



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

OFFICIAL
 MINUTES

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2009** AT 9:30 A.M.

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

Commissioner Fish arrived at 9:33 a.m.
 Commissioner Leonard arrived at 9:34 a.m.

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

Items No. 179 and 180 were pulled for discussion and on a Y-5 roll call, the balance of the Consent Agenda was adopted.

COMMUNICATIONS	Disposition:
170 Request of Gaye Harris to address Council regarding Mayor Adams (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
171 Request of Larry Crowley to address Council regarding Mayor Adams (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
172 Request of Annette Smith Levy to address Council regarding Mayor Adams (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
173 Request of Rachelle Allen to address Council regarding Mayor Adams (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
174 Request of Richard W. Hall to address Council regarding Mayor Adams (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
TIME CERTAINS	
175 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Willamette River Combined Sewer Overflow Program update (Report introduced by Commissioner Saltzman) Motion to accept the Report: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Fritz. (Y-5)	ACCEPTED

February 25, 2009

<p>176 TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM – Recognize Marc Jolin, recipient of the 2008 Steve Lowenstein Trust Award (Report introduced by Commissioner Fish)</p>	<p align="center">PLACED ON FILE</p>	
<p align="center">CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</p> <p align="center">Mayor Sam Adams</p> <p>177 Appoint Jeff Fish and re-appoint Julie Chlupach, Wayne Glasnapp, Ernest Grigsby, Mark Beckius and Linda Barnes to the Building Code Board of Appeal for 3-year terms (Report) (Y-5)</p>		<p align="center">CONFIRMED</p>
<p align="center">Bureau of Planning & Sustainability</p> <p>*178 Authorize a grant agreement with Portland Community College Foundation to administer \$10,000 in funds for the Youth Action Grants Program (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>		<p align="center">182546</p>
<p>*179 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University for \$16,750 to assist in obtaining a keynote speaker for the 17th Annual Businesses for an Environmentally Sustainable Tomorrow Awards Breakfast, promote the event and solicit a highly qualified pool of applicants for the awards (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center">REFERRED TO COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION</p>	
<p>180 Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with State of Oregon for \$10,000 for PDX Lounge for sustainable economic development (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center">REFERRED TO COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION</p>	
<p align="center">Bureau of Transportation</p> <p>*181 Grant revocable permit to Portland Saturday Market, Inc. to use W Burnside St under the Burnside Bridge, parts of SW Ankeny St and parts of SW 1st Ave for market operations and to close parts of SW Ankeny St, SW Naito Parkway and NW Naito Parkway from February 28 through March 31, 2009, during certain hours (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>		<p align="center">182547</p>
<p>*182 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Metro and accept \$200,000 to administer the SmartTrips Portland individualized marketing project in North and Northwest Portland (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182548</p>	
<p align="center">Office of Management and Finance – Financial Services</p> <p>183 Statement of cash and investments November 27, 2008 through December 31, 2008 (Report; Treasurer) (Y-5)</p>		<p align="center">PLACED ON FILE</p>

February 25, 2009

**Commissioner Nick Fish
Position No. 2**

Bureau of Housing and Community Development

***184** Amend subrecipient contract with Transition Projects, Inc. by \$138,407 for the Winter Warming Center and provide for payment (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 38249)
(Y-5)

182549

***185** Amend subrecipient contract with Clark County Public Health for \$27,617 for tenant-based rental assistance and provide for payment (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 32000008)
(Y-5)

182550

**Commissioner Randy Leonard
Position No. 4**

Bureau of Water

***186** Authorize contract with Analytical Services, Inc. for laboratory services for Cryptosporidium analysis (Ordinance)
(Y-5)

182551

Portland Fire & Rescue

***187** Accept a grant of \$321,221 from the Department of Homeland Security for the Metropolitan Medical Response System (Ordinance)
(Y-5)

182552

***188** Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland Community College for pediatric advanced life support training (Ordinance)
(Y-5)

182553

REGULAR AGENDA

Mayor Sam Adams

Bureau of Planning & Sustainability

189 Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with Metro for \$409,392 for the Recycle at Work program and to implement the Portland Recycles! Plan business outreach and assistance program (Ordinance)

**PASSED TO
SECOND READING
MARCH 4, 2009
AT 9:30 AM**

Office of Management and Finance – Business Operations

***190** Pay claim of Kaitlin Johnson (Ordinance)
(Y-5)

182554

February 25, 2009

<p>*191 Pay claim of Breanna Wyatt (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182555</p>
<p align="center">Office of Management and Finance – Human Resources</p>	
<p>*192 Authorize contract with Quest Diagnostics to provide confidential worksite blood screening to benefit eligible employees and provide aggregate reporting to the City through November 30, 2013 (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center">REFERRED TO COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION</p>
<p align="center">Office of Management and Finance – Purchases</p>	
<p>*193 Amend contract with S. Brooks and Associates to provide temporary aquatic staff for Bureau of Parks & Recreation for an additional 5 year period (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 40828)</p>	<p align="center">CONTINUED TO MARCH 11, 2009 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman Position No. 3</p>	
<p align="center">Bureau of Police</p>	
<p>*194 Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Forest Grove and Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon to provide transit police services (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182556</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Randy Leonard Position No. 4</p>	
<p>195 Authorize the solicitation of proposals for design and professional support services to City staff charged with designing the City's new Emergency Coordination Center (Second Reading Agenda 166) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182557 AS AMENDED</p>
<p align="center">Bureau of Water</p>	
<p>*196 Designate and assign certain property within the Governor Tom McCall Waterfront Park for ongoing management by the Water Bureau and certain property at Mt. Tabor for ongoing management by the Bureau of Parks and Recreation (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182558</p>

At 12:39 p.m., Council recessed.

February 25, 2009

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2009** AT 2:00 P.M.

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

Commissioner Saltzman arrived at 3:20 p.m.

At 3:03 p.m., Council recessed.

At 3:10 p.m., Council reconvened.

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

<p>197 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM – Accept the 2008-09 annual report of the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission (Resolution introduced by Commissioner Leonard) (Y-5)</p>	<p>Disposition: 36683</p>
<p>S-198 TIME CERTAIN: 3:00 PM – Support the creation of a Columbia Crossing Mobility Council charged with developing performance-based management recommendations for the Columbia River Crossing Project (Resolution introduced by Mayor Adams) Motion to accept substitute Resolution: Moved by Mayor Adams and seconded by Commissioner Leonard (Y-4, Saltzman absent) Motion to amend first resolved paragraph to add “in each direction”: Moved by Commissioner Leonard and seconded by Commissioner Fish (Y-5) Motion to amend Resolution and Attachment A to add to Partners a Department of Ecology (WA) representative and a Department of Environmental Quality (OR) representative: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Fritz (Y-5) (Y-4; N-1, Fritz)</p>	<p>SUBSTITUTE 36684 AS AMENDED</p>

At 4:45 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.

February 25, 2009
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.

FEBRUARY 25, 2009 9:30 AM

Adams: Could you please read the title to item no. 170.

Item 170.

Adams: Good morning, miss harris, welcome to city council.

Gaye Harris: Good morning, commissioners.

Adams: Give us your first and last name and you have three minutes.

Harris: I live at 7803 north emerald avenue. I'm a family practice doctor. I'm here to protest mr. Adams' continued in office -- the outcome of the 2000 election. The second was last year's revelation about john edwards which ended his political career. I had campaigned extensively for john edwards. I stopped listening to news and radio for two years after that election. The time I lost with my at-risk teenager campaigning and my four-year-old son is time I will never get back. Mr. Adams, I asked you to consider for a minute -- [inaudible] imagine the pain experienced by the gay community. A friend wrote to me, as a gay member of our community, i'm saddened by the stereotype that gay people prey on the youth of our society and think we're creeps and perverts. This sickens me to my core. Imagine how african americans are feeling about you staying in office while the chief of police was reviewed for a relationship with a 40-year-old coworker. How is this fair to any city, state and federal employee? Imagine how adults who were once at-risk kids are feeling. Those of us who are lucky enough to have an adult in our lives are angry. We feel a deep and abiding gratitude to those adults and we're outraged that your perversions of the truth have given mentoring a sleezy connotation. Finally, I would like to speak for our youth. We all know how hard adolescence is. Particularly for boys. Many studies affirm that boys receive inadequate attention and support, the suicide rate is higher amongst boys than girls and amongst gay boys than heterosexuals. They're some of our most vulnerable citizens. I believe you wouldn't have survived a week if your victim had been a girl because society is more sympathetic to girls than boys. The message your continued presence as mayor is you look good, move in the right circles, calculating and older adults in the corridors of power, you'll get ahead. Might be famous and be on the cover of magazines and certainly you can get a job. Mayor Adams, this is your legacy. Many of us would like to bury it as soon as possible. For our sake, please resign.

Adams: Thank you very much. [applause] Karla, please call item 171. To indicate your support, you wave your hand. Please read title 11.

Item 171.

Adams: Good morning, mr. Crowley. You just need to give your first and last name and you have three minutes.

Larry Crowley: I'm larry crowley and live in the Portland area. Thank you very much for letting me come before you this morning to speak. I'll tell you a little spore about my grandson about three weeks ago. Seven years old and coming down to Portland late in the afternoon, listening to a local radio station and the topic of the mayor, sam Adams, and a young man. My grandson, who is seven years old, is listening in the back seat before I could get up and turn the radio off. It's not something I want him to hear. Questions he has for me: Grandpa, why was this man kissing this man? I said, well, grandson, his name is aidan, this is a choice this person makes, it's not right. I want to explain to him before somebody he is does what is right and wrong. Little grandson, someone who is

February 25, 2009

affected by those actions because I explained to him who the mayor is in Portland, or any elected official. Integrity, the -- comes with the position. So he now has a basic understanding. 17 years old, he hears and I have to explain to him, this is a young man. I'm not here to condemn you, mayor Adams, i'm here to address you. I'm very angry that I have to explain this to my grandson. Seven years old. I bring up the word reprobate. It's a definition of the things you've done. The mayor sits here with the commissioners and i'm shocked and stunned that nothing has been done to remove you from what you've done. I'm not here to morally condemn you but the lies and things I know now as the public and the voters, the people who live and work in Multnomah county here, this has been uncovered. The council members, commissioners, there's an accountability that you have to us voters. And I see that there's been a complete aberration in allowing the mayor to retain his position. These positions are created before and way after you guys will come and when you're gone. It's not about you, these offices are bigger than the persons who sit here. What you have left is the legacy for these young children coming up if the barometer that is left of the evil and your consenting to accept the lies and his conduct in this office.

Adams: Thank you, mr. Crowley.

*****: [inaudible] remove him from office.

Adams: Thank you very much. Could you please read -- [applause] Could you please read the title to 172.

Item 172.

Annette Smith Levy: Good morning.

Adams: Good morning, welcome to city council. We need your first and last name and you have three minutes.

Smith Levy: I'm annette smith levy and I live in Portland. You need the courtesy to paying attention to my comments. During the weeks I have sat here as a observer, it's come to my attention that you all seem too busy or maybe too embarrassed to give any presenters the slightest attention. The subject can be mr. Adams and his resignation or it can be a person showing his water purification process. You ignore the person. This is distressing and i've sat here for at least four weeks and watched as breakfast is eaten. Drinks are consumed. When there's a sign outside that says no drinks, no food. Now, one of the things I find interesting is that just seems to fit right into how you don't feel you have to be responsible for the rules. It's also apparent, commissioners, that you feel that you're somewhat above the fray. Members of this community have come to this body during the past four weeks asking mr. Adams to resign and they seek -- his habit of lying before and after election. And the careers and lives he's tossed to the winds. Mayor Adams has promised that he will leave if he feels he's a detriment to the community. If -- a detriment to the community, that he's too important, too brilliant, too valuable to quit. When will you act? The proof of your brilliance is, of course, your predatory behavior in a city bathroom. With a 17-year-old. The \$250,000 outdoor solar toilet you supported failed in the first weeks of inclement weather, taxation of grocery bags gone real fast when things started to come down and now the latest attempt to local -- to further murder local business by raising parking meter fees for -- by 25-cents an hour and keeping those meters enforced for -- until 9:00 p.m. Thinking that through, how will you handle that? Will these be -- people be paid time and a half? Or will we have to hire people with new uniforms, more little carts and the whole thing? I wonder how that pencils how to? Take note, though. You have nothing to worry about. The time this gets dicey, mr. Adams will disappear on a Fishing trip or is that to hide the fact that mr. Breedlove has surfaced in the community.

Adams: Thank you very much. Your time is up. We appreciate your testimony.

*****: [inaudible]

Adams: Can you please read item 173, please. [applause]

Item 173.

Moore-Love: She has left written testimony.

February 25, 2009

Adams: Great. Item no. 174. Could you please read the title.

Item 174.

Adams: Good morning, mr. Hall, welcome to Portland city council. You need to give us your first and last name and you have three minutes.

Richard W. hall: Ok. My name is richard hall and I was born and raised in Portland and I vote and pay taxes in this city. A leader is supposed to lead with a high level of ethical and moral standards and, sam, you have not displayed that high standard. I do not need to review the problems you have brought on the citizens of Portland other than to say hitting on a teenage boy as a middle age man was and is totally unacceptable. Denial of this activity when asked, crucifying the whistleblower and destroying his career to save your political goals. Lying and lying and more lies and covering up activities. To me these are unacceptable but especially in a person who is a public servant and a mayor. I picked up a code of ethics booklet for the city of Portland and it was printed in 2003 and I wonder if you have a revision on the drawing board. On page 5, ethics means positive principles of conduct. One portion states something I would appreciate if you would read, sam. Other principles rely on individual's desires to do the right thing. I applaud the Portland police union for their statements requesting your resignation. It appears that the public Portland school district has the same displeasure and that's why you appointed a staff assistant to take your place in meetings to coordinate ongoing activities with them and I wonder how many other departments are attempting to not have direct contact with you, sam. On page 9 of the code booklet. The purpose of city government is to serve the public. City officials treat their office as pun trust. Paragraph 1 states: To function effectively, the city needs the public's respect and confidence that its power will be used on behalf of the community on a whole. Also wrong because it violates the public trust in government. Paragraph 2 says ensure public respect by avoiding even the appearance of impropriety. Deception and lying do not build trust. I assure you that your selfish behavior was not in the best interest of the city of Portland. It appears to me that the other commissioners have -- and staff of the city, employees, do not want to rock the boat in an open opposition to you because of your aggressive practice of destroying those who oppose you. I maintain that anyone else on this council, if they would show leadership if your removal would do a fine job as your replacement, plus they would have the public trust. You, on the other hand, believe you're irreplaceable. I challenge you to -- that's the same hole you'll leave in the political scene if you resign.

Adams: Thank you, sir, your time it up.

Hall: My hopes and prayers are that you will resign rather than wait for alternative actions to remove you from office.

Adams: Thank you, sir. Appreciate it very much. [applause]

Adams: I think we're going to do the consent item next and I would like to send 179 back to my office unless there's objection. And as well, 180. And -- yeah. Does anyone else -- unless there's objections, 179 and 180 go back to my office. Ok. Anyone else like to pull anything else from the consent agenda? If not, Karla, please call the roll.

Fritz: Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Adams:** Aye. [gavel pounded] consent agenda passes. And we're a little ahead of schedule. So unless there's objection, if we have the right staff in place, can we hear 189? Do we have staff in the room for 189? Great, can you please read the title, Karla.

Fish: We have a 9:30 time certain.

Adams: We do? Let's do 189. I think it will be really fast.

Item 189.

Mary Leverette, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: Good morning, mr. Mayor, commissioners. I'm mary levitt with the department of planning and sustainability. I'm here this morning to urge acceptance of an intergovernmental agreement from metro from the amount.

February 25, 2009

\$409,392 to fund the recycle at work program. This is a combined funding package for two aspects of the recycle at work program. The first recycle at work program is a very established program. been in operation for five years and been funded by metro. And this year is being funded in the amount of \$220,000. The recycle at work program provides free hands-on assistance and resources to approximately 500 businesses a year in Portland. Helping businesses to start or improve recycling practices and implementing office practices, such as sustainable purchasing of products and services. Several council members may be aware of the program. In July of 2007, the mayor's office and five commissioners received recycle works awards for their sustainable practices. This year, metro is also granting Portland an additional \$189,392 to implement an expanded program. These will implement the commercial section, adopted by council on April 30th, 2008. Bureau of planning and sustainability staff will be meeting with our director, Susan Anderson, in early March to discuss the assistance program implementation steps and she in turn will be briefing the mayor's office. Our intent is to begin work with Portland's largest generators of paper and containers by offering three resources recycling 75% of all waste generated by the year 2015. Again, I urge council to accept funds from metro in the amount of \$409,392 to support the recycle at work program. And I thank you for your time and consideration. I'm here to answer questions you may have about this agreement.

Adams: Any questions from council?

Fritz: A question, but I don't need the answer right now. I would like to know how you come up with the appropriate amount of money this service was worth. I was interested in the cost exactly.

Leverette: Very good, I'll get that to you.

Adams: The two dollars.

Leverette: Yes, Mr. Mayor, we have a formula for that and it's not of our making.

Fritz: Thank you.

Adams: Unless there's more questions from the council, we had a sign-up sheet. Anyone signed up?

Moore-Love: No one signed up.

Adams: Anyone like to talk about 189? If not, it's a non-emergency and moving to a second reading next week.

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

Adams: Can you please read the title for 175.

Item 175.

Saltzman: Thank you, Mayor Adams, it's a pleasure to bring you this update that we do twice a year on our big pipe project, or combined sewer overflow project. Which are doing things to clean up the Willamette River and particularly in these tough times it's important to highlight the number of good paying jobs that the largest public works project in Portland's history is creating and sustaining through these tough times. Paul and Dean Marriott are here to fill us in. We do this twice a year. And as I said, one spark is the job creation that's come out of the C.E.O. Program. To date, over 7,000 construction jobs have been created with many going to local, minority and women-owned businesses. Dean Marriott will touch on this during his presentation. Following the presentation, we have members of the East Side Advisory Committee who will give us their perspective on how the project is progressing.

Dean Marriott, Director, Bureau of Environmental Services: Good morning, I'm Dean Marriott, environmental director for Portland. With me is Paul Gribbon, chief engineer for the tunnel program. We're going to -- tunnel program. We try to come twice a year to update you on these important programs. First, a slide to take you back for a moment about the -- to give you a refresher here. We began this in the early 1990s when the city signed the agreement with the state of Oregon. We got busy in the mid-1990s and hit all of our time lines along the road toward completion in 2011. To show you where we are in relation to the other communities around the country. We got

February 25, 2009

started early and will finish ahead of most of the pack. I do need to amend this slide because atlanta it not finished. Looking for help for our economic recovery, when somebody on capitol hill flushes if it's raining, it goes into the potomac river. They have a way to catch up to us at this point. A couple of words on our progress. We started with the cornerstone project. Taking roof drainage and back into the ground. And most of those projects are finished. The columbia slough was the first leg to be cleaned up. Very valuable resource for north Portland. That work was finished in 2000, on time. Next was the west side of the willamette. Those projects were finished on time with the west side big pipe and other projects. And now we're doing the east side projects, and those are under way right now. The next slide has become well known as our ski slope slide. It does not represent housing starts but a cleanup of the willamette and columbia slough. It's important to remember that back in the 1970s before the city got serious about paying attention to the willamette river, as much as 10 billion flowed into the willamette river. The city began to pay attention and it came down to about six billion in the early '90s. But still, when it rained we had sewage going into the river. In the '90s, we paid attention to how to get to the cleanup goals. From six billion down to about two billion now and the east side projects you'll hear about will take us to the finish line in 2011. The next slide shows you the projects that have been completed. The columbia slough outfalls are controlled in december of 2000. Some additional river controlled by the end of 2001. 16 outfalls controlled december 2006 and the remaining controlled by december of 2011. Just a quick word about Portland citizens. They've been enormously helpful in helping us reach in goal. We began the program of downspout disconnection in 1996 and so far 25,000 homeowners have pitched in to control stormwater on their properties. 1.2 billion-gallons are kept out of the system as a result of these 25,000 homeowners and they are to be thanked.

Fritz: Where is that program now? It used to be in the office of neighborhood involvement.

Marriott: It's with our staff and they're working closely with the neighborhoods and business associations because it has been so successful that we've decided to keep it going. And we had originally planned to shut it down, but it's so popular and successful we're going to keep it going. So now we're going to focus on the river c.e.o. tunnel program. There's a air photograph that's difficult for you to see. But i'm going to turn it over to paul, who's been working on this actually since the west side project began and has taken over for the east side, as well. Paul.

Paul Gribbon: Good morning. This gives you an overview of what the west side system looks like. This is the biggest piece. It shows you the west side tunnel and the east side. The west side is already in operation and we're coming in on the east side. This shows the route. Through the -- under the greenway corridor through the central east side industrial strict and by the rose garden. What's in red is -- shows how much of the opportunity he will has been done to date. Right now, we're on our last lap on the north drive to port center way which we hope to reach by august and then the machine will be taken out and complete the south drive which right now if the tunneling continue we hope to be there by the end of 2010. Ahead of schedule. Base contract, this is where we started out. The design originally done by parsons brinckerhoff. Original contract cost was \$381 million and over the six-year contract period we assumed about \$45 million worth of inflation. So that equates a contract of \$426 million. That was our base contract. In addition, we carried a construction -- to cover the risks and that was \$38 million. Our total budget was 464. So this is where we are right now. The green line shows our actual expenditures it date and where the green line ends shows us where we are right now. The dashed line shows what we projected to spend at this time. You can see we're under-spent and a number of things have turned our ways. Materials less expensive. Equipment less expense i. Inflation has not been what we originally thought it would be. And right now, if you look at the orange line, the projection at the end of the job, if the things keep going the way they've been going, looking at a savings of about \$40 million. Talk a little bit about the contingency budget. We update the risk analysis about every six months and try to eliminate the risks that are passed and evaluate if there's any new risks we didn't consider before.

February 25, 2009

At this point, we're a little over halfway done and dropped it down to \$23 million so we hope to continue to drop the budget as we go. Right now, we've had over 160 first tier subcontractors right now. The whom majority local subs. Our original goal was \$26 million. We have reached \$25 million so far. And in discussions with the contractor, we think there's another \$4 million worth of mvesb subcontracting left to go. So we hope to exceed our original goals and right now, we have 24 employees currently employed on the project.

Fritz: That's out of the whole --

Marriott: In relation to the \$400 million.

Fritz: So 26 out of 400?

Gribbon: Yes. A word about employment as commissioner Saltzman mentioned. This project over its life has direct and indirect employment, thousands of people in the Portland area. We have a projection for what's remaining. And of the four main projects we'll talk about in just a minute, we expect to create about a thousand jobs additional it what's already been created. So not only are we doing the important work to clean up the watersheds of Portland, but we're going to be investing this locally and it will have a positive impact throughout the economy.

Marriott: We did promise we would have outside audits done as we went. We've just had an outside audit done on both project management and the financial side. We currently have copies of the draft audits. The financial audit will still be ongoing. There are additional documents that we need to provide to facilitate completion. Project management audit is completed. Overall got pretty good reviews on how the job is being managed.

Gribbon: And if any of you want to see the copies of the audits, we're happy to share them with you. The remaining challenges, this is not going to just taper out. We have a lot to do to come to completion in 2011. The three main pieces of the willamette side are the swan island pump station improvements, the Portland mouth forced main and tying in the east side outfalls. They have to come together in sequence. Followed by completion and testing the portsmouth force main and followed by the tiling in of the outfalls may, june, and july 2011. About six months ahead of our deadline. If they slip, we have a plan b. We have time to deal with the problems we have. But right now that is our schedule. To bring these projects together, one, two, three within three months.

Marriott: I know you've come to the conclusion that paul is a talented engineer. I didn't realize he was a superb orchestra conductor too. This is going to require careful orchestration to get it to work right.

Gribbon: Hasn't been done yet. Swan island pump station, we have three new wet weather pumps. The placement of those pumps are there and we're closing in on 90% design and hope to have that on the street by early spring and done by may of 2011 as I mentioned. Portsmouth main is going to be a difficult job. We have to go entirely across swan island and then under the overlook bluff under willamette boulevard to the railroad corridor up on willamette boulevard. So we'll be doing it in two pieces. Done concurrently. It's about three miles. 66 diameter pump line and segment two, the part under the overlook is supposed to start here and we should have it in another month or so and plan to open bids on segment one across swan island by the latter part of march. And then i'll let dean talk about the other two remaining challenges.

