



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

OFFICIAL
 MINUTES

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **16TH DAY OF JULY, 2008** AT 9:30 A.M.

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

Commissioner Leonard arrived at 9:40 a.m.

At 10:08 a.m., Council recessed.
 At 10:20 a.m., Council reconvened.

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.

COMMUNICATIONS	Disposition:
996 Request of Mark White to address Council regarding further expansion of the Lents Urban Renewal Area (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
997 Request of Malcolm Chaddock to address Council regarding sit/lie ordinance and homeless services (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
998 Request of Ulisher Hardlman to address Council regarding public safety and the closure of Petersons Store (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
999 Request of Jennifer Sunde to address Council regarding shutting down Petersons Store (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
1000 Request of Geno Heleen to address Council regarding employee appeal from Petersons Store (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
TIME CERTAINS	
1001 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Adopt the City of Portland Sustainable Procurement Policy (Resolution introduced by Mayor Potter) (Y-4; Adams absent)	36620

July 16, 2008

<p>1002 TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM – Appoint Shelli Romero to the Housing Authority of Portland Board of Commissioners, term to expire January 26, 2009 (Resolution introduced by Mayor Potter) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">36621</p>	
<p>1003 Appoint James M. Smith to the Housing Authority of Portland Board of Commissioners, term to expire March 12, 2010 (Resolution introduced by Mayor Potter) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">36622</p>	
<p>1004 TIME CERTAIN: 10:15 AM – Appoint Lai Lani Ovalles to Portland Planning Commission, term to expire January 13, 2010 (Report introduced by Mayor Potter) Motion to accept the Report: Moved by Commissioner Fish and seconded by Commissioner Leonard. (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">CONFIRMED</p>	
<p align="center">CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</p> <p align="center">Mayor Tom Potter</p> <p align="center">Office of Emergency Management</p> <p>1005 Approve an Intergovernmental Agreement with Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon for distribution of equipment, supplies and services procured as a result of Urban Areas Security Initiative Grant awards (Ordinance)</p>		<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 23, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p align="center">Office of Management and Finance – Business Operations</p> <p>*1006 Authorize acquisition of vehicles for use by City Bureaus (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>		<p align="center">182038</p>
<p align="center">Office of Management and Finance – Human Resources</p> <p>1007 Change the salary range of the Nonrepresented classification of Housing and Community Development Operations Manager (Second Reading Agenda 967) (Y-5)</p>		<p align="center">182039</p>
<p>1008 Change the salary range of the Nonrepresented classification of Assistant Human Resources Director (Second Reading Agenda 968) (Y-5)</p>		<p align="center">182040</p>
<p align="center">Office of Management and Finance – Purchases</p> <p>1009 Accept bid of Dunn Construction, Inc. for the Wellhead Sump Retrofit Project for an estimated \$502,471 (Purchasing Report - Bid No. 108990) (Y-5)</p>		<p align="center">ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT</p>
<p align="center">Police Bureau</p>		

July 16, 2008

<p>*1010 Amend an Intergovernmental Agreement with Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon for transit police services (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 52486) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182041</p>
<p>*1011 Amend an Intergovernmental Agreement with Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon and the City of Gresham for transit police services (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 52544) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182042</p>
<p>*1012 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Troutdale and Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon for transit police services (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182043</p>
<p>*1013 Accept a \$27,000 Domestic Cannabis Eradication/Suppression Program grant from the Oregon Department of Justice (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182044</p>
<p>*1014 Apply for a \$400,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, Secure Our Schools Program for school safety equipment (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182045</p>
<p>*1015 Apply for a \$267,353 grant from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance to assist youth and families in need (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182046</p>
<p>1016 Apply for \$269,422 in funding from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance to reduce crime and improve public safety (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 23, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Sam Adams</p>	
<p align="center">Bureau of Environmental Services</p>	
<p>1017 Designate and assign a sewer tunnel easement on property owned by the Bureau of Water Works for the East Side Combined Sewer Overflow Tunnel Project No. 7594 (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 23, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>*1018 Authorize a grant from Bureau of Environmental Services to the Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership to research, analyze and report on the abundance, distribution and habitat needs of federally protected salmon and steelhead in the Columbia River in the vicinity of the confluence with the Willamette River (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182047</p>
<p>1019 Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University to plan and implement stewardship activities (Second Reading Agenda 971) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182048</p>

July 16, 2008

<p>1020 Authorize contracts to supply engineering, project management and project support personnel for Bureau of Environmental Services construction projects (Second Reading Agenda 972) (Y-5)</p>	<p>182049</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Commissioner Randy Leonard</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Water Bureau</p> <p>1021 Authorize a contract for the construction phase of the Interstate Facility Meter Shop Relocation project (Ordinance)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 23, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Parks and Recreation</p> <p>1022 Accept a \$135,011 grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation for implementation of ParkScan, a system to provide the public greater ability to report and track maintenance issues on park property (Ordinance)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 23, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>1023 Lease certain space in Multnomah Center to seven tenant groups from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2013 (Ordinance)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PASSED TO SECOND READING JULY 23, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>REGULAR AGENDA</p>	
<p>1024 Appropriate \$510,776 from the Rainy Day Reserve in General Fund contingency to cover overtime for police officers (Resolution introduced by Mayor Potter and Commissioner Leonard) (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">36623</p>
<p>Mayor Tom Potter</p>	
<p>Bureau of Fire and Police Disability and Retirement</p>	
<p>*1025 Accept contract with Mercer to provide actuarial services to the Bureau of Fire and Police Disability and Retirement (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">182050</p>
<p>Bureau of Planning</p>	
<p>1026 Amend Portland Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map for properties along and adjacent to Killingsworth St between NE 14th to 17th Aves (Second Reading Agenda 993) (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">182051 AS AMENDED</p>
<p>Office of Management and Finance – Business Operations</p>	

July 16, 2008

<p>*1027 Pay claim of Marion Skoro (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p>182052</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Commissioner Randy Leonard</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Water Bureau</p>	
<p>1028 Amend Portland Water Bureau Customer Service Administrative Rules (Previous Agenda 988) Motion to amend Resolution to add effective date: Moved by Commissioner Leonard and seconded by Commissioner Fish (Y-5) (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">36624 AS AMENDED</p>
<p>1029 Amend Code to clarify duties and responsibilities of the Portland Water Bureau (Second Reading Agenda 989; amend Titles 3, 17 and 21) (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">182053</p>
<p>1030 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 (Second Reading Agenda 990; repeal Ordinance Nos. 172920 and 172921) (Y-5)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">182054</p>

At 11:08 a.m., Council recessed.

July 16, 2008

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **16TH DAY OF JULY, 2008** AT 6:00 P.M.

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

Commissioner Saltzman was excused to arrive at 6:40 p.m.

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

<p>1031 TIME CERTAIN: 6:00 PM – Adopt and implement the North Interstate Corridor Plan and amend Comprehensive Plan Map and Citywide Design Guidelines (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Potter; amend Titles 32, 33)</p> <p>Motion to accept amendments to Exhibit E, Attachment A that provide additional details on how the recommended zoning reflects the forecasted growth of the Metroscope 2030: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Adams. (Y-5)</p>	<p>Disposition:</p> <p>PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED JULY 23, 2008 AT 9:30 AM</p>
--	---

At 8:14 p.m., Council recessed.

July 17, 2008

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **17TH 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; Jim Van Dyke, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and Ron Willis, Sergeant at Arms.

<p>1032 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM – Adopt the South Corridor Phase II: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Project Locally Preferred Alternative and project conditions (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Adams) (Y-5)</p>	<p>Disposition:</p> <p>36625</p>
---	--

At 3:00 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 16, 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 16, 2008 9:30 AM

[roll taken]

Potter: I'd like to remind folks that prior to offering public testimony to city council, a lobbyist must declare which lobbying entity they're authorized to represent. The first communication?

Item 996.

Potter: Please state your name when you speak and you have three minutes, sir.

Mark White: Good morning. I'm a resident of the powellhurst neighborhood. Originally i'd planned on suggesting areas for further expansion, but now feel that it would be extremely destructive for powellhurst gilbert. It's most likely the most populated. We have no library, no community center, no post office. There isn't a single full service bank within the neighborhood boundaries and even though the homes are well under the affordability threshold and below the median family income, it's a bad idea. It became clear to me that there are no serious plans for applying the intended benefits to our neighborhood. We have yet to see a single job created. I also had my suspicions confirmed at the recent meeting when one of the urac members stated that they were running out of money. This tells me the money generated from the recent boundary expansion will probably go toward unfinished projects. We're drowning and from my perspective, the city is choosing not to throw us a life preserver but instead an aspirin telling us to suck it up. Though it may not be the city's intention, a foundation is being laid for a gulag of poverty and despair -- two separate urban renewal areas. Since all areas within the boundaries of the lents u.r.a., the time to create the second u.r.a. should be reduced. Everything east of i-205, including the freeway lands, going to the newly created east urban renewal area. It would begin to be identifying projects as well as identifying areas of expansion in order to utilize the 700 acres remaining for the urban renewal. However, the expansion would not utilize current p.d.c. strategy of blanketing an area, but instead, focus on major corridors. Possibly, first focusing on a business district with senior housing above retail storefronts, perhaps anchored by a deli cooperative representing immigrants to the area and an opportunity to start their own business and create a model for diverse groups, working together. I'd be happy to discuss this further and happy to take you on a tour of the neighborhood to see the incredible potential up front. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you.

Item 997.

Moore-Love: Malcolm chaddock?

Item 998.

Ulisher Hardiman: Good morning.

Potter: When you speak, please state your name for the record and you have three minutes, sir.

Hardiman: Absolutely. Ulisher hardlman is my name and I reside here in Portland, going on five years. Pretty town. I wanted to talk to you, if you don't mind me saying it that way, about mr. Peterson's plight. Please accept my apologies for my difficult appearance. Moving along due to the constraints of time, in this matter of mr. Peterson's store on morrison, on the max track, please consider this is not just a matter of a marvelous store owner, but this is a matter of public safety. Every evening and otherwise seven days a week, 24 hours a day and all holidays too. Medications,

July 16, 2008

aspirin you might need, throat lozenges ready for you. It's a great convenience downtown. There's nothing else down there. 11:00, 12:30, safeway is closed. Anyway, the store provides employment for many taxpayers, and much more incredible, emergency calls for help for people. Number one, there's been two heart attack victims, 9-1-1 calls can confirm, who lived because mr. Peterson's store was open and were able to call 9-1-1. Number two, taxicab calls. You call a taxi on your cellphone or public phone, they will not come. But mr. Peterson's clerk calls, they'll come and get you. And number three, they provide change for the max train. A bill over five, a max machine will not operate with a bill that large. They can get home out of downtown, especially downpour rain and cold weather, you can imagine what a convenience that is. And then you have situations that happen. One night there was a young couple from colorado. The girl's father was supposed to pick them up. He didn't get it done. They were stuck. He allowed them to crash out by the magazine rack all night. Cold night, dark night, two young strangers. You can imagine the help that was to them and the idea of the kind of town Portland was. So as matter of fact, you might want to pay mr. Peterson, maybe so good as to stay in business and help keep downtown a bit more convenient and safe. Thanks a lot for your time and trouble. Have a nice day. Hey, mr. Adams.

Item 999.

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

Jennifer Sunde: I'm jennifer sunde and i'm a dedicated customer and volunteer at the peterson's store. I've done careful research for your documents, indicating that crime rate hasn't gone down in Portland over the last year and peterson's store is, in fact, located in the area of Portland least involved of all accounts of crime. So I ask, what makes this store number one on your list right now of crime prevention when there are hundreds of other stores in the Portland area that are surrounded by more crime than he? I have provided picture proofs of the changes that will make it nice without the store there. It's a safe haven for a girl like me waiting at night. I also wish you had been there at the time the doors were closed, locked and lights off temporarily for not more than 15 minutes there's been an outcry of people saying why is the store closed? I can't believe it's closed. What's going on? I wish I had brought a tape recorder. Within that short time, so many were upset. Can you imagine if the doors were locked permanently? Now I ask, what are you giving to the patrons of peterson's by closing down the store? What are you getting out of this that makes the rest of Portland's crime rate ignorable and why when we have Portland crime so high in other areas and the public at our back does anything that we say and ask of you fall on deaf ears? Thank you.

Item 1000.

Geno Heleen: I'm geno heleen.

Potter: Please have a seat and when you speak, state your name for the record. You have three minutes.

Heleen: My name is geno heleen. I'm a employee of mr. Doug peterson. Owner of peterson's convenience store. I'm going to bring up a short video of our 4th street store and also a crime table. The 4th street store shows the extensive remodeling that has gone on so you can get an idea of mr. Peterson's confidence in downtown. I can appreciate -- judging by the unfortunate amount of the homeless in downtown Portland, it's apparent that the city is taking an ecological approach, by designing out crime, as opposed to a compositional approach of targeting criminal behavior based on social and demographic attributes. However, regarding his eviction has taken a compositional approach. If it's obvious to customers that a person is homeless, employees won't sell him beer. However, we would like to take a proactive approach with the manipulation of the environmentals, but leasing on a month-to-month basis discourages him from investing his money. One thing is for sure, if you board up peterson's on morrison and create an abandoned storefront, you'll lend an environment of having more type one crimes as opposed to type two. I want to quote. This is from 1993. Offenders want to avoid the risk of being seen by committing a crime. The possibility of surveillance has been found to have a strong effect in reducing crime. Placing a bus stop in front of

July 16, 2008

surface parking lots isolates people waiting for the bus. As data showed, most serious crimes tend to occur at desolate settings. Proximity to open storefronts enhances the visibility of the bus stops and its safety. Good bus stop sites, good lighting and appropriate shelter designed that does not block views, offers visibility from passing traffic and does not obstruct the view of those waiting instead. I would like to end with a quote from a professor of law. It is in effect the type of policing that fosters a disneyland aesthetic. To transform new york city into singapore or worse yet, a shopping mall. When we lose the dirt and grit of major american cities, we lose their vitality and character. Thank you.

Potter: Is that all of the communications?

Moore-Love: That's all.

Potter: Move 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 items from the consent agenda? Please call the vote.

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

Item 1001.

Jeff Baer, Director, Bureau of Purchases: Good morning, mayor Potter, members of city council.

And susan anderson from the office of sustainable development is here. I'm here to make brief remarks and seek your approval to adopt the city of Portland sustainable procurement policy. And by background, I want to remember that we had back in march of '02, we adopted and established the sustainable procurement strategy, joint Multnomah county and city of Portland effort. Which is a five-year action plan we embarked on a commodity by commodity approach. The work with the strategy was helpful because we looked at a variety of different commodities, including paper, office supplies, computers, surplus vehicles and fuel. At the end of this five-year strategy, we convened the group back together to really look at incorporating and institutionalizing our strategy into a binding policy. And the policy here related to the recommendations of that group were to develop the policy, instead relying on a commodity by commodity approach, we wanted to focus on integrating it into a existing procurement policy and provide regular communication on the different environmentally preferable products out there and especially as they emerge on the market and to continue to build a diverse stakeholder input in our procurement decisions and develop better recording and tracking methods. We formed a committee that included members from the office of sustainable development. The fire bureau and our bureau that identified the types of resources needed to implement this policy and just to -- we also had a policy reviewed by the chief administrative officer's advisory committee and the bureaus directors for soliciting their comments.

Upon adoption, our bureau will continue to develop the online tools and trainings and research assistance. And in conclusion, I wanted to set the stage to highlight what is going to be our upcoming sweatshop procurement policy that we've been working on for a number of months and we're expecting to provide policy recommendation in september of this year. And because the policy is really part of the overall sustainability platform which is I believe it includes the social equity or social justice component, it's my recommendation that these policies will eventually fold together and be incorporated into the sustainable procurement policy. I do want to thank stacy for her leadership in coordinating this effort, but also to highlight the stakeholder work group members who included michelle from the office of sustainable development, craig from the water bureau, lisa from o.m.f. and kevin from the fire bureau. Pause there and turn it over to susan.

Susan Anderson, Director, Office of Sustainable Development: Good morning. Susan, director of the office of sustainable development. I'm here to show my support and really admiration for jeff. Back in 2002 when he started and sue started this work, it was a time when o.s.d. had been trying to kind of get things going and in a dozen different bureaus and they had -- they were the first that took what we had started and we no longer had to work so hard in this area. It's a good

July 16, 2008

example of how we've been able to work as a team. About a year and a half ago, adopted sustainable city government. The goal was to instill sustainability practices in the day-to-day operations of the city departments. Each city bureau last fall adopted its own plan and part of that plan, with the help of jeff's office to identify the materials that they would be purchasing from biofuels to more efficient computers. Less toxic cleaners and recycled paper and on and on. The policy before you today is a shift. We're going away from testifying one by one products we should be purchasing and putting more accountability and responsibility back on to the bureaus. They'll use lease cost assessment principles and take a hard look at everything they're buying. This policy takes common sense, financial principles and merging them with a common sense for our environment. This policy doesn't stand alone. It's an integral part of a growing puzzle where all of your bureaus are working together in promoting sustainable practices throughout city government and community. And I look forward to continuing to work with jeff to ensure the success of this effort. Thank you.

Potter: Questions from the commissioners? Thank you folks. Did we have anybody signed up to testify?

Moore-Love: No one signed up.

Potter: Anyone here who wishes to testify to this specific issue? Please call the vote.

Fish: Aye.

Leonard: This is excellent work. Thanks, jeff, very much. Appreciate that. Aye.

Saltzman: Yeah, this is really good work and I appreciate the initiative that jeff has taken and susan anderson said to really run with this and make the job of the sustainable development office easier to do because we're working together. Also want to recognize stacy and michelle for all of their hard work too. Aye.

Potter: I'm very proud of the work that the city does and a lot of it is due to the leadership from o.s.d. and jeff and so thank you all for what you do to help us save our resources. I vote aye. I think it's within the time zone to read the 10:00 time certain. Read 102 and 103 together, please.

Items 1002 and 1003.

Potter: These two resolutions will be introduced by commissioner fish and also the individuals who are up for appointment. Commissioner fish?

Fish: Thank you, mayor. I guess we're going to invite the distinguished chair of the housing authority aboard, jeff and shelli, public affairs director, and -- excuse me, I misspoke. We're going to invite mr. Smith, james smith, to come to the podium. With the distinguished chair. And shelli.

Jeff Bachrach: Thought we'd save you time if we came up as a group.

