



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **15TH DAY OF APRIL, 2009** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Commissioner Leonard, Presiding; Commissioners Fish, Fritz, and Saltzman, 4.

Commissioner Fish arrived at 9:33 a.m.

At 9:48 a.m., Council recessed.

Mayor Adams was excused to arrive at 9:58 a.m.

At 10:00 a.m., Council reconvened.

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

Commissioner Saltzman arrived at 10:03 a.m.

At 1:27 p.m., Council recessed.

At 1:39 p.m., Council reconvened.

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

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

COMMUNICATIONS		Disposition:
394	Request of Teresa McGuire to address Council regarding Mayor Adams (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
395	Request of John Potts to address Council regarding the Burnside/Sandy intersection project (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
396	Request of Hector Lara Cervantes to address Council regarding illegal experiments on citizens (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
397	Request of Pete Colt to address Council regarding thanking the City civil servants (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE

April 15, 2009

398 Request of Rene Garcia to address Council regarding Mayor Adams (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
TIME CERTAINS	
399 TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Confirm appointment of Jesse Beason and Kira Higgs to the Regional Arts & Culture Council, terms to expire June 30, 2011 (Report introduced by Mayor Adams) (Y-5)	CONFIRMED
400 TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM – Authorize application to enhance the Portland Enterprise Zone with Electronic commerce designation with the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (Resolution introduced by Mayor Adams) (Y-5)	36697
CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION	
Mayor Sam Adams	
401 Appoint Brendan Barnicle to the Investment Advisory Committee for term to expire October 31, 2010 (Report) (Y-5)	CONFIRMED
402 Appoint Mary Manilla to the Investment Advisory Committee for term to expire April 15, 2011 (Report) (Y-5)	CONFIRMED
*403 Authorize a grant to Reynolds School District for \$1,650 for the support of the re-engagement of disconnected youth to educational opportunities (Ordinance) (Y-5)	182657
Bureau of Planning & Sustainability	
*404 Apply for a grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funding for the National Clean Diesel Funding Assistance Program for diesel emissions reduction projects (Ordinance) (Y-5)	182658
405 Accept a grant from the State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and authorize a \$50,000 grant agreement with Portland ReStore to develop a strategic marketing plan to educate businesses and individuals about the value of new salvage materials (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 22, 2009 AT 9:30 AM
Bureau of Transportation	

April 15, 2009

<p>*406 Authorize the Bureau of Transportation to acquire certain permanent and temporary easements necessary for construction of bridge and street improvements for the SW Gibbs Street Pedestrian Bridge Project No. 37504 through the exercise of the City's Eminent Domain Authority (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p>182659</p>
<p>*407 Authorize the Bureau of Transportation to acquire certain permanent and temporary easements necessary for construction of street improvements for the NE Cully Blvd: Prescott Street to Killingsworth Project No. 62302 through the exercise of the City's Eminent Domain Authority (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p>182660</p>
<p>408 Amend the Intergovernmental Agreement with Metro for the City financial contribution to South Corridor Phase II: Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Transit Refinement Study and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 53071)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 22, 2009 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>409 Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with the Washington State Department of Transportation in the amount of \$92,414 for Phase III of the environmental impact statement for the Columbia River Crossing Project (Second Reading Agenda 366) (Y-5)</p>	<p>182661</p>
<p>Office of Emergency Management</p>	
<p>410 Authorize the application to the Department of Homeland Security for a grant in the amount of \$7,896,570 to plan for terrorism events and natural disasters through planning, training and equipping first responders and volunteers and developing necessary emergency management infrastructure in the Portland Urban Area (Second Reading Agenda 367) (Y-5)</p>	<p>182662</p>
<p>Office of Management and Finance – Business Operations</p>	
<p>*411 Pay claim of Steve Arnsberg (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p>182663</p>
<p>*412 Pay claim of Lisa Mueller (Ordinance) (Y-5)</p>	<p>182664</p>
<p>Office of Management and Finance – Financial Services</p>	
<p>413 Statement of Cash and Investments Febraury 01, 2009 through February 28, 2009 (Report; Treasurer) (Y-5)</p>	<p>PLACED ON FILE</p>
<p>Office of Management and Finance – Human Resources</p>	
<p>414 Create a new Nonrepresented classification of Watershed and Conduit Supervisor (Ordinance)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 22, 2009 AT 9:30 AM</p>

April 15, 2009

415 Change the salary range for the Nonrepresented classification of Water Treatment Operations Supervisor (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 22, 2009 AT 9:30 AM
Commissioner Nick Fish Position No. 2	
Bureau of Housing and Community Development	
*416 Amend subrecipient contract with Worksystems, Inc. by an additional \$90,000 to implement Economic Opportunity Initiative projects and provide for payment (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 38225) (Y-5)	182665
*417 Amend subrecipient contract with Pedagogy Institute by an additional \$31,509 for technical assistance and the Dignity Village project and provide for payment (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 38153) (Y-5)	182666
Commissioner Dan Saltzman Position No. 3	
Bureau of Environmental Services	
418 Authorize grant agreement with Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc. to provide education, outreach and community involvement for watershed projects in Fanno, Tryon and Willamette watersheds up to \$150,000 for FY 2009-2011 (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 22, 2009 AT 9:30 AM
419 Authorize contract with Berger/ABAM Engineers, Inc. for professional services for engineering design and services during construction of the Guilds Lake Pump Station Reliability Improvements, Project No. E08877 (Ordinance; Contract No. 30000337)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 22, 2009 AT 9:30 AM
420 Amend contract with David Evans and Associates, Inc. for additional work and compensation for the Umatilla Pump Station Upgrade Project No. E08589 (Second Reading Agenda 374; amend Contract No. 36485) (Y-5)	182667
Bureau of Police	
*421 Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with the City of Cornelius and Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon for transit police services (Ordinance) (Y-5)	182668
*422 Authorize a \$50,000 agreement with Catholic Charities/El Programa Hispano to assist victims and survivors of domestic violence (Ordinance)	182669

April 15, 2009

**Commissioner Randy Leonard
Position No. 4**

Bureau of Water

***423** Settle grievance of Craig Trotti (Ordinance)
(Y-5)

182670

REGULAR AGENDA

424 Authorize the Portland Water Bureau to establish an Office and a Retail Sales & Service use for the Portland Rose Festival Foundation and the Albertina Kerr Centers on property located at 1020 SW Naito Parkway and affix an electric roof top sign (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Adams and Commissioners Fish and Leonard; waive Title 33 use requirements and historic design review requirements; and Title 32 roof top sign regulations)

Motion to add directive “g” to state that no ratepayer dollars shall be used in the design, construction or operation of the office at 1020 SW Naito Parkway: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Commissioner Fritz. Motion was tabled.

Motion to split the ordinance into two, one authorizing the office use of the space and the second on the waivers necessary for the sign: Moved by Commissioner Fritz and seconded by Commissioner Saltzman. Motion failed. (Y-2; N-3, Adams, Fish and Leonard)

**PASSED TO
SECOND READING
APRIL 22, 2009
AT 9:30 AM**

Mayor Sam Adams

Bureau of Planning & Sustainability

425 Establish the duties and responsibilities of the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability and amend code to reflect bureau title (Second Reading Agenda 377; repeal Code Chapter 3.111, add Code Chapter 3.33, amend Code Chapters 1.01, 17.102, 3.112 and Title 33)

(Y-5)

182671

Bureau of Transportation

***426** Accept grants from Federal Highway Administration through Metro for local economic stimulus funds not to exceed \$14,691,106 to keep Portlanders working and assist in the City's economic recovery (Ordinance)

(Y-4; Leonard absent)

182672

Office of City Attorney

April 15, 2009

<p>427 Authorize Sole Source Acquisition and Predevelopment Agreement and authorize Sole Source Acquisition of an Operating Agreement, both with Peregrine Sports, LLC for Major League Soccer and Triple-A Baseball stadiums, pursuant to ORS 279b.075 and City Code Title 5, Section 5.33.120 (Ordinance)</p> <p>Motion to strike Exhibit A sections 2.7 and 3.5 that refer to \$15,000,000 of additional funding for the project: Moved by Commissioner Saltzman and seconded by Mayor Adams (Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING AS AMENDED APRIL 22, 2009 AT 10:00 AM TIME CERTAIN</p>
<p align="center">Office of Management and Finance – Business Operations</p>	
<p>*428 Authorize a contract and provide for payment to furnish replacement vehicles at \$1,349,500 (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182673</p>
<p>*429 Authorize contract and provide for payment for the Smart Park Garages Recoating project (Ordinance)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182674</p>
<p>430 Extend contract with Kleinfelder West, Inc. for additional geotechnical engineering services for \$33,000 for the Fire Station No. 1 upgrade and facility remodel project (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 37832)</p>	<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 22, 2009 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p align="center">Office of Management and Finance – Purchases</p>	
<p>431 Adopt findings, authorize an exemption to the competitive bidding process for development of an MLS Stadium and a Triple-A Stadium, pursuant to ORS 279C.330 and City Code Section 5.34.810 and 5.34.820 (Ordinance)</p>	<p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 22, 2009 AT 10:00 AM TIME CERTAIN</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Nick Fish Position No. 2</p>	
<p align="center">Portland Parks & Recreation</p>	
<p>432 Honor the Portland Parks Foundation and Anne Naito-Campbell for their efforts raising funds for the Bill Naito Legacy Fountain, honoring Portland businessman and civic contributor Bill Naito (Second Reading Agenda 358)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182675</p>
<p>433 Authorize naming the new South Waterfront neighborhood park the Elizabeth Caruthers Park (Second Reading Agenda 359)</p> <p>(Y-5)</p>	<p align="center">182676</p>
<p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman Position No. 3</p> <p align="center">Bureau of Environmental Services</p>	

April 15, 2009

*434 Authorize agreement for conveyance, subject to a life estate, of the Charles N. and Vicki Glasco property, located in the Johnson Creek floodplain project area to the Bureau of Environmental Services (Ordinance) (Y-5)	182677
*435 Amend contract with Department of Environmental Quality to address rule authorization and permit requirements for Underground Injection Control Structures (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 37783) (Y-5)	182678
436 Accept a donation of \$50,000 from Fred Meyer Stores for implementation of stormwater curb extensions in the public right-of-way at SE 38th and Main, next to the SE Hawthorne Fred Meyer Store (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING APRIL 22, 2009 AT 9:30 AM
437 Amend contract with Brown and Caldwell for professional services for the Portsmouth Force Main Project No. 6902 for engineering support services during construction (Second Reading Agenda 373; amend Contract No. 36247) (Y-5)	182679 AS AMENDED

At 1:51 p.m., Council recessed.

April 15, 2009

WEDNESDAY, 2:00 PM, APRIL 15, 2009

**DUE TO LACK OF AN AGENDA
THERE WAS NO MEETING**

April 15, 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.

April 15, 2009 **9:30 AM**

Leonard: The council will come to order and, Karla, please call the roll.
[roll call]

Leonard: Thank you. Before we start, I want to welcome the foreign exchange high school students that are in the audience. They're here through the council of international educational exchange and come from brazil and the czech republic, germany, jordan, morocco. We're honored to have your presence. Thank you. [applause] Karla, please read item 394.

Item 394.

Leonard: Teresa mcguire.

Teresa McGuire: Good morning.

Leonard: Good morning, you have three minutes. If you'll state your name for the record.

McGuire: It's teresa mcguire. I'm a resident of commissioner Fritz's [inaudible]. There's an expectation that for anyone who comes before you that you will collectively and individually take action. How you act to guide our city will be based on legal, moral and ethical values. Leadership and trust. And i've come to my conclusion -- excuse me -- like it or not, your collective behaviors fall into one or more of three categories. And to use a variation of an old folk saying -- rich man, poor man. It seems the options would be liar, beggarman and thief. Each of you receive a public salary. Where is your 20% pay cut that shows sympathy to those who are unemployed and under employed? I've sat here for eight sessions and asked myself where's the accountability, the leadership and the trust that we as the residents of this city are entitled to after shouldering the financial burden, in particular this year. Sam, who I see is not here, you admitted lying about your relationship with beau breedlove. You besmirch bob ball. And these facts -- he has heard these charges leveled at him and yet he continues to remain in office. Where is your accountability, your leadership and our trust? Today, april 15th, is a day for citizens to render payment for public services. And i'm calling upon you, the Portland city council, to earn your keep. Three of you have said you asked the state attorney general office to look into this election matter. Where is this report? When will it be forthcoming and who is stalling, dragging their feet and keeping us in the dark? Commissioner Fritz, you have said as a city council candidate -- vote the mayor out. None of you is being asked to do that as a city council. What needs to happen is you each need to walk down the hall to sam's office with the message that it's time for him to go. This unresolved situation continues to cost each of you politically and I also believe personally and come july 1st, the price will be going up. Over -- I timed it this. Over 230 years ago, taxes, and sugar taxes and the tea act led the states to let king george know we had had enough. Today, through a looking glass twisted moment of time, we find a city council, who instead of shouting, "off with their heads," is shouting off with memorial coliseum. And happy birthday to p.g.e. Park who in its rebirth as of 2001 is -- of april 30th. I wonder what interest rates we'll continue to pay as we haul the rubble away. Come july 1, i've honored my present mayor as i've decided to go to the streets and solicit a teenager, as well as other older registered voters to oust -- the citizens of Portland, rich man and poor man, say to you, sam, liar, unfortunately, beggar man and thief that and we've had enough and here's the revolution. Thank you. [applause]

Leonard: Item 395, Karla.

April 15, 2009

Item 395.

Leonard: Good morning, mr. Potts.

John Potts: Good morning.

Leonard: State your name and you have three minutes.

Potts: Thank you. I'm John Potts, the owner of the business Northwest Fitness and people recognize it as where Sandy and Burnside meet. And in February, I was contacted by Sharon from Hannah -- why the easement was needed, much to my shock, she informed me that the city was closing Sandy Boulevard and realigning traffic so it would bypass my storefront completely. I got in touch with Chris Arms from the transportation bureau and she informed me that indeed, Sandy Boulevard was being closed and that it was a done deal. I have set up a meeting with the liaisons for Mayor Adams, they informed me the decision was irrevocable and the best they could do was help with temporary signage and that they would hold no further conversations with me about the damage being done to the values of my property and business by closing my access and street frontage on one of the most well-known streets in Portland. As most of you know, the number one criteria for successful businesses is location, location, location. I purchased this property in 1994 simply because of that and now the city is taking much of that value from me. In this case, it is a double dose of bad news because now not only is the value of my property compromised, but the ability of my business to survive is severely jeopardized. This has been a retail location for many years with the orientation of the storefront completely to Sandy Boulevard. With this change, not only will all traffic from in front of my store be eliminated and access in half, we will no longer have a Sandy Boulevard address as there will no longer be a Sandy Boulevard. I've provided pictures of my store. Pictures one, two and three show what our current potential customers see as they're driving on Sandy Boulevard. Four, five and six show what they'll see from Burnside and 14th Avenue. As you can see, I will no longer have any significant visibility to the flow of traffic. The city is taking one of the most recognized locations in Portland and destroying its retail value without a major restructuring of my building and this time of fiscal crisis, I believe this is money well spent as it in no way resolves any traffic problems in this area, but simply moves them one block east. I've been in business in the Portland market for 30 years and we are now in the worst economic climate of my experience. This street closure is going to drastically impact my ability to stay in business. We've 12 employees in the Portland market but when jobs are lost left and right, I've been able to keep them working by making cuts and sacrifices in other areas.