Marriott: Thanks, paul. We have a couple other major pieces to this. One on the west side in the northwest industrial area called the balch consolidation conduit. To solve long-term problems with the collection system in northwest and the one remaining outfall on the west side of the river. And the other is condition in sellwood where we need to build a pump station to control one of the remaining outfalls on the west side. And paul -- between what paul and I described, this is a map of Portland that shows you where the projects are. Of course, swan island is shown as no. 2, and no. 1 is the connection to the portsmouth force main. Three shows the balch consolidation conduit and four is the sellwood pump station. Just a quick reference to the map. You can see we'll snake this

February 25, 2009

balch conduit right through the heart of the northwest industrial area. And the construction will start this spring and scheduled to finish late summer of 2011. You can see, this is one of those last bits of orchestration which is going to be difficult to handle the timing. It's a difficult place to construct. So that one is going to start this year. And next is the sellwood pump station. It's a wet weather pumping station. To be constructed in the sellwood area just below the bluff there. And again, a very tight squeeze. It's essential to control one of the last remaining outfalls in the southeast Portland. And just a couple of accomplishments. We've been recognized, the project is being recognized nationally and internationally. Boring magazine rated it one of the top 10 projects in the united states. We set a record for tunneling the length of a microtunnel recently and we continue to enjoy support around the city. Happy to answer any questions. Following us is a report from the east side c.e.o. Review committee and dan benoit is here for bill martinek, the chair. Before we turn it over, i'd be happy to enter questions from the council.

Adams: Questions or initial conversation from the council for our presenters? All right. I just want to -- having had this assignment for four years, I want to underscore again my appreciation for your leadership, dean. Paul, for your excellent project management. The public is extremely well served by your efforts on what is the most difficult infrastructure project we've ever attempted to date. So thank you.

Marriott: Thank you very much.

Adams: All right. And there we go. Welcome to city council. Glad you're here. Just need your first and last name and --

Dan Vannoy: Good morning, mayor Adams and city council. My name is dan vannoy and i'm here to represent bill. He was unable to come. What i'm going to thank you talk about is give you an update on the review committee report to the city council. Back in january of 2006, the city council appointed a review committee to oversee the project and we were charged with the following items. To meet not less than quarterly, monitor environmental services -- service efforts to meet success criteria and provide a forum for discussion of issues and communicate the project status to the council every six months. To date, I believe there's been four of those status reports. The committee meets periodically with the contractor and city staff to review project status and significant issues and provide a snapshot based on the meetings and observations which I want to do this morning and there's nine items I want to go over quick. One is the progress of the work. Since our last report on july 9th last year, all criteria to meet the critical path are under way. Including shafts and tunnel boring and the b.e.s. And contractor teams quick response and recovery from what might have been significant has earned the committee's admiration. This five-year project is just over 60% complete and forecasted to complete ahead of schedule. Some not on the critical path have been re-sequenced and the critical path continues to run through the project boring and next on the list is safety. The contractor has fostered a safety culture, reinforcing these goals as incidents have occurred and maintains an impressive ratio. And earned -- there was time -- accidents per 200,000 hours is .3, which is awesome. Quality, the project management is quality conscious and tracks and addresses issues as they arise in a timely manner. And regarding subcontract work, the project is achieving its goals. Exceeding 40% of the subcontract value awarded aggregating over \$23 million. Apprenticeship training is an important component of the job and the job of the city's goals of apprentice 20% and maximizing workforce diversity are being met. Regarding the budget, approximately \$230 million has been expended to date and this is consistent with the work in place and the project's duration. Potential claim against the budget remain modest and if current trends continue we expect the contract will conclude with a savings. General impressions of the committee. The city has engaged a competent contract team. They're addressing the issues in a timely manner and should complete all of the project goals. Regarding the project audits, the project management audit been conducted by olympics associates company. This audit was presented and reviewed at its february meeting. The committee supports the

February 25, 2009

conclusion of the audit that over all, b.e.s. And the company are doing a very good job in managing the project. A cost audit was also presented to the committee. The committee voted to wait until the audit was in final form prior to undertaking a review. As such, the committee would like to invite future auditors to provide input. And currently, the committee chair, bill, is currently serving as the chairman and keith has volunteered to serve as vice chair.

Adams: Thank you for your service.

Fritz: Thank you for your volunteer time.

Saltzman: Thank you for mention can the apprenticeship opportunities too. That was something we left out. Very important.

Adams: Anyone signed up to testify?

Moore-Love: No one else signed up.

Adams: Anyone who would like to testify on this report? If not, vote on it? It's a resolution, Karla?

Moore-Love: It's a report.

Saltzman: Move to accept the report.

Adams: Been moved. Do I hear a second?

Fritz: Second.

Adams: It's moved and seconded to accept the report. Unless there's additional council discussion, Karla, please call the roll.

Fritz: It's important to recognize that sewer rates are high and it's challenging to pay them in these difficult times and citizens are investing in cleaning up our american heritage river, which is what the willamette is designated. I appreciate these frequent reports and good job, both commissioner Saltzman and mayor Adams, for your work on directing the bureau on this and the staff work that's been done is excellent and we, as the council, will continue to look at the contracts as they come in and making sure we stay on time on under budget. And it's putting Portlanders to work and we're going to continue to make sure that happens even more. Thank you very much. I vote aye.

Fish: Aye.

Saltzman: Well, I just want to acknowledge mayor Adams and his previous tenure and the bureau of environmental commissioner and i'm pleased to now be the commissioner once again to oversee this project to its completion by december 1st, 2011, we'll be completed. And just to acknowledge the incredible work, I think, as mayor Adams said, this was a very complicated and large public works construction project. Any time you're digging over 100 feet beneath a city that's grown up over 150 years, you never know what you're going to encounter, what kind of difficulties and it's been -- it's almost seemed flawless and it practically has been flawless and as commissioner Fritz said, it's on time and little bit under budget and hope maintain that under budget in the next year and two ahead. And I want to acknowledge the incredible team at the bureau of environmental services and delivering Portlanders and ratepayers something of value for generations to come. It's a very important project, resulting in cleaner rivers and a greener city and a much-needed job surplus at this point in time. Pleased to vote aye.

Leonard: What dean and others didn't mention this project was completed on the columbia river slough some years back and for those who appreciate history, lewis & clark, actually camped at the columbia river slough and wrote about it in their journals and what was sad was the state we allowed that slough to become as basically a toilet for decades, if not a century or more. It is now restored back to its pristine state, and if you have an opportunity to go to the slough and walk around the various walking tours, it's amazing the work b.e.s. Has done there as a result of this project of taking sewage out of the slough. I'm a big fan of the project and appreciate the benefits to Portlanders are incalculable. Aye.

Adams: Well, thanks for the acknowledgment for sort of back and forth that commissioner Saltzman and I have had on this particular project. Portlanders should feel very assured, it's in

February 25, 2009

experienced, capable hands, not only the management and staff level, but with the commissioner in charge. I'm glad we're on time and slightly under budget. Aye. [gavel pounded] that gets us to the time certain at 10:00. Item no. 176. Could you please read the title.

Item 176.

Adams: Commissioner Fish.

Fish: Art, do you want to come forward with marc? As the parks commissioner, it's my honor to be able to introduce this presentation. You know, i'm reminded regularly about what a small community we live in and how the connections between Portland and the rest of the world are growing smaller but this one actually takes the cake. Because I -- long before I ever came to Oregon, I was actually channeling steve lowenstein a little bit. Because my next door neighbor was named evelyn strauss and her first husband was named albert lowenstein. And albert lowenstein was steve's dad. And I did not know about steve lowenstein, but I knew a lot about evie strauss, because she was one of the most effective community organizers i've ever met. And she died at age 92, a month ago. And joe herschberg sent me her obituary which appeared in a new york newspaper. I remember her being a real pain in the butt. She was tenacious and never gave up. And for those who have traveled to new york and to lower manhattan, there's a park called union square. In the greenwich village, flat iron district. But it was known for the illegal activity that took place there. And evelyn strauss was part of a community coalition that took up the cause and if you've been to new york in the last 15 years, you know that union square park is one of the great parks of the city. But carol grister described her as follows: She knew all of the players and how to bug people when she wanted to get something done and I had the great honor of serving with her on a community board for a number of years and she was hugely effective and she'll be missed. But the more i've learned about steve lowenstein, the less surprised I am about his roots and the recollection to evelyn and to albert lowenstein. And as my colleagues know, steve lowenstein was mike limburgh's [inaudible] for a number of years. I could stop there, because that speaks volumes. If he was the person in charge of mike's office, that puts him in pretty rare company. But he was much more than that. And i'm going to highlight a couple of things which I think people may be interested to know. He's the author of a book called "the jews of Oregon," which when it was written in the late '80s was groundbreaking. But the history that he documented in this book is superb. And I commend it to people who want to read it and I think it's -- the jewish historical society of Oregon. It's a superb book. When I came to Oregon, I read it and learned about gus solomon and meier & frank. But he was the founding director of Oregon legal services and that's a big deal. Because the legal services movement for those of us who have the honor to practice law, is something we feel very strongly about, because but for legal services low-income people in our community would not get the vital services they need. As a founding director, he and visionary people, including charlie williamson and others, felt in Oregon we could do it differently. Oregon legal services are the national model and now they're legal services offices throughout the state and i'm pleased to say because of the success of Oregon legal services the campaign for equal justice was formed which provides a million dollars of support annually from lawyers to support the work of legal services. Of course, too few people still get the services they need. And we need more resources but he was the founding director of a movement here which has made a huge difference in people's lives. Also served in the peace corps. Steve lowenstein, the more i've learned, i've come to see him as the model of what we'll call a servant leader and his integrity and passion for social justice informed everything he did. And when he died, his friends got together with his widow and they created something called the steve lowenstein trust. And this is the seventh time that the steve lowenstein award has been given. 17th, excuse me. And I want to read to you what the trust recognizes. The steve lowenstein trust annually recognizes an individual who has made an extraordinary personal effort and sacrifice to improve the quality of life for distressed and vulnerable populations in the city of Portland. And when you look at the people who have won this

February 25, 2009

award, it's a who's who. I think in some ways, for those who care about social justice and equity, it may be the most important award given annually and i'm proud this year the honoree is marc jolin, the executive director of join. We know marc because we contract with him and count on him particularly during severe weather and we know that join is responsible for hundreds and hundreds of people being moved off the street into permanent housing. But what I also want you to know is the model that join has pioneered is a model that people look to nationally. And marc is absolutely one of the best partners we have in the city in dealing with homeless individuals and families. I could spend all day going through marc's resume. I'll just highlight the fact that he began his work on behalf of the homeless in the late '80s while in college, delivering sandwiches and blankets and basic items to people sleeping on the sidewalks in philadelphia. After college, he worked at the assist and the manager of the st. Frances dining hall and that's a place that serves about 300 hot meals a day to homeless and low-income people. He was involved with the burns advocates group organizing homeless voter registration drives. In 1994, before going to graduate school at the university of chicago, he spent a semester at the university studying homeless models and after graduates from the university of chicago law school, he worked statewide in island with the housing action coalition and chicago coalition for the homeless. Following law school and a clerkship at the seventh circuit court of appeals, which is the most prestigious job you can get, he was a staff attorney at the Oregon law center. He served on the board of join and was involved in a number of city committees that were looking into homeless and housing issues. He left Oregon law center and did private practice work. But he quickly came back in the fold and in 2006, he was hired to become the executive director of join. Marc is a gem. Not just a hugely effective nonprofit director in a very tough field, but also a deeply principled and very humble guy and i'm sure the last thing he wants to do is be before us today to accept this award and i'm certain he'll try to give the credit to everyone but himself. But I want to tell you as the housing commissioner for the city of Portland, I can't think of anyone more deserving of this award and after having worked with evelyn strauss for a dozen years and then learned about steve lowenstein, I can't think of anyone who better embodies the spirit of this award than marc jolin. So it's my honor to turn it over to art alexander who will tell us more and then we'll hear from marc.

Art Alexander, Bureau of Technology Services: Art alexander. Thank you, commissioner Fish, and mayor, and council for allowing us to make this presentation. I have to say that commissioner Fish, you said pretty much everything I was going to say. So -- [laughter] so I will say first that i'm here on behalf of michelle harper, who was chair and unfortunately struck by the flu and couldn't be here and this is her favorite thing to do and doing it for the last several years and extends her wishes and apologies for not being here today. And I would like to ask the members of the lowenstein trust to briefly stand up. Those who are here. Thank you. And I just wanted to add that the lowenstein trust exists because steve wanted one. Steve said he wanted to create this kind of award to recognize the people who are generally under recognized or not recognized efficiently for serving the needs of the under-served in the city of Portland. So it is with great pride that we present the 2008 lowenstein award to marc jolin. And thank you for all of the great services you provide to the citizens of Portland.

*****: Thank you. [applause]

Marc Jolin: All right. Yeah, thank you.

Adams: Are you blushing?

Jolin: I am absolutely blushing. So thank you for this award. It would be an honor to get it in any event but especially meaningful because steve lowenstein was a family friend when I was growing up. Spending time at his house with fannie and their kids, I knew what a kind and interesting person he was but honestly, I had no idea that he was central to the creation of legal services in Oregon. I probably didn't know what legal services was at that time. But it does mean an enormous amount on a personal level to receive an award that has his name attached to it. I was thinking back

February 25, 2009

on the people I worked with on homelessness issues when I came back to Portland in 1992 because it's truly one of the great things about this city. That there are so many people committing large parts of their lives to try and achieve social justice for low-income people. I worked for -- join's partner on the family warming center and worked with a woman named Shelley Dixon who continues to work one-on-one with people helping them get off the street and working with Rob Justice who had been working at St. Frances Dining Hall and I took over for him and he is off doing affordable housing development. I was working with Mark, who was homeless and helped us to negotiate the 24-hour notice posting and he just retired interest the board, Join's board last year. And then there are the people at Steve Lowenstein's organization, at legal aid. When I started doing organizing work with homeless folks, I met two people. Karen, who is a paralegal at -- or was, at Lasso. And Mickey Ryan, an attorney. And both of them had been working representing low-income people in the courts for years. When I met them and both are still there like so many other attorneys and staff people at legal aid who give basically their entire legal careers for this work. I feel fortunate to be living in a city where there's going to be a never-ending supply of people who are appropriate recipients for this Steve Lowenstein Award. The award is also in part for Join and there are a number of staff and board members here today who work with me. It's been a highlight of my life to be connected to Join for a number of years, and to have been able to take over at Join a couple of years ago. It's -- the vision for this organization for what we do and how we do it, has always come from the people on the streets and trying to get back into housing. We point to having helped thousands of people end their homelessness over the years but that achievement is first and foremost, the achievement of every one of those individuals who took charge of putting their homelessness behind them. Join's contribution has come largely through the efforts of our amazing staff. Today it's 19 people. And regardless of their job description, they're essentially working every day tirelessly to support the efforts of individuals and families to rebuild their ties to this community. And, of course, what Join does, the help we've been able to provide people in achieving their hopes and dreams comes directly from the support we get from hundreds of individuals, companies, foundations, agencies and nonprofit partners and very importantly, the city of Portland. We could have not got having a single unite reach worker to having a 10-person outreach and retention people who helped over a thousand men, women and children end their homelessness over the past two years. On behalf of everyone part of Join, thank you. As you know, we're in a process of creating a larger community center for homeless individuals and families. And we've set aside the money that is attached to this award to build out the planned library and meeting space. Something that I hope Steve as an author would feel good about having the money spent honor. I want it thank the Join staff who are here. My family members and friends and you, Council, and especially the Lowenstein Trust.

Fish: Mr. Mayor -- [applause] -- after any comments people want it make, I hope we can take a picture and ask the trust board to come forward, the Join staff, and the Council and stand with Marc and get pictures. But --

Adams: Well, I just want to -- I honestly didn't know if there was anyone on the planet that could fill Rob's shoes and you have, and done it with gusto and accomplishment and I admire you greatly and I couldn't think of a better person to get this award, so congratulations. [applause]

Saltzman: I'd like to add my accolades. Marc, you're a deserving recipient of this award and it's been a pleasure to work with you in your many capacities over the years I've been on this Council. I think you're a very persuasive, but diplomatic individual. Very determined. But I know that we haven't always been on the same side of issues but I've always found we can have substantive discussions about those and treat each other with respect. So I appreciate those qualities in you and very -- as I said, very deserving recipient of this award.

Jolin: Thank you.

Fritz: Thank you for all of your service for our community. Did you grow up in Portland?

February 25, 2009

Jolin: I did.

Fritz: Which schools?

Jolin: Ainsworth and Lincoln.

Fritz: It's a wonderful place it grows community leaders and I thank you for what you've done.

Leonard: And I too have enjoyed working -- we haven't disagreed very much so it's been a real pleasure. [laughter]

Jolin: Been good for me that way.

Leonard: I really very much appreciate and learned a lot more about you today listening to this. It's an honor to be able to support you.

Adams: Can we get a picture? All right.

*****: Join staff who are here and the board.

Adams: Big smile.

*****: It's not my day job. [laughter]

*****: Thank you.

Adams: I don't think there's council action on this.

Fritz: We have to vote on this?

Adams: I don't think [inaudible] all right. Thank you commissioner Fish, those were really excellent introductory comments as well. I think that gets us to calendar item 190. Is that what you have, Karla?

Moore-Love: Yeah.

Adams: Could you please read the title for calendar item 190.

Item 190.

Adams: Do we have staff? Good morning, sir.

David Landrum, Sr. Deputy City Attorney: Good morning, Mr. Mayor, council members. I'm David from the city attorney's office, I'm a deputy city attorney. I'm here on 190 and 191. The city -

-

Adams: For the rule, can you read the title for 191.

Item 191.

Adams: Thank you.

Landrum: City has negotiated settlements with Ms. Johnson and Ms. Wyatt over two lawsuits, separate lawsuits that were consolidated for trial in Multnomah circuit court. I believe the amounts are total of \$52,500 for Miss Johnson which includes \$32,500 in proceeds to Miss Johnson and \$20,000 in attorneys fees and more Mr. Aye I can't tell. The \$53,500 and includes the same amount of settlement to Miss Wyatt and her attorneys fees were slightly higher.

Adams: Why are we doing this?

Landrum: Because it will save the city money and it is the right thing to do for our town.

Adams: Could you be more specific on that?

Landrum: Yes, commissioner, I can. This case involved some inappropriate activity by a Portland police officer who pled guilty to two counts of -- to two counts of -- oh, I can't think what you call it.

Public misconduct. Official misconduct, that's the name of the charge and initially the police bureau investigated the allegations by the plaintiffs through the internal affairs division and it was trafficked and investigated as a crime and referred to the district attorney's for prosecution and I assisted in that prosecution of the officer. As part of his plea deal, he resigned and resigned the police commission. And the city had a legal defense in this case, but the chances were good that irrespective of the trial outcome, the other case to take it to the court of appeals and potentially the supreme court because our legal defense was based on an issue that is tied up in the tort claims act and even to prevail in this case would have cost considerably more than what it's costing us to settle it and the specific facts in this case were unhappy, let's say.

Adams: This is a settlement recommended by a mediator?

February 25, 2009

Landrum: We did go to mediation. The mediator actually recommended something slightly higher. I was able to negotiate something lower than his recommendation.

Fish: And if the city had taken these cases forward, and had lost, was the city potentially at risk of both the damage award as well as paying the attorney fees for the two plaintiffs?

Landrum: Yes, there were three claims for each of the plaintiffs that were state common law claims for which attorneys fees would not have attached but there was one where attorneys fees were recoverable and -- excuse me, at least at the trial stage, yes, the city was at risk for paying a potential jury award higher than what we're paying today.

Fish: In light of the misconduct, which -- I learned a little bit more reading the newspaper, but I understand the gist of what occurred. Do you know whether the police bureau has taken steps to make sure there's just the isolated efforts of one officer and will not occur again?

Landrum: Well, I don't know that they've taken any steps that are specifically related to this particular case. I know that the police bureau is making efforts to tighten the hiring standards and its ability to evaluate candidates all the time. And, in fact, in this particular case, i've been in touch with chief sizer about that particular issue. So the short swear to your question is my understanding is yes, but I can't give you any specific examples.

Adams: Any other discussion or questions from council on these two council items? Thank you sir. Anyone signed up?

Moore-Love: We have one person. Dan handleman.

Adams: Good morning, welcome to city council chambers. We just need your first and last name and you have three minutes.

Dan Handelman: Thank you, mayor Adams. I'm dan handleman with Portland cop watch. I just wanted to testify about these settlements. In the context of the racial profile discussion we've been having over the last few years, I look forward to having a discussion about the plan that came out around that. I'm glad commissioner Fish asked about what the bureau is going to do to prevent this from happening. We've seen this kind of sexual misconduct happening repeatedly in Portland. Sexism is also sexism plus power. We haven't had a lot of discussion about -- it got lost in the shuffle. There has been several officers who have left their jobs after facing criminal charges for sexual misconduct over the last few years, not to mention the money that this is being paid out in these tough financial times for this misconduct and other kinds. Of course, today we're talking about officer john wood who asked -- he pulled over to show their underwear to avoid being cited for d.u.i. When he was a reserve officer, shot and killed a robbery suspect in 2000 and we're wondering sometimes when people in the force have shot somebody if they had enough counseling so they don't go on to commit other offenses like officer wood did by abusing his power with women. And hope that will be looked into as well. We also know as was mentioned, officer wood had his police certification revoked and the other officers in recent years who have committed such offenses, officer conki who shined flashlights down women's pants, and officer jason falk, who had sex while on duty with a woman suffering from autism. And officer howell picking up a woman -- driving a prostitute around town and also been known for harassing exotic dancers. And, of course, there's also many years ago -- not that long ago, the scandal, the hazing operations when people joined the special emergency response team were asked to go through sexual hazing rituals and a woman blew the whistle and got disciplined because she -- instead of being honored as a whistleblower. There's issues around sexism and gender policies in that they'd to be discussed and hope as the chief has expanded the sex crime unit which has gotten good ratings that she'll look into training about sex and abuse of power.

Adams: Any comments or questions for mr. Handleman.

Fritz: Thank you for bringing that my attention. I have read the chief's recommendations on the profiling and using the word -- and noting that the bureau policy is biased [inaudible] this is really helpful that you came today and highlighted for me, as commissioner in charge of the human rights

February 25, 2009

commission, that now this community policing committee is housed there, that we need to continue our ongoing efforts looking at all kinds of community-police relations.

Adams: Thank you very much for your testimony, dan. Unless there's someone else in the room that did not sign up that would like to testify on these matters or additional council discussion, Karla, please call the roll.

Fritz: Aye.

Fish: I'm going to vote aye. I think the city owes an apology to miss johnson and miss wyatt. I'm pleased officer wood is no longer with the bureau, and I know that police commissioner Saltzman shares the feeling we all have about this kind of official misconduct and i'm hoping these paid claims don't appear on our agenda again in the future. Aye.

Saltzman: Well, as police commissioner, I do apologize to miss johnson and miss wyatt for what they experienced by officer wood. This was inappropriate and this settlement -- this was inappropriate and this settlement is the right thing to do. And while I just want to note that our police organization, our police officers are fine outstanding hardworking people, you know, like any organization, there's always people that defy in a label that i've just given them. But as has been commented on through more training, we hope these situations do not occur again and again, my apologies to miss johnson and miss wyatt. Aye.

Leonard: As distressing as the facts of this case are, what is deeply distressing is how the actions of a person can cast a pall, as commissioner Saltzman referenced, to the literally hundreds of outstanding men and women in the police bureau. And with all due respect to commissioner Saltzman, this is not a training issue. This is an aberration of a person who behaved outside the conduct and the high standards of the Portland police bureau. I've had the privilege, notwithstanding my prior position, but in a much more deep level this past summer meetings do dozens if not hundreds of officers and unfortunately, we don't have a resolution come before council when we sit and talk about the person who donates their time off at meals on wheels, the officers that do that. That work with distressed kids and did all of the outstanding things that I observe and you have a person like this come forward and raise questions about the integrity of the entire force, it is I know distressing to the officers and I want them to know this council puts in context those kinds of behaviors and there's no question that we have really in the front lines the best men and women that could be serving the force and I know they are as distressed as anybody else is about the facts of this case. So i'm sorry that this happened. I appreciated commissioner Saltzman's words and apologizing on the behalf of the bureau and i'm equally distressed by these incidents. Aye.

Adams: I too want to thank commissioner Saltzman for his words prior to his vote. Aye. [gavel pounded] let's do -- just to be safe, 193.

Moore-Love: Do the roll on 191.

Adams: Got it. 191. Sorry. Got too much ink on my [inaudible]

Fish: Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Adams:** Aye. [gavel pounded] passed. Can you please read the title for item 192.

Item 192.

Adams: Unless there's objection from council, i'd like to pull this item and return it to my office. [gavel pounded] so done. Could you please read the title for council item 193.

Item 193.

Adams: Good morning. Welcome to the city council.

Christine Moody, Bureau of Purchases: Good morning, mayor Adams and members of city council. Christine moody with the bureau of purchases. And before you is an ordinance recommending amending contract no. 40828 with s. Brooks & associates for an additional five-year period for aquatic staff for bureau of parks and recreation. An estimated \$1.5 million. And through our strategic sources program, the city was able to directly renegotiate our contract with

February 25, 2009

brooks and they agreed to reduce their overhead charges by 7% for \$120,000 savings. S. Brooks & associates is a locally based temporary services firm and an Oregon minority-owned business and they have a strong recruiting in the community that helps to develop a diverse applicant pool for our staffing needs.