Fish: This is not the first time we -- I had to get him a new job, thank you for taking it on. Drunk with power. Allow me, colleagues to make the introduction, if I could. I'm pleased to introduce to you shelli -- shelli romero and james smith who are nominees for the housing board of directors. As the former chair, I take pride in moving these nominations. Both of these individuals have shown a strong commitment to serving our community and each brings a unique vision for their role and contribution as members of the board. First i'm pleased to introduce shelli romero, whom i'm known for many years as the city of Portland's nominee. She has extensive experience in housing gained through her work in the public sector and non-profit world. She's gained a unique perspective on the importance of housing as a direct service provider, working with low income families where she specialized in educating people about homeowner opportunities and chief of staff to the Multnomah county commissioner where she was involved in policy decisions. Critical supportive services which keep people successfully housed. Shelli now serves on odot's government liaison for region 1. She will bring her desire to work with underserved minority communities to the board and I believe will be a great asset to the public housing community in the city of Portland. Next i'm pleased to introduce james smith, Multnomah county ted wheeler's

July 16, 2008

nominee to the board of the housing authority of Portland. Mr. Smith brings a strong business and consulting experience. He's the ceo of a management consulting board for small businesses. He fell in love with Portland and decided to relocate here and we're fortunate that he's called Portland home these past three years. In a relatively short amount of time, he's demonstrated his leadership in advocating for small businesses and job creation and economic development. He provides assistance to business owners in Portland. He's a member of the city of Portland small business advisory council. And since 2007 he has served as the chair of the Portland chapter of score. Counselor to america's small business and an all-volunteer organization whose mission is to help small businesses and business entrepreneurs become successful. Mr. Smith's specific interest in joining the board is to use his expertise to help our public housing residents gain economic independence, by providing opportunities in small business. He wants to involve Portland's small business community in this effort and i believe he has the knowledge and experience to be successful. As my colleagues know, the housing authority is a moving to work agency. Which means it tests innovative approaches to provide incentives for families to be economically self-sufficient and I believe mr. Smith's skills will be uniquely valuable as a member of the board. Welcome to both and if you'd like to make a statement.

Shelli Romero: Thank you commissioner fish and members of the council. I'd like to thank you very much for this appointment. I look forward to serving with my colleagues. Not as a voting member, but the first meeting of the h.a.p. board yesterday, i'm excited to dig in and do the work. Thank you for this. And my parents are in the audience, i'd like to say thanks to them for inspiring me to be involved in this, making this community and every community a better place. Thank you.

Potter: Could you introduce your parents, shelli?

Romero: It would be my pleasure. The guy with the camera. And kathy romero right here. Thank you.

James Smith: I, too, am very honored to be a member of the team and I just hope that, as nick said, I can put my skills to work. Thank you very much for your vote of confidence in me and I hope that it all comes together. I appreciate the opportunity.

Fish: Jeff, would you like to say something? I have to acknowledge, I have a conflict of interest. Our daughters attend the same high school and we often see each other at soccer events but seriously, jeff -- I did not have the pleasure of serving with him on the board. But jeff is doing a great job. And they put in an enormous amount of time and do great work and it's one of the reasons we're a nationally recognized housing authority. I thank you for your service.

Bachrach: Thank you. Two strong members on our board, we have a lot on our plate and being a full strength board is going to help us succeed. And so thank you very much, and though I always welcome the opportunity in front of this board and -- to discuss housing, that's probably not what your agenda is today, and i'll leave it there. And thank you very much. It will be great to have these new members.

Potter: Questions from the commissioners? Thank you.

Fish: Thank you very much. We look forward to your service and hope we vote today to confirm them. Don't forget.

Potter: That's next. Is there a sign-up sheet on this?

Moore-Love: There was, no one signed up.

Potter: Anyone here who wishes to testify to these two candidates?

Potter: Please call the vote.

Adams: I look forward to getting to know you better, mr. Smith, and shelli and I have hiked mountains together. We were part of class 13, leadership class, seem like a long time ago. I can attest to her excellent leadership abilities and congratulations to you both. Aye.

July 16, 2008

Fish: I want to welcome shelli and jim. We have a very full plate going into the fall. The housing agenda for the city is ambitious and the times perilous and we're delighted to have people of your background and commitment on board. And I can tell you as the housing commissioner, i'm looking forward to working with you in your new capacities and i'd like to acknowledge others who have helped me through this process and i'm proud to vote aye.

Leonard: Thank you both for serving and you're going to be outstanding members. Thank you very much. Aye.

Saltzman: Thank you, we look forward to working with you. Aye.

Potter: Shelli, it must be in the genes, tends to run in the family and congratulations to you. And james to you, we wish you well and do good things for the people who need good housing in the city of Portland. I vote aye. We're about eight minutes before 10:15 so we'll --

Moore-Love: Vote on 1003.

Potter: You're right.

Moore-Love: Mr. Smith.

Potter: Let's call the vote on 1003.

Adams: Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Thank you for keeping us honest.

Moore-Love: You're welcome.

Potter: We'll have a seven-minute recess. [recess]

At 10:08 a.m., Council recessed.

At 10:20 a.m., Council reconvened.

Potter: Please read the 10:15 time certain.

Item 1004.

Potter: I'm proud to present for council's consideration today a new candidate for appointment to the planning commission. Lai lani ovalles. Tackling significant issues of growth and change throughout the Portland plan. She's currently serving as indigenous coordinator for the neighborhood youth and family center. As a community activist, she's empowered youth and adults through leadership development and non-violent activities. She's successfully lobbied seattle's city council to get more young people involved through the get-engaged program. It was created in 2001 and continues to place young adults on boards and commissions in seattle. The planning commission consistently garnered the most applications. Connected her to urban planning issues. She currently is a resident of east Portland and she has expressed she's willing to work hard and will bring a strong voice reflecting indigenous cultural values and knowledge not planning commission. Lai lani, thank you for taking the time you're going to commit to this and we look forward to working with you during the coming years.

Gil Kelley: I wanted to summarize the background that I know. We were very, very impressed in the interview process. We had a lot of great candidates and she really rose to the top for her passion and intellect and her willingness to dive into the deep end of the pool in terms of planning. So we're thrilled to have her. I think her work with the native american community, with youth, with the school districts is really going to add an important perspective on the planning commission as we enter this Portland plan process. We're thrilled. So thank you.

Potter: Lai lani, would you like to say something?

Lai Lani Ovalles: That'd be great. [speaking different language] thank you for having me here today and for gil accepting me as a new commissioner for the Portland planning commission. I'd like to introduce my partner, she's here and she's a graduate student of the Oregon college of oriental medicine which is the primary reason that brought us to Portland. I'd like to say that I think that being part of the planning commission, I hope to bring a lot of my own indigenous cultural

July 16, 2008

values and beliefs and I always go to the source of who I am in the culture and i'd like to share a saying that elders have taught me. And I present it to you here. [speaking another language] that means no matter how big the task, it can always be done quicker and better together. I hope to bring that to the planning commission model.

Potter: Questions from the commissioners?

Adams: I think we have a new motto for the city of Portland. The city that works is getting a little tired. [inaudible] [laughter]

Leonard: You can look forward to a phone call as soon as you leave here.

Potter: Thank you very much. Did we have a sign-up sheet for this?

Moore-Love: We did. No one else signed up.

Potter: Anyone here who wishes to address this nomination? This is a report, I need a motion and a second.

Fish: So moved.

Leonard: Second. We're so excited.

Potter: Please call the vote.

Adams: I wanted to thank you for the willingness to serve. This is a huge, huge commitment, especially with Portland plan, the process about to be initiated. So I want to thank you for your willingness to serve. Aye.

Fish: One of my former colleagues on the housing authority board, howard shapiro, is one of your new colleagues-to-be and I know how much time and effort it takes to be a successful member of the planning commission, so I congratulate you for taking this on and thank you for your service to our city. Aye.

Leonard: So thank you for coming. I really appreciated your comments and hopefully you can, in addition, bring us hawaiian culture and weather to Portland as well.

Ovalles: I don't know if we can do that.

Leonard: Thank you for serving. Aye.

Saltzman: I wanted to thank you, welcome you to the planning commission and thank you in advance for the service. It is, as has been said here, it's one of the more challenging, daunting citizen volunteer assignments we have with the city of lots of work, lots of reading and hearings. So it's a good thing your partner is here today so she knows in advance all of the things you're committing yourself to do. Thank you.

Fish: You won't see her for months.

Saltzman: Thank you, especially during this time. Aye.

Potter: Thank you, lai lani. Aye. Congratulations to you and your family. I'm going to move to the regular agenda. Please read item 1024.

Item 1024.

Potter: Commissioner Leonard, did you want to introduce that? This issue came up rather recently and the police bureau in their initial budget for '08-'09 requested this amount of money and whoever the commissioner in charge denied that and now we're back faced with the reality of the fact that it's an election year, there's a lot of things going on, and it's important that we provide this resource to the bureau so that they can maintain their level of service. So with that, chief, did you want to come up and talk about this? Anybody else that wanted to address the issue?

Rosie Sizer, Chief, Bureau of Police: Good morning, mayor, commissioners. Rosie sizer, chief of police and this feels a little bit like déjà vu all over again. I recall back in november, having a discussion about police overtime and what we talked about is a historic overspending pattern of the last 15 years. An average of \$1.5 million over our budgeted, overtime budget. The auditor did audits of our usage patterns in 2002 and a refreshed audit in 2005. And found that we were employing good management practices. The bureau's financial analyst talked about remedying our overtime predicament and in the budget, we asked for ongoing money of a half million dollars. And

July 16, 2008

\$600,000 for dignitary protection for the election year in this fiscal year. Didn't get any of it. I sent out correspondence within the organization about our overtime practices with the idea that we had to retrench. So we didn't put the bureau's budget into crisis or the city's budget into crisis. As we more rapidly hired to fill vacancies. And it's hard work. I mean, I think we're a leanly staffed organization, given the demands for service that are placed upon us. And so it really was a discussion about making hard choices about what we could do and not do and what we could only do on overtime and the fact that there isn't sufficient overtime available. So I want to thank you for considering allowing us to dip into the rainy day fund made up of partially frozen police positions and this will allow us to do two things. Allow us to retrench some from restrictions on optimal staffing level and I can go into detail what that means if you would like. And the other it will do is to put together good plans for the visits that are going to occur as part of the general election psych. So i'm very thankful, very pleased, and just want to express to you that I intend to be a good steward of the public trust and also the public dollar. And i'll do what I can to live within our means -- do what I can to live within our means, and providing the best service we have.

Fish: Retrench some?

Sizer: It's kind of --

Saltzman: An explanation of that?

Sizer: It's shorthand for a strategy taking place in east precinct under the leadership of commander krebs for some time now. Ally way in the way of vacation of the contract guarantees every member two vacation blocks. The sign-ups occur in march and based upon the seniority position, they're allowed two guaranteed vacation blocks. They depended on seniority can be anywhere from one day to four weeks. And if you're lower in seniority, you'll have probably available time between november and march. If you're high in seniority, you'll have an opportunity to get vacation time in the summer. The strategy that we were employing regarding optimal staffing never impinged upon the contractually guaranteed blocks of vacation time. What it talked about was more last-minute requests for vacations. And the idea that we have minimum staffing numbers for all of the precincts, so on every shift, we don't go below a certain staffing number. And if we do, because someone is -- calls in sick or has to go to training, then we'll hire back on overtime. And the strategy we were employing on those more last-minute requests for vacation time, that we don't go the minimum staffing until we know that someone isn't going to call in vacation. So it was kind of a clunky process that only made it possible for people to know at the last minute whether their last-minute vacation request was going to be honored. That is probably as clear as mud, but it -- but it's complicated stuff. I do want to make sure that people understand that what is guaranteed by the contract, we're totally honoring and it was the other shorter and last-minute requests that were the things in danger.

Fish: I know that you're here to discuss the overtime issue and not the challenges that the bureau is facing with recruitment but I do want to note that if a young officer in your bureau were to partner with an entry-level firefighter in today's city, they would not have a combined income to afford the median priced home in our city, but they're city employees. So as you deal with the challenges of recruitment and staffing, I would like to invite your thoughts with my bureau, as the housing commissioner, of ways we may be able to find -- develop strategies that enhance your recruitment efforts by addressing the affordability issues for folks in public safety positions in our city.

Sizer: That can be huge, because the landscape has changed since I was hired over 23 years ago and was hired and could afford to buy a house almost immediately. Part of the demands and real energy on some of our civic name is people want -- engagement, people want the officers to live in the city of Portland. I'm afraid very few, especially early in their careers, can't.

Fish: A third of our firefighters live in Portland but increasing it's becoming challenging because of the cost structure. So I would welcome working with you on that issue and perhaps as we look at housing affordability, maybe strengthen.

July 16, 2008

Sizer: That would be great.

Robert King: My name is Robert, the president of the police association. Today's issue in the short term for me is about making sure that police officers working in the precincts on the various shifts have access to a day off and I thank you for your willingness to find funds to restore sort of the model we've gone by in the police bureau allowing people to have more advance notice. And commissioner Leonard, in particular, I appreciate your willingness to meet and talk with me about these concerns and move forward with a resolution. And Mayor Potter, I thank you for being willing to sign on to the resolution. And I think it's a solution in the short term to this issue, but this recruiting and staffing and pay is all intermixed for me. And the one thing that I'm reminded of every day by my membership is that Portland police are slipping in our pay, both nationally and locally. We really were the highest paid in the state of Oregon until a handful of years ago. With some settlements and then I know every one of you have heard me talk about the Seattle police settlement. They received 25% pay increase in a four-year time frame. 10% over the cost of living but they're the not only ones -- Oakland and Honolulu. We don't begin bargaining for at least the next 18 months and we think the recruiting problem is going to get worse as the pay disparity becomes greater with the implementation of the Seattle settlement. They'll make \$20,000 more than the Portland police officers and we'll have more and more qualified applicants applying in agencies like Seattle because Portland is not competitive. So in addition to thanking you for the -- your willingness to utilize some of these funds in the short term to help alleviate the pressure we find ourselves under, my members have told me that if you all were willing today -- I don't know if you can do this -- if you're willing today to vote the Seattle pay raise on -- at the same time that you vote for the resolution on the --

Leonard: Would that include the conditions that the Seattle management got? I know you've just forgotten.

King: There's something about concessions, I didn't mention that.

Leonard: As long as we can talk about that.

King: This will be a longer conversation, I suspect. Thank you very much for the support and the officers -- we're working on the street and taking radio calls for service every day in the city, I think they genuinely appreciate it and I look forward to continuing the discussion about pay and work conditions with Mayor-elect Adams and I think there's opportunities to make improvements that will make a real difference for all of us.

Potter: Thank you, folks. Did we have a sign-up sheet on this?

Moore-Love: We did. One person signed up.

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

Teresa Teater: Good morning, Mayor. Commissioners. Teresa, downtown civil rights activist. Commissioner Fish, I wanted to commend you on your idea. That's what I was going to testify on. The marketing package for Chief Sizer to get officers back into this town. H.U.D., I don't know what page it is, but down in the H.U.D. book, the H.U.D. Office, there's a page for public service employees to get a first-time start. No downpayment on a home and 50% off on the price of the payments. Something to that effect. I could find it for you. I quote it quite a bit. But that's my suggestion. You've got to find a way to market your Portland police that intrigues them to come in from elsewhere. And me being from the Midwest, low conservative income. Where I'm from, they pay \$42,000 a year, I believe it is, for police officers. A whole bunch walked off the job due to high crime rates in Omaha and stuff like that. Same problems as you have here. When you have low pay, you don't want to put out that much work because you don't feel appreciated. For the income that you have here for the officers and offset it with the first-time homeownership in the area. Maybe the city council can pass a lower tax or something -- I don't know how to explain it, but you know, on their wages or something. So that -- like military. So that they can be police officers and focus on their jobs but with all of the new law, deadly use of force and things like that, there's a lot

July 16, 2008

of things that make people not want to become police officers anymore because of the new strict guidelines for civil rights protections. So the housing, marketing and then coming up with regional training facility is a plus, and communities like my town, Oregon city, buy in and help you pay for this, that's money you can put back into why the police department. These folks renting the facility so you can buy more officers and sweeten up the packages. I know that obama is out here in the next few weeks and massive crowds and you don't want burnout on the officers that you do have left. So highly consider passing today what they urgently need. Thank you.

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

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

Adams: I want to congratulate the mayor and commissioner Leonard. And robert king and chief rosie sizer, and the management of the police bureau for working on this. Our commitment to improve not only the work life of our folks that serve in our police bureau, but partnering with them to continually ongoing improve the quality of life of the city of Portland and the citizens of Portland. I think this will help. Aye.

Fish: I seem to recall that mr. King appeared before us about a week ago and expressed some concerns overall that his members wanted us to know about. I'm pleased that in a week we tackled one of the issues that was on his plate and sending a signal that we really appreciate the work of the men and women who wear the uniform and protect us and I want to thank the chief who's been working on matters related to this. Aye.

Leonard: I want to particularly thank chief sizer, renee and robert king for work with the mayor and I in a very dynamic thoughtful process that helped us all work toward the solution that the council sees before it today. But I also want to make a couple of other observations that I think might be useful for the council as we start moving forward and thinking about how to tackle this problem of getting enough officers hired. Because to be clear, oftentimes, we hear criticism that the council has not done enough to allow there to be officers hired to increase staffing when the truth is that we actually have funded a number of positions as a council that remain unfilled. So the issue isn't whether or not at this time we go out and get more money for the police bureau budget, to be clear, it is that we figure out what is going on in hiring people and getting them into places that there are already funded positions for. I would just challenge a little bit as to whether or not we have a recruitment issue. I have some concerns that it is our internal hiring process that doesn't allow us to get the best and brightest police officers after we've selected them because if you can think about it for a second, if you're a 25-year-old or 24-year-old man or woman who is offered a job at the beaverton police department, as you're waiting at Portland to be hired, you're going to take the job at the beaverton police department, because it's important as a 24-year-old to have the paycheck. I know tom Potter has been working on it. I think it's important to frame the issue correctly as we move forward. But I do thing one of the issues, and this is a phenomenon that we have had, with the 9-1-1 service, that we have identified that the pay for the 9-1-1 dispatchers and for building inspectors was really so low that the pool of qualified people looking at coming to work for Portland at a lower pay than for example, Washington county or clackamas county, decided to go to those entities because the stress level was less and the pay more. That's in fact a dynamic that I think we're as a council is going to be charged with looking at as the contract comes up. Having said that, robert is correct there was a pay increase in seattle. 6.25 a year. But there were considerable concessions and workplace rules that get to some of these staffing issues, so I would conclude by saying there are a number of artificial barriers we place on ourselves to get officers hired. So I look forward to trying to figure out what those are and addressing them piece by piece. If this issue, that we have tackled in the last week is any precursor to the future, I look forward to us figuring that all collaboratively, working together, and I really appreciated what i've observed so far as to the professionalism and willingness of not only the chief's office, but certainly

July 16, 2008

robert king and his members in finding this solution we're here voting on today. Thank you, again, mayor Potter for your work on this. Aye.

Saltzman: I too want to thank mayor Potter and commissioner Leonard and also robert king and chief sizer in working hard and coming up with a good solution. Aye.

Potter: I think this is a good solution to a really difficult problem. And I think that some of the reasons why this problem exists go back a long way. Some of them are found within the police bureau, some are external. Nationally, police departments are having a very difficult time recruiting police officers. And that seems to go across the board in large towns and small. So it's I think something that has to be dealt with, not just in terms of pay issues or process, but also to begin to look to see why people are giving up what I consider to be good jobs with fair wages and excellent benefits. And so I think as we look forward to trying to remedy the issue of not being able to hire, I think it's going to have to take into consideration some of these national trends and what's driving it. Is there -- are there any best practices out there in terms of how we do go about recruiting and hiring new officers? It's been around as long as I can remember, and it seems like -- early in my career with the police bureau, it wasn't too difficult of a problem, but as time went on, I think that perhaps things have changed in terms of the kind of careers that people choose. For me, I think it's a wonderful career, it's an honorable career and a way to serve the public, unlike any other job that exists in our society. So I appreciate the efforts this morning and commissioner Leonard's leadership and the union and all of the good folks that made this happen. I vote aye. Please read item 1025.

