's first congestive pricing approaches was implemented, very successfully. They realized a 20% reduction in congestion and a number of other benefits. My vision for this project is for the, you know, electronic permanent congestion price tolling. That will be operate and had priced in a way that we will get as many of those trips that currently come from clark county to Multnomah county and beyond, onto the light rail. And, and I wanted to, to, just for the record, get your sense, if you sort of share that sort of operational vision that combines operational funding and design of the bridge.

**Hansen:** Mr. Mayor, commissioner Adams, I do share that fully. I believe that congestion pricing, beyond the issues of raising revenue to be able to help support the capital or operating cost, is a very effective tool to be able to discourage the use of, of single occupant vehicle, when, in fact, there are effective alternatives. Light rail being the most key, but certainly, the bike and pedestrian access that is here is, is also very important. Car-pooling. Other, other methods of being able to make most efficient use of our limited resource is absolutely critical. The numbers that you have voted from stockholm, although I was not aware of the exact percentages, do not surprise me. I believe that those are ones that we ought to be able to achieve here, as well.

**Adams:** Ok. A question.

**Saltzman:** One of the issues that came up, the pricing you were just talking about. It's my understanding that, that the tolling doesn't begin until the, the new bridge is completed. Is that in the l.p.a. Or is that, is that --

**Garrett:** Commissioner Saltzman, I think that there is some questions in the direction to look at tolling as soon as possible.

**Saltzman:** Previous to.

**Garrett:** But that said, I think the, the tolling comes with the new bridge, and all the opportunities and the options of congestion pricing. I do subscribe to, to the vision.

**Saltzman:** To the extent that people raise the issue, the high gas prices we're seeing now, continuing into the future. We're seeing vehicle miles traveled right now declining, and that will effect gas tax revenues, which until congestion pricing is in place, is the primary method by which we have a state funding share. What's your response to that kind of a scenario? Can't generate the initial capital to get to the point we're we're going to have a more steady, more even fair pricing.

**Garrett:** Well, again, it's certainly one tool, and in managing congestion. Also, compliment mr. Hansen, with other travel options, whether the light rail [inaudible] gives folks the option but it is a double-edged sword. You are right. It speaks to the issue that we have attached our revenue source to a falling star. The gas tax is not producing the revenue. We, at the department of transportation, have gone out and identified a transitional opportunity inizing transponders and cars to track the vehicle miles traveled. The pilot was important. 260, 280 folks in Portland put these in their car. There was two service stations in southeast Portland that attach to the transponder on the pumps, so,



**July 9, 2008**

the existing infrastructure we can use. The pilot was, was termed successful, and the technology is there to track the number of miles traveled. So, we're out in front of this. It's not, in all, the work that we have done. I would argue had the eyes not only of the nation, international folks looking at this opportunity to make a transition from the gas tax. So, we know over time, you may be a decade out or sooner, things seem to be coming at us very fast but we know the technology exists to improve the concepts. We are progressively resuming the next phase of it.

**Saltzman:** We have sufficient legal authority to do these things?

**Garrett:** Yeah. I think that we have. We, we positioned the opportunities. There are some, some additional legislative conversations. We have to have.

**Saltzman:** Is there a fundamental legislative yes or no that would be required in order to, to require them and use them?

**Garrett:** The biggest issue, two of the issues that came up, are the issue of privacy. And there are some people that raise the concerns. Again, big brother in the car, to be very honest with you. That this, reminding folks that we're just tracking the number of miles you travel within the state of Oregon. Don't care we're they go, and the number of miles traveled. The second issue, incentives, are you charging everybody the same way? If mr. Hansen drives a prius and I drive a hummer, should we be treated equally? Those are policy type of questions that I think will engage the legislature in these types of conversations.

**Saltzman:** But the fundamental legal authority right now does not exist?

**Garrett:** It does. I think we worked to position this state to, to did.

**Saltzman:** Any comments?

**Hansen:** Just one thing, mr. Mayor, commissioner Saltzman. Although mr. Garrett might be able to speak to it more directly, the secretary of transportation, in fact, may allow for, this is probably implicit in the question, to charge earlier than, than the, the actual implementation of the construction. That is a high bar, it is my understanding, to be able to receive that approval, but that, that approval can be given by the secretary of transportation, so that answers one slight or narrow piece of the question.

**Adams:** And she told me that when I had a face-to-face conversation with her, that she, that she thought that early tolling was possible. I just want to underscore why, why using the existing bridge with tolling for me is not a long-term strategy, and that's because this crossing remains a draw bridge.

**Hansen:** Yep.

**Adams:** And half of our, you know, half of our crossing capacity north and south is dependent on two draw bridges, and so for me, after a lot of discussion, and I think reasonable people can disagree on this, but after a lot of discussion and, and analysis, early tolling, I personally would like to see happen. But, that, combined with using the existing draw bridge in the long-term, doesn't work for me.

**Fish:** Mr. Hansen, I had a question. You mentioned the economic opportunity this project presents for our community, and opportunities for women and minority owned businesses. And can you tell me we're you have a situation we're tri-met and odot are, are partners in a project? Who is the lead person on that, and would, would your policies and perspectives in contracting be the standard for the project?

**Hansen:** On the issue, i'll let director garrett speak to that, and this involves Washington, the department of transportation, as well. All of us, I think, and I can certainly speak for matt on this, are committed to insure women-owned, minority owned businesses, emerging business local participate fully within our projects. We have developed a very successful program in the project that we have led. Interstate max, current green line, and, and that have, by breaking down contracts into small piece, making sure that, that those very businesses are, are able to compete and compete successfully and provide high quality of work. I know that director garrett will want to be able to

**July 9, 2008**

insure that whatever role he plays will be, will, will also abide by those same approaches. I'm convinced that we can do that on this project in all aspects.

**Garrett:** I go to school on the work that mr. Hansen and the folks at tri-met have done. There is no question about it, is as a matter of fact. The procurement conversations at the Oregon department of transportation have changed because of some of the efforts of mr. Hansen. But, it comes down to, we have a long way to go and a lot of partners with them. I will assure you, and maintaining the theme of opportunity, this, this project provides opportunities for all businesses to grow. Small, women-owned, minority-owned. We will be aggressive on that front, and I know the state of Washington.

**Potter:** I have a question, director garrett. Has to do with the financial plan. Last time we had a work session on this, and you were here, I asked what, what was the financial plan, and it seemed like, like it was rather loose in terms of how it would be paid for. And what I would like to know is, is, will there be a specific financial plan in place that is specifically dedicated revenue streams that had been guaranteed before the construction of the, of the bridge begins?

**Garrett:** Mr. Mayor, there has to be but this is, this is kind of the awkwardness of the process that we have. We are moving through a process we're we, we have taken multiple alternatives. We have narrowed those down to, to the alternative you have before you today. So, we now know exactly what the project is. So we can now look at refining the financial side of that. Once we secure the locally preferred alternative and continue to move forward. It is, it is in the time period between the draft and the final environmental impact statement we're we will engage aggressively on the financial planning. We will understand exactly we're the numbers are. That will, that will, because once we move to, to the, and secure that the final e.i.s., and then following that, a federal document, know the record coming from the federal highway, we have to, we stand ready. We stand disciplined. You have to have your financial plan in order. I would argue, we're just now starting this process because this is a multi-modal process and the engagement of transit. They are wanting the information earlier because once we lock down on, on the pricetag associated with the transit department, that's built in, and we must honor that budget as we move through. That is a little -- that comes sooner than most highway time line, but I can assure you, as we move into, into the, the late summer and move to, to and toward that, that final e.i.s., sometime in the fall of 2009, the financial plan will be solved.

**Potter:** I thought it was my understanding that the city of Portland would not be required to contribute towards that financial plan, is that correct?

**Garrett:** Nothing before you today that is asking for money.

**Potter:** Will there be?

**Garrett:** No obligation to put the skin in the game. I'm sorry.

**Potter:** Will there be?

**Garrett:** As of right now, that's not [inaudible] if you look at the exhibit and some of the conversations pertaining to enhancements or mitigation type of things above and yawn, community investments, there may be an opportunity in the future to leverage those opportunities. We're not asking you to engage them. That's a project cost that we will deal with around that project sponsors. That said, going to school in delta park, some of the other projects, there has been opportunities for the city. It has put skin if the game to leverage additional opportunities for the neighborhood communities. The bryant street overcrossing. We were engaged in that effort, and I think the city put forth 15,000 just to leverage the additional opportunity. So, I wouldn't forego the opportunity for the city to, to invest in the project. We're not asking for anything then. But, I wouldn't foreclose on that in the future. It may be beneficial to secure the future opportunity.

**Potter:** The last time we met you were going to provide me with information about, about the decision points and what those would look like so that we would have a better understand, from

**July 9, 2008**

this point forward, we're the decisions would be made, who would make them and what would be the result of those decisions.

**Garrett:** I have a time line that kind of walks through that, mr. Mayor, and I am more than happy to give that to you and hand that out now with you and the staff to walk you through what I put down. Really, it's the calendaring out from we're we start today. We reached back to 1999. We fast forwarded from this point forward we're the major milestone is and what are the types of discussions, that transpire over the calendar as we go out through and end the 2010 and beyond time frame.

**Potter:** You have that today?

**Garrett:** Sure.

**Potter:** Could you give that to the council clerk? Look at that.

**Adams:** Mayor, if I could, there is a couple of issues relating to the finance that I think may be useful to get on the record and, as well, that this, this -- I think that I can speak for the city council. That any effort to come up with state funding that preempts local government's ability to raise our own local revenue for transportation, would be, would be, I would oppose strenuously, and I think the entire city council would oppose, and I know that big oil, big oil suppliers are trying to preempt us from considering local transportation fees, so I just want to make sure that, that you know that my personal view, and I think the council's view on that effort, and then I would also say that, you know, that we will know before we have to sign off on the final details of this project whether there have been -- whether there are state enthusiasm and success at getting more resources to the local governments, transportation resources to local governments, and the work of senator metsger to potentially raise the gas tax to the benefit of the, of the funding formula. We will know by the end of the legislature his success at that and our expectation is that we would see enthusiasm at all levels of city government, not only to find the statewide resources for this bridge, but also, for the, the long backlog of maintenance and the safety transportation needs for local governments, as well.

**Potter:** Other questions? Thank you, folks.

**Adams:** Thank you very much.

**Hansen:** Thank you.

**Potter:** Any others?

**Adams:** We have two more invited and then public testimony courtesies to our good partner, robert liberty, and then leslie from the office of sustainable development commissions, sustainable development commissions. Did I say the wrong name. Ok. Good.

**Robert Liberty, Metro Council:** Mayor and commissioner Adams, I am robert liberty. My business address is 600 northeast grand avenue Portland 97232. I'm a member of the metro council. I represent district 6, which is almost all of southeast Portland, large area of southwest Portland and part of northeast Portland. I'm here today speaking on my own behalf as metro councilor. My views verge in significant respects from my colleagues. I will cover four topics, one, my resolution on the project before you, second, two factual matters relating to the bridge lifts and the condition of the bridge that may be important to you, and two topics, always of interest to politicians, money and, and power, and conclude with some, some suggestions to you about, about how you might proceed. So, my position on, on the project, I think that there are many, many ways that we can address the movement of goods, materials, and services through our region across the columbia that are financially, environmentally, and socially responsible. The project proposal before you is not one of them. It is bad for taxpayers and bad for the environment and bad for our communities. I don't think that we can afford it as a region, as a set of taxpayers or as a planet. Unfortunately, that is a proposal you are considering today. So, let me go over two points, factual information that might be useful in the consideration. One is a structural condition of the two bridges of the columbia river. One built in 1916. One built in 1958. The same year that the 1916

**July 9, 2008**

bridge was raised and improved. 1916 bridge, by the way, is younger than three of the bridges over the willamette river. Odot website, the Oregon department of transportation website is a bridge condition, and they have a rating of, some of the design standard and structural sufficiency of all the bridges on the highway system. They have identified 30 bridges on the i-5 that are structurally deficient. The i-5 bridges are not on that list. Those are rated structurally fair for, for substructure, deck, and superstructure. And in fact, they have the same rating as the marquam bridge and the boone bridge, so, what we're saying, with this recommendation, is that it's more important to tear down the existing bridge, which has the same structural rating, as the marquam bridge or the boone bridge, and replace itself than to fix 30 bridges that the of transportation department has identified as deficient. Second point has to do with bridge lifts. I have some information in print. I didn't bring as many copies as required, but certainly, enough members of the commission. This is from one of the technical reports in the draft environmental impact statement. On page 4-3, you will see a diagram that shows the height of the bridge clearance now, so the primary channel of the lift is only a 40-foot clearance, but the barge channel, which is farther to the south, the alternative barge channel is 69 feet, and you could see the roots. There are issues having to do with the downstream bridge. It could be addressed. If you trim -- turn the page over 4-5, the bottom marks it with the star, the distribution of trips by type of craft and the height requirements. If you look to the right, you will see that, that there is a, a, about 30 some trips a year that can't fit under the existing lifts. Some of those are, are sailboats. It may be cheaper for taxpayers to buy each of the owners of the 24 boats replacement boat or additional boats and station it upstream or downstream to avoid the lift. Perhaps, saving a couple of billion dollars. There is a problem. You could see the diagram, the barge moving downstream has to swing to the north bank to go under the swing span. That could be fixed by putting a lift span on the rail bridge, and that bridge is more important for great than the freeway bridge. That's the main north-south rail link. And the cost of that in mid 1990s was \$45 million, which compares favorably with the cost of the c.r.c. Study which is \$30 million so far. Then I want to, to talk, having talked about those two points, I want to talk about money. I have in my hand the proposed amendment that will be acted on by the joint policy advisory committee on transportation, of which i'm a member. In fact, people hate it when I remind them i'm the vice chair. We'll be acting on tomorrow morning. It has a list of, or a description of finances. None of this is too surprising but it's useful to remind ourselves what, what we're talking about in the way of money. A total. 3.5 to 3.7 billion. A share from the federal discretionary highway funds is 400 to 600 million. 400 to 600 million. The state share is, is 823 million to 1.45 billion. Now, if that's divided equally between the states, which has been how this project has been described. We're talking about 400 million to 725 million from the state of Oregon. If there was a 14 cent gas tax, a proposal that was endorsed by the joint policy advisory committee, with one member voting nay, you are looking at them, and if there was a 14 cent gas tax increase, we saw a list of projects that could be funded. The c.r.c. Is not on that list. I don't know what you think the chances are of the next legislature approving a 14 cent gas tax increase. I think they are rather low. How about federal money? Are we going to be protected? Are we going to be able to have our cake and eat it, too, and have pie and two entrees? What you have before you is, is just a page capture from a website from the federal highway administration that has fax sheets on the current transportation bill, call it safety lou. This is the fax sheet for the national corridor infrastructure improvement program. And has the amount of money authorized for the entire country. We're in the 2009 fiscal year. The 390 million to the united states. There's a list of projects provided, as well, and the c.r.c. Is not one of them. The current bill expires in 2009, safety lou, and no one knows how much money will be appropriated, whether it will be earmarks or structured differently, so we actually don't know what the federal contribution will be. The deadline that's been referred to is for transit funding share, 750 million this year, but no one really knows we're the live money will come from, from the federal government. We have a \$200 billion payment that we make each year

**July 9, 2008**

on our federal debt. We'll have a new president. What are the chances for a substantial tax increase and what will be the contents of the federal transportation bill? I don't think that we know. Congressman Blumenauer has warned us, as is appropriate, repeatedly, don't assume that we can fund everything. So, my conclusion about money is, is, I have billed out the money is going to be there, but I think that we're taking a big gamble on a very, very expensive project with modest benefits. Finally, power. I believe as a matter of practical politics, staffing, and as a matter of law, by approving this resolution, Portland is seeding its oversight of this project through Washington and Oregon departments of transportation. I think it is naive to think that a project that has been driven by the department, the department of transportation staffs, the particular goal from the outset, somehow is going to be transformed based on, on letters from two governors. It's not the real world. Second thing is something that I just learned last week. I'm not sure, in a session in the 1990s, the Oregon legislature adopted a special procedure for approving north, south light rail. Called the land use final order legislation. It's not codified. And it sets up a separate process for approval of, of a transit project across the Columbia River. Staff at Metro now says that the highway can be approved using that process. A process which does not include the city of Portland. You would have no rule, no role in determining whether it complied with your land use plans. Metro would make the decision using criteria drafted by LCDC, also not codified, which I never examined. I don't know what they are. So, whatever chance you thought that you might have, if this, if this proves to be the case, actually you have a say over land use, impacts of this in the city of Portland, I think would be lost. Now, whether that's susceptible of different interpretation, it's an interesting question but I needed to advise you that you may not be able to play a role in the land use decisionmaking that should accompany the transportation decision. Finally, do I have some, have some suggestions? Yes. First, object to the resolution before you, saying that, here are some options. Make your approval valid for one year. During which you can receive and evaluate information on available federal and state funding and funding tradeoffs. We'll know whether Congress is going to enact a bill and whether the legislature is going to raise taxes substantially to fund the project. You also know what the impacts are on the greenhouse gas production goals, vehicle miles traveled, and you will have a better idea as a result of the work underway at Metro about what are the good strategies of the regional level, instead of a project level, should have more impacts on land use patterns to the neighborhoods of north Portland, and the impacts of increased gas prices, as I think Mr. Saltzman mentioned travel has, has fallen, I believe, on the bridge two years in a row now. So, that would be one approach. One year approval. Subject to reconsideration to see whether these conditions have been met. Or the project needs to be rethought. Second approach to make it contingent on securing 600 million to identify solely from the state of Oregon. And not to exceed that. Third, and this is a separate amendment, is because, because I believe that, that the chance this project will be built is less than half. Less than 50-50. For a variety of reasons. There's a lot of politics to work through in Washington, Olympia, Salem. And, and probably litigation. Do we have a plan B or a plan C to do something constructive? I think it would be useful for you, regardless of how you vote on the resolution to direct your staff and, and the bureaus of transportation, planning, environmental services, and, and office of sustainable development to prepare options for plan B and C. And plan B is based on the idea that we have tolling to, to invest in safety and seismic improvements, to, perhaps, extend the local bridge and extend the max line, but would require cooperation in the state of Washington. Plan C is what if Oregon and Portland and the region have to go it alone? Are there things that we can do that will make it better? Make it better for people commuting, for people driving trucks? I believe that there are things that are smarter, cheaper, and greener. That would give you some options to look at if the money does not materialize or other obstacles arise and allow us to have a positive alternative to what I think is a mistake, a tragic based on the 1960s ideas charging out at [inaudible] prices. Thank you. I would be glad to answer questions.

**July 9, 2008**

**Adams:** Robert, you and I are friends, and you and I have had an opportunity to talk about the issues that you raised, and I take your, your experience and expertise and passion in this area very seriously. I consider your points very carefully. I think that the difference between this bridge and the other bridges on i-5 is this is a draw bridge. And, and for me, that is not an inconsequential difference between the state of, of the condition of the other bridges, and I do think advancing this project in the next phase of evaluation to, to, to, to -- i'm not satisfied with all the evaluation that's been done today. I think that things have changed in the environment and in the transportation world, significantly, and perhaps, permanently. I think the next stage that we will require the kind of evaluation, evaluation, updated evaluation you talked about. For me, the, the -- there is -- there will have to be a drop dedicate in which this bridge has the finances to move forward or not. I don't think anyone in the room is going to approve moving forward with, with construction for projects for which is not financed or commitments to financing. I think that, that the notion of plan b is a very useful notion. That's why i'm, you know, very interested in early implementation of tolling that you have called for, and I think it's a really useful idea, that sort of begins to sort of be a plan b or an interim plan while the decisions are made on how to fund this particular bridge. So, um, the part about making our, our decision contingent for one year will not -- we've looked at that. It will not pass federal muster. We, I think, that's why we're being very clear that our decision today before the city council sunshine a yes to the project. Moving it from one phase of study to the next, and with starting assumptions for the next phase of study.

**Leonard:** Mr. Adams, if I could respond to one point. One of the things that's troubling about this project is how it intersects with the development of national policy. We built our reputation as a place with integrative land use and transportation that understands that we're and how you grow affects how you travel, and therefore, how it will contribute to global warming or access to jobs. And, and that, that the best approach is combining choices of travel, choices of, of places to live, but when it comes time to be an advocate, what we'll do is say the most important thing to do, draft national legislation in a way that we can get a toll lane bridge, which seems to be a reversal of what our national leadership role has been. This project, although we say it's not going to compete, is competing. It is competing, and we still have no system for putting one project against another in terms of the cost, the performance, along a spectrum of benefits and costs. So, that we can say that we're going to keep a tight rein on it, but I have watched the politics on this, and we will lose other projects and other policy. That concerns me. I know we share a lot of policy perspectives but that's my take on the politics.

**Adams:** I think very validly so, the way I view it, though, is we're not going to be required to sign off on the final plan. Nor will we. I think I can speak for city council, sign off on a final plan unless we see that the money to build this bridge, a project of national significance, unless we can see, touch, smell, and taste doesn't come from, from other needed projects in the region. So, we share the same concern and passion. I think that the time line that we've been given allows us to, to do that in the future, if we think that, that, um, that there is some money that should be going to local governments or transportation projects.

**Fish:** Robert I have a question. You alluded to the fact that there could an state law, or rule that, that would allow, allow for the displacement of our land use clause in connection with the light rail or someone suggested previously to me in the land is pertinent. Do you have specific authority on that?

**Liberty:** What I can tell you is that the legislation is referred to as a land use panel order. We're using it, will be using it with the milwaukie light rail decision. It was designed to clarify, simplify and consolidate land use decisionmaking by creating a separate review process focused only on metro rather than all the affected local governments and setting up criteria that are different. That law is in effect now. What our staff said in the last week was that the legislation refers to, to any

**July 9, 2008**

related highway improvements. That's a paraphrase, but any related things. The effort will be to take the light rail crossing and treat [inaudible] process.

**Fish:** Whether you say the effort is to do that, do you have any indication that, that odot or someone else is, is planning to, to cite that authority?

**Liberty:** Yes, our staff told me that last week. So, yes. [laughter]

**Adams:** The land use issues that are most challenging for me are, um, the fact that our approaches to land use and planning are, are different north and south of the river. For me, the operation of the bridge. The toll lane, the permanent toll lane, congestion pricing approach and in europe it's electronic, you don't use gizmos, they take a picture of the license plate and you set up an account and it comes out of your credit card or they send you a bill. Those are important because they need to act as a virtual, less auto dependent planning that, that would be great north of the river, but we, on the south. River, can't, necessarily, dictate. So, that's why, why in the four areas that, that i'm going to continue to be vim lent on, the operational, the tolling, congestion pricing, and for me, are going to continue to be so important that we go those right because I think that they can act, they can achieve the same kind of benefits as good land use planning.

**Leslie Carlson:** Thank you. Good afternoon mayor and commissioner. I am leslie carlson, and i'm a small business owner, and I am the co-chair of the Portland Multnomah county sustainable development commission. I want to thank you, first, for being willing to tackle and raise hard questions about the c.r.c. I know this is a difficult issue, and it was difficult for our commission when we considered the proposal. The l.p.a. Before you today. I know you have read the commission letter of june 2, so I won't reiterate those concerns but I want to give you more information about the background of the sustainable commission numbers that we're thinking when we wrote the letter. There is a paradigm shift going on right now, and that society, in 20, 25, 50 years, will look differently about transportation and land use than we do now. You could see that paradigm shift and the rise of all things sustainability is, including the city of Portland's reputation. The same is with the climate changes increasing and gas prices are rising on almost a daily basis. We have seen e.m.t. Go down, public transit systems are filling up, and our consumption of gas in the pacific northwest is down to 1966 levels, and that is a stunning reversal of decades of increases. Many public policy experts expect attacks on carbon in 2009 when we get a new, a new administration in Washington d.c. That may mean carbon taxes or a trade system or both. Even if the cost of oil were to drop, the taxes on carbon will mean oil will remain expensive into the future. The s.d.c. Felt like the shift was not reflected in the data that underpins the, the c.r.c. And the number of lands and the demand we'll need. The l.p.a. Had [inaudible] redistricted at \$1.25 a gallon for gas, and I can't remember the last time gas was \$1.25, but it was a long time ago. And no allowances for, for carbon taxes were built into that modeling and the concern is that the l.p.a. Is not built on what will likely happen in the future, but on predictions from the past. You all know very well that Portland has a, a reputation and a model for sustainable development. Our efforts to create a vibrant economy and site climate changes at the same time are heralded nationally and around the world. We have this reputation because of the innovative and brave decisions of the men and women who created thing like the land use system be like our transit mall, light rail system and more recently, our bicycle transportation system. The s.d.c. And the c.r.c., sees it as a, as an opportunity to create a new model for sustainability. We believe you can create a transportation system while decreasing greenhouse gas emissions. It will not be easy but we believe it's possible. This bridge needs to reduce the vehicle miles traveled, not increase them. And unfortunately, the l.p.a. That you are voting on today increases the greenhouse gas emissions from today by 30%. Were with those numbers, we feel it would be difficult to meet our own global warming action plan goal of 75% and greenhouse by 2050. They support additional modeling or new data to determine what kind of things we are going to need. We support tolling with congestion pricing, and, and we also support that tolling earlier than the new bridge, to toll the

**July 9, 2008**

existing bridge to see how much demand can be pulled off prior to new construction. Most importantly I think we believe that sustainability needs to be at the core of this bridge, and we're going to just affect our lives, our kids and grandchildren's lives for the next 100 years to we need to look at what kind of bridge is built. Thank you.

**Saltzman:** I want to thank leslie and the commission for all the effort you have put into this, and I think what's historic about our consideration of the project today is the fact that, that we have a sustainable development commission providing insightful testimony today, so thank you for that.

**Carlson:** Thank you, commissioner.

**Potter:** Director garrett, could you come back up and respond to, to liberty's statement recording the -- councilmember liberty's decision on the state level? Did you hear what he said?

**Garrett:** This is with regard to lufa, I believe?

**Potter:** Commissioner liberty, is that correct? Council liberty?

**Adams:** Yes, land use.

**Garrett:** I know it exists. It goes back to the connecting light rail. There's a vehicle. It's not a vehicle to hide me on. It will be open and transparency. We can use it and bring some type of opportunity to streamline decisions, i'm all for it. That said, everyone needs to understand what the decisions are. As I said before, we are here to seek concurrence in the direction we move. I think that's just good partnership. And so, i'm sure that whatsoever decisions are discussed back in the 1990s, and whatever tool they thought would be used with this, with this statute, if it has application here, it's a positive application but an open and comprehensive transparency type of effort. That's the best that I can do. I don't have a whole a lot of information on the application. No-no way will [inaudible] making any conversations around the direction. Whatever vehicle we use to, to assure remedies to the solutions. It will be transparency and we'll seek, as partners, seek the appropriate consensus. That doesn't change.

**Potter:** Thank you, sir. We have 179 folks signed up to testify. I'm going to limit testimony to two minutes. Pardon? So, please call the first three people.