Lisa Turpel, Portland Parks and Recreation: I'm lisa with Portland parks and recreation. I thought it might be important to share a little bit of information about how parks and recreation uses our brooks employees. We use them for a variety of part-time needs. Everything lifeguard, rec leaders that help us do a variety of unskilled and lower-skilled kinds of work at our community centers. They operate teen gym time, roller rink attendance, that sort of thing. We've used -- as you know, parks and recreation has a long history of partnerships. And we have a variety of tiers of kinds of employees that we employ. Everything from our permanent full-time civil service employees to our seasonal employees to our volunteer cadre and kind of we have a small sector that we use a temporary services contract for and as christine mentioned, that's been brooks staffing. Due to the -- we very aggressively keep limits on the number of brooks employees that we use. Our contract allows us to be somewhere in the 60 to 120 of our 2,000 employees. During the course of the year. Right now, currently, we have 57 brooks employees on -- that are helping in our -- do our work. The variety of these individuals that we employ through brooks is when we need a seasonal kind of work at a variety of locations. Most of these staff work at a variety of locations, maybe two hours over at this community center. Another four hours elsewhere and on and on. And they need - - or we want them to stay as a part of our workforce, more than 1200 hours a year, which is a limit of our seasonal employees. The average brooks employee today works somewhere between 24 and 36 hours a week. We have a very small number that work 40 hours a week. Because this is an extension of an existing contract, we're hoping that that will happen. And we do not anticipate any changes whatsoever. Although we have as christine pointed out negotiated a lower markup with the contractor. Brooks staffing has been an excellent collaborator with us. They've partnered very well as you can imagine when you have an employee situation where the employer actually is another contractor and not the city of Portland. It's very important that we work closely together on personnel needs, training, getting people ready for their work. It is a certified minority business here in town. They provide us with a large pool of diverse candidates. We make hiring decisions, collaboratively. They come with kinds of qualifications that we need and then we provide the technical training that they would require for our workplace. What I would like to mention is working with a contractor, the -- brooks does provide a very small fringe packet for these employees which the city cannot offer. A one-week vacation package. Three days of paid vacation and so forth.

Fish: Lisa, thank you. I also want to note that we'll be hiring 600 young people to serve at lifeguards at our facilities this summer. It's one of our biggest youth employment programs.

Fritz: Those are hired directly through Portland parks?

Fish: Right.

Fritz: Do they get health insurance?

Turpel: They get a small limited health package, yes. One week of paid vacation and three holidays, I believe. Three paid holidays.

Leonard: Does we establish that last year.

Fritz: I'm wondering about the comparable health insurance of the temporary employees that are working 24 to 36 hours.

Turpel: If you're interested in that, margaret brooks is here and she can comment on that.

Adams: I think the question is about the applicability of our council ordinance on seasonal temporary workers.

Fritz: My understanding is that our temporary workers get -- i'm questioning [inaudible]

Adams: So am i, I agree.

February 25, 2009

Margaret Brooks: I'm sorry.

Adams: Hi, Margaret.

Brooks: Hi, how are you?

Adams: Good. We last year passed an ordinance that after negotiations with local 43 that our seasonal workers, part-time seasonal workers would -- part-time seasonal workers get healthcare and -- does it apply to these workers?

Turpel: No, it doesn't. That ordinance applies to seasonal maintenance workers. I think our Brooks workers work on the recreational side.

Fritz: What health insurance do they get?

Brooks: We pay 50% of health insurance because of them coming and going a lot in the temporary service, it's hard to get any coverage. So what we've allowed to do is we have a coverage that costs the employee 29 cents an hour and we pay 29 cents an hour. If they go to a doctor, they get \$35 off. 10% off prescriptions, life insurance for them and their families and depending on the hours they work, the coverage gets greater and I thought I brought that to me, and I can get it to you. If you work up to 15 hours, you get so much coverage. Up to 35, and if you're working 40, you get more coverage. And there's some hospital coverage. It's minimal, but -- and they do take advantage of it. The employees we have working. Not all of them do. But a good portion and I know they've found it very useful to have it.

Adams: That's great and you're the sort of the sourcing -- our sourcing contractor on this. And I do think, though I wasn't aware what we did last year excluded -- so this is back to sort of the parks side. I wasn't aware that excluded recreational temporary seasonal workers and I would like parks to look at the options of extending for the maintenance workers benefits that we achieved last year for the recreational workers.

Saltzman: Are these workers represented?

*******:** No.

Leonard: So the one caution I want to throw out and this is going to come up again when we're talking about our sports venue, I've been thinking through this whole issue as it's come up because there are some advocating our sports venues, we establish a family living wage. I think we need to be very cautious as I'm thinking through the policy implications about us taking the place of what otherwise would be a bargaining unit, for instance, in the park temporary employee, those changes came through a collective bargaining agreement and an elected representative. I'm finding myself increasing uncomfortable us making decisions outside of that kind of format. If your workers wanted to organize, and then bargain that as the other temporary workers did, I'm very supportive of that. But I think we need to be very cautious. Because once you go down this path, we have a whole lot of people in this situation, including people who clean our offices. That we don't address in our family wage policy that we've adopted at P.G.E. Park. That creates a lot of questions for me as how do we pick some and not others? The easier answer for me is we should allow workers to organize that want to organize and then come to us and as you do in any collective bargaining environment, and agree or not to a set of wage, hours and working conditions. I'm increasing -- us interceding in -- you know, an ad hoc basis.

Fish: As the new parks commissioner inheriting a system this council set up, I think those points are well taken. The use of contract employees does alter the ground rules as you mentioned, organizing. Commissioner Fritz's point or the sort of gist of her point about the benefits, I would actually like to raise the benefits of all the people who provide services for parks. And if the council wants to go that way, I'm actually thinking about putting in a supplemental winter bump request so we can do that. But I'm also going to charge --

Leonard: You're going to charge us money to do that?

February 25, 2009

Fish: But I'll say this. The points you're raising are points that resonate with me. I was, after all, a labor lawyer. Some these points I can address, but I appreciate that, anytime they're raised, we can address them. I, too, have a concern or two. This is contract time-sensitive?

Turpel: We have to execute it by the end of march.

Fish: What i'm going to suggest, because there's a few points that have been raised where I don't have a clear answer -- I think, by the way, your presentation was excellent -- i'm going to set this over for a week, because I want to do a little more homework on it and then be able to answer the questions that have been raised. I think commissioner Leonard's point about the context of this issue being raised in other settings -- and I do think we have to think about that. I know this is something that has been discussed with buzz. Anyway, I think it's useful to take a week or to make sure we get it right. With council's ok and if christine and lisa are ok, let's set this over a week. Pardon me?

Fritz: It's actually coming under the office management.

Fish: I appreciate that. I would recommend we set it over a week.

Leonard: I wonder if I could make one more observation. I work with four people who very much are what you recognize as pro union people. It has been my experience that, where you have -- for an example, the private sector, employers who are savvy enough to look at a competitor who pays wages, hours, and benefits according to a collective bargaining agreement, to adopt those standards for him or herself, the union gets the same benefits. The council taking these kind of unilateral actions really serves to undermine the effort to organize people, because the workers then don't recognize the need of union dues and having the normal processes you go through to get a collective bargaining agreement. This is just an issue i've been thinking through quite a bit.

Fish: If I may, commissioner Leonard, on that, again I completely agree with the spirit of what you just said. I think the challenge is, in a bureau like parks, which has seasonal part-time people -- like, for example, teenagers provide services for three months in the summer -- I guess there's nothing which would prevent them from coming together, forming a union, and having those rights for the three months. But I think we probably pay something just above the minimum wage. I'm not sure that that degrades the overall collective bargaining scheme, but I also think it's worth asking people how have people in every category been treated.

Leonard: You may be right, but I am immersed on this subject and increasingly am getting to the point where I believe we actually are enabling bad behavior by paying a living wage.

Fish: I get those emails as well. I would suggest we set it over a week.

Adams: These things take time, so i'm totally open to of moving forward with what you've already proposed for the summer.

Fish: That's not covered by this. The summer employment program for teens would not be covered by this.

Adams: Ok. I like the fact that you're willing to go back and take a look at it. What i'm saying is sometimes these things take time. Do what you can in the time that you have so, at the same time, we're also covering what we need to cover for the upcoming summer. We absolutely did negotiate - - your right -- with local 49 on the maintenance workers. It took longer than it should have, but it did take some time to get done. Unless there's council objection, we will set over --

Fish: Why don't we set it over for two weeks.

Adams: Two weeks, council item 193. Is there anyone that showed up in the room to testify on this matter?

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

Adams: Not seeing anyone interested in testifying, the matter is set over for two weeks.

Fish: Thank you.

Adams: You bet. Karla, could you please read calendar item 194?

Item 194.

February 25, 2009

Saltzman: I'd just like to introduce the captain to tell us about this ordinance.

Vince Jarmer, Portland Police Bureau: Thank you, mr. Mayor and commissioners. The i.g.a. That i'm asking you to approve today is the vehicle by which forest grove will become the 12th member of the transit police division. The division is currently made up of a group of about 50 sworn police officers whose focus is safety and security on the transit system, which is the buses, the max, and including the new wes train down in tualatin. And also the properties of tri-met. We have been given some extra positions to fill to bolster our ranks, and I made a foray out into the up to now nonparticipating agencies in the transportation service district to see if they would be interested in contributing an officer. Forest grove is one. I should have a couple more for you here in the near future. But I would ask that this be approved to bring the forest grove police officer, whoever it is -- we are in the selection process next week to select an officer from the people who have expressed interest of course at the police department there -- and we'll bring that person over as soon as we can to join our ranks. That, in a nutshell, is the transit police division.

Adams: Any conversation from council?

Fish: I have one question, commander. It's not directly related to this, but I had lunch with a friend the other day who takes the max to gresham home every night. And when there was a lot publicity about some of the challenges on the line, she was in the middle that. She had some personal stories about people getting on and behaving in a disruptive way or threatening way. Do you have any sense of whether there has been some demonstrable improvement in the safety for riders on the max?

Jarmer: I feel that, and I think crime is in a down right trend. Hopefully it will stay that way. But the way I would gauge whether or not we see an improvement in criminal behavior or not criminal behavior but disruptive behavior just making the ride really uncomfortable. Through a couple different sources, I now wear two pagers so I can get all the calls that are coming in, and the paging system has become thankfully a little bit quieter. We have a record through tri-met that keeps track all the customer service inquiries that come in and all the ones that are related to behavior on max or buses that are either criminal or just disruptive. Those are starting to slow down. Our activity level that we report -- and I think each one of your offices gets the report monthly -- is pretty steady, but that's because we actually have a fair amount of self-initiated activities that takes care of this. Just as one final note, one of the things that we find pretty effective, not only the visibility but, to add to that, the invisibility thing we do occasionally where we have a demonstrable problem. We'll have plain clothes officers on the vehicles to address either a concern that's stated overtly or we just go where we think the action is going to be. That's the long version of the short answer of, yes, I think it's getting better, especially out to gresham shame or out east because we have a dedicated crew to that area only, and we hope to increase the number.

Fish: I'm pleased to hear about the undercover folks. That's a good way of sort of testing. She taking the max between 5:30 and 7:00, and she's done it for many, many years. She has not been the victim of a crime per se, but what is disconcerting to her is when groups of people come in and engage in very loud, boisterous, antisocial behavior, vulgarities, and what she perceives to be threatening behavior and that she feels, as an older woman, powerless to engage. And she can try to change her seat or move to another car, but that's what she reported was the most offensive.

Jarmer: Our goal is to make the ride comfortable really, and there's a certain amount of limitation we have about freedom of speech and what people can actually say, but we do have some control over the volume level of that and how uncomfortable it is. We also have some control over dogs and other animals that are sometimes on the train that can cause disruption. Loud phone talking, those kinds of things. It's kind of -- we have to take a pretty measured approach to the way we approach those issues, but our goal is to make the ride comfortable where you can just get on the train, mind your own business, drive home comfortably, and not be hassled by these groups.

Fish: Thank you.

February 25, 2009

Saltzman: I was just curious. What's the typical tenure of an officer on the transit team? From other jurisdictions.

Jarmer: Well, what I would like to do is ask that the agencies participate for three years with possibility of a one-year extension. So four years is the max. However, we've had people rotate out of it after two.

Saltzman: It's typically one individual for those -- one individual for those two?

Jarmer: Yes.

Fritz: Thank you for your efforts to get a new person without additional cost to us.

Leonard: I appreciate the absolute professionalism the officers in making sure all of us drive within the speed limits of Portland.

Jarmer: Our pleasure, commissioner.

Adams: Thanks for the infusion of resources. All right. Any other conversation on the council item 194 from council? Is there -- thank you. Is there anyone in the room that wishes to testify on council calendar item 194? Hearing none, this is an emergency. Karla, would you please call the roll?

Fritz: Aye. **Fish:** Aye.

Saltzman: I want to thank the commander for the outstanding job he's doing with our transit system. Aye.

Leonard: And I agree. Aye.

Adams: Thanks again. Aye. Item number 194 is approved. Please read the title for council calendar item 195.

Item 195.

Adams: Commissioner Leonard?

Leonard: There were questions raised last week. We think we've addressed those. We have b.d.s. Director Paul Scarlett and water director, David Shaff, available for questions.

David Shaff, Director, Portland Water Bureau: I'm Dave Shaff, the director of the water bureau.

Karla is distributing a packet for you. It includes a cover memo from me about this project, an outline of b.d.s. Staff that we will be utilizing for the project from Paul as well as a memo from James Van Dyke, chief deputy/city attorney regarding errors and omissions and liability concerns that were raised last week. We also have a little bit of a numbers estimate on what it would cost to build the building as a one-story building, build it with the shell as we discussed last week, and what might be the costs if we were to add that shell one, two, three, four, and five years from now on the questions that were posed last week were what are the current estimates for the 1 story building. They range between 15.5 and \$17 million for a one-story building that is built with the idea that a second story could be added on later. The estimate for a second floor shell only building was approximately 22 million. Building it out was estimated around 24 to 25 million. Using a construction escalator of about 7.5% annually, after five years, the cost to build the second floor would be approximately 9.3 million, and that's based on how our estimates and experience with construction escalation go. We were asked questions about design and review, conflicts of interest.

My memo covers that a little bit. But basically each member's work is going to be reviewed or signed off by either the section manager or another member of the team to ensure that proper checks and balances are in place. In addition, the plan review functions are separate from the functions of b.d.s., and they're under different managers. We don't anticipate that there would be any issue at all with the b.d.s. Employees doing the work and then having that work reviewed by other b.d.s. Employees and of course inspected by yet another group of employees. From the standpoint savings, we were asking the question about savings, and we're really trying to accomplish two goals with this project. One is to build a building or to design a building, a state-of-the-art, e.c.c. For the city. The second is to take advantage of the in-house expertise that we have of b.d.s. Employees that are otherwise potentially going to be lost to the city of Portland because of what's going on in

February 25, 2009

the economy. If we were doing this two years ago, we probably wouldn't be doing this with b.d.s. In a couple years, I hope b.d.s. Will be so busy that they won't be able to do this for us. In the meantime, we have people with that expertise and can tap into it. We may potentially have to try and find replacements a couple years down the road. I was asked about checks and balances on the potential cost. We've estimated that the design of this building will be between 1.2 and \$1.9 million. Right now, we don't know. We're hoping it will come in lower. We're hoping it will come in substantially lower than what we were estimating six months to a year ago partly because of the change in the economy. There are more firms out there, and hopefully they're hungry and will be wanting to be very competitive in their bids. We don't have unlimited resources, and I can tell you our chief engineer, mike, has called in sick for the first time in 15 years. That's why he's not sitting here with me. Mike run as project review board on a monthly basis. He meets with all the principal engineers and board members, and they pick apart the project they're doing. We've gone from an organization completing just 50% of its capital plan three and a half years ago to 98% -- years ago to 98%. As a general rule, cost changes and bureau projects are typically due to changes and conditions. For instance, we just discovered that we have some contaminated soils in our sandy river crossing project. That's a change in condition that was unanticipated. Otherwise, we are on track and within our budget. On the errors and omissions, we really weren't prepared for it last week. This is what we do on a typical basis at least in the water bureau and I think to a certain degree in b.d.s. Our engineers do a lot of the design work, but we will also work with consultants and other contractors. And we negotiate the scope of that, and our contractors, people that contract with us to do work for us, as we are proposing here, are required to provide omissions and liability insurance, and I actually have with me the excerpt of the omissions or of the insurance documents that we require our contractors on a regular p.t.e. Contract, and it's seven pages long. Now, what jim van dyke says is that, as a general rule, we are -- we, the city Portland -- when our own people do the work, we are responsible for the work. So, if we make a mistake, we don't turn around and sue ourselves or our employees, but we do require our m.t.e. Contractors to have insurance, and they are covered under omissions -- errors and omissions provisions, and that is part of the scope of work that has worked out. So what jim says is basically what we should have said last week, which is this is the sort of thing we do on a fairly regular basis. We do design work and work with consultants, and it's real clear where we draw the line. If we're stamping the documents, if we're doing the work, then we're responsible. If it's done by the contractor, then they are responsible for their errors and omissions. From the standpoint of scope, we're anticipating the equivalent of four, maybe four and a half f.t.e.s out of these seven people, and we might even use something more than those seven people if there's a particular skill set that we need, that we identify, that we haven't outlined in the seven people we have in front of you. If you need them, I have the resumés for all seven of those people, but I didn't think you would really want them. What I say is four, four and a half f.t.e.s. We might use 1-10th of one of these people over the course of the year. We're talking four, four and a half people for about a year, and we're spreading that work among, right now, these seven identified people. We're intending to create a scope of work in the r.f.p. That's broad enough to give us some flexibility to get the project done, to find the skills that we need but narrow enough that we're real clear what the contractor is going to do, what we're going to do, and we have a project manager, david gray, who will be riding herd on this to make sure everything comes together as we expect. That's david's job. That is what a project manager does for the water bureau. And he's done a number of projects for us recently, over the last several years, and I have no question that we're going to be able to make sure that everything comes in as we expect it to win the budget we identify.

Adams: Paul, did you have something to add?

Paul Scarlett, Director, Bureau of Development Services: Very little. Good morning, paul scarlett. I'm pleased to partner with the water bureau and to provide the design assistance --

February 25, 2009

assistance and development. Very confident the list of employees you have from b.d.s. That will be part of this process have extensive years of experience and qualifications -- qualifications and right certification, and we know we have a process that includes the proper checks and balances and actually mimics what we typically do with projects or work coming from the outside in that the person reviewing the plan or designed the plan will not review their own work. We will contact the applicant, in this case the water bureau, if there are corrections that need to be made in the form of a check sheet. And those processes will play out as they similarly would with outside projects. We are very confident we have folks that will contribute constructively to the department.

Adams: Questions from council?

Saltzman: First of all, thank you for the information. It was very responsive to the issues that were raised. I had several questions last week about liability, what the governors were on the cost of the design. This will take about a year?

Shaff: We expect the design process will take about a year, yes. Year to 18 months I believe is what we're projecting.

Scarlett: I did review the resumes -- resumes of the design team, and my concerns were about checks and balances and property aspects of the department doing design work, which also they were reviewing.

Saltzman: I think you've answered those questions and certainly there are circumstances here where this proposal makes sense to me now. I do want to just pursue some other aspects I didn't raise last week and should have. One is that this facility, per city policy, immediate the leads standard? We do have a 2005 green building resolution that requires city-owned facilities to have an eco roof and at least 70% of the roof -- covering at least 70% of the roof and also high-resistance, energy staff material. Are you cognizant of that?

Shaff: I'm not, but I know that my project manager, david gray, is.

Saltzman: In reviewing the credentials of the team, there's a lot of green building experience there.

Shaff: Yes, there is.

Saltzman: I wanted to make sure we'd look at that.

Shaff: I know, simply from reviewing it, that we are going for leads goals. I wasn't team with the other, but the water bureau does know what it's doing on this stuff.

Adams: And i've had conversations with both commissioner Leonard and with chair wheeler, and our work with our federal stimulus, interjurisdictional federal stimulus coordinating committee that's going to be making an application to the federal government for the resources for -- to do the phase two, and we'll know, over the next 40-odd days, 45 days, which I think gives you -- is within the parameter of allowing you design phases how realistic that is to get the additional money so we can co-locate the county with the city which, in the last topoff, showed a really strong need for.

Shaff: I agree with you on that. This is a facility that the city desperately needs.

Fish: If I could just say, I thought it was a superb presentation, as usual, from both of you.

Scarlett: Thank you.

Fish: As you may know, i'm looks for a new director of the housing bureau. [laughter]

Leonard: No.

Shaff: David, you should leave now.

Fish: Because of your professionalism, I know you would never publicly comment on the challenges of working with any particular commissioner in charge.

Shaff: I would.

Leonard: If asked, he will.

Fish: For personal and professional reasons, if you need a change of scenery, i'd be delighted to have that conversation with you off-line. And thanks for your responsiveness.

*******:** You're welcome.

February 25, 2009

Fish: One other thing to paul.

Scarlett: Yes.

Fish: You coach which high school track team?

Scarlett: St. Mary's high school. I'm in my 10th year of coaching that started monday.

Fish: Paul and I had lunch a while ago, and he regaled me with his history as a track star, and he's coaching now. My daughter is signed up for her high school track team.

Scarlett: Oh. We should talk.

Fish: Well, we can talk up until game day. Then you're on your own.

*******:** Strictly professional.

Fish: Thank you, both.

*******:** You're welcome.

Fritz: I, too, thank commissioner Leonard and you all for being so responsive to my questions over the last week. I'm still questioning the additional cost of the shell of the second floor. I wasn't asking about the inflation costs. I was asking how much extra does it cost to take off the roofing and now have the eco roof and add the second story in a second phase, even if it's two weeks later. When the construction site is set down, all of the materials have been recycled, how much extra does it cost to do it?

Shaff: That difference is \$6.5 million if it was two weeks later. It's the difference between building a \$15.5 million building today and, two weeks later, saying, ok. We've got the extra 6.5 million. Let's put that second floor on that.

Fritz: How much of that 6.5 million is taking off the roof and adding --

Adams: We actually have dealt with this, and tom lipton and the bureau of environmental services I know would be happy to provide technical help. We can do eco roofs that are pretty easily removable and reinstall label.

Shaff: But, commissioner, that really is the answer. The difference is between the one-story building of \$15.5 million and the two-story building with just the shell as 22 million.

Adams: You factored in, though, commissioner Fritz's question, the cost of stripping the roof?

Shaff: Right. That is our operations building out at interstate was built that way. It was intended to be increased in height.

Fritz: How much would it cost to build the second-story shell in the same phase?

Shaff: \$6.5 million.

Fritz: And exactly the same amount to take off the roof.

Shaff: If you do it in two weeks. But next year it will cost more.

Fritz: In two weeks, it would cost exactly the same amount?

Shaff: That is our estimate based on -- you know -- I have 100 people who work for me who do this for a living, and that is what they have said. This is how much it will cost to build this building. This is how much it will cost to build this building.

Adams: In part because you're designing this building --

Shaff: To be --

Adams: There's no expansion system on the roof?

Shaff: We've designed this so we can build it. As mike mentioned to you in the meeting we had last week, this building will not be your typical one-story building. It will be built with the idea that the second floor will be added on.

Fritz: I understand that. I don't understand why it wouldn't cost anything extra to take off the roof and do it in two phases.

Shaff: That is included that cost of \$6.5.

Fritz: I do have another question.

Leonard: The answer is that it's an insignificant cost. It is absolutely insignificant.

Adams: As long as it's built that way.

February 25, 2009

Fritz: Ok. So my next concern is that we didn't get the \$2 million in last year's federal appropriations, and it would be nice to get the full cost of both stories in the next appropriations, and i'm wondering how we're going to be working on that.

Adams: Our near term -- again, our best opportunity is the federal stimulus where they have actually set aside -- there's a bucket of money for exactly these kinds of operational centers, and it's competitive. The initial word is, the more local money you have in your application -- in which case, ours is pretty significant the more competitive you are. That's on the short-term. On the longer term, we'll be looking for the usual places i've earmarked.

Fritz: So we'll be asking for the whole 22, 25 million in combination with our local set aside?

Adams: For stimulus, yes. The difference.

Fritz: Thank you.

Adams: Any other conversation with our staff? Thank you, gentlemen. Anyone in the room that wishes to testify? Oh. This is a second reading, but is there anyone that wishes to testify since we've had some more conversation? I don't see anybody. So, Karla, unless there's additional council discussion, could you please call the roll for council calendar item 195?

Fritz: Thank you again for your help in getting me up-to-date. Aye.

Fish: This seems to me to be a win/win. The city will get an emergency coordination center. And thanks to the creativity of paul and david and commissioner Leonard, we're going to be able to soften the impact of this downturn by using in-house people with tremendous skills and capacity to help us do the work. I really appreciate the ingenuity, and frankly it's times like this that the rest of us sort of watch and listen and perhaps even borrow some of these ideas as we are trying to figure out how to handle the challenges in our bureaus. Thanks to both of you, as always, and commissioner Leonard. This is a very creative solution, and I would perhaps be willing to throw in some additional consideration if -- [laughter] Aye.

Saltzman: Thank you, commissioner Leonard and paul and david for your response to the questions we had last week. I'm fully satisfied and comfortable. Aye.