Item 1025.

Potter: Linda.

Linda Jefferson, Director, Bureau of Fire and Police Disability and Retirement: Good morning. I'm linda jefferson, the director of the bureau of fire and police disability and retirement. And i'm here this morning about a contract that we would like your approval of for mercer to do the actuarial services for the bureau of fire and police disability and retirement plans. Any questions.

Potter: Can you give a 30-second explanation.

Jefferson: What the actuarial contract will provide is a periodic study of the -- for funding purposes of the program. Looking at our -- not only what our historical experience has been relative to our disability programs and retirement requirements, but also looking at what the trends and the projections are and how they may impact what the future fund requirements are of the program. This contract will also provide for any incidental services that may be related to any of the financial activities doing an audit or an independent assessment on a case-by-case basis as requested. So that's pretty much what is involved. They do a complete study every two years and then they do on the off-years, a more limited review of the program and provide a report to the board of trustees.

Potter: Also another brief question, and that is the voters voted in some significant changes almost two years ago.

Jefferson: Yes.

Potter: Could you let the public and us know how things are going with that and what is the status and perhaps how this actuarial will help focus on the issues that still need to be resolved.

Jefferson: As a result of the reform from 2006, there have been a number of significant changes, including the actual makeup of the organization. The fpdr is now a bureau with a new kind of organizational make up. We have secured the staffing that I believe is necessary to better manage the program. We have hired a number of experienced disability management personnel who have really, I feel, been able to develop a better relationship with our -- the beneficiaries of the disability program. And put different procedures in place that better help to address their individual needs. And then the needs of the organization as a whole. We are just getting in place additional resources that are needed to complete the different pieces that we believe need to be put in place to further

July 16, 2008

secure the intent of the reforms a couple of years ago. But everything is moving along very well. We had support not only from the board of trustees with the direction, but also from the mayor's office. So I feel very optimistic about us being at a point where we can say with confidence that we've addressed those issues that were -- that were really of concern when the reform came about a couple of years ago. Any other questions?

Saltzman: Is mercer -- is this a new job for them to be our actuary?

Jefferson: Yes, it is.

Saltzman: But there was a previous company?

Jefferson: There's been a previous company that had been employed by fpdr for a number of years.

Potter: Other questions? Thank you linda.

Jefferson: Thank you.

Potter: Did we have a sign-up sheet on this?

Moore-Love: I did not.

Potter: Anyone here who wishes to testify to this specific issue? It's an emergency. Call the vote.

Adams: Good work. Aye.

Jefferson: Thank you.

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

Potter: Yes, I want to express my thanks to you folks too, and I know when commissioner Adams assumes his role on the board of trustees in january, he'll appreciate what you folks have been doing. I vote aye.

Jefferson: Thank you very much.

Item 1026.

Potter: Please read item 1026.

Item 1026.

Potter: Call the vote.

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

Saltzman: Well, again, good work, debbie, and also all of the neighbors who really identified this issue as something, and our neighborhood planning liaison was able to run with this in a relatively quick amount of time. As I said last week, you can bring these types of lovefests anytime you want. Aye.

Potter: Aye. Please read item 1027.

Item 1027.

Randy Stenquist, Office of Management and Finance: Good morning, mayor, commissioners. Randy with the city's risk management office.

Scott Moede, Sr. Deputy City Attorney: Good morning, mayor and council members. Scott moede with the Portland city attorney's office. We're here today to seek your approval regarding settlement of a lawsuit. And i'll briefly give you the details of it. Plaintiff is the owner of two pieces of real property in southeast Portland. Plaintiff sought to develop these properties and in turn, the city sought to have plaintiff dedicate land to widen the sidewalks abutting the -- these developments. Plaintiff objected and filed a lawsuit. Following discovery in the case and motions filed by each side, there were no real factual disputes, and in this case, the federal judge ruled against the city on one piece of property, and set trial to determine damages. As to the other piece of property, the judge also set trial on the validity of city policy and for damages. And given that the plaintiff here originally sought in excess of \$3 million in delayed damages, lost profits, rents and other matters, we decided to mediate the case to see if we couldn't come to some sort of resolution. First we tried federal judge, judge coffin. Going down to eugene. That was unsuccessful. We then tried retired Oregon supreme court justice, william riggs, that went for a period of several weeks on three different days and we came to what we thought was something that

July 16, 2008

we could live with. And that is we now seek approval for \$300,000 settlement which includes everything. We recommend this for the following reasons. One it saves taxpayer dollars. To fight through trials and appeals would be far in excess of the settlement. Two, and most importantly, I think the settlement gives the city an opportunity to consider future code changes regarding developer sidewalk responsibilities and this will give us an opportunity to do that. Plaintiff agrees he's going to widen the sidewalk at one location to our desired 12 feet. The other is at 10 feet and that will remain the same. Fourth, it stops attorney fees rolling on both sides. A lot of times, that's what ends up running these cases and it's over and done with. Finally, I think the city should be in a better position in the future if we face this type of thing again, after being able to review what we have in place and perhaps also our strategy in terms of what court we select and that type of thing. And so on that basis, I'd ask the mayor and council members to approve the settlement.

Potter: I have a question and it dealt with what's going to happen in the future. How do these kind of issues keep from being brought up again and us being back here voting on a settlement?

Moede: I would respond to that in the following ways. Which is, one, what we're going to do is take a look at our city code and our pedestrian design guidelines. Which is essentially what gives us the authority to impose these conditions when a property owner seeks to develop property. We're going to try to bolster our reasoning in those design guidelines on one hand, and also try to consider making the criteria more specific as to the city code. That in turn, when the case law that's been developed, is applied to our guidelines and code, that should give us a better position with the court. That's one thing. Number two, in this case, we wound up in federal court, and next time, we will seek to be in state court. And I think that will also help us because I think the judges are -- not necessarily better able to deal with the issue, but I think it's a forum where they see the issue more frequently. So on those two items, I think that's how I think we'll be better off in the future, mayor.

Potter: Just to clarify, as I understood, this case revolves around the allegation that this amounted to a taking and because it went from a request for -- six-foot sidewalk to a 12-foot sidewalk. Going back to what you just said, tell me how this is going to work in the future in terms of preventing a future similar allegation. I don't know if I heard that.

Moede: Certainly. Each -- basically in the analysis on this type of case, you have to apply the criteria to each different development and each different piece of property. It's a separate animal, essentially, unto itself. Every piece of property is different and every development is different. And so the criteria that gets applied is without boring you too much, is on the one hand, there must be a rational nexus between what the city is seeking from the property owner and what the property owner intends to do with respect to the property. Then there needs to be what's called a rough proportionality. One of the things that we thought about doing here is changing some of the ways that the developers, when they develop these property, the information that they're providing us on the front end as well. What ends up happening is we will, if we bolster our code and bolster our guidelines, that will help with the rational nexus piece that the court applies. And so when mayor, you ask how are we going to improve in the future, the answer to that is we will have, number one, hopefully, a better process in terms of what the developer is providing to us which will help us analyze it earlier in the process. And number two, if we bolster our code and design guidelines, when the court looks at the rational nexus analysis, they'll have better and improved reasoning to apply and hopefully that prevents us from being back here again, say, two years from now or whenever it might be.

Fish: I'm a big believer in mediation. Most of the civil rights I got involved in was resolved by mediation. I'm also -- good mediation is a mediation where both sides feel somewhat aggrieved and unhappy with the outcome.

Moede: I agree with that.

July 16, 2008

Fish: But as I look at the pleadings in the matter, one problem, they assert a federal claim and that gives the plaintiff the right to go to federal court. Federal court is much more expensive than state court for the benefit of my colleagues. The plaintiff's bar in employment indications would prefer to stay in state court. Does your office consider mediation pre-summary judgment in select cases? I understand you have a decision by a federal judge but then you went to mediation. Are there occasions when you get a tort claim notice or a complaint that you'll go to mediation at an earlier stage?

Moede: Commissioner, I love this type of question and this is the first time i've ever been [inaudible]

Fish: I want to say it's about time we have a lawyer.

Leonard: Can the rest of us have coffee when you --

Saltzman: And he was nervous about being here.

Fish: Pay no attention to the amateurs in the room. It's about time we had a lawyer on this panel.

Moede: Absolutely, 100%. I've been with the city for ten years, coming up frequently. That's something that we do frequently. When I mentioned we first attempted to do this with judge -- once we had the court's rules, then we went to judge riggs over that six-week period.

Fish: I have a problem with the amount we're going to approve. When you have someone like a judge riggs at that level and they're telling you that you're going to incur more costs to pursue than in settling, I think the taxpayers at least know that we're stopping the hemorrhaging at that point and that's important.

Moede: And agreed. That was one of the key points, obviously, that judge riggs imposed upon the city. And similarly, the costs to the plaintiff in this case, trying to get his development going, and even though he was ahead, there's no guarantees as you know in terms of what happens. The idea, why spend hundreds and hundreds and thousands of dollars ten years from now and maybe back at trial. Something in that regard. The idea here is let's stop spending the taxpayer dollars and get this one resolved and take a look at our processes and try to move forward.

Stenquist: As a participant, with judge riggs, he was hugely effective in getting the parties to move off their original positions. The plaintiff came in with fantastic demands and the city's stand was we don't think we need to pay anything. And as it developed, crunched the numbers a lot. But both parties moved significantly from their opening positions in this multi-week process. It was a good process and I think we all came out of it having learned a lot. I'd like to thank pdot staff who were helpful and patient and willing participants in this process.

Potter: Other questions. Thank you, folks. Is there a sign-up sheet?

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

Potter: Anyone wish to address this issue? It's an emergency. Call the vote.

Adams: Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Please read item 1028. **Item 1028.**

Potter: Commissioner Leonard?

Leonard: Does the water bureau want to say anything about these. I think we have a presentation prior to this.

Potter: Anyone signed up to testify in this matter?

Moore-Love: We took testimony last week, but there is an amendment to this one. The amend --

Potter: Are we amending it today or --

Moore-Love: Today, yes.

Leonard: And that's what you were going to work on then?

Ben Walters, Sr. Deputy City Attorney: Right there was an amendment distributed to the council.

Leonard: Which is exhibit a.

Moore-Love: In the resolution itself.

July 16, 2008

Walters: In the resolution. It's a final be it further resolved, which identifies when the policies will take place to coincide with the amendments of the city code.

Leonard: But the six struck out.

Walters: Yes, that should be 17. I don't think we have a title 167. Not yet.

Leonard: I'd move the amendment.

Fish: Second.

Potter: Call the vote.

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

Adams: Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Please read item 1029.
Item 1029.

Potter: Second reading. Call the vote.

Adams: Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Please read item 1030.
Item 1030.

Potter: Second reading, call the vote.

Adams: Well, over serious concerns about this agenda, i'm going to vote for it anyway. Just kidding. Aye.

Fish: Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Potter:** Aye. Recessed until 6:00 p.m.

Fish: I'd like to express the good wishes to mayor vera katz who may be watching.

Leonard: She's actually not watching.

Fish: Looking for a little cover here. [inaudible]

Leonard: You think we're kidding.

Adams: You're on your own. I would never do that, vera.

At 11:08 a.m., Council recessed.

July 16, 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 16, 2008 6:00 PM

Item 1031.

Potter: On a tour we discussed the neighborhood's concern about potential development and their interest in having greater clarity and certainty about the type of development that would be allowed in the future and what could be done to mitigate any negative impacts. Planners and staff from transportation, parks, pdc, have been working with the community to work for the future and the transformation of this area. It involved neighbors, realtors, developers, and others to come up with strategies and proposals that would meet community needs and desires for the area. The plan meets our goals for transit-supported densities to maximize our substantial investment in light rail and supports the community's interest in seeing a broad array of services and opportunities throughout the corridor. Like any good plan, there won't be 100% consensus about all aspects. We're likely to hear about a few aspects of the plan that some would like us to modify. The extra height allowed in certain areas was an idea that emerged during the design commission hearings. I expect we'll hear from some who would like to keep to the original staff proposals for height. I want to emphasize, though. That the north interstate corridor plan is more than just about height and zoning. It's a package of design guidelines, special right-of-way standards and special use and development standards that work together to ensure quality development. It will contribute to the livability of the neighborhoods along interstate and provide predictability for the long transformation of the area now and into the future. May I please have julia gisler and courtney duke please come forward. After that we will have four invited speakers.

Gil Kelley, Director, Bureau of Planning: Thank you. Good evening and council members. Gil kelley, bureau of planning. I'll keep my comments very brief, an over view and help answer questions later if need be. I think your introductory comments, mayor, covered it very well. I would just sort of add a perspective here that we, like in all of our district planning efforts, are working with the community of today for the vision for tomorrow. And the tomorrow in this case is probably accelerated somewhat of the light rail investment we've made recently by emerging demand for new and more intensive development in the corridor, and certainly reinforced by the spike in energy prices and fuel costs, which doesn't appear to be simply a spike, but to be a long-term systemic trend, that and in combination with our increasing awareness about global warming is really forcing us a community, in a good way, I think, to look at our existing corridors to accommodate new growth. And this was part of the background that julia and the other planners dealt with in working with this community to really keep their eye on this as a growth corridor, but do it in a way that made it feel like Portland and have the quality of neighborhoods that people wanted. So I think what you are seeing there is kind of a quiet drama, if you will. Some increases in height that you'll hear about. Not so much increases in floor area ratio or overall density, but in height in the molding and the shaping of that new development. And I think in many ways it is a package deal here. There's a lot of design thinking that's gone into this. I think some real opportunities for an enhanced identity for the whole corridor and for the neighborhoods that adjoin interstate avenue. That was the context for our thinking going in. And julia, who has been the project manager, will describe the recommendations of the planning commission in some detail

July 16, 2008

now, and courtney duke from transportation will augment that as well. I wanted to say we have four speakers that will follow me as you indicated, mayor. One, andre baugh, a planning commissioner, who will present the planning commission's intent in their -- behind their recommendation, and his own sort of personal -- how he came to the motion, the majority motion himself, as well as tim eddy from the design commission. The design commission spent time looking at the set of issues from their point of view. And we'll hear from the president of the -- both the overlook neighborhood association and the arbor lodge association as the first testifiers. With that, unless there are questions, i'll turn it over to julia.

Potter: Please proceed.

Kelley: By the way, one feature here h it's not simply about height, street standards. In the rezoning processes, as julia will describe, we kept our eye on really making the neighborhood function the way it wants to do. Part of that was acknowledging their existing nonconforming uses.

This was a topic we heard about the other day in the killingsworth proposal. And here I think we're addressing 37 nonconforming uses in one fell swoop. So just wanted to make sure that wasn't lost. Thank you.

Potter: Certainly could pass on your recommendation.

Kelley: You can just vote aye now.

Julia Gisler, Bureau of Planning: Hi. I'm been the project manager on the north interstate corridor plan. Can I get this to -- yeah. This has been a collaborative effort. With me is also courtney duke with the office of transportation and kevin cronin with pdc. This plan has a lot of different components, so rather than dive into the details what i'd like to do tonight is to give you an overall view, and there are also quite a few staff from our technical advisory committee that are here to answer your questions if you'd like to dive deeper into some of the issues. We are doing this plan to put in place a development framework and zoning needed to realize the vision of this area as a high density transit corridor to maximize the investment of light rail and to improve the livability of the surrounding neighborhoods. The station area includes a quarter mile radius around each of the station areas in the corridor. It starts to the north with the kenton station, then as we go south, the lombard station, rosa parks station, killingsworth station, prescott station, and the overlook station. There are three neighborhoods involved in this study area. South of killingsworth it's the overlook neighborhood. North of killingsworth to lombard it's the arbor lodge neighborhood. And north of lombard, it's the kenton neighborhood. To see how this sits in the -- our study area sits in the region, we're right here in between the Portland central city and downtown vancouver. We've built these recommendations on past planning that's occurred in this area, starting with the albina community plan in 1993. That was the last time we looked at the zoning in this area. In 2000, we implemented the interstate corridor urban renewal area. And in 2000 there was a -- a transportation management grant to look at station areas in anticipation of the light rail. And that was the interstate max station area revitalization strategy. The max yellow line opened spring of 2004. And we began this project, which was initially called the interstate light rail corridor zoning project in september of 2006. I wanted to talk a little bit about the zoning amendments in the albina community plan, because that sets in motion the policy that this would be a high density corridor in the event of light rail on either -- at the time at either interstate or -- or i-5. And so if you look at the gray area, that area has a comp plan designation for high density residential that could only be realized in the event that light rail was constructed. The purple area, south of killingsworth, was zoning that was put in place in the albina community plan in its employment zoning, it's the ex zone, and that was put there because at the time we saw that as an area that could be an employment center with its good access from -- to swan island on going. We started our public involvement with gathering together a community advisory group. And our community advisory group, or cag, consisted of neighborhood, business reps, property owners. We also had developers and architects and real estate agents, people just in the neighborhood at large. And the idea was it would be a

July 16, 2008

diverse enough group that we could all talk about how development gets built and what kinds of impact it would have on the neighborhood. This group met 12 times over 14 months. They were very involved in -- in all aspects of the plan. We also held four community events, and those are circled in red on the screen. And these community events happen periodically throughout the process, so we were always check nothing with the broader community, and asking them, you know, what their input was about the -- about the proposals as they were being developed. And the blue box talks -- the blue box identifies the public hearings that we had. We not only went to the planning commission, we went to design commission because we had community-designed guidelines we had to review with them. And in terms of just our general public engagement, how to keep people involved, one of our most successful tools was the project web site. We had over 30,000 hits on the public web site. So on that site we had access to the cag minutes and agendas. We also had all the documents and maps, and just general information on the project. We did a series of e-newsletters to a list of emails that we had, interested folks, and we also just did general information mailings. We did of course our required notices for the public hearings, the designing commissioner the planning commission, of course this hearing. We also, because we were changing -- or proposing to change the zone, we had to do a ballot measure 56 notice to everyone that would potentially have their property affected by a zone change, and we met throughout the process with the interstate corridor renewal advisory committee and the neighborhood and business association. This is the north interstate corridor plan. There's several -- i'll walk you through the sections in it, what the elements of the plan are. We start out with an urban design concept. That's in section two to set the framework. We then have comprehensive plan map and zoning amendments. That's section three. That's how -- those are the proposals for the zone changes. In section four, there's amendments to the zoning code. Primarily that is to add a new plan district for north interstate, and the planned district regulations focus on the urban form of the area, also making it more pedestrian oriented, and -- and -- there's something else. Pedestrian oriented, and so this even in section 5 we have amendments to the community design guidelines. We're putting design review almost on all the properties and interstate, and that started with the albina community plan, where design review was -- was put in place with the higher density, because it was -- because of the different scale of the existing development and the new development. In section 6, we have the special right-of-way standards that pdot has developed with us, and I believe you have a copy of the latest street framework criteria and special right-of-way standards that they're currently developing. We worked -- we worked in two scales when we were coming with the proposals. We worked on the corridorwide, looking at the issues from a corridorwide perspective, and also zoomed in on the different station areas, so we could refine the proposals at the station areas. So if we go through the subareas, it starts with interstate avenue. The interstate avenue. Then we call it neighborhood east is between interstate and i-5. And then neighborhood west is the area west. And there's a transition zone you can see in purple where we have a transition zone to the single family neighborhood zoning. That's in the yellow. So if I start with interstate, interstate we know has the light rail. It's pretty much a use of pretty low intense uses, and one of the character-defining elements is the remnants of the highway 99 route that has the neon signs and the motels and the different restaurants that were along there. This is our urban design map. And if you look at interstate avenue, the red are the station platforms, right directly at the station platforms, and the hatched areas are in between. And the overall goals of the plan for the station areas are to make the -- or to have more opportunity for activity at the station platforms, but still recognizing that each of the station areas are different. We also want to reduce the barriers for commercial and mixed-use development between the station platforms. These are some examples from the special community design guidelines for interstate avenue that are found in section 5 in the plan. These are some ideas of what types of development we could see at the platforms. This is a new development that -- the over look height condominiums. It's a little less intense, but still has the ground floor commercial.