**Potter:** Thank you for being here. You each have two minutes. State your name for the record.

**Edward L. Barnes:** Good afternoon, mr. Mayor and members of the council. I am edward l. Barnes, and I live at 4009 northeast 50th avenue. Vancouver, u.s.a and I heard councilman sam Adams speak the last, through the last 3.5 years of involvement, I was pointed in 1995 as transportation commissioner for the state, and i've been involved with the columbia river crossing as a transportation commission and attending 90 to 95% of every meeting on both Oregon and Washington. I talked to all five of you individuals about the columbia river crossing and how important it is to the people on both sides of the river from the great mobility standpoint and for the workers that have to form across the river every day, and if you look and see that people have to get up at 5:00 in the morning in order to be able to get to beaverton or get to wilsonville or some place like that, and have, have kids that they need to get into daycare or try to get back across the river at night to get to see their kids play little league or scouts or, or ymca or some kind of activity on the Washington side of the river, when you are out here sitting in the traffic anywhere from a half-hour to, to an hour and a half, and when you talk about, about waste and, wasting gas, every time that there is a wreck on that bridge, when the bridge goes up or down, or the traffic gets heavy, there is accidents and the bridge in both directions continues to get, to get bottled up. As the lift spans are an absolute hazard, the bridge seismically is not in very shape. The safety aspects of that bridge, when you are trying to drive across, if you have an accident, there is no place to pull off. The patrol or fire trucks cannot get to the people on that bridge, if they need to have some kind of a, of assistance. So, I urge this council to do like the city council of vancouver did, c-tran did, and some of the other groups have supported and vote for a new crossing, plus the light rail. I urge you to do that. Thank you.



**July 9, 2008**

**Craig Smith:** Mayor Tom Potter and commissioner, I am Craig Smith. I live in Battleground, Washington, and 555 [inaudible] in Battleground alone we have 10 finishers, and out of the 10 finishers, this is only two of them that work for the same company. So, we don't have that option of taking the light rail or car-pooling together. We have to take several vehicles to different jobs. Sometimes we can't work together on different jobs alone. The only time that we have the option to sue the bus system is if we are on one of the downtown projects. We're there for, for any length of time we're you can leave your tools there and you can use that, and so we, you know, we, obviously, need a new bridge, light rail, and it's something that, that, not just for the workers out here, but, but it's for, for, for my daughter, who just is learning how to drive. She drove over here on a Saturday. And it took us from Battleground to over to Delta Park, an hour and a half. That was without the bridge lift. So, I think, you know, we need to do something, and, and myself and, and members of the local 555, we would like to replace the bridge with light rail, and, and, um, and also with, with a bike lane in there, that would be really nice. Thank you.

**Jim Howell:** Mayor Tom Potter and commissioners? I'm Jim Howell, [inaudible], northeast 43th. The bridge across the Columbia River is structurally obsolete and probably should be replaced. Its opening span causes major traffic delays and has been identified by tugboat operators as a serious navigational hazard. In addition, it is corroded and coated with peeling lead paint, built on timber piling, it would not survive a major earthquake. Seriously lacks the capacity to meet future demand and today, traffic delays occur in the bridge affluent area. This bridge is between Mexico and Canada. It is a link, if this were to be broken, for any extended period of time, commerce would be impacted along the entire West Coast. The impact would be felt in the metropolitan area. If you think that I am referring to the I-5 Interstate bridge, you would be mistaken. I am talking about the Burlington Northern stay bridge located one mile down the stream. Rising, rising gas prices, increase dependency on foreign oil and global climate change will require railroads to expand to meet the future demand. They provide the most cost effective and energy efficient ways to transport and people. They can be run on electricity instead of oil, and in the near future, railroads can be called upon to provide more of the freight and passenger service. Replacing the two-track bridge, Teddy Roosevelt's administration should be one of the top priorities. A new bridge with major improvements to Vancouver and Portland, including the bypass track is needed. Incidentally, like fixing the railroad bridge, you eliminate just about all of the lifts on the Interstate bridge. Commuter service is, is something that could be added to this -- 16 seconds left. Basically, commuter service between Portland and Vancouver running every 20 minutes, is about a 12-minute trip, you have about 6,000 people capacity, about the same as I-5. And, and, and a supplement to the D.E.I.S. The freeway and light rail have been extensively studied but until, until heavy rail has been given the same level of analysis, a multi-million-dollar project should not move forward, and I thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**Adams:** Thank you very much.

**Potter:** For those testifying after this, you don't have to give your home address any more, so just, just your name will suffice. Pogue please state your name and anyone can begin.

**Lynn Lehrbach:** [inaudible], representing joint council teamsters who have approximately 20,000 members in the metro area, including Vancouver, and I'm here to urge you to vote for this resolution. Three years of hard work have gone into this by a lot of people, and, and the feds are onboard. Most states are onboard. We're are we going to do this and how long is it going to take to get back to this point again? Congressman Oberstar, who is a ranking chair on transportation and chairs it and will next year, and the next administration, to your point, commissioner Adams, visiting out here, went across that bridge, and was appalled that it had a draw bridge on it. So to your point, Sam, you are right. Shouldn't have a draw bridge on it. It impedes the movement of people. I would like to give credit to Tom Markcroft who has worked very hard to keep both states on track on this thing, and congressman Blumenauer and Defazio. Again, if we don't do it now, when will we do it and

**July 9, 2008**

what will be the cost in the future? All raw products are not being, are [inaudible] oil, steel, lumber, cement. It's being taken off the market by the emerging third world countries, and the price will continue to rise. It will cost 10 times as much if we wait because we won't be back to this for 10 years if we don't do it now. It's important to note, too, that the movement of great is very important, not only to our community, and economically to, to the community, it has to be moved smoothly, and we use the goods, every one of us here and every one of our citizens gets their goods through the movement of the trucks, whether it be food or dried goods. So, we get to do it efficiently and effectively or the employers that do it will move on us. I would like to just, just finish with this on congestion pricing. I agree with tolling, but when the bridge is built and not before, and to, and we already use transponders. We weigh trucks and charge, charge things, so transponders are in effect in the state, and thank you.

**Pia Welch:** Thank you for your time. My name is pia welsch and I am representing the Portland air cargo association. Our membership includes airlines, trucking companies, brokers, and many other pretty-related businesses. Air cargo connects p.d.x. To the world and the world to p.d.x. Air cargo is a vital link in our global economy. Many items we use in our daily lives come to us via air cargo. Over 274,000 tons of air great moved through p.d.x. In 2007, representing significant economic value. Our members are part of the wholesale trade and great transportation sectors of the economy that employ 93,000 people in the metro area. A smooth transportation flow is important to our economy. Last december with the flood in chehalis, Washington, we had a glimpse of what happens when nothing can move across the i-5 corridor. In order to maintain our economic competitiveness and our quality of life, we need a transportation network that moves products reliable, safely, and ontime. The columbia river crossing is an essential part of our regional distribution system. We support recommendations for rea, for a replacement bridge at the columbia river crossing because it uses existing transportation corridors, and it is a multi-mode samuel alito system, and wants to help move people out of cars. They recommended bridge is a good step towards improving safety and reliability for the air cargo pickups and delivery that are very crucial to our economy. Thank you for your time.

**Jeff Swanson:** Mr. Mayor and members of the commission, my name is jeff swanson, the logistics manager for schnitzer steel industries west coast metal recycling and steel manufacturing businesses. We support construction of a new bridge with light rail. On a monthly basis our organization ships approximately 25,000 tons of metal scrap and steel goods across the columbia river, primarily, the i-5 span and in either the northbound or southbound direction. This translates to roughly 900 truckloads per month or 45 truckloads per business day. With these kinds of volumes, time matters. Delays, such as caused by congestion, accidents, and bridge lifts, has a direct, tangible impact to our bottom line and economic viable. As a company, we utilize the transportation resources of multiple great carriers encompassing a variety of great modes. Highway, rail, and marine. We also possess our own fleet of trucks, rail cars, and barges. When delay and inconsistent transit times affect productivity, great rates must increase so that revenue earned will continue to cover costs. Rapidly rising energy prices exacerbate this problem. The current outerly costs of operation for trucks is in the 120 to 140 per hour range and rises with every increase in the fuel costs. Put this figure in perspective, on a per minute basis, the costs of operating a truck is \$2 to \$2.33. These costs are incurred whether the great is moving at 55 miles per hour down the highway or parked on the interstate bridge for 30 minutes. And this, in this context, consider the rate of return on a \$10 bridge toll. A conservative estimate is that it would pay for itself if only five minutes were saved. Congestion represents a tangible, economic cost to our community, one that we pay for every time we purchase a good or service. Every time we sit in traffic and every time we see the results of congestion on our natural environment. In conclusion this project is long overdo and needs to swiftly move towards fulfillment. While it will not solve all the transportation problems, it represents a visionary leap forward in doing so and shows the kind of

**July 9, 2008**

leadership that our region requires to maintain and improve upon the present standard of living. Thank you.

**Kathryn Williams:** thank you, folks. Mayor tom Potter and members of council, I am kathryn williams, I am the business and rail affairs manager for the port of Portland. I appreciate the opportunity to be here today. The convergence of surface transportation with the port facilities in Portland and vancouver make the i-5 corridor between 84 and 205 the crossroads for great flows by all modes through and around the region. We believe that the columbia river crossing project is a smart transportation and quality of life decision that will benefit both sides of the river as our region grows. The port supports the replacement bridge with light rail transit and improvement to the seven interchange within the study area. We support the use of tolls to finance the project and manage traffic. The c.r.c. Will have safer travel, more commuter choice, better great mobility and an opportunity to, to create a sustainable, visual signature that models the environmental and community ethics of our region. And the marine drive interchange is the most critical interchange within the state of Oregon. It provides direct access from the interstate to the state sea only intermodal container terminal, six, and the logistics center in river getaway. It provides access for columbia sportswear, nordstroms, Portland french bakery and many others. The redesign of the interchange must insure great mobility is the design priority, and I have shared a letter from our executive director with all of you with some additional details on that, and I encourage you to look at that. Just very quickly, we believe that this project addresses quality of life issues that we all care about, and ultimately, it's about people, families who need to get to where they need to go and have choices on how to get there. Thank you for your hard work and careful attention to this project. We look forward to working with the city and other partners to move this project forward.

**Mike Houck:** Mayor tom Potter, commissioners, I am mike houck. I serve on the board of directors for thousand friends of Oregon and i'm a member of the sustainable development commission, as well. All three of these groups have given you is a host of reasons for, for rejecting the current preferred alternatives and offered you specific recommendations for creating what we call a, a climate smart alternative. Having participated in numerous, and I would say intense, very, very complex conversations with all of these groups, I can attest to, to the fact that, that, and you have heard very, very well thought out testimony earlier, and you will hear some more to follow, that, that the recommendations that you've been receiving are far from knee-jerk recommendations that the Oregonian referred to yesterday or the day before. These are very well reasoned alternatives in my opinion. And i'm struck with the similarities this issue, between the similarities, between this issue and, and one that, that Portland city council considered over 30 years ago, the mount hood freeway. And as with the decision, as with that decision to reject the freeway in exchange for building the max light rail and other alternatives, transit projects, I believe that, that the c.r.c. Decision represents an opportunity for you to move the region to an alternative that responds to, to a carbon in the future. Your decision is potentially symbolic and precedent setting, as they are decision to embrace the a more socially and economic responsible alternative. There are two specific points that I would like to raise in my remaining few moments. One is, the post-guard nature of the bridge, the potential for excellence in design, I cannot believe, and I am pleased that the planning commission raised this, the pierson airfield is the tail wagging the dog in this process, and I am hopeful that we can resolve a situation we're you have 35 or 40 planes taking off that affects the desire design of the bridge, and the last point I will make, having set for two careers on the columbia river council, working to find a side that would, that would provide mitigation for the wetlands lost sat p.d.x., we came up with the van port wetlands, a huge portion of that wetland is likely to be impacted by the current design, and that is a significant concern of mine having, again, spent so much time and energy coming up with an alternative out there that, that really replaced a lot of the wetlands lots on the corridor. Thank you.

**July 9, 2008**

**Chris Smith:** Mayor Tom Potter and members of council, I'm Chris Smith, and I would like to talk with you a bit more about the finances today. The council of liberty shared with you the plan from e.i.s. It could be written on the back of a napkin, it would fit and I have about as much confidence as I would have on one written on the back of a napkin. As council already pointed out it contemplates 00 million in Oregon state sources. I would like to give you other numbers. 231 million in maintenance backlog on Portland streets, which include 65 million on the 157 bridges of the city of Portland. And, and 300 million to replace the Sellwood bridge, and 325 million of maintenance backlog on the bridges owned by Multnomah county. And, and what do all these numbers have in common? They will compete for motor vehicle taxes of some kind in the state. Commissioner Leonard has been in the legislature, and I think he knows that the political will to increase motor vehicle taxes is a finite quantity. And if we are looking to Salem for 700 million of this bridge, there is no question in my mind those other critical needs will be impacted. This will not simply be purely incremental money from the state. It will come as an opportunity cost against other needs that are very important to the city and this region, and to think otherwise is simply naive. I would also like to point out that, that significant portions of the funding for this bridge will be borrowed. Whatever, whatever motor vehicle tax option Salem comes up with will be bonded over a long number of years to provide the revenue to build this bridge and the toll revenue will be bonded. Both those depend on people thriving. If, as many of us believe, prices will decrease the amount of driving the people in the state do, the revenue to repay those bonds are at risk, and there is the risk that we will need to take other transaction revenues, not contemplated in this and use those to repay the bonds. This is very financially risky, and I urge you to vote to request a supplemental e.i.s. To request more options for this crossing. Thank you.

**Terry Parker:** Good evening, good afternoon, I am Terry Parker. Last month I delivered a copy of the accessibility on the draft for this project. It offers a savings for taxpayers. Hopefully you have read it. One further note to that, demolishing the existing bridges carries approximately the same price tag as it would to upgrade. Sustainability starts with financial self sustainability. Singling out motorists for tolling, as the council has proposed, the socialistic profiling based on the vehicle of transmit. Therefore, discriminatory, and changes the credibility of any discussion this council can have in the future on discrimination issues. The skyrocketing costs of motor fuel, no outdated subsidizing incentives are needed to promote alternative forms of transit. A real bridge and a reality check will necessitate equitable plans, which must be a condition that hopefully Clark County will mandate. If the, if tolling is implemented for any kind of motor vehicle, the users of all vehicle traffic must be required to pay a toll or a user charge. And at a cost per passenger, per crossing for max at \$9 a crossing, transit passengers need to be obligated to pay a proportionate share of the local transit infrastructure costs with a surcharge on transit fares. And instead of just providing free loading, bicyclists must be expected to pay their way with the bridge toll to cover any match moneys on the bicycle, and that -- the [inaudible] as for the seco, the number of lanes for the standard motor vehicle will need to sprawl? Hey, it's population growth. That's, that's the key, and that's what this, this council should be discussing. I'm sort of running out of time here. But, can't legislate from a bubble with a one-sided agenda that dictates lifestyle, housing, and transportation choices. Talk about reducing population and growth and stabilizing -- thank you.

**Bill Scott:** Mayor Tom Potter and members of the council, I'm Bill Scott, Janel McCarville general manager of [inaudible] I was previously the director of the state of Oregon department of economic and community development for nine years. I've advocated for many, many highway transportation infrastructure projects over the years. I'm here to advocate that you take a step forward for solving the Columbia crossing project by rejecting this resolution. And taking action that does not endorse a locally preferred alternative at this time since I don't believe you have a viable project in front of you. The Oregonian referred to a, to opponents of the 12-lane bridge assignee jerk. I actually started as a knee-jerk supportive. Obviously, a major problem to be solved. Lots of smart people

July 9, 2008

were working on it, and I was inclined to [inaudible] the more I learned about the size the structure, the lack of conceivable sources of financing, for a project this size, and the more I realize that we need to take a stand against it regardless of the desirability of regional unanimity in building your partnership with the state. I'm convinced that this bridge won't be built in this format because it's not affordable, and it will never meet the conditions that you are attempting, you and others are attempting to place on your support for it. It isn't needed to solve the problems of the crossing, and it won't solve them if it is built. It's time to pull the plug. Zip card business won't be affected by whether the project goes forward but it gives me a window on the choices that thousands of Portlanders are making to live a different kind after life that's less -- diminishes the role of the automobile in their lives. Those choices are consistent with the goals that you stated and the state of Oregon has stated. I think that the real opportunity cost here is, is a once in a generation chance to take advantage of the, of the new administration in Washington, and go forward with the visionary Portland project and I hope you do that instead of dragging a toll lane freeway in there. Thank you.

**Jill Fuglister:** Mayor and members of the council, thank you for this opportunity to talk. I'm jill, and I am the co-director of coalitions for livable future. We're asking you to reject the resolution before you today. We think today is a unique opportunity for you, as a council to, demonstrate that far-sided sustainability focus, brand of leadership that Portland is known for. When you view the project, as pivotal precedent setting project it comes at a time when we must transform how we do things as we grapple with the threat of global warming and rising gas prices. An investment of this magnitude must take a big bite out of our carbon footprint so even as regional population grows, the title am we drive doesn't. Yet the alternative you are considering supporting today doesn't -- falls far short. The resolution under consideration acknowledges that critical information for making a sound decision is missing, and that the 12-lane alternative is based on flawed data. Yet, your resolution will support this flawed alternative should you approve it, and the more steps forward taken toward the 12 4-lane bridge, the harder it will become to shift direction. In the three years that [inaudible] served on the task force, there are concerns, many of which are listed in the resolution or in the exhibit, have not been addressed. What should we expect looking ahead? And at what point will the city have a vote on the issues that are identified in that resolution and that mr. Garrett verbally assured you odot wouldn't override. It's unclear and should be clarified, those decisionmaking points before moving ahead. I understand that not moving forward today would be difficult, but that's what we're asking you to do. Again, today is, is a unique opportunity to choose, to choose and try to redirect this project now or choose to support a 12-lane freeway bridge expansion and hope you will be able to right size it and redirect it later when some memorandum will be harder to shift. We usually you to make the right choice and not to support the resolution before you. Thank you.

**Mara Gross:** I'm the policy director for coalition for a livable future. We share the concerns that other speakers have about global warming, induced sprawl in clark county. Due limited time I'm going to speak on other specific issues. We're really concerned about the impact the crc is going to have on funding of other critical issues. Chris smith spoke on some of these. There's the selwood bridge replacement \$240-420 million; safe sound and green streets; not to mention all the needed projects safe sound and green doesn't cover if the voters don't pass funding for that. How are we going to pay for --I believe we're looking at \$800 million. Grey to green program to manage our storm water and protect our rivers and watersheds. \$15 million we're missing for that. Just these three examples add up to over a billion dollars. I don't see how we can spend \$600 million without sacrificing other needs even if the local funding for the crc comes from the state portion of the gas tax. Commissioner Adams opinion piece in the Oregonian today contains some excellent language that speaks to a number of our concerns. However it also referenced connecting east and west hayden island. I believe he's referring to a bridge to w hayden island which would cost about \$100

**July 9, 2008**

million. It would also have a major environmental impact as the proposal's directly tied to creation of a marine terminal over one of the most critical natural areas in Portland. Another one of those critical areas is van port wetlands. There's also the cost of what other expansions this project will necessitate. Don wagner who spent 25 years with odot is now watch dot's regional manager, was quoted in the Columbian the other day talking about the rose quarter. He said Oregon will eventually need to solve this problem and "it will be a mega project of the same magnitude" as the crc. If you approve the lpa today I'd like to be reassured that the city will have another later on. I heard that crc won't move forward if the city votes no. I want to be assured that there is that vote and have an understanding what the time line is. But with all these problems and more, we're asking you to reconsider. An updated environmental and economic data can find a better solution.

**Adams:** Just to clarify, I appreciate your testimony. What I talked about was the current bridge slices in half east and west hayden island. You're referring to a north south issue.

**Gross:** ok thank you.

**Adams:** The Council has to approve. This does have to come back to council—probably more than once—to approve going from the 2 phases ahead, the final eis and the record of decision.

**Emily Hicks:** I'm a recent graduate of PSU's college of urban and public affairs. I have a masters in public health and sustainability certificate and I'm hear today representing the next generation of leaders who see a tremendous opportunity to implement higher level assistance thinking and impact analysis. There is also a tremendous responsibility to live up to our reputation as innovative planners and leaders in the sustainability movement. I'm hear today also to encourage you to listen to the experts here in the room and you've heard from over the past several months and years and demand a clearer vision of what this project looks like before moving forward. For instance the epa has raised concerns about contaminating our county's major underground drinking water aquifer. There's also concern about permanent increases in Stormwater run off and construction related impacts to water quality. Multnomah county's impact assessment said an increase in volume of vehicles is likely to yield more severe health impacts from the air pollution and disproportionately affect low income families and people of color. So moving forward without all information and without legally binding conditions doesn't seem to line up with our intentions here in Portland to start accounting more for equity and long term impacts. There are also concerns about causing urban sprawl in clark county. This means more people spending more time commuting in cars. Public health research shows that the amount of time spent in a car has a direct effect in obesity and motor vehicle accidents as leading cause of deaths. So shouldn't we be thinking of ways to decrease the amount of single occupancy cars rather than making way for more? I believe there are many innovative upstream alternatives possible and I'm wondering if we've really considered and explored many of these options in our region. This is an opportunity to lead in a new way of doing things that is fully informed, participatory and in a way that promises have lasting impacts for all the regions residents.

**Mel Rader:** I work for upstream public health and I've come to emphasize the impact the project will have on the health of the residents of the region and to voice concerns about the analysis and the timeline for public comment. Part of a diverse group of organizations that came together to examine the effects of the proposed projects on the health outcomes. The Multnomah county public health dept led the way by writing a health impact assessment as a commentary on the draft environmental impact statement. Some of the impacts include air pollution, which impacts increased rates of respiratory disease and cancer, the effect of excessive noise on cardiovascular disease and impaired mental functioning. A lot of these effects are likely to fall disproportionately on low income people, households that live close to the freeway. Portland and the region has long been a model for sustainable design and I think we can also be a model for healthy community design, but that requires that we assess health impacts of these projects and find ways to mitigate the impacts. I encourage you to think about that. Also, although there are a number of things

**July 9, 2008**

positive about a project, there are many major concerns I have. One is the impact on global warming. This is also a big health issue and well as environmental. I encourage you to step back and take the time to assess the impacts and not pass the resolution that is before you today because I do not think it's good enough and we're not ready to have a conscious step forward.

**Bob Stacey:** I'm from 1000 friends of Oregon. I turned in copies of testimony that 1000 friends provided on the draft environmental impact statement that point out that the project improved by this lpa violate Oregon and Washington laws requiring reduction of greenhouse gas because of the increased capacity provided by the 12 lanes and 14 lane miles in the 12 lane version of the bridge. I don't think it's necessary to belabor that today. I take note of commissioner adams comments that were published in the Oregonian and it's clear that the council understands the concern that we have about global warming. We think it's irreconcilable with this project. And so the only difference we have with the commissioner's statement is that we believe these concerns impel a vote not to approve the lpa. To instead request a supplemental environmental impact statement that identifies one or more alternatives that would comply with or and wa laws regarding greenhouse gases. That would meet the objections, concerns and objectives of the city of Portland rather than proceeding to approve an lpa that is inconsistent with those views. We also agree with the statement attributed to commissioner adams in the paper this morning that people in the city are afraid of getting rolled. That is not an illegitimate concern given the legal structure under which you operate. You should be concerned that you don't really have agreement with your partners. Vancouver was unable to agree on tolling. It's not clear that clark county is going to be able to agree to light rail. And it is clear that washington state dot's regional manager believes that this bridge project won't be successful until Oregon four-lanes I-5 through Portland and clears up the alleged bottlenecks south of the bridge. That's what you face. We don't have a happy family here you should send a clear signal by saying no to this design and you are asking for a better design. Thank you.

**Adams:** Bob, if I could, I think your comments are well stated as have been the comments that proceeded you. It's not often I'm accused of being on the side of the automobile and production and the production of greenhouse gas and consumption of oil. The opportunity to change to have sort of a transformation change in the way that we build and operate transportation systems does exist. It's possible that we can get what we're asking for. It's possible. And we've had assurances that we're not going to be rolled. Time will tell. There's people like you that will be vigilant about that. Hopefully i'll be here for another four and a half years on this body. I guess the hope that I have that it is possible, that we can have one of those transformational moments regionally with this project, is three and a half years ago when I started out, the ambitions of some of the stakeholders was for a much larger bridge than simply replacing the three lanes we have in each direction now. And we're not approving a 12-lane bridge up here. We're saying moving forward the assumption of three lanes in each direction which exists right now. And there was adamant opposition by leaders around the taken that it would not be light rail. So in three and a half years, i've seen stakeholders' opinions change on this. And I would not necessarily have predicted it three and a half years ago. But it has come to pass, and this is exactly what Portland asked for three and a half years ago. So I think your points are absolutely, you know, excellent, and if we couldn't shut this down in the future, if we do get rolled, I wouldn't recommend moving forward with further evaluation. If I didn't feel confident of that, even though our leverage in the future is political, not necessarily statutory. And I wanted to give you an opportunity to respond to my glass half full based on the experience of the last three years versus the glass half empty based on your experience that goes back further than mine.

**Stacey:** Commissioner, thank you. I greatly respect the progress you feel you've made and I do believe you're not on the side of greenhouse gas production. And I --

**Adams:** And I love babies too. [laughter]

**July 9, 2008**

**Stacey:** Yes, all around successful. The strong feeling and legal position that I have and take is that the council has a specific leverage point in the environmental impact statement review process. That leverage point is now. You exercise it by voting not to approve the locally approved presented. If it is decided by the two dots could be the basis for a 12-lane bridge and 14 miles of expansion within the project area because that's acknowledged of the impacts of this deis and, therefore, you should not send an ambiguous signal that you need to continue to talk, without sending an unambiguous signal that you refuse to accept the alternative.

**Joe Smith:** Joe smith, citizen. What does one do when he sees his friends hell bent on making a mistake. The first, the letter released weeks ago saying you've decided to make the second mistake to spend \$4.5 billion on a mega bridge. How can we say that the public opinion has meaning when the decision makers have made up their mind before the public has been given a chance to comment? I've been told that we shouldn't bring this up because it might make you defensive, but you are my friends and someone needs to say. It seems one more -- those speaking against the mega bridge plead with you to step back and take a fresh look because the second mistake would be to build a mega bridge. Let me be clear. We recognize the need for a new or expanded crossing for public transit and bicyclists. But that can be met with far less money and far less effect only time than the monster that you would foist on us. I'm providing you with my testimony to metro last month. The proposed mega bridge assumes and supports continued traffic growth and most important, continued growth in private automobiles commuting across the river. When what we should be focusing on is how not just to slow that growth, but to reduce it. I offer ways we can do that both long- and short-term, in an age facing a future of limited petroleum and global warming. We have a chance to proceed leadership for the entire country. The mega bridge goes the wrong direction. Please, take a new look.

**Ben Rhiger:** Hi. Ben, citizen. And I grew up right off of powell boulevard and I can't help but see kind of the parallel between the freeway and the mt. Hood freeway. I reflect, and I think how much different my neighborhood and the region would be if we had gone through to create the mt. Hood freeway so I was asking the councils to cautiously reject the resolution. To nip the momentum in the bud before it gets out of control. I know there's a lot of money and thought and research behind the project but I think we should really think about what the point of the interstate system is and where that fits into intraregional travel. It's unfortunate that the river divides these two disconnected cities, vancouver and the metro area. We should think about what is causing the traffic between those two regions.

**Fish:** Can I ask a question?

**Stacey:** Two today. Three.

**Fish:** I've heard people talk in terms of the approach, yes but, or the no but, so i've been thinking about those two options, but i'd like to ask you specifically. Are you comfortable with the "but" that we've arrived at in this document?