Leonard: Mr. Potts, your three minutes are up.

Potts: Quickly. 12 employees are not many, but to me, each is a family that I'm doing my best to support. The decision to close Sandy Boulevard will result in the taking of the value of both my property and my business. As both the business and property owner, I can't believe this is either wise or fair. I would encourage you to reconsider this project.

Leonard: Thank you, Mr. Potts. [applause]

*****: Thank you.

Leonard: Karla, please read item 396 and so the audience knows we don't allow audible demonstrations, so if you wave your hand it's you support what somebody is saying, that would be appropriate.

Item 396.

Leonard: Mr. Cervantes. Currently not here today. Item 397, Karla.

Item 397.

Leonard: It's always a pleasure to have you with us. Welcome and you know the rules, but for the record, please just give your name and you have three minutes.

Pete Colt: Thank you. My name is Pete Colt. And I've been to the Czech Republic. A wonderful country. Been to Germany, you guys are great. Hi, you guys. I'm happy to see you up there, Commissioner Fritz. And Commissioner Saltzman, I wanted to start with an apology to you. I lost

April 15, 2009

faith in you concerning your interest in children and how you were running the parks department because of the dogs that keep infesting couch park, the feces, you struck a cord with -- feces. I owe this man an apology and i'm going to talk to all of the people I talked to you about you and say I was wrong. Commissioner Saltzman does care about children. Because you're right, we care more about ponies and puppies than our kids, so thank you, and i'm sorry. So here I am because I live in the kid zone. Ok? And I want to invite merritt paulson to come and live in the kid zone because we include p.g.e. Park and sylvia was sitting there and her husband and their child, are selling their home between 18th and couch. Mr. Paulson could be there and be at p.g.e. But the kid zone is in the alphabet district. The kid zone is a sanctuary where infants and toddlers and small kids and teens from everywhere come to learn the performing arts, entertain and entertain, they play sports and live. Only the Oregon zoo, omsi, the rose garden have as many people congregate. We already talked about sylvia's house. Inviting mr. Paulson to move in. He'd have neighbors, we have all of these wonderful families moving into the neighborhood. It's a huge historic home in one of the west coast's historic neighborhoods. Here's what you can do. St. Mary's catholic cathedral. Couch park with a new early childhood development program, kindercare and held in such high esteem that doctors from legacy good samaritan entrust their children to be -- one junior high school, one high school, lincoln is close by, northwest children's theater school, fred meyers, mcmenamens. The reason he wouldn't want to live in our neighborhood is this. And i'm sorry to say [inaudible] these are from last week. The mcdonald's on burnside at 19th and 18th. The catholic schools, cathedral school, trinity episcopal school, and the northwest children's theater and school. Those who know me in the neighborhood know every day I go out and pick up all of these things every day before the kids come to school. I pick up the cigarette butts and the beer cans and bottles and I do not do vomit from thirsty thursdays. I draw the line at bodily fluids.

Leonard: You're [inaudible].

Colt: I agree she's tired of picking up used condoms on the steps of the cathedral.

Fish: I have a fundamental concern. What you've put on that table is actually considered hazardous material and this is an event and I don't know where you found those things. What drugs or items are involved, but we now have a public health issue.

Colt: Thank you for agreeing with me.

Fish: I want to deal with another issue. We have to remove this and do something to this table.

Colt: I'll remove this and clean the table because I do this every day for the children. And thank you for saying exactly what it is. The question is, how are we going to help these kids?

Leonard: Thank you.

Colt: Thank you. [applause]

Leonard: I guess it's april 15th, so civil disobedience is ok.

*****: And I love you [inaudible]

Leonard: I have --

Fritz: You need a rigid container for that stuff.

*****: [inaudible] I do get this right out of the neighborhood.

Leonard: But the next time, you bring them in a see-through baggie --

Colt: I put them in the original container but this one actually had [inaudible]. The children skipping and playing every day while it's going on --

Leonard: That would be great. Thank you. We'll just make nobody sits right there. But actually, maybe -- you know, pete, the security here just reminded me that we have other people come up to testify, so I think we're going to take a recess for a few minutes until we have somebody come in with some alcohol and clorox to -- I think it would be unfair. We have another public --

*****: You're absolutely right. Please --

Leonard: We're going to take a recess --

Fish: We appreciate your passion, but this was not well thought out.

April 15, 2009

*****: Thank you, sir. [recess]

At 9:48 a.m., Council recessed.

At 10:00 a.m., Council reconvened.

Adams: Good morning. City council at its wednesday, march 15th meeting is reconvening after a recess. Karla, please call the roll.

[roll call]

Adams: My understanding is we're on the fifth communications item. Karla, can you please read the title for council calendar item 398.

Item 398.

Adams: Good morning, welcome to city council. Glad you're here.

Rene John Garcia: I'm new to this, I don't know what i'm doing.

Adams: It's simple. Give us your first and last name and you have three minutes and that count-down clock helps you keep time.

Garcia: Thank you. I'm rene garcia --

Adams: Move closer to the mic.

Garcia: I lived in Portland for 27 years and seen this community change dramatically through the years. About myself. I'm from havana, cuba and came to this country to escape communism and i've seen through the different spectrums of society and I believe that we have potential to solve so many problems in so many different ways that abuse of power to get things done is inappropriate. We just trying to get out of iraq because we had the finger on the trigger and because we could, we pulled it. I'm against terrorism. I'm against abuse to children and people and that includes when it comes from the government itself. So, therefore, I just want to say briefly, I see great potential of solving problems in this country, and being an automation specialist I can tell you that the source of powers are incalculable. People know who thomas edison is but nobody knows who nicholas tesla is. And he was working on a project where electricity could be achieved through ground. Its own contained battery. His plans and projects were stashed away. I'm surprised that this stage of the game with technology, that we don't try to uncover what he was trying to provide us with. He invented the induction motor. Created inventions that are phenomenal. I would ask all government strategists to look at the brilliant minds we have that are graduating from colleges and universities and that we establish an entity that unites these minds to brainstorm ideas to solve the problems in our society economically, technically, ecologically, there's so many options. I didn't come here to condemn people. I just came here to please ask you to consider the potential of our minds. What this man did today was a small inkling of what could happen in a revolution situation where people cannot stand it anymore. He demonstrated his frustration and I can understand where he came from. Again, I think that randy Leonard's idea of bringing it in a plastic bag would have been appropriate but his exhibit of frustration is warranted. Thank you very much.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony. Appreciate it. That leads us to the time certain at 9:30, which is council calendar item 399.

Moore-Love: Do you want to do the consent agenda first?

Adams: Yes, I do. Thank you. Are there any items that anyone would like to pull from the consent agenda? Hearing none, Karla, please call the roll on the consent agenda.

Fish: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Adams:** Aye. [gavel pounded] consent agenda's approved. Now would you please read the title for council calendar 399.

Item 399.

Adams: Do we have either kira or jesse here? We do. Great. And eloise damrosch. It's with pleasure that I introduce the appointments of kira higgs and jesse beason as board members for the regional arts & culture council, known as racc. And I thank eloise damrosch, the executive director

April 15, 2009

for being here as well. I'm impressed with kira's work with the metlife procurement forum and participation as a member of the work for art and as a board member of the northwest business and cultural for the arts organization. One of kira's talents, I understand, is her expertise in communications that she does with great innovation and creativity and will be a great access to the race board. Some of you might be familiar with jesse beason, as a member of the commissioner's staff, he was my arts and culture director when I served as city commissioner. He also was the key person on my staff that helped bring back from the brink and now revitalized ifcc. He's an outstanding fellow, I can tell you and is a great addition to the race board as well. I'm pleased to offer to the city council these two appointments and give you just a few minutes each to maybe tell us why you're passionate about this.

Jesse Beason: Well, I now work for an organization that helps low and moderate income folks own their first home in Portland and as we've seen over the past 10 years, the availability of folks like that to actually purchase their home has gotten more scarce and we've relegated folks to certain neighborhoods, where they used to rent and their families grew up in and now they're forced to move elsewhere and yesterday, I met with a playwright who has a production that tackles these issues in people's homes. It's a traveling production where folks are invited into people's homes to be able to share their stories at the same time engaging in a play. And that to me is really why I care passionately about the arts because I think the arts can bring voice to people who don't currently have one and i'm very excited to bring that perspective and as well as my experience in mayor Adams' office to the regional arts & culture council.

Kira Higgs: Instead of singing a song, I think i'll share my perspective on the value of the arts and one way to think about it is when the economy is doing really well, arts continue to thrive, they create jobs. They create a transfer of wealth between artists and patrons and when the economy is struggling, the arts is a big part of what brings us together and supports us. When I think about what happened after 9/11, it was in many ways music that brought our hearts and minds back to a grounded place. So i've enjoyed working with race for the past several years, to work for the arts campaign has been a huge success. Thank you, mayor Adams, for your support with that and northwest for business in the arts. The business community has been very supportive for arts in the area and will continue to be and thank you for the appointment.

Adams: Thank you for standing for consideration for the appointment. We appreciate it. Any questions from council? Anyone wish to testify on this matter? If not, Karla, call the roll.

Fish: I want to thank you for agreeing to serve. Set the standard in terms of corporate involvement and volunteer service. I appreciate that jesse, you know, we lost you here in city hall but I gained you on the housing agenda which i'm delighted and there's no one more passionate about interstate - - we're working on a plan to provide relief. Thank you for your willingness to serve. I need to enlist you on another project, which is i'm experiencing challenges getting great northwest art to my office and I may call on you to intervene with chair wheeler. But again, this is an important --

Adams: [inaudible]

Fish: We thank you for agreeing to take the time to do this important work. We need champions for the arts more than ever and i'm pleased to support your appointment. Aye.

Saltzman: Thank you for your willingness to serve and sounds like you have exceptional backgrounds. Pleased to support you. Aye.

Leonard: I agree. Aye.

Fritz: This is a significant commitment of time and I appreciate your willingness to volunteer and thank you. If anyone is watching at home, i'm wondering if you would like to volunteer, you can go to the neighborhood involvement website and we're happy to accept all applications. Whatever citizens are interested in. Portland is blessed. That makes us a better city and a better place to live. A better community. Aye.

April 15, 2009

Adams: Aye. Congratulations. As of -- [gavel pounded] -- now you're appointed. Karla, please read the title for council calendar item 400.

Item 400.

Adams: Staff, would please come forward. The enterprise zone is one of the important tools we have to create local investment and provide job opportunities in Portland. Today, we're going to hear about over 50 companies have participated in the Portland enterprise zone program resulting in nearly a billion dollars and creating 5,000 jobs. As a requirement, the community has received over \$5 million in investment in workforce training for the residents of north and northeast Portland. With unemployment at almost 12%, in the state, and 9.6% in our region, we need to employ every tool available to us to try and encourage investment and to save and help grow jobs. The e-commerce designation is consistent with the goals of emerging economic development strategy which cites software and digital media as key industries in order to create economic growth and job prosperity for all citizens over the next five years. That's why I believe it's important to bring this item forward and bring the e-commerce designation to our enterprise zone. We're going to hear from p.d.c. And others who manage and take -- make use of the program, or hope to make use of the additional e-commerce destination. Keith, do you want to start?

Keith Witcosky, Portland Development Commission: Keith, government relations, Portland development commission. I'm going to give you a quick overview of the item, a little bit about the enterprise zone and then sierra gardener will take it from there. The mayor said, the purpose of today's action is to authorize p.d.c. To apply to use the state's program and it works in close conjunction with the existing enterprise program and for some who haven't been around for a decade, the enterprise zone in the past has been controversial. Questions come up about our companies. Would they have made the investment anyway? And I think today, people can look at it and know that if we need this tool, we need to enhance this program. We have a current enterprise zone. What this does, the action today allows us to put an overlay for electronic commerce so that companies that do electronic commerce become eligible for the enterprise zone tax abatements. We're going to focus on the benefits and financials and want to mirror the good work done by commissioner Fish in terms of identifying the amount and talk about compliance monitors and speak to the electronic commerce program and there's actually Portland vital signs is here to testify about how they would very likely use this program should it be approved.

Fish: Would you put in plain english what electronic commerce refers to? Can you do that?

Sierra Gardiner, Portland Development Commission: Yeah, i'd be happy to. An investment in electronic commerce would include facilities related to the business-to-business transaction of electronic commerce. That's using the internet to make transactions. So that would include -- the types of qualified investments would include computer equipment, network, servers or software.

Witcosky: And it's understanding it's tied to people that do over 50% of their business through electronic commerce. What today's tool that will help those kinds of companies. So ok, a quick overview of the enterprise zone. How it works is if you have a company, let's say, there's a million dollar facility you've got within this designated area, north and northeast Portland, if you want to put another million into it, you're eligible for a five-year property tax abatement on the value of the second million. And it starts from the point you make the investment and it's good for five years and in exchange for -- and that's significant benefit, you've got to agree to requirements about increasing employment by 10%, retaining employees. There's other requirements related to wage levels, local procurement. And then larger investments require things associated with transit passes.

A company that wants to come here or a company that's here and we want to keep them here, have them make the investment in exchange provides local job opportunities and career paths and workforce training. I think one of the most interesting examples is if you look at chris king, that's something they do high-end bicycle components and if you go to any bike store, you look in the glass case and see these really expensive fittings for bicycles, they came from california and moved

April 15, 2009

to Portland for a couple of reasons. One, the enterprise zone was great but ties back to what the mayor talked about, our economic strategy and the work we've done if active ware and the biking industry creates eagerness for Chris King to move here and do his work in town. I'm going to hand it over to Sierra.

Gardiner: Thanks, Keith. I'm Sierra Gardener, the coordinator for the Portland development commission. I'm going to talk about the value of the e-zone compliance monitoring and the benefits of the enhancement. Since 1996 as mentioned before, there's been two enterprise zone programs, one is the north-northeast and today we have the Portland enterprise zone adopted by city council last year. Both of these programs have enrolled over 50 companies, we've seen an investment of over -- nearly a billion dollars in private investment in the north-northeast community and generated over \$5 million in community contributions, creating and retaining over 5,000 full-time quality jobs. So p.d.c. Verifies compliance. On an annual basis if compliance is not met by August 30th, a company will be considered in non-compliance. Some of variations of types of non-compliance that can include like not meeting -- as Keith mentioned, not meeting the 10% hiring increase and retaining over 50% of the full-time staff for nearly two years or failing to meet job quality requirements. That includes 150% of the minimum wage and benefits that meet the Bureau of Labor and Industries benefits standards. Next slide. So I'll explain how the e-commerce zone works. Like e-zone, it's an instrument for job creation and investment but whereas the e-zone provides the property tax exemption, the enhancement provides a corporate income tax credit. So it's for qualified e-commerce related investments only, a company must be entered into the enterprise zone in order to qualify for e-commerce enhancement. Can receive both the abatement and the e-commerce tax credit simultaneously. The tax credit would be for 25% of their qualified investment up to \$2 million per year and that can roll over for the full five years. With council's improvement, the p.d.c. Has carried this designation in the past. As mentioned before, the north-northeast enterprise zone was approved in 2002 and ran until 2007 and the new e-commerce designation would last the duration of the new Portland enterprise zone until 2018 and there's 10 designations of which nine are currently filled. Applications are accepted by the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department. We would be applying for the last, tenth, designation available. Must have a perspective company. That company, is Portland Vital Signs, a local retail graphic manufacturer. Nick, co-founder, is here today to speak on behalf of our application to the state.