July 16, 2008

And the biggest barrier that we saw to the -- to the mixed use and development along interstate were the nonconforming uses, because this area was very typical of a lot of long commercial stretches where we took -- took the long commercial stretches and created nodes, and then in between the nodes we put high density housing. And so this -- in this high density housing area, along interstate, you have, like, swan island, which is a restaurant. You had all the motels, the little stores, and in the bottom, the bottom right you had a house that doesn't want to be a house anymore, it wants to be a commercial area. It too would be nonconforming. We had, as gill said, 37 nonconforming uses, and we have legalized all but four of those uses. We also have created four nonconforming uses in the form of gas stations along interstate. So these are -- the next couple of slides are diagrams of each of the station areas, because we did a lot of thinking about how the actual development in the station areas, but i'm going to quickly go through and kind of highlight what the overall development theme is. So if we start in kenton, it's the historic commercial gateway. The area directly around kenton station was -- the zoning was revisited in the kenton downtown plan in 2001. So this is outside of our station area, but there's a little bit of kenton that's still outside -- outside the station area and outside the lombard station. So here's lombard. Lombard has the fred meyer's lombard and it's the retail and commercial anchor. Kenton school is north of lombard on the west side. Rosa parks, probably that's known for the new seasons that's located on that -- on that -- in that station area. This is seen as more of a neighborhood corridor. It's less intense. We've got more residential zoning in this area. Killingsworth is the main street is the theme, and we put the zoning in place to implement this main street concept that connects killingsworth in this area all the way to killingsworth in to mlk. Prescott station is a neighborhood center. This is one of the areas that we see particularly -- on the -- or the east side of interstate, where there's the most owe there's the most potential for a real -- a real mixed-use, vibrant neighborhood. Does a lot of undeveloped -- or a lot of under-utilized land there. It also has great connections across i-5 along skidmore to mississippi. So that's a good connection. And there's also -- it's also relatively isolated from a lot of the single family residences. Overlies the employment anchor. Kaiser is to the south, and it also has overlook park to the west. I think of all the station areas, this is one area that we did the most tweaking to the original -- the original proposals. And in part that was due to the fact that it -- it -- the -- it's more geographically constrained in this area, and the space between interstate and i-5 has been reduced down to just two blocks. In this area there's a little bit less density than in some of the others as you go further north. The next subarea would be neighborhood east. These are slides to orient you with kind of the existing conditions. It's primarily single family. There are a scattering of kind of these courtyard apartments that you see in the top right. And goals for this area were to fine hewn the high density zoning and to put tools in place to ensure a successful transition to a higher density neighborhood. Primarily the tool we used to do this would be design review. We had design review on all these properties. We knew that this was going to be probably the most challenging part of this -- of this -- of this plan, and so we hired the architects early on in the process to look at prototypes and look at how this area could develop. We looked at what it would look like to have larger buildings next to the smaller buildings. We also looked a lot at what the different development types would be like as the size of the lot changed. So what we found was with smaller lots, of just the typical 5,000-square-foot lot you're looking at maybe a three or four-story building at most. It wasn't until you were able to consolidate larger sites that you were able to see a seven-story building, but we maxed out at a seven-story building given all the requirements you'd have to meet. As you can imagine, we talked about this a lot at our community workshops. We talked a lot about the zoning. We also -- with the slide on the right is a lego table that some of the cag members put together to visualize the scale and how the -- how the mapping would be. These slides are a project that's under -- under -- in the design -- it's in the permit stage. These are the montana condos that are on montana behind the fred meyer site. Currently they are, I believe, eight stories toward fred meyer's, and they slope down to

July 16, 2008

six stories as they meet the neighborhood. This is development in the mississippi -- well, these are the mississippi overlook condos and the prescott station. This is an example of the r-1 zoning in the -- example of the r-1 zoning in the overlook neighborhood in between interstate and i-5. And in neighborhood west, these are some slides to orient you. Primarily -- actually almost predominantly a single-family residential area. And just to orient you again, this is i-5. This is transition zoning. Then this is the single family. I think the thing to remember about the neighborhood west is that over half of the quarter mile radius of neighborhood west is -- remains in single family. So we're preserving a lot of the existing single family neighborhoods by just not touching the zone. It stays r-5. The pink areas a transition, where we're going from -- it's the transition from the higher density along interstate to the single family. We've used a zone that is a -- that is an r-2 zone, that's a medium multifamily zone, particularly what you'll see there is row houses, duplexes, and if you can consolidate a couple of lots you might see some small apartments. And we also want to ensure that the quality of this new development in this area is high, and this area doesn't have design review, but it does have, in the plan district, some compatibility standards. And this is an example of the r-2 zoning, which is primarily what we have in the transition zone. These are some row houses in the overlook neighborhood. And this is a new development in the arbor lodge neighborhood in the r-5 zone. We also -- we're also proposing a neon sign district. These are some good examples of the neon signs that I talked about earlier along interstate. We have made some amendments to the sign codes, so that these signs can be moved without meeting all of the sign regulations. And we're hoping that that -- that that helps preserve some of these signs. We also, in the community design guidelines, are putting the guidelines that talks about using neon sign -- neon in new development. We were really happy to see that the overlook heights condominiums, that their ground level cove shop added a new neon sign. Hopefully this is the way that people will be using neon in the future.

Transportation. We want to foster a multimodal urban street environment with an emphasis on pedestrian, bicycle, and stormwater management. A lot of these slides that you see here are from the sunday parkways, a really successful event a couple weeks ago. These are the streets that we've identified -- montana and concord -- as east/west routes through the corridor. As I said, we're working with pdot to create special right-of-way standards. The special right-of-way standards are based on the recommendations in the plan's urban design concepts. One of the most important is of course making it easy to get around by bike, by -- by -- by bike and by walking throughout the district, but also to improve the connections across i-5, and in these slides you see a picture of the flailing street bridge to your left and to the right the bryant street bridge, and at the top is one of the very wide streets that go across and connect the two. Open space. The green along the corridor is the open space areas. And the -- kind of the brownish color are the schools. If we start from the top, we have in kenton, there's kenton park over here, that's not even on this map. Then you go down, and you have the kenton school. And then further down is the ockley green school. And off to the -- off to the east is peninsula park. And then as you travel further down, there's patton park, which there's a slide, the top slide on the right is patton park. It's under construction -- or actually just received a lot of pretty massive renovation. We also have -- we also have beech school is down here. Then this is over -- is anchored by overlook, which again is the slide to your right. One of the things we heard a lot from people was concern about the kenton school site, that Portland public schools still owns it, but it's being leased to to a private school. There's concern about when it redevelops. We want to continue to have some component of open space, and so the planning commission's recommendation is to -- is to identify on the urban design concept map, which you see to your right, that this is a site when it redevelops should contain a component of open space. You'll hear from Portland public schools that this is an idea that they support, having master planning process in the future when they're more certain about the site that, it doesn't retain a component of open space. Then I promised I wouldn't get too much in the details, but I have to talk about the height and the floor area ratio, because it's kind of a confusing thing. I know that you've

July 16, 2008

heard a lot about concerns about it. If you look -- on page 55 of the plan, we have a map that shows, in the blue, what the special f.a.r.s are, the floor area ratios are, and on the right, the red, what the special heights are. I added another map to show the process to where we've gotten with our height proposal. On the right the areas in the red are places -- if this was in our proposal right now -- places that we could go to 100 feet maximum building height. And those are the high residential zoning that is within 1,000 feet of light rail. So if you look at the map, on the left, it's all, you know, pretty much throughout the corridor. The neighborhood was very unsettled about having such a large amount of land that was 100 feet throughout the corridor. From an urban design perspective, it doesn't even put the most height right at the station area where we want to see more activity. So the proposal that went to the planning commission and the design commission had -- had one place, the prescott station, where there's 1,000-foot maximum height. And that was there because as I was talking about that is a really good place for an urban vibrant mixed-use area. And so that's the one place in the corridor, that by right you can go to 100 feet. The orange area is at the killingsworth station, at the lombard station, and at a focal point up in kenton where interstate bends and along the freeway there's a proposal that you could have 85 feet maximum height. That just gives you a little bit more height than the 75 in the rh and the 65 in the employment zones, which are the predominant zones in the corridor. And so that was a proposal that went to the design and planning commission. And their proposal and their recommendations or amendments to this proposal was to allow a little higher building, 125 feet, if you could -- if you would go through an extra design review -- extra design review. And the idea behind that was that they -- they saw that you could get a higher quality building, an actual building that would -- higher quality building with having more flexibility. Again week, not information the f.a.r., so it's not an increase in density, it's just an increase in building flexibility, by being able to go to 125 feet. So before I go through the actions that we'd like you to take today I wanted to make some acknowledgment. I wanted to acknowledge the community in general and the people that worked on this. It was not a short process. It took a long time, a lot of hours, and complex issues that we grappled with. There were a lot of folks that rolled up their sleeves and did a lot of good work in terms of trying to understand the balances between some of these decisions that we were making. I also want to acknowledge the people that questioned what we were doing along the way, that questioned, is this the right zone, is this the right setback. These questions really allowed us to dig deeper into the proposal, made the cag think, made staff and the design and planning commission think about what the tradeoffs were, and were these the right recommendations. And finally i'd like to acknowledge the planning commission and the design commission for their review. This is a volunteer group that has a lot on their plate, and they had this on their agenda for about three months between the time we briefed them and the time we made recommendations. I think you'll find that the quality of the work in the plan reflects, again, their dedication and really good behind the plan. So with that what we would request is that you adopt the plan. And there would be amendments to the community design guidelines to create special character statements for the interstate. We'd also request that you amend the -- the Portland comprehensive plan map and zoning map, and also amend title 33, the zoning code, and title 32, the sign and related regulations. And we also have an amendment to exhibit e that we would like you to -- to accept.

Potter: Questions from the commissioners?

Fish: I have a question by way of clarification. Julia, by the way, thank you for the briefings you gave me in my office. Very helpful leading up to this. At prescott station, where you now have the -- the red grid, which I guess signals you could go to 100 feet --

Gisler: Right.

Fish: My understanding that covers fire station 26, part of that package?

Gisler: I believe that does.

July 16, 2008

Fish: Fish: That's a significant piece of property within that area that is not slated for development.

Gisler: Correct.

Fish: Okay. Just want to make sure I --

Potter: Is that it? Courtney?

Courtney Duke, Bureau of Transportation: I wanted to mention real quickly, we had a great working relationship with pdc and the bureau of planning, and did a significant traffic impact analysis on the rezoning proposal. As you found in your findings, we've met state, local, and regional policies and goals as a part of that analysis. And april wanted to let people know that we have copies of the right-of-way standards here if people in the audience would like to look at those. We'll continue to work on those throughout the summer. We're both here for questions.

Potter: Questions? Thank you. I would like to invite up the invited speakers. Andre, you're first up.

Andre Baugh, Portland Planning Commission: Andre bah, Portland planning commissioner. Mayor, commissioners, i'm pleased to forward this plan to you on north interstate. I think it is the first of many plans you'll see that is the new urban development that will be coming forward that includes transit, density, you know, close to schools, and it's going to create a vibrant neighborhood. As the planning commission, we feel strongly that this is the long-range plan going forward, that really brings transportation and housing goals together. We do believe also that there are some concerns that the neighborhood residents did put forth. And we did hear those concerns around height as we had our hearings. The one thing I would say is that we would also emphasize in our support that we look at making sure that this plan does not displace members of the community or the businesses as we redevelop it, and pdc has made a commitment to that effort to develop some plans and tactics to ensure that the development of this plan works well. The plan -- and i'll address the height issue. The plan and the height from my standard is one that is a tradeoff. This is a new existing -- you have an existing neighborhood with transit. You have a tiff neighborhood. And the planning commission wrestled with height as an area that -- how do we put height next to a freeway, along transit, to enable really a vibrant neighborhood for the future. And the tradeoff was, from our standpoint, to have those buildings that want to go through to get the extra height, to go through the rigors of a design commission. And that rigor, we felt, gave the neighborhood an opportunity to come back in and talk about what they'd like to see, address their concerns, from not only materials, to the design of the building, you know, balconies, whatever. So it's an opportunity for the neighborhood, we thought, to come back in and talk about what does that building look like, how does it face the neighborhood, and address their concerns from a building standpoint. The north interstate also does a number of other things from a grassroots standpoint. It looks at and preserves the neon signs that are out there today and will celebrate that. I think that with an existing neighborhood brings much more character to that neighborhood long term as you look at the development of a neighborhood. And the last thing is, we would urge you to continue to talk with Portland public schools, parks, for the kenton site, as was mentioned in the presentation. We felt strongly that that should be an open space and continue that opportunity. Just real quickly, I think this is an exciting opportunity for you. This really is the future of Portland from a standpoint of, as you look at the expansion of light rail into existing neighborhoods, how do those neighborhoods look, how do they feel, how do they grow, and from a density standpoint how do they function. And from a transit standpoint, you know, it's an encouragement of a transit oriented bike pedestrian how do you manage stormwater, and those things are key along with open space. If it works here, and we think you need to keep your eye, and we will, too, keep our eye on how it works, but if it works here we can use this as a model for other existing neighborhoods that are going to face the same challenge as we go forward and look at the Portland plan. Thanks. Any questions?

July 16, 2008

Adams: Could you tell us more about the planning commission, the process, the discussion of height?

Baugh: The process discussion of height was we looked at -- and we heard a consideration of there's a tradeoff in the height, if you will. There's actually a decrease in height in a lot of the areas that we actually reduced the height in some areas and we traded that height, if you will, along the freeway to the 125 feet. The discussion in -- much of the discussion we heard from many of the members of the community was the concern for the visibility to see back into the neighborhood. You know, could you see the visibility of the neighborhood from the buildings. And relative to the neighborhood, because the neighborhood does go back into an r-5 just a few streets off of interstate. It's an r-5 neighborhood, so you're talking about single-family dwellings. And how that would look. Hearing how to give designers have flexibility to make that look good in a neighborhood, we knew we were not increasing the density in any manner, just looking at how that building looks in specific nodes along a transit street. And that discussion was really between us. In all honesty, I will tell you I was not a fan initially of the height, and really the design flexibility and the ability for the residents to come back into the design commission and say, we don't like this, we'd like this changed, really convinced me to support the plan.

Adams: How do we know the -- how do we measure success of this corridor plan?

Baugh: I think from my standpoint, the planning commission standpoint, would be that we're building -- first there's a couple of things that we're building buildings that are truly are, I think, utilizing the design standards to get in most people's minds a building that's appropriate. I think the second standard would be that were maintaining the residents and businesses that want to stay in that neighborhood, and from a number of standpoints. Third we're putting businesses and residences into the neighborhood that are utilizing transit, because we heard clearly if we put a lot of cars into that neighborhood, it's not going to function. So it really is -- has to be to function, businesses and residences that are going to look good and function and that's a design of the design process. If the design process is not working, I think that's really a standard that you can look at and say, are they taking advantage of the design process, to fashion a better-looking building, a building that fits with, you know, not everybody's concerns, but I think that addresses many of the concerns. I'll let tim talk about some of those design standards, but I think the -- that that's some of the standards to look at, what are the modal splits of the new residents that come there, and how do we encourage them to get even higher modal splits.

Tim Eddy, Design Commission: Mayor, commissioners, i'm tim eddy, a member of the design commission. We were fortunate enough to have four hearings on this plan before the design commission, and saw quite a lot of neighborhood participation. And I participated in planning commission hearing at jefferson high school about two months ago with respect to the plan. I guess i'll start by saying that it -- you know, it doesn't -- there was work done on the plan by the -- by the staff planners through the process. We saw it evolve. And the design commission strongly supports the plan that's being put forward at this point. Some of the elements of the plan that I think we found to be very exciting and saw a lot of excitement within the neighborhoods, the neighborhood, included neon sign district. And the opportunity that that provides for the interstate corridor to really develop a character of its own that stretches all the way from overlook to kenton. It is a transitional zone. If one looks 30, 40 years down the road, and tries to imagine what that area will look like relative to vancouver, Washington, downtown Portland, and as a transition between those two, both from the perspective of the freeway and the travel on light rail, it's very important area of our city. And I will jump right ahead to the height issue. We encouraged providing greater flexibility in specific and strategic areas of the plan for designers, architects, and developers to configure buildings that would fit their sites well and enhance the neighborhood. And you ask, you know, what would -- what would make this a success, and what would make this plan a success. And I think this is maybe personal opinion to some extent, but success is -- is, you know, leveraging

July 16, 2008

the investment in the transit system that's already there, and providing great opportunities for developments to happen that will spawn buildings that will create and enhance that sense of place and create a sense of place along there, along the interstate corridor, and to reinforce the real positive aspects of that area. That said, we looked at the station areas as specific opportunities. Those are the areas where folks are most likely to walk, where projects may be able to reduce parking to some extent, vehicle parking, and where configuring buildings at a higher height, even without increased density may help to enhance and provide greater open space and light and air at those areas. We also suggested that the same be done in the strip along the i-5 freeway for a couple of reasons. One is, those are tougher sites to develop. They are next to the freeway. And the -- one of the advantages that they have is the opportunity for greater and longer views, and to give designers and developers the opportunity to capture those and it could help to make them more successful. And also, give the neighborhood an interesting edge quite frankly from the thousands and thousands of people who pass up and down the freeway corridor. The suggestion that a greater height would be allowed with further design review, an increased level of design review, we felt would give adjacent neighbors and the community at large an opportunity to participate as we see in other areas of the city, and to comeback those designs in a way that improves them and enhances the neighborhood. And what we're concerned about is really to avoid an unintended consequence of forcing the density that's allowed in this area into lower building blocks. There's an 85-foot height limit in some of these areas, which is really about 20 feet higher than the allowed height for a wood frame -- five-story wood frame structure over a concrete podium, and it was our specific concern that if that 85-foot height limit was in place, that it's very likely that the majority of the buildings would be forced into that specific construction type, which we felt could artificially create forcing that density into a very predictable skyline and box. Likely quite static for the neighborhood and have unintended consequences, both economically and from a sense of place standpoint for that cord. With that, I think from the design commission standpoint, we support the plan and support the special right-of-way standards, and as I mentioned earlier fully behind the neon sign district.