**Stacey:** Yes, commissioner, I believe you stated concerns that are consistent with the ones we have. I would be a little more forceful on the global warming. I think it is a violation of what the legislature enacted last fall session as the target for greenhouse gases to expand highway capacity this significantly, it leads in the wrong direction. Other than that, yes. The but is --

**Fish:** If it's fair to say we have agreement on the but, the conditions, just so I understand it, the gist of your disagreement is over whether we're going to lose the leverage going forward?

**Stacey:** Yes.

**Fish:** Thank you.

**Greg Johnson:** Mr. Mayor and commissioners. I'm here today representing 1,000 members of local 516 fabricating ironworkers in the Portland-vancouver area. I'm also here as a member of columbia pacific building trades. We'd like to go on record in support of the columbia river crossing, including light rail. We're in need of a new bridge and the price to build it will only up as



**July 9, 2008**

time goes on. I seem to remember -- i'm a long time resident of the Portland area. I remember a debate going on whether Portland should build the light rail system. A lot of pros and cons. I think the bridge sooner or later has to be built and either build it now at \$4.5 billion or 10 years, \$10 billion. So thank you very much for your consideration.

**Jay Coolman:** I'm Jake. I was concerned with -- I believe building this bridge is crucial and opposing it naive and it's going to happen one way or the other. I think this is an opportunity for the city because building this bridge, whether it's 12-lane freeway or light rail, it's going to funnel growth into Clark County and Vancouver. And if we're going to subsidize sprawl in Clark County, we can use this as an opportunity in the future to require them to adopt similar growth management plans or officially join Metro as a -- i've heard him talk about that as a possibility and it seems to me that if you guys don't force essentially -- we keep discussing this as if Vancouver is an equal partner as Portland in this project. And I hate to sound superior, but in many ways, they have to submit to the fact that they don't have the equal authority as we do. And if you're going to try to support this project, you have to pass it, but I think it's really, really important that we control growth and also with the increased traffic, we're going to suffer the disproportionate share of the cost of maintaining other infrastructure. When you guys address tolling, consider the fact that Portland is probably going to need a disproportionate amount of the toll revenue to maintain our streets.

**Adams:** I will give the mayor of Vancouver your phone number. Who we value as an excellent regional partner.

**Fish:** I think we just set back regional about 25 years.

**Adams:** They're an equal partner. Thanks for your testimony.

**Per Fagereng:** The year is 2015. It's hot and the air is hazy, maybe from power plants burning supposedly clean coal. Maybe forest fires. Maybe from China. Oil is priced at a thousand dollars a barrel. A meaningless number. In fact, oil is one of the new currencies. Useful skills, booze and bullets are other useful skills. We have one of Oregon's problems is how to deal with refugees from Las Vegas and Phoenix. We're left with empty box stores. Goods are moved by boat. How do we pay the workers? Perhaps with food and booze and a piece of reclaimed land when the job is done. That's how we pay the workers at the airport project. Their job is to cut up the runways and use the concrete to make garden beds. A huge bridge rises into the air. Trains use it, occasionally a truck. On most days, the lanes are empty. But today, two motorcades converge. Out steps the governors of Oregon and Washington. Here to dedicate the bridge. Officially open it to traffic. [laughter] the governors make speeches about a bright future when this bridge will be jammed with new cars that run on the new energy we're waiting for. Meanwhile, this bridge can be used for other neat things. When the ceremony is over, the motorcades turn around and head back. A thousand young folks jump on their skateboards and race down the concrete slope. Thank you. [laughter] [applause]

**Adams:** That, of course, is Governor Robert Liberty. [laughter]

**Marian Haynes:** Good afternoon. My name is Marian. I represent the Portland Business Alliance. The board endorses a replacement bridge with light rail as the locally preferred alternative. It's our number one transportation priority given the importance of this corridor to the region and national and international people and goods movement. The alliance is working with the ports of Portland and Vancouver, Clark County and others to create a Columbia River Crossing Coalition. We recognize this is a first step in a longer process to bring federal and state dollars into the region to construct this project. The coalition has well over 100 members at this point. Businesses and individuals, it's growing rapidly. Companies like Providence Hospital, Columbia Sportswear here in the region, as well as associated Oregon industries, Association of Washington Businesses and other statewide groups that realize the importance of this bridge to both the state, not just this region. I've included a list of supporters that will be passed out to you and also case studies we're doing for businesses in the area about how they're trying to adjust to the congestion on the I-5 bridge and what that means to their businesses. I want to state that where we are in this process, this is not about building a new

**July 9, 2008**

big bridge. We're not approving a 12-lane bridge. We recognize there are lots of questions that still have to be answered. That is appropriate. The number of lanes, precisely, tolling and when that will occur, all of these are discussions that need to go on. That's normal at this stage but we need to approve the l.p.a. So we can get to those answers. It's important to note if you look through the materials and the input they got back during the draft environmental impact statement, there's a broad support for this crossing. Three zip codes within the city of Portland where there's not a majority of support for replacement of this bridge. Three zip codes. We have a window of opportunity now. We've spoken --

**Potter:** Over your time.

**Haynes:** Ok. Thanks.

**Douglas R. Allen:** My name is doug. I think it's fair it say that a greener smarter replacement bridge is oxymoronic. I would take it from commissioner Adams that if it weren't for those -- a supplemental bridge or fix-up but it's those lifts that cause the problem. And I think that fixing up the existing bridge is the only way to achieve a greener smarter and vastly cheaper alternative and we need a supplemental draft impact statement that looks at such an alternative. I think commissioner Adams is probably well aware that as -- councilor robert liberty said when the 1958 bridge was built, the original 1917 bridge was raised so that both bridges would not require lifts for regular barge and towboat traffic. They're high enough. The problem, downstream, it has a swing span. We've replaced the willamette river one, but not the columbia. Now, the columbia river towboat association, and group in clark county, came together and recommended that the columbia river railroad bridge be fixed which would eliminate all lifts to towboats and barge traffic and leave the very few caused by special equipment and a couple of yachts. That was brought to the coast guard, all of the regional governments approved that, and then it didn't get funding so it was brought to jpay in 2004. This stiff-armed it and prevented it from going ahead. If we do that, we don't need to replace the bridge.

**Leonard:** Thank you.

**Rich Brown:** Commissioners and commissioner fish, it's great to see you. I'm rich brown. I'm a senior vice president of bank of america. I'm a member of the citizens task force that has spent three years reviewing options. There are several facts that argue in favor. With light rail, bicycle and pedestrian features. The first is whether you build a bridge or not, more people -- over a million people in the next 20 years. The worst thing we can do is accept public gridlock. That would be bad for public health and our economy. Just throwing up a bridge won't solve the problem and I want to expand on that a little bit. Much has been discussed about the need to facilitate the movement of freight. But don't forget that Oregon and -- Oregon and Portland are small-based economy. There are all kinds of working people from drywallers to plumbers to interior designers whose livelihoods depend on work in southwest Washington as well as Oregon. Their need for mobility is not a luxury. It's a matter of necessity. Second, while this is undoubtedly a very large project, it's a necessary upgrade of an existing highway. This is one small stretch of a system of thousands of miles of road in the Portland-vancouver region. We're fixing five-mile stretches all over Oregon and Washington, and we need to fix the most dangerous one. Finally, both traditional and new auto companies are designing cars that will make the gasoline combustion engine obsolete. It's forcing our children to pay for our failure to act.

**Adams:** Go ahead.

**Walt Evans:** Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I'm walt, a lawyer. I chair the trade policy committee of the pacific northwest trade association. As a former member of the vancouver national historic reserve trust, I also think the river is an artery that unites us, rather than a bridge that divides us. I've submitted written testimony and a 1905 map of Portland and vancouver. Summarize my testimony. First, columbia river crossing is needed to remove the choke point in moves freight up and down the coast. Freight that includes Washington and Oregon exports.

**July 9, 2008**

Pacific northwest has worked for years to expand trade with asia. Trade related jobs pay for than jobs not tied to trade. I've testified in the past that freight doesn't vote but the people behind that freight are people making family-wage jobs. The cargo needs efficient regional transportation with less congested freight corridors to move goods back and forth across the columbia. The second point I asked the question, will our generation invest in our children's future the way our grandparent did in our future? The 1917 bridge, my dad was a little kid and one of the four little kids that pulled the ropes that let the state flags drop down. The generation at that time invested so that our parents and we could have the economic opportunities we've had today and I ask the committee to consider and approve a columbia river crossing plan that invests in our children and grandchildren's future so that they can prosper in international trade. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

**Michael Powell:** I'm michael powell. Pleased to be here today. I've had 20 years of association with the city and the city planning and other public service efforts. A strong transportation bias. My work, Portland business -- Oregon business association transportation, port of Portland, done legal and streetcar planning and worked on the congestion plan and freight mobility plan that metro chaired in and put forward and I can tell that you having been involved in those processes, I can only come to one conclusion, which is support for this effort. Everything we consume in this community and almost everything we provide has to move into and out of this community. The lion's share, the overwhelming share moves by truck. I wish it moved by rail or some other vehicle, but it doesn't. Our largest partners, will be the primarily mode of choice, will be trucking. To put it on a personal level, I run a bookstore and you would think I don't have a big stake. But we handle about 4.5 million books a year. Every one came into this town by truck initially and 3,000 parcels get shipped out every day thanks to our internet and customer service efforts. We rely on prompt and just-in-time inventory moving out and quick delivery when we deliver goods to people. If you would pick a distribution center, about the last place you'd pick would be Portland, Oregon. It's too far away from the geographic center of the country. We compete with people located on the east coast and we rely on being able to compete by having a good transportation. The internet world is measured in hours, not days. So rightly or wrongly, people expect that kind of service. Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Support it please.

**Phillip Kalberer:** Mayor Potter, commissioners, my name is phil, a member of the Portland business alliance. Director, board of directors, which has named this columbia river crossing its number one transportation policy. As marian hayes mentioned earlier. I also served on the original task force convened by the governors of Oregon and Washington in 1999 to analyze issues facing the i-5 corridor and the Portland-vancouver area. This group developed a strategic plan to address growing congestion and safety problems in the corridor and issued its report in january 2000. This task force concluded there was a need immediately to take steps to address the challenges of the i-5 corridor including a multimodal replacement structure for the river crossing. It's now nine years later and as the plan has developed and particularly in the last three and a half years where a lot of meat has been put on the project, we can now see a clear answer to the situation as been with us for over a decade. A replacement bridge that includes tolls and light rail extension to vancouver. The extensive analysis shows that this multimodal situation is the best way to address increasing congestion and safety and reduce vehicles traveling over the bridge when compared to a no-build option. we've heard about freight mobility. I'd like to address one other issue. And that is what does it mean to downtown Portland. Portland is the arts and culture center of the region. Our businesses here rely on a labor and customer pool that is drawn in from the entire region. Just like vancouver downtown is also creating a cultural center. We need to be able to move people in and out of these areas and this replacement bridge will be an integral part of that. Thank you.

**Jim Labbe:** Mayor Potter, city council, i'm jim, representing the audubon society of Portland. Thanks for the opportunity to provide testimony. We're here in full support of the request for and

**July 9, 2008**

asking you to reject the locally preferred alternative. We really hope the council will not surrender the critical leverage you have at this point in determining the outcome of this process, and prevent the potential massive 10- to 14-lane bridge. I want to -- issues that need more emphasis. The first is the opportunity costs and I think it's important for the -- the fiscal impacts. I think the 4.2, everyone knows that's conservative and the potential for cost overruns, whatever the funding source, federal, state or local, to displace other priorities. We're particularly concerned that this is going to leak over and impact the extent to which the city can address other priorities that are important to our communities, not just transportation. The transportation ones are significant enough. I think in terms of where we want to go in this region understanding terms of land use strategy and more diverse transportation system. So with the potential double whammy, with the direct impacts of this bridge and forsaking of opportunities to make smarter public investments. The other issue is my -- my -- 20 seconds left. Around natural impacts of this project. And I'll quickly say that the draft deis -- 1300-acre project area that would be impacted. They don't go much beyond that in terms of information and how much. But know it's going to include places like vanport wetlands. And there's a lot here that we're becoming increasingly concerned about as we dig deeper into the draft report. And I urge you to reject the locally preferred alternative so we can address some of these issues. Thank you.

**Jeremiah Baumann:** Good afternoon, mayor and members of the commission. My name is jeremiah. I have not been with city council before. About 30,000 members across the state, including 12,000 in Portland. Our top priority is global warming at the state level. Convincing the state to follow Portland's lead as much of the country and the world is looking to do. I don't have to tell the members of the city council that global warming is the paramount challenge of our time. What that means for transportation projects. As commissioner Adams' opinion piece in the Oregonian today hit the nail on the head. Reducing miles traveled is important when addressing global warming. If we had 40 per gallon cars by 2020, if we had a 10% reduction by 2020, we would still need to keep the vehicle miles traveled at about today's levels. Unfortunately, the goal of reducing vehicle miles traveled is exactly where this project falls completely flat. The locally preferred alternative that has been advanced plans on a 40% increase on vehicle miles traveled and spends \$40 million making room for that increase. It's hard to figure out how it works the way the deis is structured. But on the charts that have been handed out to you, the short story, the vehicles trips across i-5 increase 40% if we do nothing. We only do 3% better than that under the preferred option. I would dare say on a 20-year planning time, probably within a margin of error. On i-205 the total across those freeway bridges are only 0.76% over business as usual. If you squint hard, you might be able to tell there's a difference. You have to look at for the deis, the planners point out that total regional miles traveled will increase slightly from business as usual with this bridge.

**Jaime Maygra:** Good afternoon, mayor Potter, members of the council. I'm jamie of ironworkers local 29 here in Portland, Oregon. On behalf of our 1400 members we fully support the recommendation of the columbia river crossing task force concerning the replacement of the old i-5 bridge with a new bridge, light rail capabilities. As you know, ironworkers local 29 has played an integral part in building the beautiful Portland skyline for over 107 years. Our members live and work in communities all over the state of Oregon and southwest Washington. The majority of our members live in the tricounty area and clark county. I understand that the council had voted on a resolution in favor of the -- a resolution in favor a few weeks back. And I urge you to move this project forward. We've heard a lot of testimony today. This project has been studied over 13 years that I know of. And we're at the point where it's just about studied to death. Another 13 years -- someone mentioned earlier about an a and b plan. Well, the c plan is that in another 13 years, this bridge, when we will have to replace it, is going to cost 10 to 20 times more than the cost right now. We want this project to go forward without any more delays. It's good for the future economic development. And these workers in these communities around here, that's how we keep our

**July 9, 2008**

communities growing and going. Is by putting these members to work and sending our kids to school and paying our taxes and I would appreciate it if you vote yes and thank you for the opportunity to address the issue. Thank you.

**Fish:** Can I ask a question? Mike talked about the vanport wetlands and the impact of this bridge. Is there a specific mitigation plan you recommend we take a look at?

**Labbe:** It's difficult to mitigate a --90 acre parcel in the Columbia slough. It's a landscape that's suffered immensely from 100-plus years of urban development. And it's also -- it is a mitigation site. We're talking about mitigating the mitigation site. And -- which is -- well --

**Fish:** Something specific to this planning process that you're recommending that we consider in terms of mitigating the potential impact on the wetlands.

**Labbe:** I didn't come with specific ideas. I would point out it's hard to know the nature of the impact. Looks like it would be affected by the interchange there. And I don't know how to you mitigate for a natural area that size in existing landscape. One of the other issues I didn't get a chance to mention is around west hayden island. I think we're very interested in protecting west hayden island and if it comes to that, that might be something we would want to see on the table, is protection of west hayden island.

**Adams:** It's not a foregone conclusion that the wetlands will be impacted. There's a variety of options put out for discussion in the next phase. There's -- I think we're going to hear from David Wilson who has concerns, who manages the expo center. Impacts on that. It's an incredibly important issue to get out on the table. But it's not a given that we have to impact the wetlands.

**Potter:** Please state your name for the record.

**Jeffrey Bernards:** Jeff Bernards. I'm here for the CO2 thing and the fiscal responsibility of the state legislature -- or the city council. But I think a lot of people who support it want to wait until tolling. I think they should toll today to start to save money to do that. The cost is almost twice as much as it was to build MAX. And to spend that kind of money for two miles isn't really worth it. I mean, you know, the \$4.2 billion isn't written in concrete. It's written on water. Just like the convention center hotel, that's been increased now 30%. All of a sudden, well, let's do it. Oh, by the way, it's now \$6 billion. I think the infrastructure in Portland has imploded. How can you have a golden bridge -- I ride my bike a lot around town and the roads are in deplorable condition and we want to replace the Sellwood bridge but all of a sudden we can find \$4.2 billion to spend? I think we have way too many needs. I think we need to be part of the new economy. It's built on finite resources. Trucking is short term and if we invest in building a mass transit bridge over the I-5 and the bike thing and fixing those bridges is fine and that money could be used to fix Portland's roads which are in deplorable condition right now. Anyway, I could go on, but I had too much. So -- we need -- the toll that I saw in the paper was \$2. The cost was \$13 for crossing, so I think the toll needs to be \$5 or \$8, and people don't realize what the real costs are and when they start to pay, I think some of the people supporting it, paying 5 or \$8 to cross the bridge might change their mind.

**Martha Perez:** Hi, I'm Martha Perez and you're invited to a funeral for oil from 5:00 to 7:00. I believe in green jobs and I believe in saving the environment. It's not really -- why do we always talk about it in terms of conflict when it can complement one another? If you do build the bridge, make sure the increased jobs, north of the river, and conservation, I've learned is important, as well as alternative energy sources. What else? I work in downtown, and all of my coworkers live in Washington or outside of Portland and they have to commute, and so -- and nobody talks about a tunnel underneath the Columbia River. Would that be an alternative possibility? I don't know. But whatever you decide -- I would be willing to compromise, and that's it. Thank you.

**Pamela Ake:** Hello, my name is Pamela, and I represent the Northwest Industrial Neighborhood Association. And we've participated in public discussions about the needed improvements to the river crossing for years and publicly important supported the need for a new multimodal crossing. Speaking from personal experience, I own an employment agency and employers want to draw

**July 9, 2008**

from as large a geographic area as possible to ensure they see the best candidates for the job. If workers can't get from one side of the region to another in a reasonable time, this will reduce the businesses' ability to attract the best people. Congestion reduces the choices of a workplace. From an economic standpoint, this is one big region and the transportation from your needs to be built to serve the entire region. Monster.com asks candidates why do you want to change jobs and commuting time has moved from no. 3 or 4 to no. 1. The recommended project has light rail, which is important for moving the commuters. It has a great bike and pedestrian component which is also important. Finally the recommended project will include enough travel lanes so that safety will be improved at many exits and entrances to the freeway. We ask you to support the replacement bridge with light rail and bike and pedestrian. Thank you.

**Potter:** Please go ahead.

**Jeremy Ginzberg:** I'm jeremy. And as to yes but or no but, let me say no, no, a thousand times no. My horror that this has gotten to this point with absolutely no public discussion and that a public comment period, I had to wade through an hour -- actually, all of my factual statements were contained within stuff said by robert liberty and chris smith. The numbers are overwhelming clear that this is insane, but what -- i'm particularly offended by a democracy's claim that you can come to a decision and then have public comment upon it. And I -- I don't know how I can convince you to change your mind about that and actually start to accept public input. Especially when there's so many reasons not to proceed with this. I was pleased to see robert liberty walk out of here with a helmet and I think that several of you behind the dais of government there have attempted to present yourself as green-washed and this is one of the brownest projects in -- that i've ever come across and i'm seriously offended that you're continuing to fly through with it. I'm nauseated. Thank you.

**David Woolson:** Mayor Potter, members of the council, i'm chief executive officer of the recreation commission. We'll use the term merc. We manage the Oregon convention center, the expo center, as well as the Portland center for performing arts on behalf of the city. I wanted to discuss a few concerns we have about the c.r.c., particularly about the marine drive interchange option. I appreciate that today your efforts are on a much more threshold issue. But arguably marine drive with one of the most important, most expensive and complex aspects of the project. Our mission is to serve as a catalyst for community culture and economic development in the region. The expo center is a major regional facility. Community public events, corporate events. The largest exposition center in the west. It's a fully self-supporting publicly owned facility. It exists solely on the ability by taking care of the clients and public that come there. The vast majority is a modern facility. We're 250 square feet of exhibit space has been developed in excess of over \$30 million investment. Significant community asset. Hosts 100 different events a year. The expo is potentially significantly impacted by the marine drive interchange. A couple of options about rerouting it. Has been proposed by the city of Portland planning. And transportation. Including a southern alignment that would around the back side. One that will go through us and there's significant concerns to be able to protect this asset. We're in the middle of our master planning. We look forward working with you but I urge you to consider the future of expo as we move forward with this project.

**Joe Esmonde:** Excuse me. Good afternoon, mr. Mayor and commissioners. My name is joe. I'm a business agent for the i.b.w. Local 48 representing 4,000 in this area. And we also are a proud member of the Portland business alliance. We're coming out with a pair of hats. I'm here on behalf of john mollis, the executive secretary of the columbia pacific building trades. He's at a concert and can't make it and asked me to read this correspondence into the official record. Please accept this letter as official notification that the columbia pacific building and construction trades council supports the columbia river crossing task force. C.r.c. The recommendation to build a replacement i-5 bridge with light rail. With light rail. Due to a concert, I will not be able to attend the hearing

**July 9, 2008**

but please know that my council and all of its affiliates, about 18,000 people, are solidly in favor of the c.r.c. Recommendation. It's my understanding that the Portland city council unanimously passed a resolution in favor of the c.r.c. Project two weeks ago. I sincerely hope that the council will now follow through with an unanimous yes vote to move this project forward. Any delays would threaten the project, so now is the time to move forward to ensure this important project is funded and built for our region. It's the right project at the right time for our region's from your and economy. Feel free -- our infrastructure and economy. Feel free to contact me. Sincerely. John mollis.

**Potter:** Please state your name for the record and go ahead and begin.

**Marleca Alcantar:** I'm a small business owner. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today and share my thoughts about the c.r.c. construction project. I come from a country, from Mexico, that if when there's no opportunities in construction, you basically delay opportunities in all areas. Education, opportunities for jobs, for trade. So I fully support the idea of constructing a new bridge. I'm a civil engineer and understand the concept of being a new bridge and the cost and everything that goes along with it. As well as the opportunities that this presents for women and minorities in this region. My -- I would like to focus my few minutes to talk to you about the opportunities for small businesses. I have been approaching the current partner for engineering opportunities and there be very limited. So I hear loud and clear that you are committed to bringing this opportunities aboard for the construction phase. But we minorities also face critical, especially for women to work in science and serve as models and currently the only two firms that participate is, one is recognized nationally as the biggest small business and the second one who graduated from -- because he's making too much money, so I don't see those two firms as being disadvantaged. Hopefully you guys could put a critical face on what is a disadvantaged business in all areas, especially in the areas of engineering or not just -- but the main course. Thank you.

**Althea Hayden:** I didn't realize I was going next. I'm Portland -- i'm a Portland native. I actually don't live in Portland right now because i'm going to school out of the region and just to give you a perspective of how critical this issue strikes me, i'm spending one of my only afternoons that I get to spend -- two weeks in Oregon this year with time off from school, and i'm spending one here. So i'm here to support the no but position. It seems like it's boiled down to yes but and no but, and this is me registering my support. And there are a lot of other people like me who didn't take the time to come down and take up the minute or two that I get. So thank you.

**Jason Wurster:** Hello, my name is Jason. Commissioner Fish, as a new commissioner, I would ask you to define yourself by voting to take more time to listen to the residents of Portland and hear their needs for affordable housing. I haven't heard much but one of the reasons congestion is so bad on the I-5 bridge is for affordable housing in Clark County. A larger bridge to affordable housing in another state is not my idea of a solution to that issue. Commissioner Leonard, please more time for Portlanders so they can be more informed on this issue and preserve what makes our city special. Commissioner Saltzman. Thank you very much for raising the vital question to this project and giving people an opportunity to voice their critiques and their concerns. Mayor Potter, please give time to the citizens so that we can get more current data and discuss the implications of this project of this magnitude with our friends and neighbors. More so, represent Portland. Got to scroll down.

As an Oregonian who understands that a new bridge is not the solution. Instead build a bridge with the rest of Oregon by allowing our transportation funds to go to other projects in the rest of the state. By voting no now on this resolution, you'll be able to do something that many mayors have not done and send a message to the rest of Oregon that we know they exist and care about their needs. By creating something new, you destroy something old. Before you vote on this bridge, please take the time to have an in-depth dialogue with the residents of old Portland to see in the cost is really worth it.

**Potter:** Thank you, folks.

**July 9, 2008**

**Michael Hanson:** Hi. My name is actually michael hanson. David had to leave for a work emergency and asked me to speak on his behalf. Thanks, all of you, commissioners and mayor, for continuing to listen to a lot of testimony today. I've heard a lot of repetition on both sides of this issue. I came here as an opponent, but know I think i'd like to propose a compromise, and I don't think it's something that I have heard today. I came with objections that you've heard, all of the objections but i'm also sensitive to the need for transportation. We all see that. This project is driven by growth. And our biggest concerns and really stem from the growth we can't manage. The growth in clark county, which is not part of metro. Now we've talked a lot about the yes buts, the conditions we can put on this moving forward. We've talked about addressing costs and mass transit and our control over it. But there's a but that encompasses all of that and speaks well to the future of our region. I think that city council should make its support of the columbia river crossing contingent on clark county joining metro and establishing an urban growth boundary. There's never been a better time to attempt to use our leverage than now. Clark county wants and needs this bridge. We want and need smart growth. We've certainly tried in the past, there's a long history of attempting this. We don't see eye to eye on everything but it gives us better leverage than we've had to give them the real comprehensive access to alternative transit. To give us assurances that increased travel times won't just produce more sprawl in northern clark county. Out of time? Please consider it. Thank you.

**Bill Burtle:** I'm bill. This commentary is going to talk about the railroad bridge. Some commentary today to that effect, but basically i've been in the railroad industry for 38 years. And the railroad industry locally, regionally and nationally would benefit from a infusion of cash to alleviate the bottlenecks in the Portland-vancouver area. The state of Washington recently put together a rail policy paper that identified the region as one of the bottlenecks in the pacific northwest. However, the local rail industry relies heavily on the symbiotic relationship. The rail industry is responding to the high fuel prices in that the economic watershed between the viability of trucking versus rail to make a profit has shifted from an historic 500-mile transit to something more in the 300-mile range. That's a recent development. There's been movement there. I was on the i-5 trade corridor feasibility study that developed a list of projects that we're in the process of completing of the net result should they be completed would be an accommodation of the freight. And we'd be able to move more passenger trains to take up the capacity on the Portland to seattle rail corridor. These rail-related projects would add capacity on both sides of the columbia and it would be like a second track. Increasing capacity. Higher speed switches and yard capacity. Closing and adding grades are also included in this list of projects. The regional local impacts, higher fuel costs on transportation modes is a relatively complex issue and would require additional study of the association of american railroads recently put together a national rail freight infrastructure investment study that worked on those issues. Thank you.