Witcosky: Just one other thing. Unlike the residential tax abatements when we're authorized to use that program, applications come back to the city to approve on a case-by-case basis. On this -- we apply to the state to use it. We don't come back to the council -- I wanted to make you aware of that.

Fish: Let me be clear on that. It becomes in effect an entitlement for companies that qualify for the benefit, but you've got a verification system and an annual system to monitor compliance and if people are not delivering what they're required, you can not only cut them off, but recapture the benefit that they've already received.

Gardiner: Exactly.

*******:** Includes penalties as well. Yeah.

Adams: Additional council discussion?

Fish: The one question that often comes up -- it's gotten awful dark here, Karla. There's a haze over the front of the --

Leonard: I think that's a personal issue.

Fish: Well, I'll come back to you later, Commissioner Leonard. The question we often get asked is with any program that creates an incentive where we trade a property tax break, an income tax break, a corporate tax break, the question comes up, how do we know but for this incentive the investment wouldn't be made? We don't want to be in the business of creating incentives for

April 15, 2009

conduct that would otherwise -- that the market would already respond to. What do we say to people in this instance, to address any concern they may have about creating an incentive program for actions that otherwise might already been undertaken.

Witcosky: Sierra will respond.

Gardiner: The Oregon economic and community development department is commissioning a study to have better data on that. We know -- we require that 150% of employment and etc. So when a company -- even if a company says that they would have moved but for this program, we know that what they're meeting for us in exchange is a great benefit to the community.

Fish: The shorthand on that is that we look -- very closely at the companies that make these applications and monitor it closely to make sure we get the benefit which is above and beyond what they otherwise have to provide to the community, which is clearly identified and on an annual basis, if we determine we're not getting the public benefit, we can terminate this particular benefit, so there's an upside but also a way for us to police it to make sure no one takes advantage of this program.

Gardiner: Yes, this program is intended to work as a catalyst for investment and job creation.

Fish: Thank you.

Adams: Any other discussion from council? Did anyone sign up to testify?

Moore-Love: Yes, we have one person signed up. Nick oleson.

Adams: Anyone else beside --

Leonard: Is that someone from the company?

Nick Olson: Yes, vital signs.

Adams: Good morning, mr. Oleson.

Olson: Good morning.

Adams: Welcome to city council. We're glad you're here. You need to give us your name and you have three minutes.

Olson: My name is nick oleson. Portland vital signs.

Adams: Can you move closer to the mic?

Olson: How's that? This program is definitely something that helps us out in these hard economic times. Without this program, I don't know if we would have actually considered doing what we're doing. It's going to leapfrog us into allowing us to buy new equipment. We just launched a new website, which is going to allow us to increase our online sales and it's -- this is really going to help us as a company.

Adams: Thank you very much for testifying. We really appreciate it.

Olson: That was quick and easy.

Adams: Well, it was very effective. To the point and effective. [laughter]

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

Adams: All right. Anyone else wishes to testify? If not, this is a resolution. Karla, would you -- keith?

*******:** Yes?

Adams: An encore?

Colt: I left my bag.

Adams: We're going to have you searched.

Colt: I have a question. If they hired 100 employees at the start, I was wondering if it's a typo, they need to maintain 15% in the slide that said overview.

Adams: Give us your name for the record.

Colt: Oh, pete colt. Thanks. If a company has laid off that many people and down from 100 to 15 people, they're in dire financial straits and I don't think the city would get much money back from them. I'd like to know if that's a typo.

Adams: Keith. Somebody. Sierra.

April 15, 2009

Gardiner: According to statute, it's 50%. They must retain 50% of the peak employment. That's in addition to the retained baseline.

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

Fish: I want to thank the mayor for his leadership on this issue. P.d.c. for the briefing that I received on it. And as i've reflected on this, I think if this were a period of good economic times, I would be inclined to support it. But in a time of economic calamity, I think it's essential. There's a high degree of skepticism in the public that provides tax breaks and that's why we need to be rigorous in monitoring to make sure they're meeting the stated objectives. \Anyone reading the paper, will have noted we're third in the nation in hunger, third in the nation in unemployment. We know that the city license fee revenue has fallen off the cliff. Every day, it seems a business that's been a household name is closing. We're going through the worst economic times in my lifetime and it's incumbent. It's encourages the businesses we want to recruit and claim long term in Portland. The clean energy businesses, high tech. It creates an immediate sort of primer of the pump to get people to make investments, which lead to expansion of job creation. And it's a state program which we're linking up with which has, in my view, enough bells and whistles built in that we can be certain that we're getting the bang for the buck in terms of investment. I want to compliment the Portland development commission for ramping up. There's a good strong argument to do this but in the economy we have today, I think it's essential that we explore local tools like this to jump start our economy I vote aye.

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

Fritz: Put together a study and found that they're extremely effective and there's so many checks and balances that this is a program that citizens can be assured that the money invested is going to promote really good jobs, not just any old jobs so i'm glad to see the expansion. Aye.

Adams: Thanks, team, for your excellent good work. I vote aye. [gavel pounded] item no. 400 is approved. Could you, Karla, please read the title for council calendar item 424.

Item 424.

Adams: Commissioner Leonard.

Leonard: Thank you, mayor Adams. We have jeff curtis from the rose festival foundation already up here. If I can ask sterling bennett to come forward -- this ordinance waives portions of title 33 to allow the rose festival foundation to authorize the yeon building, otherwise known as mccalls on the waterfront. Since it's been vacant, it's lost all of its nonconforming use rights and must, therefore, revert to uses consistent with open space which does not allow office space. And to allow albertina kerr centers to operate a -- it's because the building has been vacant since 2005 and lost its nonconforming use rights and number three, the wavers portions of title the 33 and 32 to allow a rose sign to be affixed to the top of the outbuilding and I want to before I get into a broader explanation of the ordinance, give the council just a few examples of where we've waived title 33 in the past. I have a more exhaustive list that each of you can have upon request, but in 1999, we waived portions of title 33 to allow for the expansion of the powell valley operations center and 2001, we waived portions of title 33 to allow the temporary location of the sheriff's booking facility. In 2000, 2002, and 2003 and 2006, waived portions of title 33 for the circus --

*****: Circus soleil.

Leonard: And we waived portions of title 33 so that the day labor center on martin luther king boulevard could be located there. The building was designed by Portland designer john yeon and in its time, it was considered a cutting edge -- and considered one of the -- and suffered through a number of tenants and non-historic additions that have left the current building a shadow of its current self. The rose festival is one of the Portland's traditions and occurs each year in Portland. The rose festival foundation who puts on the 100-plus year old event is suffering financial hardship that jeopardizes the long term viability of the rose festival. Allowing them the opportunity to

April 15, 2009

occupy for a nominal lease cost is an opportunity for them to improve their financial condition and enhance their visibility in the most fitting location. Tom mccall waterfront park. Where many rose festival events are staged. And it will help stabilize and perpetuate a proud Portland tradition that generates millions of economic activity in Portland each year. The addition of bicycle rental facility will enhance of enjoyment of the park by many visitors and valuable revenues that can be invested in Portland's world class parks system. Further, the building has always had an use that was unique. And the sooner the city can get long-term tenants who will be good stewards of the park and these excellent historic buildings, the better. The first phase is currently under way and will include the renovation of the reflecting pond. New landscaping and the awning and the hvac on the roof. the security fencing will be removed and the building welcome painted its historic color, which thankfully is not the color on it today. The work will be completed by the may 22nd kickoff of the 2009 rose festival. The city is working and will be renovated by a local design expert, peter miser, at the end of the renovation, I will request that the building be placed on the list of the historic places. Ramsay signs is donating the sign and installation of the sign that will be on top of the building, of a rose, and the rose festival foundation has offered to maintain the sign after it's constructed. The rose is an emblem associated with the city of Portland, which is commonly referred to as the city of Portland. It's an opportunity to affix a civic icon that Portlanders can identify with for now and hopefully forever. We have two members of the development services who are here to answer questions. We have jeff curtis, who is president of the rose festival foundation and ty kovak who is going to operate the computer.

Fish: We have a former governor who has joined us today and if we acknowledge that governor vic atiyeh is in the audience. [applause]

Leonard: Nice to have him here.

Adams: Welcome, governor. Go ahead. Who is speaking?

Leonard: Ty, why don't you put up -- you have slides.

Ty Kovatch, Commissioner Leonard's Office: Quickly run through the -- these are the images of the proposed rose sign that will be affixed to the outbuilding. The john yeon building. This is an artistic rendering of where the neon will be affixed. Here's a lighted version that shows what it looks like at twilight. This rendering does a good job of showing the color scheme of the neon and the third one shows it better in its context. That's all I have for the visual.

Leonard: Thank you. Jeff.

Jeff Curtis: Council, thank you for your support for the rose festival. I just wanted to provide context to the project. Some of the commitments that we're making and provide additional historic perspective about the rose festival related to partnership with the city. And that's where my comments will relate to. I've been in front of you before and mentioned some of these. I think it's appropriate in the setting as we get closer to kick off the festival, as well as it project moves further along to provide greater context. The festival design defines -- at that time, the mayor called for colleagues to commit the resources, the great lewis & clark bicentennial celebration and as well as additional fund-raising within our community that would sustain a festival and obviously that has carried through for 102 years. I also wanted to offer the credit of prior councils as well as prior leaders of my organization in perpetuating the festival in the city as well as this goes well beyond me and the council, for decades. And relates to this particular project is notable. Every year, when an ordinance comes to fruition. This council and prior councils adopted an ordinance to allow the rose festival to happen. That's an incredible commitment by the city and we appreciate it. City infrastructure and partnerships that go beyond that, and i'll share examples. In the early 1980s, the Portland rose festival wanted to bring major car racing to Portland. Portland did not have the infrastructure to make that happen. Through a partnership with the city, the city loan -- the city loaned the rose festival money to build resources out at Portland roadway, and after that initial investment was paid off, the rose festival made an additional \$2 million in asset improvements to

April 15, 2009

that track. Bleachers and amenities and infrastructure that allowed that -- and actually, those facilities are still used and most recently this council approved a final gift that ultimately [inaudible] those asset. That's one example. There's smaller examples, recent examples related to a store up at Washington park. A 600 square foot store up there and on a contract with my organization that manage that store. That store has produced over \$400,000 in revenue to the general fund for the city of Portland. And we operate and manage that store. It's a prime example of the partnership that exists beyond just producing a rose festival. Smaller but very notable is the parade cleanup program. This costs a lot of money 15 years ago. We worked with the city and the maintenance bureau to create a cleanup program using the private sector as well. To have a program that's innovative and it's the cleanest parade in the country due to the citizens of Portland cleaning up after themselves on the parade route. And last, our centennial year in 2007. The council was -- increased our efforts that won us the best festival in the world and we're seeing the benefit of that internationally and people make commitments to come to the rose festival in June to see that happen. That brings us to the context what does that have to do with this building? It's exactly the same type of partnership. This is an ongoing effort, we're going to be good stewards to the city and the community and this building is going to show that in what it looks like and how we operate it. And I want to provide some examples of what we're going to do as an organization. We're working on a lease right now, but the rose festival is going to make major capital improvements to the building. It's not a functional office right now. It needs work, some care. And upon signing, upon selling our current property on lands landing, we're going to -- John's landing, we're going to get that to be something we're proud of. Randy mentioned maintaining the sign. That's another piece and there's people around the rose festival that are part of this. The Portland rose society. The oldest rose society in the United States is going to be stewards of the roses that are going to be planted around this -- around the building. And just more recently, 239 roses have been donated by week's roses that are going to be planted. Donated free to the cause of this project. I think that shows the example of the stewardship of the rose festival and the city that this is working to the taxpayers' benefit. And I want to mention our friends of John Yeon, Randy Greg and his team that have provided a commitment to pay for some of the historical preservation efforts that we get this right. There's a lot of good work being done and my organization is proud of that and I'll close my comments with the obvious -- the technical side of the rose. That's an important piece. It ties it all together. The sign itself is a common denominator on this entire project. The intent is to spread a common symbol that unites all of us and reinvigorate a brand -- the city of roses. Our presence in the park will help brand Portland even more, but this sign and the image that translates the message and the rose garden around the building will only reinforce this rose capital aspect of Portland. We have a -- roses all over the city and we have our rose festival and our rose garden and our rose quarter and, of course, we are the city of roses but this city will put it all together in a visible way. And I think it's impactful and future generations are going to appreciate your actions. Thank you.

Leonard: Thank you, very much, Jeff.

Adams: Questions -- do we have other people speaking?

Leonard: No, they're here to answer questions.

Adams: Discussion from the council? Commissioner Fritz?

Fritz: Are there going to be any public uses of the office space?

Curtis: Short term, no. Right now the immediate impact is just to get to provide office amenities for the rose festival foundation. Long-term uses have not been established. When I say long-term, more than three to five years out. The public side -- I can't speak for Albertina Kerr, but that outbuilding is going to be used to rent bicycles.

Fritz: But will the public be coming into your offices to do stuff?

Curtis: Volunteers on a normal basis, we have volunteers that come into our office to provide project work and things of that nature. That would continue in this building. In terms of -- if you're

April 15, 2009

thinking from a perspective of showcasing our historical pictures and things, it wouldn't provide that at this point in the project.

Fritz: Could it?

Curtis: It depends on space. One important point. We're downgrading our space. This is a significantly smaller space.

Fritz: You won't be doing publicity and have people come and pick up brochures and get things and stuff?

Curtis: It will have that aspect. I'm answering the question more in terms of being able to wander around the building. The public has access. We have small kiosks, that wrote happen in this building as well. They can pick up brochures and that's an option and this has greater access for people to get rose festival information because our doors will be open from 8:00 to 5:00. So that piece of it will be accessible.

Fritz: Good --

Leonard: I think jeff has focused on the interior of the building and there's a courtyard and the original design had a reflecting pool in it. That's all being restored as part of this for use by the public. So it will be restored in addition to having roses planted around the outside.

Fritz: And my second question, why is it important to have the sign this year rather than next year?

Curtis: Great question. The sign, again, really exemplifies the rose festival and in economic times, when we're looking to spearhead and kick off a vibrant festival, it's a great beginning of 102nd rose festival. From a planning perspective as we plan to kick off this year, especially in light of the discussions about this building, this is the year to do it. From a planning perspective as well as from the -- all the excitement that's building around and in the media, of course, about this. The exciting addition to the rose festival. It puts a final component in the sense of immediacy, now, versus 13 months from now.

Fritz: Were there any considerations doing anything else that could be done without a code waiver?

Curtis: I can't answer that. None from the rose festival perspective. Can't answer that on behalf of the city staff and others. None from the rose festival.

Adams: Other discussion?

Saltzman: Jeff, you said the rose festival is committed to tenant improvements subject to the sale of your existing building. So absent that, there's no tenant improvements to be made until the sale? And then I guess where is the lease? I can ask that of both parties, I guess.