Potter: Thank you, folks. Chris?

Chris Duffy: Good evening, mr. Mayor, commissioners.

Potter: Turn it toward you. Thank you.

Duffy: I'm very happy to be here this evening to lend my support to the rezoning plan for the interstate corridor. I'm also submitting a letter of support from our neighborhood association board, which i've submitted tonight and another letter from our land use chair. I believe the rezoning of this corridor at this time presents an exceptional opportunity for growth and development in our city, and it is critical for the future of this area. A major investment has already been made in the light rail system through the corridor, and zoning to promote higher density along the line is the next logical step to support that investment and to maximize its potential. It is also crucial that Portland do everything possible to encourage the use of mass transit, which this plan will obviously encourage. I can tell you that I was originally was not particularly in favor of the high density planning that we had in the overlay that went back a number of years to the albina plan. However, over a period of time, and working with the rezoning project, and learning more what is necessary for the city of Portland i've come around to be totally supportive of the plan as it is being presented to you tonight. We are expecting greater numbers of people to come to Portland in the next few years, and it's crucial that we provide opportunities for housing, for affordable housing, for job opportunities, and for places that people can live and work close to one another without needing to use cars to drive clear across the city. There is a potential for that kind of development here in the interstate corridor. And I think this plan allows that kind of potential to be developed. Our concern originally was primarily with the quality of building that we might get when we started to see development happen in our neighborhood. But through this plan, and the requirements for design

July 16, 2008

review in the larger, taller buildings that may eventually develop there, I think that we will get a neighborhood that is of high quality, with good design, and with solid construction that will last for years, and the type of homes and businesses out of that that people will be proud to live and work in. The higher buildings, reaching above 85 feet, we learned will be required to be built of steel and concrete rather than wood structures, that will give it durability, and it will allow a different type of design and attract a different type of developer that we might get with shorter buildings, that tend to be built out to the limits of the property, allowing very little space around them. The height will give us design and the opportunity to have greenspace around those buildings and more flexibility for the look of the neighborhood overall. We are concerned about greenspace in the neighborhood.

This has been a big subject of discussion throughout this whole process, but we feel by attracting good developers, good architects, we'll have greenspace incorporated on to the building sites. And we hope that as this plan progresses there will be preservation of the existing greenspaces and a possible development of new ones for people who come to this corridor. I have a personal vision for the development of interstate. At its ideal, it would develop into an area that provides housing and workspaces through the ex designations that we have, and that could become a corridor known for green building practices and an interest in sustainability. I'm hoping that this development will attract new businesses to settle there that deal with green technology and energy use technology, businesses that we may not have even seen in the Portland area before, but that will meet the needs of our future, and where people can work and live in close proximity, eliminating the use for vehicle traffic in the area. This plan, I think, captures that as well as anything possibly can, and I hope that it will be accepted, and I hope that in the future you will encourage business development along this corridor also to meet the needs of our future in the city, and that's going to be something I will personally be lobbying for over the next few years. And I have to say that as a member of the urban renewal area committee for interstate, I think the proposed plan will help to meet the goals of the urban renewal group as well as the goals of the neighborhood for development, and will be in good compliance with Portland plan, that it's developing now also.

Potter: Thank you. Thanks, folks. Is Mr. Gale here? Please state your name for the record. Go ahead and speak.

Eric Gale: I didn't want to sit on anyone's lap there. My name is Eric Gale, the chair of the Overlook Neighborhood Association, which covers 55% of the southern portion of the corridor. The letter was approved unanimously by the neighborhood association last night. This is a huge project for us, and we've worked very hard over the past year and a half educating ourselves and each other.

We've discussed it at every board meeting, constant emails and postings, and I think these efforts have been reflected in both the quality and quantity of the comments submitted by Overlook residents. Overall the planning commission did a great job communicating with us, however not surprisingly we do have a number of concerns, particularly with significant last-minute changes to the maximum height. On the heights, in the proposal presented to the public on April 10th, the height limits for RH zones ranged from 65-100 feet. At the time we objected to these increases over the base design limit of 65 feet. I'd like to note that within the zoning code now allows for 100 feet of light rail stations, but that when the Albina Community Plan was adopted in 1993, that this was based on, that zoning code was not in effect, and it was 65 feet. I think that's significant in terms of tradeoffs that we're giving up height here, bringing height there. Anyway, neighbors were shocked when after nearly a year and a half of community involvement with no mention of heights over 100 feet the design and planning commissions proposed what are called height opportunity areas with the height limits of 125 feet. This is a significant change that as a community we've not had the opportunity to discuss. Without other examples to compare, we worry it would be intimidating and out of scale. The thinking is that with the development of the Portland plan, the concept of height opportunity areas will likely become more developed and well thought out and we'd like to request that the consideration of these height opportunity areas be postponed until that time, essentially

July 16, 2008

addressing -- at this point there's a lot of uncertainty of what it would look like, what would be prohibited, permitted, what it would look like, there's not a lot of precedent, certainly no information, and no opportunity for community discussion of this. And it seems -- we're not quite sure what will happen in terms of you've got the f.a.r. Ratios of 4:1. If you're going to achieve this, you would have to leave essentially 2/3 of your property undeveloped to build your very tall, skinny tower. We're not sure if we're opening up a can of worms for later on increasing f.a.r. Ratios, if you're a developer and you have this height opportunity, it would seem a lot easier to tweak the f.a.r. Ratio, get a variance, than it would be to tweak that, etc. We're nervous on those issues as well. If it goes through, obviously the extra design review process is going to be really, really quickly to making it happen. And additionally, as kind of a lesson for future planning projects, we feel that input should be solicited from the design commission and the planning commission before the period of public participation is over. Their expertise is obviously crucial, but significant changes at this late stage make citizens who have been involved in this process the whole time really wonder what was the point of going to all those meetings and etc., etc. I'd just like to briefly touch on other items in our letter. We feel more direction is needed in the design guidelines to address the issue of popping large buildings next to houses in a way that's sensitive to neighbors and privacy issues. There's currently some guidance on the border west of interstate avenue, but really nothing for the neighborhood east of interstate avenue where the greatest discontinuity will occur and those height opportunity areas exist. In particular we feel that guidance is needed -- more guidance is needed for developers on things such as landscaping, window orientation and balconies. Obviously a lot of those will come up in the design review process, but we're worried there's not enough guidance in there. On the park issues, as with the doubling of the number of households by 2030, that pdot estimated, obviously we're putting a lot more pressure on the existing parks, and would like to see some kind of commitment to using and increasing those resources, an definitely support the work on the kenton property at interstate and lombard. On the traffic issues, in the same transportation study, pdot estimated 2500 additional daily trips during the afternoon peak. Considering we already face congestion issues this is a bit alarming. In their analysis, which concluded that the proposed rezoning does not trigger further traffic study, they used -- they compared the new zoning with the albina community plan rather than to what's actually going on and what's actually there now. While legally correct, it's not entirely satisfying for the neighborhood, and we're concerned about similar stresses on other infrastructure, power, water, sewer, etc., and really think that a little bit of foresight now could prevent a lot of cost and headaches later on. And finally, we do support the neon sign district, which I believe you'll hear more about later. Thank you very much.

Adams: The concern about the water and sewer is based on --

Gale: Based on not much. We've asked at various points to get a little bit of reassurance that it will be okay. We've gotten some reassurance that "oh, it will be fine," but when you double the number of households, bring that many people in, I just have to think that something at some point's going to give. Like traffic, when big developments come in --

Adams: I've got the traffic piece. We have new sewers under interstate, so we're okay on the sewers.

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

Adams: I can tell you the sewer part. Maybe randy knows the water part.

Leonard: Water's great.

*******:** All right, scratch that off.

Adams: I hear your points on traffic. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you very much. Karla, how many folks have signed up to testify?

Moore-Love: We have 13.

July 16, 2008

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

Libbi Albright: Libby albright, 7044 north interstate. I'm a member of arbor lodge neighborhood association. I served as an alternate member of the community advisory group that was part of this process. I just wanted to say how very believed I am with the city's positive and community oriented approach to increasing population densities along mass transit corridors such as the interstate light rail corridor. Two years of hard work on the part of the city of Portland bureau of planning, the design commission, the Portland development commission, the office of transportation, neighborhood associations, and the community advisory group have yielded a workable plan featuring proposed zones. I support the exd zone along interstate avenue, including existing properties. I think the rhd zone with design review, which allows heights of 100 feet or more is excellent. I would support even the 125-foot height in the region between north interstate and the i-5 freeway, because it would enable developers as we've heard to build higher quality buildings, include more greenspaces, underground parking, stronger structures, etc. You, commissioners, in your wisdom and professionalism have been entrusted with the responsibility of doing what's best, not just for a relatively few people, but for the whole city and the entire region. Higher density along mass transit line is an accepted and well-reasoned city goal. Higher densities along the interstate corridor, which will mean higher buildings, will allow more people to afford to get to work, to shop, to get medical care, even as oil prices spiral upwards. I strongly support the proposed rezoning. I feel it's a well-reasoned solution to the important problem of increasing Portland's population density both for today and for the future. Thank you very much.

Potter: Thank you.

Michael Mintz: Good evening. My name is michael mintz. I'm here, I have the privilege of representing the mid century modern league, and --

Adams: Michael, could you move the microphone? There you go.

Mintz: Thank you. I'm representing the mid century modern league, and we of course -- as you know, we work for the preservation of postwar architecture, and i'm here for the neon signs. But first I do want to commend the planning commission for -- and everybody, the neighborhood people who have put so much work into this over the years. It's really remarkable to me in the last six months to watch the process. So, you know, I say to everybody who's worked so hard on this good job. We do want to see the neon signs preserved. So the mid century modern league is really pushing the idea of the neon sign district, because we feel that it's important to preserve our cultural and artistic heritage. I also see that there's room to maybe set the bar a little higher and set a precedent. You know, it's known that these larger neon signs really suck up a lot of energy. I think if they can keep these signs around, and do this in a sustainable manner, by using renewable energy sources, we could be setting a precedent for the rest of the country, and really -- really making a contribution to historical preservation of these. So that's about it. Although I do wonder about the financing of the preservation of the neon signs. You know, in my letter I didn't write anything about that, but i'm wondering if we could somehow tuck the financing for the preservation of the neon signs into the redevelopment plan and get money from the developers for the upkeep and the preservation of these signs, and to make them -- to power them with renewable energy to the extent that's possible. So I thank you all for your time and the opportunity to speak here. And that's it.

Potter: Thank you.

Fish: I have a question. My sister-in-law gave me a subscription to "atomic" magazine. Are there signs that have successfully done a neon sign that you're aware of?

Mintz: Las vegas has a neon sign zone. [laughter]

Fish: Maybe you've spent time there.

Leonard: You'll get a second phone call from vera.

July 16, 2008

Fish: I'm already in the doghouse. The other question is, do you have an idea for how we could make these sustainable?

Mintz: Well, I think we could be doing solar offsets and possibly wind offsets. And that would be something obviously that would take a bit of study. Myself, i've worked on restoration of neon signs for many years. That's what I was doing down in the bay area. Then I came up here and got a degree in environmental science. And now i'm looking at going into the solar industry. So, I mean, I think it's a unique opportunity to do something that's really different and to do it in a sustainable fashion. We need to keep these cool signs.

Adams: Yeah. We worked on the crown motel with -- who was it?

Mintz: Alyssa.

Adams: Reach to preserve that sign. You'll be happy to know that i'm working with tri-met. We're putting in -- we're close to being able to put in helixes on some of the new light rail stops on the green line in the east where there's a fair amount of steady wind that will power some of the station energy needs. So your idea is a good one, and we're sort of beta testing it in other places. There's also, brian borello's piece of art that is totally solar-powered, so it is within the realm of possibility, but you're right, neon sucks up a lot of power, but we can at least contribute to lighting them with renewable sources, if not entirely.

Mintz: Exactly. Thank you very much.

Molly Paris: Hello. My name is molly paris with the interstate corridor of business alliance. I represent the businesses in the interstate corridor. We've discussed this plan at a few meetings, and we are in favor of the plan. We feel that it's going to be good for the businesses in the interstate corridor. We think it needs the vibrance that is going to come with new construction, new businesses, new influx of people, and more use of the light rail. And so we feel that that also will bring more vibrance to the businesses in the area. Specifically our last meeting, we discussed the 125-foot max for buildings in the area. There was a bit of diversity in that. Some still are worried about the single-family home and that abutting to some of it, and the effects of all that, but the majority agrees that we like the 125-foot max. We think that we are -- our biggest concern in this area is that we want quality buildings coming into the area. And if that would help bring more developers, more competition for the area, more money, we feel that will enhance the area and bring a better product to the area. So we're in favor of it. Thank you.

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

Terry Vanderkooy: Okay. I will go away. I live at 3725 north massachusetts in the overlook neighborhood. First i'm very supportive of the overall plan. I think it's an excellent plan, and i'm also at the same time in support of the overlook neighborhood association input that you heard because I also was involved in some of those discussions. And the issues they raise. Because of my overall support for the plan, i'm a little bit -- almost embarrassed to request a very specific, very limited change, consideration of a change for the two-block area immediately north of overlook park on the west side of interstate avenue. That two-block area is a from overlook boulevard north to shaver street, and what i'm asking for is a modification to the maximum building height, surprise, for the interstate frontage just in those two-block areas. In terms of the proposed zoning, recommended zoning for the two blocks, i'm totally in support of that. I think it's excellent. I'm asking to modify the maximum building height to establish a maximum building height of 45 feet for that west interstate frontage, for those two blocks. That would be in lieu of the 65 feet that would be allowed by the ex zone. Here's my rationale briefly. There's alternates to the base zone maximum building heights, so this is not -- does not have precedent in the plan. The sizes and scale of future buildings in this particular area, on the interstate frontage, is significantly greater than in most of the corridor. That's because the block pattern, if you look at the block patterns, if you haven't already noticed that, in this area between overlook park and going street, they're north/south

July 16, 2008

blocks. So the interstate frontage is 400 feet long compared to typically throughout the corridor, 200-foot-long frontages. So that means the development of that interstate frontage block would result in a building that has greater scale than elsewhere in the corridor. Plan guidelines call for sensitive transitions to the low density residential districts. This request would provide a more streetscape for the area, because the area to the north has a 45-foot maximum building height on the interstate frontage on the west side. Also within this two-block area on the east side of interstate is the kaiser campus and the three culturally historical buildings that you heard about earlier. So basically what i'm asking for is a change only for those two blocks. I don't think it has an impact on the overall plan, which i'm very supportive of. Thank you.

Jillian Detweiler: Good evening, mayor and commissioners. I'm a senior planner at tri-met. A lot of the testimony here tonight is extremely gratifying to your transit agency. I just wanted to add a little bit of background first. The federal government paid for a research study on trends around transit oriented development around the country. They named Portland as one of the cities that can expect to have a tremendous increase, more than 200% increase in households that are going to be looking for transit oriented development. They have the household demographics that will make transit a first choice for them. And there are two ways to make that choice available. We can increase the housing availability around the transit we already have, and we can increase the amount of transit that we make available. Frankly we'll have to do both if we want to satisfy the demands for the household changes we're going to see. Throughout this plan process, and I hate to be the one to bring it up, but I might as well bring it up, throughout this plan process we've had concerns about security on our max system. What I wanted to say is that tri-met is working hard to provide what is essentially a stopgap measure in terms of an increased security presence on our max system. We need to do that. We'll continue to do it, but the best way to address safety on max is will you vibrant active station areas that have a good balance of people and activities, that are used throughout the day and into the evening. And so my hope for this plan is that it stimulates that kind of development at our station areas, a place like the prescott station where we have had two significant incidents. Today it's fronted on one corner by a one-story car parts sales shop, and then you have a large parcel that is slated for redevelopment, and right now is boarded-up homes. So those are conditions where it's going to be hard for us to be successful. So i'm excited to see the plan move forward so that we can really get at the root causes and create a much better environment for a safe max system.

Larry Mills: Honorable mayor, fellow commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is larry mills. I reside at 1406 north winchell. I cut my teeth as a community activist with this plan, attending many meetings with michael harrison leading the charge. The results of the plan were begrudgingly accepted by the communities with the understanding that zoning would be revisited once light rail became a reality. Much has changed since then. I volunteered to sit on the current advisory committee examining the zoning issues. I was selected an an alternate member. After several meetings I quit attending, feeling this process lacked credibility. Here are my concerns. It became clear early on that the current process wasn't planning at looking at other options, but rather tweaking the current recommendations. In 2001, city council adopted the kenton downtown plan spoken about earlier. This plan concentrated density around light rail station location while maintaining much of the -- as much of the residential neighborhood as possible. When I approached the bureau of planning staff, I was told that we looked at that model, an we decided it wasn't workable. I don't know who we are, but that's the answer I got. When the albina community plan was adopted, rh zoning was recommended for large areas of the transit corridor. Rh zoning had a 65-foot height limit. Early in the current meetings I kept hearing rh zoning of 100 feet. When I questioned this, I was informed that the 65-foot limit was increased if development was within a certain distance of light rail. That's interesting. I was on the tri-met citizen advisory committee working on light rail for many years, and never heard about that. Apparently this change

July 16, 2008

was done administratively with no public input. That's when I decided this process had little, if any credibility. Why go through the public process? The transit corridor isn't the same as 15 years ago. When the corridor was established the area appeared more blighted on the east than on the west side of interstate avenue. Well, that's not the case any longer. Increased homeownership, coupled with rising home prices, has substantially altered the residential landscape. Consequently the determination to only densify the east side, is no longer a compelling arguments. Both neighborhoods are well established and well maintained. When developing the albina community plan members felt that "d" overlay provided a safeguard, an opportunity for citizens to weigh in on projects through design review. In reality most developers follow the administrative path of design guidelines, there by foregoing public involvement. All in all this public process appears to be smoke and mirrors. I wonder how many citizens affected by your decision have a clue what's coming down the pike. These are established, historic neighborhoods. As much as possible these neighborhoods should be protected. This approach is simply too broad-brushed. Interestingly i'm not against growth, just bad planning.

Adams: I missed the first part, larry, of your comment. So you're opposed to -- cue quickly summarize because you're someone who I know and whose opinion I respect. Can you summarize quickly? I'm sorry, I had to use the restroom.

Mills: The first project on montana, 2 1/2 blocks from a light rail station, and I think that what I was hopeful of in the process was that we would have an opportunity to look at other options, and really look at the zoning carefully. And we put a lot of time on the kenton downtown plan trying to come in to something where we're really putting the density station locations and trying to maintain those residential neighborhoods, and I see high density popping up here and popping up there in this transit corridor with really no rhyme or reason. It really needs to be near the station locations if that's what you're trying to support.

Adams: Thank you.