Leonard: Thank you. I just want to again point out the great work that david and paul have done in putting this together. Without you two guys working on it, the project wouldn't be going forward. It's very creative, and I really appreciate it. Aye.

Adams: Well, we have an amazing talent pool in the bureau of development services, and this helps us preserve that in the face of an incredibly unique set of difficult economic circumstances. So I want to laud you, commissioner Leonard and ty and paul and david for your creativity on this and moving forward and being creative about how to finance it. We desperately need the building, so thank you. Aye. 195 is approved. Karla, could you please read the title for council calendar item 196?

Item 196.

Adams: Commissioner Leonard?

Leonard: You've had your peas all morning. This is your dessert. This is a, strictly speaking, resolution based on a conversation I had some time back at commissioner Fish's suggestion to literally transfer a piece of property known as mccall's restaurant on the waterfront to the Portland water bureau in exchange for transferring properties that are located at the mount tabor maintenance yard to the parks bureau. Given the discussion we just had prior to this of the creativity, I just want to acknowledge commissioner Fish's creativity, because it was not something that occurred to me to suggest as a way of having a transfer which has the ultimate goal of frankly saving the rose festival for Portland. There exists this building on the waterfront, as we will hear more about later, that was originally designed by john eon which has been, without pointing fingers, allowed to deteriorate over the decades. We have the opportunity to do two really cool things for the community. One, get the building back in, as much as possible, its original condition and, two, have the keepers of the soul of the city that is the vigilant and watched over right now by jeff curtis of the rose festival

February 25, 2009

association in the building and having the building be the icon that it originally was designed to be but will be, I think, viewed, when this work is done that tom is going to discuss a little bit, and others will really be a treasure that Portlanders will then recognize as significant as they have come to embrace the "made in Oregon" sign. That is absolutely my goal. We'll talk more about that later.

But tom klutz is our property manager at the water bureau, does an outstanding job. He will be integral in the development of the exterior the building at the suggestion of one of the folks who are going to testify here. We've already entered into discussions hiring a landscape architect that has worked closely with parks over the years to help us design what we consider to be a world class rose garden that will surround the property. And we want to do it in the most thoughtful and sensitive way possible. As we move forward, every step will be done with the thought of having no further harm occur to the building and, in fact, reversing some of what has happened to restore it to its original state.

Tom Klutz, Portland Water Bureau: My name is tom klutz. I'm the property manager for the water bureau. I want to thank all the commissioners today and mayor Adams for letting us go forward on a project that's about to happen. Like commissioner Leonard said, both commissioner Fish and commissioner Leonard kind of put their heads together and came up with a unique opportunity for us to engage on making truly a beautiful piece of property on our waterfront something that can be cherished and be held for the ages. The Portland water bureau has had the benefit working with the parks bureau to complete this waterfront property in exchange -- exchange with the mount tabor property. By working with the Portland rose festival foundation, the city will establish a consistent presence that will not only enhance the energy and safety of the tom mccall waterfront park but will restore this structure to its proper and needed use. You'll see some slides here in just a little bit that will show kind of differences before and after and some things that we're looking at, and that will really give you an idea of what we want to be. The city benefits by supporting the historic Portland institution in the rose festival we anticipate the full transfer will take place in october or november. It's no secret, given its name and the idea of putting a rose on top of the building and some things that you'll see that part of our plan will involve lots and lots of roses -- part of our plan will involve lots and lots of roses. I think people will look at it and say, wow: That really is an improvement of what we want to do.

Steve Planchon, Portland Parks and Recreation: I have very little to say other than it's been a very good experience working with water bureau on this. Enjoyed it immensely. We look forward to having the decks cleared up at mount tabor. We appreciate that. I look forward to the presentation.

Leonard: Ty, when were you going to do that? Want to do it now? I was like a kid in a candy store looking at the stuff that was brought in, and we want to give you an idea of where we want to get the building back to.

Ty Kovatch, Commissioner Leonard's Office: So thomas lauderdale has also put together a presentation on this which will probably go a lot more in-depth into the history. Just to help give people context of the building, it's something that I think time has lost in a lot of ways. So you're looking at the front facade of the building, and there's a lot of changes that have occurred over many generations different tenants and whatnot. You see there's a little water faux. This is looking north at the south facade which used to have street frontage and had an entryway on it, and we'll show you what has been done with that since that time. This is from the rear looking -- that must be southwest. Another view. If you look to the right, you'll see the reflecting pool that was there with a fountain just on the edge. This is the interior. Today it has a drop ceiling on the interior so you can't see the original woodwork that was up there. Another view of the interior with the light coming in and the really clean lines. And this is what it looks like today. You'll see, on the roof, that over the years -- you know -- tenants like restaurants and others have installed hvac equipment and, right behind the tree to the right, there is a vent -- a large vent -- that you can see better from

February 25, 2009

this view. This is the view looking north of the south facade of the building, which is dramatically different from its original view. This is where those doors were that you looked at before that are in a condition of disrepair. There's some areas where it looks like graffiti has been repaired. Another thing to note right here, 'cause this is a good view of it up close, is we'll see another picture of the original again, but there is a line that goes right up the middle of where the panels are. And in the original, you didn't see any lines. It was a very clean, consistent piece all the way through. Again, the red overhang that currently sits over the doorway was not part of the original design. This is the rear of the building. The blue area that's a different color in the corner there is suffering from a lot of dry-rot. One thing we'll look at in a minute is the windows, in many areas around the building, have been inverted. And we'll have to look at sort of the history of why that is. It might have been some practical reason for tenants who have been there before, but if you look from the right to left, there is a line of clear windows that go right over the top of where the dry-rot area is, and those used to extend all the way across the entryway that is right on that side. There's two randys looking at the dry-rot. This is just some of the landscaping. Our idea is that we would have some sort of striking roaster landscape design that would be something that might even be destination in and of itself.

Adams: Roaster?

Kovatch: Exactly. You like that?

Adams: Love that.

Kovatch: I have an expansive vocabulary. If you guys would let me testify before, you'd know that.

Fish: That may be how you talk in commissioner Leonard's, but we would like plain language.

Adams: Plain centric language, please.

Kovatch: In the original design you'll see in another picture, there was very little in the way of landscaping. It was part of the clean line design that I think was the deal. This is just to show that lights have been affixed to this area that were not originally there. It was also designed to be really clean, and there's a number of different kind of lights, in fact, on it. Just to the right, this is a similar view. You can see where the reflecting pool was and another view it right there. You can see the fountain in the reflecting pool. Right now, we have plywood over where the fountain was, and there have been attempts to improve this over time. We'd like to have the water bureau develop a water feature that would go in there that would come at the guidance the designer that we've brought onboard for this. There's another view looking south. There is the original. Again, if you notice from what we've seen, the very clean look of the panels that go up and down --

Fish: On that slide, that's the original color, that sort of --

Kovatch: Yes. That's another key element of this is we intend to restore it to its original color. And if you look, you can see here the windows going all the way across to the rear entry and the panels on the bottom went all the way up. Our office, when we were looking at the picture, we debated whether we were looking at the same thing. If you look at it, you can see it's the same view the south facade of the building and used to be an entry. Windows are on the bottom now. There are some cool cars in that picture as well. And then this is the theoretical image that commissioner Leonard asked the water bureau of graphicing to put together. He had an idea in his mind, and this is sort of a rendering of that so it's easier to describe to others. Certainly it's a concept, but that would be the idea. And the idea is that you have a very elegant, simple rose neon light that would be visible from across the river that would kind of have its own iconic sense as well as the iconic nature of the building that we hope to bring back. That's all i've got.

Adams: Great pictures.

Leonard: Did you bring those?

Kovatch: I can bring them back in.

Leonard: We'll wait a little while. Great. Thank you.

February 25, 2009

Adams: Do you have more. Presentation?

Leonard: I don't.

Saltzman: Questions or testify?

Leonard: Either way.

Adams: Shall we run through testify since we made them wait a while? We'll have you back, I promise.

Moore-Love: I have about four people signed up. The first three are nate overmeyer, thomas m. Lauderdale, and richard louis brown.

Thomas M. Lauderdale: Good morning. My name is thomas lauderdale. I'm a member of the friends of john young's public business association's building. We're here to advocate for a long-neglected architectural jewel, the center also known as mccall's restaurant designed in 1948 by the great Portland architect, john young. Several of you know yesterday we made the rounds in this building, exploring what the best options are for the building as you consider transferring its management from parks to the water bureau and consider leasing it to the rose festival. In the end, we concluded that the path commissioner Leonard is offering is the very best opportunity to turn the building's history of neglect around it to begin moving towards proper stewardship. We also see the rose festival as the same kind of quasicivic organization similar to the chamber of commerce who first commissioned the building back in 1948. We believe commissioner Leonard and the rose festival see the same points on the horizon as we do, and we look forward to working with them to find the best fiscally and historically responsible path here. It's easy to think of it as a colorful little shack, but there is an opportunity here not just to bring the rose festival to the building on the waterfront park but to honor Portland's architectural legacy.

Randy Gragg: I wanted to run you through a little history on john yon, because I think it's important to see the depth of his work. That's the man standing next to one of his masterpieces which he designed in 1936 at the age of 26. His legacy of his 20s is really quite amazing. This is probably the most internationally publicize the house that's been built in Portland on skyline drive. It was exhibited at the museum of modern art a couple times besides masterpieces like falling water. You can see the pools are kind of a theme motif in john's work. He also designed inexpensive houses. This is some the first plywood houses in the country using the new technology of plywood in the early '40s. But his legacy extends way beyond that. John, at age 21, bought chapman point and saved it from becoming a dance hall on top of it. And there by preserving the most photographed vista on the Oregon coast. Highway engineers liked to blast and build roads in straight lines. He intervened on -- intervened on several occasions. He also intervened in the second generation of highways in the columbia river gorge to bring curves to those, because the engineers were intent on building that highway as straight as possible. He also played a role in waterfront park. The p.d.c. Was planning to build it as a series of horseshoe pits and barbecue stands sort of in the world of the public at that time, and john intervened and made a very eloquent argument for a linear park against sort of the chaos of the background of the city, which I think we can really thank him for. He also was a very, very early historic preservationist. The first international bank building was supposed to become a parking lot. He intervened and saved that building. And in the '60s, I also purchased a lineal mile the columbia river gorge, basically the northern edge of the river directly across from Multnomah falls, and did what's basically a kind of picturesque landscape that is now in the stewardship of the university of Oregon, and I stood on that advisory board for those two properties. Now, ty did a great job of running you through what the building looked like. It was designed in 1947, built in '48 through the chamber of commerce. And it was also exhibited immediately along with the equitable building built in the u.s.a. Show at museum of modern art with a range of masterpieces by everybody all the way to frank lloyd wright. America was sort of flexing its muscles in the art and architectural world. There are some great pictures of the car at the time. You can see how far ahead it was for its time. It was basically

February 25, 2009

designed for a situation that was very different with harbor drive there. John very much designed it to be a kind of refuge, a peaceful place to be in the immediacy of harbor drive. But also it's really the first structure on the river to really address the river and really sort of foresaw the possibility of a future for waterfront park. The windows were placed to basically keep views of ugly structures like the journal building out of your mind. It was really designed to be a peaceful place. And obviously very elegant. Tremendous layer upon layer. The p.d.c. first took it over the chamber of commerce more or less abandoned it. P.d.c. took it over and brought a restaurant in. The first remodel was actually fairly careful, done by wall yam hawkins. Subsequent remodels have been done really willy-nilly on it. We have great confidence that commissioner Leonard and the water bureau and the rose festival can bring it back to its former splendor. We have done a lot of research. We have original construction drawings, original analysis of the paint. And we have a lot to bring to the table as you'll see in subsequent presentations.

Richard Louis Brown: I'm richard louis brown. I was a close associate of john yeon -- john yeon for several years. Randy showed you a picture of the wassick house. I've lived there for 36 years. I gave it recently to the university of Oregon. And when I leave it, it will be the john yeon center for architectural studies. I want to address an idea that's been repeated quite a bit. That john yeon advocated removal of the building. It wasn't because he was proud of the design but precisely because he was proud of it. He was 35 when it was built and, at the end of his life, it was very painful to him to see the neglect and I know dignities it had suffered. He preferred to see open parks rather than the sorry remains of a once-admired building. He predicted that it would be allowed to deteriorate further and about that, as usual, he was right. Like the man himself, the building was highly original, yet expressive of its own time. It was intellectually rigorous, yet elegant. It was unpretentious, yet beautifully proportioned. It turned modest materials into a work of international distinction. I believe a great city recognizes its masterworks and restores and honors them. If we're going to leave the visitors information center there, we really must truth it with care and respect for its original design. So I am pleased and hopeful that we now have a new opportunity to get it right. Thank you.

Nate Overmeyer: My name is nate overmeyer, and we are aware that our enthusiasm here could possibly be misconstrued as preservationist finger wagging and, as such, reproachable. On the contrary. We're very encouraged by the identification of a solution for the building and committed to doing what we can to enable the realization of that proposal using best practices. To that end, we're offering, at this point, to pay up to \$15,000 of privately raised funds for design and research services by an expert preservation architect to guide any changes to the exterior and interior in preparation for the rose festival's occupancy. That way the city can spend wisely, it's clear that, for far too long, the neglect that has befall length building is due to every proposal that's come forward being nonviable due to lack partnerships, and we're very excited about the opportunity to achieve a kind of synergy between commissioner Leonard's "can do" spirit, the rose festival's need for space, and the downtown presence. And our goal to give this great building and its architect's legacy some much-deserved respect and care.

Adams: Your testify was fantastic. Any questions from council?

Moore-Love: We have one more person, jeff curtis.

Leonard: Richard, before you leave I didn't know of you until you testified today. These particular gentlemen, particularly with your strong personal connection with john yeon, I want to tell you something, and it is that, aside from the advocacy that has happened on this project, the suggestions that have been made, my -- I think, in a way that believes in historical renovations, as an example, to give you some -- to establish a little street cred for myself, at least two of my colleagues are a wear of this. The others have arrived since last year's budget. When I got the water bureau three and half year as go and did a tour of the bull run, the thing that stood out to me, aside from the beauty of the bull run was three historic cabins that were built originally by the workers, had been

February 25, 2009

allowed to deteriorate that the roofs on one had collapsed, the roof on another had a tree fall through it and ruin it. The house known as bear creek house was designed and built for the chief engineer in the 20s that built dam number 1. And I don't know if you've been to bull run and seen the house i'm describing to you, but it was designed as a very classic mid 20s architectural house. When I toured it, the chimney had lapsed. It was used as storage for anyone of a number of water bureau appendages, shovels, rakes. Had mice in it. I singularly advocated in the budget against the recommendations of the citizen budget committee and, frankly, against some strong skepticism of my council colleagues to put money in the budget to rebuild the cabins, to restore the house to its original grandeur. One of the three cabins has been restored to its original state. The house has been rebuilt, the chimney rebuilt, all done absolutely consistent with the '20s architecture, including the house haven't been furnished in '20s pieces. I inright each of you to go along with me for a tour of bull run, which is a wonderful treat itself but, given the passion you have for historical preservation, I think you'll be greatly relieved to work at the work that reflects my belief system and know that, on this building, I intend to do the same kind of thing, only with a higher degree of awareness that it's in Portland's front pore which -- porch. I promise you'll be proud of the result when we're done.

*****: Thank you. We appreciate that.

Leonard: You bet.

Adams: Who signed up?

Moore-Love: Jeff curtis.

Adams: Welcome to city council.

Jeff Curtis: Good morning. Also good afternoon. On behalf of the rose festival foundation, the individuals that have come before me, it's ream humbling and an honor to see what I see. What I see today is the spirit of cooperation and partnership and recognizing the vital role that my organization plays and has played for 102 years. The work we're doing today will pay off for future Portlanders. The festival will go on another one hundred years, buff it takes some caring, some passion, and some efforts by all. What i'm seeing through this project and other conversations about building the future festival, it's really humbling, and I want to thank you on behalf of the rose festival foundation for that. Again, thank you -- to occupy as a tenant of that magnificent building is truly a treasure for us, but it's much more than a building. We talked about the infrastructure. I just want to touch briefly on the people. The people that will occupy this building are people that care very much about this community, and they do that through the production of our civic festival. They're talented people. They're volunteers that will come in this building. So this building will not only have a physical property itself, visually important, but it's the people inside of it, the rose festival, that will be working on behalf of this community and building a legacy, and future festivals will be born and created out of this building. And I think that's a legacy piece that has not been touched on that should be reflected in our comments and certainly with my organization, the people that will occupy the building who will make a profound impact in the success of this project. It's an honor. I look back at history as we partner with the festival through good times and bad. While these are tough economic times for all of us and tough for the rose festival, that spirit of partnership with the city has been there and been there before, and the rose festival has also delivered back. The festival is making an investment back. I'll give you a couple examples of that. We've put in over \$2 million at Portland international raceway to make that a racy that would attract. For 25 years, it was a major part of the Portland sports program, and the festival made that happen. Today at waterfront park, that park many have a better -- work for special events a lot better. The message is the festival in strong times will be there for the city and also on tough times. I just wanted to thank you on behalf of my organization.

Saltzman: Just a couple questions. Has a lease been negotiated?

Curtis: No. No.

February 25, 2009

Saltzman: My understanding, from what I read in the press, is it's \$1 a year.

Curtis: That's correct.

Leonard: With some conditions.

Saltzman: Tenant improvements contemplated?

Curtis: The rose festival absolutely is right now discussing that with commissioner Leonard's office as our liaison. We have to sell our building first. In other words, we have a building, and our plan is to use some of those funds from that building to reinvest in the building. Specific tenant improvements have yet to be discussed. I look forward to some specific lease conversations about tenant improvements moving forward, but those have not begun yet.

Adams: Thank you, jeff, for the excellent management you're providing to the rose festival during these tough economic times.

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

Adams: Anyone else in the room that did not sign up that would like to testify on council item 196? Are there additional questions of staff?

Saltzman: Yes.

Adams: Staff, please come forward. Commissioner Saltzman.

Saltzman: So, I guess in a lot of discussions that occurred yesterday, there's some question as to the historic designation of the yeon building. Is it considered a historical landmark or contributing resource?

Kovatch: That's what we're looking at now. I mean, i've heard -- the short answer is maybe.

Leonard: Ty, come up. Ty has been looking at it.

Kovatch: It's a historic landmark.

Saltzman: So, it is?

Kovatch: Yes.

Saltzman: So then any changes would be subject to the historic landmarks --

Kovatch: We will be engages the bureau of development services interim design review manager, tim herrin, who I spoke with over the last couple of days to sort of map out what are all the things that will be pushed through that process. From the color of the building to any material changes that occur.

Saltzman: And then I guess the big question to me is what is water repair dollars going for?

Klutz: For exterior-wise, we're looking at the design piece of it, and we've looked at bringing on carol mayer. And as a result, our crews on the outside will take care of any of the exterior things that we do between curb, painters, our folks that do the landscape work.

Saltzman: Interior?

Klutz: Interior, that's the part where both the rose festival and the commissioner's office were talking about how can we lay that out and make it work for all of us.

Saltzman: So I guess the larger question, I mean, city charter is very clear that water repair dollars should only be going for water-rated improvements.

Leonard: This is not unprecedented. The east Portland coalition actually, for a dollar a year, rents a building at hazelwood for their offices. The staff repainted the building and fixed up the inside. This is property that connects to the fountain at waterfront park that the water bureau maintains. Our intention is -- our intention is to the extent possibly take advantage of down times and work. I've talked to the fire chief and some of his painters and carpenters. At times they're very busy. At other times, they're not quite as busy. So i'm hoping to take advantage of lowdowns.

Saltzman: Including tenant improvement.

Leonard: That's a source of negotiations between the rose festival and the water bureau. We've talked to them about us doing the improvements and then repaying them over a period of years. As part of a lease agreement.

*******:** The other piece --

February 25, 2009

Saltzman: Will this come back to council?

Kovatch: Yes. I don't know about the lease. What I was going to say is there will be a variety of expenditures that will need council approval throughout the course of this. And your question is appropriate. We'll be looking for the various solutions all along the way, because the water bureau is as conscious of -- conscientious -- as we are and you are.

Leonard: Before we sign this, I'd have commissioner Fritz review it. I'm not going to treat this any differently than we would any other.

Saltzman: I mean, the council has a prerogative on this matter. I know recently on the gateway park property appraisal, there was a request that council have a second look at the appraisal. Now, technically that didn't need to occur under our system of government. I guess I'm asking if there's others on the council --

Leonard: I'm happy to share it with you and have you review it and make suggestions.

Saltzman: Before it's signed?

Leonard: Before it's signed. I'm happy to bring it to your office and commissioner Fritz and happy to go through it with you. You can make observations, ask questions. You know from our history of working together, I'm very open to --

Saltzman: I appreciate that, but nevertheless, I want council to have a say in this because of the concerns I'm expressing which are shared, apparently, by the water bureau.

Leonard: I don't know that we need to go through the necessary steps of bringing it'd back -- it back. That's something we do.

Fish: The matter before us today is the issue of the exchange of properties? The question of a future lease or these other issues are future matters. The injure mane -- germane issue before us right now. The --

Adams: I'm confident that, with commissioner Leonard's commitment to show us a draft lease and be responsive to any comments, I'm comfortable with the normal sort of process.

Fritz: I think having a water bureau property within a parks property, I can see why you'd want to do what you did with mount tabor, so I'm wondering about -- for instance, and you brought to my attention that the salmon creek springs is a water bureau facility. Who paid for that?

Leonard: The water bureau.

Fritz: The water bureau paid for that. So would the water bureau be paying for the water feature within this property?

Leonard: Mm-hmm. Again, this is all subject to the negotiations. Negotiations with the tenant.

Adams: So one of the reasons that I am comfortable personally with sort of the -- I should say I'm very comfortable with sort of the underlying efforts being made here to provide greater support to the Portland rose festival. And, in this case, being done so by avoiding costs and providing more publicity. Part of the reason for doing that is commissioner Leonard's and Jeff's commitment to update the festival and to look at making it more germane and more successful among more people.

I think it's just good to put it out there on the table. This is considered one of the -- still one of the best festivals -- annual festivals in the United States. It is being conducted with very little financial support from the city of Portland despite the fact that we reap many benefits from it. I support the notion that we provide more support or, in this case, we're providing support in terms of a low-cost lease for this building. That was derelict and abandoned, and we're doing it in a way that will preserve some important architecture. I think the questions are good. I think we have an opportunity by the way commissioner Leonard has said he will continue to confer with the council, but I also think it's important that we send a strong message of support for the rose festival. So I think these are great questions. I think they need to be answered as we move forward, but I think getting this done today is equally important.

Leonard: I would just observe that the current, the status quo has produced the building in a state that it is. Something has to change. And we have an opportunity to do two things simultaneously:

February 25, 2009

Reclaim a historic landmark described here and retain what I consider to be nothing less than the keepers of the flame of the city. And display them proudly on Portland's front -- proudly on Portland's front porch. We have to be creative in order to do that. This is a path by which we have made in order to accomplish both of those.

Saltzman: Well, again, just returning to my point, with all due respect, I do believe that, similar to the discussion we just had on the emergency communications center, an o.m.f.'s writeup of this item, they note their concern that, as the project proceeding, the emergency communication center, care must be taken that the water bureau does not fund the greater portion of the emergency communications than is consistent with what its staff will use. In other words, the nexus between what water ratepayers are paying for and the project. And I think that concern is a legitimate concern for this as well. I fully support getting the rose festival in there, restoring this building to what it once was, but I still have concern about the next sustainability between water ratepayer dollars and what will go into this project, and I would like to see -- I would like to have council review that, given -- we're expecting a rather large water brunch the budget -- budget this year in terms of rates, and I think these are germane issues.

Kovatch: There are two points. One is the lease, which I would separate from the broader issue of the big picture cost of the building. And i'm confident that we have in the makings a solution that will address your concern, but it would be much too early and presumptive to discuss that at this point. As we move through the process, I am confident we'll be able that address that concern they're raising.

Adams: I'm going to facilitate some decision making on some of these points. Do I hear a motion, commissioner Saltzman, regarding your concern?

Saltzman: If it's not the lease, where else would we discuss this?

Kovatch: In the air yang contracts that will come through about what's necessary to renovate the building, do improvements, those kinds of things.

Saltzman: Maybe not necessarily the funding but maybe the nature? The landmark, all that.

Kovatch: Well, sort of -- there are certain things that the rose festival will absolutely need to make that building functional for their purpose. Those things are things that logically should be something that they amortize over the life of the loan. Some materials may be more expensive than your run the mill -- run of the mill materials. There's sort of a die versus the citywide against of who is responsible for which pieces, and this is sort of the city's pressure that we're looking to unearth. We will work hard to make sure that the rose festival helps with the part that it's responsible for, but there's a much broader universe of items that the city will be responsible for. To that end, we will need to demonstrate that it's in compliance with the city's charter, and I feel we'll be able to do that.

Saltzman: And you believe that's true with the lease itself, that you'll be able to demonstrate -- it will come back to council for review which I think as a motion in the past. When commissioner Leonard sits down with the lease and I ask questions or commissioner Fritz or anybody on this council asks questions about the nexus between using water ratepayer dollars as applies to any provisions in the lease, you'll feel you have have solid charter-approved answers?