Curtis: Yeah, we have not -- [inaudible] We're not moving in yet.

Saltzman: You have to do tenant improvements?

Curtis: We're working on the lease discussion about what those look like and what the upfront costs would be and they're still being discussed but we have committed that we would make tenant improvements and planning on using the resources from the sale of our building to ultimately fund that, but again, the final piece is part of a lease that doesn't exist yet and we're discussing that with the commissioner's office right now.

Saltzman: And I guess that does lead to other questions I have about -- I think this is a great -- in concept, I support this, but as i've expressed before, i'm concerned about no lease. I'm concerned about the exposure of water ratepayers to the expenses associated with this. And there's no numbers. About what is the extent of repair dollars going to this. What is the lease going to look like in terms of respect to responsibilities.

Leonard: If you're done, i'll respond.

Adams: Commissioner Leonard.

April 15, 2009

Leonard: You've asked these questions before and i've answered them and i'm happy to tell you again. You asked if you could look at the lease when it was completed and i've said yes and the reason you haven't seen it is because we haven't completed the lease.

Saltzman: I wanted to see it before it was completed and --

Leonard: That's fine as well. There's nothing anyone wants to hide from you, commissioner Saltzman. You raised a concern about ratepayer dollars being used and i've committed to you to raise the dollars separately in prior council meetings. We've got ramsay signs to donate the construction of the sign and randy greg leading the effort to come up with the design review and i've discussed with jeff, to the extent we have any out of pocket expenses he can't cover, we'll recover those in the rose festival association. We've heard what you've said and intend to do just what we've promised we'd do, you're saying that --

Saltzman: This is new to me. You're going to seek private fund-raising to do the capital improvements.

Leonard: That's not what I said.

Saltzman: What did you say?

Leonard: I said in prior council meetings when you raised the issue of spending money on the building that we've gotten capital projects paid for by outside organizations, including ramsay signs and the historic community and to the extent we have to spend money, we have discussed with jeff that they'll reimburse us one way or the other for the cost of actual out of cost expenses.

Adams: Is that for tenant improvements or any improvements to the building?

Leonard: Any capital expense where money has to be spent to approve the build can, we've talked to jeff and he's agreed they will reimburse us.

Adams: Using the proceeds --

Leonard: It could be any one of a number of means.

Saltzman: And then what is the total water bureau budget for this project?

Leonard: We don't have a budget. As i've said, we've been looking to others to help with the renovation and as jeff said, we've got the roses donated and the amount we're hoping to spend, whatever that is, on the restoration on the building will be reimbursed to us by the rose festival foundation, or other private fund raising.

Saltzman: We're looking at major rate increases for water and sewer this year.

Leonard: This is not going to impact rate increases.

Saltzman: You're telling me that but --

Leonard: I don't know how many times i've had to say that. If you don't believe that, I guess I can't address that.

Saltzman: It sounds like you've got the terms of a lease -- everything you're telling us should be terms of a lease. I'm not sure why we haven't seen --

Leonard: They haven't sold their building and not prepared to move in. Don't know the total out of pocket expenses. We talked about all the expenses have to be recovered one way or the other. That's part the negotiation.

Curtis: The building is not -- we can't even have -- I don't know if you've been in recently, but it's absolutely --

Saltzman: [inaudible]

Curtis: Not appropriate for an office. We can't physically move in right now.

Fritz: [inaudible] by may 22nd?

Curtis: We're talking late fall. The time keeps moving backwards.

Saltzman: I didn't understand that.

Leonard: We're doing the exterior of the building. The interior of the building will have boards so that people can see the future interior of the building.

Adams: But so we have on the record the legislative intent --

April 15, 2009

Leonard: And they're not moving in until we have a lease.

Saltzman: I didn't understand that.

Adams: Would be reimbursed by the rose festival or donated or fund raised some other way and as I understand the reason why you can't do it tentative -- you can't do a lease right now is it's some ways off before you move in and you're in the process of analyzing what interior work needs to be done.

Curtis: That's correct.

Adams: And before that comes a lease before you can take occupancy.

Saltzman: None of this expense will be in the water ratepayers?

Leonard: No.

Adams: And none paid for by water rates. Any other questions from council?

Saltzman: I have questions for development services. The waiver of the sign code includes waiving the changing image sign requirements or permitting it -- I guess I don't understand what the changing image.

Leonard: I can speak to that. The made in Oregon sign has a reindeer on it. Every christmas, a red light goes on the nose. Inspired by that, what the rose festival thought would be iconic, only during the rose festival period, there would be white l.e.d. Lights within the petals of the rose that would blink. So when you saw the rose, it would be clear that the rose festival is occurring. All other times of the year it would be a solid red.

Saltzman: And the rose is larger than our current restrictions on changing images --

Sterling Bennett, Bureau of Development Services: That's correct. Sterling bennett, p.d.c. Supervising planner. There are limits on size, changing image signs are not allowed in -- on sites that have non-conforming uses unless it's a sports field so, therefore, any changing image sign regardless of size would be prohibited on this site.

Saltzman: And have other people sought us to change our sign code, to waive the sign code for store top or rooftop signs?

Bennett: I did a quick research of our records and found no requests to provide approval to signs in the last 20 years. There were some to change existing signs?

Saltzman: We're not talking about a [inaudible] of any kind. Ok. Thank you.

Fritz: Following up on that question. Would it satisfy your need to have the white lights not flash? I was on the planning commission when we --

Leonard: A need to have --

Fritz: There was a lot of concern about the danger to motorists being distracted by changing signs -
-

Leonard: Of reader boards because people would read them.

Fritz: It was all -- it was contentious. And I was wondering if it would meet your need to have the white lights stay on during the rose festival and not flash.

Curtis: The whole intent was to have this illuminated differently. There's a special lighting every year. So years from now, the rose gets lit a different way.

Leonard: I don't mind doing that, but I would not like to do it on the fly here. I've seen a computer image of it. It is not what one might think of as typically would be on a reader board. It's very subtle and not bright. It's not a big deal.

Fish: For what it's worth, i've got -- hundreds of emails on another sign we had recently, you might remember, to how many people rudolph's nose was the most important.

Leonard: And that light blinks, it flashes.

Fish: My understanding is we're trying to create something iconic. And these have not been the best of times for your festival. It's been struggling like others in other cities are struggling. And we're talking about here is a new partnership where the city is saying your success is important to

April 15, 2009

us. This is not just a building, just a sign, this is actually a rebuilding and relaunch of something that we care about that we're at risk of losing if we don't support each other better. Thank you.

Douglas Hardy, Bureau of Development Services: And if I can add. Douglas Hardy with the bureau of development services. In the body of the ordinance, it does indicate that the -- that element of the sign will be limited to twinkling lights during the rose festival. And so that may help to some degree in terms a concern of it becoming, you were referring to a reader board.

Fritz: Wouldn't twinkling count as changing?

Hardy: By the code, yes.

Leonard: I personally wasn't sure it fell under that provision. Staff thought it did so we wanted to be cautious to make sure that anything we did met the standards of b.d.s.

Adams: Let's pause and contemplate on the concept of to twinkle or not to twinkle and take public testimony. How many people signed up?

Moore-Love: Two people.

Adams: Good morning, and welcome to Portland city council. Glad you're here. Just need to give us your first and last name and the clock in front of you will guide you through your three minutes.

Joseph Reedy: I'm Joseph Reedy, an architect and urban designer here in Portland and I don't speak before the council very often. But I would like to thank commissioner Leonard for making a great deal happen. I appreciate your dedication to this building. We all look forward to its restoration, but I'd like to urge the council to separate the sign from the restoration and not to approve the sign, the three waivers that the sign -- waivers are unnecessary. The sign severely diminishes the architectural integrity of the building and it's a mistake that we'll regret.

Richard Potestio: I'm an architect here in Portland and I concur with Joseph. In light of the architectural caliber and importance of the building and debates that have raged over signage in years past and recently, I think the proposal for this sign is unfortunate. I ask, is this sign going to be iconic or ironic and will Portlanders embrace it as they have the one down the river. Maybe they will. But I wish to commend commissioner Leonard for securing great tenants for the building and engaging in its restoration and it's important that this building be restored and I hope that our icon would be to respect it.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony.

Brian Libby: Hi, my name is Brian Libby, a journalist in Portland. And although I'm here later to speak about the rose quarter issue, I wanted to reiterate with what these gentlemen are saying in that it's commendable to the council and commissioner Leonard that there's a plan in place to save this building. It's designed by one of the two or three most important architects in the city of Portland. But again, with all due respect, when I heard there was going to be possibly a neon rose on this building, I absolutely cringed and I feel like, might as well put eat at Joe's on it, or something. Everybody is familiar with the rose festival and the rose festival foundation and they absolutely deserve our support and to be recognized. But I just would like to implore the commissioner to consider restoring the building that does not include a neon sign. It feels very much not of Portland and I believe that John Yeon, the original architect would be rolling in his grave if he knew a big neon sign was going to be placed on his building and I feel it's crass and against it for that reason, but I say that within the context of being supportive to commissioner Leonard and everyone involved in trying to restore this building. Thank them for that.

Adams: Thank you all very much for your testimony. Any one else wishes to testify on this issue? Pete? We're going to call you repeat Pete today.

Colt: Pete Colt, and I should clarify here that I'm not speaking here as a commissioner for elders in action or the chair for the public safety and livability NW district association. I want to thank you commissioner Leonard because 16 months after you did away with duct tape, as I walk through the city, of course you guys know my name, I saw the duct tape still on the ground. We all know that

April 15, 2009

what goes in the ground, goes in the river. Thank you for that and thank you for this effort too because this building is lovely. I agree with the architects. I live with an architect and all of my gay sensibilities are going off right now saying please do not put a sign on top of the building. It's like oh my god, how Estacada. It's like being in Alabama and taking a 6-year-old girl and dressing her up and putting her in a beauty pageant. We just don't do that here. Let's put the sign to the side of the building. Let's light it up for the rose festival, maybe take it down during the rest of the year. It's important for our city. It's iconic. Mayor Adams, a question for you, please, in terms of this vote. I went to a meeting with state senator Bonomichi and there was a man in a wheelchair who said, the reason I was -- I lost a knee is because I was hit on a sidewalk.

Adams: You have to stay on the agenda topic.

Colt: This is exactly that. Since there's going to be a bicycle rental facility in there, it's important that pedestrians, elders, and children are protected, and I would encourage you, please, to do something in this when you vote that says we need to follow Oregon state law, which is this: That when on a sidewalk or pedestrians in a shared road, bicyclists may go no more than the average rate of speed of a pedestrian, which is about two to three miles per hour. That would be very much appreciated for public safety in terms of this. Thank you all very much.

Adams: Thank you, Pete.

Fish: Mayor, I think it's important to clarify something if I could have a colloquy with commissioner Leonard. The main building. The kiosk will rent bicycles. The rose will not be put on the main building. It's an accessory building at the corner and surrounded by an area that is public. In fact public will have access to it. I want to be very clear about that.

Adams: Additional council decision the discussion on this matter?

Saltzman: I guess I would like to --

*******:** There is another lady who wants to testify.

Adams: First and last name, and you have three minutes.

Garcia: I'm basically questioning the sign. It's kind of after grab bag in people liking it, some people not liking it obviously. But the architectural integrity is going to be intact. Adding the rose would just give attention to the rose festival, part of the intention to do that. I don't see what the problem is there. That's all I want to say.

Adams: Ma'am?

Jane Garrett: I need to be clear that I am not here today representing the architecture foundation of Oregon of which I'm the executive director. I am here representing myself as a resident of southeast Portland and someone who loves my city and the rose festival. Commissioner Leonard, I also commend -- commend you for putting this deal together. This is a space we are glad to see saved and in this important part of our city in Tom McCall Waterfront Park. But I also concur that the sign is totally inappropriate. For one thing, personally I sort of feel like having that neon there in this park doesn't seem like the right thing. On the other side of the street in the commercial area perhaps. For another, it seems totally out of proportion -- proportion on the building itself. It's kind of overpowering to the building. We can all argue whether it's attractive or not. I personally don't think it is. Were John Yon here today, I think he'd probably be throwing rose petals on the table.

Sam Williamson: When Rick was talking about this, I sort of expected him to say this. The whole idea of modernism is to reduce ornament and to create a useful, clean, whole aesthetic to be simplicity. To add a decoration on top of it seems to contradict the whole movement. If the sign were placed on the ground elsewhere, I think it could do everything you want it to do and weren't with the architecture, too. I also disagree that the fact that this is an accessory building means it doesn't really matter, because the whole thing is of a piece. It's a composition. Just because of the arm of the statue is far away from the body does not mean it's not part of it.

Adams: Anyone else who wishes to testify? Come on up. This will be our last two testifiers.

April 15, 2009

Don Circle: I think this is a great idea, but I would disagree with the sign being on the building. However, it would seem that, if this is a branding situation and we're looking for something iconic, a suggestion might be that it would be placed somewhere across the river. So that would have a viewpoint from the entire waterfront park. You would be able to see this larger probably sign or rose. I know there's financial constraints that might be part of it. It would certainly give a greater viewpoint and become truly iconic of Portland when tens of thousands of people are gathered at the park at any given time for the festival.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony.

Samuel Lumsey: I am not in favor of the rose with the neon lights. I understand there's a need to promote what Portland has to offer, and I think that's very important to the city of Portland. I just feel that it doesn't look right. When you have something that's famous and you want to recognize it, you should do it in a way that really brings it to light and not in a neon light. Again, the city of roses is Portland, and it's pretty famous. Just like to Seattle Jimi Hendrix is popular, they dedicate a statue mounted on the ground. My proposal would be not a neon light but maybe a statue of a rose that -- a rose.

Adams: Council discussion?

Leonard: If I could just point out a couple things based on the testimony, I want to remind folks that the building, up until a week ago, had a neon sign on the side of it, the same size of this sign, that said "MCCALL'S." It was actually permanently affixed to the building. In addition to that, the building is painted only what I could characterize as neon turquoise currently as opposed to its original color, which is actually known as John Yon Blue. There currently is, getting to kind of the clean lines of the original design that people talked about -- there currently is an exhaust fan that sticks through the roof of the building that can be seen from literally miles away, including HVAC equipment. There's dry-rot throughout the building. We're going to correct all of those deficiencies. I appreciate the comments made here, but I do note that the design community doesn't like neon signs. In fact the owner of the current "Made in Oregon" sign, which is in the design community, said if he had his preference, he'd remove the "Made in Oregon" sign. I understand the resistance, but I think there's a broader community here that actually will appreciate. I don't think it was fair to refer to this as a Joe Hamburger sign or something that belongs in Estacada, not fair to the Estacada residents. I think people will feel as protective of this sign, once it's up, as they do about the "Made in Oregon" sign. I appreciate the Rose Festival and what they do, and I very much defend their vision for this building.

Adams: Additional consideration by the council?

Saltzman: I would like to propose an amendment that would be -- on the last page, it would be a subparagraph g that I believe reflects the discussion that happened today, and it would state no water ratepayer dollars shall be used in the design construction or operation of the office at 1020 Southwest Naito Parkway. If I can explain my intent, I mean, I think my intent is clear. I think if the Portland City Council wishes to assist the Rose Festival, it should do so, as it has done in the past, by appropriating money from its general fund. My concerns about the use of water ratepayer dollars is I don't think there's a nexus between the charter restriction that water ratepayer dollars shall be used only for investments that relate to development of clean water and delivery of clean, safe drinking water. So that would be my amendment. This is not a rule-out council support. It's simply to say that we don't use water repair dollars.