**James Posey:** Good afternoon. My name is james. I'm the president of nanco. I think most of you know me. I'm here to represent our organization and to talk a little bit about what we are anticipating in terms of this project. We were very, very happy to see the new commissioner, nick fish, at our meeting last night. And it was very exciting to see someone come into our hood, as it were, and really express some sentiments about our participation on this project. It's a very vital project. I do have a statement that i'm not going to read because I think you all will pretty much understand what we're about in terms of this project. But there are three items that I want to talk about briefly. And those items are leadership, specificity and accountability. Leadership, we've been this road -- this way before in terms of talking about minority contracting and so on, etc. 28 years or such. And again, there's the express leadership that's going to make a difference and we -- we're anticipating you, as city commissioners, will actually follow through on seeing that something actually is achieved relative to this momentous project. This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to change the dynamics of the city in terms of economic impact on minority and women and emerging



**July 9, 2008**

small businesses. So it's a function of leadership to see that this occurs. I notice that mayor Potter, when they got around to the money, you were very specific about the time lines and the guide points and so on. And mayor Potter, we would like to see the same specificity in terms of how odot and tri-met plans to involve minority women and emerging small business in their program. We look for that same specificity. The final thing is accountability. We know that tri-met has a track record. We're not sure about the other entities involved in this project. So we're looking for front end accountability and people who can see and talk all they want to, I think, commissioner fish said last night, talk is cheap, but when we look and see whether or not there's a project that has those items of leadership, specificity and accountability, everybody will know you're serious and we know we'll have outcomes that will be representative of this fine city. I want to make --

**Potter:** Your time in up.

**Posey:** I'm sorry, sir. I think you get my point. I appreciate the opportunity.

**Potter:** How many folks are left?

**Moore-Love:** I'll get that for you in a moment. Why don't you go ahead and start?

**Potter:** Please go ahead and proceed. State your name.

**Fay Burch:** My name is faye. And i'm going to pick up where james left off. I represent minority contractors. We have 60 members, several here today but had to leave to make payroll and a number of things. Our organization is diverse both in membership and leadership. We formed our local chapter because none of our 60 members had ever worked on odot projects. We're cautious about the leadership role on this project. We're supportive of the c.r.c. Moving forward, but we're concerned about the management of odot. We heard mentioned earlier that odot will be -- take tri-met council. Tri-met has been there all along and yet the information has not exchanged hands. During a seven-year period, I have a report from you from odot's study that I would like to pass along. If you take a look at the diversity column, during seven years, you'll find two african-americans that worked on odot projects. You might look at the other groups that participated. It's limited. That represents billions of dollars worth of work. So we're concerned. During a three-year time period, most recently, members of our organization were involved in \$60 million worth of work. We didn't do it all, but a portion of it. With tri-met. I think that ends my time. Call your attention to one last thing -- oh, thank you. The council under mayor vera katz actually decided to vote no on the interstate max project until a plan was in place that the people in that community, specifically, minority community, would have an opportunity to participate and i'm asking you to do the same today. Thank you.

**John A. Charles:** My name is john charles. President of cascade policy institute. I think we need a new bridge. I'm glad you brought in the issue of tolling to pay for it. Open road tolling, all of those things are good and I support them. But there might be one misperception stated by commissioner Adams. And i'm glad you went to stockholm, but you mentioned that you hope the 60,000 commuters can shift to light rail if we build this and that's not possible even in theory. Because light rail is not a high-capacity system. It's high cost. But it's low capacity. I regret to tell you that you've been misled by transit planners for the last 20 years who insist on calling light rail high-capacity transit. It's not. To give you an example. If you go to the foot of the steel bridge where you have three lines running in 22 years, between 6:00 and 10:00 in the morning, inbound, you have one train every four minutes. If you look at the bus way going up the new jersey turnpike into new york city, they average one bus every seven seconds. That's high-capacity transit. Any sizeable fraction of these 60,000 people wanted to do what you want them to do, the train won't be able to do it. So the other thing is that you need to know that the pedestrian crossing can -- if you have congestion pricing on the new bridge, what that means is that is the avenue for express bus service. You save a billion dollars. That's what you need to do. Simple and inexpensive -- inexpensive.

**July 9, 2008**

**Tara Sulzen:** Good afternoon. I came here a year ago with a background in urban policy and planning. In addition to asking you today to reject the proposal on the table, i'd like to address the topic of induced growth in clark county. Oregon and Washington have made strides in recent years to reduce carbon footprint and this 12-lane bridge would make it impossible of that goal. As you've heard from many people before me, a new bridge with more lanes would increase vehicle miles by 2030 and that's without taking into account future growth into clark county once the bridge opens. The last time we added capacity was the glen jackson bridge, and projections of travel, they were nearly 50% below actual travel in those years. Currently, the i-5, the flow is 7-1. Many recent in lower density of clark county and commute in single-occupancy vehicles. We cannot build our way out of this congestion. In the case of this new bridge and what travel will look like, the task force maintains the same land use projections, regardless of which bridge option is selected. They project 93% of commuter trips will be from the suburban fringe. Outside of vancouver, isn't it likely that building a much larger bridge will hasten this development? Increasing the ratio of who is using the bridge. The building -- more sprawl, even if the proposed improvements of transit and biking, and that's why I ask you to reject this proposal.

**Fish:** Can I ask a question of mr. Charles? The two questions before us are whether we support a replacement bridge and the other whether we support a light rail. Is it your testimony and the position of your organization that we should support a replacement bridge but oppose the light rail component?

**Charles:** Correct.

**Fish:** So my further understanding is under the new starts program, the federal program, we're eligible to have the federal government pay most of the cost of the light rail. If we take your approach, are there federal dollar dollars available for comparable bus service?

**Charles:** Yes, because the three new lanes in each direction, you could finance all of them, 100%, through tolling. You wouldn't need federal money for that. You congestion price with ten different price points to ensure free flow conditions as done elsewhere in the world. The only thing you need is to make it work is express bus service. Buying more buses. You can get help with that through the same system we talk about for light rail. Maybe 1/100 of the cost. That's the low-cost alternative.

**Fish:** Assuming we don't rip out the light rail in place for the expo center, is it your position that the extension across the river to clark college and the connecting of clark county to Portland is under no circumstances something we should consider?

**Charles:** If you want to be fiscally responsible, I would say you should not consider it. It doesn't serve any value. People across the river, if they're transit users, they're express bus users. They don't want to go on a slow train through north Portland. It was a waste of money in the first place. Stop wasting money.

**Fish:** Thank you.

**Potter:** Go ahead and proceed, folks. State your name.

**Ray Polani:** Well, good afternoon, mr. Mayor. Commissioners. My name is ray. I live at 6110 southeast ankeny in Portland. We will have lived here for 55 years. Today I speak as an old time member of friends of earth, the only organization with worldwide following. We must quit answering the future by continuing the recent past. This is the time for alternatives. This is the time to think and fund transportation as a whole. This is the time to face limits. The signals are unmistakable. We must change. So upgrade the two existing bridges and build a new really green bridge to accommodate light rail, local transfer, bicycles and pedestrians. And most of all, rebuild the downstream rail bridge to accommodate freight, passengers and commuter rail. That and light rail are the correct, efficient, relatively frugal answer to the needs of today and tomorrow. The rail line is the equivalent of i-5. By design, it's underused by freight, certainly by people. It's less expensive to fix. It has much more benign and efficient. After all, it is the west coast alternative

**July 9, 2008**

corridor for both freight and people. From Canada to Mexico, to Washington, Oregon and California. Let's use and save our scarce resources officially. Do not, I repeat do not follow group think and approve this monstrous, expensive, wasteful 12-lane project for \$4.5 billion scarce dollars, leading -- scarce dollars.

**Ron Swaren:** That was a brilliant comment. That's definitely what I would like to say. If the western arterial had been considered as a potential crossing for quite a number of years and the I-5 partnership, and it was dropped specifically because the C.R.C. did not feel it was within the area that needed to be examined, that is like saying I-205 doesn't factor in because it's not in the area. We're looking at a regional need and so anything within the region should be considered. We don't necessarily need a ring road. I know the western bypass is not a popular idea. That's fine. The western arterial route could use I-405 and Columbia Boulevard to provide another crossing. We need to get into the 21st century and look at how we can improve rail transit. A bipartisan bill, that's an alternative that could provide a better connection between Portland and Seattle, especially as airfares go higher with higher fuel costs. I think it's going to be shown to be a cost effective solution. That's what most people that analyze it think. I'd like to ask you to examine other cities with comparable geographical situations and ask if they can utilize only two major crossings. Maybe our mayor-elect should contact the mayor of Philadelphia and ask them if they could use only two crossings instead of seven. Or the mayor of St. Louis if they can use only two crossings instead of five. We need to be realistic and have a third crossing. Thank you.

**Larry Epstein:** I'm Larry. I represent Diversified Marine Inc. We build tugboats and refurbish tugboats and landing craft and other barges and similar maritime facilities. They're the only tugboat builder in the region. They built about 24 of them so far. And they've serviced hundreds of ships, small ships. Up to 120 feet and 650 tons. They employ 30 people whom they pay \$45,000 to \$100,000 a year. These are good, skilled, blue-collared jobs. This is the kind of business Portland wants to keep and unfortunately, it's one of the businesses that will go if the C.R.C. project is built. Based on the standard plans, the very preliminary plans that have been published so far. This is the marine facility, it includes 3/4 area on the upland, a two-acre area that they lease. Storage. And a two-acre area that they lease that's in the water. They have two big dry docks. They do a lot of work. They're in great demand. They've got work out to 2012. The problem is that the light rail facility will cut them in half and the marine drive improvements will prevent access to their property and at this point, the only solution that we see to that is the south marine drive realignment that the folks the metro are concerned about at Merc. But it's a feasible plan. We recommend you modify your resolution to do what the C.R.C. Task Force did, which is to recognize that avoiding impacts is better than mitigating them. But when you have to, you minimize those impacts to minimize the mitigation.

**Rick Gill:** My name is Rick Gill. I am a past president of Hayden Island Network also known as High Noon. We are the neighborhood association representing both the residents and most of the small businesses on Hayden Island. During the past 2 years we have participated in numerous meetings, seminars, charettes, openhouses and hearings that affect Hayden Island's future. We have become well informed on the problems that the Columbia River Crossing project intends to solve and the issues it presents. In January our association voted full support for the replacement bridge with light rail alternative. The success of our recently drafted Hayden Island Neighborhood Plan depends on this alternative. Our reasoning is sound. Current traffic problems on I-5 make public safety on Hayden Island substandard or marginal during many hours of the day. A minor disaster could cost many lives due to inability to have timely emergency response or transport. We also add hours a week commute time getting on and off I-5. The replacement bridge alternatives creates longer on/off ramps at Hayden where traffic hazards and bottlenecks are today. It also removes existing impediments that prevent effective east-west travel on the island. The light rail alternative keeps the direct route between Hayden Island and downtown Portland that we have now with mass transit. The

**July 9, 2008**

bus rapid transit alternative takes this direct route away from hayden island. This is not just a single bridge project with a single solution to a single problem that only benefits hayden island. It's a construction project with multiple solutions that work together to solve a myriad of problems from miles of existing highway in Oregon and Washington. If we don't solve all the problems, we don't achieve the goal. The timing of the construction project is a rare situation when the opportunity is presented to accommodate long-term requirements for insurmountable problems each year. Please join us in supporting the replacement bridge with light rail transit alternatives. Thank you.

**Rick Gill:** I am roger [inaudible] north island cove lane. That's the floating home community. I'm here as president of high noon. High noon is the neighborhood association representing residents on hayden island, as well as the smog businesses there. High noon supports the replacement bridge and whale with the configuration of light rail being adjacent to i-5. We spent a lot of time with this. We've been studying it. It is a critical and integral part of our concept plan. The comp hennive plan that will be adopted for hayden island. We never had a comprehensive plan before, and without c.r.c., we can't adopt the plan that we worked on for over a year now. We don't support the idea of terminating light rail on hayden island. Land is at a premium there. We really hope to see whatever land might be left over when the project is done being dedicated to public areas and parks, which we have, we have, a sorry few of at this point in time. We prefer the light rail to continue on to vancouver without, without having the terminus of hayden island. We're very concerned about the displacement of the small businesses and, and the residences, as we understand, there could be as many as 50 or 55 floating homes affected by the project during the construction, and ultimately, somewhere around a dozen or more that will be lost entirely. We are eager to see this project move forward. We are fully supportive of it, and, and we are, we are eager to see our concept plan implemented, and we would like to see this all done with as little delay as possible. Thank you.

**Brendan Castircano:** I am brendan, and I am here on behalf of hannah fisher. Hannah fisher is the elected student body president for Portland state university, and i'm a student senator. I'm also here with three other student senators from Portland state university, just right over here, there is heather spaulding, amina ali and peter welte we are here today to represent -- we are here to represent the elected student government at Portland state university, which is a commuter school, a school of some 25,000 students, as I am sure you all know. And, and again, these are students who, in the coming decade, who largely inherit the legacy of the decisions for this project. We still believe it is very possible for Portland to retain its role as a leader in sustainability, and as such, we are deeley concerned about the conflicting reports regarding the environmental impact of the columbia river crossing here. As such, our student senate, as well as the student executive branch, under president hannah fisher, assigned a referendum stating support for commissioner Saltzman and his suggestion for an independent analysis of the, of the project's projected global warming pollution, excuse me, traffic and land use patterns. Thank you.

**Moore-Love:** Heather and peter were not speaking. Are you speaking -- ok. Sorry, then. Ben, heather spaulding, peter welty and then tom bushelli.

**Potter:** Go ahead and begin and state your name for the record.

**Heather Spaulding:** Good afternoon, my name is heather spaulding. I am the vice president of the student senate at Portland state university, and I am the assistant to our campus sustainability coordinator, and I also have a copy of the resolution that we passed last night by a vote of 13 opposed and one for.

**Adams:** 13 against one?

**Spaulding:** We support the declaration of support for, for an independent analysis of the i-5 extension. So, we do represent 25,000 students, and we are also the number one visited destination by tri-met. So, we are very involved in this debate. And we think that this is a temporary solution to a problem we'll have to deal with later, and personally, i'm from southern Oregon. That's the timber capital of the world, so I have my own issues in that area, which include the health

**July 9, 2008**

department being closed, and also, having police who will not go out to the city limits because of that. So, in proposing a solution for, for this, this, I would hope that you would consider methods that would also benefit other parts of our state because, because if you are just thinking about a, a, thinking about a solution for economic reasons, we also have our own problems in this state that need to be addressed. So, I really, um, I learned a lot from what the robert liberty proposal was, and I definitely agree with that. I think it would be good to toll first before, before thinking about other options, and then also, using the train because the trains also benefit more for our community. And, and i, I -- i'm sorry. So, I have a quote, and it's that you can't attempt to solve a problem with the same mindset that brought you into it, and that's albert einstein, so I think that, that the congestion problem is the result of our dependence on cars and to continue doing that will not benefit us in the long run. Thank you.

**Peter Welte:** Thanks for having us here. My name is peter, and I am one of the student senators from p.s.u., and also, I live downtown during the school year, and currently, i'm living in beaverton, so, so, it might be interesting. The, the problems that I have with this are that its, that its, that its based on the number of preposterous assumptions. One is that people driving from vancouver to, to Washington county for soccer practice or, or whatever they are shopping, I don't know. Walmart is, is acceptable. And, and the way I see it, Portland's is a pinnacle of sustainability, and you can pride yourself on that, but it's surrounded by kind of a sprawl, and, and to just accept that a 12-lane highway connecting, essentially, allowing more commuters from, from clark county to, to Washington county is, is just asking for, you know, for what you have, you have worked so hard to achieve to be bulldozed over. And, and it's also, also a crazy assumption that, that, that the gasoline is going to cost \$1.25 a gallon in 2030, and traffic, a traffic model that, based on that, is flawed. And, and it's, it's prep strauss that doubling the width of the bridge will have absolutely no, no impact on development in clark county. They doubled the bridge before 1958. And, obviously, that didn't work. And, and spending 4.2 billion on this bridge, it's crazy to assume that that will not reduce the amount of money available for other needs, which is safe, maintained streets, schools and affordable housing, and, and, and odot, apparently, thinks that transponders are a viable idea, but in an age when vehicle miles, mileage travel is decreasing, it's prep strauss, so I guess on this, affirming the assumptions are acceptable, and it is a vote to throw away any legal power that you have so please vote no.

**Tom Buchele:** Good evening, I am tom, the managing attorney at the pacific environmental advocacy center at the lewis & clark school of law. Peek is representing a diverse group of organizations regarding the bridge proposal, including northwest environmental defense center, coalitions for livable future and the Portland add done society. Why are we rushing to approve something that none of us really like? That's really my first question. There are, right now, I keep hearing, the bridge project being referred to. There are four very specific alternatives on the table right now. They are in the draft environmental impact statement. But, no one I know, expect may be rex burkhalter and the oregonian editorial board seem to think that the alternatives are green or are compatible with Portland's values. I read today that Portland needs the right kind of bridge, and that approval here only moves the bridge proposal from one phase of evaluation to the next one. Well, my next question is, when, exactly, are we going to see a specific analysis regarding this right kind of bridge? The next phase is, in fact, the final environmental impact statement. What if we don't like the bridge in the final environmental impact statement? That's the final document. The federal highway administration's record of decision usually follows within a matter of weeks after the final environmental impact statement is issued. The draft environmental impact statement, which is the stage we're at right now, is, in fact, when we're supposed to see all of the reasonable alternatives. We still haven't seen a reasonable green alternative. This is when, when the city has leverage. What I would like to know is, does the city, in fact, have a legal opinion that it can enforce any conditions that it puts on this bridge, or will have significant legal tools to fight if they

**July 9, 2008**

don't get those conditions. I don't think that it does. And if it does have that legal opinion, I would like to see it. I think the public should see it. Thank you.

**Adams:** It doesn't.

**Buchele:** I didn't think so.

**Adams:** It's political leverage. I don't know if you were here at the beginning.

**Buchele:** I wasn't.

**Adams:** Political leverage.

**Buchele:** Thanks.

**Potter:** Let's go ahead and begin, please.

**Sharon Nasset:** Ok. For the record, I am Sharon Nasset. Hello, gentlemen, I parked six blocks away and going up to feed the meter was a very hot experience. You have a very, very hard challenge in front of you today, and it can be made a lot easier by thinking about it in a couple of different manners. And that is the environmental national environmental policy act, NEPA, specifically sets up times where you stop and reflect about what you are considering doing. Before you go forward. Those people who have been coming forward saying, if we don't do this, you know, it's another, another, you know, how many years, and they won't live through it. Absolutely incorrect. We have started the process. The process right now is an evaluation step. Sam was very, very -- commissioner Adams was very correct in the beginning statements and several of the things that he had to say. All those things still follow. When you stop and look at the process and follow the NEPA process. When Matt Garrett was talking about, we need to build on the previous studies we do. I've been involved in three of them. The I-5 taskforce recommended a replacement or supplemental bridge. And it recommended an alignment bridge that was a port to port to be studied thoroughly in the future, and, and the rail. The, the paperwork that I handed you here, which is b, states what they did not study. The elephant in the room is, we are not supposed to be picking one bridge. We are to have a range of options. Mr. Howe brought in a bridge option. I brought in a bridge option, and so did others. The NEPA process says that, that they will go through a process and, and at the end, you get place, show, or, or third place. We were removed, and these, on b, are what they did not study. I know I'm out of time, but I can tell you, if you read the I-5 taskforce, which did evaluate some of these, land use, the economy, safety of the environment, all these were rated high and significantly on freight. Thank you. Any questions?

**Adams:** I just want to recognize you, Sharon, for the many, many hours and tireless interests that you have taken in this project, and we might not always agree on every issue, but you have shown up more than any other Portlander, I think, on this process, so I admire that. Thank you.

**Nasset:** Thank you.

**Matthew Denton:** Um, my name is Matthew Denton. Mayor Tom Potter and members of the commission, if widening the freeways make the cities greener, Atlanta would be the greenest city in the U.S., but they have 72 air quality action days in 2007. I was in North Portland, and I read my bike almost everywhere. Bicycles are green, they are good exercise. Cost me very little, I don't know what the price is gas is, I don't care. 70% of Portlanders would ride a bicycle if they weren't afraid of cars. During morning rush hour, the freeway south of the new bridge will flow at 10 miles per hour. I don't think that very many people will wait for that. Many people will get off the freeway and drive down the local streets. And the D.I.S. agrees, they say if a new bridge is built there will be increases on local traffic as far south as Broadway. They didn't study south of Broadway so we don't know how far south it goes. Let's look at what history has shown us about the Broadway bridge. In 1991, 30,000 cars traveled across the Burnside bridge, and in 2007, only 27,000 cars traveled across the Broadway bridge and the economy did not collapse. Why? Because 3,000 bicyclists traveled across the Broadway bridge, too. So, how do we decrease the number of cars in the long-term and increase the number of bicycles? A lot of ways, but one of them is not building a bridge that increases the traffic on the local streets. The bicyclists use. However, I don't

**July 9, 2008**

endorse a do nothing option. The sooner we reject the l.p.a. And the soon her we start the supplemental d.i . S. With alternatives, the sooner we can build a bridge that solves the problems of the current one. If we wait a few years to start the project and then we write the correct d.e.i.s., that's a few more years before the real bridge gets built. What are the odds the project will get stopped in a few years? Robert liberty says more than 50%. That's high odds. Is that what you are willing to risk? Thank you.

**Corky Collier:** I lived in atlanta for six months, and then I moved from there to here. [laughter] I am corky collier, executive director of the columbia association and serve on the c.r.c. Taskforce, or great working, excuse me. I had a great speech for you, but I believe commissioner Adams stole it and put it in today's Oregonian under his own name. So, great words. [laughter]

**Adams:** We have your house under surveillance.

**Collier:** I wish that they had been my words. I'll just add a couple of things to today's comments. One is, I think most of us can understand and appreciate your concerns about odot managing the project. I feel confident that both governors and future governors will respect the commitment to come to this council and get your approval as we move forward. And if they don't, rest assured that many of us will stand by your side to make sure that we correct that situation as quickly as possible. I want to make a couple of comments aboutially testimony. Jim levy testified there would be an increase in congestion with the project and the sustainability development said it would increase green house gases by 30%. That's not correct. Greenhouse gases and congestion will increase with a no-build option. If you go with this, what you will have is a reduction in the greenhouse gases compared to the no build option. You will have a reduction in congestion compared to the no build option. Please build this bridge. Don't build to it to bring people to Portland. We're going to have enough of them coming anyway but build it so we can restore the neighborhoods and hayden island. Build it so that we can watch vancouver residents come to Portland on light rail. Build it so that we can, we can improve stormwater run-off, so we can breathe the congestion. Build this project so that we can get rid of one of the most dangerous sections of i-5. And build it so that you can get a kick out of a stunning bicycle ride across. Thanks.

**Potter:** Thank you, folks.

**Fred Nussbaum:** Thank you. Mayor tom Potter and members of council, I am fred nussbaum representing the association for Oregon rail and transit advocates. Now headquartered in room 253 in the Portland union station. One of our primary places of interest. I have written testimony that, that I hope will be handed out here mainly addressing the procedural issues about, about, about, about whether you have to make a decision on, on the, the alternatives today or whether you can send this, this whole process back to have the whole range of alternatives. Many people ahead of me have been, have been quite eloquent in raising the issue, so i'm not going to be belabor the point. But, regardless of the conditions that you are trying to put on, on your, your approval today, you are going to be losing local control. The other thing i'm not sure has been clearly mentioned is if you, if you air-conditions are for something as widely divergent from what was proposed in the deis, then you have to have a supplemental deis in order for the consideration of that proposal. So, for instance, six-lane bridge without auxiliary lanes is not in the did the eis. It cannot be carried forward into the final deis, and so if that's what you think the resolution is getting you, it won't get you there so, you need to address all these issues before you, you pass on the local preferred alternatives. Rather than -- you have this before you. You can read the text and the justifications for what i'm seeing here, but I would like to leave you with this following. What we are facing in the columbia river crossing is very similar to, to what the agencies face when they are faced with, with overflow situations on the sewer system. You can build new sewer treatment plants at a high cost or you can get smart about what the problem is, and we've gotten smart here in Portland, and others have, also, by recognizing that there is separate streams of water running into the sewer

**July 9, 2008**

system. You have got surface water, and you have got black water. We've got the same thing on the columbia crossing. We have lots of commuters.

**Potter:** Sir, your time is up.

**Nussbaum:** Ok.

**John Reinhold:** Good afternoon, mayor tom Potter and commissioner, I am john ryanhold, and I believe that, that at this point in time, the five of you already have your minds made up so I hope that, perhaps, I can share a bit of my experience. But, on june 17, a company based in seattle, Washington called emerix released a comprehensive study, a city-by-city study of traffic congestion. Portland didn't rank anywhere in the top cities for traffic congestion. You read the top cities, they are like a who's who of build more freeways, houston, atlanta, Washington, dallas, and the current i-5 crossing did not rank in the top 100 traffic bottlenecks in the entire nation. So, we're looking at spending \$4 billion on a traffic bottleneck that does not even rank in the top 100 in the nation. If I were to apply the current columbia river crossing approach of all or nothing to a metaphorical situation, the population in my household within the last year has increased 33%. I would like to ask the council to support my locally preferred alternative for my household to tear down my home and replace it with a home that is double the size. I would ignore any options such as reconfiguring any of my rooms or adding a small room at the rear of the house, but instead, tear out the entire thing, and build a massive home but yet do it with no money, no financing, no loan. That's the equivalent of what we're asking us to do with the columbia river crossing, inside all or nothing approach. I support enhancing transit, traffic, great mobility through the i-5 corridor, however, I don't support the is, a \$4 billion bridge or do nothing else. I think that there are tons of little solutions that we can do that can improve the situation and we can do it now and we can do it ourselves as a community. Thank you.

**Jim Edelson:** Mayor, commissioners, thank you for this opportunity. My name is jim edelson, and I live in Portland and serve on the transportation land use subcommittee of the global warming commission but today I speak on my own behalf. It is too bad that it has come to this. You are making a decision between false choices based on false data, and I think you all know that. We have heard a lot about the oil price forecasts, one of the sheets I passed before you be puts a quote from, from, from the, the testimony, of [inaudible] caruso, the man responsible for this forecast, and from cross-examination of ed c-harky. He said, if you were to ask me today what would I use? I would use a higher price, not the reference price, used in this c.r.c., deis. That sounds like good advice. But the c.r.c. Is not following it. Let's look at what you've done yourselves. Your peak oil passport recommended in the file recommendations to you, prevent infrastructure, investments that would not be prudent given the shortages of fuel and higher prices. I think that's good advice. Not for the c.r.c. It says our bill use will decline and people will seek alternatives. That sounds like good advice but it's not in the c.r.c. snalysis. Likewise, the Oregon public utility commission uses \$100 a ton up to \$100 a ton, in global warming, gas and costs, not the c.r.c. They use zero. So, Portland, port of Portland in their airport expansion plans, that, that quote is before you, and they will monitor and use up the \$40 a ton, not the c.r.c. To paraphrase commissioner Adams, let's not get rolled in this, and the best way to do that is to request a new supplemental environmental impact statement now before you make the decision s once a decision is made, it's going to be too late. Thank you.

**Melinda Merrill:** Good afternoon mayor tom Potter and commissioners, I am melinda merrill, i'm the director of played nod for the fred meyer stores and I thank you for making sure that everybody gets a chance to talk to you today. I think what fred meyer is bring to you on this is how important it is to move great across the bridge and in and out of the port of Portland. Fred meyer and crowingr are the port of Portland's largest import customers. We move the product to our fred meyer stores in the northwest, and to kroger stores across the country. We don't have the option of doing that during non peak hours. We have to pick up and return our containers when the longshore



**July 9, 2008**

men are working. We recognize and appreciate and participate in efforts to get our employees and customers to consider alternative modes of transportation before you the fact remains in Oregon, a huge chunk of our economy is reliant on our ability to move great in and out of that port. And when we have an empty space on our shelves, it affects all 31,000 of our employees in the pacific northwest. We're competing against companies who use other west coast ports of Portland, and can get their, their product to their shelves ontime. Once we lose a customer, it's very, very hard to get them back, and that has a ripple effect on every one of our employees. There are alternatives, of course, that we don't want to look at. We want to keep the business in Portland, but my transportation and logistics department tell me that without any change at all, the situation on that bridge in the next decade is unacceptable. We won't be able to move our product the way that we need to. So, I encourage you to take the steps that need to be taken for a new and workable bridge that enhances our public transportation system, and enhances our ability to move great. Thanks.