Potter: Thanks, folks. Please call the next three.

Potter: Thanks for being here, folks. State your name when you speak. You each have three minutes. Why don't you go ahead and begin.

Douglas Hartman: Mayor, commissioners, my name is douglas hartman. I reside at 4615 north colonial. In the overlook neighborhood. I've been a longtime resident in overlook, a realtor in north Portland, and one of the cag members on this project. I was also heavily involved in the albina plan, zoning in that, as well as the sars project. First i'd like to commend julia and kevin for their work and their outreach. This project really did match and exceed any previous efforts in our area, in reaching out to the communities, and getting them involved. They did a great job on that. My primary concern in the redevelopment of the interstate corridor all along, long before this zoning effort, has been the quality of development that we can expect. And I believe that zoning is not the number one problem, but that parcel assemblage is indeed the problem, and what we've got is a lot of small parcels that stand to be developed, and potentially with lower-quality development. So anything that can be done to facilitate increased quality is something i'm supportive of. And I think there are a lot of elements of this plan that directly address that. And the height is one of those. Now, i'm not suggesting that someone shouldn't be anxious about 125-foot building next to them, however the difference between 100 and 125, I think, is probably irrelevant. This reminds me a lot of the "a" overlay issue that occurred in the albina community plan when a group got together and convinced the neighborhood, overlook in particular, that we were going to have granny flats in every other parcel, a neighborhood where we would have traffic problems, and that it was going to be completely unmanageable in no time. As a canadiens, overlook was one of the few neighborhoods in the city that didn't have the overlay for a number of years. We've had it for over a decade now, and I can probably count the number of granny flats on one or two hands at the most. And I think there's an element of this, too, particularly in the overlook part. If you look at -- and the

July 16, 2008

concern is predominantly, not entirely, but predominantly on the west side of interstate. If you look at the depth of zoning along interstate, and the economics of it, it's just very unlikely to occur. The other thing I'd like to remind people is that since the '60s there's been over a 20% drop in the population in those neighborhoods up there, and the loss of services that comes with that. And what I think would be a good measure of success of this plan is an increase in population and the commensurate services that we want in those neighborhoods. Thank you.

Hallie Joyce: I'm halle joyce, a mere member of the neighborhood association, which what I basically want to say is that chris duffy has done a jam-up job, making sure that in our neighborhood, which is arbor lodge, this information is not only available, it comes in meetings, it's on the table at festivals and events to discuss. I have only lived in the neighborhood for three years, and discovered the neighborhood association somewhere in there, and have been really impressed with the grassroots determination to be broad and open and good communicators in our arbor lodge neighborhood, having lived many years in a place where planning was a dirty word. It's especially impressive.

David Chott: Hi, mayor and commissioners. My name is david cotton, the land use co-chair for the overlook neighborhood association. In my testimony, I'd like to talk about the process leading up to today. As we know, the community advisory group convened for 14 months for an exhaustive planning process, and heights over 100 feet were never mentioned during that time. In fact, planning bureau staff often said they felt 100 feet was too high, and there was an expectation being said of maybe we'd have a 75-foot maximum building height. So we were surprised that the plan emerging from that process had several areas of 85 feet and one pocket of 100 feet. But I thought maybe 85 and 100 feet represent the best compromise coming out of that. You know, I welcomed increased density along the yellow line. I think that makes sense. So that's kind of what I was thinking, but then, you know, it's proposed to make all the 85-foot and 100-foot areas eligible for 125 feet. And that was after the community process ended. You know, that is a big difference going from 85 to 125 feet in quite a few areas. That's a 40-foot increase to just kind of throw in at the end. So I was shocked that that drastic increase came at what seemed like the last minute. So if we want to go to 125 feet in interstate, I really feel it should have been openly discussed much earlier in the timeline. So I oppose the increase in height to 125 feet for two reasons. First is that this last-minute height increase seems like bad process. It's frustrating to engage in the process of all the options that are really on the table are not shared with you. You know, we only heard 100 feet as the maximum height. And then kind of having 125 feet come out at the end was frustrating, especially height was the single most contentious issue during that process. Now with the 125-foot increase coming at this late stage, it's not been subject to more thorough community process. Going to 125 feet in a residential neighborhood seems to be experimental. I'm not aware of any precedent in Portland of what these tall buildings will look like next to single-family homes. My understanding is that many buildings in the pearl are not this high. Our neighborhood is not a blank slate like the pearl or south waterfront, where sensitivity is warranted going that high where you have pre-existing landscape of people that have lived there a long time. I'm not sure that 125 feet can ever be in scale with my neighborhood, but if we're going to go to 125 feet I think the implementation should have greater public process. I would encourage the city to, you know, delay that, if that's what we want to do, then we should do it the right way, make sure we're doing it in the right places with the right conditions. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you, folks. [applause] please, no clapping. Thank you. Thanks for being here, folks. When you speak, please state your name. You each have three minutes.

Alexsandra Johnson: Good evening. My name is alexandra. I'm a member of the community advisory group for this project, and a member at large on the arbor lodge neighborhood association. I also both live and do business in the interstate corridor. My perspective of this project has evolved greatly over the last 18 months. In the beginning I was opposed to the idea of even 75-

July 16, 2008

foot-high buildings. Although it took me quite some time to wrap my mind around florida area ratios and other building and city regulations, I finally understand the benefits of increasing building heights. If we are to truly have a high density transit oriented corridor, 125-foot height limits in rhd zones will be mandatory for our success. Josh pointed out to me that your choice is either spreading out or going up if we're going to have this many people coming into our corridor. In today's "the Oregonian," rene mitchell wrote a column regarding this zoning issue. She said one of the community's request was to cap new buildings at six stories. That request was made by a handful of members from the overlook neighborhood association. I would like to point out there are several other neighborhoods in the corridor that will be affected by this decision and the overlook does not speak for all of us. For those of us a bit more flexible and forward-thinking, we want a plan that will grow with our neighborhood and the influx of people expected to arrive in the following decade. Making maximum use of the light rail and bringing new customers for existing and new small businesses can be a good measure of the this plan's success. With higher height limits in limited areas we can benefit from taller, slimmer buildings with room for greenspaces, desperately needed north of killingsworth, subterranean parking and design review for all large scale projects which will bring more neighborhood involvement. Quality concrete construction and design will give us livability for generations to come. Lacking foresight has perilous repercussions in the past. The albina plan of 1993 was out of date for this year just 10 years after it was formed. Northeast killingsworth is still experiencing problems with outdated planning. I support the overall plan as well as the added amendments as do the organizations I belong to, and i'm enthusiastic about an urban renewal area that will thrive and a future we can be proud of. Thank you very much.

Dan Haneckow: Dan haneckow on north longview, pretty close to the prescott street station area. I've been very impressed with the way this process has been going, and my only caveat is the kind of late arrival of the 125-foot limit. Once again as other people have much more eloquently stated the process does beg a certain amount of questions, why did it come in when it did as opposed to during the public discussion. By and large, though. I think that the plan is quite sound, and nobody wants to see interstate as it was in 1985. So I think that we should look closely at this height increase, maybe even set it aside for more consideration, because it is a rather new item in the debate. Another concern that I have is the amount of density that we have on the tri-met system right now in that area is -- it's a little crowded. I recall reading fairly recently that the loadings on the yellow line are up 10%, and oftentimes those cars are single-car trains. So 10% on a loaded single-car train is quite noticeable. And so I would like to see that -- that increase in -- in trains going along with the increase of density. And then the final thing is, I believe, that people's sense of place is very important, and especially in a time of great change zoning-wise, and so i'd like to put forth my support of the neon sign district. One thing that I would think that would be outside of the box, we could look at these signs perhaps as public art or large found public art that would preserve people's memories of the area and at the same time bring a new area that isn't generic. And so with those three concerns, by and large i'm impressed with the process, and impressed with the plan. Thank you.

Joshua Stein: Mayor, commissioners, my name is josh stein, an architect with michael willis architectures, as well as a member of the community advisory group for the north interstate rezoning project. As you've heard, there are many issues and concerns regarding this plan. And I would like to reiterate the overall goals and aspirations of this project that we tried to achieve, both through the community advisory group process, and as i've seen in the present plan today. This strategy simply is to allow flexible zoning that is market-friendly, thought out with streetscape and right-of-way standards review under the design commission all incorporated into a transit-oriented model of growth that I feel most people feel is an ideal model of growth for this corridor and for many other parts of the city. The strategy also intends to allow neighborhoods to accommodate the

July 16, 2008

present needs and their future needs, both anticipated future needs and unanticipated future needs, and I think these unanticipated future needs under lies the importance of the flexibility that this plan offers. So the overall plan and zoning is not shoehorned into a pattern that might be outdated 10 years from now. I believe a strategy also allows a best combination, allowing basically the market to determine the use with zoning regulations and design review with neighborhood input to create the most appropriate building form while in a sensitive integration into the existing and evolving neighborhood corridors. Much has been said about the building height issue, an issue early on in the community advisory group discussions and continues to be. I won't get into minutia, but I believe if there's questions from a building architecture standpoint, I can certainly answer questions about that, but i'd like to close with the acknowledgment that the change toward this transit oriented pattern brought by this rezoning plan will not be easy, but it is necessary to accommodate our future growth and aspirations of our great city. Thank you.

Potter: Thank you.

Kathy J. Martin: Good evening, council, mayor Potter. I'm grateful for the opportunity to speak about this plan. I'm just an average citizen who lives in north Portland. I live at 1431 north dekum in Portland. I have concerns about this plan. We're all talking about all the people that are coming, but i'm thinking about the people that are here now. And I went to two of these planning meetings, and there weren't more than 50 people at these planning meetings. I was told the largest group was about 80 people. I believe there's a large group of citizens in the interstate corridor actually have very little idea about what's going on with this rezoning, because they haven't been informed enough. I also have concerns about Portland. It's one of the most livable cities in the united states, right? But who owns the sky? I like to see sunsets and sunrises, and I hear people want to rise the buildings and take it away. How about the people who want to put windmills on their property to generate electricity? I'm also concerned about the environmental impact. The average person, I saw a program, "national geographic's" carbon footprint, and they stated in that that the average person produces about 20 pounds of liquid waste -- 20 gallons of liquid waste a day. And in the course of a year, there's about 22 tons of carbon waste produced by each individual. Also in the course of a year, we use about 28,000 gallons of water just to shower. With global warming no longer a debate, more of a fact, and the possibilities that there'll no glaciers on mount hood and the willamette river could possibly go dry in 100 years, I think that we have to think about that. And because of that, I think that western be thinking more -- I think that growth should be controlled. I think something like boulder, colorado, does. About 2% a year, raise the population, keep new blood coming into the city, but all this new planning is -- and a great many people here have talked about how wonderful and what it's going to do, but I remember in 1953 when the commerce secretary announced that nuclear power was going to be so cheap that we wouldn't even have electric meters put on our house. So ever since that time i've been a little skeptical of that government planning. I'm out of time. But I hope that i've planted some seeds for thought.

Potter: Thank you. Thank you for your time. Gil kelley and julia, could you come back up? There's a couple questions.

Fish: Gil and julia, I have questions off the testimony. Some of this is just helping me with a learning curve as the the newest member of this body. I heard concerns about the 125-foot limit. My question is what protections do neighbors have in this area through the design process that there will be some kind of process that ensures good design, not something that is just rubber-stamped through?

Kelley: Let me address that question and then turn it over to julia. There was one testifier who mentioned through a typical design process outside of the central city, which this is, you would have the choice as an applicant to either go through a discretionary design review, which involves at a minimum staff discretionary review, and in most cases design commission review of the project, or the alternative of abiding by the more objective design standards that are embedded in a code. I

July 16, 2008

wanted to make clear that in the case that we're talking about here, to exceed the 100 feet to go up to the 125 feet, they're essentially asking for permission to do that as something not as part of the base entitlement, and therefore would be required to go through the discretionary review process, and that would involve not only neighbor notification, but the ability to testify and influence the project at the design review commission. So I wanted to make that feature of it clear.

Adams: Not automatic?

Kelley: It's not automatic, not in any way.

Fish: But that's a significant protection. Gil, we had a couple of people talk about this process question, having this lengthy process, lots of public participation, and then all of a sudden near the end of the process design review comes up with a significant tweak.

Kelley: Yeah.

Fish: People feeling disenfranchised. Could you talk about that as either a glitch in our process or what's the safety valve when that does happen?

Kelley: I'd defer to Julia to talk about factually about what occurred. I don't want to pretend to know that one way or the other, but what I would say is that the design commission and planning commission in particular act much as you're acting today. That is to say they don't declare their decision early in the process. They do it based on the testimony they receive and the balancing. I think in the case of the design commission in this case they heard from the design community and from their own membership that the flexibility, the ability to go through a discretionary process to get that extra height would make the difference between a person willing to go to a different construction type versus not. And so I think in their view, what you were hearing from Tim Eddy, for example, was that nobody's really going to use that 100 feet, because it doesn't give me enough increment of height to actually go to a different construction type. So that was part of the testimony that they heard, and the part of what influenced their decision. The planning commission heard that system from them, from the design commission, and from other testifiers. So I guess I would say that the -- while we like to have those full-fledged discussion at the beginning, and I don't want to say that it didn't occur there, both those commissions, who are advisory to you, make their decisions on the basis of everything that came before them, including testimony that comes that night as it is to you here. The reason that we have a process that involves them first and then you have a de novo hearing, the whole process in front of you, so if they make any change to draft proposal that came from staff that's subject to testimony before you. So that's the sort of extra step in the process here. Would we have liked this issue to be more robustly debated earlier, probably, but I guess the check and balance in the process is you have your own hearing where you take their recommendations and weigh that against the testimony you've heard.

Fish: One other last question. With the kind of development that could occur under this plan, we're going to probably have your more cars and displacement of cars on to side streets and impacts on neighborhoods. So could you talk a little bit about how we manage additional cars under this plan?

Kelley: Yeah. And I want to say that the team included pdot as part of this. Really the one with expertise, so I'd defer to Courtney on that question.

Duke: Jerry, Courtney Duke, office of transportation working with the team. There's a couple different answers to that question, I guess. Part of what we look at is the emphasis on using the existing infrastructure that's already there in terms of light rail. Also parking is not required along this corridor 500 feet from the light rail line or high capacity transit, parking is not required. It can be offered if the developer chooses, but it's not required as a part of development. So from our perspective, looking at the types of development that might come through, as well as those provisions of not having to require the parking, although we do think there is additional traffic that's assumed, a lot of that traffic is already absorbed in a part of our transportation safety plan and the regional transportation plan, a lot of the plans we've already done, that traffic's already assumed in

July 16, 2008

that -- in our modeling, and the projects we've picked for the tsp, the projects we're working forward on, so that when we looked at the exact zoning proposal for this part, for the zoning proposal, a number of trips, and therefore the number of cars were pretty minimal, because so much growth was already assumed because of the albina community plan. But there's some other things that we've put into the plan regarding what we call transportation demand management programs. So looking at doing another smart trip in the area, which we did right when the light rail was put in. The right-of-way standards that we're working on is looking at improving the bike and ped facilities in the area, to increase connections to transit, to improve, you know, the walking and biking environment, the bike master plan that's coming through, looking at doing more bikeways and things like that. We're looking at what andre had mentioned, in terms of the mode splits, trying to get more people to be using the transit and biking and walking and making the environment better for that. Does that help answer that?

Saltzman: Just one clarifying question. Gil, I thought you said in response to commissioner fish's question, that the break point between different types of construction between wood frame and steel, I guess, and concrete is 100 feet. I always thought it was more like 50 feet. I thought you couldn't go higher than 50 feet with a wood frame.

Kelley: You can get up to at least 65 feet with wood frame.

Saltzman: You can't do 100?

Kelley: No. But I think what the testimony was, is the differential between the 65 and the 100 wasn't enough to justify the higher construction costs type to go. But if you can get a couple more floors to go to 125, suddenly --

Adams: Got to go to steel.

Kelley: -- it was possibly to get to steel. That then freed up options that they thought should be considered by the neighborhood and by the commission in terms of additional open space or the ability to justify cost-wise underground parking.

Saltzman: Thanks.

Adams: Thanks, mayor. So consistent with my request of the clinton division plan, i'd like to see you develop some performance measures that we can judge whether the various goals of this plan are being met. So some performance measures and then some monitoring sort of expectations of how we would judge that I think would be very useful. So the assumptions that pdot has made about mode split. If it's different for different sort of areas of the corridor, then I think that would be useful to report back to the neighborhood and to report sort of -- allow us to learn what's working, what's not working. I also think, then, with performance measures we better be able -- you know, we're either going to provide ourselves reassurance -- the neighborhood reassurance that this idea of more increment leads to better buildings, although somewhat subjective, at least it will require us to have that conversation of how things are really going along the way in an increment of years, you know, much shorter than 10. One observation that i've had is that redevelopment along this line, since I use this line on a nearly daily basis, and for the record I have -- I own property -- I live in kenton, not part of the study area formally, but people should know I live in the area just north of the study area, that redevelopment on this line has been underwhelming, the height has been in the wrong places along this corridor, and not necessarily lined along stops. Killingsworth and interstate, where pdc struggles to find a developer that makes things pencil, would this affect that project or is that project going forward right now and therefore is not affected by this?

Kelley: I don't think it would affect it --

Gisler: The height is lower than --

Kelley: I think it's going forward. At least that's our current understanding, is it's in motion.

Adams: Okay. And then what's been the experience of if you own a house in this area, it's a single-family house, and you're listening to staff and others propose and the council consider, you know,

July 16, 2008

120-foot buildings. What's the impact on their property values? They have the ability to stay there or they have the ability to redevelop as well or -- what sort of accommodation is made?

Kelley: Clearly they have the ability to stay, stay as long as they'd like, to redevelop if they'd like, to sell if they'd like. The plan is not contemplating driving people out. It contemplates increment change over a number of years, but clearly in those areas where we've indicated the greatest height, we do anticipate fairly substantial changes over the years. I mean, I don't think we want to hide that fact. We didn't do any sort of rigorous prediction of property values one way or the other. I think our experience over the years is generally where we've seen redevelopment, we've seen property value increases.

Adams: Those people that have a residential zone and are -- this would zone them to commercial or cx or ex zone, is generally property that moves from residential to ex or cx become more or less valuable to the owner.

Kelley: It depends on a lot of circumstances, but in a general sense it becomes more valuable, because there's a broader market for uses.

Adams: They can do more -- a variety of different uses with the property?

Kelley: Yeah.

Potter: Other questions?

Saltzman: Just one more question. There was a question from a gentleman about the two blocks north of overlook park, which has 400-foot faces, lower height. What was your response, your rationale behind the recommendation?

Gisler: Right now that's zoned ex, so that would be a 65-foot height. On the rest of the corridor we're trying to get full block zoning, but as you go south of going it's very difficult because the lot configuration is more difficult. So there is a pattern a little bit north of having a storefront commercial, and that would be 45 feet. This was always kept at --

Saltzman: North of going?

Gisler: Right. Right. I guess, you know, one of my concerns would be just that the property owners of the palms motel and then that block north of the palms, that the property owners aren't here to kind of hear this -- hear this proposal, and it would be decreasing, you know, the development potential.