Fritz: I'll second that, because I'd like to hear what Commissioner Leonard has to say about it.

Leonard: As we've discussed in prior council sessions, Commissioner Saltzman, you brought this up. If you're approaching from a purist point of view, I'm a little struck, because I'm not sure then why you wouldn't argue the signs at Benson Bubblers, owned and operated by the Portland Water Bureau, aren't included in your motion. I'm wondering why you're not having the expression of same concern about the Portland Water Bureau maintaining all of the civic fountains in the city. I'm

April 15, 2009

wondering why you don't have that concern about dodge park, on the confluence of the bull run and clackamas or sandy river, a public park owned and operated by the Portland water bureau. I'm not going to agree to the kind of language you're suggestions because, in times where we're utilizing water bureau crews when they have down times, when they actually have to go out and find things to do, we take advantage of those down times and have them work on the building. We're signing work crews -- we're assigning work crews now to have them take care of these buildings. It would be our effort to have every rock not left unturned to find resources to restore the building. In the final analysis, we may have to spend money because the rose festival hasn't sold the building, and we may have to wait for them to reimburse us. Your ordinance would prohibit that. Your approach is basically unprecedented.

Saltzman: I guess I offered the amendment because I thought you said earlier there would be no water repair dollars invested in it.

Leonard: I said we would be reimbursed through either the lease or when they sell the building.

Saltzman: But, again, this council will never see the lease.

Leonard: I've repeatedly said to you I will show you the lease. Repeatedly. You're free to look at the lease.

Fish: If I could jump in, commissioner Saltzman, I have great respect for your focus on protecting rate payers, although the public utility review board has called out tens of thousands of dollars devoted to b.e.s. And water they have identified as relating to the core mission of the utility. This is a big discussion. Now, perhaps someone could explain to me how campaigns are directly related to the bureau of environmental sciences. Some don't think the department should fund youth employment programs. I think you've raised philosophically an important point. I think this is a mistake for us to do this on a case-by-case basis. I would recommend that, if this issue rises to the level of such significant, we talk about this as a policy matter. My concern, though, is doing one offs and putting the handcuffs on one bureau or another when frankly we are inconsistent about this. Respectfully, I would not support this but would support an effort to look more globally at this.

Adams: Commissioner Fritz and then I'd like to move to a vote on the amendment.

Fritz: I don't hear all that much disagreement, and I'm wondering, if we were to table the amendment right now and work on it between now and the second reading, that there might be a way to get an agreement on what I hear most people saying.

Leonard: But it needs to be a broader discussion, commissioner Fritzes. It's not fair to pick on the rose festival all of a sudden when there are many more, I think, unrelated activities that occur from b.e.s. And water.

Fritz: That's what I heard commissioner Fish say. I think what the intent is on this one is to make sure we know who's paying for what and when.

Leonard: But I'm just saying, if we're going to do that with these guys, then there needs to be broader discussion.

Adams: Your second has been that we table the amendment.

Saltzman: I want to respond to commissioner Fish and the exceptions specifically authorized by the city council in the past. This is not a specific -- I mean, we're sort of --

Adams: Do you want to table your amendment?

Saltzman: I would suggest tabling it and bringing in something on the second reading.

Leonard: It probably would be helpful to have a discussion about that. If you had raised this before today, I might have been able to figure out something to deal with your concerns.

Fish: The amendment has been tabled. I move the ordinance.

Fritz: I haven't had my time to talk about it.

Adams: She has an amendment as well.

Fish: We have a lot of people waiting to be heard on another matter. And I agree with you.

Adams: We're moving things along here, commissioner Fish. What do I do in this situation?

April 15, 2009

Linly Rees, Deputy City Attorney: If he's determined that he wants to table his motion, then it is tabled.

Adams: Automatically tabled and we don't need to take any action on it?

Rees: I don't think you do. He's basically taking back his amendment motion. If this is not an emergency ordinance, if any amendments are proposed at the second reading, they need a third reading.

Fritz: I would again in the next week request that we split the ordinance into the two pieces, one authorizing the office use of the space and the second on the waivers necessary for the sign. I in no way want --

Adams: Let's see if there's a second for that motion.

Saltzman: Seconded.

Adams: Go ahead and speak to it.

Fritz: We had a good discussion about the use of this building for office space for the rose festival when we agreed to the transfer, so that to me has been well flushed out and I'm ready to support that. The second issue on the sign is a more fundamental one for me in terms of having public input.

I think where he should have the historic landmark association address this, and we should respect our citizens who, like earlier today, volunteer their times on commissions to give us expert advice.

I'm not comfortable waiving several aspects for the sign without hearing from our citizens and having a board discussion on that. I'd like to separate the two pieces of the ordinance.

Adams: I think the underlying substance of this issue has been well discussed by council, so I'd like the council, with their permission, to move to vote on this amendment. Please call the roll on the proposed amendment.

Fish: I'm going to vote no. I'm also at a later date going to come back to my colleagues and propose a more rational way for substantive amendments to be circulated before council it's not a comment on commissioner Fritz, commissioner Saltzman or any of other colleagues, but I do think discussion on this would be enhanced if we have some prior notification of substantive amendments. I think there's a way we can make the council deliberations even more dynamic by doing so. I appreciate the concern she's raised, but I believe this is a well-founded package. I vote no.

Saltzman: Aye. **Leonard:** No.

Fritz: Mr. Fish, I was planning to vote no on the entire thing until we came to the hearing today and heard testimony from folks. I'm now comfortable in supporting office uses, and that was why I proposed my amendment and didn't bring it forward before. I vote aye on the amendment.

Adams: No. The amendment fails. Unless there's further discussion only the underlying ordinance, it moves to a second reading.

Fish: Mayor, just for the public, this will go to a second reading so it will be picked up next week. Just so people understand, there are some instances where we give our comments the week before. On this one, I think our senses we'll hold off to next week.

Adams: This comes to a second reading next week. Please read the title for item 425.

Item 425.

Adams: This is a second reading and vote only. Please call the roll.

Fish: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Adams:** Aye. Item 425 is approved. Please read the title for emergency ordinance council calendar item 426.

Item 426.

Adams: Through a competitive process, decision makers across the region divided up the federal stimulus money related to transportation coming our way. It comes with the expectations about turning dirt, giving the projects actually under construction very quickly, and so these are the projects that met the criteria as ready to go, and Greg's going to give us a little more detail on what's involved.

April 15, 2009

Greg Jones, Bureau of Transportation: This is a different process than we normally take with our agreements with odot on federally-funded projects. As the mayor has indicated, we have some very tight time lines to deliver these projects, so we are grouping all of these projects together and asking council to delegate the authority to the mayor, the auditor, and the office of the director to sign the agreements as they come in. We have not received most of these agreements yet from odot. As soon as they're in, we need to start work, so that is the purpose of grouping them together in this ordinance. The attachment describes the projects that we are working on. These are all core infrastructure projects for the city of Portland. They range from paving projects in southeast Portland. They are filling gaps on existing projects, whether or not iting projects, boulevard projects, repaving the springwater trail and transit improvements in the downtown area. There's a very substantial amount of work here, and we'll retain jobs as well in the construction industry.

Adams: Discussions from council or questions of greg jones? Anyone here wishes to testify on council calendar item 426?

Fish: Aye.

Saltzman: I want to say good work to the mayor and Portland bureau of transportation for getting these stimulus projects up and ready to go and getting the funding from the federal government to move on them. Aye.

Fritz: I agree with that. This is really great. It's over \$14 million of federal money with no city match required. For those who are in the business of construction and want to get in on the bidding, go to Portland online. On the very front page, mayor Adams made sure this is a direct link to show you how to do it. Aye.

Adams: Thank you, president obama. Aye. Could you please read the title for council calendar item 427?

Item 427.

Jeff Baer, Bureau of Purchases: Mayor, before we begin, I think there was a request to read that with item 431.

Adams: Makes sense. Can you please read the title for council calendar item 431? And would mr. Janik please come forward.

Item 431.

Adams: Good morning, mr. Baer.

Baer: Good morning, mayor Adams, city council. I'm jeff baer with the bureau of purposes. I'll keep my remarks brief because I understand there are a number of people signed up to testify. Item number 427 requests council's approval to execute a sole source agreement to execute a predevelopment agreement and an operational agreement for developing and operating major league soccer stadium and the a.a.a. baseball stadium. To meet our requirements to today's hearing, we did not receive any protests whatsoever. The award of the predevelopment agreement we believe should be exempted because peregrine is the only to hold what justifies the sole source procedure. The award of the operating agreement in addition to the predevelopment to peregrine also should be exempted, sole source basis on the same findings. While we understand there are potentially other companies that could operate both stadiums, there is no other entity that will operate and also make a contribution toward costs at both stadiums. Agenda item 431, the ordinance again, as you recall back on march 11th, council adopted and approved resolution number 36687 that declared the city's support for peregrine l.l.c. To bring a major league soccer team to the city. The request before you is seeking approval to adopt the findings and authorize an exemption from the bidding requirements. One action was to provide a major league soccer stadium and a a.a.a. Baseball stadium. One of the keynotes in the findings as we provided, they do meet the requirements as outlined in state law and city code. They are the basis for which supporting the exemption do produce several cost savings to the city. With that, i'll stop. I understand there might

April 15, 2009

be some questions procedures, and also we have jim van dyke from the district attorney's office as well.

Saltzman: Were there any protests received for 431?

Baer: There were none.

Adams: I also just want to underscore up front that, on page 4 of the development agreement, it says the definition of a a.a.a. Stadium site means the city-owned location of the a.a.a. Stadium, as determined by the city council, the site decisions will be made not today but next week on wednesday, april 22 11]nd10, at 10:00 a.m. Today we're here to receive testimony on the predevelopment and sole source agreements. Mr. Janik?

Steve Janik: Well, i'm here as the principal of --

Fish: Could you move closer to the mic.

Janik: I'm here as the city's outside council who negotiated the predevelopment agreement as long with the city attorney's office. I'm mainly here to point out this does not commit the city to any particular site for the proposed a.a.a. Baseball stadium. If you will note, this agreement authorizes either party to terminate it at anytime for any reason. So if the transaction is not working from either side's point of view, it can be terminated. The reason for the treatment is in order to make the april, 2011 opening date for the two stadiums, it's necessary to start architectural and engineering services at this time, and we would be prepared to see that work go forward upon the adoption of this agreement by the city council. If you have any other questions, i'd be happy to respond.

Fish: I have a couple questions.

Adams: Before we do that, there is an amendment that is going to be proposed by commissioner Saltzman. I just wanted to get that out on the table before we get to the general discussions.

Saltzman: As you may recall, when we last passed the resolution to work with peregrine, I authored an amendment that was unanimously adopted to remove the \$15 million associated with forming a new urban renewal area as a source of funding for the mls stadium renovation. And when I made that amendment, it was my intent -- it was not my intent that the city was obligated to come up with that \$15 million from some other way. I'm not ruling it out, but it was not my intent to say that remains a city obligation to find that \$15 million. My ladies and gentlemen -- language basically targets the wording that says peregrine will secure the \$15 million. I think that's consistent with the amendment I authored. That was certainly my intent, but it's been interpreted as the city needs to come up with that \$15 million. I'm not going to rule out the city, but i'm absolutely not putting us on the hook.

Adams: It's been moved and seconded to adopt this amendment, item number 427. The commissioner has made his point of view pretty clear. Is there discussion on council?

Leonard: I'd like to say something about that. As one that was involved in bringing that last agreement to council and as one who voted for the amendment that commissioner Saltzman alludes to, I said at the previous council that while I would vote for the amendment to take the \$15 million out of the proposed u.r.a. For the west side, it would still be my intention to deposit phi that \$15 million as coming from that source. I will support this amendment today, but I want to make it clear for the record, particularly to the other side we negotiated with, that I would consider it to be bad faith on our part at this time to depend on them to come up with the \$15 million given the parameters of the negotiations we had, the financial obligations assigned to each party, the part of financing that was assigned to us. I would be just as concerned if, at this point, mr. Paulson or any of his agents came to us and said that the commitments they made financially they now wanted to relax and now wanted the city to share some responsibility for. Again, I will support this but only understanding that it will be my intent that the resources needed to fill this \$15 million gap come from the city, because that was the nature of the agreement we made.

Adams: Given the look at the clock, i'd like council, if they have to make comments, to do so as they vote on the amendment unless there's additional discussion.

April 15, 2009

Jim Van Dyke, Sr. Deputy City Attorney: Jim van dyke, city attorney's office. My understanding of the amendment is that it would --

Adams: Do you have a copy of it?

Van Dyke: No, I don't.

Saltzman: It strikes paragraph 2.7 and paragraph 3.5.

Van Dyke: I understand that. I thought it was important to clarify that the amendment goes to some terms in the predevelopment agreement itself and does not modify any of the findings that the council has to make in the ordinances in order to exempt these contracts from the requirements of state law and city code regarding competitive low bidding. Because findings is a very technical term of art in state law regarding the exemption process, I thought it would just be important to clarify that at this time, that we're really talking about the amending of the predevelopment agreement attached to the findings, not to the ordinance.

Adams: You're willing to move forward?

Van Dyke: Absolutely.

Adams: Would you please call the roll on the proposed amendment?

Moore-Love: Who seconded it?

Adams: I seconded it.

Fish: I voted no on the soccer deal. Second, I voted yes on this amendment, and I want to read what I understood the amendment was when it came before council, because we pulled the transcript anticipating there would be discussion today. The amendment was a motion to, quote, remove the \$15 million from a new tiff area financing plan. That was the amendment. It was seconded. So i'm going to support this amendment, but I want to be clear what I understood we were voting on last time, and i'm speaking as someone who voted no on soccer, so let's be clear. We were expressing the will of the council to find an alternative source of financing other than tiff. I believe this amendment goes beyond that. Because of the time and because I think this issue can be revisited at some point, i'm going to vote aye.

Saltzman: Well, just let me be clear. I am not saying absolutely i'm going to rule out the city coming up with the funding, and it could be through urban renewal if there is in fact consensus among the county and school districts and the public about forming a new urban renewal area. It could come from other avenues. But my intent of the amendment was to not make a judgment as to whose responsibility it is to come up with that 15 million, that it remains a joint responsibility. That's why I vote aye.

Leonard: Aye.

Fritz: I respect commissioner Leonard wanting to honor the agreement he made with the company. My understanding was the same as commissioner Saltzman's that it left a hole and it wasn't specified who was going to fill the hole. It's interesting to me how intelligent people who are paying attention can hear the same thing in different ways. This was my understand can that there is a hole and it's both parties that should be looking to try to fill it. Aye.

Adams: Aye. The amendment is approved.

Fish: Steve, it's a pleasure to have you here and have a chance to grill you.

Janik: Thank you, I think.

Fish: I have a couple of questions. I'm doing a little bit of catch-up and i'm trying to understand some of the elements of this agreement. While jeff bayer has made it clear there is a narrow purpose for today, you have also put together a document we have to understand. In that spirit, i'm going to ask you some questions. There has been a lot of debate in our community about the question of the linkage between major league soccer and minor league baseball and in particular whether or not the soccer deal is contingent on there being a separate venue for baseball. I would not give you a chance to address that, because I haven't seen a document -- I have not myself seen a document addressing that. Is there some document we can look to?