**Karl Rohde:** Good afternoon, mayor and members of the city council. I'm Karl Rohde, government relations and public affairs director for the transportation alliance, formerly for the first time welcome commissioner fish. Nice to have you here. The bicycle transportation alliance is extremely concerned about, about elements of this project and the, the deis we are calling on the project including a world class bicycle and pedestrian facility. The 16-foot placeholder in the deis is a kentucky class bike and ped facility. We should be looking at something far better than that, and we are calling on it to be 24 feet on one side and 12 feet on the other. The second issue that we are extremely concerned about is the issue of money. The spending the estimated 3.1 to 44.2 billion to pay for light rail is, interchange along a five-mile corridor, and the bridge, itself, does place a strong question as to what other projects in the region are in jeopardy as for funding in the future. The third issue, of course, is the issue of local control. In the event that the assurances that you have not received from the, the Oregon department of transportation, are not, are not afforded to you, then I would hope that, that, in fact, the city council is prepared to take the strong position of not issues the permits for this project, which is, in fact, your only legally binding way of stopping this project from happening all together. The issue of tolling is extremely important, especially when you talk about congestion and pricing. We need to, to start addressing the issue of transportation demand management and gas taxes simply do not do that, and finally, considering the size of the bridge, the evaluating only a 10 or 12-lane option is not enough. A rigorous analysis of six, eight, 10, probably 12, just to show what that would do, is necessary, as well. Thank you for the opportunity to address you at this point.

**Ron Buel:** I'm Ron Buel, and say really liked your column in the paper this morning, Sam, and the goals you laid out in it. But, your replacement bridge has a problem. One of those is it will be high in the air to avoid lifts, and when the federal freeway requirements of no more than a 6% grade it, means it will be high in the air over Hayden Island and downtown Vancouver. And your resolution and exhibits, you have not commented on the billion dollars worth of on and off-ramps also planned to hook to this skyway up in the air. What will Hayden Island look like with a forest of skyway ramps, 60 to 70 feet in the air? Does it the city's Hayden Island plan directly couldn't district with your own personal understanding of what happens today under the ramps of the Fremont bridge and the ramps of the Marquam bridge? I know the citizens of Hayden Island are obsessed with the traffic that they face every day. But, is the city of Portland really ready to voice this project off on them, complete with the noise, the air pollution, the dirt and the ugliness of the concrete forest you propose building for them on their island? There are a lot of contradictions in the deis, and why does the, the, why do people keep referring to the deis? Your resolution says whereas the draft environmental impact same has been prepared in accordance where federal national environmental policy act guidelines. But, there is no low cost alternative. No arterial, supplemental bridge and transit and bicyclists. Doesn't state law require examination of just such a low-build alternative? When Metro asks for such an option and didn't get it? Why did, why did ODOT and WASH-DOT say they

**July 9, 2008**

wouldn't finance a low-cost alternative to a replacement bridge? Is there a sufficiently broad range of options before you you were the law? The traffic modeling and the deis is based on a gas price. Wow.

**Adams:** Please continue.

**Buel:** The traffic modeling and the deis is based on a gas price of \$1.25 is a gallon. And you are out of compliance with state law when it comes to greenhouse gas emissions. You really are by the c.r.c. Task force contention and the deis that by speeding cars up through the bridge impact area, you will reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Does it bother you that when it comes to the life of the planet, that deis, you are approving, completely ignores all of the scientifically provable evidence of second level effects? For example, the congestion moves down the road to another location. The landuse modeled in the deis no build option is exactly the same as 2030 land use outcome, as that used for the replacement bridge. This means that there is no calculation for travel induced by, by the new clark county development in the c.r.c. Traffic modeling, and can a case in illinois, the court stopped a major highway project dead in its tracks because there was no consideration of induced travel in the deis. So, say followed this process closely --

**Potter:** Mr. Buell.

**Buel:** Yeah, i've got to quit.

**Adams:** I bought you a minute and 20 seconds.

**Buel:** That was very kind of you. I appreciate it. The council has got a remedy here. You simply decide today you won't approve the locally preferred alternate without a supplemental deis which addresses the problems that I detailed.

**Adams:** Do we have a copy of your written?

**Buel:** Yeah, I will turn it in. [applause]

**Potter:** Please, no clapping, folks.

**Jerry Grossnickle:** Good afternoon mayor tom Potter and council members. My name is jerry, I am chair of the bridge committee of the columbia river toll [inaudible] association, and the [inaudible] tug company. The barge line, and, and we represent a major industry that uses the, the i-5 corridor, but a bit differently than the truck and, and car traffic. We use the river. We have a major navigational hazard at the i-5 rail bridge columbia crossing area. And, and we probably all heard about it or read about it, and that is that when we can't use the lifts, we have to, to use one of the higher spans of the i-5, and, and make, make a very complicated s-turn and line up with the rail bridge opening on the north side of the river. The same side of the river as the lifts. So, we would much prefer to use the lift, but we cannot use it when, when there is, um, rush hour traffic. The problem that we foresee is, is that, is that there will be increased traffic on i-5. It's inevitable. That will create more pressure for, for fewer, fewer times that we can use those lifts. That creates more danger for us. The danger is very real. Our captains have testified that they expect that we will hit that rail bridge, which could knock out rail traffic and barge traffic. It would be a major catastrophe for our economy. Now, there was earlier testimony today. Robert liberty and, and jim howl talked about, about, well, why don't we, we replace the rail bridge with the new rail bridge? We need one, and i, I absolutely, absolutely agree with that. And why not move the opening? Toward the middle of the river and then we can always use the, the i-5. We can voice the lifts, here again. There is only one way you can get a privately owned bridge to be fixed without the owners consent, and that's through the, the [inaudible] action, we instituted a truman hogs action in 2 on your side. Got the region behind it, great testimony. And the coast guard district came out and approved our application. We had shown a major safety problem, and, and the decision was, was taken to Washington and, and reversed, partly because, because the major benefit to, to our action would be, would be the highway system. There would no longer be any lifts and we could not count that and the cost, in the cost benefit analysis. That was one of the, one of the, very, very disappointing thing for us, but also, it put us in a catch 22. Because, the only way that we could appeal this, get around

**July 9, 2008**

this, this restriction, would be to ask congress for, for a special exception, and to apply highway trust funds to this particular project. We were not able to successfully do this because, because, um, all of our congressional delegates knew, knew that the i-5 project was about, about to be, to be entering a new, a new stage, which, of course, was the stage that we just finished with the c.r.c. Taskforce. And, and so, it is important that we get this problem resolved from, from the point of view of the tugboat association. We support fully this, this c.r.c. Proposal. Thanks.

**Robert Marino:** Hello, I am robert marino, and I am a resident of Portland. I would like to acknowledge that it can be intimidating coming up here speaking before all you fine gentlemen in suits and all these cameras. I would like to recognize the folks that wouldn't feel comfortable enough to come here and speak before you today. That said, I appreciate the opportunity to rise to the challenge. My request to you is to vote no on the proposal that's before you from the c.r.c. Further, my request is that you verify the c.r.c. Modeling from, from an, through an independent analysis, as outlined by, by commissioner Saltzman. Further, please consider modeling scenarios to address these questions. How can we mitigate the delays from the draw bridge without replacing the whole bridge? How does oil price relate to the number of cars on the road? At what point to rising fuel costs negate the need for building a new bridge. How can we limit sprawl from bridge heater roads in vancouver we're it is especially projected to grow due to the new bridge. How can we build vancouver into its own destination for business and social activity? How can we get a high speed transit system in the Portland-vancouver region that can compete with vehicle drive times? And lastly, does building a new bridge meet the principles of reduce, reuse, recycle? Thank you for your time.

**Margaret Johnson:** Good afternoon, I am margaret johnson. I'm a member of the c.r.c. Community and environmental justice group. I'm also a board member of the neighborhood association on hayden island, but i'm here today as a board member of the jantzen beach mortgage and i'm representing our general membership, which is 177 slips. Our mortgage is really the only housing impacted in Oregon from any of these alternatives, and I want to bring it to the council's attention because you or your staff will not see it in the deis, that floating homes are, actually, residential housing, residential single family housing. We think we provide important single family residential housing in Portland, and we live densely and we live across from diversified marines and underneath the flight class and the railroad bridge, just want to bring it to your attention that we're out there. We know we're not going to be able to -- we're very supportive of the replacement bridge and the light rail option because the people that live on the island are fully aware of the horrible situation we're in now. Our air quality that we, we breathe every day is affected. Something has to be done, and i'm -- I have enough confidence in the system, maybe naively, that we can address these problems as we move forward, and we have to move forward because the existing situation is intolerable, but I do want the city of Portland, the planning commission, and the council members to understand that there is single family residential housing being displaced on hayden island. It's a huge challenge for this project, and we're not portrayed, we're not count in your tax revenue office. We're not doubted as acreage. We're not count as houses. This is because we're floating homes and we don't fit into any of the nice, neat categories, and I would like you to keep an eye on us, please. Thank you.

**Gerald Fox:** I am gerald fox, and I am an engineer, been involved for many years in the development of the regional rail system. I've been following the progress of the c.r.c. Study since it began, and I assumed the process would eventually lead to the development of a practical, attractive and cost effective plan. To remedy the defects that we presently see in the i-5 bridges. I've been sorely disappointed. I believe the deis is fundamentally flawed because, especially some of the key project data is flawed, inadequate or out of date. Deis does not consider the impact, the added bridge capacity would cause on regional land use urban sprawl nor on the rest of the highway system. In particular, I would be worried that, that if this bridge capacity was increased, it would be

**July 9, 2008**

gridlocked in the freeway loop around downtown Portland. So, we could be importing a major problem by trying to solve a lesser problem. I think this is a huge issue. Finally, apparently, there's no serious effort to develop less costly alternatives that would solve or mitigate most of the project goals at a fraction of the cost. How much might be accomplished for a project that has a ceiling price of maybe a billion dollars, not four? How much could be accomplished if the ceiling was \$2 billion but not four? It's worth remembering that the \$4 billion cost is almost twice what the region has spent building the 50-mile rail system that now serves us. It's also a sum of money that could go a long way towards developing a faster rail service between eugene and seattle. One example is, we're listening to the advocates of this project. One is led to believe that, that, that, that if this was only [inaudible], life would be a lot easier. The commuters could continue to drive to work ask the tracks could flow freely. Sadly this will not be so. I hope that you will vote against this deis and press for a more practical alternative. Thank you.

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

**Adams:** I think to facilitate q&a from council, doug and matt, thank you. If doug and matt could, could come back to the table and, and answer questions from the council. Doug, do you want to sort of explain who you are in relation to the project? And jason, sorry.

**Doug Ficco:** I'm doug, one of the co-directors on the project. I work with the Washington state department of transportation.

**Matthew Garrett:** Matthew garrett, i'm the director of the Oregon department of transportation.

**Jason Tell:** Jason tell, the Portland region manager for the Oregon department of transportation.

**Saltzman:** All right.

**Fish:** The draft resolution that we have before us has, has four pages of policies as exhibit a, which is, incorporated by reference. And it specifically states that, that the city asserts its right to continue to comment on, on and participate in all major decisions, and in furtherance of the policies outlined in exhibit a. And those policies reflect the broad-based consensus of, of people in our community in terms of a number of concerns under interchange, urban design, environmental justice, and the process, itself. Can you tell me if there are any stated policies in exhibit a, which you, as the director of odot, specifically disagree with?

**Doug:** Commissioner, there is nothing on the face of it. Now, again, is a full vetting of those issues as articulated in exhibit a play themselves out in the next phase, and that's we're we can drill down, that's we're the city of Portland, with their representative on the project sponsor's council, will help inform those discussions.

**Fish:** If I may, sir, do you consider any of the specific policy statements in exhibit a to be poison pills, which would otherwise kill this project?

**Doug:** I do not.

**Saltzman:** I know we discussed this yesterday, but one of the conditions is the c.r.c. Shall conduct an independent analysis of the greenhouse gas and induced automobile travel demand forecasted for the project. You are committed to such an independent analysis.

**Doug:** I am.

**Adams:** My hope is the model out of that, be based, everything we heard today based on the most up to date information, but i'm also interested in that analysis being dynamic that, we model congestion, electronic congestion price tolling to determine what, what the, the, what the, the trip, what do I want to say, trip change, trip shift from automobile traffic to light rail would be given the other assumptions of the project. And, and so, I hope that it will be dynamic, and, and allow us, as decision makers, a reason to, you know, to not only vet the design of the, of the capital components, the hardscape stuff but that policy around tolling is, is an incredibly powerful tool that's used around the world. Not here. So, I understand that its not well-known, and therefore, there isn't -- we don't have a personal experience with it, so there might be some skepticism about it but it's used

**July 9, 2008**

very effectively on the ground all over the world. With demand of management, in our case, the ability to get vehicles, people who currently drive their car on the light rail.

**Saltzman:** My other question was the -- there was a statement that the option of, of separate light rail, pedestrian bicycle bridge, seismic upgrades to the existing bridge was rejected for further consideration, rejected by the c.r.c. Committee? Or, or.

**Doug:** I may refer to my technical folks.

**Saltzman:** Who rejected it?

**Doug:** it's part of the task force engagement so over the three years there were alternatives put in, and this purpose and need was driving the conversation and as we funnel down to the decision point of last month, those that did not meet the purpose and need, those fall off and continue to pursue until we made the decision on, on the replacement bridge and light rail.

**Saltzman:** So it was rejected by the task force, which represented the 24 some --

**Garrett:** 39.

**Saltzman:** What was the basis for the rejection?

**Garrett:** Well, go back with the process a bit. With the task force, they, they, they helped us with the criteria to put together the purpose and need of the project, and on top of that, after that was done, we went into, into the criteria. We would measure the alternatives to see that they met the purpose need of the project, and-- I don't remember the, the reason or what criteria the supplemental, or they use an existing bridge and retrofitted it, fell off on, but I can remember, it did not help with the safety issue because, because you still had the same issue with the bridge lifts, where we had, actually, four times the, the chance of having an accident during the bridge lift with, with the normal hours, and also we had the issue of, of not dealing with some of the interchanges, like at the, at the bridge head at hayden island at sr 14 it did not solve any of those issues. A lot of it was on the safety criteria.

**Saltzman:** What about the cost? What was the cost of that option? Is significantly different or was it costed out?

**Doug:** Well, I don't know if the total cost was, what the total cost was, but seismic, to retrofit the bridge, which you can never retrofit the bridge to today's seismic standards without a huge amount of cost, we're you are almost getting in the neighborhood of building a new structure, anyway. There is some remedial type of, remediation, or, what you could do with the bridge, itself, as far as seismic retrofitting that would keep it from collapsing, which would be, the 150 million, \$200 million range.

**Saltzman:** What would be the cost of the, of the light rail, pedestrian crossing?

**Doug:** That, I can't -- I don't remember the exact cost of that.

**Saltzman:** Is it significantly less than, than 4.2 billion if you add the two --

**Doug:** The bridge, the bridge, the bridge, itself, is about, with the, the light rail portion, the biking pad and the, and, the six-lane, each, each direction option or the 12-lane, whatever you want, that's like, like a billion dollars. Or 1.1 billion. So, the extra costs are the interchanges and the highway improvements in between. So, if you start adding the, the seismic retrofit the existing bridge, you take into account, of you got to go back and, and -- what I want to call is preservation, redecking the bridge needs to be done over the next 30 years, maybe, maybe twice. Painting of the structure you have got to do, you have repair of the trennions. The cables need to be revamped. You start approaching the cost of a new structure.

**Saltzman:** And then, also, we have heard a lot today, the call for, for a supplemental deis. Obviously, this means more than, than it sounds like. What is the supplemental?

**Garrett:** Supplemental.

**Saltzman:** What are the practical ramifications? Does that mean we're rejecting this and saying, study that option? I don't understand deis speak. [laughter]

**July 9, 2008**

**Garrett:** I'm not sure that I do, as well, commissioner but what I can tell you, if you move beyond the supplement, you do not accept the work and the direction of the alternative that we have before you, so stand down and continue to study, from a practical sense, it means more time, more expenditure. My concern is, we have, we have specific funding timelines associated with the federal one, whether it's the federal transportation administration or more importantly, the greater reauthorization of the surface transportation bill, where significant moneys are invested in the transportation projects. My concern would be we would compromise our opportunities to, to ride that reauthorization as well as the fta cycle. So, the delay may be ...

**Saltzman:** I understand the delay part but, is the scope of a supplemental draft environmental impact statement mean you would look at, at, like once again, other options, perhaps the one that we were discussing, the separate bridge?

**Garrett:** It may mean that or more, you open it up, and that's how far, how far do you go determines how long and how much you expand.

**Tell:** Normally to add to that, where a supplemental comes in, is you proceed with an deis, like the process we're in now, and before council now, we continue from the draft into the final, which is we're all the analysis and data and all the stuff that people want done will happen, and then you get to the record of decision, which could, which does include the possibility of a no bill. The supplemental comes in after you go through any eis process, and you either get a record of decision on the option and let's say you can't fund that option, we have highway projects in this region, deiss were done 20 years ago, and the funding never arrived, and so if you want to go back and consider that today, you would go and do a supplemental, which means you use some of the work that was done prior but you have to update the data and stuff, so to me, the supplemental seems premature because we haven't carried the process we're in now for it to get to that record of decision and decide, what is it? We haven't had a chance to analyze all the things that people want us to, and that's the question in front of the council today is, let us go and do that, and then we'll have all the information that people want, and then a decision can be made.

**Saltzman:** If we complete the final eis and determine the funding, this isn't going to happen, then we, we, a supplemental deis, we'll look at other options?

**Garrett:** There is a shelf life, so to speak, attached to the deis, and let's say we secured that record of decision, it places us right at the cusp of construction but the dollars aren't there. The clock is ticking on that document. So depending on when the funds will be infused, we may have to come back and refresh as mr. Tell just mentioned.

**Adams:** If I could, having set through the 3.5 years of this in terms of behind your question, mr. Saltzman, is we didn't look at row boats as an option, crossing the river. But we looked at --

**Saltzman:** Ferry boats?

**Adams:** We looked at ferry boats. The options started out with a very wide, wide margin. We didn't look at swimming. [laughter]

**Adams:** We looked at a lot of options that, that didn't meet the purpose and need statements, that was put together by, by this big group. So, this was a very involved, doesn't mean that everything got thought of, but a lot got thought of.

**Fish:** Director Garrett, could I ask another question and i'm, interested in the issue of if we put tolling on i-5 bridge, the question of displacement. It has been suggested for this to work you would have to toll the glen jackson bridge. What's the position of odot on that option?

**Garrett:** I think it's an option that we're looking at. It's not necessarily one to the other. There may be some diversion. I will tell you the i-5 corridor is the corridor of choice by most people. That's we're the infrastructure for commerce and goods ports of Portland on both sides. That's what is built around the i-5 infrastructure. So, while I will say that, that as we look at financing vehicles, conversations about i-5, conversations about 205 are, indeed, on the table. But you don't necessarily jump.

**July 9, 2008**

**Fish:** Do you, as the head of the department, have a bias against tolling on the Glen Jackson bridge?

**Garrett:** Not at all. It's a conversation that's being played out in terms of, of tolling policy in front of our Oregon transportation commission. I don't go in with a bias. I see tolling as nothing but a revenue mechanism. And then, there are some collateral issues with regard to congestion pricing. The dynamic pricing commissioner Adams speaks to. The collateral issue on managing the system and the capacity of the system, so I have no biases going in. Again, I see it as a useful tool. Want to apply it appropriately.

**Tell:** And just to add to that, the Oregon legislature, the state statute, gives the authority to, the decisionmaking authority on tolling to the Oregon transportation commission so that's why director Garrett mentioned we're they will be involved.

**Fish:** If I might follow up on that. To the extent that we have heard that, that there could be a displacement of congestion south, towards the Rose Quarter, to what extent would the revenues from tolling that exceed the needs to meet the bonding requirements, the available to Oregon to cover the cost of any kind of mitigation measures as congestion moves out?

**Garrett:** It's a corridor look if I'm understanding, and correct me if I am wrong. It's my understanding, if you toll the I-5 corridor, you can, you can invest, along the I-5 corridor so make, obviously, the efficiency operational.

**Tell:** So, the requirement is, the federal requirement is, you have to show you can pay back the debt and the next order is you have to show that you are maintaining that investment that you built, and then after that, if there is excess, you have the option to spend that money on that roadway.

**Adams:** In the next phase, I'll be advocating for that the tolling revenue is the use for improvements, in the corridors of I-5 and 205. The other thing, I think, is an important part to reiterate is, is that getting the tolling right is also the difference between this problem moving from the crossing to downtown Portland. So, tolling, itself, can serve as managing not only reducing the congestion but also managing the bottlenecks, whereas if you build the new bridge, 15 lanes and let it go, it would end up at the I-5, I-405 split and we would have a mess. I'm not going to accept that. These folks, I don't think will accept that, either.

**Saltzman:** My final question is, we're talking about the city of Portland, talking about the six through-lanes, and the issue of whether we have up to six additional lanes for auxiliary traffic or whether some of those lanes become through traffic. Is that still up for review? Between now and then?

**Garrett:** The lanes going both ways so six through lanes going north and south. The other lanes are auxiliary lanes we're speaking to. Access to the interchange. They are not through lanes, just again, to create a much more safe and, and --

**Saltzman:** There is no question they would be auxiliary and not through?

**Garrett:** That's correct.

**Saltzman:** And is there a question about whether up to three auxiliary lanes or one auxiliary lane or two?

**Garrett:** That's still on the table.

**Adams:** One is contemplated as possible arterial access of the three auxiliary lanes, one might serve as arterial access for the out. That's not decided, either.

**Potter:** I just have one question, Mr. Garrett. It has to do with the deis. You said that if the subsequent environmental impact statement is different, it would open up the entire process. Is that correct?

**Garrett:** I'm not sure --

**Potter:** The whole design process because much of the design, itself, was premised on the deis.

**Garrett:** That's where work is done, when you start speaking about lanes, much of what we have heard today, the concerns that people shared with you, is the type of work if we clear this and

**July 9, 2008**

support the locally preferred alternative, it would allow to us to address the auxiliary lanes, how do they look? Of the greenhouse gas modeling, the financing and pricing elements of this, the design, the bike peds. That's during that, year long period, maybe more, but year long period. That's when we engage in this discussion. That will inform how close we are to realizing the project. Completing it with a final securing that record of decision from the federal agency.

**Potter:** What I heard from the discussion today, and maybe you can clarify for me, is that it was, a lot of it was about the fact that the information, the basis for the deis was outdated information. You talked about shelf lives. It sounded like it was some information from 1975, not 2008, and I am concerned that if that information is going to remain as the basis for the decisionmaking about the number of lanes and tolls and so forth, that we're operating with faulty assumptions to begin with. I'm concerned that that's going to lead us down a road that the conclusions may not be what is necessary, but what is based on this faulty information.

**Garrett:** Mr. Mayor I appreciate that, but I respectfully disagree. I don't know about any information dating back to 1975.

**Potter:** When was the last time you paid \$1.25 for a gallon of gas?

**Garrett:** Well, I can't remember. It's been a while, I would agree with that. If that's, that's what was cited. I'm not sure that we used that in our modeling. We used a different modeling in terms of what it cost to operate a vehicle. With that said, I would submit to you that some of the best and brightest minds from my agency, from the Washington department of transportation, from the city of Portland, from metro, and from the other partners, and the private sector folks that we brought in to vet these issues, I think that they have suicide the most current information to inform this discussion. We want to make sure that we make the right decisions. The opportunity for this bridge, has it has been articulated is a once in a lifetime. I think that's reflected on the folks doing this job. Is the gravity, sensitivity of what's being discussed here is not lost on anyone, whether you are on the private or public side of this. I don't think that anyone, anyone wants to be ashamed of the work that they have done associated with this bridge, so I guess I would just, just respectfully disagree with those folks that called the question on how the work was conducted. We're trying to inform with the best information that we have to move a project that we can all support and somebody proud of.

**Potter:** Other questions? Thank you.

**Garrett:** Thank you, mr. Mayor.

**Adams:** Thank you very much.

**Potter:** Resolution, please call a vote.

**Adams:** Sorry, we have some slight amendments, if I could move those, we put some furthers, and now therefores in places that we shouldn't have, and we misspelled the word minimum, and, and I wanted to put in explicitly the, investigate the option of tolling i-5. Those are the amendments.

**Leonard:** Second.

**Potter:** Call a vote on the amendment.

**Saltzman:** 205.

**Adams:** Sorry. I-84, 205. [inaudible]. Aye.

**Fish:** Aye.

**Leonard:** Aye.

**Saltzman:** Aye.

**Potter:** Aye. [gavel pounded]

**Potter:** Call a vote on the resolution.

**Adams:** I want to thank Shoshanah oppenheim in my office. And Tom Miller in my office. Good folks at pdot, john and, and paul for their work on this. Continuing work on this. I thought the testimony today was, was really good. And almost all of the concerns expressed, I certainly share. And we have, I think, I was looking for any concern expressed that it wasn't memorialized in the



**July 9, 2008**

exhibit or the resolution, and I think we have captured most of them. I want to specifically just sort of, for those of you watching on tv, just sort of speak to some of the issues, specific issues, the concern that rushing to approve. This does not approve the bridge. I said that at the beginning. I want to reiterate that. This moves from one level of study to the next with some basic assumptions. And it moves forward the assumption that if a new bridge is built, it is built with no more through-lanes than exist right now. The data is flawed, and we have to update it. The idea of a \$4 billion investment for a 3% improvement is totally unacceptable. Unacceptable to me, and I assume unacceptable to the council, and I'll talk in a second about how I think that we can do better. This has to be dynamic and the work on 205 has to be dynamic so that we're not encouraging sprawl in the region on either side of the river. It has been studied to death, but it needs to be studied more. So I can appreciate the frustration of some that expressed it has been studied to death but, but it does need to be studied some more. I do not consider those people that are expressing concerns to, to be expressing sort of knee-jerk reactions. The challenge before your transportation commissioner and the city government and everyone involved with this is to really change our thinking. We are so very used to, up to this point, of building transportation infrastructure and leaving it. This is, this has got to be, we have got to change our thinking. This is really building a dynamic response to the crossing, and it's much more than bricks and mortar. It is about tolling. It is about operations. It is about congestion pricing. It is about managing our infrastructure in the most dynamic way that we probably can, in a way that we have never done before, in Oregon. So, it is new, and the bar is high, and in terms of our leverage, I was reminded by the testimony that, that we stopped the freeway to mount hood, and we stopped the water avenue ramp, both freeway proposals, and, and if this doesn't live up to, to its promise or the expectations, we can stop this, as well. But, I think that the potential here exists. I think the raw materials here exist. The goodwill exists to really make a bridge that we can be proud of on all the various levels. Aye.