Fish: A question for julia. I live in northeast, but I travel this corridor quite a bit, in part because my daughter uses sports lab. So i'm familiar with the area. You know, one thing we're going to hear a lot about these kinds of rezonings, we don't want another pearl district, we want something unique to our neighborhood and our character. So is this laying the groundwork for a mini or is this going to develop in a different way in your judgment?

Potter: Mini pearl?

Adams: Hand it to the commissioner. He doesn't beat a beat.

Fish: You know what I mean, we hear this in a lot of places, they don't want the pearl district style development to spring up everywhere, they want something that's unique to the character of the neighborhood. So do you have a response?

Gisler: Well, the heights that we're proposing in the interstate corridor are not nearly as intense as in the pearl. So right away you won't have the absolute heights that you have the in pearl. I think also it's such a different place. The pearl was able to transform, whereas this area is going to be slow in transforming, because it's so long. It's 2 1/2 miles long. And so it's going to be eclectic for a long time with different heights. I don't see -- and I still come back to the neon sign district and things that can make it special and different, its own place.

Kelley: I wanted to distinguish between the area of floor ratio. In the cases where you've heard the request from the planning commission, design commission, for additional height, that doesn't come with additional floor areas. So it's essentially allowing a different sculpting of building, but not more than what was in the base proposal, base recommendation.

July 16, 2008

Adams: Is there a template for the design commission to follow of what -- when we say unique to this part of town, what we mean by that. I mean, the neon signs, we'll work on that.

Gisler: In section 5 in the document, there's specific plan area -- plan area statements that will guide them as they're doing design review. The design commission spent a long time --

Kelley: Do you want to tick some of those off?

Gisler: It starts on page 77.

Adams: I see a picture of a pearl district building.

Gisler: Maybe just at the station.

Adams: I got you back.

Gisler: Page 78 starts what we call the Portland personality guidelines.

Adams: I see the belmont district.

*******:** There you go.

Adams: There's something from north Portland.

Gisler: We actually had trouble finding that midlevel, that 10-story building, because there's not -- there's lower. There's the five and six stories along belmont and hawthorne, but then when you get to the higher buildings, that's not what we're looking for either. So some of these pictures are going to other cities. But basically we've got the -- the guidelines give direction in the platform, and the neighborhood east. We talk about the focal point, we talk about the density in the lower residential communities. Someone testified in terms of if you're a single-family house in this transforming area, you know, what kind of protections will you get through design review. And so the guideline "g" -- or actually the guideline "f" that talks about the neighborhood east would be what the design commission would be looking at.

Adams: So it just -- it says strengthening the character of the individual station areas behind on what? What does that mean?

Gisler: So with the design -- with the guidelines, you'll also -- also it's part of the appendix. If you keep going to page 82. Each of the station areas have some text talking about what's special about each of the station areas. Then there's the graphic that I showed earlier that talks about just the -- the area, specifically in what kinds of development in each area.

Adams: So in our public outreach to the citizens, I mean do we ask them about what's the feel they want for the place for each of these stations?

*******:** The feel?

Kelley: I think that was part of the planning effort, how these words were derived, but during the application review these guidelines, at least the ones that pertain to specific geographic areas, need to be the structure of the discussion at the design commission. And so the testimony from the neighbors in affected residences and business owners would also be along the lines of defining these, whether the project proposal meets these, as you said earlier, commissioner Adams, through good designs in the eye of the beholder, but that subjective kind of discussion occurs within this framework, the same framework that is used by the design commission to make its decision, the framework that's advanced for the public and the public notice.

Potter: Further questions? Thank you, folks. We do have an amendment to exhibit c. Is that correct?

Duke: Exhibit e, the transportation memo.

Potter: To e?

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

Potter: Okay. Do I have a motion and a second.

Saltzman: So moved.

Adams: Second.

Potter: Please call the vote.

Adams: Since we're voting -- this is our only vote, right?

July 16, 2008

Potter: Yes.

Adams: I want to thank first and foremost the citizens that engaged in this process. Sounds like there was good debate. I would not feel comfortable voting for the change from 100 to 125 feet without this hearing and an opportunity to sort of discuss this. I think absent that, I would not feel comfortable, but the planning commission and the design commission and the city council are part of the process as well, and it's our job to study and listen, and I think that the fact that this is not an automatic 125-foot building, and that it has to have community input and a process outlined in the future, I can support that. Also want to thank the staff and the planning and design commission folks as well. These are hard, hard projects, but it is dealing with a lot of the nonconforming uses and i'm very grateful for your work on this two weeks in a row. I can't wait to see which neighborhood you're in next week. So with that -- oh, I also want to acknowledge and thank the mayor's leadership as the commissioner in charge of planning for seeing this project through. So i'm voting on the amendment. Aye. [inaudible]

Fish: I'd like to thank chris duffy for her testimony and for educating this commissioner about the problems of cellphone towers in residential areas, which this council will be taking up august/september under commissioner Saltzman's leadership. And to the folks who testified, as the newest member of this body, I appreciate the testimony and particularly the comments about process. I'm interested in looking into that at a greater level, deeper level, because I can understand how you would feel after all this time at the end having a different height come in to the equation, but I too am satisfied that this process anticipates that we get a de novo hearing and we get to hear from you about this, so there is a backstop, and it is with us. Commissioner Saltzman is the parks commissioner, so your comments about open spaces and particularly the kenton school i'm sure has found an audience here, and will be urging him to explore those. It's a terrific neighborhood, and I have very high hopes for this zoning change. So I thank you for -- and staff, I thank you for your excellent work on this. Aye.

Leonard: Aye.

Saltzman: Well, first of all, let me just respond to the park. I think that's a great idea. And as parks commissioner I will certainly work to be opportunistic as possible to make that a reality. It sounds like conversations are already occurring. So that's a great thing. I'd like to work to see that. I guess I want to sort of harken back to -- I think it was like 2005 when I attended an arbor lodge neighborhood association meeting, and, you know, one of the issues that came up at that point was the -- the feeling that there was a -- sort of a part left undone from development of the yellow line, and that was, you know, upzoning or rezoning of interstate. You know, I thought at the time, you don't usually get those types of statements at neighborhood association meetings, that there needs to be higher density, but I was very impressed as I always am with the arbor lodge neighborhood association, and overlook as well, and took that to heart, and my office as well, to get pdc to fund this study, and worked with gil kelley and the mayor's office to assign dedicated talent to make this process work. And i'm pleased to see that this process has worked very well, and I think that the -- it's great. I'm really -- i'm very supportive of the plan. I think the design review associated with 125 feet will serve us well and serve this neighborhood well. So I just really want to commend everybody, the citizens, planning, pdc, mayor's office for this process actually working and resulting in us here today -- or actually next week voting to make these zone changes a reality. So it's a great process, and i'm very pleased to support it and support this amendment. Aye.

Potter: I'd like to thank randy and dan and mayor-elect and minnie pearl for -- actually I do -- julia, you did a wonderful job, both in terms of how you engaged the community as well as your presentation tonight. I want to compliment the two neighborhood associations. It's really refreshing to hear citizens speak with such authority and eloquence and understanding land use and the issues. So I really appreciate everybody's testimony tonight. And I vote aye. What we have

July 16, 2008

done is -- [gavel pounded] all we've done is the amendment to this particular ordinance. Next week -- will it be next week, Karla?

Moore: It will be in the morning session, 9:30 session.

Potter: 9:30 session of council next wednesday we will take the final vote on it. So just in case you wish to come in for that. So gil, thank you, and your planning bureau.

Kelley: Mayor, a couple of other quick acknowledgements. I appreciate everything you said about the neighborhood leadership. It's been superlative in terms of spreading the word, involving people and bringing them in, even where there were disagreements on some points. Obviously julia, courtney and kevin who were mentioned did a great job, too, but I want to acknowledge mark ragette from the planning bureau who really worked on the urban design aspects of this, and joe zinder who really helped julia in the beginning to shape the process so it can be successful. Those two guys deserve a lot of credit as well. So thank you.

Potter: We're recessed until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow. [gavel pounded]

At 8:14 p.m., Council recessed.

July 17, 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 17, 2008 2:00 PM

Potter: The city council will please come to order. Karla, please call the roll.
[roll call taken]

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

Item 1032.

Potter: Commissioner Adams.

Adams: Thank you, mayor Potter. If we could have staff come forward. Council had the benefit of in work session, talking through the details of this project. But suffice to say that if we are fortunate and successful in extending light rail to the state of Washington and completing this leg, we will have completed the rail strategy -- strategy -- strategy set out, what? 25, 30 years ago. So tri-met along with pdot and p.d.c. And in partnership with metro and planners and a whole bunch of stakeholders who have been working hard on this. We'll get a quick briefing, covering a lot of the same ground but trying to answer questions that came up.

Mauricio Leclerc, Bureau of Transportation: Good morning. Mauricio Leclerc with pdot.

Paul Smith, Bureau of Transportation: Paul smith with pdot.

Leclerc: And as the said we'll go fast through the locally preferred alternative and walk through the recommendations that the city staff has identified for you to consider and then we have invited testimony and public testimony. Again, a lot of this was covered already, so here we go. Basically the resolution called for adopting the steering committee's locally preferred alternative, the c.p.l.a. And that's in your exhibit a. As well as accepting the recommendations on the columbia river crossing. Exhibit b and then addressing the post-work items. Exhibit c and a future design report led by tri-met and brought back to you and the planning commission for review before the project gets to detailed engineering level. So again, quickly, there were several options for this alignment and for the ultimate l.p.a. You can see in the map above, there were several columbia river crossing options. The one before, the northern one was 2003 locally preferred alternative and through the process, we developed several additional alignments. And then the second issue which alignment to go, just south of tacoma, the three maps below. Two were to just continue near mcloughlin. Main street, and the northern industrial area of milwaukie. And have a park-and-ride there with 600 spaces. The other option on the map to your right is to go through the tillamook rail line and connect to downtown milwaukie. And if -- the final -- the third item was to terminate the line. The two options there. The one on the l.p.a., to your left, was to terminate at lake road. That is at the southern tip of downtown milwaukie. Have a small park-and-ride there. Or continue .8-miles south to park avenue at mcloughlin at a thousand space park-and-ride. And the final was station as well as the park-and-ride. What the steering committee recommends and the city staff concurs is the first item, the columbia river crossing partnership. To have a new willamette bridge for transit, pedestrians and bicycles, as well as to adopt the consensus agreed upon modified assignment, which you have on the bottom of the map, we covered it last time. A little work was done to get to that consensus. And then to -- in the northern part of milwaukie, to go ahead with the

July 17, 2008

tillamook branch alignment and terminate at park avenue. That's the southern most. A thousand-space park-and-ride. However, funds cannot be found to meet the cost of the project. We will have a first phase, which will be to build a first phase from downtown Portland to downtown milwaukie and lake road and have a small park-and-ride there, but ultimately. Goal is to go to park. And the ten stations. And you walk from north to south, along the map here, also on your screen, you'll have -- the first will be lincoln. By p.s.u. And another one would be at south waterfront, water avenue and then cross the bridge. The river, i'm sorry, on a bridge that will accommodate bikes and transit, including ultimately streetcar. And then have another station at omsi and then continue along the railroad trackings and a station at clinton to serve the abernathy neighborhood. And then continue across powell and get on southeast 17th and have two stations there. And one at rhine with a pedestrian bridge over the tracks and another at hole gate by the tri-met headquarters facilities. And then at the end of 17th, the line veers east and go between the railroad tracks and the mcloughlin and it would veer south along mcloughlin and have a station at bybee. You've seen that overpass and finally, the last station would be tacoma with a thousand-space park-and-ride and then go to the city of milwaukie and have a single station at lake road. And from the park, a thousand space park-and-ride. That's basically the line. In terms of performance, the line would generate between 23 and 26,000 daily riders. This is the year 2030. The difference between the numbers in lake road and the longer extension would be the extra 3,000 riders. 9,000 to 12,000 new riders. Not just transferring from light rail. And by the year 2030, almost 90,000 jobs within a quarter mile of a station which is your typical walking distance. And in terms of the corridor, the corridor itself would experience a 60% growth in households and 42 in employment between 2005 and 2030 and it would lead to increased transit between d.a. And milwaukie. Double the transit [inaudible] l.p.a. That is before you for adoption. In terms of traffic impacts, there would be a net reduction of vehicle miles trafficked, about -- trampled about 700,000-miles. 460 hours delay reduction in the corridor. Lead to reductions in carbon emissions. Some of the issues, that the l.p.a. Identified, recommends in this case, combining and lengthen the harbor station. The environment impact station analyzed, the harbor station, which you see in the map, was intended to serve river place, instead of the l.p.a. Recommendation went through river place. But you needed to be located right on top of harbor drive and harrison, offramp where the streetcar goes. So it turned out to be very expensive and \$17 million and not generate much ridership and it hurt the project from a ridership perspective because it discouraged riders overall. In terms of the willamette river crossing, as I mentioned, the l.p.a. Recommends to mention included station holders from both banks of the river as well as agencies and some post l.p.a. Issues to be worked on from now on would be to continue to collaborate on the ohsu's campus plans, as well as to continue to work on bringing the streetcar loop and the couplet that should be built in this area, as well as to amend some of the street plans and greenway plans in the area and improve bicycle and pedestrian connection to the bridge as well as to deal with environment issues that are expanding. And the same with the omsi. As well as the development plans in the area. Including both omsi and the Portland opera. Potentially more. In terms of the bridge cross can, tri-met has begun a study. The city of Portland includes and our recommendation report back to council on the bridge design as well as the impacts on the environmental issues. As well as navigational clearance, both horizontal and vertical and to integrate the bridge to bicycle and pedestrian connections as well as the greenway plan and aesthetic issues are important, especially in the central city. An issue that came out of the l.p.a. Was to recommend harold station, that is located between hole gate and bybee in the northern part of the more land neighborhood and east moore land. Not build it right now, that will be year 2015 but instead build the tracks with offsets to accommodate a future station when we're ready. We'll define performance measures that will tell us when we'll build the station. And tri-met has done in the past, come back and built stations in the future. Some of the issues were that harold generated low ridership, about 1200, I think -- or 1400 riders and that included having a bridge over the tracks

July 17, 2008

to the east side to connect reed college. That added to the cost. By not having it right now, the project saves about \$14 million because the bridge would be [inaudible]. However, this hurt cost effectiveness because it slowed down the line again. However, the community and the neighborhoods around it do support the station and also to finding the funds to fund the bridge and whatever other amenities may be needed. Finally, the station would have a park-and-ride. And recommended 600 stations. Recommends a thousand patients spaces. Our traffic analysis we can support that extra. However transfer through the local streets and we need to continue to monitor that. Something to note, if we terminate the law on a first phase, lake road, we may have to increase the number of spaces in tacoma up to 1260 spaces. In terms of project cost, it varies between \$1.2 billion and 1.3.

sometimes 1.4 depending on how you do the calculations and we've identified -- we've identified funds already, about \$750 million would come from the federal government. That's the maximum we can ask. \$250 million comes from state lottery. 80-\$100 million we can get the federal government to pay because they let us charge the interest to the government. And \$72 million have been allocated to the line, the metropolitan improvement projects, that's regional funds. \$72 million. That leaves about \$75 million for local jurisdictions and tri-met to figure out. If we go to lake or about double, \$150 million if we go to park. However, if the federal transit administration raises the cap, and we get 60%, then the local share is reduced to \$120 million. And the financial strategy to locate those funds and to report back to the local jurisdiction by the end of 2008 and report as well to the state legislature on the funding strategy. Final slide, there's a lot of work to be done, staff has identified post-l.p.a. Work program and that's in exhibit c. Basically requesting tri-met to work with the city to develop a conceptual design report. That would be to report back to council on the optimal station location and maximize in the area. Lincoln would be an example. Lincoln harbor, to finalize what the ride location would be. And we'll work with the local state holders and do analysis for that. As well as to integrate light rail with ohsu, omsi and other plans on both sides of the river. Balance the goals, environmental and navigational concerns. Minimize the impacts. We need to work to minimize property impact to the best of our ability. And to mitigate traffic in the areas. And report back to city council on the bridge design and conceptual design report. And to develop a financial strategy for the 0 project and to initiate final environmental studies and preliminary engineering and that will take about a year. 2010 and following that, will be the final design and engineering and construction and the line would open up in 2015. That's basically the presentation.

Potter: I had a question about the transportation department's slide.

Leclerc: Sure.

Potter: What is that based on? Some future out-year --

Leclerc: Yeah, it's 2030 numbers. Basically we used metro models, the land use changes in the corridor in the year -- from now to 2030. Based on zoning that's allowed today on our comprehensive plan, that resulted in about 22,000 households and 8,000-9,000 jobs and we ran a transportation model that determined how many of those people will take the car versus bus or light rail in this case or walk. So it's a very complex process that metro undergoes and their a lead agency in this type of analysis.

Potter: All of these numbers representing new homes, businesses and jobs?

Leclerc: Basically the future in Portland in 2030.

Potter: The only part -- I sort of figured that until I looked at the first two figures. One was the daily riders and the second was new system riders. It sounded like the other remainder were already riding.

Leclerc: Yeah, there's a shift between buses to light rail, as well as -- but in this case, this project would in addition to that generate about 12,000 new system riders. Basically who would otherwise use other modes.

July 17, 2008

Potter: Out of the 22,000 new households and 89,000 new jobs.

Leclerc: Actually more. About half of them would be new riders, to tri-met. And potentially more than the numbers that you have before, because it would capture also folks that could drive further and use the park-and-ride facilities. Along the corridor, there's an increase in 100,000 jobs in about a 50,000 households if you expand the boundary of corridor. So there's a lot of market there for light rail. It would be tapping into people walking to the stations on biking or driving to the park-and-ride facilities.

Adams: Thank you. Invited testimony. We have metro councilor, robert liberty. Tri-met fred hanson and planning commission president, don hanson. There he is. Hi, don. Followed by howard shapiro. Councilor liberty.