April 15, 2009

Janik: First of all, this agreement doesn't address this linkage. There is no obligation to commit to have two facilities. There is a commitment to commence work right now on the architectural and engineering work for two facilities but not a commitment. It is a requirement of peregrine that, in order to go forward, there must be both a plan for a major league soccer stadium and a plan for a.a.a. Baseball stadium, and the working assumption that exists right now is the city is willing to work toward that goal. So recital number 3 says that the proposed transaction includes renovations to p.g.e. Park as well as construction of a new a.a.a. Park.

Fish: While you're saying we're not committed to that, that is the spirit of the agreement before us. What you just said is news to me. You said that the requirement of a separate venue for baseball is not a requirement of major league soccer but is a requirement of the owner operator of these two sports franchises?

Janik: That's what we've been told. Correct.

Fish: And without getting too deep into this, is there any, that you're aware of, practical or legal reason why we could not negotiate with peregrine a point agreement at p.g.e. Park?

Janik: I know of no legal reason that exists at the present time that would prevent that negotiation. I have no way of predicting the success of that negotiation.

Fish: In light of what you've just said, there would also be no reason why we could not at least entertain a discussion about a phase-in. Correct? Let's say a joint use for a period of time to create a cooling off agreement over the planning for a possible minor league baseball stadium?

Janik: I know of no legal impediment to doing that either.

Fish: Thank you.

Fritz: I'd really like to get testimony before people have to leave?

Adams: Any further discussion?

Leonard: In response to commissioner Fish's inquiry, originally that's the way this plan was proposed, that there be a joint operations. And the explanation that we had, which made sense -- and I don't know whether you're heard this or not, so I thought I should just add it to the discussion -- is that, from a business operations point of view, once major league soccer is here, the expectation is that it would be potentially to sell-out crowds. Instantly you would have 20,000-plus fans, I think is the number, that would show up to good to a soccer game. The concern raised by the owner is that, as in any business venture, you want the first impression to be the best impression. And not doing the renovations that need to happen at p.g.e. Park to create the best fan experience, including adding the bleachers on each side, which is an integral part of this plan, denigrates the fan experience and causes some concern that the business model can be achieved. Though you're correct that I think mls would be fine with them playing on the same field for two or even three seasons, the business concern is that it would diminish the experience for fans and cause people maybe not to come back. The idea is to -- who otherwise might attend. The idea is to have the modifications done so the facility is appropriate for that amount of fans.

Adams: We've had a little more airing out of that, but we do have people waiting to testify. I'd like to get to that. Thank you, gentlemen.

Moore-Love: We have 29 people signed up to testify.

Adams: I'd like you to try to keep your testify to two minutes. What can be said in three can usually be said in two so we can get to everybody. If you are dead set that you've prepared remarks for three, then just let me know ahead of time.

Adams: I'm sorry. I'd ask former governor vic atiyeh to come up. Mr. Governor, please take a seat up here. Governor, welcome to the Portland city council. We're glad you're here.

Governor Vic Atiyeh: For many years, I told the voters I didn't need to do a better job of selecting who they were going to vote for, and they constantly asked me how do you do that, and I never really had a good answer until one day I said, well, you need a higher level of awareness. What i'm leading up to is that, when I left office, I didn't stop thinking or being concerned, and I continue to

April 15, 2009

read newspapers to keep up on what's going on. And now i'm watching the lease into speed of moving to spending a lot of money for a major league soccer, and it looks like it's closer to happening, and I have some really serious thoughts that I want to share with you. In this morning's "oregonian," this morning talking about this case here, it says more than \$250 million, and they mentioned rehab of p.g.e. Park, and I would ask the question: All of p.g.e. Park, is it paid for now? Just a question of council. And revamp of rose quarter and demolish the memorial coliseum. They didn't go on to say anything about the baseball park, but i'm sure that's part of it. And i, during my career, always tried to decide what's desirable and what's essential. There's a lot of things that are desirable but not necessarily essential. What's happening now with the legislature, for example, is cutting many programs because they can't really meet their \$4 billion shortfall. And among them is -- I read again this morning's paper -- the commission on children and families being cut. And so i'm now relating your discussion of \$250 million for major league soccer versus whatever small amount there was for the commissioner of children and families. But I only use that for comparative purposes and no other reason. So you need to know what's pulling my string. I come from a time when, before any of you were born, and when in world war ii it drained the lives of thousands of soldiers, I came from a time when there's a great debate as to where we ought to place a memorial and enjoyed the reality of the memorial to the dead, and it was called the coliseum -- memorial coliseum. And it was wonderful to see it happen. Now, I may be wrong, but I have not yet got the sense of urgency from anything i've read in the paper. It seems to me a very cavalier, almost casual discussion of tearing down the memorialally why up to put a baseball stadium in its place. I don't think that -- and i'm going to get a little even more serious -- that john dehning in the u.s. Navy, gail floathouse of the air force or robert jones of the air nurse -- air force or john cyber, if they were alive today, would be champions of this program. You don't know them of course, but I know them. I knew them. They were my friends. And they didn't volunteer to die. Cy sitesinger wrote me a letter that they called v-mail. They call them e-mails today. But it was v-letter. He wrote that he was now in europe and there was a lot going on and he would be writing me a longer letter, and then he said, I didn't really ask how much I want to live until I got here. And a week later I read in the "oregonian" that he died. Now, there's many of them like that, many of them. I only picked these because I know them. They're real, live people. And so i'm saying to you, as you go about what you're doing, think about the money you're going to spend. Think about those that we've built the memorial coliseum for and all the soldiers that have made it the fact that I could come here today and you could be sitting there listening to me only because of them. I ask you two things. What form of a veterans' memorial will you be doing if you decide to tear down the memorial coliseum. That should become prominent in your discussions, not subordinate. And second, because of things that you're aware of in the past and recent past, I would add in which we saw sums of money change rapidly, I think it would be worthwhile and will certainly help me and the stings of Oregon -- and I listened to some of your conversation earlier -- if you could actually precisely -- not accurately, I know, tell me and them exactly how much this is going to cost. And when we say the city is going to pay for it, i'm the city, so that means i'm going to pay for it. How much we're going to be obliged for and how much of the debt for p.g.e. Park and even probably the brand-new building -- how much we all want those. In other words, give me the exact facts and let the paper print it so everyone can see what we're facing. And I expect a fairly accurate account, not a precise one but not as inaccurate as recent events that took place, and I won't mention that. You almost got me that time, but now you're getting me for sure. So, anyway, I thank you for the opportunity of telling you about my friends that are no longer with us, and they are a lot of -- there are a lot of people like them, men and women, and I want to see a memorial to them being a major part of your discussion, not an oh, by the way discussion.

Adams: Governor, I appreciate the opportunity to hear your testimony today. Rest assured, since i've been an elected official, some of the first groups that we talk to and some of the continuing

April 15, 2009

conversations over the past decade or so regarding the various potential futures for the rose quarter, the veterans' groups, and some of them are here today that we've been dealing with, have been the first group we have talked to. We talk about the potential decommissions and always the discussion of a new memorial that we would involve them, as I discussed last night at the public meeting and planning design and every aspect of the memorial. We take this very, very seriously. We really appreciate you being here today to underscore that. Thank you, governor. [applause]

Brian Libby: My name is brian libby. I'm a journalist living here in Portland. I write in freelance for the Oregonian, "new york times," "architectural record," and i've been writing about architecture in Portland for the last several years. I want to discussion in the strongest terms the preservation of the memorial coliseum. This is by leaps and bounds the biggest threat to a key architectural landmark in the city, and i'd like to probably qualify that by saying of course i'm excited to have major league soccer coming to Portland and realize also that the Portland beavers need a home that is easily accessible by mass transit and various other issues. I would not support any project that threatens the memorial coliseum. It was designed by the famous new york architectural firm and is one of the most unique arenas or basketball arenas not only in the united states but anywhere in the world. There are generations of Portlanders who have memories of standing in that building not only to see shows but standing on the outside of it in the concourse and seeing a panoramic view of the whole city through a wall of glass. I've never been to any facility of that kind in my life that has that kind of special architectural significance. Also i'm trouble by the fact that the development plan for this is being called a sustainable space, because you could build a platinum leed building on -- leed building on this site in terms of design and architecture. I'd also like to emphasize this is not something i've said on my own. The national trust for preservation, the largest preservation organization in the united states, has supported this preservation and so has the american institution of architects and the -- architects and the hundreds who have written to my website in opposition. The rose garden is vastly inferior as a piece of architecture, and the memorial coliseum would still be here for our grandchildren. Thank you.

Ann Forsthoefel: Good morning. Many different arguments have been used to advocate government funding for a sports stadium. I implore each one of you to study the research that's been done of what actually happens once new sports stadiums have been erected. Andrew knoll has written a book on this. The new sports stadium, what people always say, they generate jobs, attract more business and additional tax revenue and lease payments will be a long-term investment for the cities. That's contrary to what the findings have shown. Not one study has shown those three things come about. Secondly, as a new resident in the rose quarter, I would like to discuss attracting new businesses. What businesses will this attract? We're here in Portland because of our local businesses. We strive. That's why people move here. And I had a terrible vision last night in the meeting of seeing this new 24/7 entertainment complex contrary to why I live here and many other people live here because of businesses that attract. The prices will be high for the lease space, i'm sure. What's it going to track? It's so generic, it could be a place in any city. So I really implore the commission to really look at what we're looking at doing to the rose quarter in general and what will be the impact in long-standing.

Adams: Good morning. Almost good afternoon. Welcome to the city council. Give us your first and last name and just the clock will guide your time.

Jeffrey Paul Weil: I am a veteran. I'm going to make it very simple and very short. I have terminal cancer as a result of my service to my country. Three tours of action. I have biltmoreals all over this state and other states. If you go downtown beaverton, walking the street, you will see a beautiful park, memorial with people from the civil war, revolutionary war, bricks in the wall. There is a fly-over every holiday, they tip their wing. I am proud of this state. I grew up in new jersey, but i'm very proud of Portland. What I implore is, one, you preserve the integrity of the coliseum. It is literally a memorial of its own. To we don't need any other sports venues here at

April 15, 2009

this juncture. We have enough. And for a state that is suffering economically, it behooves me where is the money? People don't come here anymore, not to the extent that they used to. What number on the list is our state economically? Intel corporation, which I worked for since 1981 when the founding members of intel -- I was badge number 9. Intel was treated by the state of Oregon like garbage. They almost did not build there.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony and thank you for your service. I wish you all the best with your health challenges. Mr. Parker?

Terry Parker: Oh. I thought I was the third one, but I'll again ahead. I've written this for three minutes. What we have here is a failure to communicate. It is obvious this stadium deal has been put together with working group of special interests, all done behind closed doors, and without the transparency that the public expects. It is absurd to suggest that public input from nondecisive studies for a rose quarter alternative can now qualify as upfront public involvement for this short sighted and fast track stadium proposal. 10 years ago, there was a strong sentiment to preserve the memorial coliseum. The majority of people in attendance were in defense of keeping this iconic landmark where it currently stands. Suggests memorial coliseum can be relocated is another deceptive trick and unfounded ruse that comes from a mayor that already used abate and switch -- a bait and switch tactic. He already has plans for using the removed materials from the coliseum. Who is writing and supporting this scam? Many buildings that exist today, the construction of the memorial coliseum was approved by the voters as a tribute that honors veterans. Moreover, the mid century architecture of a stadium in a glass box was one of the first to be built that way, making memorial coliseum a significant structure in its own right. Tearing it down would be a travesty and also outright consumption plain and simple. Additionally, there are many unanswered financial questions being raised about the funding for this proposed stadium construction. Portland city services cannot afford creating, enlarging of yet another urban renewal district. The runaway spending train needs to be slowed down to bring some form of sanity to this process. Alternative stadium sites need to be considered. With a slower process that actually reaches out to the public for input, the beavers could be accommodated. The memorial coliseum needs to be saved from the wrecking ball. More than one speakers from last night say don't tear down this historic building.

Daniel Deutsch: Hello, council. I have a building in the lloyd district, and I thought it would be remiss if I didn't comment. There are a lot of strong opinions in here, and I thought I would try to look at its from a little bit of different angle, more of a broader perspective. First I want to say I understand the directive to create jobs and to galvanize the economy and the need to create activity in the district. I do appreciate that, and I think that that kind of leadership is necessary in times like this. The two concerns I don't really hear talked about and something I've spent a lot of time cultivating in my own work -- they are being talked about but not in a way I would. One is the Portland culture and aggressive agenda. In many ways, sam is seen as embodying this. The green streets, streetcar, volunteering, reusing, composting, I mean I could go on. That, to me, is the thing that separates Portland from every other city. We don't have fabulous skyscrapers. We're not in new york city, l.a. We're not all these things, and I don't think that's necessarily bad. In fact a lot of those people are coming to Portland right now. I need another minute. I didn't realize I was going to take this long. I guess what I want to say is I really want that to be recognized that it's one of Portland's most precious resources, our culture, our community especially on the east side. I know that we do, because I see it exemplified in many ways. Reconsidering that development -- I think ann touched on it for a moment, but who are our neighbors going to be? I want to understand that more deeply. The second thing that I wanted to talk about -- and I'll make this as brief as I can -- is sustainability and repurposing the building. Obviously there is a spectrum of sustainability, and I think everyone would agree the most sustainable thing you could do is to reuse the existing building and the least you could do is not consider the environment at all. I understand there's a spectrum and it's a complicated thing. What I'd be interested in doing is seeing if you guys would be willing

April 15, 2009

to look at an alternative option, maybe put a call out to developers and private money in Portland, seeing if they'd be willing to invest in repurposing the coliseum. I know at one point, it was looked at as reusing the building. Maybe on some level we could pull together, and you could actually see if the public is serious and will put action to their words. I would welcome that, and I think that you'd find that the public would receive that really well, that kind of challenge. If they don't come to it, they don't. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony. Good afternoon. It's now afternoon.

Chris Bleiler: I've never been here before. I really appreciate three minutes because I wrote it for three.

Adams: We'll give you three, and good luck.

Bleiler: The rose quarter has 4300 parking spaces for 20,000 people.

Adams: For the record, your name?

Bleiler: Christopher biler. I'm here as a neighbor. The rose quarter has 4300 parking spaces for 20,000 people which equals 4.5 6 persons per car. Riding the max, biking our walking means 16,000. 3.7 humans, 1700 of the 4300 spaces are at lloyd lots where people write the fearless max. The 268 humans one hour before game time equals 216 max riders plus the 1700 lloyd-parked fareless riders, which is about 5000 humans on the max which means everyone on the max before game is going to see the trailblazer. There's no opportunity for grandma. 16,000 arrive in cars with 3.67 humans inside. Let's round down the number and add it to the walky/bikey folks for the carbon footprint thing. That's 2000 cars parked in the neighborhoods. The long and the short is that it ends up impacting 25 actual blocks of overflow parking that the rose quarter can't figure out that they currently need and use. I'm concerned that they will not include any sort of plan to deal with this if they make the rose quarter an entertainment district. I would prefer that there would be a slower process. I don't want them to value engineer a bunch of promises they can't keep. They don't have the cred. They never did. This is an opportunity to redesign something for Portland, something far greater than solutions to kansas city's or louisville's problems. This is Portland with skilled firms that would rally together to design this and set the bar for everyone else. The process has been ignored. This is Portland. You should know better. And a recession does not excuse process nor responsible development. Plan this well. Do more than your best. We live here. You live here. This is Portland. Thank you.