Kovatch: Well, the water bureau owns hundreds and hundreds of properties throughout the city, some of which are in active use every day and some of which are not. They systematically -- I mean, they just have those properties.

Fish: I think we're forgetting our history here. We could have that debate for a week. What's the fair market value of the property?

Kovatch: I have no idea.

Fish: Do you have a guess?

Klut: No. I'd have to look and compare.

Fish: Is it fair to say --

February 25, 2009

Adams: It's priceless.

Fish: Is it fair to say in the millions of dollars?

Klutz: Yes.

Fish: So under this ordinance, a property valued in the range of millions of dollars is being transferred to the water bureau to be the custodian of that property. As I understand it, there will be a negotiation with the rose festival to figure out the allocation of cost to make this building habitable for a purpose. And then, at some point down the road, it may be the water bureau's intention to move its own operations there if it chooses or to maintain the rose festival. But as a consequence of this ordinance, on the balance sheets of the water bureau, it will now be an asset that I assume is worth in the millions of dollars. Is that a fair comment? From someone who does pay his water bill consistently, I would say this is the deal of the century for the water bureau. I attempted to rescind the offer of the engine change for the 1.8 acres to a fraction, but I'm comfortable with using the typical protocol of having the commissioner in charge handle the follow-up work. I think the issue, quite frankly, commissioner Saltzman, with gateway is particularly distinguishable, in part because you presented the appraisal to the council which the council had questions about, and the presenters on that acknowledged that a second appraisal would be in the public interest. I think that is completely distinguishable. I am perfectly comfortable on this record, having the commissioner in charge handle those lease discussions. And I think inviting colleagues to comment and review that process in an informal way is gracious. Unnecessary, but I think it's gracious.

Saltzman: By point on the gateway proposal is that it's the council's prerogative to review what it chooses. Quite frankly, I think comparisons of property value offsets is really missing the questions I'm asking here.

Fritz: Could your questions be satisfied in the budget process for the water bureau, having their costs line itemed out?

Saltzman: Yeah. Is there a cost code that will be set up for this project?

*******:** No.

Adams: So we've established as a legislative record that we all are interested in seeing the full cost allocation for this project, whether it's through the -- and obviously we're interested in seeing it in a summary form and as individual pieces come through. Is that a fair characterization of where you're at?

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

Saltzman: I guess it's a fair characterization for where I'll land today. But I do want to flag this concern not only in this discussion but also reflected by financing the emergency communication center and in others, the nexus between spending ratepayer dollars opened on the water system.

Kovatch: As I said, I'm confident we'll be able to address that concern both for yourself and o.m.f.

Adams: As always, we involve the legal shop if we need to get that verified. All right. Is there any other discussion? I'm looking at the somewhat late hour. Any other discussion or questions from this panel -- for this panel from council? All right. Thank you, gentlemen. Unless there is additional discussion from council, are we ready to move to a call of the vote? All right. Hearing no need for additional discussion, Karla, can you please call the roll for this council item?

Fritz: I'm comfortable supporting this in part because of the discussion that we just had and thank you for raising those concerns. I think that we -- I hope that we can get that information through the budget process as far as the funding and looking at that. And I also appreciate your offer to let me and anyone else to look at the lease before it's signed to suggest changes. I'm supporting it in part because it will be a landmark. Review of the internal and external changes and improvements. I would suggest considering a monument type placement of the rose. But I was impressed that the skylines do, I think, address or allow staff and the landmark commission to address the concerns I

February 25, 2009

spoke of in the last week. I do actually have one more question if I might just break into this. Anybody speak up if you had any correspondence from the folks in mount tabor and the friends of mount tabor park. I know this was -- there have been a lot of highly contentious issues, and I haven't heard from anybody that the swap part of it is a problem, so i'm going to support it on the basis of not having heard about that. People care about our public property, the rates we pay, the taxes they pay. Even though we have a large budget in the city of Portland, they're concerned we do use the money for the right stuff. I'm very excited to have the rose festival in that historic building. I think it will be a signature place regardless of what the design improvements end up being, and i'm very pleased to vote aye.

Fish: First I want to begin by just taking commissioner Fritzes' last comment and express some concern. You were at a budget forum last night and still had time to review the code on historic preservation? I think that is tantamount to a cry for help, and I think that this should be referred to employee assistance programs. From my own experience as a -- [laughter] I appreciate your thoroughness, as always, commissioner Fritz. While you were at a budget forum last night, I was being roasted, and I would have much rather been you're shoes.

Fritz: I was taking one for the team. That's for sure.

Fish: The usual bias kicks in, so the flax prevails. The flaks were voted down and the hacks won. But I think the flaks -- the hacks showed a little more class in their humor. It's a rite of passage. It's over with, and I don't expect to be invited back. [laughter] I want to just say a few things. First to jeff curtis, jeff, I want to say that I am very grateful that you and the leadership has engaged us in how to update the rose festival. It's a wonderful tradition, and there's a chance now to breathe some new life to it and make it even more relevant for the comment times. Your leadership and willingness to engage that is to your credit, so I want to thank you for that. I love that style of architecture. When I used to live in new york, I used to love the sebring building, the tile the stool - - style of modernization in his work. Thank you for sharing the history with us. It's important. When I lived in new york, I was part of a citizens' group that helped save and earnest flag building that was in great disrepair and had suffered a fire and now has been restored as a city treasure. I know how hard -- it took us 10 years, and I say that because I think that we recognize that this building has got into its current condition over a long period of time, and it's going to take time to restore it. As I was looking at some of those pictures you brought, I wondered even where the furniture was. I'm hoping that, in the bowels of the Oregon historical society, some that modernist furniture might be located and restored to the site. We are looking at a long-term plan to bring back the building. To commissioner Leonard and commissioner Adams, I want to say thank you for having put the marker down early and establishing the precedent for this city to step in and be a partner and help the rose festival. It took leadership. You have been criticized for it in some quarters. I think it's exactly the right thing to do. We get a tremendous return from the rose festival. It's critical to the city and social fabric of this city. It bring as lot of people here from outside of our city. And it is, I think, entirely appropriate during these tough times that the city would reach out and offer to help the rose festival. To me, this is an example of what's before us today of creative problem solving. There's 1.8 acres at the mount tabor yard that will be brought back into parks ownership, so we have the ownership of the complete stretch that is now also subject of a marvelous master plan which we're going to try to fund through stimulus dollars and actually make sure that our workforce and parks has the ability to do the work. At the same time, the john yeon building goes into the hands -- the capable hands of the water bureau, which will end up being the 'cause todayian of that building and its proximity to the fountain at the park that makes this, I think, imminently tense sable. There is a lot of work that needs to be done, and there's obviously some details that have to be worked out with informal consultation with my colleagues. I'd like to thank steve of parks for all his hard work and jerri and her leadership team that sort of kicked around and maybe first came up with this idea of a trade. We're always going to be

February 25, 2009

supported of using mccall's at this purpose, but the trade for me was the icing on the cake, and I want to thank commissioner Leonard for his leadership. We did this in record time in terms of due diligence and contracting. We did that because commissioner Leonard insisted we keep the lawyers out of it. [laughter] Just kidding. We're very grateful for the work of the city attorney's office. I think this is something we should be celebrating, and I think it's an example of where creative thinking allows us to meet a number of compelling social goals. So i'm of course pleased to vote aye.

Saltzman: Well, I want to thank commissioner Leonard and commissioner Fish for their creativity. I fully support the idea of the land swap, and I can fell commissioner Fritz I know the friends of mount tabor were fully supportive of the master plan, so this helps bring the master plan probably a step closer to actually happening. And I think the rose festival, this is a great idea. And to the preservationists, thomas lauderdale and nate, we want to thank you for your offer of \$15,000 for historical assessment. I'm glad we have determined in fact this is a historical landmark and will be in fact restored to its greatness. I have to confess I never really had the full appreciation for mr. Yeon and his architecture at least with respect to that building. I never knew about wassick house and other places. Having grown up in Portland, i'm sure some wished it would be removed because it was deteriorating and inaccessible. I think this is an appropriate place for the rose festival to have its headquarters, and I do think that will be a win/win in terms of restoring the building. Notwithstanding my concerns about the nexus between water repair dollars and funding of this project and its restoration, which I hoe the -- which will hopefully be worked out to my satisfaction. I'm pleased to support this. Aye.

Leonard: I want to either explain or brag, depending on how you want to characterize what i'm going to say. As you look around Portland, there are parts of Portland that people look at and say, that's what makes Portland complete. One is simon benson's bubbler's, unique to Portland. The fountains, whether it's skidmore fountain or a fountain across the park here or any fountain you see in the city, paid for, maintained, and kept functional by the Portland water bureau, dodge park is probably one of the most beautiful parks i've ever seen, and I love to go and travel to places. Dodge park, I promise you, you will never find a more beautiful setting owned, operated, and paid for by the Portland water bureau. So i'm not going to challenge anybody, 'cause they'll take me up on it, to show those nexuses to the ratepayers of Portland, but I would say I think one of the great traditions of Portland is that it would have a Portland water bureau that not only delivers water to people's homes, the best water in the world, they are truly a community partner in this city. And so I would actually argue that, in the historical context, that the Portland water bureau has delivered its services. This is probably one of the most appropriate situations that they have this in their charge, to make it soon be a fourth of those iconic things about Portland. To commissioner Fish, this would not have happened without his help. He came up with the idea of the swap, and I am only sorry that I didn't think of it first. It was a great idea, solve as number of problems and lets us move on. We do intend -- and i've talked to mayor Adams about this, and this has caused some angst, I know, for randy gregg. As i've told others before, for instance gary blackmer when I told him I wanted to get the building purchased and Portland state to put the new archives in, we only had three months to pull the deal together, which meant getting the council to agree, the legislature to approve the bonding capacity, and then sign the deal. We had three months to add an extra building. They the he said, we can't get it done. I said, gary, just get on and hold tight. Close your eyes if you want to. I would say that to those worried that we can't do this properly. We may be moving quick, but it's not too quick. We'll get this done. The goal is, by the rose festival kickoff in may, which is going to be a little earlier than normal, to have a celebration, an unveiling, full, of this building. It certainly won't be completed. It certainly will have much more work to do. But mayor Adams and I have discussed the idea of inviting all of the living former mayors to that celebration that would include former mayor ivancy, mayor goldschmidt, mayor clark, mayor katz, and mayor Adams.

February 25, 2009

Who am I forgetting? Mayor potter. Of course. Have all of them present for what will be the -- i'll just call it the lighting ceremony for now that commissioner Fish will be intricately involved with. We intend this to be more than just a project but a celebration. And a celebration of the beginning of a new era for the rose festival, this building, and for Portland landers -- Portlanders to view what I call an iconic landmark on their waterfront. I appreciate all the testimony, the comments, the work. We have a lot of work to do. So, I mean, i'm leaving here literally and walking down with an architect to the building to review what needs to be done. So we're really moving quickly. It's an exciting project. I welcome all the oversight and input my colleagues as we move forward. Aye.

Adams: Well, first I want to thank john yeon for a beautiful building. I want to thank the nonfinger-wagging preservationists who have stepped forward with resources and sort of a preservationist bear hug of this project. They don't often get the opportunity. I want to underscore my thanks to thomas lauderdale who probably does more to promote Portland internationally than any other single human being on the planet. Thank you for that. And randy gregg, from your vantage point as a journalist and a couple of different platforms, thanks for continuing to both challenge us and to really help put a spotlight on the great talent that we do have in the city. I'm very happy to support this and continue to be amazed at the great fast work that commissioner Leonard and his team helped lead. I think this is exactly what the city needs, and I also want to acknowledge commissioner Fish for his creatively and help, helping to make it happen with the parks bureau. So avenue got a lot of work to do, but it's the best kind of work, and i'm happy to support this. Aye. All right. We are in recess until 2:00 p.m.

At 12:39 p.m., Council recessed.

February 25, 2009
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.

FEBRUARY 25, 2009 2:00 PM

Adams: Council will come back from recess. Please call the roll. [roll call]

Adams: We have two items on this afternoon's docket. Can you please read the title for item number 197.

Item 197.

Leonard: If you guys will come forward, we have representatives of our historic landmark commission here, chaired by art demuro, and we're going to hear a presentation, something we try to do to keep our work in context with our strong partnership, and so folks, have at it.

Art DeMuro, Chair, Historic Landmarks Commission: I want to acknowledge commissioner Fish, though he doesn't remember, it was his idea to have the session, commissioner Leonard facilitated it, which I appreciate, commissioner Fritz endorsed the idea, so thanks for the support and allowing us to do those. The way i'd like to structure this, we certainly want this to be a conversation, not a lecture. So i'll read opening remarks and summarize some background information and then just hit each of the objectives one at a time, and pause after each one and have a chance to have some exchange on each one. We'll spend as little or as much time on each item as you wish. Never to be taken for granted is the civic pride carried by Portlanders who love their home town. one of the greatest source assist our rich heritage, a history that has shaped our community spirit and determined our built environment. Our city has been blessed with rich, man made historic resources, including buildings, public spaces, and neighborhoods that compliment the mag 95 sent natural surroundings that provide our backdrop. Many just as our community strives to be second to none in production of our natural environment, so that it can be sustained responsibly for future generations, so does Portland need to be responsible to protect its I replaceable built environment. You have established the office of planning and sustainable development to oversee the protection of our community's natural assets and to promote our city as exemplary in this arena. Similarly, city council has appointed the Portland historic landmarks commission as your toought oversee and direct stewardship of our historic built environment. We accept that responsibility as a serious charge and have embarked on an active course to fulfill that mission. It is in that spirit we submit this report of the first annual installment of direct accountability of the Portland historic landmarks commission to the Portland city council. We want to start by touching on the historic preservation assets that our community has, which really puts us in a strong Position to provide historic preservation support. We have a landmarks commission which provides -- which is represented by a number of professions, architecture, legal, history, transportation, development, architecture, we provide advice requests, which are voluntary, of course type two and three design reviews, and even type four demolition, and review and acceptance of national register nominations. Our city has the special assessment incentive in which 15-year frozen assessed values are offered on national register properties, which provide financial incentives to restore these properties. And we have a number of support preservation organizations such as the architectural heritage center, and we now have the resurrection of the historic preservation league of Oregon. We thought it would be instructive to understand what our landmarks commission activity has been since 2009. Type two cases which are staff reviews, have increased from annual number of 65 in 2001 to 91 in 2008. So about a 50% increase in eight years.

February 25, 2009

The type two staff reports which are appealed to the landmarks commission averaged less than 1 and a half annually. Type 3 reviews, which are the initial applications reviewed, rather initially bite landmarks commission, have increased from four in the two years of 2001 to 2002, to 27 in 2007 and 2008. Designed advice requests, introduced in 2005, now average four annually, type three Appeals to city council, there have only been four this decade, two of which interest -- were the northwest Irving Street garage and only once this decade has the landmarks commission been overturned by an appeal to city council. And in this decade a total of 84 Portland properties have been added to the national register of historic places. The first preservation objective we'd like to touch on is maybe the most important point to make today. That relates to the issue of sustainable preservation. As Portland officially adopts public policies, contemplates new initiatives, reorganize pg and builds a center for sustainability, it is crucial the embraced of sustainability includes historic preservation principles and priorities. Historic preservation must be recognized as a centerpiece of sustainability, and elevated as a core principle. The concept of destroying historic resources or threatening historic districts to make room for new green build cans must stop. And be replaced with principles that promote and acknowledge resource efficiencies resulting from adaptive reuse through historic preservation. Accordingly, preservation should have a present in the Oregon sustainability center and financial incentives should be created similar to those for green initiatives.

A small first step was a proposal from the landmarks commission to the city to establish a new policy for Salvaging historic materials discarded by other city bureau and state agencies. We ask the mayor and city council to direct the new office of planning and sustainable development to investigate how sustainable preservation policies can be incorporated into its work. One statistic I think might be instructive for you relates to this issue of destruction of historic properties to be replaced by more energy efficient buildings. I'm sure you're all familiar with the concept of embodied energy. The energy used to create these buildings and eventually demolish them, that's what happens. Statistics show it is a 65-year payback of lost energy. In other words, it will take 65 years for a new building of similar size to save enough energy to replace the lost embodied energy of the building that was just thrown in the landfill.

Adams: That's an amazing statistic.

DeMuro: It's most buildings you think are not going to survive beyond that 65 years. So we have a vicious cycle of never gaining ground. Any thoughts on that, any of those questions? Number two has to do with the central Portland plan. The central Portland plan should incorporate historic preservation as the guiding principle of urban planning. There's four issues that I think are important. Some of which will be Reminiscent of recent discussions you've had. That is, there are conflicts which develop between the drive for density and historic preservation. We certainly understand the urban planning advantages of densification in our city. Support of mass transit and sustainability benefits. But we think that perhaps in the last planning cycle that the density push was perhaps overzealous. What we have found is that there are a number of historic districts that have had code amendments, or code language which is written which calls for buildings which are - - have a greater massing and height than would be compatible. So what we're finding happening is applications before landmarks commission for very large buildings which absolutely conform with code maximums, but which were unlikely to receive landmarks commission approval because they are disproportionate to the district and would be destructive towards character. And that's not fair to applicants to lead them on in a false direction. A lot of money is spent by the applicant and a lot of staff time is wasted as well. So that leads to the drive for code consistency between historic design guideline and planning codes. And we think it makes sense for the central Portland plan to create a conversation between the planning commission and the landmarks commission to try to bring code maximums in line with Historic design review principles.

Fritz: Why just in the central city plan, why not in places like Irvington?

DeMuro: I meant -- I apologize. I meant the central Portland plan.

February 25, 2009

Fritz: But the entire Portland plan?

DeMuro: Absolutely. We find we have -- all -- a good example -- if you're familiar with the Irvington Squire project at 15th and NE Hancock. This was 75-foot height limit, the developer proposed a beautifully designed building that was at first 75 feet, the next go-around brought it down to 65. But this is a neighborhood in Irvington which has two, three, four-story buildings, and so the landmarks commission rejected it, asking that the building be lowered to four stories. The application was rejected and the project will not go forward. But it was tens of thousands of dollars spent by the applicant. That project alone generated -- I'm trying to think how many citizens participated, either written in verbal forges I want to say 100 or more. So it was very controversial.

We think that cooperation between landmarks commission and the planning commission not only in the planning process for the central Portland plan, but just even joint meetings, the Skidmore Old Town gave us the first opportunity for a joint hearing. And we'd like to see more of those. The charter does allow for a planning commissioner to sit as a member of the landmarks commission. Rick Michaelson did that for a number of years, and we certainly would welcome to fill that chair with a planning commissioner and think that would increase that communication. Number four would be addressing the Skidmore Old Town which is generated a lot of different questions, but one is the idea of surface parking lot and how they fit into the plan. Perhaps the central Portland plan can address how those parking lots can be than than -- encouraged to be developed.

Fish: You've mentioned Skidmore Old Town twice. Mayor, I see that this -- it's coming back to us on March 19th. Has there been a substantial reworking of that proposal that's coming to us? If so, has it gone back to landmarks and planning, are we going to get briefed? Can you give us a sense?

Adams: I can give you assurance that we will not be making that date.

Fish: Oh, ok.

Adams: We'll be pushing that off.

Fish: Ok.

DeMuro: Number three is the historic resource inventory. 20 years ago the city helped conduct an inventory of our historic resources. Which sounds really formal and wonderful, but it was a little more informal than that. It was windshield tours of the various neighborhoods and identifying properties that appeared to be historically significant ranking them as rank One, two, and three, and we'll tell you that it's not always 20 years old, which means there's a number of properties which have acquired additional historic status to be included, but some properties were included that probably should not have been, and there's a number that were missed. Historic resource inventories provide a wonderful resource for planners to make planning decisions regarding the city and understanding where these resources are located. When we -- at landmarks review we view -- we ask, how is this property in relation to other historic properties in the area? This inventory has become useless. It's so old and inaccurate. So we are asking that you consider funding an update of the historic resource inventory. We -- it will be helpful to landmarks commission as well as the planning commission in our opinion.

Fritz: Are you familiar with what the Irvington Association is trying to do, update their inventory with volunteers, and if that's a model that could be replicated in other neighborhoods?

DeMuro: I'm not familiar with that.

*******:** I understand Irvington and Buckman have started these efforts. The problem is, there's no coordination, there's no city staff person to assist with doing it in any sort of uniform -- based on any sort of uniform procedures. And there are standards for deciding whether a building is contributing or not, and without applying those uniform standards, I'm not sure how coordinated the effort. This is what could help individual landowners learn about their buildings. This could be something that pops up on PortlandMaps.com and a person could be exactly what somebody who knew about historic preservation knew about a building, and that could spark an idea to get involved in a neighborhood association or get a building listed.

February 25, 2009

Fritz: I think the foundation was helping can that inventory process, right? That was happening last year that they had a if for -- .

*****: [inaudible]

Fritz: You did the workshops, and those were well attended? We could help with the office of neighborhood involvement in working with the landmarks commission and staff to see how we could, in these tough budget times, how we could help with assessment for homeowner and residents and businesses to know more about what's in their neighborhoods.

DeMuro: We appreciate that. These neighborhoods are passionate about protecting their resources, and our guess is there would be many volunteers, if given the standard set of criteria, that they would provide a lot of that labor if we could just provide central staff support.

Fritz: Thank you.

DeMuro: Just as an aside, Portland public schools spoke to landmarks commission several months ago and as they're reviewing their portfolio, one of the first things they did is ask how significant are these Schools that we have? And they started looking -- asking staff here, can you help us determine which schools are worth preserving, which have significant -- and all they had to rely on is this antiquated h.r.i. So 3 going to expend their own dollars to do a historic resource inventory for just the Portland public school property, which is a wonderful thing. So that's a great segue to the heritage schools. There are many public school properties that many merit historic preservation protection. While the decisions of the next few years will determine their fate, we think that -- many of these schools are landmark buildings. Not only architecturally, but also they are significant cisterns of heritage. Many times children go to these schools whose parents and grandparents went to these schools. In addition from an urban planning standpoint, these schools are often the sun and the solar system for these neighborhoods. They really are define can for many of them. So we consider it critical to maintain these schools. No doubt that they need substantial improvement, mechanical systems, seismic upgrades, the whole shooting match. But we think it's -- it should be one of the most important issues in preservation, and also we consider the sustainability issue as well. We're talking about 90 schools in the district, so to be able to say that we think makes it consistent statement, or proclamation on behalf of a city that wishes to have the highest green perception possible. We also think this -- so we're working when we have been advising Portland public schools district, which has been extremely receptive, has taken bus trips to seattle to view some of the historic schools there that have been saved, seeing how spectacular these spaces are that are generated, and are hoping to duplicate that here. So they certainly seem on the right track. We would like to extend that passion to our friends at Portland state also, which has an inventory of historic buildings on their campus, they just saved one and did a very beautiful renovation. But they have never done an inventory of the significant historic buildings and we've taken the initiative to meet with folks to ask them if they would entertain undertaking that. Number five is special assessment. Again, special assessment is statewide initiative which allows owners of national register properties to freeze their assessed valuation for 15 years. It embryos a substantial real estate tax savings with the theory that this -- in exchange for submitting a renovation plan for your property, that savings then can be reinvested into the property. Right now there is -- there's only a one-year term, which is offered for this 15 years. And the state legislature has offered the opportunity for a 15-year renewal term. So right now -- carrie, would you update --

Carrie Richter, Historical Landmarks Commission: The renewal opportunity is identified as senate bill 1192, for anyone who wanted to follow up. My understanding is it has not been formally submitted to any committee at this time. So there's still opportunity to get involved in that, and we intend to do that.

DeMuro: And nicholas serves on that committee. One of the representatives for the city of Portland, and came to the landmarks commission to get feedback regarding requirements that we would wish time pose for a renewal term and our understanding is that the state legislature is asking

February 25, 2009

that the landmarks commission provide a forum for citywide input regarding offering a second renewal term.

Fish: When you say renewal term, are you talking about a bonus 15 years and a reauthorizing the 15-year initial freeze?

DeMuro: No, it would be a second 15-year term. Right now you freeze your valuation for 15 years, implement the preservation plan that you submitted, that has been approved, and right now it goes back on the tax rolls and this is offering the opportunity to impose another 15-year term. However, at an increased, a stepped-up valuation.

Fish: What's the quid pro quo On that?

DeMuro: Meaning -- explain -- .

Fish: The original 15 years is to presumably create some flexibility to make the investment in getting the building up to historic standards or whatever. So the renewal term, what does the public get as a benefit?

DeMuro: Yes. The way that the -- the presumption is that there will be additional renovation that will be done. Many but what will that fall under. The current proposal states that this renewal term could only be offered if the improvements are in the area of sustainability, a.d.a. Accessibility, or seismic upgrades. So we could have a debate about whether those are three categories worth singling out or not. But that's what's on the table right now.

Saltzman: Do you need state legislation to enable the city to do that?