Robert Liberty: Good afternoon, mayor, members of the city council. I'm robert liberty. A member of the metro council. In the last 18 months i've chaired the steering committee. I want to acknowledge bridget here in the front row who has supervised this project and done a fantastic job and also thank your staff and the staff at tri-met, odot, clackamas county for their participation in this project. I also want to thank a group that I don't think is acknowledged enough which is the citizens. The citizens who turned out at the open houses and hearings who provided great advice on everything from the alignment to the location of stations and design of stations and how to make the project a safer project for both of community and the users of the project and they really have added value to this effort. Also, thank brad newman my predecessor as chair of the steering committee. This project has a 15-year history. 15 years. After the first line was built, discussion began with the south-north line and it was assumed there would be a line through southeast Portland into clackamas county and this line has had the support of residents of southeast Portland, or most, from the beginning and so they're anxiously awaiting its construction. , the statistics you've heard, I want to mention a few other of interest. 22,000 new households will be in walking distance of light rail if this line is built. And 85,000 employees will be within walking distance of this line. It will facilitate of growth of 5,000 new homes in the south waterfront and about the new bridge, we tend to forget it's not just carrying light rail, but also the streetcar, buses and pedestrians and cyclists. 14,000 bus riders in southeast Portland will have a shorter trip as a result of this project. And that's a substantial benefit. It will facilitate a science education corridor. Between omsi and ohsu and p.s.u. at a time with gas prices as high as they are and concern about our planet's future, this new line will save about 70,000-miles of travel a day and that's a significant contribution, I believe, to the goals set in Oregon to reduce greenhouse gases. And something about money -- oh, one other statistic. It will increase the use of transit for work trips by up to 24%. People coming from southeast walk Washington, 24% new transit ridership. About money, we always have to be concerned about money for this and other projects. The good news is that thanks to leadership of mr. Newman and others and tri-met, particularly the legislature two sessions ago confirmed the use of lottery money to the tune of \$250 million. Sterling performance of past projects. And a vote of the joint policy advisory committee of transportation, metro, another \$72 million, leaving about \$200 million left, to cover the gap, and we think is possible to cover and i'm not going to step on toes by suggests any amounts. But the city of Portland is a major beneficiary and we intend to be a generous participant in the financial of the project. I think commissioner Adams talks about what this represents, not just the creation of a south-north line, but 40 years ago, we had a debate over a freeway. That would have gone through where my house is now. In fact, we wouldn't have been on one of the lanes, but they typically have a slope with bark dust on it.

Don Hanson: It would have gone through mine too.

Liberty: And there was a decision that there would be a -- developing a light rail system. And with I guess the exception possibly, the barbur line, this and the action taken really realized that vision more rapidly than anyone would have anticipated. That we would be in the verge of completing a system and it's a substantial system for a mid-size metro area. I heard the mayor of

July 17, 2008

milwaukee, wisconsin speak with chagrin about their inability to get a single project under way during the period we're looking for a 50-60-mile light rail system. This is an exciting moment and I hope we have full support from all of you. If I leave, it's not because i'm not interested in hearing more but there's an hearing going on about another important project at metro across the river. Thank you very much for your time.

Adams: Does it include a bridge?

Liberty: What was that?

Adams: Does it include a bridge?

Liberty: It would always include a bridge. The question is new or existing. [laughter]

Saltzman: Before you leave, I have to ask you, since you mentioned barbur, is that next? Has that become the next logical place for light rail to go? Fred may want to comment on that too.

Liberty: It's changing as we discuss it. But I think the design of the next generation of the design of the system is something we really need to think about so i'm going to hold answering one way or the other. Because I want to see how much money do we have and how do we design the system. The role of buss is important. How many people have access. There's a lot of people who expect a line in barbur and I think in recent past, mayor of tigarad expects a line. It may be logical, but i'd like to think how much money we have and how do we design the entire system for the next 20 or 30 years.

Adams: Council might recall that my request we appropriated money to do rail planning within the city, which looks at both corridors for potential streetcar and/or light rail expansion and a consideration of future corridors around bus planning. That now goes to concentric wider circle with the region before the whole thing sort of comes back to all of the decision making bodies. And that will serve as the rail strategy for the next 25, 30 years, so the planning work for that is under way with all of these jurisdictions.

Liberty: One of the other issues, commissioners, the discussion we've had is we've talked about the need to link the suburban centers, directly as well and this project creates some potential for that and the commuter line opens in the fall in Washington county. That's an architectural thing we need to think about. That you have for your time. Pardon me for leaving.

Fred Hansen: Thank you mr. Mayor. I'm general manager of tri-met and i'm pleased to be here to support the action on your calendar for the approval of the locally preferred alternative. My board, the tri-met board, took action to approve that locally preferred alternative on july 9th and other jurisdictions will proceed. First I do want to be able to thank commissioner of transportation sam Adams for his leadership on the steering committee as well as the committee robert liberty chairs and to sue keel, the director of pdot as well as her staff. A lot of very good partnerships. In the interests of time, I will not repeat much of what you heard, although I would certainly second the issues around ridership, the price of gasoline, the opportunities to be able to connect with an important part of the region, to be able to have those jobs and residences be able to connect. I would like to be able to focus for a moment, on a bridge, for the 21st century, not to the 21st century, but it is truly I think an opportunity to be able to not only have a signature bridge be built, but it's an opportunity to have an alternative mode bridge. As have been noted but I would like to reemphasize. This will carry light rail because of the nature of the track and electrification. It will be able to carry streetcar and pedestrian and bike and particularly, I want to be able to emphasize, the hawthorne bridge, bike lanes, being attractive as you compare it to the ross island with only one narrow sidewalk. Here it's a minimum. 12 feet for the pedestrian, bike lanes. Importantly, it will carry bus, tri-met buses. Those that are, in fact, on the ross island bridge, the 9, 17, carry substantial loads, and by bringing them on to the bridge, we'll make those bus riders have shorter trips for the distance and going through both of congested elements of the ross island bridge, but particularly that spaghetti like fashion on the west end that's very congested. And this is obviously a benefit. I might note that it is also, particularly important in relation to the federal government

July 17, 2008

and their participation. These are monies that we're applying for that aren't formula but rather discretionary that are allocated by. One of the factors they look at is the benefit in terms of time saved by transit users and although we certainly have a number of disagreements with whether that's a good cost effective analysis, it is the analysis used and we must, in fact, play by it. The ability to bring bus riders over that bridge provides somewhere in the range of 1/4 of the transit user benefits we're calculating for to put ourselves in a competitive position. It's an important part. But it's not a bridge for trucks or cars. It really is an attorney mode bridge that I think will be tremendously important. I might note also in the south waterfront, even if we had unlimited budgets, the ability to make the roadway system carry all the traffic that will necessarily be in and out of that area would be impossible. It's not a budget constraint. It's a physical constraint. It cannot be accommodated unless we have high-capacity transit. And that's going to be tremendously important not only to the south waterfront, but the connection to the tram and ohsu, certainly the largest employer within the city limits of Portland is critically important. With that, I would like to be able to recommend, again, approval of the locally preferred alternative. I think it has many, many benefits and commitments that we have made in the construction and employment of people locally and people of color, women, emerging businesses. Is something that stands with this as well. Lastly, let me disagree ever so slightly with what Robert said. This is not a completion of a system. This is just another very important link in a continually expanding high-capacity transit system in our region. Thank you. I'd be happy to answer questions. There are two studies under way. One the study within the city of Portland that commissioner Adams referred to. There's a transit study for the region as a whole by metro. My personal judgment is that Barbur should be the next alignment. There's the growth occurring on the 99-w, particularly into Tigard. Soon, literally within 20 years, Tigard will be -- it's then projected population against today's numbers, about the fourth or fifth largest city in the state of Oregon. It's unbelievable the amount of growth and if you look at the Joe Cortwright numbers. The young and restless, that corridor is very, very important. The ability to connect those areas is important. The more circular fashion needs to be had as well as.

Hanson: Don Hanson chair of the Portland planning commission. We voted to support the locally preferred alternative. It was an easy conclusion to reach. The staff did excellent work. I compliment the project design team. They gave us clarity about not just the overall, but the details on where the stations should go. We got a lot of great presentation material on the Willamette crossing. Why is the bridge the way it is. We understand that completely and support it now. I'll highlight three points in the letter of recommendation that we forwarded to council. First is extending the system to Park Avenue. When I first started thinking about this, I thought it should go to Lake Road. I changed my mind as I heard more details and I know that Milwaukie city council voted 4-1 to extend it to Park and I agree. It's the reservoir of parking. A thousand-car garage. When you look at the geography, that garage would make sense and be effective. So we support that strongly. The second item I'll highlight is the Harold Street station. We know that the ridership performance is an important statistic for Tri-Met to look at as they compete for funding and we're pleased they've shown this as a fewer station. We've heard testimony from Reed College, they want a station that's a shorter walk distance. We hope future station means near term future station. It's expensive and we'll see how it goes. The last point I'll highlight is where we go from here. As a commission, we'd really like to have the opportunity to review and comment on the bridge design and on the design for the system as it advances. Not that we're nervous about where it's going to go. Quite the opposite. We're very supportive and very interested and we think perhaps our setting is also a good setting for public comment on the system. So that concludes my remarks.

Potter: Thank you folks.

Fish: On the \$750 million cap, the new starts project?

Hansen: Yes.

July 17, 2008

Fish: Is there any chance looking forward into your crystal ball that that cap could be raised?

Hansen: Mayor Potter and commissioner fish, the answer is yes. It's been extraordinary set information other -- one is new york city for the second avenue subway. It was a \$4 billion project, local funding was at \$3 billion. Meaning 75% and the federal government chose to put in \$1 billion. Going over that. And recently, as sound transit, that is seattle, likewise, they chose to be able to have extra continuancy, to allow that to go ahead. We have to make the case, it's not going to be an easy case to make, but I think we can make it. It's potentially doable. But whether or not our odds -- I don't know what our odds are. I will be going back to milwaukee and discussing it, it has a maximum amount they've contributed. One last comment. In each of those projects, whether it be in seattle or new york city, the local share has been relatively smaller than what we're asking for. We're asking for essentially the maximum. 60-cents on the dollar. That means we have a steeper hill to go up to be able to break that 750 cap.

Potter: Thank you, folks.

Fish: Thank you.

Adams: Thank you.

Potter: Shapiro.

Saltzman: On deck.

Howard Shapiro: I'm howard shapiro, planning commissioner. And I would have been earlier but there wasn't a chair for me. Depressingly, I have nothing to add to the comments. I think they're all what I would have said, with one little addition. The planning commission, in considering this, was concerned and continues to be concerned with the rapidity -- \$3.50 for gas. Which changes everybody's mind in terms of how you're going to get around. Looking at projections in the future around ridership and so on is something that we're concerned about in all the mystic way in terms of getting more people into public transport. This project is welcomed for a number of reasons. Let me reiterate something that mr. Hanson said, a bicycle-walking bridge. It opens the gate for a variety of people who were restricted in some way in getting across the river and it's an exciting part of this whole proposal. Thank you for that and letting the commission continue to come before you and share what we think are honest and sincere deliberations and that we thoroughly 100% stand behind. Next time, there should be another chair.

Potter: We'll make that happen.

Shapiro: Thank you.

Potter: How many folks do we have signed up?

Moore-Love: Six more people.

Potter: Please call the first three. Thanks for being here. When you speak, please state your name for the record and you have three minutes of go ahead and begin.

Dan Zalkow: Hello, mayor and commissioners. I'm dan and representing Portland state university. And we just want to be here to pretty simply say we strongly endorse and support this project. It's extremely exciting to us. The value to us is obvious, just looking at the map. The connection to the size and education -- the science and education corridor. How you draw your shapes with omsi and ohsu and the southeast neighborhoods and milwaukie and we wanted to share our appreciation for the staff and metro, tri-met and pdot who have done an excellent job in the last year and the tremendous amounts of public outreach that have gone on. Thank you.

Steve Satterlee: My name is steve, i'm here today to urge council to support and adopt the Portland-milwaukie locally preferred alternative. I have a long history as a citizen in this project going all the way back, is a years, early -- the 15 years. Early '90s. Until recently a that-year resident of southeast and also leadership positions in the neighborhood activism community going all the way back to the carruthers -- and at times it was tragedy. Fell on some rocky shores there for a while with public votes and things like that. But i'm here to basically support this project as an individual at this point. Since now I live in northeast Portland but my experience with southeast

July 17, 2008

indicates that the community's had a long history of supporting public transit. Ride transit in record numbers and support transit improvements at the ballot box and have been an outspoken and believe that light rail is the best transportation solution for this corridor. In addition to congestion relief and preservation of the neighborhoods, we also recognize that light rail can be a catalyst for needed redevelopment and infrastructure improvements in our neighborhoods and we want to stress that it's very important that it's serving major cultural and economic interests, including omsi and the central east side industrial district and i'm very excited about the process expects for the multi-modal. I'm excited because i've been babysitting this thing for 15 years and I am really, really excited that we're getting close to fruition here. Thank you very much.

Gwen Millius: I'm here in my capacity as a Portland design commissioner. And our chair penned a letter addressed to you. And asked that I come down today and read it into the record. Dear mayor Potter and commissioners. On behalf of the Portland design commission I'm writing in strong support of the milwaukie light rail project. The Portland design commission reviews land use plans through the fundamental and community guidelines. They frame community values that support sustainability, green buildings, infrastructure, accommodation of higher density and a more walkable city and transit oriented. Light rail as originally conceived from the heart of Portland and radiating from the heart of Portland and serves neighborhoods today is an essential part of Portland's personality and architectural heritage. The Portland-milwaukie line will meet future commuting needs. Preservation of our region's liveability. It's a nonpolluting transit option. It's vital to our region's mobility and moving our work force. In conjunction with the i-205 -- this line is essential to maintaining and expanding our region's competitive advantage within the global economy, recreation, healthcare and other services. Time is of the essence. Especially given demand. The Portland design commission encourages you to support.

Potter: Thank you very much.

Adams: Thank you.

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

Paul Carlson: My name is paul carlson. Senior vice president for the Oregon museum of science and industry. Nancy intended to present but she had an unavoidable commitment. I'm here to speak for omsi on behalf of this -- in favor of this milwaukie light rail project many as you know, omsi provides a wealth of educational project programs. Teacher education, traveling science programs throughout the state and region and last year, 1.2 million visitors to our omsi campus. That number is very important. One, it's a record number for us, and we intend to grow that number further. In the last two years, we've worked hard on light rail design and location issues. We're pleased to see that the preferred route through the omsi route is the sherman street route. This route was favored by all of the property owners in the strict and does the most to serve transit riders and preserves the business to continue to thrive in our area. We continue to work with tri-met and metro on related design issues such as the width of the bridge coming into the east side, the elevation of the bridge at the waterfront, as we prefer a ground-level entry to be able to develop a pedestrian campus that we're striving for at omsi. We believe all of these issues can be solved and that tri-met, in particular, has been very cooperative in working with us on these issues. Omsi looks forward to works with metro, tri-met and the governments of this area on this most worthwhile project. We believe that the future of the region and the county and the city and omsi highly depend on its successful completion. You may know that omsi purchased 6.5 acres of property just south of our current site. We have just completed the first phase of a master plan, which calls for new museum office, lab, and retail development in the range of 1 million square feet over the course of a decade or more. The success of that development, the jobs it will generate, the activity that will result are dependent on this new milwaukie light rail project. We look forward to its grand opening in 2015. Thank you very much.

July 17, 2008

Marie Phillippi: My name is marie. I'm part of the brooklyn neighborhood and been on the board since '91. I was on the first citizens' working group the first time this light rail came around and I hope i'm still living when this one happens. I wish I thought about this, I have a t-shirt that says the whole neighborhood [inaudible] i'd rather have carruthers. This goes way back and I couldn't resist the chance to come and plead again that this project go ahead. I am representing also the brooklyn neighborhood today. We're the association, the board, and they -- we remain committed to the construction of this maxwell -- max light rail that will serve our neighborhood. And especially I live a block off mcloughlin and i'm 20 years that i've lived there, I can't believe the noise and traffic of the freeway. And it is a freeway. The way it's constructed now. Although we're fortunate enough to have a lot of bus service, frequent, it gets bogged down by traffic congestion, as well. The introduction of max service between Portland and milwaukie will go a long way towards making transit a more attractive transportation alternative. Congestion, cut-through traffic in our neighborhood and more cars down mcloughlin, 17th and milwaukie avenue. Pose an increasing threat to our liveability. The brooklyn neighborhood will benefit in our ways, though. From max. Much of the industrial and commercial land along 17th avenue where it's planned is currently vacate or underutilize. The addition of the light rail to this corridor will spark new residential and commercial activities as it has in other parts of the city. Will bring much needed improvements. Such as road reconstruction, new traffic and pedestrian signals which we're really lacking. New street trees and maybe even public artwork. Please honor the commitment that was made a while back when the i-205 got ahead of us somehow and we're hoping that phase ii, which was promised then, will happen. Thank you for listening.

Mark Williams: Mr. Mayor, i'm mark with ohsu's campus planning and development unit. Like our colleagues, we're here to support the resolution before you, support the locally preferred alternative alignment and support the recommendation of the willamette river partnership group chaired by mayor katz. I believe it was this council that first identified the desirability of establishing an true science and technology corridor back in 2002. What's exciting about this light rail line is the ability to joining omsi, ohsu and p.s.u. And making that dream a more achievable reality. It fosters collaboration between these institutions in a very important way, we think of the fact that we've having conversations with the Oregon university system now about developing a collaborative building on the waterfront, I think, really shows how these kinds of transportation infrastructure decisions can promote positive goals that the city wants to achieve. We were also appreciative of taking part in the willamette river partnership group. That was an interesting process. We weren't all on the same place when we walked in there, by the time the mayor got done, with us, we were. It was a good result. There were refined porter-sherman alignment is a good result for the city and the science corridor and we urge your adoption today. Thank you.

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

Potter: Does council have questions for any of the panelists? It's a resolution, please call the vote.

Adams: I want to thank paul smith and marie lakirk for your great work. I want to thank planning and the planning bureau and commission. Tri-met. And metro. We will get this built. Now we got to go and find a way to pay for it. Aye.

Fish: I want to thank commissioner Adams for his leadership and former mayor katz, enjoyed her testimony during the council informal. I'm pleased to vote aye.

Leonard: I had a meeting recently with folks from tri-met that I observed the discussion had become so different in the last decade with respect to installing light rail. I was still stuck in the frame of mind from back when I was in the legislature when everybody fought light rail and it went on the ballot and those of us who opposed those efforts by people not to have light rail really felt under siege and it's taken me a while to get used to now the argument where's the next line going to be. I mean, it's really refreshing. Particularly in this other discussion we're having about the new i-5 bridge and the discussion in vancouver seems to have changed remarkably as well. So

July 17, 2008

it's really refreshing for me from that perspective to recognize that the region has finally completely not only embraced light rail but is now competing to get new lines, which may be a no-brainer new to the area, but for those of us here a while, recognize that as a new phenomenon. It's the future, it's exciting. I think the primary source of transportation for working people in the future and so it's really a fun time to be here and participating in a decision that extends yet another leg of this fabulous transportation system in our region. Aye.

Saltzman: I'm very pleased to support this. I wanted to recognize steve, and marie, and their neighborhoods' long time involvement. Some of the first neighborhoods. Brooklyn and east moorland and they did have to take a promise that they would be the phase ii of the i-205 light rail project and think we're here today to say we agree with this, this is the phase ii and we're prepared to not only approve this wonderful alignment and design of where the stations go and the bridge and but also to say that we'll be there with our financial commitments as well to make sure that we're a generous partner in making this a reality. Pleased to vote aye.

Potter: This is one of those pieces that a lot of folks have been involved with for many years. If not the final leg, the tri-met general manager told us it was, but appears inside of Portland, it looks like it. Because we now have spines in the system going out to all directions of the region. And, you know, as to future alignments, I guess that's for another day, but today we're going to celebrate the fact that Portland and yesterday, the city of milwaukie, took the step to approve this and support it and ensure that the funding is there when the time comes, to congratulations to all the parties, to the leadership commissioner Adams. I vote aye. We're adjourned until next week. [gavel pounded]

At 3:00 p.m., Council adjourned.