**Fish:** I want to begin by thanking my colleague, commissioner and mayor-elect sam Adams for his leadership and his vision and his resolute insistence that the city of Portland will not relinquish our authority or our policy goals in this process. I am convinced that he will continue to provide the leadership required to represent the needs of Portland as this complicated bistate project moves forward. In the past week, I've spent many hours listening to all sides of this issue, pouring over reports and articles and communications on the columbia river crossing project. After all the hours of testimony, briefings and presentations on the c.r.c., the question before the council today is, actually, two narrow questions. Do we support replacing the i-5 bridge over the columbia river? And do we support extending light rail to vancouver? This is the biggest public works project in our region's history. It involves two states and a long list of partners and stakeholders. The multi-million-dollar planning process stretches back over a decade. Now, this project has, has aroused a lot of passion because it touches on so many core values of the city and the state. And they include protection of our environment, reducing the greenhouse gases and implementing the sustainable policies you, and promoting transit, bikes, and pedestrian policies to reduce the use of automobiles, and, and creating a sense of place about our community and rejecting old ideas of development and big highways. It's clear to me today that the city council does not have a definitive answers to a great many questions that have been raised about the future of this project. To be, the most important questions are, what is the local control that we will have on the design, financing, and contracting decisions for this project? How will Portland's goals of reducing use of automobiles be advanced in this project? And what contingent financial obligations may we face? And how does this project impact on other transportation and transit priorities. Now, we have assurances from our congressional delegation and from our governor that the concerns and the policy goals of the city will be addressed in the development of the project. This may sound like a trust us approach that odot and wash-dot will take care of us, expect that we do have the right at a later date, I'm convinced, to reject this proposal, and I am also convinced this council will not hesitate to exercise

**July 9, 2008**

that right. We have heard from a number of very committed individuals raising a wide variety of legitimate issues. I'd like to highlight a few of my concerns that I believe need to be addressed as we go forward. They include the mitigation of the health, economic, and environmental impacts on the north and northeast Portland neighborhoods, and the reintegration of communities that have been divided by, by I-5. The burdens of this project should not weigh disproportionately on those residents. And next, a strong commitment to employee, local certified contractors, and workers. And the \$4 billion project should be used to create local wealth and jobs. The use of minority women and emerging small businesses and contractors, and apprentice programs is of fundamental importance to me. Third, the C.R.C. Project must be consistent with the city's historic and successful policies of promoting sustainability, reducing green house gas and improving water and air quality.

And finally under no circumstances, can the city of Portland be on the hook for the financing of this project. Unless the city of Portland's legitimate concerns and policy goals are substantially addressed in the future phases of the project, I am prepared to join my colleagues in rejecting any final project. Mayor-elect Adams stated succinctly in his, what I call excellent piece in the Oregonian today, when he said, "it must be the right kind of bridge," and that is the only acceptable bridge to me. I received almost 1,000 emails and messages since last week. And frankly, mostly they have urged me to reject this proposal. At this point, I am not prepared to reject this historic opportunity to replace this outdated bridge or to extend light rail to Vancouver. Some advocates have urged us to vote no, but to preserve our leverage in future implementation phases. Based on the assurances that we have received from the governor and from the director of ODOT and our other partners, today I am prepared to vote yes, but. While I believe we must move this project forward, the decisions of the state department of transportation, TriMet, and all other jurisdictions must be consistent with our community values and goals. I pledge to be vigilant with my colleagues in protecting those goals, while building a green bridge to the future. Aye.

**Leonard:** It seems to me that, that the issue of replacing the bridge has been confused with a lot of debate that is important, but I think detracts from what has struck me as the core issue, and that is that on, on half of this structure, that is the southbound structure that was built in 1917, just shy of 100 years old, by nine years, it rests on the logs at the bottom of the Columbia River. As we sit here at 6:15 on a nice, summer evening I noticed that there was a nice breeze outside. Which reminds me that I recently acquired a nice little sailboat. That, that sits out on the Columbia, if I went out on that sailboat and decided I wanted to go down the river a ways, I would call the, the bridge tender, on my little 122-foot boat and say, I'm going to come through there, and stop traffic both ways. Raise the bridge, I would go through, have a great time. And when I was ready to come back, he would do that for me again. That's quaint, but dangerous on a number of levels. To the people on the interstate. And I happen to know that because I spent the last five years in my prior profession working at the fire station on Jantzen Beach. A number of really horrible accidents happened in just exactly the circumstance that I described, of the bridge going up, people not paying attention to the abrupt halt of traffic and a trucker or a passenger vehicle plowing into a whole bunch of cars in front of them. So, that's the problem. And we have to resolve that problem. The status quo is shockingly unacceptable, folks. It is irresponsible to suggest that, that the bridges that exist should stay, for not just those reasons, that I have just given you an examples of, but many more, as well so the question for me has been right along, what type of bridge do you build to replace it. And I think that I've been rather, rather brief, considering the context of this debate, and what it is that I expect. And it's just simply that, that whatever bridge is constructed, and I have confidence in the groups that have been working on this, I have watched them on Channel 30 debate it a number of times and once again, admire Commissioner Adams' patience in sitting through what at times, almost feels has to be just mind-numbing, mindlessly numbing meetings and, and with all due respect, repeated testimony over and over and over, and but still stay on the course. To me, what it's come down to is we need to replace the bridge but what to replace it with. Replace it with something competent

**July 9, 2008**

enough to handle the traffic and engineered in a way to reflect the 21st century, meaning that, that the on and off ramps dedicated between Portland and Vancouver will be dedicated for that purpose, and, and as commissioner Adams pointed out, will be existing number of lanes. But, you also have to recognize, recognize that the behavior of, of the Washingtonians and the Oregonians is changing as we speak in terms of transportation. You can, you can -- the traffic isn't what it was a year ago because of the cost of gas and diesel. So, we need light rail. It has to be part of the bridge. I insisted from the beginning that it has to be a condition. Has to have light rail. Secondly, it has to have adequate bike and pedestrian lanes. Most noticed refrain on what the bike lanes and pedestrian lanes look like and how big the light rail lines have to be and how many light rail tracks there should be. I have a lot of faith in the people that are debating this that will come out. Those three things need to be done, and, and to the extent that, that I've been assured that they are going to be there, to the extent that this also, and I don't think that we should minimize this, is going to create jobs. Oftentimes I think most of us need to remember that, that, that what created, really, the, of the United States that we know today was, was a president called Franklin Delano Roosevelt who recognized the way you create a wealth and middle class and opportunities is to create jobs by doing public works projects. And he created -- I invented a number of public works projects. This is not, this is a need. This is something that has to be done anyway, and it also creates jobs and wealth for the working class people in our community. So, for those reasons, honestly, dozens more, this, this is a project that, that I can't imagine the circumstances under which, which should not happen. Beyond those conditions, the three conditions that I listed, not being that. I tip my hat to commissioner Adams, and all those that have been involved in working through this, what has been a really arduous process until now, and, and look forward to lending my support until they begin construction on the new bridge. Aye.

**Saltzman:** I really want to thank everybody for, for the debate, the input, the thoughtful expressions of points of views, and that has occurred during this, this consideration by the council and, and I know other governing bodies have considered this and will consider this, as well, but this is, this has certainly been one of the, one of the most thoughtful debates that I think I have ever had the chance to participate in, and I think that, you know, there are certainly things that concern me about this project, perhaps, the cost being, being the most, and I will come back to that, but I also do believe that this debate has been healthy. It has been healthy for Portland. It has been healthy for, for our region. It certainly, I think, has helped to bond, establish more bonds, and dialogue with Clark County and Vancouver, Washington State, and, and, you know, when we talk about issues of sustainability, carbon footprints, we have to look beyond the Columbia River, I mean, these are issues that require, require national solutions first, regional solutions, and then local solutions. They are all necessary. And, I think that, that that's something that, you know, I'm looking at here. I think that, that, my goals for this project are fairly straightforward. I want to see light rail extended to Vancouver. I think that this will really assist in our efforts to profoundly reduce our carbon footprint. I think that's an area that has been neglected. We talk about the traffic, and there will be, but the light rail connection is going to be something that you have to give people an alternative. You can't just talk about, about getting them out of their cars if they have no other way to get to work. So, that is, you know, first and foremost my, my condition, and, and, you know, commissioner Adams has put a lot of conditions in here that, that are good ones. It should have enhanced bicycle and pedestrian access, the project should increase the ability to transport great, but also to decrease overall vehicle miles traveled, and it should incorporate renewable energy sources, and I encourage both wind and solar options are being looked at in the design guidelines. So, I think that, that we can get to, you know, a better project by starting with this locally preferred alternative. I think that, that, you know, as I said, the debate has been a good one. But also want to associate my remarks with what Mr. Leonard has said, it is my understanding that this will create an estimated 6,000 to 9,000 jobs a year, prevailing wage jobs. And, and we need those jobs. We

**July 9, 2008**

need to keep the skilled workforce that has, has done a lot of work on, on other projects in Oregon, as a result of the Oregon transportation enhancement act. We need to provide -- we need to have something in the pipeline that is going to provide places for those jobs to stay in this region, for people to earn family wages. So, as I said the pricetag can be, is, overwhelming. \$4.2 billion, that's at least a b-1 bomber. [laughter] Not that high, and I think it is an aspirational figure. All I can say is if we were to have lockdown ahead of time, the financing for every transportation project this region has undertaken, we would never have, we would never have done the mount hood freeway and built light rail. We thought the federal government would really support something like that. All of our streetcar efforts have always been, you know, build the line and we'll figure out the financing by the time that we're done, and, you know, and you have to start, I mean, we're part of a federal dance of legislation. And you have got to get on the line and in the process if you have any hope of getting a substantial federal funding, and, and as I say, it's still is a stretch, but, but you have got to get a line and we are at an opportunity where our Washington delegation and our Oregon she goes, senator patty murray, representative brian baird, and congressman blumenauer and defazio are as well positioned from Oregon and Washington's point of view, you know, since the era of, of senator hatfield, so, we need to undertake this, and I have concerns, and I think we well articulated the concerns that we have in this three or four page list of, of conditions for this resolution, but I do believe it is appropriate now for us to take the next step, and it certainly is not the last step, and there will be more opportunities for us to review and way into this thing as it progresses. So, I want to thank commissioner Adams for his leadership and I want to thank rex burkholter. He's been a real leader in this and I am pleased to put my trust in them to make sure that this becomes a bridge and light rail project that we can all be proud of I believe aye.

**Potter:** This has been one of more interesting days that I have had as a mayor. We have had some interesting discussion, and I think much of it has been good, and it has enlightened me in terms of some of the remaining issues. I think that the council speaks on one voice as to what we want to see on a bridge, what that bridge will look like, and, and how much it will cost, and how it will be paid for, is all up in the air. And that, that does concern me. It's like we're stepping off and not sure exactly we're we're going to land. So, i'm very concerned about a lot of issues regarding this bridge, and I think it's really incumbent upon this city council to track very closely what happens from this point forward and to support commissioner Adams in terms of trying to insure that the voice of Portlanders are heard very clearly. And that, that we do build a bridge that does meet the needs and resolves the problem that are inherent in the current bridge, the last thing in the world that I want to see is another bridge built on sand with wooden pilings. I want to make sure that our bridge is strong, that it's well thought out, that it truly is, is going to last for the rest of this century and meet the needs of a country whose dependence on oil is going to be first reduced and then eliminated. What does that mean for us and how do we contend with it? Since this may be one of my last votes on this issue before I leave office, I want to support the work that has been started, but I want to urge caution. I want to urge people to step back and take another look. If it doesn't fit us, then we shouldn't buy it. So, congratulations, Commissioner adams and thank you for your leadership and I wish the best for this project. And I vote aye.

[gavel pounded]

**Potter:** Recess until 2:00 pm tomorrow.

At 6:28 p.m., Council recessed.

July 10, 2008

## 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.

**JULY 10, 2008      2:00 PM**

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

**Potter:** I'd like to remind folks prior to offering public testimony the city council lobbyist must declare which entity they're authorized to represent. Please read the 2:00 p.m. Time certain.

### **Item 993.**

**Potter:** This is known as the Killingsworth rezoning project. Gil Kelley, planning director, and Debbie Bischoff are here to present this item. Please come on up. The Killingsworth rezoning project is the result of the district liaison project which assigns planners to each section of the city to work directly with Portlanders to resolve issues in their community. I went out for a tour of Cully neighborhood, and it's clear the district liaison for northeast Portland, Debbie, has gotten to know the people in the area and is working hard, hand in hand with them to develop ideas and solutions. She's been instrumental in working with the diverse stakeholders, with work on improving livability for children, youth, or families in the overall community. Killingsworth projects is another example of that work. So Debbie, thank you for doing that, and Gil, thank you for having the wise sagacity to know she's the right person for the job.

**Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning:** Thank you, mayor. Gil Kelley --

**Adams:** [inaudible] [laughter]

**Potter:** I should have just stopped. [laughter]

**Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning:** Thank you, mayor, Gil Kelley, planning bureau. Just want to take a moment before Debbie introduces the project itself to say a word or two about the program following your comments, mayor. This program has been fully staffed for just a year this month, and it's been a very successful one, and I want to thank the council personally for funding that program, and also giving us a little bit of extra money in the current fiscal year to help Debbie and her counterparts in the other districts around the city to be able to do these kinds of quick action projects. This is one of the benefits of this program, that we can respond quickly to community needs, we don't need to come to you a year in advance and ask for special funding. With the small-scale projects, we can be a bit more of a rapid response team, and Debbie's done a lot of work in many northeast neighborhoods. I think it's the first legislative act we've brought to you from the district liaison program. I think you'll see today the benefits of that program. They're really our eyes and ears continuously in the community, hearing about community needs and wants first, and being able to respond in the most efficient and direct means possible. And I'd like to thank Deborah Stein who is here behind me in the front row, she's heading up that program for the bureau. With that introduction, I wanted to say this is really a community initiated effort, and Debbie took charge of it and I think has really delivered something that the planning commissioner had almost unanimous support for. We had an on-site meeting at Jefferson High School with the planning commission, which is where they conducted their public hearing recently, and got a lot of community support for this. I haven't seen that kind of love fest in quite a while at the planning commission. We usually have a more split audience. This is a case where I think the Albina community plan from the early '90s have one vision and view for Albina, and this corridor, this

**July 10, 2008**

piece got swept up in that, and I think that this is a good corrective action to take 15 years later. So with, that I'd like to introduce Debbie.

**Debbie Bischoff, Bureau of Planning:** Thank you. Good afternoon mayor and commissioners. Debbie Bischoff, senior planner at the bureau of planning. As Gil said, through community outreach as a northeast district planner, I became aware of neighborhood property business owner interests, and seeing the blighted area of northeast Killingsworth Street from 14th to 17th avenues rezoned from its existing multidwelling residential zoning to a commercial zone. And as Gil said in 1993, as part of the Albina Community Plan, the city rezoned this three-block area from commercial to residential hoping that residential redevelopment would happen, and at that time in inner north-northeast Portland in the '80s and early '90s there was a loss of population and a loss of housing stock. And there were also citywide housing goals to try to achieve more housing in our city. And so this was one location that the plan thought housing would happen. 15 years later, no housing redevelopment has happened in this three-block area, and what is left is the fact that most of the buildings here are commercial in nature, about 75% of the buildings in this area are commercial. They are legal nonconforming uses, but they're limited in how much they can renovate or expand as a nonconforming use in a residential zone. Over time what's happened is, buildings have not been kept up. Some uses have vacated and what you see -- there's an example I think you have handouts also of the buildings in the area. You see some shelves of build -- shells of buildings that aren't active. And it's really created a blighted situation here. And according to property owners and area residents, criminal activities are occurring here on a daily basis. Marginally due to this lack of active storefronts with a mixed, you know, what it needed was a mix of neighborhood goods and services which draws positive pedestrian activity. So the recommended comp plan and zoning designation changes are aimed at bringing back commercial vitality to this three-block area of Killingsworth Street in the Vernon neighborhood, and it's a neighborhood that is also in need of some neighborhood -- additional neighborhood serving commercial and mixed use. The area is well served by transit, bus line 8 runs north and south down 15th. And the changes proposed through this rezoning fulfill a variety of city goals related to livability, housing, and economic development. Planning staff, we conducted two public engagement and outreach events. The first meeting in January drew about 100 people. It confirmed the interest in seeing pursuit of this zone change on Killingsworth Street. We also asked what people wanted to see in the future in this area. And we developed a public comment form, one question was what were the desired qualities or values you have for this area, what are the desired land uses you'd like to see, and if you had any other comments. We received 80 written responses and we took copious notes at that January meeting. Through these public comments, they helped inform the analysis and the alternatives of what commercial zones we might consider in this area. On March 26th we held a second community discussion, and that was a special meeting at the Vernon neighborhood land use committee that drew about 60 people. We reviewed the comments that we received from the January meeting, and I want to share with you what those overarching values and desires are from the community for this three-block area on Killingsworth Street. First, folks would like to see neighborhood serving commercial vitality and activities within walking distance of area residents. They want safe pedestrian family friendly environment. They want to see a diverse mix of locally owned, nonauto oriented commercial businesses that serve local families and households and may include housing that reflects a range of affordability. The desired specific land uses they'd like to see include restaurants, bakery, cafe, hardware stores, offices, housing above retail, live/work units and public space. Sustainable and green development and community gathering spaces were also valued from the community. In that meeting I then discussed the review of the alternative zones, but there were three pertinent considerations that have guided this process for staff. One is we want to minimize nonconforming uses. And right now all those commercial uses in the residential zone are nonconforming uses. We want to limit the area of which we would apply commercial zoning to that

**July 10, 2008**

being the historically commercial area, that area that was commercially zoned prior to 1993, and this map over here, the orange area shows the previously zoned commercial area on Killingsworth. And third, there's some properties on the south side of the study area that have split zones. So that means one parcel has two zoning designations assigned to it, and we always try to reduce the amount of split zones for properties. So we wanted this project to say, each parcel has one zone, and that's it. So we looked at four potential commercial zones. Two of them were pretty quickly deemed not appropriate. One is the general commercial zone because the community said pretty loud and clear we don't want auto-oriented uses. You have Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard nearby and Alberta Street, that has general commercial zoning. So they didn't want to see that type of zone. Second, the property owners and community wanted more flexibility with the commercial zone, and there's one commercial zone called mixed commercial or the c.m. Zone that requires housing with commercial. And folks wanted to see housing happen, but have it be more flexible, like allow it, but not require it. So we didn't consider the c.m. Zone as one of the alternatives. So that left the commercial storefront zone and a neighborhood commercial one zone. The planning commission recommendation that you have before you today, which is on page 4 of your report, it's the same recommendation that I initially presented to the community back in March. It's also the same recommendation that went to planning commission in May. The majority of the recommendation calls for commercial storefront zoning along Killingsworth Street, and this map right here, the lower map where you see the red, is the proposal for the commercial storefront zoning. The primary reasons for selecting the commercial storefront zone are as follows. It's similar in development scale as to the general commercial zone that was previously there, and also to the existing residential 1,000 and -- zone that is there today. So the scale of development will be similar to what has been historically and is today. The c.s. Zone is more likely to produce housing than the cn-1 zone. The cn-1 zone has a lower height limit of 40 feet a. Smaller floor area ratio, and what we generally see with neighborhood commercial zones tends to be single story, convenience stores, or restaurants, or offices. But we don't see mixed use with the cn-1 zone very often. The third is just the -- that envelope of development potential is much greater with the commercial storefront zone, where you have a floor area ratio of three-to-one for the cn-1 area it's a .75-to-1. So you can build more development, which leads to fulfilling more of the community's desires if you have a bigger building envelope, maybe there's more -- there is more possibility for different commercial uses or other uses to come in. So it seems like it would meet the community's goals more, and again, provide that opportunity for housing. And overall the greater development potential of the c.s. Zone further capitalizes on the great transit service that you have with bus line 8 running true that -- through that area. So most of the public that attended the March 26th meeting where we explored the initial recommendation, concurred with staff's recommendation of the c.s. Zone there. Were a few people that liked the smaller scale nature of the cn-1 zone, but that was a small minority of those who were at the meeting. I also want to highlight, if you look at the proposal map, there's one little blue square that's south of the c.s. Zoning. That address is 5402-5418 Northeast 15th Avenue. And that's being recommended to be rezoned to R-1, and currently it's a nonconforming use. It is an apartment building and a -- in a single family residential zone. So we have recommended and planning commission has recommended to you the rezoning of that from R-25 to R-1 to bring that property into conformance. And it also whether provide a transition between the commercial storefront, a transition in zoning from the commercial storefront to the single family as a transitional zone in that location. Planning staff -- one other aspect is that transportation analysis was performed on the recommendation and it showed that there were no significant impacts to the local regional or state system with this rezoning proposal. Planning staff attended and participated at the main meetings of the Vernon neighborhood and the North-Northeast Business Association, and at both meetings, both organizations endorsed this rezoning proposal. And at planning commission the Concordia neighborhood also testified in support of this recommendation. And as you've heard,

**July 10, 2008**

nearly all of the testimony at may 27th planning commission hearing was positive. The only different testimony came from two property owners outside of the project area who asked to be included in the commercial zoning recommendation. And the planning commission in its unanimous vote of support for staff recommendation did not find it appropriate to expand the commercial zoning into an historically residential area to the north and west of the project area. So with that, the planning commission recommendation before you today is to adopt an ordinance which amends Portland's comprehensive plan map and Portland's zoning map as shown in the report dated june 2008, and that concludes my presentation. There's staff here from the bureau of development services and pdot also if you have any questions, and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

**Potter:** Questions from the commissioners?

**Saltzman:** So the new zone goes in two blocks on either side of killingsworth?

**Bischoff:** Three blocks, from 14th to 17th.

**Saltzman:** I meant north-south.

**Bischoff:** Oh, north and south. Both -- on the -- it's like half a block in on the north and south side.

**Saltzman:** Ok. Half block.

**Bischoff:** Half block, i'm sorry.

**Moore-Love:** We have seven people signed up.

**Potter:** Thank you for coming in. When you speak, please state your name for the record. You each have three minutes.

**Amy Hendrxx:** I'm amy hendrxx, property owner on northeast 19th, just south of killingsworth. First -- and I support this recommendation. I'd like to thank debbie and gil and their staff and the vernon neighborhood association and the Portland planning commission for bringing the process to this point. And I guess now we're in the final stage of voting on a small change that has very large implications for the residents and business owners. The positives of this rezoning reached from the current business owners to the immediate neighbors, to vernon neighborhood, and surrounding communities. I've been to just about all the meetings. They've all been very well attended and very enthusiastic. Through no fault of the business owners, the three-block stretch is definitely a blighted area, as it has been described. Very accurate description. The area still has a lot of drug activity and gang tagging. Personal experience, last fall a dealer was chased into my back yard, wrestled down on my patio before being arrested. We all have stories. If you've lived in that area for any length of time. So the rezoning could have a positive effect, even on these types of ongoing issues. So for the business owners, neighbors, vernon, and surrounding communities, I hope you'll give this a yes vote for the zoning change. Thank you.

**Larry Holmes:** Larry holmes, cochair of the vernon neighborhood association. This process started a little over a year and a half ago when we were collecting information from the neighbors about what they liked, what they didn't like designwise, and commercially in the neighborhood. And we received a lot of comments about why is this area so run down, why has alberta redeveloped and this hasn't? Debbie was able to answer that question for us. And then we went to the business owners there and asked if they were happy with the situation, and unanimously they said no. And they all had stories about trying to get their property rezoned, and they were all unsuccessful. And this is where we engaged debbie and started looking at this as a neighborhood. And we've had complete support from everyone we've talked to, in addition to the meetings that b.d.s. called, we've had -- in 18 months, 18 neighborhood association meetings where this has been discussed since then. And this is something that the people who live and work in the area want. And in addition to correcting this historic mistake, I guess rezoning could be called, we really believe it's going to go a long way towards resolving drug and prostitution problems that exist in



**July 10, 2008**

this small section. Of killingsworth. Close to a park, close to a school. So it's something that we've nothing but support for, and hope you guys agree with us.

**John Fall:** My name is john fall, i'm the land use cochair for the verson neighborhood association.

I guess a couple of things to add to that. One is, in some ways this is about the district liaison program. I do want to say that a very important function that debbie does is keep us out of your hair. Because as i'm sure you can imagine, whenever an issue comes up, everyone says let's go to the city council, and debbie if gait keeper who says, mmm, maybe not this time. And I also want to emphasize that we didn't -- the neighborhood association did not go to this business node and say, you have a problem. Or, this area is blighted. We just said "what's up?" and the overwhelming issue from the residents was safety, blight, the condition of the sidewalks, and the business owners phrased it as the zoning issue, because obviously they were familiar with it. And the tool in front of us at the time -- well, past neighborhood associations have attempted to address this, but the current incarnation of the association was lucky enough to have the district liaison program. So we learned about the rezoning possibilities, we set -- sat in on several budgeting meetings so the district liaison actually had staff hours budgeted for this process, and debbie took it from there and heard the results of that. Just want to reiterate, the concordia neighborhood, which is three blocks away, supports this north-northeast business association planning commission, and of course we do. Thank you.

**Adams:** Thanks for your persistence.

**Potter:** When you speak, you each have three minutes.

**Stevan Arychuk:** Steven, i'm a property owner at 18th just north of killingsworth. I'm going to express support for the plan and the process that debbie has brought forward. The general consensus from the residents is that the area is blighted, as expressed, and it's just generally a concern with safety and an area that people generally want to avoid. There's active drug trafficking, prostitution, smashed windows from car break-ins on a weekly basis. And I think people in the neighborhood generally avoid it, whether due to safety or they don't want to look at it or deal witness or whatever. I think that even during the short time that the obama headquarters for the northeast was there, there was some improvement because there was generally activity in that area. So anything that the council can do to promote investment activity I think would be extremely appreciated.

**Clark Henry:** Mayor, commissioners, i'm clark henry, I manage the brownfield program out at bureau of environmental services. I'm really encouraged by this action, and strongly support the change of zoning. Three of these sites in this area are former gas stations, and we've provided technical and financial services on them. The thing that really triggers environmental assessment remediation is that there's pending development. It's rarely done just for the sake of it, and with two of the sites not having -- i'm not saying this is a huge danger, but the redevelopment and development interest is what triggers that association, so I like to see that happen. There are times when regulatory compliance on -- with d.e.q. On sites like this prohibits residential use on the first floor of the building. So with the current zoning, that don't really match what regulatory compliance might potentially require. It makes developers more comfortable, residents more comfortable.