DeMuro: The state has to -- the state legislature has to authorize the allowability of a renewal term, but each local government has to ratify it, allow it to be implemented. So there's nothing for you to do on this point other than wait for property owners to proceed and know that we expect that we'll be coming before you to see if we can present an acceptable renewal term structure that you would find approvable. Number six, updated historic guidelines. Of course I don't -- I guess I get a dollar for every time I say skidmore-old town. Maybe I'll be rich at the end of the meeting. We've all gone through the baptism of skidmore-old town, design guidelines generated in 1987, and we went through this extensive process to replace those guidelines. They were -- I will tell you very difficult for applicants to use because of their vagueries, their out of date nature, they were difficult for us to use for the design review process. And so through use of a private consultant and cooperation with the planning commission, new guidelines were generated which -- not to pat ourselves on the back, but we seem to be getting much acclaim, that they're very clear and would become a model for other neighborhood design guidelines. So eventually that process will end for skidmore-old town, but we want to advise you that right behind them in queue are a number of other neighborhoods which need exactly the same process. Most notably Fair Hill, those were created in 1980, the Yamhill district, 1987, Ladd's, 1990, east Portland Grand Avenue in '94, and the northwest 13th Avenue district in '96. So of course all that takes is money and staff time, of which of course there is an unlimited supply.

Fritz: Where is the east Portland Grand Avenue district? We don't think of that as being in east Portland --

DeMuro: M.I.K., Grand --

Richter: Ohsu -- no, OMSI on the south side, I want to say, and I think Glisan or -- .

DeMuro: About to the convention center.

Fritz: Thank you.

DeMuro: By the way, maybe that process becomes less expensive because having gone through it with skidmore I would think we have learned some lessons, and also we could actually plagiarize a bit from that. Because there will be a number of things, at least a format perhaps we could plagiarize. Number seven is -- historic preservation is oftentimes painted with inconsistent with economic development. Nothing could be further from the truth. Many communities across the country, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco, Sacramento, to name a few, do an excellent

February 25, 2009

job of promoting their historic resources as sites and experiences for out of towners. We would like travel Portland, and other related interests, to maximize the potential of marketing our historic landmarks and districts as destinations worth visiting and financially supporting. Especially in the year of Oregon's 150th anniversary, there are many opportunities available for us to showcase the heritage of our state's most significant city. I can tell you as somebody who offices in -- at the corner of couch and naito, I am constantly seeing tour groups walk by, getting tours of skidmore-old town, and we would just like to see more of this. We think Portland has an untapped resource here that could be promoted.

Fish: Just on that point, I Saw something in the paper recently about a street of ea mehs houses. -- eames houses. I asked if could I go, but it sells out in one day.

Richter: The designer. He designed modern style chairs -- .

Fish: It's a tour of architecturally distinctive homes in Portland. It sold out in one day. To your point about cultural heritage tourism, there is a houston appetite, including people here who are interested.

DeMuro: I live in irvington, my home has been on the home tour, and they sell a thousand tickets and it's a big fund-raiser for that neighborhood. It's a very popular tour. So I think your point is correct. It might be interesting to think about doing something similar to that for historic commercial buildings, perhaps. Number 8 is the threatened landmarks list.

Fish: [inaudible] I thought there was some proposal for the french-american school or someone to take that over. Is there some consequence of one of those proposed transfers that threatens the building?

DeMuro: No. The -- it's a proposal i'm involved with. It's the international school. The g.s.a. Has been trying to dispose of the custom house and give it to a new owner which can love it for a few years now you might remember they had a aborted effort a few years ago. And they're doing a good job maintaining it, but if it's awarded the international school, then it can certainly come off this list, because they're going to be a qualified entity to renovate it. But if it doesn't, it will go through a g.s.a. Disposition process, and if a proper entity purchases it and recent vaits it, it certainly should come off the list. Let's just say it's on the list because it's such a significant historic -- we would consider it one of the most significant properties and we'd like to get it out of the hands who is not going to further invest in it, such as g.s.a., and into the hands of a user.

Fritz: It is designate the as a national historic landmark?

DeMuro: It is.

Fritz: Good.

Adams: Very challenging building.

DeMuro: It s it's got a terrible load factor, meaning only 55 or 60% of it is usable. The grand space which makes it so architecturally wonderful makes it so functionally difficult. It's also -- it also needs seismic retrofit. It's a very heavy building and it's an expensive seismic retrofit. And there's a limited changes that can be made to accommodate new uses. That would be another reason we're concerned about it.

Adams: I'm glad you're working on it.

DeMuro: Thank you. Appreciate that. Centennial mills, it's not a coincidence it's at the top our list. I'll comment on that. We understand that it's gone through a process and -- an r.f.p. Process, a development agreement has been signed with a developer from california for what is primarily a retail oriented development. And that's all wonderful, but here's a couple of concerns. One is that that particular development proposal proposes demolishing about half of the complex. Which in our opinion is a concern because the story of the project is the complex itself, how the buildings interrelate to each other. Once you lose half of them, that's a problem. it's an adaptive reuse, which does not place the buildings on the national register. From our perspective, which is perhaps more purist than some, it's a fairly liberal interpretation has been overlaid to the design. The third thing is

February 25, 2009

the market itself I suspect the project would have moved faster at the -- if the economy had been in a different state, which leads to the fourth concern, these are buildings which have been vacant and deteriorating for a long, long time, and what often happens in these cases is delays happen after delays, and the buildings continue to deteriorate, and at some point someone says, you know, it's really in bad shape. And the deterioration itself becomes a bit of a condemnation. And I would doubt that the Portland development commission is investing the substantial sum Of money at this point to stabilize those buildings. The last time I was in them there was substantial dry-rot and water infiltration, etc., and I suspect that's continuing. So it's important that it be on the watch list. I'll run through these and make a sentence or two about each. Portland public schools, we've talked about special highlighted concern for Washington high school. P.p.s. May use that as a swing school for -- as they close schools they may move students there temporarily. Or it may just go through an r.f.p. Process. But it's empty and it's being vandalized severely. Jefferson's on the list. There's been a lot of changes that have been made to jers, which have jeopardized its integrity, in addition to that, there have been some plans that have shown up on the internet at which some outside architects were hired that didn't think very much of it, it involved demolition of jefferson, advocating it was not going to be productive to renovate it. So there was special concern there.

Fritz: Your recommendation are significant and should be retained.

DeMuro: Highly significant. Skidmore-old town, there's another dollar, northwest cultural center, this is the building on northwest everett and 18th, is that right? We have an owner who maybe is not in a financial position to renovate the building, and it's a very important community use Property, but it needs a major investment. And architecturally I think it's quite beautiful. The simon facade, if you know -- if you remember where the old couch street Fish house was, there's that parking lot next to it that has like the old western facade, it has that freestanding building facade there. That site is -- that actually is listed as -- as an historic -- national register structure, but that is one of the five opportunity sites. So if they -- it's a tall building -- if a tall building is put on that site, it's doubtful that facade would be retained. P.s.u. Historic buildings are on here until we hear from p.s.u., maybe -- buildings that I will confess I have not seen but commissioner eveningman has point out is the brooklyn roundhouse and locomotives. Perhaps someone on the council is familiar with that property. These are near southeast holgate and 18th avenue. Threatened by union pacific railroad yard expansion, and the locomotives, three of which are city-owned, and two of which are on the initial register and are in operating condition. They're threatened by neglect and inference, and unawareness.

Fritz: -- in charge of locomotives?

DeMuro:: Parks, not transportation?

Fish: We take a very broad viewf our jurisdiction.

Adams: Actually, transportation gave them towrks because we couldn't afford them.

DeMuro:: Next on the list is the union Station and certainly the development commission is working hard to take care of this property. They've done a rehab on it, doing pieces that they can budget for. It badly needs a new roof. That's next on the list, but don't quote me on that. But it's just such a significant landmark in town. It's in the center of an area that I know is going to be subject to redevelopment visioning. The union pacific railroad, albina smokestack, located in the albina yard, is on the national register. That's of concern. The Portland gas and coke building, this is the building you probably don't know by name, but if you drive on highway 30 going to the st. Johns bridge it's that wonderful building to the right towards the river that's in the middle of the tank farm. It's a superfund sie. We would love to see it saved, but it's an -- its environmental hazardous surroundings are threatened.

Saltzman: Northwest natural owns that building?

DeMuro: I thought it was p.g.e. I apologize.

Saltzman: So they still own it. Is anything going on in it?

February 25, 2009

DeMuro: I don't think so.

Fish: It looks like a hopper. On the smokestack you mentioned, if that was threatened with removal or demolition, would we have enough notice to weigh in on this and possibly suggest a Relocation? Because it is iconic thing, and there will be places in the city that would welcome it, fient was no longer functioning as a landmark.

DeMuro: It's listed on the national register, therefore it could be subject to the type four process. The final one is the morris marks house and the dory court apartments, late 19th century Italianate house, 1134 southwest 12th near p.s.u. and the adjacent apartment building. In an area of the city zoned for high-rises. The owners are interested in redeveloping the property, but it would be expensive to relocate the structures. The number nine, archaeology.

Saltzman: You get a dollar from me.

DeMuro: The the city of Portland should develop a strategy plan to manage it's heritage resources or for insuring it for compliance with federal, state, and local law and regulations regarding the identification and proper treatment of properties, objects, and other archaeological resources that may be affected by city undertaking. So this has been an afterthought, and I think the attention has surfaced because of the whole cindy's bookstore issue at fourth and burnside. So one thing that we're -- landmarks will -- we will be better equipped to take on this issue because used your wisdom to appoint paul solomano to fill our current vacancy, so we will ask him to help coordinate efforts to -- in this regard.

Adams: In -- .

Fish: In light of the Testimony we got from ken aims and everybody, is it the intention of planning, as they do the Portland plan to have someone actually dedicated to the archeaology?

*****: Yes --

Adams: Yes, and to develop a set of protocols, workable but protocols in place to make sure that as we develop and redevelop the city that we're not missing the opportunity, not destroying the opportunity to learn from our archaeological past. So that's one of the work items on the Portland plan.

DeMuro: Streetscape is right of way design guidelines. As it stands now, when we have design guidelines for our historic districts, they speak to the buildings themselves, but knott streetscape. And those are important. What kind of street furniture is used, whether street trees are appropriate, types of paving, width of sidewalks, etc. So it's something we would like to take up and to do some research as to what is done in other cities and perhaps incorporate some guidelines for particular districts. Number 11, a catch-all administrative objective. Number one, you've knocked off the list in filling the current vacancy. Number two is we've taken the initiative to try to improve the coordination between landmarks and other city agencies. P.d.c. deals with a lot of historic resources and we think that we should be in communication with them to make sure that they are pursuing plans that are in concert with our goals. Pdot certainly has been before us with h.p. Shiewrks park and rec. So we -- what we do now is simply ask representatives of these agencies to come before us maybe once a year just to kind of ask what they're working on, that might interface with us and offer our advice where we can. Cooperation with shipa. We've had two incidents in which people who had certain agendas would go to the state historic preservation office in salem to get their position on certain preservation matters in Portland and then use that as a hammer against the local landmarks commission, which is your appoint the agency to make recommendations on h.p. issues. So we have been -- we've started conversation was roger roeper to ensure that shipa isn't stepping on our toes. I'm sure wouldn't want the governor putting pressure on you for local decisions that are under your jurisdiction, and we feel the same. Very important to provide more coordination between b.d.s. and opsd. Our commission hearings always have staff members from both b.d.s. and planning, and we do sometimes have conflict. So we'd like to have that conversation probably once susan anderson gets her head above water we'd like to have that discussion. And

February 25, 2009

then going back to landmarks commission and planning commission communication and cooperation, we really think that's important and make that a high priority. So we end with the budget request. We've not -- we've submitted to commissioner Leonard a request for a mere 440,000 to fund some of our needs. And we understand that your resources are limited. But just so you know, which -- we would love to do that update, p.p.s. Has hey ken care of their own updates, so that saves a lot of money. We would love to be able to assist neighborhoods who wish to nominate their neighborhoods for national register district nominations. Irvington, buckman, laurelhurst, and reed are five very active neighborhoods that would like to become historic districts. But you have to have an awful lot of bake sales to raise the money necessary to hire consultants to do that work, so we thought perhaps city money could be made available perhaps on a matching basis to help encourage these neighborhoods to step forward. It's only in the best interest of the city that these historic neighborhoods apply for those sorts of protections and design protections -- design review. Land marks commission training, that would be -- not that we don't know what we're doing, but it would be nice to learn more. Finally, historic preservation staff, a dream of ours would be to have somebody at the city be the historic preservation officer would that be a one-stop shopping for people who need historic preservation issues answered. We're working with tim heron, who has ti ken -- taken the helm On behalf of staff and perhaps we can at least get a planner who specializes in historic preservation assigned to design review cases that come before landmarks commissions who have a deeper background perhaps in historic issues.

Fritz: You don't even have one staff now?

Tim Heron, Bureau of Development Services: Tim heron, bureau of development services. We have many staff. There's not one point person designated that can focus on that specialty receiving dismi all historic design review. Related to preservation or landmark status. Typically that role doesv fall on someone like myself in b.d.s., but we also have counterparts that work for the now consolidated b.p.s. I think in the public's eye that's confusing. And this we actually have a designated historic preservation officer, there's potentially a clarity in that message to the public, an advocacy of that person's direction that makes sense.

Leonard: Do we do that with existing staff? Is there some way to reconfigure --

Heron: Already thinking about it. And i've started that conversation with the chair and I think it's a matter of how we structure that contact.

Leonard: I would be very interested -- .

Fritz: It would be more efficient to have that. I think that used to be that way when it was housed in the old bureau of planning.

Heron: And that has create add sense Of confusion. Who do you call? If you've made enough calls, there's probably four people that can get the answer.

Leonard: I would just call you.

Fritz: When planning was doing -- before we split development services off planning, there was somebody in planning who was the person that I used to call.

Heron: Correct.

Fritz: Even if there was one person in planning and one person in development services. Designating a person wouldn't take additional resources.

Heron: Exactly.

Leonard: We'll work together on that.

*******:** Of.

Fish: Could I add one thing for your future list in roman numeral five? You have the 15-year renewal term. I think not this session, but the next session of the legislature we'll be talking about the renewal of the Oregon cultural tax credit. And since it's arts, culture, and heritage, and many of our heritage groups get grants from the cultural trust, we want to make sure that your voice is heard on the renewal of that tax credit. I it this will be in two years, but just to have it on your radar.

February 25, 2009

DeMuro: Thank you. That completes our report. Any questions?

Leonard: I just wondered, Tim, is this an opportunity for you to talk about this broader kind of conversation we're going to have with the design community in the upcoming couple of months based on the feedback, or do you want to take a rain check on that?

Heron: I love being put on the spot.

Leonard: We've had the unfortunate loss of Jeff Jocelyn, who was -- had a staff there for a long time, and now Tim has stepped in as temporary position, but we've been doing a lot of interaction with the design community, and I'm assuming the historic preservation community as well. And we're talking about some forums that you might like to inform the council about public forums that we're going to -- he and I and some of the managers will be going to to get feedback about what we do to improve the services.

Heron: I think the timing of the landmarks commission's presentation of this report not just frankly what I see as how thorough it was done, it was a pleasure to read on my part. I think we'll be implementing a similar format with the design commission. We haven't done it in the past, and frankly I think it's led to kind of a business as usual many over time, and I think what we've found recently is perhaps maybe a slight disengagement with the design community particularly. And maybe in some aspects the historic community and how we do what we do, whether it's related to design guideline and how it meshes with the zoning code. And then the other also just having DWSH having an understanding of the process and how we did it. We did a similar type of for Number 2001. It actually generated more process that was supported by the development community. That I'm proud of the Enron -- the commissioner spoke to the devine advice request process. That did not exist before 2001. It's a voluntary opportunity to bring a proposal in before you do the design. The bare bones, the basics. You have a pro forma, matching diagrams, maybe red flags that you want to put in front of the review body that will review them at the end after three-month-long formal process. So the forms are very useful. We're relooking at putting that out there again. It's about time, it's been about eight years, I think it's over due. It's an opportunity to set it up on a more regular basis, much like I think a more regular basis of this commission being in front of you all, to talk about what they've been going. It's getting busier, and that's a good thing. And the time in this economy is the perfect time to take a breath, rally these horses, streamline the process, but also reach out to the community.

Fish: Just -- then your decision will occur at some point, what's your time line for a decision?

DeMuro: A vote could take place --

Richter: Could it take place on the 9th or it could be continued to another meeting which would maybe be the second meeting in March.

DeMuro: It would be April.

Fish: Any action you take could potentially come to us for a quasi judicial --

DeMuro: It could be appealed.

Adams: We have one person signed up to testify and we have six minutes left. Thank you. Very illuminating. I look forward to Van Gundy back soon.

*****: Thank you.

*****: Grateful for the time.

*****: Thank you.

Leonard: Appreciate it.

Adams: Thank you for sitting so patiently. Welcome to the city council.

Cathy Galbraith: What an interesting subject. To come down and listen tomorrow I'm Cathy, the scientific director of the Bosco Milligan Foundation. We operate the architectural heritage center, in the heart of the Grand Avenue East Portland National Register Historic District, which was designated in the late 70s to recognize it as the part of the original city of East Portland, which annexed to the city of Portland in 1894. We're in the oldest building in Portland central eastside, and we have

February 25, 2009

served the needs of more than 45,000 people in public historic preservation education programs since we started doing programs in the mid 1990s. We're a local partner organization with the national trust for historic preservation, and we were complimented with the award of a matching grant, and one of the things we said yes going to start out by doing was a preservation needs assessment around city of Portland, so in october and november we conducted five quadrant-based forums around the City, and a lot of people took the time to come and attend meet cans, talk to us, fill out a questionnaire and primarily people had -- we're synthesizing tallying, we sent draft report to our board of directors on friday and we'll have the formal report ready for public release in about two weeks, but people expressed over and over again their concern about new developments not fitting in well in traditional neighborhoods and in commercial areas of the city. Very, very great deal of concern about the inadequacies of the historic resources inventory that are talked about that dates back to 1983. How we increase density in neighborhoods without destroying the neighborhood character that is really the strength of our city. And it's really beloved neighborhoods. A great deal of concern about Portland's public schools. The school district has recently stepped up and issued an r.f.p. real quick observation also, we want the ability to review and approve, modify applications for local landmarks designation and alterations to buildings. And we want the private sector to participate and accept regulation on the part of the public sector, we should try to make that easy for people. Landmarks application fee for the city of Portland is \$2900. The city of seattle's fee is zero. And many cities and counties applying fees no those -- to these applications when they want the ability to review and approve or deny applications or modify designs. There's been some talk about the planning bureau staff. There are two people on the bureau of planning that we recognize as having historic preservation qualifications. The city of seattle has eight full-time employees, including a long-time historic preservation officer. I had the privilege of being the director of historic seattle for five years before I returned to Portland to be the director of the foundation. And I can tell you seattle does not do everything right and there are many things we do much better. But we do think the investments in historic preservation in Portland is warranted to be increased. Preservation in this city especially in the urban renewal districts is economics-based, and if we want to continue that we need to provide incentives. When demolition denial was restored back to the Portland's preservation code in 2004, there were a lot of conversations with the development community, the preservation comes with the need for incentives. Not where the city write as check, but where the city provides regulatory relief, property tax relief like we do for the transit oriented developments, the affordable housing projects, etc. And we really do need to return to the conversation about incentives, and there was a lot of talk about that around an alternative strategy for skidmore-old town. I didn't come to get a dollar, But that is really the biggest preservation issue in the city of Portland in 20 years, and it's probably why so many of you have heard from so many people about the issue, because it's the heart of the city's founding as the city it is today. So I think i've taken up my six minutes. I'm just really happy to be here. We it this world of the landmarks commission and everything we dock in the nonprofit sector to participate and be supportive and work with you about building that economic engine of heritage tourism we're more than willing to do.

Adams: Thanks again for being here, all the work you do. Council is going to take a seven-minute break.

Leonard: Vote on this resolution first?

Adams: I apologize. I thought it was a report. Are we accepting it?

Leonard: Yes.

Adams: All right. Unless there's additional council discussion, Karla, please call the roll.

Fritz: I really appreciate all your work. Volunteers and staff supporting the landmark commission, and it's on so important, i'm glad you brought this report to us today. The statistic about it taking 65

February 25, 2009

years to have the same energy savings as saving an existing building is one we should all remember. Aye.

Fish: I thought it was an excellent report. I hope it does become an annual Event. I know you have a champion in commissioner Leonard. Thank you for your leadership on this, randy. I learned a lot this afternoon, and we look forward to supporting your good work going forward, aye.

Saltzman: Great report. I hope this becomes an annual event. It's very important for us to sort of keep abreast. It can be overwhelming to try to understand everything and get the full flavor of what's going on. But I do appreciate art's continued leadership of the commission. Art, you've risen to the top and continue to provide fine leadership. Thank you. Aye.

Leonard: I too appreciate the report, and I do think that maybe we should just focus on staff to make sure we do this annually and have it just be a regular update, because I think it's important to make sure we keep the frame of reference of everything we do up here appropriate to what it is you focus on, and it's something I believe in. Aye.

Adams: Thank you. Got a lot of work to do. I see a lot of opportunities in the Portland plan as well to move forward on the issues that you raised. Thank you. Aye. [gavel pounded] item passes. We're going to take a seven-minute recess. [recess]

Adams: Commissioner Saltzman. Karla, would you please read -- we're back from recess to our second item on the wednesday, 2:00 p.m. February 25th session of the Portland city council. 3:00 time certain. Karla, would you please read the title for item number 189.

Moore: 198?

Adams: 198.

Item 198.

Adams: The first thing i'd like to do is to move a substitute resolution which I will walk through an excruciating detail in a second.

Leonard: Is that your motion?

Adams: I move.

Leonard: Second.

Adams: Moved and seconded to substitute the resolution from the place holder which was in the book. Any discussion on that on council? If not, please call the roll.

Fritz: Yes, I accept resolution.

Saltzman: Yes.

Fish: Aye.

Leonard: Aye.

Adams: Aye. This is another meeting in a continuing discussion of the columbia river crossing, some of us have been attending meetings for four years, some for 11 years. There will be continuing discussions before this body as well as the city council of vancouver and the boards of c-tran and tri-met. The metro council regional council, clark county board, elements of this discussion will be coming back here. Today for council consideration is to give me direction on the issue much the number of lanes for the proposed columbia river crossing at i-5. We've been looking for common ground, both in terms of our partners on the south of the river, but also common ground with our partners to the north of the river. I will go into detail on what that is. If the council is amenable I thought I would give some introductory information and then have testimony. I think we have nine people signed up and then have questions and discussion after that. If that's ok with folks. I'm going to explain a little bit of background of why i'm proposing why I am today. We are known in this region, and parts of this region, for being innovators in certain aspects of transportation, clearly we're innovators when it comes to transit, when it comes to pedestrian mobility systems, when it comes to bike mobility systems. We actively plan and manage those transportation modes, but when it comes to vehicular roadway management, we are in my opinion in the dark ages. We plan to build a freeway, build a street, build a road and especially if

February 25, 2009

its outside the grid, and especially if it is a freeway, we walk away and leave it to function however it's going to function. For those of you that have followed my work on the c.r.c. Advisory committee, that include 40-some people, for those of that you have followed my Comments, you know that I have long advocated for this region to take a more active role in managing not just developing and building, but actually managing our transportation system. And i'm going to read for you the op ed that Portland -- vancouver mayor royce pollard and myself put together, walk through the resolution, and then we can take testimony. And the op ed reads as follows. A new bridge across the columbia river is more -- is about more than just the number of lanes or new transit service or totals. It's also an opportunity to show ourselves and the nation a smarter way forward. We must build a new bridge, but it must be the right kind of bridge and the right bridge must include new cross river partnerships that will actively manage daily mobility to get the most out of our investment in the columbia river crossing. The Portland vancouver metro area is poised to seize a unique opportunity as we plan for a new columbia river crossing. The project is one of great importance and unprecedented magnitude in Washington and Oregon. As local officials in the two states linked by this project we are joined in the following thoughts and proposal by metro president, david bragdon, vancouver city council member tim leavitt, and clark county commissioner steve stuart. All of us have participated in years of planning at the c.r.c. And each of us welcomes the benefits that a new crossing will bring to our community. Done right, the project promises safer and more reliable multimodal travel for people and goods while reducing negative impacts on our environment. Done wrong today's gridlock moves south to downtown Portland and 20 years from now the new bridge is once again filled with stop and go traffic. With that in mind we have is a proposal for consideration by the community and by individual elected bodies giving us guidance. The idea takes us beyond decisions on lanes and construction to a time when the new bridge is open, which will be 2018, and our communities can assess how the crossing functions within a larger system. We acknowledge that to the casual observer of this project this proposal is an unusual step but our region has always been home to innovation. So we liken this new cross river partnership to a thermostat. We would not build a home heating system without the ability to control the temperature based on time of day, outside conditions and who are using what rooms. Nor should we build a freeway bridge without a mechanism to adjust conditions for maximum efficiency. Just as would you at home, we'll define the comfort zone for the new columbia river crossing. Before adjusting the thermostat we need to build the house and along with other members of the c.r.c. Project sponsors council we are slated to make a decision in march about the number of lanes on the new bridge. We propose that the bridge be built to accommodate up to three add-drop explains three through lanes, but these lanes will not Be created equal. Our new partnership agreement will determine how the lanes will be phased and managed over time and to get the right mix of technology, van pools, h.o.v. And programs to reduce vehicle miles traveled and pollution. Because our partnership recognizes that these decisions affect more than just a limited i-5 bridge influence area, we propose to actively assess and manage other impacted areas including the i-205 river crossing and rose quarter. The columbia river crossing will function differently in 2030 than it does on opening date. Technology will change, as will community needs. We share the belief that a performance-based thermostat is the best tool we have to ensure the new bridge meets the needs of current and future citizens. What we envision as an actively managed columbia river crossing no other jurisdiction in this nation has done. We are determined to blaze a new trail towards smart transportation management and protect our investment for generations to come. And we look forward to putting our active transportation partnership into action for the benefits of both communities now and for future generations. So the resolution, substitute resolution provides me the direction basically contained in that op ed. Attachment a provides a concept on how the columbia crossing mobility commission would work. We wanted more of an agreement than sort of, this is what we're going to do. We also provide some process, the governance that partners

February 25, 2009

would be odot, wash dot, the cities of Portland and Vancouver, tri-met, c-tran, metro, r.t.c., port of Portland, port of vancouver, we'll start with i-5 but consideration of expanding it to 205. In terms of the governance, the chair will be appointed jointly by the governors of the two states Oregon and Washington, each partner is a nonelected citizen representative to serve three-year terms on the columbia river crossing council the way it will work is similar to the jpac process, where the columbia river crossing council will recommend to odot and recommend as well to the city of Portland to tri-met, can recommend to the ports and other partners what they need from each partner to achieve the performance goals that will be set forth in the coming months. They will submit an annual plan to those partners, the partners can choose to accept them or they can reject them with comments, giving the columbia river crossing council the ability to on an annual basis, work out any differences. This council can make changes if it's unanimous to the performance goals in the future, and if all else fails, if we get a runaway columbia river crossing council, the partners may unanimously override a recommendation from the council if they pass the resolution each governing body of the partnerships pass the resolution. Attachment b is the beginning conversation about a performance Warranty. We are going to be spending billions of dollars on this project, and we begin to lay out attachment b financial, safety and health, travel reliability, sustainability, and also performance measures outside the actual crossing management district area to make sure that we're not sub-optimizing performance across the rivers only again to have it land unintended consequence in downtown Portland. So those are -- that is what I have before the city council today. It is general direction.