Adams: Thanks for your testimony.

Ann Talbott DiLoreto: I'm a native Portlander, live in northeast Portland. The owner of an old and tired iconic building wants to tear it down for something new and shiny. Yet, when this building as completed and during its heyday, it was the talk of the town. It came Portland a sense of place. Visitors came from far and wide to visit and stay and see and be seen. Designated by one -- dined by one of the great architectural firms in the country, it was touted as a great architectural work. Now it's old. It needs maintenance. It's outdated and must be demolished. No other options exist. If this sounds vaguely familiar, it's because we're back in 1951 when the city allowed the destructive of the old Portland hotel. It took almost 30 years to overturn that mistake and make it a positive asset. Portland is littered with the dreams of potential development. The burnside bridge head, vacant for five years, blocks around emanuel hospital, vacant for four years, kiss worth and interstate, vacant for eight years. So before you rush to tear down under the guise of new money, let's exhaust all other possibilities. Let's not repeat our past. Mayor Adams was quoted in the "oregonian" as saying that there are legitimate exceptions to Portland's public process, and I say this is not the issue to dismiss citizen input, not when it involves destroying an iconic architectural masterpiece which is dedicated to -- in memorial to Oregonians have that given their lives in service of this country. It's not when the neighbors are dead set against it. Anyway, I guess my time's up, but I just would like you to hold off and move slower and allow for process.

Adams: Thank you for your testify.

April 15, 2009

Val Ballestrem: I'm the education manager for the boscos co-milligan foundation, the local partner of the national trust for historic preservation. I'm speaking today on their behalf to present their concerns of the demolition of the memorial coliseum. The national trust would like to express its support for the preservation of the memorial coliseum. Any qualities of the memorial coliseum structure and its important to the community involve a careful evaluation of alternatives before its demolition is considered. The national trust is also highly skeptical of claims that the demolition of this Portland landmark is a sustainable solution. In fact, demolition followed by new construction would be a dramatic step backward in Portland's goal of becoming the world's most sustainable city. The memorial coliseum contributes significantly. The coliseum is architecturally notable for its freestanding concrete and arena bowl, glass enclosed walls. The facade is an uncommon treatment for arenas from this era, therefore contributing to the historic significant. The coliseum is an award-winning building and is currently listed on the city Portland's as a rank 1 resource. The rank 1 rating distinguishes the memorial coliseum as one of the important structures in the city. By seeking the successful reuse of this building, Portland can lead in sustainable architecture while developing a practical model for communities nationwide that are debating new uses for their ages arenas. Finally, the national trust is concerned that the mayor has supported demolition of the coliseum under the mantra of sustainability and questions the accuracy of this assumption. Choosing new construction over reuse is really the most sustainable choice. Energy to manufacture or extract building materials, transport them to the construction side and assembling them into a new building, a substantial energy is already embodied in the glass and steel frame. Materials must be factored into the arm tag cost if the city is to tout sustainability as an objective of this plan. Memorial coliseum is an asset as a result of its heritage.

Adams: Good morning. Welcome to the city council.

*******:** Good of after noon.

Adams: Glad you're here.

Cathy Galbraith: I'm the executive director of the boston-milligan foundation and am here to speak in opposition to the potential demolition of memorial coliseum. I think it is I am possible -- impossible for anyone in the room to support the demolition of the memorial coliseum -- memorial coliseum. It was nationally recognized for its architectural and technical innovations. In the elliott neighborhood, 1386 buildings have been demolished, beginning in the -- demolished. I don't we should tear down that resource before its time. The philosophy nationwide, which is sustainable by definition, says to make a brick today, to build a building on a site where there is already a building steals from two generations. It steals from the generation that built the brick originally by throwing away those assets before its work is done and steals from a future generation by using increasingly - - the demolition is anything but eco friendly. One final point, demolition by neglect is an internationally known philosophy. We should not punish the coliseum by citing its condition issues because of our lack of maintenance and investment as a city. I would also plead with you to not move hastily to demolish anything before all of the questions that have been raised in past, present, and possibly future meetings are answered.

Adams: Thanks for your testimony.

Kristen Minor: My background is an architect and planner. I'm now working as a historian. I am a soccer mom, but most importantly i'm a citizen of the Portland and of the pacific northwest. I have three points for your consideration. I'll try to be brief. First I want to talk about the process. The process so far has not been linear. Last night, mayor Adams, you presented your ideas for the rose quarter, and you said numerous times that there had been years of study of the memorial coliseum. Those studies have mostly been focused on adaptive reuse, so those are useful. That work can hopefully continue. We can draw upon that and add to it. But where is the conversation about finding an appropriate location for a new baseball stadium, maybe even keeping baseball at p.g.e. Park for some time? This is really the missing link, and this is the part of the conversation

April 15, 2009

that we need to slow down and put options on the table. My second point is conversations about the aging infrastructure at the coliseum seem to be a bit of a red herring. We need to have the conversation about what we value, what we support over time. In today's "oregonian," there was an opinion piece by merit paulson. He said, quote, retiring memorial coliseum and using the site for the new stadium making the most sense because it would take vance of the existing rose quarter parking garages, eliminating the need to build costly new ones. Now, this is a pretty stunning admission. Our leadership values parking garages more than our glass palace? That the east side is valued for all the parking and that's about it? One last point quickly. The memorial coliseum belongs to all of us. It is part of our collective history, and its contribution is huge. It is so easy to forget, 50 years later, how radical and innovative this space and structure were at the time. My office, peter major architects, is finishing up a nomination of the building to the national register. No one is paying us to do this, but it is the right thing to do if only to buy time to allow more ideas to come to the table.

Adams: Thank you for your testify.

April Burris: I'm a native Portlander, so I grew up here and have seen lots of changes. Now I live in the north tabor neighborhood. The question of funding the construction of a soccer stadium, in my mind, shouldn't even be a question right now. It's a question of whether your priorities are for a business venture that may, in the future, enhance the city or taking care of your citizens right now. I would really hope in this time of financial crisis that I could say that my mayor and my council members were more interested in taking care of the citizens of their city and realize that investing in the citizens of their city, rather than in businesses that may someday enhance our city -- enhance our city is the most important thing, I think. That's why I elect my city council is because I want to live in a city where there are services for people. At this time when public services are being cut because the city is in financial crisis, my priority would be to take care of the citizens. And another thing I heard this morning that really bothered me is that you were looking at having the soccer stadium being built with an exemption to a competitive bidding process. I'd like to find out more about that. We have competitive bidding processes for a reason: So that we can include everybody. Again, I think it's about -- you know -- whether your priority is people or whether your priority is -- you know -- the future of this city that may or may not come to pass.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony. Good afternoon. Welcome to the city council. You can go ahead and begin.

Thomas Phillipson: We lost somebody there. I work in the Portland art museum, the northwest film center. I'm not an expert about architecture our historic preservation, but I am passionate about these items. You know, you've heard a lot of testimony about why the building, the memorial coliseum, is significant. I did not get a feeling in the meeting that was held yesterday, the town hall meeting, that -- there was no acknowledgment of that from you, mayor Adams, that it is an important building and just exactly what is significant about it. Modern architecture is often difficult to really appreciate and this building especially I don't think is fully appreciated by people because it's difficult to tell the construction of it with the black curtain that is around it right now, hard to tell that it is a freestanding teacup inside of a glass curtain wall have is a very magnificent piece of a customer if can see it without the curtain there. I don't know if any of you ever have. I've seen pictures of it. I want you to value the expert testify you've heard from historic preservationists, arc techs, as well as -- if an engineer was testifying that the building would collapse in the next 15 minutes, I hope you would listen. I don't mean to preach. I want you to think about all the options that still could be open that don't involve demolishing the coliseum. It feels right now that that's a fait accompli, that you've decided that's the only option: To bring soccer to the city and support the beavers. There are a lot of other options by creative problem solvers, and they can probably come up with something we'll all be happy about.

April 15, 2009

Will Macht: I'm a professor of urban planning and development at Portland state. I've distributed to you a copy of an argue in a fort coming architectural development journal we publish. It describes seven different uses for the coliseum, and it also raises a number of public policy questions, beginning they are on page 16. Let me highlight a couple of thing for you. Strangely the use for which the coliseum is most well adapted has received the least attention as a coliseum. One must understand the basic deal structure to surmise the reason for this lack of attention. While paul allen's corporation has the obligation to cover any corporation losses at the coliseum, it must pay 60% from the coliseum to the city, and they can restrain 40% as a management fee. Events at the rose garden are not so burdened. While the city may have believed that the agreement was favorable to it, one must realize that it is in the economic interests of the manager to hold just enough events at the coliseum to keep it at a break-even level but no more. There is not incentive to exit that level when all the property available for holding the same event is there at the rose garden.

The Oregon arena corporation was granted and enjoys development rights for any nonpublic development that would occur on the coliseum site but has no such rights for public development. It is in o.a.c.'s economic interest for the city to declare that there is no public use for the coliseum. Over the years, it has advocated precisely solutions that demolish it. So many uses have been developed to spend at least \$55 million building a baseball stadium that would operate only six months of the year and house only 70 home games. What will produce revenue there in the other 295 days of the year? In a rainy area like Portland, why does it make sense to demolish a covered, enclosed, and heated venue usable year-round for multiplicity -- multiplicity of uses than one which is only open half of the year and then only for a single use?

Adams: If you could wrap up your comments?

Macht: I will.

Adams: You're heading towards three minutes.

Macht: Thank you. I will. Of the alternatives, is may well be the simplest, improving and operating the coliseum as a coliseum under the management of merk, which used to operate it. How can the city decide in a period of weeks, after private discussions with only two companies owned by wealthy families who each advance their own private economic interests to demolish and historic 50-year-old public asset that has served the community well. The hippoc tic oath to which every doctor swears allegiance -- allegiance is first do no harm. What sense of public priorities and public interest does this course of action reveal, and why should the public support any city commissioner who advances it?

Adams: You're now going on four minutes. I need you to wrap up.

Macht: When city leaders purport creating the most sustainable entertainment district in the united states, is it not incumbent on them to show the demolition of the complex and itself be the embodiment of energy, efficiency, sustainability.

Adams: Thank you. We've got your written testimony. Very compelling. Thank you for being here.

Fritz: Thank you for your comprehensive analysis and for sends is ahead of time.

Lumsey: I would like to use the full three minutes, please.

Adams: Sure.

Lumsey: Thank you. I have a few points I want to make, a few comments I would like to share. First I want to ask the question for the public and for the council. Is Portland a city that's destroying itself? I love sports. I really love sports. I love the excitement, the passion. As a former athlete, I understand what it takes to train hard, to prepare and be very disciplined, and I know the same principles are involved in City planning. I'm really excited about city planning, like urban development and would like to see some things come out of the rose quarter and rose garden area. With respect to mayor Adams, randy Leonard, and the commission, I know it's important also for politicians to approach business leaders and work with them. I think it's very important but do not

April 15, 2009

think it's appropriate the stakes of the citizens. I oppose tearing down memorial coliseum. I don't like to talk about greed too much. It's a topic that is difficult for me. Being a positive person, I do recognize that it's out there and fair acknowledge that. So my question is this. Who is the stadium really for? There's talk about an entertainment district which is 24/7. It sounds like excitement, action, but I know that the youths here in Oregon have a problem with alcohol. When you're talking about building an entertainment system that's 24/7 and then having bars and restaurants, I feel like that contributes to society in a negative way. And again is this something that we're looking at for our society, for our community, and for individuals or is this something we're doing for business leaders? Again, it's important to work with the business leaders but not at the expense of the public. With this minute, I'll try to be brief and figure out what else I want to say. I think eagerness is great. I think again we should look at doing some things. I'm excited that we have the opportunity to bring major league soccer to Portland. I think the opportunity will come if we can't make it happen now and as a democracy, you guys have the power to vote and I will hope that you guys will take time and deliberate very thoughtfully on what's best for the community. Again, eagerness is great but rushing a project is just unacceptable. Also, I just have to remind you guys that we are in a recession and while it's good to stimulate the economy we should be thinking about the individuals and building a nice facility which requires money to be a part of, there's a lot of people in Portland who don't have the money. I, myself am one of them even though I work full-time and as a student at PCC. And I'm concerned about the budget. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you.

Gil Frey: I'm back.

Adams: Good to see you again.

Frey: Thank you very much. My name is Gil, Gil Frey. And I'm from here in Portland. I do not represent the Rose Festival nor the Oasa or the Winterhawks or Brian Parrot. I'm independent. I'm a veteran. And my first attempt to save the coliseum was in about 1993 and I was probably the only season ticket holder that showed up. But Paul Allen was giving public proposals for his Rose Garden and I was there and I got there last and was there to speak and I signed up and I said I'm Gil Frey, and I represent 10,000 people. And don't know who they are, but there's only 100 of us here. And technically, we all represent about 10,000 people. So Brian Parrot wasn't scheduled to talk but he got up after me and said, I'm Brian Parrot and I represent 10,000 people. I've been one veteran who has been concerned before the coliseum all along. So when you -- all along. When you say you have the support of the veterans, I'm sure you do. Because I'm sure that the --

Adams: I've said we've been working with the leaders of the veterans groups. I don't claim to have the support of the veterans.

Frey: It seems to be implied. But I know that some of the veterans are actively working with groups and want it down and work seemingly to go along with that. But the Rose Festival, the memorial coliseum was built with the Rose Festival in mind. It was a memorial to the veterans. But they have told me at some point that the representatives of the Rose Festival were on the spot when they were building it, week by week by week. That probably isn't the case with the Rose Garden. That was probably built with a contract out of Kansas City and I don't think there was much consultation between the people in Portland and Kansas City. But not so on the coliseum and ever since the coliseum was built, the Rose Festival that started there, not always have they had their coronation of the queen there. They do now. But the Rose Festival starts there and people come from all over the world and sometimes in tours and buses to come to this coliseum from all over the world. And the coliseum is designed to accommodate the vision of a parade from sitting there inside when it's raining. And it rains every -- you know, it rains every Rose Festival. So then you have the Oasa. The Oregon State Association. Oregon's School Association. Oregon School Athletic Association -- thank you very much -- they have brought to Portland three state championships in the last 50 days. Three -- most of them in the month of March. Three state championships and that

April 15, 2009

was wrestling and when they bring the wrestlers into town, they bring the wrestlers, the coaches, they bring the parents, the grandparents, and they fill all the motels over here.

Adams: Mr. Frey, we're out of --

Frey: We're out of time.

Adams: I've given you four minutes.

Frey: Let me make it quick. That is that I think that the Oregon school activities association with the three state championships and the rose festival bring more business to Portland than the blazers all year long during the regular season.

Adams: Thank you, mr. Frey.

Fritz: Mr. Frey, I have a comment. Since you've been participating since 1993. My office pulled a transcript from 2004 and we wanted to see what I had said at that point and you were testifying as a citizen on the memorial coliseum in 2004. So thank you for your dedication.