**George Thompson:** I'm george thompson with aldrige associates. I'm a real estate broker representing the new jerusalem baptist church at the corner of northeast 17th and killingsworth. The church is for sale, that's why i'm here. But I want to speak to the bigger issue. Everything the prior people have said about this neighborhood being in disrepair is absolutely true. I have been all over the city of Portland for the past 25 years. This is among the worst three-block neighborhoods I can think of. There's also -- I want to bring up something that might be touchy, and i'm not representing the church in its capacity, i'm just relaying feedback i've heard from some of the property owners that actually own those buildings on killingsworth. They're predominantly

**July 10, 2008**

minority owners. Primarily african-american. There is some deep animosity towards city hall over what's happened to this neighborhood and the fact that they haven't been able to do anything about it. And in the case of the church, I can give you two specific examples. Number one, they've done extensive remodeling in that church in the last 10 years. They're upset because they've had to pay commercial water and sewer rates. They also are upset because when they did this remodeling, they were required to earthquake proof their building. Now, this is not supposed to be a commercial building. Even though it was grandfathered in. But -- and yet they couldn't do anything else with it except as a church. They couldn't sell it to somebody else who wanted to convert it to offices or retail or anything else. And there's some hostile feelings up there from the property owners that actually own these buildings on Killingsworth. And this change can only improve that neighborhood. I can't see any down side to it. Thank you investment

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

**Andrew Clarke:** My name is Andrew Clarke, and I'm a developer. I'm just going to read a quick statement here. Good afternoon, my name is Andrew Clarke, again, and I'm here today to support the planning commission's zoning adjustment for Northeast Killingsworth Street. As a long-time resident of Concordia and someone who hopes to be an active part of revitalization in this area, I appreciate the hard work and the diligence of Debbie Bischof, the Portland Planning Bureau, and any one else who's been working to bring you life in this community. This proposed zone change will give us a chance to create a new and innovative mixed use project to serve an important and underutilized portion of Northeast Portland. As president of Hugh Development, I'm excited about the prospect of creating new spaces for local retailers, as well as expanding the neighborhood stock of green residential and business use. This area spanning 14 Street and 17th Street already enjoys some great advantages. Its close proximity to Alberta Park, the residents and amenities of Upper Calcagno and nearby Alberta, and transportation links to downtown are just about anywhere else you'd want to go. With this zone change, we'll create a project that builds on many existing strengths of the neighborhood while charting a course for future development along the way. We appreciate the strong neighborhood support that we've received from area businesses, the Vernon Neighborhood Association, and many others. We're encouraged by the feedback from the open houses facilitated by Debbie Bischof, the Planning Department, and -- in March and May, and we understand that responsible development considers how our buildings fit within the larger community. It is our hope that with the community brought about by this zone adjustment, we can work with the neighborhood leaders and residents for a project that improves the vitality of the streetscape. We can create a new cluster for local businesses and retailers, and we can build a striking modern space using the best in green construction technologies. Thanks for your time today and for your interest and consideration in the future of this neighborhood.

**Gary Marschke:** Gary, vice chair of the North-Northeast Business Association. And proud member of the vision attached coalition team. I also wanted to welcome our newest commissioner, Mr. Fish, and I don't recognize this guy over here. What did you do with your mustache? I had to mention that. In any case, I wanted to read our letter of support for the rezoning. But I also wanted to preface it by reiterating that there is a deep disconnect between the business owners and the business district there, and the building owners. And City Hall and City Resources. And I think it's a question of access. They don't feel as though they've had access, they're outside the urban renewal zone, and as a result, that along with the zoning has really alienated that community. And we're trying as an organization to act as a liaison to try to make sure they get access to those services and that those property owners are empowered to participate in their own development. So that being said, this letter is to convey our unanimous support for the Portland Planning Commission recommendation to amend the city's comprehensive plan map and Portland zoning map by rezoning the three-block area of Northeast Killingsworth from Northeast 17th, 17th as storefront commercial.

**July 10, 2008**

The reasons for our support -- the bureau of planning led capably by debbie bishop, conducted -- conducted an open process in which the staff recommendation clearly reflects the diverse public input. The staff report and proposal clearly identify the problem at hand, and the best solution. The historic three-block formerly commercially zoned section of killingsworth, 14th to 17th, is the appropriate extent for this rezoning to commercial mixed use. Rezoning to commercial storefront will allow for the rebirth of local serving retail and commercial uses along the mixed use, along with mixed use, including housing, to support the retail and take advantage of the nearby bus service. The c.s. Zoning allow for new small local business opportunities that are needed in the area. The c.s. Zone is flexible and by not by requiring, but allowing housing and c.s. Zoning fits with the plans under discussion by various affected property owners. Finally the recommendation will bring about a safer more pedestrian active neighborhood center. The entire community is looking forward to a more vibrant and attractive killingsworth street instead of the unattractive and underdeveloped area that exists. The community and residential rents best served by providing the broadest and most flexible -- flexible menu of options. This is on behalf of the entire board of the north-northeast business association, who unanimously support it. Thank you.

**Potter:** Thank you, folks.

**Adams:** I have a question for planning. I'll try to leave out, filter out my frustration that this issue raises for someone who's I guess been hanging around planning issues too long. This is not the only place in the city that the city council and in the '80s, '90s took what had historically been operating as commercial nodes, part of our concept of bringing back the 20-minute neighborhood, and zoned them residential. Which virtually has ensured these kinds of situations. Where they bought it as commercial, it gets down zoned to residential, it takes a lot of falderal to get through, even if they're eligible for making improvements to continuous commercial, and back when I was chief staff to the mayor, we identified I think actually the Portland business apmba as one of their to-dos, identified doing an assessment of these kinds of nodes around the city, and that was a long time ago. So it's great that this is coming forward, but I also recall before I left my job as chief of staff to the mayor that there was supposed to be a project underway, systemically more citywide to address these kinds of issues. So it's great this is coming forward, but it's frustrating that it's coming forward in such a modest scale. And at a modest pace. And I wanted you to comment on that, if you would.

**Kelley:** Sure. Well, two things, sam. I think the district liaison program is aware of this issue and it exists in other places as well. And there may be other opportunities as debbie has taken to do these in a one at a time fashion. It's also an issue that we have included in the Portland plan, where we're really looking at the zoning patterns across the city. There are one or two other hot spots i'm aware of, where this is the case. I wouldn't characterize it as being brought scale, but there are some opportunities to do this same kind of thing in a few other locations. And it's an issue we're look at in the Portland plan. I would -- the other thing I would say is to reiterate a comment you made, which is, if you look at this one in particular, it's done in a very -- in a quick fashion, but with a holistic look. And in some ways, really illustrates the notion of the 20-minute neighborhood. If you look here you can see there's a school, a park, and what is meant to be a commercial area, the missing piece until ways to complete the 20-minute neighborhood has been this commercial piece. So here's one where it made complete sense, there weren't a lot of cross-cutting or conflicting issues. It's one where we can run right up the middle without a lot of corollary conflicts or issues to deal w with.

**Bischoff:** Another area in my district that has some nonconforming uses is the elliot neighborhood. When we look at this issue, we have to be careful, because in the elliot neighborhood plan it was very -- there was a very strong policy decision that that neighborhood had lost a lot of housing between legacy, hospital land, and between the rose quarter and memorial coliseum. And it was a very conscious effort in that plan to bring more residential back to their neighborhood. So if we do revisit nonconforming uses, I think we have to pay careful attention to the context, and then not

**July 10, 2008**

every place there might be appropriate, or maybe times have changed in elliot and elliot neighborhood is willing to reconsider that. But there's a very strong policy basis for the creation of those nonconforming uses in that neighborhood.

**Adams:** I want to be clear, I want -- I stand for good things, not bad things. I like fuzzy bunnies and babies. And I support neighborhood, I like a place to garden, and i'm for strengthening neighborhoods, not making them work. I would respectfully submit that it's more than a few places around town. And I would respectfully submit that if the conversation with neighbors is big, tall commercial, or what you have now, that if I was given that choice, and i'm not suggesting that you're posing it that way, but I think that's natural for people to sort of think of it that way, that we've learned a lot about mixed use. And we've learned a lot about, you know, neighborhood appropriate sort of scaled mixed use. And we need to be serious about our greenhouse gas goals, our peak oil goals, our 20-minute neighborhood goals so people don't have to get in their car or transit or anything to get basic necessities. And I see an incredible opportunity around the city that seems to be moving very, very slowly. And I smiled when I said that.

**Kelley:** Deborah Stein will speak here. -- I just wanted to say, in case it was miss interpreted, I don't know if there were only a few spots that have the potential like this. It's the very few spots that don't have some of the cross cutting issues that we need to dig deeper into in the Portland plan. We'll do that.

**Adams:** Your point is this one was relatively easy. There might be other good opportunities, but maybe they aren't as easy, or have as much unanimity as support.

**Kelley:** And I think those will be well-served by advancing the 20-minute neighborhood concept and getting larger buy-in to that.

**Deborah Stein, Bureau of Planning:** I'm deborah stein, and I manage the district liaison program. I agree with everything you just heard, and I want to add a little bit more to that. I have asked am five of the liaisons to do some scouting of some other opportunities where we have same kind of situation, and we're doing some sorting, we're doing kind of an examination of where we have the killingsworth example, that prototype is one section where we can see that it's not laden with policy issues, it's fairly clear-cut and these are things that can move forward. So we're trying to find other examples that fit that model. There are places where we made deliberate policy decisions where it wouldn't be appropriate, so we're starting to do that sorting right now. But I also wanted to mention i've been working with clark henry from the brownfields program. He's provided us with different properties in different parts of the city that are brownfield sites that are zoned r-1, but have some former commercial use, and we're look at those right now specifically to see which of those could follow this kind of prototype where we could look at how we could potentially rezone them. We're not ready to launch those now, but we're looking at those to see if there's some ability to achieve multiple objectives, facilitating clean-up, and at the same time prompting redevelopment in an otherwise blighted area, then we could achieve multiple objectives simultaneously, we might move forward with some of those as well.

**Adams:** Underscore the multiple objectives. I really don't think you need to pose it -- to summarize it, if it is true the way it's summarized than elliot plan of housing or commercial. It really doesn't have to be that anymore. You really can fulfill goals and as inspirations of the elliot plan and i'm prove our efforts towards meeting our goals. Thank you.

**Potter:** Any other questions? Is the city attorney sitting over there?

**Fish:** Stop hiding behind that map:

**Potter:** I have a note here that we're supposed to take the amended title 33 off the cover. Could that be a scrivener change, or should it go through an amendment? There's in parentheses the phrase "amend title 33." this doesn't amend title 33.

**Adams:** So moved.

**Leonard:** Second.

**July 10, 2008**

**Potter:** Call the vote.

**Adams:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. [gavel pounded]  
nonemergency, moves to a second reading.

**Saltzman:** I just wanted to congratulate debbie bischoff for doing great work here, and please feel free to come back to us with more of these types of issues.

**Potter:** It's nice to know you're in charge of planning now. [laughter]

**Leonard:** And feel free to keep discouraging people to -- from coming here. [laughter] I appreciate it. Thank you.

**Adams:** I disassociate myself with those remarks.

**Potter:** It's 2:45. We have a 3:00 p.m. time certain. So the council will take a short break and we'll be back at 3:00 p.m.

At 2:45 p.m., Council recessed.

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

### **Items 993 and 994.**

**Andrew Aebi, Bureau of Transportation:** Good afternoon commissioners. I'm Andrew Aebi, local improvement district administrator with me is Sue Donaldson of the Parks Bureau. I'm going to walk you through these two alternative proposals. We're considering 51st Avenue and Buddington Street and 53rd Avenue and Buddington Street. I wanted to start out by giving a geographical overview. I'm showing you a map of the far southwest neighborhood. You can see that the blue area there is the land owned by P.C.C. Sylvania, that campus is part of far southwest. You can see far southwest, the rest of far southwest in gray, you can see Tigard is on the left side there to the west, and likes on is to the southeast, they're kind of in a pink color. So the major arterials are shown, I-5, Barbur Boulevard, Capitol Highway, 45th Avenue. The streets that are shown in green are streets that are improved city standards, which means they have pavement, curbs, and drainage. The dirt and gravel streets in the neighborhood are shown in red. They're virtually all adjacent to the project area, and you can see the project area is shown in black with the crosshatch in the middle. Other streets in the neighborhoods that are substandard, which means they're paved but do not have curbs or drainage. Shown in orange, and you can see those are in the southwest part of the neighborhood. Finally, you can see the major road through P.C.C. Sylvania, which is kind of that thick yellow line that runs along the north side of campus. The main entry to P.C.C. is the 49th Avenue entrance with the service entrance at Lesser Road. Just to be clear, there's no connection to P.C.C. campus from 53rd Avenue or any of the other north-south streets in between Lesser Road and Capitol Highway. And finally, there's two parks in the -- park sites in the neighborhood. One is Lesser Park adjacent to the P.C.C. Sylvania campus, and the other is the future Sylvania Park site, which would be included in the -- in this I.I.D. if it were to move forward. So in terms of the fire southwest neighborhood, far southwest, the entirety of the neighborhood was annexed to the city from Multnomah County in 1979. Fairly typical situation, where the development standards were pretty lousy when it was in Multnomah County, so the infrastructure was not built at the time of development. What's interesting, if you look at all the residential development in far southwest, 54% of the homes in far southwest were built while the area was in Multnomah County. But the remaining 46% was built after the area was annexed to the city. So the point being, there's been a fair amount of infill development and higher density since the area came into the city. And far southwest, that particular neighborhood has the highest proportion of dirt and gravel streets in the city. So almost 15% of the streets in far southwest are dirt and gravel. And then finally, those streets that are paved are twice as likely to be substandard and lack curbs and drainage. So just to kind of walk you through how we got here, I have been getting quite a few telephone calls over the years from the area adjacent to this proposed I.I.D. Where people have been calling me and

**July 10, 2008**

complaining about the condition of their streets. So early last year I held a large meeting at p.c.c. Sylvania and invited everyone from the block where people had expressed an interest in street improvements. Based on that meeting, following up, rather, to that meeting, I spent quite a bit of time making personal phone calls and contacts with everybody I could get ahold of, but tried to determine whether there would be interest in petitioning an l.i.d. And based on that, I put together a proposal for 51st and buddington. My feeling at the time that I petitioned it was that we had the opportunity to attract in excess of 40% petition support for the l.i.d. Obviously the reason we go through the petition process is to ascertain whether there is support for the improvement. I'll go through the petition strength here in a minute, but there was -- alternative 53rd and buddington proposal. Then lastly, I took the city engineer out to look at this neighborhood, and his parameters were, if we're going to do some street improvements in the neighborhood there should be an improved connection to capitol highway. Finally, I -- I do want to mention that there would be no cleared access to p.c.c. Sylvania if street improvement were made. I'm going to go ahead and give you a copy of a letter from Portland community college noting they have no interest in a third connection. This is how 53rd avenue looked january of this year. You can see the streets been pretty atrocious condition. The left side of the street there is the future sylvania park site, also known as sylvan nature area park. The right side are residential properties. Gravel was recently added to the street, but it is summertime, and my past experience has been that when winter returns the potholes will return as well. By city code the abutting property owners have maintenance responsibility. That means the residential property owners on the east side of the street as well as properties owned by the park -- on the other side of the street, even if the property is undeveloped. The street was graded and graveled recently, the street looks much better today as you go out and look at it. My -- again, my experience has been those are temporary fixes and are usually not long-term. What I often find with l.i.d.s, people try to grade and gravel, and do that a couple times, and then they dot l.i.d. when it's clear that grading and graveling is not a long-term solution. This is buddington street, the other street that would be improved if this l.i.d. were to move forward. You can see the storm water is not infiltrating into the street. Basically had a little creek running down the middle of the street, and that untreated storm water is running towards the direction of the future sylvania park site, which is in an environmental protection zone overlay area. Here's the map of the original 51st and buddington l.i.d. You can see all of buddington street was proposed to be improved, and the connection with capitol would have been on 51st avenue. And much smaller portion of 53rd would have been improved there on the left side of the map. The difference here with 53rd and buddington is that 51st gets removed from the area of improvement. The eastern half of the block there on buddington street also is not improved. And much more of 53rd gets improved, and there's a connection to capitol highway via 53rd. Kind of comparing these two projects, the key block we're look at here is looking at the block approaching capitol highway northbound. When you come up 51st avenue, it's relatively flat as you approach capitol highway. 53rd is steeper. This is not with the benefit of survey, but per g.i.s. It's approximately a 7% downhill grade as you approach capitol. So you have gravel and storm water and debris potentially washing out on to capitol highway. If we were to move forward with either of these projects, 53rd would be preferable to 51st avenue, and I think almost everybody in the neighborhood agrees that if we were to move forward with one of these projects, 53rd would be a better project than 51st. It's less out of direction travel from the neighborhood, and as I mentioned, it would keep -- it would do a better job of keeping debris off capitol highway. It's just the more logical connection into the neighborhood. And again, I had the city engineer do a site visit. I asked him his perspective. He said from his perspective, the project made sense, and again, if you're going to pave a connection into the neighborhood, this is a good place to start. Just comparing the project report on this, the 51st and buddington l.i.d. Has unique disteens that it attracted the highest level of petition support by amount for a residential property to my knowledge in the history of the city. So I think when

**July 10, 2008**

you look at petition support and the amount of dollars people are willing to put on the table, I think that's a good indication of the relative benefits of a project. You can see the numbers here in terms of petition support is a little skewed by the amount of government support. The total support would be 60%, including the city-owned property. If we were to remove the city-owned properties from both the numerator and the denominator in terms of measuring support, the support level is at 21.1% under an abutting linear footage assessment methodology. The 53rd and buddington l.i.d. Would be on an abutting square footage assessment methodology. The petition support is a little bit less, but that's because there's a higher proportion of the l.i.d. Being carried by the government-owned property. So again, if you take the government-owned properties out of the equation, there's 47.1% petition support. So you can see we're pretty close to a split here in terms of whether to move forward or not move forward. We do have quite a few folks here to speak. I do want to note this is a relatively small l.i.d. There are seven property owners that own eight properties. So you will be hearing from people today that would not be part of the proposed 53rd and buddington l.i.d. If it were to move forward. I guess on a final note, i've been talking to the neighborhood for 18 months, and I think it's unlikely that we would either get to a consensus to either improve this street or a consensus not time prove it. So that's why we're here today, to have council make that decision whether to move forward. If we compare the project cost, i'm going to focus here on the property owners who did not petition in favor. Under the original proposal, the average per property assessment was \$40,000. Under the revised proposal, the average assessment of those not in favor is \$15,000. So there's been a pretty dramatic reduction in the proposed assessment for those who are not in favor of the original proposal. Tabling 51st and buddington eliminates 12 out of the 21 properties assessments. So it does eliminate quite a few assessments on top of reducing them significantly for those who would still be part of an l.i.d. And would I also note that the reduction in assessment assist slight higher than for those who are not in favor, as opposed to to those properties that -- whose owners were in favor. And that's just simply a uniform application of the assessment methodology. And everybody except for one property owner in the l.i.d. Owned one lot, there's one property owner who owns two. If the l.i.d. Were to move forward, I just want to emphasize that nothing would be charged until the project was complete, so we're a couple years away from anyone having to pay for an l.i.d. We would custom arly offer five, 10 exprks-year programming ---- state referral prom is offered. What's unique is we would be in a position to offer a low-income grant for qualifying property owners. Assuming this grant were to be limited to owner occupied homes, it ends on the level of participation rate, how much that might buy down the assessment. For example, at 100% assessment or -- excuse me, 100 perspiration rate, it could potentially reduce residential assessments for those who qualified by 35.8%. At a 50 perspiration rate, it would be a 71.5% reduction in the assessment. And if it was a 36 perspiration rate, then it would be a complete elimination of the assessment for those property owners. The amount of the low-income grant would simply an estimate, it would be a function of how much we'd spend on the project. I would also note this summer and last summer i've been building four projects that didn't move forward on the first attempt. Council's option at this point is to move forward with 53rd and buddington or table it. If it's tabled, it would by city code be tabled for a minimum period of six months, but it could be repetitioned again in the future.

**Adams:** Andrew, what's the -- for \$15,000, over 20 years, what's the payment, monthly payment?

**Aebi:** If you were -- why don't I start with the \$40,000 figure. Under the old proposal, \$40,000 over 20 years would be about \$309 per month. Under the revised proposal, \$15,000 over 20 years would be about \$118 a month. And again, that -- not taking into account the application of the low-income grant or the other funding that might be available to potentially buy down that assessment. We encourage people to budget 6.75%. The city's credit rating got upgraded recently, and we found when we do bond sales we're getting good interest rates below that 6.75%, but we encourage people to budget conservatively.

**July 10, 2008**

**Potter:** Do you have any -- .

**Fish:** Do you have any hard numbers or -- impact on the value of the property?

**Aebi:** You know, I get asked that question a lot. There's so many macro economic factors that go into it, such as the status of the housing market, interest rates, if your neighbor starts parking six cars on his front lawn that don't run, there's so many give factors that will play into property values.

What I would tell you is a couple of things anecdotally. I'm building a project this summer where the house was put on the market, and after a year of it being on the market, keep in mind this was in a pretty hot housing market at the time, the house couldn't be sold because there was no l.i.d. Coming. So what I would suggest to you is that street improvements do a good job of improving the liquidity of somebody's investment. So if somebody has to move or they fall on hard times, it's very common for people to have an easier time selling their home than they are if there's no prospect for the street improvement. And keep in mind there's carrying costs to mortgage and taxes and insurance until such time that you sell the house.

**Fish:** If I might, one other question. I also wear the hat as fire commissioner, at what point do you determine that the road is sufficiently bad condition that there is a significant risk that a fire truck, for example, could not get access to a neighborhood so that there's ooh -- you've gone from a theoretical to an actual public safety issue?

**Aebi:** Sure. I'm not a fire expert, but I know on another l.i.d. The key factor that we were looking at, which is the number of homes that were being served by one access route, and i'm not sure what that threshold is, what I do know is that 53rd is really kind of a main entry point for a good portion of this neighborhood. Again, you saw the pictures of the potholes. If I were on a fire truck or driving an ambulance, I wouldn't want to be having to traverse those potholes to get to an emergency response. Having said that, this neighborhood does not have hundreds and hundreds of homes that are being served by one access point. I do not think would it rise to the level of improving 53rd as a secondary access point. A short answer is, I don't know of the exact threshold that would meet that criteria, but I think you have to look at the condition of the street entering the neighborhood.

**Saltzman:** Did you have any remarks to make? Or are you just here to answer questions?

**Sue Donaldson, Bureau of Development Services:** I'm only here for questions. Parks supports the project.

**Saltzman:** What's the total project budget? I didn't hear that.

**Donaldson:** Oh. The total -- the total project budget as shown in the resolution here, the total project budget is \$501,000. There's \$34,000 in overhead. Total project cost is \$535,000. But the overhead would only be charged to parks and we customarily waive it for residential property owners.

**Saltzman:** Thank you. Any other questions? Andrew or -- we have public testimony.

**Moore-Love:** We have 19 people signed up.

**Saltzman:** Call them up three at a time. We'll do two minutes. Welcome. If you could just give us your name for the record, and then you each have two minutes to speak. And there's a timer in front of you.

**Rich Peters:** Good afternoon. Rich peters my name. Appreciate you guys' time. I've only seen you before on t.v. I've never been in this building. It's kind of interesting to come down. I already saw one camera guy here. I'm sure they can always get a story when you leave the room.

[inaudible] [laughter]

**Leonard:** You don't have to answer that.

**Adams:** He looks older. Short.

**Peters:** I lived at 5216 southwest buddington for five years, and the potholes on the picture that you've seen are so deep, you can't drive down there at times. You walk to get your mail. And it just seems to me like this is all kind of about livability. Just to come home and not have the dust right



**July 10, 2008**

now in the summer, not have the potholes in the winter, and just have a clean place to live with some lighting, it's just a basic common, everyday thing. I just feel like we have a lot going on every day, and just to come out of your house and not hit a pothole, not to-to-have to correspond bring if your kids go out at night, if you can find them, because there's no street lights right now that you can adequately get around. To me, I just want to keep it short and say livability, just the basics of upgrading the neighborhood and living with pavement and lighting and no pothole stuff. Again, thanks.

**Saltzman:** Thank you.

**Beth Dahl:** Hi. Hello commissioners. My name is beth dahl. I think you've all had email from me. I hope you've all read them. Can I show a few pictures?

**Saltzman:** You can hand them to our clerk.

**Dahl:** I took these yesterday. So they were just random shots. We do have a trail that people are able to walk down the street. It's a nature trail. And I was going for pictures of that, but in the meantime, you can see the streets look nice. I mean -- so I want to read this, because i'm so nervous, I can't just talk normally. My name is beth dahl, I live on southwest buddington. My estimated cost for my portion of the street would be \$32,000 as stated as a low estimate. I'm the one with the two property thing. I purchased my house four years ago knowing it's on a country road. I work hard to be environmentally friendly, recycling, upgrading my drain fields on my property, and not attaching to the storm drain. Also, we have a few other neighbors who have done the same with the drain fields. They've put in themselves. I don't think paving one half block up 53rd street and one-half block up southwest buddington will help the city. If anything, it will divert more run-off water into the stream at the end of the nature park at the end of southwest buddington. The only water damage i've seen has come from the culverts installed my ms. Green and the conovers, which has nothing to do with the street. A rut in the street had formed over the winter, but in the springtime was easily fixed with neighborhood involvement with gravel and grading. And I think you saw the pictures of the ruts. But it's no longer there. I invested my retirement money into my house. If you let the paved road go through, I will lose the front yard, which was a part of this property when annexed before the city came in. I'll lose my driveway, the landscaping, the trees, which have been there for the last 30 years. I refinanced 30 years ago and i'm not able to take out any more money for the city. And the city financing plan, at \$350 a month for the next 20 years for a street that would cost me somewhere in the order of \$80,000, once again, a low estimate. Does this mean my time is up?

**Saltzman:** Yes. We let do you a little longer.

**Adams:** 350 a month is base on the current estimate? Or is that the original?

**Shea Conover:** The current estimate of \$350 a month for the next 20 years. With a 6.75% interest.

**Adams:** We face these issues all over the city. Some of our least happy tasks. When you bought the house and you know we get -- i'm the transportation commissioner. And we get vicious complaints from southwest residents about the fact that we don't have -- that we have so many -- and parts of north-northeast that we have so many dirt roads, lack of sidewalks, lack of curbs. The rest of the city, for the most part, is paved for their own -- paid for their own streets, sidewalks, curbs, through assessments like this, or when the house were originally developed by the developer. Unfortunately, southwest was developed outside the city limits. I'd like you to comment on that. Where on one hand we get criticized for not providing for the sidewalks and curbs and streets, and the other hand, we often times have have good intentioned folks like yourself who are financially limited, like we all are, saying, not this street.

**Dahl:** The comment being that the neighborhood has pulled together and are grating and graveling and we're all happy with the way it is. I mean we don't have a problem. I mean people walk on it, they use the trails, the trail path that I've showing in those pictures -- I've talked to people who've

**July 10, 2008**

said they'd rather have it that way. It's a little dusty. There's dust everywhere. That's the only drawback you know. We walk on it all the time, Alan who's handicapped walks on it all the time. It's not a problem so I don't understand where there's a need. I mean the city doesn't need to put out all this money for something that we don't want -- we don't need, we have a street.

**Saltzman:** You're next. Go ahead and give us your name --

**Conover:** My name is Shea Conover and I live on the corner of 53<sup>rd</sup> and Buddington. I am a petition signer and I'm very much in favor of this l.i.d. For me it is not a matter of if the streets will be paved, it's a matter of when. My husband's family has owned multiple properties on this street in the past 40 years. They've been in favor of paving the streets each and every time it's come up. Back in the 70s the costs started at about \$1,000 for each homeowner. That was when you could throw asphalt down, rake it around and call it good. Since that time, the issue of paving has come up on average every five years. The costs have gone up dramatically. The additional requirements of how it is to be done have changed and everybody says that we should have done it five years ago when it was so cheap. As we continue to get older, we are constantly hit with the 20/20 hindsight. We should have bought that house or we should have bought this or that. I should have bought Google at \$75. The cost of doing this project continues to rise and history tells us that it will never be cheaper than it is today. I would like to stay in our home. I'm a small business owner and my business is less than a half mile away -- it's very convenient. We would also like to continue to improve our residence but have been placed in a holding pattern, waiting to see if our streets will be improved. Although we intend to stay in our property at least until retirement, nobody knows what's going to happen tomorrow. So we need to carefully consider each dollar we invest in our property. We don't want to throw away good money. The streets are a pride of ownership issue to me. They reflect the general attitude of our neighborhood. Is our neighborhood going to grow and thrive or will it continue to be repressed and die? It's time to step up to the plate and improve our neighborhood and I urge the city council to approve this project. Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Next three. Welcome. Before you start you each have two minutes. We'll start with you Mr. Conover.