*****: [inaudible]

Fish: If we have questions, do we pose them to you or to the panel.

Adams: We can start with me, and if I need help i'll pull catherine up here or somebody else.

Fish: I have two questions, they're just for clarification. So I --

Adams: Sure.

Fish: The first is under governance. And just the reason for the decision to have nonelected citizen representatives, and to circumscribe the universe of eligible people to be nonelected.

Adams: There's a lot of conversation among the proposers of this on how do you best ensure conformance towards the goals. And that if difficult decisions are to be made, there was sort of a -- there was a consensus around the table that those difficult decisions were best made by nonelected representatives. That if the -- if there was changes to fares, or changes to Tolls that are recommended, that staggered terms from non-elected citizen was probably be more likely to recommend that than elected officials.

Fish: In part to insulate people from that pressure. The second question I have is under the page 2 of the attachment. That is the requirement that the partners, and I count 10 partners, must unanimously override a recommendation. And so just your thoughts as the difference between, say, a majority, a super majority or in this case, anonymity.

Adams: The conversation around table, because, if you have changes in governors or the cochair and have you changes in administrations and people are on the boards of directors of these various organizations, that the composition of the columbia river crossing council could change. And it might reflect a different political point of view over time than who the elected leaders might be in charge. So the notion of -- there's that. The second is there's the notion for a possibility of a runaway columbia river crossing. So the group around the table that work order this proposal on the other hand, they wanted a very high bar for overturning those recommendations to keep the focus of discussions on the columbia crossing council. To really make that the body that over time gets the expertise and develops the History on how best to actively manage the district. But still having a fail-safe if for the local governments to go directly to the d.o.t.s if necessary. So there's a lot of checks and balances in the concept that's approved -- proposed.

February 25, 2009

Leonard: I wonder if I could offer what I think would be a friendly amendment. It's in your now therefore it be resolved. The first one. It reads the city recommends the new bridge be built to accommodate up to three add-drop explains three through lanes. I would suggest just after lanes adding three words "in each direction."

Adams: Sure. That's a friendly amendment.

Leonard: Do we need to vote on that? We do? I move that.

Adams: That's a scrivener --

Leonard: Yeah.

Fritz: We're clarifying we're giving direction for a 12-lane bridge. Aye.

Fish: My understanding of the amendment is we're just correcting an error and not changing the substance -- .

Fritz: No, but it says -- it's a 12-lane bridge, not a six-lane bridge.

Adams: A structure that can accommodate up to 12 lanes. That's an important clarification.

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

Adams: Aye. Any other clarifying questions?

Fritz: You said that the council and by -- could -- would be able to -- the performance goals? By that you mean our council?

Adams: No, the columbia river crossing council.

Fritz: It says a timetable for developing a mutually acceptable set of performance goals.

Adams: One is developmental, one is after it's constructed and up and operating. The performance warranty, the performance goals will be coming back to this council for consideration. Once we put them in place the columbia river crossing council can unanimously, if they act unanimously can make changes on those performance goals. For example, if electric vehicles catch on, and it significantly changes the experience of emissions, we want somehow for future decision makers that are looking at all the modes to be able to make changes to reflect that performance warranty.

Fritz: How are you considering the 10 members of the mobility council would get mutually acceptable set of performance goals to all 10 jurisdictions have to approve the performance goals that the mobility council will be reviewing?

Adams: Be working with?

Fritz: Yes.

Adams: Yes.

Fritz: Everybody has to unanimously adopt the same performance --

Adams: Yes. That's an acknowledgment of the existing process. We're calling for it to be done in a more comprehensive way and a way up front as to a piece by piece by the end of the -- that we're all -- where all the individual performance goals were done piecemeal by the end of the sponsors project council process.

Fritz: Do you have a proposed time line?

Adams: We're going to at the project sponsor's council -- at the next council we're going to be working on coming up with time line and work plan for developing those -- the performance warranty. But we don't have that now because the project sponsor's council hasn't met. But for me personally, sooner than later, given the workload of staff and the ability to gather and analyze information. Any other clarifying questions? Catherine, anything I left off? Anything you want to underscore? Catherine heads up our transportation team in the mayor's office.

Catherine Ciarlo, Mayor Adams' Office: Just one quick clarification. In response to your question, commissioner Fritz about who would agree on these initial goals, the mayor had said it was all 10 jurisdiction, but actually it's jurisdictions that the project's sponsors council.

Fritz: But it's the same that the vancouver city council has to approve the same set of goals that the Portland city council approves?

February 25, 2009

Ciarlo: If the vancouver city council in authorizing their representative to make -- would like to do so, and I assume they Would.

Adams: That's been the paragraph us us -- that all of us have gone back to our respective bodies for consideration. Any other clarifying -- catherine, anything else that I mangled or you want to identify?

Ciarlo: I don't think so.

Adams: Thank you. Let's begin working through the sign-up sheet.

Ehren T. Evans: Thank you Mayor and Commissioners. I live in the Irvington neighborhood of Portland and I'm a registered democrat and I voted for all of you. I think 8 lanes is a reasonable size and 10 lanes is a stretch. 12 lanes in our difficult times right now seems absurd to be embarking upon. If you think about the city of Portland's share how many potholes would that fix in northeast Portland and how many sidewalk would that build in southeast? It seems like the bridge will benefit mostly vancouver. Or maybe 60-40, Portland vancouver. Vancouver does not share the same commitment to transit and promoting alternatives to driving that Portland does. They have a good commitment to transit, but not as good as ours. I would suggest as a alternative, an eight-lane bridge with a design that would accommodate adding up to two lanes in each direction at a later time if our cities did grow to the size where we need that. Thank you.

Adams: Thanks for being here. Thanks.

Christopher Lowe: Hello, my name is christopher lowe. At present, i'm a public health graduate at ohsu working in environmental and social epidemiology and have taught history at reed college and p.s.u. And several other colleges in the area. Before turning to my main public health concern. Let me begin with this objection. A decision to support a 12-lane c.r.c. Option will be the first option of the cross river in the recent op-ed article. If the partnership begins by making such a bad initial decision from the point of view of sustainability and public health what reason is there to trust that any subsequent decisions will handle those concerns well? Since coming here and seeing the actual resolution which was not available before, i'd also note that the composition includes two departments of transportation and two transport agencies. Two ports and representations of the city but nothing that represent either environmental or public health concerns. So I would raise why we should not have perhaps representation from Oregon d.e.q. And Washington ecology and the department of -- the health aspect of the department of human services and in Oregon and whatever the counterpart in Washington would be. I don't feel I don't trust the composition of this -- the organization -- council as it's laid out. The main body of what I had intended to testify on, i'm going to have to cut short because of what I just said, but I have great concerns about what are called ultrafying particulate emissions which is something which has been a recent health concern in air pollution and i'm concerned about the likelihood that a fast transit bridge at the columbia river will create new bottlenecks or intensify the bottlenecks that exist on east side Portland at the places where i-5 and i-84 come together plus the different interchanges for getting across the willamette and the mayors talk about congestion if downtown Portland. I'm concerned about east side Portland, back up along i-84 and the likelihood this particularly emission which is tied to diesel exhaust and other kinds of health affecting air pollution will be intensified in residential areas on the east side of Portland and I don't think this has been examined at all in the environmental impact statement, and I don't think the planning study have looked at it from a health point of view.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony. Glad you're here.

Terry Parker: Terry parker, northeast Portland. I'm going to deviate from what I was going to say. If -- one of the stipulations must be that the commission is not just another means to establish political socialist policy. Article 1, section 20, reads the equality of immunities of citizens. No law passed to any class of citizens, privileges or immunities shall not equally belong to all citizens. The primary and basic terms here are using the new bridge to cross the river. Not dissecting them based on transportation, the purpose of crossing and by whom or even the time of day when the crossing

February 25, 2009

is being used. Another stipulation must be that all of the users be treated equally. Be it auto, a motor trades carrier, an s.u.v. loaded with merchandise for a trade show, a bicycle, etc. Therefore, any tolls charged, tolling must be charged to all of the users including bicycles and transit passers. And must only be used to pay for the bridge, not social engineering or to subsidize another method of travel. Furthermore, also non-toll motor route that connects the region together. That would be i-5. One of the terms must be that it be comprised of more citizens than politicians and those citizens must be representative of both Oregon and Washington but also on a percentage basis, the various transport modes and not be a politically motivated stacked deck. If Portland disagrees with the decision, they shouldn't be allowed to take their football and go home. And directly to you, mayor Adams, you've said you've wanted to be everybody's mayor and working hard for the people of Portland. Approximately 80% of the trips in the region are made by motor vehicle. You must also represent those people who choose to drive and this is not doing so by viewing motorists as the cash cows, or to subsidize other modes of transport. Moreover, it's not done by manipulating towing or any other means.

Adams: You'll be happy to know that yesterday, a meeting around transportation stakeholders, there's representatives from a.a.a. and the Oregon trucking institute.

Parker: Thank you.

Adams: Thank you very much, I appreciate it.

*****: Good afternoon, gentlemen. Glad you're here. Welcome to city council.

*****: Mr. Mayor.

Fish: Are you going to give us a preview of the first question you're going to pose to the mayor tomorrow?

*****: Well --

*****: Might.

Adams: Mr. Stone, you're first.

Michael Stine: I'm michael stine, actually. Pardon that. I was impressed with how much energy is going forward in the very detailed resolution. So I kind of feel like david against goliath a little bit.

There's all of this energy going forward. And I know you're inviting us to give you our thoughts so I hope you're open to the input and I was impressed by the folks before me. And I would echo the first gentleman's concern this would so much more benefit vancouver than Portland. I myself live in southeast Portland, mount tabor neighborhood. One of amanda's fund raisers, at your first try. It took two tries, sorry.

Fritz: Worked out very well

Stine: And I work in vancouver. So I -- I have a commute from -- every day from inner city southeast to vancouver that takes 25 minutes at rush hour, both ways. This is an issue of people coming into Portland at rush hour, and leaving Portland at rush hour. That is the problem with the i-5 bridge. There's -- if there was enough money to solve all our problems, great, let's build a huge bridge. My problem, Portland's problem is the i-5, i-84 junction. A junction of two major freeways. Really, the front steps, the entrance to downtown Portland for anyone coming on i-84 and south from i-5. Those roads are basic parking lots. Much of the time. I mean, i'm not just talking at rush hour. I'm talking all the time. And the gentleman who was the environmental specialist, he pointed out the pollution problems of that. And people basically parking on the freeways with their motors running. It would be much quicker and if the traffic problem was easier for me to come on my route, i-84. And i-5. Starting at 2:30, it's impossible in the afternoon. Starting at 6:30 tomorrow coming into town, it's impossible. There's other problems with the area. Two. There's unsafe weaves that happen. There are -- it's also where the rose garden is. So to the solution, about the i-5 bridge, excuse me, i'd ask you to consider -- I don't know how unsafe the current bridge is, but if there's any way of saving it. Build it up so it's earthquake safe and maybe add two lanes and if you build a whole new bridge, go with the eight-lane idea.

February 25, 2009

Adams: You're four seconds over.

Stine: Am i?

Leonard: I can't help but observe, but it sounds like what your objection is that -- your observation is that the rest of the system is bottlenecked so why build an appropriate size bridge. It sounds to me that you're making the case --

Stine: I thank you for the question. I think the primary problem is the i-84/i-5 junction.

Leonard: Why?

Stine: For everything i've said.

Leonard: It's too constricted?

Stine: It's the weave that happens. If you drive that area, you have to -- people getting on and off the freeways have to weave. There's not capacity for people going either direction. I know I should be finished. I want to say back east they have lanes that change direction based on where the traffic flow is happening.

Leonard: In seattle they do that as well.

Stine: We could have two more lanes on the current bridge. And two lanes coming in the morning and two in the afternoon.

Adams: Thank you, mr. Stein. I really appreciate it.

Ray Polani: Mr. Mayor and commissioners. I live in Portland, at 6110 southeast ankeny street. I address you as co-chair of citizens for better transit. This moment in time is all about change. When need change. Drastic change. However, we definitely do not need a new freeway bridge. But, yes, we do need two new bridges. In fact, we need one for light rail and local traffic, including bikes and pedestrians. And for sure we need a new railway bridge for the main rail line of the west coast to accommodate comfortably both freight and passengers. Commuters, as well as high-speed rail passengers. Because this is the designated high speed corridor for the west coast. Global warming and different energy use dictate clearly against highway and freeway expansion. What is desperately required is the provision of viable alternatives. Useable light rail and buses for local option and state-of-the article rail for intercity movement. Automobiles, trucks and airplanes used must be reduced and competitive alternatives provided. More than ever, political will are essential for the radical change the people have chosen which is a clear break with the past and the current present. People do expect change. Not a continuation of the status quo. And leaders must lead in the new direction. Or else. Therefore, no new freeway bridge. But, yes, to two new rail bridges for local traffic and the west coast freight and passenger corridor to address the enormous problems facing our cities, our states, our nation, and indeed, the world. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you, mr. Palani.

Mike Smith: My name is mike smith, a resident of north Portland. My concern is with the bridge of this scope, 12 lanes, the bottleneck that would be created between lombard and the i-5-i-405 split, would be or reign did you say and i'm wondering if there's any provision in this plan for widening that area and if there is, is there any eminent domain issues in this? The reason I ask this, i'm a member of the neighborhood that would be directly affected by this and myself and my neighbors have had concerns ever since the c.r.c. Project has been announced and can get no answers or direction in this regard. This is my concern. That this bridge will tear our neighborhood out. Or a portion of it. And would like to see some way of addressing this issue. Now, because homes are our major investments and this would address our financial future. It would affect it directly. And this is my concern. Thank you very much.

Adams: I can report to you that if there's eminent domain will be required but it will be on a portions of hayden island that are currently commercial, there's no plans related to this project for any eminent domain requirements in the -- on the -- from the lombard south. And I live in kenton, which is the other neighborhood on the other side of the i-5 freeway, so I paid attention to this

February 25, 2009

particular issue like you as well. But there's no plans for eminent domain as part of the project in the area you're talking about.

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

Fritz: Who gets to make those eminent domain decisions?

Adams: We'll have richard answer that. I can tell you the terms this project don't include that area.

Smith: Just the columbia river project or does this include, as i'm to understand here, on page -- pardon.

Adams: That's all right.

Smith: Would this include the whole district, columbia crossing district. Would that include lombard to the i-405/i-5 split?

Adams: No, the district standards haven't been established but the bridge influence area for this particular project goes south, I think, to victory and through the delta park interchange and terminates -- i'm sorry, the marine boulevard interchange. The current project you see going on that portion of the freeway, that did require some eminent domain but that's a separate project from this one.

Smith: I'm to understand then, there will be no provisions for widening --

Adams: No.

Smith: -- from 12 lanes -- then it will go down to six and it will be a bottleneck between lombard and the i-5/i-405 split.

Adams: Right now, we're widening that section --

Smith: I understanding.

Adams: That's being widened to three.

Smith: But it will go from six to three in each direction?

Adams: Correct, three lanes.

Smith: No anticipation of bottlenecking.

Adams: We can have the engineers -- there are three through lanes and potentially up to three through lanes and three auxiliary lanes. I wanted to get the other testifiers up here first. But I promise we'll cover that. Thank you, mr. Smith. Thank you, gentlemen. Appreciate it. Karla.

Adams: Welcome to the city council. All you need to give us is your first and last name and you have three minutes.

Jeff Bernards: My name is jeff. I like the balance of the council. You're all representative. Fiscal conservative. Anyway -- so I just had a couple of things, like the c.r.c. Is doing lease cost options and it seems no money has been raised to date to help pay for this project. It's time to do the planning now and you've chosen the most expensive option to solve the i-5 congestion problem. I feel you haven't -- discounted tolling for people who pay electronically or tolling, like a minimum of \$35, since it's going to cost \$13, I think charging \$5 is more than care. Discount for carpool and encourages businesses to locate in vancouver to reduce job-related travel. Like -- maybe raise gas taxes. I don't think we should keep borrowing money on the world market to help build stuff. We're not planning for it at all. If this is such a pressing issue, why haven't options been tried. If they would work for the current bridge -- you're hiding the true cost of the bridge by not tolling now. It will make people aware of what it's going to come. Solving the bottleneck and not passing the two lanes passing through the rose garden area is shortsighted. Expanding the bridge and not solving both problems is like expanding the convention center and now claim they need a hotel to make the expansion pay. We need to fix the rose quarter area to make the i-5 bridge work. The state will contribute 100 or \$200 million, I was wondering how many teachers laid off and the prisoners released so the state can make this contribution. The movement is to buy local. To subsidize the trucking industry, only forces people to buy from faraway lands. I personally stopping bananas. I haven't heard -- bottle ground or hook up at i-205. If it's just going to end in

February 25, 2009

vancouver, I don't think it's a big commitment from vancouver. They've had plenty of opportunity and constantly voted down and only going for this bridge max so they can get the bridge, not concerned with max. The last time gas prices hit \$4, many trucking companies went out of business. To spend this much money based on past experience is misleading. You're building a monument to the past.

Adams: Thank you, jeff.

Jill Fuglister: Mayor Adams and commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to testify. I'm jill and with the coalition for a livable future. A partnership of over 90 organization working for healthy and sustainable communities in the region. At what point are we going to shift our actions around road projects to match the goals and values? Apparently, the answer is not yet. We're disappointed that you're poised to support 12 lanes. How is this a propose? There's still no clear decision on tolls which were supposedly a condition of the city's support. The council never got an independent analysis. Things that the council asked for last july and even if you accept the project's current analysis of greenhouse gas, it shows it doesn't meet the goals to reduce emissions. Approving 12 lanes today is giving out the single most valuable leverage point you have for minimizing the negative impacts of the project. Part of the commitment to sustainability is the interests of future generations in our decision making and in this case, if you approve this resolution, you're ceding your responsibility to future generations by the committee, saying, saying you take care of it, committee. And why this group, which largely mirrors the current sponsor council will do the very things that nobody has been willing to do yet. What will Portland get off you on the of this? I have no idea.

Adams: Thank you, jill.

Ronald A Buel: Randy threw the gauntlet last time. And so i'm going to take a crack at doing it in three minutes here. Because the supporting work for this project is knowingly dishonest, your project is threatened. The c.r.c. Project staff and consultants have used a static land use model. One that assume assumes the land use in clark county will be the same with and without a big new bridge. C.r.c. Staff and consultants know there are 5,000 acres in clark county zoned for housing but not developed. Many of these acres are in battle ground, and with long freeway travel required. The 20 and 30 year projections used for the i-205 bridge, also used a static land use model and were nearly 50% low in projecting traffic. The gargantuan glenn jackson bridge -- the second independent way in the which the c.r.c. Staff and consultant worked is that it twists the science of the queuing theory. The work says a big bridge will reduce congestion. And the bridge impact area and in the region. What queuing theory says instead is when you eliminate a single bottleneck or choke point in a process flow, that bottle neck in this case, the traffic congestion, simply moves somewhere else in the system. In this case, i-5 entrances and exits and surface streets, to the rose quarter and to the points in i-5 where the freeway narrows to three lanes or two lanes. What these two knowingly dishonest piece, admitted by the city council and metro taken together do for you is to create errors in the projections, not just for induced travel, b.m.t. And congestion, but importantly, for the resulting air pollution, noise pollution and global warming pollution projections. These errors were called out to you, sam, and you and david, and a promise they would be fixed and the work has not yet been revised. The highway departments and c.r.c. Staff have stone walled everybody. Yet this city council is going ahead with a 12-lane project knowing that you have not yet been honest with the communities in the project's environmental cost. Tolls and transit will not somehow fix in dishonest work. They're assumed in the projections, as you know. These known false assumptions were called in testimony before city council and written and spoken in testimony. On the draft environmental impact statement. The federal environment protection agency also quote about them to you. The basic idea of the protection act is to bring honesty in considering the environmental costs of a project. There may be a reason why every environmental

February 25, 2009

and land use organization in this state was represented in testimony in opposition to the 12 lane, \$4.2 billion columbia river crossing. What you're doing in joining in dishonesty --

Adams: Ron--

Buel: -- is in contrast --

Adams: Bring it to a close.

Buel: You can't finance this project and you won't get it passed and [inaudible] a court review.

Adams: Thank you very much. Appreciate your testimony. Karla.

Adams: Welcome. Welcome to the city council. All you have to do is give us your first and last name and you have three minutes.

Stephanie Noll: All right. My name is stephanie noll, representing the bicycle transportation alliance and our 5,000 members in Oregon and Washington. And i'm delivering this testimony on behalf of my colleague, michelle. Our members care about the columbia river crossing for two reasons. One, because they want to see a wonderful world class bicycle connection between Portland and vancouver as part of this project. And two, because large highway projects like the c.r.c. Have the potential to affect the communities around them. Near and far in ways good or bad, not just for bicycle and pedestrian safety, but also community and public health. On january 28th, my colleague michelle asked you to connect any decision on the number of lanes part of this project to a decision about the levels of tolling that would be applied to the bridge. Without linking those two decisions, our members are not confident that the gels of this project -- goals, low carbon emission and improved safety will be realized for many years. Our members have a variety of opinions about the design of the bridge but many of them share the concern that the lack of the quantified goals and strategies will cause this project to disappoint most everyone in the end. We continue to work with the staff toward the great bicycle facilities. We will flock to. But cannot miss this opportunity to address the larger concern. Please, council members, tie your decision about the number of lanes to quantified goals and management strategies that will make it a successful gel for years to come.

Adams: Thank you.

Walter Valenta: I've been paying attention to this for 11 years and different committees.

Adams: God bless you.

Valenta: This is important to people where I live and it's important to me personally. I'm here to support the resolution. To me, the resolution is the prize. Everything's been focused on lanes as though the number of lanes is the thing that's going it determine how we manage the freeway. It's saying choke off the lanes so they won't sprawl. That's -- we have three lanes in each direction now and clark county sprawled because we don't have this. This is the prize. This is the thing that let's us manage what we're building. There's lots of talk about the induced demand that this would happen. But what i'm seeing is the good things that are happen with the urban planning around the c.r.c. Gets forgotten about because people keep thinking it's all about clark county sprawling out and battle ground. Downtown vancouver is going to add 10,000 units and hayden island double its population. Year going to create another recreational corridor by moving marine drive away from the river as we build it. Maybe we're going to induce tightly built demand. Not sprawling demand. And so this has ace land use component. That's why this is the prize and we're in a political environment where you have to give and take. So the other side wanted the lanes. To me getting the ability to manage both bridges and have an ongoing way to manage the extra capacity is worth the compromise. And i'm here to support in. I think it's a good thing and the most important thing we could get out of the c.r.c.

Adams: Thank you, walter. And he came on his own volition. We didn't even invite him. Anybody else.