**Mike Conover:** Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Will you pull the microphone a little closer to you?

**Conover:** My name is Mike Conover. I'm a petition signer. I live on the southeast corner of 53<sup>rd</sup> and Buddington. Like Shea told you, we've been here, well our family's been there for 40 years. We've owned multiple properties on the street. We actually owned Beth's house prior to her purchase. Anyway, I think it is basically an indisputable truth that paving the streets in any neighborhood improves the value of each and every individual property. The benefits that are available to everybody on the street, the parks bureau, the greater neighborhood at large, the city taxpayer are just indisputable. The issue that there may or may not be a value increase has been studied to death and I believe if you take two homes that are identical and place them in the same neighborhood, one on a paved street and one a dirt street, there's no question which one has more value. The way to illustrate this might be to ask the city council when was the last time someone came before the city council with a petition to rip out the streets in front of a house. It's a ridiculous premise. So saying it's not a good idea to pave our streets is almost as ridiculous. We have kind of a rare opportunity here to let everybody walk away from this meeting today with a net benefit. The parks bureau is going to walk away with a benefit because this project fits like a hand in glove with their 2020 parks development program. I had the opportunity to listen to the director speak about that program a week or so ago at the Portland city club. It's an interesting program. It will benefit our neighborhood greatly. And this street is part of that program. It will define the border of the eastern side of this park with a sidewalk for all of these people that are coming to visit our new park. It will provide --

**Saltzman:** You're going to have to wrap up here. 30 seconds over.

**July 10, 2008**

**Conover:** I'm sorry. Well, basically, i'm in favor of the streets and I couldn't write the check fast enough.

**Adams:** Can I ask a follow-up question?

**Conover:** Certainly.

**Adams:** What about the folks who say they just can't afford it?

**Conover:** I don't believe there will ever be a time when there isn't someone who won't be able to afford it. I don't see how this time is going to be any different from five years from now or 10 or 30 years from now. There will always be people in our society that cannot afford it. We just cannot stop progress waiting for 100% of the people to get on the same page.

**Adams:** Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Next.

**Steve Beining:** My name is steve. I'm a homeowner at 5111 southwest buddington. Newcomer to the neighborhood and I just want to speak in favor of the resolution to terminate the l.i.d. For 51st and buddington. I was surprised that -- I didn't know when we purchased the house that that was going on and I don't want to assume an additional tax load, living on the street. So I briefly wanted to state that I support the termination of the l.i.d. On 51st and buddington.

**Saltzman:** Thank you.

**Andrew Clark:** My name is andrew clark. I own the house that's I guess being suggested for termination. I just wanted to say for the record that i'm not in favor of any l.i.d. In our neighborhood. I don't like -- you asked before about -- you asked beth about you know, to answer that question for you, and I don't understand how some people believe that pavement is an improvement to this situation. It's -- it's not -- putting pavement next to a nature park is not an improvement to me. It's just a waste of everybody's money. People haven't really gotten specific about the finance part of it. But when they were suggesting mine, basically I got a letter in the mail that said it was going to be around \$50,000, which is -- there's 100 feet of property in front of my house and it's 500 and some dollars per foot. Which to me -- I mean, that's absolutely ridiculous. Even if I had the money, which I don't, I would never pay that. It's not -- when I moved into the house, nobody ever said anything about having to pay that. At the time, I didn't even know what property taxes were. It's 1,000 square foot house and the property taxes are \$3,000 a year. So I mean, i'm not ashamed to admit that I don't make enough money to make \$500 a month payments on pavement. My dad owns a business in tualatin and they tore down this area in tualatin and they turned it into a parking lot. You know, and that's kind of just what this reminds me of. It's not -- to me, it's just not an improvement. The cost to benefit ratio. I heard the parks were going to chip in a certain amount of money that's supposed to pay for the part next to the parks. And that should be for the parks, not for pavement. So --

**Saltzman:** Thank you all. Next three. Welcome. If you could give us your name and you each have two minutes.

**Jean Nations:** I'm jean, and I own the property at 11434 southwest 53rd. I actually do not live there. My grandchildren live there and so this is a very important topic for me. My grandchildren used to live at the house that I live in now on 17th avenue. Which is people use it -- and it is paved and people use it as a shortcut to go from berth to barbur. I know what happens when you have shortcuts. It's very, very dangerous and so we started looking for a place that would be more liveable for the children and we found this place that was perfect. On a dirt road, next to a park, and moved the family there almost five years ago. It has continued to be perfect for them. I am not impressed with p.c.c. Saying they have no plans to have the street go straight into their parking lot, if you see any pictures of the area, you will know that that 53rd street goes exactly from capitol highway straight to their parking lot and there's no way that they're not going to have that be an entrance to their parking lot at some time in the future if it's paved. I did talk to -- I want to say very, very quickly. I talked to some people in a neighborhood who do gravel their roads. They

**July 10, 2008**

turned down the l.i.d. And they're very, very happy with it. They say that every one to two years, all the neighbors get together and have it graveled and they say it's been happening so many times, it only costs \$600 a year. Divided up between all of them, it's nothing and they love t. We have a few neighbors who don't want it, they don't want that because they see an increase in traffic just with that. They certainly don't want as fault on it -- asphalt on it.

**Miechelle Nations:** I'm michelle. Any part of 53rd were paved it would be a matter of time before the portion in front of my home would be paved. I feel that the city engineer will add our property to the l.i.d., as stormwater goes down in front of our home. If the road were to be paved in front of the property line, the stormwater would undermine the pavement. I come here as a mother of a child who five years ago when we were preparing for my eldest son's kindergarten, we came across a wonderful piece of property on southwest 53rd. We knew this would be the perfect place to raise a child with special needs and our little piece of country in the city. Mind you, he would have loved to live in a rural area. We knew that living in the city of Portland would afford my son the access to facilities that he needs. As part of his disorder, he was deeply impacted. We took him to occupational therapy. Insurance soon ran out. At that point, I became my son's therapist. You'll see it's my son's therapy gym. As long as we keep up his therapy, he's able to better participate in daily life. If the road were paved in front of our house, half of my son's therapy gym would become eliminated. It would be a financial burden to my family which would require me to work outside of my home. Living on a country road -- such a natural space would be important to our children and foster their relationship and attachment with nature. We want to nurture them to be effective stewards of our planet. If the road were to be paved in front of our house, it would create a vast divide and the nature park would become less accessible.

**Saltzman:** Your time is up.

**Nations:** Ok.

**Saltzman:** Your properties are outside of the proposed l.i.d.?

**Nations:** It abuts it.

**Saltzman:** Outside.

**Nations:** Yes, but talking about ending the asphalt right at the property line, which means if there's any water that goes on the road, it would flow there and cause a deep ditch there which would make it a lot worse than it is now.

**Ann Peterson-Meier:** I'm ann peterson and a property owner at buddington street. I'm really nervous. I wish they would have written something. I think you all look better in person.

**Adams:** You're kind. You're my favorite.

**Peterson-Meier:** I was born in 1951. I know I don't look it. But I lived at that address ever since - - until I got married and moved out. Currently my stepfather is there raising my great niece, it's really my intention -- my great niece. And it's my intention to return after I retire and spend of the rest of my life there. I've never thought of that neighborhood as having sidewalks and paved roads. It's always been gravel. When I moved in there, when I was growing up, the houses across the street from my property, we called that the little woods. We used to camp out there. I think it's the connovers on the other side. The other properties, they didn't exist. We climbed trees and had a good time. I'm concerned about the first proposal, which my liability -- my bill would be \$105,000, which, guess what? Can't afford. I'm trying to save for retirement. Can't afford those payments. The second proposal brings the street up 50 feet into my property and no offense to the author of the proposal, but I think that's a little schizophrenic. I don't understand what that's going to do, except cause problems for people driving and the water run-off. My other question is whether or not the assessment is assessing me for my whole property, for the benefit of 50 feet of cement. And another question I had was whether or not -- what is the benefit to the park to have a street with no access to the park? So I guess what i'm saying is I oppose both proposals and I hope you'll agree with me.

**July 10, 2008**

**Saltzman:** Thank you. Thank you all. Next three. Welcome, please give us your name and you have two minutes.

**Gene Hammond:** Jean hammond. Southwest buddington. The 51st and buddington proposal, on february 1st, had 17 owners with three yes and four no votes. It's now evolved into the 53rd and buddington proposal. If the park wants all of the paved, it seems to me that the cost of the project to the park the way it is presented here would just about pave all of 53rd for them past the park without ever having anyone else be assessed for it. Anyway, i've been through four of these l.i.d.s. Three sewers and one street. The street was next to jackson high school, which was alfred street and at that time, about 1979, I believe, I asked the city at that time how do we compete against the high school with all of the property? And at that time, i'm sure that I was told that they would count our votes and then the school district would go whichever way the majority was. And this comes out with 70% for the park to start with. As I understand it. Anyway, i'm -- we're against both proposals. We like the gravel road the way it is now. The traffic goes by slow. And we like it. Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Thank you. Ma'am?

**Denise Whitney:** My name is denise. Take my glasses off. I'm opposed to any paving on our streets. It doesn't really make sense to me to do two half roads go up three-quarters of the way and then go 200 feet up buddington. I don't see what that will be of value. We have -- junior has a tractor and we have graded and graveled our road and I sent you all in our packet of how our road really does look nice. It's what we can do. Originally, there was 34 homes in the l.i.d., the first one. Three wanted the road. Then there were 17 people, three wanted the road. Now there's seven and three want the road. I don't really see where the majority rules. It doesn't seem fair. And we would like to maintain our own road by paving -- or not paving, excuse me, grading and graveled it ourselves. I would think the park could better spend the money on lighting and security for the parks. Or maintenance for the park. I would suggest if you do want to pave it that you do like you did on the holly farm park. On the south side, where you paved half of it and then the home owners have it graded and graveled and where the walkway goes within the park, I would like to suggest that if you really do want to pave it, that you pave the city's half, which is the park, and that the three home owners that want it, pave their half. I really honestly think that's a solution to all of our solutions here.

**Saltzman:** I got an update on the holly farm. Apparently we've got a lot of complaints about doing exactly that. And so we have people driving the wrong direction to stay on the asphalt part of the street that, the half of the street that was improved. So I just wanted to share that with you from our staff.

**Whitney:** I did talk to the two homeowners that lived there, and they said they were never -- no one ever contacted them about doing their half. Which I was surprised about, as much as we've been hounded and they said they did check into it and they said it was ridiculously expensive and not interested.

**Adams:** I understand that, i'm saying paving half the street is probably worse than not paving the street.

**Whitney:** Ok, well, it's a natural park. It's just a nature park and it just -- maybe a pathway that --

**Adams:** I got it. I just wanted to share with you the experience of holly farms has not been positive for pdot.

**Whitney:** I did talk to the homeowners and I wanted to make that statement.

**Adams:** If we had contacted them, they would have said no --

**Whitney:** They couldn't afford it.

**Adams:** I totally understand. I understand.

**Whitney:** I cannot afford.

**Adams:** I got it, I hear you.

**July 10, 2008**

**Saltzman:** Thank you. Sir?

**Edgar Solares:** I own the property 53rd and capitol highway. And I am here to express my strong opposition to the southwest 53rd avenue and budded about street local improvement development. I think we cannot afford any money to finance such a expensive project nor do I want to be forced to acquire a debt in the form of a loan to finance an unnecessary project such as this one. I -- on the one hand, I appreciate the fact that i'm given two minutes to speak to you and everybody here, but I think hearing the different opinions and ideas that people have in favor of this project, I wish I had more time to be able to have an open conversation and be able to understand each other and see how paving the street didn't really benefit a large number of citizens. And I think that any resources that the city has to spend in transportation, creating roads or anything that has to do with transportation, should be directed or invested in projects that will benefit a much larger number of citizens. One example that I have in mind now is the number of bridges we have in Portland and it's come out in research that bridges all over the country are not in great shape. And given the number of bridges we have in Portland, I think that any money that the city would spend on paving a road that we do not want to have paved, you know, that money can be used to keep up the bridges here in Portland that benefit a much larger number of our community. Instead of a limited number of individuals.

**Adams:** I want to be clear that there is no \$12,000 is what the city would discount this project, but there's no city resources that would go into this project. So if we cancel it, which is an option on the table, it wouldn't save us any money to put towards the bridges. But I like the way you're thinking in terms of fixing the bridges.

**Solares:** I wanted to make sure that I strongly oppose any l.i.d. On 53rd and buddington.

**Adams:** Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Thank you all.

**Whitney:** Thank you.

**Saltzman:** Next three. Welcome, if you could state your name for the record and then you have two minutes.

**Jessica Gactione:** My name is jessica. And I live on southwest 53rd avenue. I have lived in my house for my entire life. My great grandfather built it in 1947. It was the first house in the neighborhood. There are some days I can spend all day out in my yard and never once see a car drive by. I have a three-year-old and four cats and a dog that can play peacefully as well. Since i've lived in my house the entire life, I have the luxury of knowing the woman who owned the land now known as the sylvania natural park. She donated the land to her church to save it from development. She fought for several years to keep the road from being paved. I think the city should be grateful for being able to acquire this land and leave the park and surrounding roads as a natural park as it has been intended. There are a total of eight homes on 53rd avenue, only one of the homeowners wanted it paved. Now with this enough proposal. Still only one wants it paved. All the homeowners are happy with the way the road is and all choose to live in that neighborhood with a dirt road. The one homeowner pushing for this proposal chose to live on this road knowing it was a dirt road. They moved in after knowing it was a dirt road and it doesn't make sense to pave part of a road to please one resident. This will cost the city an estimated \$500,000 in park funds. All the homeowners on 53rd avenue with the exception of the connovers have put a lot of hard work into improving the road in front of their homes. There's more than one solution to this supposed road problem. The city could spend 1/20 of the proposed budget to improve the road without paving it.

**Adams:** Just a note on that, we've had to cut \$44 million out of the city's transportation budget over the past four or five years. We just got word that we have to cut another the million dollars out of the current year because of declining revenues because we rely on the gas tax and it's the amount used is going down, so we have \$431 million maintenance backlog in the city that's been growing

**July 10, 2008**

over the past 22 years, so we don't gravel and we don't grade dirt roads and gravel roads and I wish we could afford to do that. But we get a fair amount of people who say don't make it too flat for the same reasons you were saying. People use it for shortcuts. I appreciate your testimony.

**Charles Radosta:** My name is Charles. I live at 11334 southwest 51st avenue. Only affected by the 51st l.i.d. But I'm here to offer my opposition to both proposals. Financially the proposal for 51st l.i.d. would have added \$35,000 to our price tag and we've only been in the neighborhood for a few years and we don't have a lot of equity built into the house. And it's a pretty good hit. For that reason, I'm opposed to it. Our l.i.d. Also about the piecemeal approach to paving part of the road. Drainage is not going to be solved. Not having a way to treat the road above it because it's still gravel under the 53rd l.i.d. And as been mentioned, we don't have a majority. The third reason I'm opposed to both l.i.d.s is what I do is a little bit of a careless approach. I -- in favor. I realize that's the way the code is written. That \$305,000, or whatever the number, set aside out of a limited budget. Doesn't seem appropriate. We raised our taxes to provide for a variety of park services and I realize there's other funding sources available that to me that money could be used for better needs and the park bureau website actually lists things not covered by their own funds and includes a.d.a. Accommodations and other vital needs that I feel are more important. And finally, I'm concerned about the process in which the 51st l.i.d. was brought into this -- brought into this equation. We received a formal petition to form the 51st l.i.d. Was established first and we -- as we were responding to that it became apparent it didn't have support. The 53rd l.i.d. was brought to the table and I felt that the 51st should have had brought to the table and I feel it's been confusing for our neighborhood to have two presented at the same point and respond to them at one setting. I feel they should have been separated.

**Saltzman:** Sir, your time is up.

**Sandi Green:** I'm Sandy Green. Southwest Buddington. I purchased the house in 2000. By myself. One of the first things I did was to look at how to get that street improved. And in 2001, I took the initiative and had Buddington and 53rd graded. That street had not been graded until this year when this proposal came up and everyone got riled and they decided to grade it. It's gone seven years without being graded until now.

**Saltzman:** Did everybody help pitch in? How much did it cost?

**Green:** I really don't remember, Mr. Adams. But my concern is I had an issue where I was dealing with someone who was mentally ill and would do things. Flatten my tires. I got a phone call that person was in the neighborhood. I had three little girls staying with me. There was not anything I could do. There's no streetlights. You can't call the police because nothing's happened and the mailboxes cannot be located in front of our houses. You have to walk down to Capitol Highway to get the mail and the post office won't let you lock the mailboxes up. Because you can't move them. If you get home late at night, you're walking in dark areas to get your mail. Unless you drive to it and the potholes are big and deep. Anyway, the cost, again, as he said, we're several years out from the cost being anything. And if you had to replace your sewer or need a new roof or need something that is going to cost money, you get it figured out. You're not writing a check today unless it's a big emergency. Safety, number one, and will the graveling continue if this dies.

**Saltzman:** Thank you. Welcome. Please give us your name for the record and you have two minutes. Start with you, April.

**April Ann Fong:** My name is April Ann Fong. And live at 11234 southwest Capitol Highway, which is paved. I think there are some roads more appropriate to put sidewalks and everything on. This is a gravel road and I think something -- a major arterial would be more appropriate. That's my opinion. I was on the initial l.i.d. And I'm against it because I bought my property conscious that I benefit from being on Capitol Highway but I like the access to the gravel roads, and I'm also someone who has worked very hard on Sylvania Natural Area Park which is actually a real park, not a future park. It's a park today and used that way. I've gotten several community watershed

**July 10, 2008**

stewardship grants and part of that is because there's part of the tributaries to the creek right there to upper red rock. And so we have this creek going down and it's cut down about two to three feet because of stormwater drainage and such. And i've been working on improving the conditions there and spent a lot of my own personal time to get grants to improve from watershed and i'm concerned that paving part of these roads is creating more impervious surface. I don't think we need that. It's going to collect the water into our poor creek which i'm trying to work on. [inaudible]

**Saltzman:** That means you have 30 seconds.

**Fong:** I got that now. Anyway, i'm not in favor of any l.i.d. I feel the presentation to us was rather disingenuous. Mr. Abbey said we would have to have 50% of the neighborhoods for -- neighbors for this to go ahead. He didn't tell us about waivers. When we found out, was when we received the petitions. I feel like I was misled.

**Adams:** Are there sidewalks on capitol highway?

**Fong:** Only in little tiny sections.

**Adams:** Would you -- i'm curious, would you favor a l.i.d. To put sidewalks on capitol highway in lieu of paving and sidewalks what's been proposed?

**Fong:** No I live on capitol highway.

**Adams:** Just curious.

**Fong:** I would probably vote no. But I would -- don't think I would protest if the majority of my neighborhood was for it.

**Adams:** Why would you vote no since you talked about the sidewalk better purposed on busy streets like capitol highway?

**Fong:** I think because I like the feel of it being like a country-like road.

**Adams:** And so that we're clear --

**Fong:** And I walk it every day. I walk all the roads that are intended to be paved every day since I work at p.c.c. Sylvania.

**Adams:** So there's no surprises later. There's long standing plans to put sidewalks on capitol highway.

**Fong:** I'm aware of that.

**Macia Leslie:** I think the key word was unfunded. I live on palatine street. From the beginning this project has been under questionable ethics. The assessment is left to those who support the l.i.d. Versus those who oppose it. As seen in the photos, the potholes no longer exist except by the three properties supporting the l.i.d. Who choose not to take part in the graveling. Access is not a problem for emergency vehicles. Regarding the vicious complaints by people, the squeaky wheel gets the attention. Three out of 19 properties. Three out of eight now. Not a justifiable majority to approve this l.i.d. In all cases, not counting city owned properties, the same three people have favored it. Two are absentee owners and the other says he plans to move. When approval for the l.i.d. Couldn't get approved using linear footage, they switched to square footage. Having more square footage by -- 84%, guess what? They had more than the 50% needed for approval. It seems almost like stacking the deck. Playing five card draw with eight aces up your sleeve. The counter proposal of the supporters has one valid point. Yes, we want safe places to walk but it makes no sense to put sidewalks on side streets when there's none on the main roads feeding them. The google map shows the sidewalks in green and some of the ones that andrew refers to. Containing dozens of trees. Second, increased density in the neighborhood is unlikely near the l.i.d. Because most of the available infill have already been developed without paved roads. It doesn't mean the neighborhood is neglected. It just means we in southwest Portland like things more natural.

**Saltzman:** Thank you.

**Allan Kinney:** Allen. I live at 5202 southwest buddington. Been there since '93. I bought the house because -- before I went inside it, because of the way it looks there. I'm from a small town. Ashland and it reminds me of home. I have been in on quite a bit of the improvements on the roads



**July 10, 2008**

over the years, doing it myself, helping and paying and such. And what I disliked about the photos put up, one, 53rd, we kept that way. It keeps the tourists at bay. We wanted it bumpy like that. And then part of the other part of the photos was showing property where the people would not pay to help improve the road. That are wanting it to be paved. And so those two photos, to me, I didn't feel were very justified as a representative of the properties there. Once again, i'm against them both. I can't afford it like everybody else. I'm disabled and live on disability and there's no way I can pay any of that.

**Saltzman:** Thank you. We have -- you say one more?

**Moore-Love:** Uh-huh.

**Saltzman:** Anybody in the audience who wishes to testify that didn't sign up?

**Leonard:** One guy.

**Saltzman:** One guy.

**John Schott:** My name is john. I live on 11406, at the corner of buddington. How I got tied in is that I have 125-foot lot and they want to take and pave 25 feet. So i'm going to have gravel and i'm going to have pavement. I've been there for about 30 years. The reason I bought the property was because there was no sidewalks, no curbs. It was a country setting. And the years passed, we've had people on 51st move in and move out of the neighbors, we've always gotten together. 51st doesn't compare to 53rd. 53rd has been neglected because the neighbors have not put in any gravel. We've done gravel, we've done shingle tabs in the past to keep the road intact. We don't have the chuck hole problem. People worried about property values. I get my taxes every year and you know what? My property values are still going up. And so i'm just in support of not having the l.i.d. Come in. That's pretty much -- and again, i'm one of those people that my wages aren't going up with everything else around it, and affordability.

**Adams:** Each one of these hearings is a learning process. I want to make it clear that the public owns the right-of-way. And you're -- if you go on Portlandmaps.com you can see where your property line is. It might be attached to your front or side yard, but I want to be clear that the public has the right-of-way.

**Schott:** Right.

**Adams:** So it wouldn't be a taking. The street would take away some of your useable space, but I want to make sure --

**Schott:** I'm not saying useable space. My frontage is 125 feet but i'm not getting all of that paved. I'm just going to pay a bill for 25 feet.

**Adams:** I thought you said the city was going to take something.

**Schott:** No, they're taking that 25 feet that i'm going to be billed for but still have 100 feet that's not going to be paid. So it's not in my benefit.

**Adams:** Thank you.

**Saltzman:** First, anyone have any questions of them?

**Fish:** One of the people who testified said when they bought the house, they were not aware of a pending l.i.d.

**Adams:** Right.

**Fish:** Is there requirement that a pending l.i.d. Is filed, or is there due diligence that you can learn that there is one in a normal situation?

**Adams:** I have to research that and get back to you. I don't think that this proposal is baked enough and my recommendation to the council is to not approve it. So it's a resolution.

**Leonard:** We need to deal first with resolution 994 which tables the 51st avenue l.i.d. terminate. I'm sorry, terminate. Anyone want to make a motion to --

**Adams:** Move to terminate.

**Fish:** Second.

**July 10, 2008**

**Saltzman:** Ok. It's been moved and seconded to terminate the 51st l.i.d. Please call the roll, Karla.

**Adams:** Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. That's been passed. We move to resolution 995 which I believe that commissioner Adams was speaking to. Make that into a motion.

**Adams:** My recommendation to council is that we vote down to vote no on resolution 995.

**Leonard:** Or send it back --

**Adams:** For clarity's sake, better to just vote it down. Otherwise, I think they'll be continuing concerns that somehow it might spring to life.

**Fish:** If we vote it down, what's the earliest it can come back to us?

**Adams:** The earliest it can come back is six months. But I will be honest with you, it needs a lot more work and I just don't -- with this level of dissension in the neighborhood, i'm not -- in my next four and a half years not going to bring it back.

**Leonard:** Second? It's just a resolution. Just vote.

**Fish:** Still new at this job.

**Leonard:** You're the senior member.

**Saltzman:** Karla, please call the roll.

**Adams:** I appreciate the testimony and I absolutely know that the folks in support of this have the best of intentions so there's two things I need you to keep in mind. One, we have to find ways to improve the major thoroughfares in southwest. Which means, I need you to open up your minds to helping to pay for improvements to the major thoroughfares for which you may not have property directly on. I need you to be open to that, we'll get more people being able to realistically access transit stops. Which means, I can provide cheaper alternatives for folks on fixed incomes and don't have money to not have to take their cars. Right now southwest it's incredibly dangerous to get to and from a lot of the bus stops. Transit doesn't serve them well. We can add a lot of buses but people still won't use them because it's unsafe to get to and from the bus stops. I need you to join me in opening up your minds that you might pay a lot less, but a little bit for it. The second thing, there's emerging legal decisions around the country from folks that are physically handicapped who have successfully sued to get streets paved and sidewalks put in because gravel roads in some jurisdictions have been ruled as a violation of the federal americans with disabilities act. You have a number of neighbors on this street who have standing in that regard. So I just want to flag that for you. So having said that, I mean, this is clearly not ready to move forward. There's just too much dissension in the neighborhood and that's why I recommend a no vote. No.

**Fish:** I want to thank commissioner Adams for his leadership on this. This is my first month on the job, and there's some issues that I want to know more about as we deal with l.i.d.s and they include claims to financial hardship and how we weigh them. The argument that's been made about the piecemeal approach versus comprehensive approach and the ways in which we get to consensus and how we weigh the residential votes and non-residential votes. On the housing -- i'm the housing commissioner and we have a huge need for affordable housing in your community and we're looking at sites all over the place, but we have incredible infrastructure challenges. We're trying to place housing for families with children in places -- I want to enlist your help. As we put family-friendly housing in your community, that we do have sidewalks and places for kids to not only get to school but to commercial districts and that's going to require community-wide effort and support. Appreciate the work of staff. I'm going to vote aye. No.

**Leonard:** No.

**Saltzman:** Well, I appreciate the testimony on all sides, I guess i'm -- i'm struck by the irony that commissioner Adams alluded to. I know when we go to neighborhood meetings in southwest or outer southeast, one of the global issues is the lack of paved roads and sidewalks, but yet when it comes down to a specific application, we often get mixed emotions. And I think this project doesn't strike me as providing enough benefit to either the park or, in fact, to the city and certainly to those who will be assessed the \$500,000 to do this project. It seems to be too small of a project and too

**July 10, 2008**

much lack of agreement amongst the neighbors. So I too will vote no on this. So the resolution is defeated and I believe that's our last item of business and we stand -- oh. [inaudible]. Yes, I voted no. We stand adjourned to Wednesday at 9:30. Thank you.

At 4:21 p.m., Council adjourned.