Moore: That's all who signed up.

February 25, 2009

Adams: Anybody else in the room who would like to testify? Come on up. We've got three chairs here. I think we've got three folks. Welcome to the city council. Glad you're here. Give us your first and last name and you have three minutes and the clock will tell you how you're doing.

Brock Howell(?): I'm Brock Howell with Environment Oregon. And we had testified earlier on this matter. In opposition it's a 12-lane bridge. And I just wanted to reiterate our position. Our concerns that the effect will have on global warming. And then the secondary position that we hope that this land use component will become a binding component to ensure that Clark County does not sprawl and that both sides are treated fairly as well. I think it's key here that we treat Clark County fairly and that we're protecting the environment at the same time. So I hope that in this process of achieving this goal, that we find an innovative approach of ensuring that the U.S. does not increase in size and they do to the up zone agricultural or -- if we can do that, we remain concerned about the global warming aspect here. I'm not sure what stage we're at to be able to influence that discussion, but that's where we think the debate needs to shift is making sure we have better development on the other side of the river.

Adams: Thank you very much. Sir?

Christopher (last name?): My name is Christopher. I'm a geography major at Oregon State. It's of interest to me and the concerns about -- regarding the expansion of the interstate bridge, the Columbia River crossing. Relating to bottleneck, the I-5/I-405 loop, seems to be a concern, but I also know this has been a topic of study by a commission recently and I don't know what their recommendations were, but I think this is something that's been addressed in the past, and hope to know what those results would be. In the meantime, as far as whether the Columbia River crossing gets built. That to me is something I look forward to. Whether it gets built as a six-lane or 12-lane expansion.

Adams: Thanks for being here. Appreciate your testimony. Sir?

Alan Willis: Alan Willis is my name. I apologize for missing the sign-up sheet. I was delighted to see the headline in this morning's paper. As I have followed this issue, I have been concerned that for a variety of reasons, many which I understand and am sympathetic with, that we might once again go after and build something that was less than needed for the time period we needed it. I'm here to fully support the resolution in front of the council. I was always hoping for a 12-lane solution, but I think what you've come up with this council and the notion of going up to 12 lanes and the ability to really manage that and be inclusive of the I-205 crossing is probably the best most balanced way to go after this question. I fully support the resolution.

Adams: Thank you all very much. I appreciate your testimony. All right. I think that covers -- Henry. So we're very lucky, the co-chair of the project sponsor is in the room. I didn't know if you were here to observe or testify. But this is Henry Hewitt and also the co-chair of the big one -- how long was it?

Henry Hewitt, Co-Chair Project Sponsors Council: Half my lifetime.

Adams: Glad you're here.

Hewitt: I didn't come really to speak, but I was struck by a couple of things. One, I'm encouraged by the progress being made by the project's sponsors council to reach consensus. And the op-ed piece this morning was one element of that. And I thought that the piece was well done and covered all the issues that I think were important that I can think of. And I think that the collaboration among the government entities on both sides of the river is at an all-time high and creating a framework for the future on this issue and other issues that I think will be helpful and encouraging as we address the reality of one region, rather than many, many governments on this side of the river and the other side of the river. The bridge is a multimodal bridge. I think sometimes that gets lost in the discussion around the number of lanes. The transit and mass transit benefits and light rail benefits of the proposed bridge are significant. Maybe overwhelming in terms of what they will bring to our region. The benefit of the advisory committee on this subject

February 25, 2009

and other subjects, I think, you can't hardly look for well enough to understand how that will play out in terms of operating the bridge and making sure it operates correctly to meet the goals we have for it. Those are dynamic concepts. What we decide today may or may not be the way we want it in 10 years and having a mechanism in place we realize everyone needs to agree in order to make changes in the way the bridge is operated. Performance standards, also dynamic. It's important to have those on the table and get them created but understand that we will change how we think the standards ought to be and what they ought to be in the future as we see how this operates in fact. And the last point I guess I'd like to make is that the number of lanes on the bridge, the number of add-drop lanes, the three add-drop lane each way being discussed really have very little to do with the number of vehicles crossing the river. And it's -- it's virtually entirely how the interchanges operate on both sides of the river and those lanes on the bridge are what facilitate getting on and off at marine drive and hayden island and into and out of vancouver and the number of lanes really dictate a congestion at the interchanges and bottlenecks of the freight and users that are getting onto the freeway and off at those points and so I think that if we end up with a 12-lane bridge, it really is about supporting those interchanges and their functionality for the future. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you, mr. Chair. All right. Council discussion.

Saltzman: I had a question for you since you're the sponsor of this. There was a suggestion by the gentleman whose name I forget about having somebody from the department of ecology and d.e.q. Serve on the mobility council and suggested health departments. I think four is too many, but I would go with the environmental agencies and I wonder if that was discussed and would that be upsetting the apple cart at this point to include them? I regardless of one's philosophy about the 12 lane bridge, air quality issues are very much here to stay. Associated with transportation and having air quality be one of the criteria under which decisions are made about tolling and --

Adams: Sure.

Saltzman: -- hot lanes and things I think it would be good to have that perspective.

Adams: I think it's a useful suggestion and we've got assume a Washington equivalent to the Oregon department of environmental --

Saltzman: Ecology.

Adams: I could support that. The other is one of the reasons I didn't mention that we put citizens as representatives is we can also -- there's expertise there. So the citizen representative from Portland could -- we could seek out a certain profile of that person. Around the table there's been informal discussion. For example, the d.o.t. Representative might be a nominee from somewhere else in the state. And if the council is interested, I'm supportive if you want to put on a ecology d.e.q. Person.

Saltzman: Make that motion, I guess.

Fritz: Agree.

Adams: It's been moved and seconded to include a d.e.q. Ecology -- what's it called?

Saltzman: Department of ecology.

Adams: A doe and d.e.q. Representative, one from each state and seconded. Can we call the roll, unless there's discussion.

Fish: You're accepting this as a friendly amendment.

Adams: I think we still have so vote on it.

*******:** Is it an amendment to resolution or attachment.

Adams: We'll put it in the resolution and assume it's also reflected in attachment, how's that?

Fritz: Aye. **Fish:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Adams:** Aye.

Fritz: I'd like to follow-up. I was interested in dr. Low's suggestion for health department person from each state. I think there are different values that somebody with a health background would be concerned about than somebody with a ecology. And that seems to be missing because it's mostly transportation folks.

February 25, 2009

Adams: I want to be clear it isn't prescribed who we appoint to be on, other than it cannot be an elected official. We can choose a doctor.

Fritz: We've got one citizen. We might want to have a bicycle person and a health person. Interested in adding an environmental justice person. If we've got one person, we need a doctor who is a bicyclist and doesn't have much money.

Adams: I think that's dr. Low. I'm open to taking suggestions and seeing where council is at on that. We're up to 13. So would you like to make that in the form of a resolution? Or -- sorry, an amendment.

Fritz: Yeah, I move we add a suggested -- a representative from each state to represent health concerns.

Adams: I assume there's a state health department on both sides. So is there a second? Ok. The motion fails for lack of a second.

Fritz: Move that we add an environmental justice representative from each state.

Adams: Is there a second? Motion dies for lack of a second. Other discussion. I was going to tick through the questions raised so that you know we've thought about these things and note where we haven't. The -- mr. Low talked about money going into this project that could be going into potholes. Or somebody did. Chris. Who is Chris? Anyway, a testifier talked about this could take money away from local efforts. That's something that we're vigilant on. The state money that's being raised could be distributed to cities. But it's being raised specifically for this bridge. There's no local money going into this bridge that would compete for potholes. The bottleneck and other -- I'm very concerned about this bridge and spoke to it at the beginning and want to underscore. I'm concerned about both bridges being managed in a way that we're looking to their potential impacts outside of both bridge influence areas and that's why you see on the performance warranty that's one of the criteria that the crossing council will have to consider and that we will have some performance warranty language for that. The discussion about tolls should be the same for everybody. There's active discussion about different tolls for freight, different tolls during time of day. So I wanted to make sure that people knew that. The i-5/i-84 is a bad interchange. We advocate for that being fixed. Like it or not, portions of each freeway, all over the state and nation are fixed on a project-by-project basis. Eminent domain, who decide that's. Paul, do you have an answer to that? You have to come -- do you have an answer?

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

Adams: Why don't you come on up. Paul Smith from the bureau of transportation.

Paul Smith, Bureau of Transportation: Well, if -- representatives are here from odot, Jason tell is here, but expanding i-5 in Oregon, if that were to happen, just like the project that you mentioned between delta park and lombard, that would be the Oregon department of transportation that would consider that action.

Adams: The other question --

Fish: Excuse me, to follow up. They would consider that action but does this body have a role in that action?

Smith: You'll remember that in this project, the council passed the locally preferred alternative resolution last July. We typically have the same role in a major highway project. We did that for the delta park, lombard project and odot is responsive to the issues brought up by this council.

Adams: But ultimately, it's the commission that decides?

Smith: I believe so. Jason can confirm.

Adams: Is that right, Jason? OK.

Fritz: The project council could recommend condemnation of land alongside of i-5 and we would not have the right to say no? Get the entire --

February 25, 2009

Adams: No. Only the, the state transportation commission. The state transportation commission that currently exists is who -- the body who authorizes condemnation for freeway projects is my understanding.

Smith: Right.

Fritz: And we don't have any say in that?

Adams: We don't have say now or in the future. The rightful concerns about the analysis, it is actually one of the reasons for this approach. I want that performance warranty. I want form to follow function. I don't want these decisions coming at me and others in a piecemeal fashion without some sort of guidance and performance goals based on reasonable assumptions and great analysis. So I agree with that. In terms of leverage, we still have leverage now. The same we had with or without this. This council's been very clear, i'm very clear, we have to make decisions -- we have to come up with decisions on different components, but if we don't like how the sum total functions for us, we can still say no. Our leverage is political and significant. There are lots of these projects around the united states and we've been told by Washington d.c., the projects that were the most unified support of local decision makers are the ones that are going to get funded first. I do not want to -- I want to co-manage the notion of ceding responsibility to future generations. I want to co-manage and give future generations a place at the table in managing not only this project, but hopefully other aspects of our transportation. What we do now is passively rely on things like the number of [inaudible] and think that that somehow is managing things and it's very, very illusionary. I thought, walter's point there's three lanes right now in each direction and we have massive sprawl in parts of region spoke directly to that point. There's nervousness, I have nervousness about this project, but taking everything together, I think this is the best way forward. I just wanted to make sure we had some response to some of the comments.

Fritz: Question. The -- there are 31 of the conditions specified in the resolution passing the locally preferred alternative which are not yet met. And thank you, staff for your response on this. Including things like reconfiguring the marine drive exit, which will be reviewed by city council in march. Would we still get to see that?

Adams: Richard, did you want to come up here? Adjust i-84.

*******:** Good afternoon.

Richard Brandman: Good afternoon. Richard , odot c.r.c. project director.

Fritz: There are 31 of the conditions specified in the locally preferred alternative resolution that passed and some of them have specific time lines about things that -- in your response, the crossing's response to me and my questions from the last hearing includes things like the marine drive interchange, recommendations were made to the city council in march and does this resolution supersede that and those decisions would go to the new council?

Brandman: The project is working actively on all of the issues raised in the resolutions and we're acting in good faith on all of those. The marine drive issue has been a particularly sticky issue in some of the land owner, which are merc and the government which oversees them, which is metro and the city staff and tri-met have not reached an agreement amongst themselves about which is the right design of the interchange. So the design work has been shifted and changed. I think at least three times in the last several months, to try and find a design that is supported by all the local governments because we're striving for consensus.

Fritz: Will that come to the Portland city council?

Brandman: If you would like, we can bring it here.

Adams: I will bring it. And as walter valenta mentioned, we're trying to get some of the transportation infrastructure a little further away from the Oregon channel, Oregon slough so that there would be opportunities to activate it.

February 25, 2009

Fritz: Would have been helpful to have more information about which of the more than 31 conditions this new council will be responsible for making sure they're implemented and which ones we still get to weigh in on.

Adams: Let me be clear. The project sponsors council and the process of coming back to the Portland city council, the vancouver county, metro, c-tran board and tri-met board and the dots, it's the project's sponsors council with you that is going to decide the basic components of the project and the performance warranties and goals. Maybe in 2016 or 2017, we'll be impaneling the actual columbia crossing mobility council and they'll --

Fritz: When are we having the mobility council?

Adams: The bridge scheduled to open until 2018? Is that right? The project i'm proposing today wouldn't be impaneled until 2016 or 2017 but we'll be deciding the basis on which they operate the district. We, the council here and other decision makers and other bodies will be collectively deciding the basis of their work, including answers to the questions you have in front of you.

Fritz: We're voting on today is the 12 lanes and the future creation, once the bridge is built, on its management, correct?

Adams: No, also setting forth the -- we're setting forth the expectation that we'll be putting together the performance goals, which will be performance warranty and that will help us guide decisions on design and activation of the lanes and what they're used for, tolling, transit, activation issues of fares and schedules and frequency and all of those things. Right now, my frustration is we don't have those performance goals in place and yet we have to make decisions on the individual components because there's that whole time and space -- they've got to design and engineer some option.

Fritz: That's helpful. And so the project sponsor's council will come up with those and bringing them back to the jurisdictions?

Adams: Correct, that's where we try to come up with a consensus that we all, most of us have to take back to the actual governing bodies for confirmations.

Fritz: Thank you, that's all.

Adams: You bet. Any other conversation? All right. Then I think, Karla, would you please call the roll.

Fritz: I'm profoundly disappointed that this authorizes a 12-lane bridge because I don't believe we have answered crucial questions about why we want or need 12 lanes. We're proposing a fourth through lane that is 4.2 miles long, and calling the extra lanes auxilliary lanes but we haven't been discussing why we need the three through-lanes if we have the 3 auxillary lanes and I didn't have my questions answered in terms of the weaving between 6 lanes to get into the very fast lanes or how that would work. And i'm concerned looking at the junction of i-405 and i-5 near the killingsworth exit which is a difficult maneuver. That we're creating another problem like that. I'm concerned that we're not addressing congestion in the i-5/i-84 and setting up the city to agree to widen the i-5 in the Rose Quarter which I have no interest in doing -- we've already taken the neighborhood there and don't need to take more of it. I'm concerned we're choosing the most expensive option and the resolution passed last july called for the smallest possible bridge and I find it ironic that the smallest also happens to be the biggest proposed bridge. And i'm concerned about the funding when we have so many other needs in the state of Oregon. I believe we have \$4-6 million coming from the state. We don't have the money and we have a lot of other construction needs in the Portland metro area which I believe are more crucial than this particular bridge. I share mr. Palenti's urging to look at freight. More attention to the rail aspects, which was outside of the project impact area and, therefore, did not receive as much attention as I would have liked to see. And concerned about the amounts and locations of the tolling which conflicts with some of the information -- some of the proposed elements of the concept for the resolution. Talking about assure all trips are affordable. Which I don't know what that means. And that multimodal trips are

February 25, 2009

less expensive than drive alone trips. I'm concerned about the proposed health standard. Preventing health air pollution hot spots which would allow overall pollution to be high. I don't think we've addressed the environmental justice concerns not only in the project area but in i-5 and i-84 neighborhoods. And while in principle, an interstate columbia river crossing council may be a good idea and i'm comforted it's a -- long term idea rather than happening next month. It doesn't give the city of Portland, which is the biggest winner or loser, any say in the outcomes and the goals that were articulated in the original resolution. There's no accountability to Portland voters and no elected officials proposed on this council and that concerns me greatly. Big is not necessarily better if the goals of the project cannot be met and that's why I continue to be concerned about the 12 lane bridge. Giving all the power to the regional authority whose decisions will never be overturned is troubling. Reversing a regional council decision requires all of the jurisdictions to pass exactly the same resolution and realistically that's not going to happen. I can't support 12 lanes based on the evidence in the record and i'm concerned about mobility council and the increase in pollution in Portland and specifically the lombard/405 section. The potential for us to be missing opportunities in this crossing and causing problems outside of the project area and making them worse within portland. Nay.

Fish: Well, I -- Karla, people -- we recently switched the order we're calling out. I'm actually in the same predicament you are, because I keep thinking you are going to call me first, but we're on a rotation. You know, I have been on a colleague of commissioner Fritz's now for about two months and I have to say I have said at every neighborhood meeting, I thought she brought -- she was a great addition to this body and her comments today further illustrate that and I appreciate she has strong views, she is her own voice and expresses herself and I think on this and other issues going forward, we'll be better for it. And I listen carefully to the concerns that you raised and a little part of me thought that on some of those issues, you certainly would have been within your rights to offer an amendment during the normal -- the earlier stage of our discussion -- for a discussion, rather than to identify them as a deal-killer. But I appreciated very much the points you made and i'm beginning to have a sense on this issue, that we're doing sort of -- to the critics of this plan, we're taking our normal transportation model and inverted it. One the first votes I cast on this body was a vote to support light rail to milwaukie. And what we got on that plan was basically a little sketch on the back of a cocktail napkin presented with no way to fund and most of the details, other than the alignment over the river, left open. And I remember turning to dan Saltzman, who is the second most senior member.

Leonard: The senior.

Fish: The most senior.

Leonard: I'm the senior citizen.

Fish: I remember turning to the most senior member and saying is this how you guys do transportation planning? And he might have said -- he'll deny it now. But he said something to the effect of the way we do transportation planning is set the vision, get -- we vote on these things. We queue up for the money and we always deliver a good product. We work out the details. Which actually was something that was familiar to me because that's also how we do affordable housing. We set the vision. We kind of put together some of the details and tell these creative people to make it happen and we find a way to pay for it. So in effect, some of our best transportation planning and housing planning is based on that leap of faith. But the faith is that we have the right people at the table to make good judgments on behalf of people. And I take it from commissioner Fritz's comments that she has significant concerns about that and we may replay this hearing in 10 years and she may be right. But i've come to a different conclusion and I don't think it's because I have any greater insight than she does, but i'm willing to treat the planning process on this bridge the way we do for light rail and housing and to take that leap of faith. And to accept that, yes, it's not perfect, but that we have enough protections built in that we might get the bridge we want. So I

February 25, 2009

think that's ultimately is where the dividing line comes down. And I say that, though, because my good friend ron buel has come before this council and he keeps getting more agitated at us and appreciate that. That's one of his unique roles is to be agitated before legislative bodies. That's why he's been so effective. And today, you know, in your statement, which I thought was eloquent. You say if we accept this resolution, we're sort of aligning ourselves with something we know to be dishonest. And to my good friend ron, I want to say I take that challenge very seriously. I will go home tonight and sleep reasonably well in part because I don't think my vote is dishonest. But I do think you and I have a reasoned disagreement and I will continue to listen very attentively to your testimony because as the mayor said, it is still within our hands to shape and if at some point the sort of balance tips and you can convince me otherwise, i'll join with my friend, ron, in raising a flag. In casting my vote today, I don't believe i'm acting in a dishonest way but I respect your right to vehemently disagree. Henry hewitt, talked about establishing a framework for the future. We're not penciling in the details you but from my point of view, we've made huge strides in putting light rail and pedestrian and bicycle. And we've done huge strides in thinking about how form follows function and stepping back and putting into this what the mayor calls a performance warranty. We've listened to the concerns of people in north Portland, peninsula and I believe this plan can be better because of that. So for me, this is a framework that is getting sketched in with greater detail, but from my point of view is still headed in the right direction. And so based on the information that we received today, listening to the very thoughtful testimony, i'm going to vote yes on this resolution. But I will continue to keep an open mind as my colleague, commissioner Fritz, raises her concerns, and as my friend ron buel raises his. I want to thank katherine, who I guess left. But - - and sam's staff for the briefings we got and the time been spent. And I want to say one thing on behalf of our beleaguered mayor. People will pick through issues from time to time. And try to point to one that shows our mayor is leading. I think on this one, in fairness, he gets credit for leading. This is an example of bringing a region together around a compromise. It's a compromise that a lot of people don't like, but the essence of leadership is not getting complete consensus, in fact, sometimes the best compromises are ones that everyone has some grumbling about. To me that's leadership. I complement the mayor on his leadership and vote aye.

Saltzman: Well, I think the proposal by mayor Adams and mayor pollard and others to have this mobility council with performance measures is really the only way to go. Whatever your feelings are about the right number of lanes, the important part of this innovation is to have the ability to manage the asset. I mean, that's currently the rage of all the infrastructure bureaus is how do you not only build the assets but how do you manage their performance over time? Because we often spend more time on the former, building things, then we do on the latter, and that's managing the assets. This sets in place, the tools to truly manage that asset to achieve a number of performance measures. Whether that's the ultimate number of lanes that are opened or how those lanes are used or maximizing or assuring a certain level of use by lightrail. So I think -- and i'll admit that i'm probably as -- I think this innovation is important and i'll support it, but i'm probably as disappointed as maybe commissioner Fritz is or others that there's a lot of things we talked about in july never happened. There was never an independent analysis of the greenhouse gas emissions or looking at induced demand or how land use patterns might change. There was a third one, never was an independent analysis of and i'm chagrined about that and disappointed but not to the point i'm going to beat my head against the wall here. I think there are good foundations for the decision to move forward that is going to serve the interests of Portland, residents of Portland and also the residents of clark county and vancouver who many -- i'm really pleased that Portland is the job center and I want to keep it that way. I'm perfectly happy with people from clark county coming here to work. It feeds our land use system. It feeds our transportation investment decisions over the years. So it's a dynamic not likely to change. I'm sure clark county and vancouver would like to

February 25, 2009

have better jobs and housing balance and that's great but I'm ok with Portland being the jobs magnet too-- so i'm pleased to support this. Aye.

Leonard: There are very few times in one's political career that you cast a vote that affects more than those that you currently represent. And this is one of those very few times in an elected career that I have chosen over the last 16 plus years. This won't affect just the current generation of Portlanders and Washingtonians, but I would expect well over 100 years in the future, at a minimum. It's difficult to isolate those issues when being hit eight different ways. As mayor Adams was. I fortunately was pretty clear from the beginning and didn't have to suffer through some of what he has had to suffer through these past few years but observed from afar, both personally and as I mentioned before, watching on comcast, the hearings, and so I appreciate what it has taken for him to get to this point. I'm one of those forces, by the way, he's had to deal with. That he -- he satisfied in the really balanced approach he brought to this. So I certainly want to echo commissioner Fish's very -- what I think are appropriate remarks about mayor Adams' leadership on this and echo that sentiment and recognize that it's not easy to find the balances when you have such volatile competing forces wanting you to do whatever it is they think is the right thing. But i'm also convinced that -- also reminded that this morning we had a discussion wherein we used pictures to describe where we were and where we want to go. We have a picture of a building that's 60 years old that we went -- compared to a building that today has been allowed to get into a state of disrepair and we want -- actually get back to what that building looked like. If we can go to 2016 when this project is done, I hope somebody takes a picture of bridge we replace with the bridge that's going to be new and I think people will scratch their heads and wonder why some advocated to keep a bridge that had absolutely no possibility of light rail and no possibility of using it as a bicycle path, and dangerous to say the least, for pedestrians when what we will have is a world class light rail system and world class bicycle system and a world class pedestrian path. And -- and I recognize that and I think sam, you recognize that. Which I greatly appreciate. You know, in terms of traffic management, this really is a microcosm of a solution on a larger scale that a lot of us have been talking about for a long time and some in the room and I have talked about as well. Gasoline is too cheap in the united states and it's too cheap because -- not because as our attorney general says we're a nation of cowards but because we have a congress that are full of people afraid to do what is the right thing and raise the gas tax to a level that will manage traffice and get them out of their cars and on to transit systems. We're paying \$4 a gallon about a year ago and everybody was howling and I was riding tri-met and noticed I couldn't get a seat anymore. people were voting with their feet, parking their cars and getting on tri-met and max. That's really the answer to this problem. But until then, we have to come up with solutions like sam has developed here to manage traffic. So i'm pleased with the work you've done, mayor Adams. I commend you and recognize how absolutely challenging under any conditions it is to reach this kind of consensus, and I appreciate it. Aye.

Adams: Thank you for your comments and your support and loyal opposition, I appreciate it. I really also want to underscore a thanks to david bragdon and tim leavitt and steve stuart and royce pollard. These were lively conversations and everyone had to get really creative. Also want to thank catherine ciarlo and Shoshanah oppenheim from my transportation team and dan anderson, really appreciate your great work and we have a more work to do. I like the way that commissioner Fritz -- commissioner Fish, sorry, now i'm doing it, pointed out that this project is still in our hands, and, you know, what I proposed here is to build some tools to put in those hands and that's really the development of those goals up front. The goals will be done as soon as we can get them done. Accurately. We're not waiting until the end. We want them upfront so they can shape our decisions on everything else and remember, the traditional way these things are done is 205. You build it, walk away. The dots in olympia and salem do their best. This provides more of a local influence over the way the project is done and done based on performance and I appreciate everyone's

February 25, 2009

willingness to dig into this issue and your support and concern. And we are far from this being the last council session on this project. There's a lot more coming back at us. So I vote aye. Thank you. [gavel pounded] we are recessed. We are adjourned.

At 4:45 p.m., Council adjourned.