Frey: Thank you very much.

Adams: Sir.

*******:** Thank you, mayor.

Adams: Thank you, mr. Frey.

Leroy Cameron: I'd request three minutes.

Adams: Sure.

Leroy Cameron: And my name is leroy cameron. And i'm going to start -- i'm going to read this, because -- so pardon me in I don't have a lot of eye contact. I have a lot of stuff to cover.

Adams: That's ok.

Cameron: Assuming the minor league stadium is built in the rose quarter, in the next few years, Portland will need a major league stadium. What then? Build a new stadium? Big problem. But the bigger problem, much bigger problem is that in properly development will probably have already taken -- improper development will probably have already taken place around the minor league stadium. Common sense, putting it there will -- a development handicap that will inhibit the quality design of the area. Would forever be diminished and compromised. A cardinal rule in urban planning is that an area should be planned initially to its ultimate best use. The comparative losses for not following those guidelines can be so enormous they are incalculable. Virtually all of the lloyd center business and activity and their -- and their architects do not support the coliseum. Radio and tv polls indicate that roughly 65% to 85% of the people on the poll that -- that were polled do not agree with removing the coliseum. A glitzy 24-hour entertainment area will attract the wrong elements to our community. By contrast, our proposal includes the infrastructure to ensure the development of a healthy vibrant self-sustaining neighborhood. That project is called the veterans memorial coliseum arts and athletics center. It's designed to turn the coliseum into an arts and educational center magnet center which could become the cornerstone of a new cultural and creative industry campus. The employment opportunities will encourage high-density development along the waterfront and surrounding areas creating a heart and soul. Our objective is to make Portland the cultural center of the pacific northwest. It's going to take a commitment to education. To -- to realize that goal. And to create a major expansion of the cultural tourism industry, a clean renewable industry that will bring tens of thousands of new jobs and hundreds of millions of new dollar in our regional economy. We have identified several successful models across the u.s. And canada. And we believe we will have activities to support -- that will support approximately a 16-hour day in the new facility. The multi-revenue streams that we have located, we think will make this facility self-sustaining. We have sent -- we have spent thousands of man and women hours on this project. It's impossible to explain this multilayer project in a few minutes so I look forward to giving a full and formal presentation in the near future. We respectfully suggest that the decision be made to demolish the coliseum be delayed so that alternatives can be studied. By the way, the vnac is similar in many ways to the mark project, I think you're familiar w. I think doug will be up here

April 15, 2009

in a minute. Except it has a huge arts and cultural component. The beavers can play a year or two in other locations. And to end on a positive note, the vnac continues and expands all existing activities, including the rose festival, winterhawks '08 ss, etc. Thank you very much.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony. Karla. Good afternoon. Welcome to city council again. We're glad you're here. You need to give us your name and if you want two or three minutes.

Henry Kane: Henry Kane. Former Portland resident. World war ii veteran and opponent of destroying the memorial coliseum. You have notice of litigation if the city does not hold o.r.s. 335 sub5, suba of the hearing. So now you have notice of litigation. If council had listened to both sides before it voted, it might have read the part that says you have to give notice of a hearing, and that is a paper of general circulation. 14 days before. The world war ii veterans who came back, and there were 770,000 of us who did not, with a population was less than half of what it is today, were very forthright and when they found that a sheriff was elected under false pretensions, they got signatures to recall and defeated him. Now, I don't care whether there's a soccer stadium or not. But I do care about keeping the face, keeping the memorial coliseum and some of those listed, i'm afraid are my buddies. That's going on 65 years ago. Now, I will file a complaint that you did not comply with the 14-day notice. Secondly, a separate complaint will allege that the development agreement is not definite and under the heading of waste, the purported agreement does not bind deep pocket merritt paulson. Shall corporation, particularly one from delaware, is not [inaudible] entity. And then finally, I expect to be able to challenge the agreements why it's article 11, section 9, you don't lend credit by bond issue or otherwise to a private body. The last part deals with the possibility that the coliseum will not have to be destroyed because nothing in major league soccer says it has to be exclusive. By the way, five, ten, 15 home games a year is not going to produce much tax revenue, the soccer has been losing money. One or two of them may even be breaking even.

Adams: Mr. Kane, you're doing a great job and the written testimony you provided us is exemplary and for those reasons, I gave you four minutes, but well said. I appreciate your testimony.

Kane: I'll have my word in court. Thank you.

Adams: Fair enough.

Douglas Oblatz: I request 2 minutes and 59 seconds please.

Adams: So granted. We appreciate your compassion.

Oblatz: Douglas oblitz. I wasn't sure I was going to testify today. I'm not here to speak again the larger plan of bringing major league soccer to Portland. We like going to timbers game, not in one particular section the stadium but i'm a fan. However, Portland is a city that prides itself on excellent urban planning and sustainability and finding a way to put an unique stamp on the city. Today, the process of -- this plan is not a Portland plan. The drawings I saw last night at the rose quarter are not ready for prime time and they're not ready to be the basis for a 55 to \$200 million set of decisions. Over the last 30 years, i've been involved in a number of projects around town and what I saw last night represents maybe the first 1% or 2% of design. Put another way, the first few days of a process that would normally take one to one and a half years. I'm not merritt paulson but it would be difficult for me to find the debt financing for a project at this early stage of evolution in good times much less the times we're in now. If you asked me if I were ready to sign up for a project based on what I saw last night, I would say no. And if you asked if I would ask the city to make a siting decision based on what I saw last night, I would advise no. Portland wasn't planned in a week. I don't think it's possible to make a 50-year decision about one of the most important districts in the city based on the two-day design shurette. P.d.c. Chairman, the late bill roberts declared a plan to build a public square on the site of the old meier & frank parking garage and an enclosed glass structure that would require the purchase of a ticket to enter. The people of Portland famously rose against that idea and pushed the council to hold an open design competition and plopped down between \$20 and \$25 to buy the bricks. Pioneer square would not have happened

April 15, 2009

without the people of Portland caring about their city and investing time and money to make it an extraordinary place. Given what I heard last night and how the blogosphere lit up after, I believe this might be a once in a generation opportunity to create Portland's signature district. I think the council may be surprised at how the public can help to shape the rose quarter into a uniquely Portland place and maybe be willing to vote to save and invest in memorial coliseum. There would be a nice irony and maybe symmetry to this that people voted to build the coliseum and the veteran's 50 years ago.

Adams: Thank you.

Martha Peck Andrews: I'm martha peck andrews and I didn't coordinate my testimony with the previous speaker but I think we are going to echo the same comments. I've distributed my testimony. It has the andrew's architects on the top. Briefly, we're proud of Portland for its liveability and take pride in our excellent urban planning and that's the Portland way. And what we're looking at right now is a process that's failed to have any public input into the design of the rose quarter and we've all jumped to the poor conclusion that the only place for the baseball stadium is at the memorial coliseum site. That's not the Portland way. We need to step back, take a deep breath and good through a public process that gets public input and very specifically on the second page of my letter i've requested changes in the language of the ordinance that's in front of you. If you turn to the second page of my testimony, section 1, and I won't read the whole thing, but the council has two findings, one that the city partly finance and develop renovations to p.g.e. Park and that's the mls, the major league soccer stadium. And secondly, a new triple-a baseball stadium. And you need to strike the language that says potentially on the site of the memorial coliseum. That's the only site that's listed at all in your proposed ordinance and it's jumping to the wrong conclusions. For many of the reasons that speakers have said today. Secondly, I would request you strike the language potentially on the site of memorial coliseum and add language that says the new baseball stadium would be on a site within the city of Portland to be selected through a professional design evaluation process including opportunities for public input and comment. In the interests of brevity, i'll conclude. Thank you.

Adams: Appreciate your letter and the written testimony is very well stated. Karla. Good afternoon. Welcome to the city council. Glad you're here.

Paul Falsetto: My name is paul falsetto and I teach in the historic preservation fields. This might be a trifecta. When you're looking for a stadium, you look for it on land we already own. That makes sense. And looking at the drawings, knowing that you have a hardworking and dedicated and planning staff, I can see them struggling to find room in the rose quarter area. If you do the logical thing and push it up against Broadway, we have major utilities that have to be removed and also have roadway and infrastructure systems that we're disturbing if we push it closer to the rose garden, we're starting to collapse two venues next to each other where we really want space around them and I looked at the variations as well and it appears to me that we're trying to put six pounds of mud in that proverbial five-pound sack and i'm concerned about the -- is the baseball field in this location has its flexibility quite limited. Beavers have been here for a while and god forbid, they'll stay here for quite some time, but if they go away, we have a -- don't have a major tenant where we don't want it to be. If a very young mr. Paulson decided he wants to do for baseball what he did for soccer and gives us a major league baseball here, we've got no room for them. And now the stadium is not where it wants to be. I see a variety of compromises. I think the ballpark is compromised and the rose quarter could be compromised and the historic resource, the recognized historic resource, the memorial coliseum is greatly compromised in this proposal. And what bothers me most is that compromises are harder on reputation as progressive and insightful planners and leaders and deep sustainability efforts. So I would encourage you to not live with compromise, but find the win-win situation and find time to be able to do that and let's make it work the Portland way. Thank you.

April 15, 2009

Adams: Thanks for your testimony. Sir.

David W. Ferriday: I'm david ferriday. I've lived in Portland 40 years or more, i'm an architect. I'm interested in preserving the coliseum. I could go on at length. I would like to say when friends and colleagues of mine have come to Oregon to visit, I would take them to mt. Angel and look at the library there. And take them to silverton to see the frank lloyd wright gordon house there. And in Portland, we look at beluschi buildings and the john yeon building we discussed earlier and the skidmore -- memorial coliseum building. And that building is by one of the major firms practicing architecture in the 20th century in the mod modern idiom. The influence on the specifics of the design of that building are very apparent. That's one thing. The other thing is i've had marvelous experiences there. I mentioned last night, going to musical events and hearing john denver. I also remember steve prefontaine running there as a high schooler there on the east coast. We have had indoor track in high school and college. It was a marvelous experience. We don't have that anymore, but we used to have that in the memorial coliseum. The university of Oregon has come back to having a baseball team. Hopefully, Oregon state might come back some day and have a track team. I remember dick fasberry, the most famous track star of that school's history. They're part of the history of that building and perhaps could be again, and perhaps high school indoor track could make a return to testimony.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony. Good afternoon.

Angela H. Kremer: My name is angela Kremer, a resident of elliot and as a resident, i'm bringing forth a resolution passed by the board in the general meeting at elliot on monday night. Colleen couldn't be here but encouraged me to come. I want to make two points before reading the resolution. I'm asking the council to slow this down and, in fact, construct a process. That can be dynamic, live and sustainable for the neighborhoods around the rose quarter who are all affected by what happens in the rose quarter. With very little time, we have not been involved and that is wrong. We need a civically engaged group of people that can work together across neighborhood and business boundaries to invigorate the rose quarter. There's much we can do together. We already have rich relationships that can be grown and leveraged. We are the experts in our own neighborhoods and we are the ones who must move forward together. Please slow this down and involve us and involve us with our business partners in the lloyd district and rose quarter. Second, we need, we believe -- we believe we need a good neighbor agreement that's binding like goose hollow. We do not have one with the blazers, it was evident at the meeting. So I will read the resolution with time allowed.

Adams: Sure.

Kremer: Ok. An elliot resolution in opposition of minor league baseball stadium at the rose quarter. As a preamble, these are our findings: Elliot neighborhood is a diverse and creative neighborhood with a desire to see new residential and commercial development within and adjacent to its boundaries and suffered many -- boundaries. And continues to suffer negative impacts today. The planning and development for a new minor league baseball stadium in the rose quarter has to the included any neighborhood involvement. The elliot neighborhood association participated and supported the outcome of the previous rose quarter planning effort and that recommended reestablishing the neighborhood in the rose quarter and precluded the development of a baseball stadium. The elliot neighborhood association wants to work with the city and other stakeholders to create a plan that builds on the previous rose quarter plan and appropriate to this important site. Current impacts from events at the rose quarter negatively impact the elliot neighborhood and have not been adequately addressed by the city. The goose hollow neighborhood has a good neighborhood agreement with the city that governs the use of p.g.e. Park. Including the number and types of events and this neighborhood is a good example of an agreement between elliot neighborhood association and the city which could be binding and could show a change in the behavior in this situation. Be it resolved, the elliot neighborhood association opposes the current

April 15, 2009

planned development of a minor or major league baseball stadium in the rose quarter or anywhere adjacent or within the neighborhood association boundaries. Furthermore, the neighborhood association requests that a good neighbor agreement be established between the elliot neighborhood association, the city, the trail blazers and any other development interests within the rose quarter for any new entertainment uses as a condition of development. And closing I would like to notice that sustainability is really a three-way partnership. It is about the environment, it is about the economy, but it most importantly is been equity and that's essential, especially in a neighborhood like elliot which has not experienced the fairness that we can have through planning. Thank you.

Adams: I appreciate your comments. As a staff person, I was involved in putting that neighborhood agreement together in northwest Portland. That is a good agreement. Thank you for your testimony. Karla?

*****: You don't validate parking, do you?

Adams: No, you didn't take transit, walk or bike here?

*****: No, I had to --

Adams: I'm teasing. Sorry, we don't have the budget for that. You guys must be hungry. How many more do we have, Karla?

Moore-Love: Two more.

Adams: Ok. Good afternoon, welcome back to the city council for some of you. Glad you're here. Just give us your name and the clock will guide your time.

*****: Three minutes.

Adams: You'd like three minutes.

*****: You know.

Adams: Try to pack it into three.

Jeff Bernards: I'm going to try. Jeff bernards and i'm here, the whole soccer deal has become that they require a soccer specific stadium. Has anyone approached mls and ask that the requirement be waived? We've had soccer there for 10 years and the games went on just fine. I think if someone wrote a letter, hey, we're having economic troublings, if we can combine the field for a couple years until the economy got better. There was a letter in the tribune, the guy claimed he read the thing -- there was no thing that there had to be a soccer specific stadium. The soccer deal has turned into a major project. As a taxpayer, i'm worried about my future and reading the paper every day. You need to welcome at least-cost options. Merritt said it was going to be \$40 million for a team. It ends up 35. You're looking for 15 and I know where five is. I don't see him volunteering the five. You know? And there's a lot of books on how stadiums are fields of schemes. You should read some of that. [inaudible] any other opportunity investment. Sam Adams, you want to be the education czar, I think just hiring back the teachers that have been laid off would provide jobs. That would be a better use of money. I mean --

Adams: I don't know if I used the word "czar."

Bernards: Anyway, paul allen reported to be the seventh richest in the world, was able to file bankruptcy. Paulson's family isn't as wealthy but they'll have a back door if things don't work out well. So it's not really a -- and in concrete or that great a deal. I've met no one that supports the soccer deal except the guys in the green jerseys. I mean they did a tv poll. 70% of the people didn't support it. I mean, I don't want to dare you, but I dare you to put it on a ballot and see it pass. It won't pass. People are more worried about their job and paying their rent. I own a little rental property in town. The trend is to go and ask your landlord to ask for a discount on rent. I think you can go -- we're paying \$35 million to have this thing and then we can have the baseball and everything all in one and wait for things to get better. Seattle pointed out as an example for soccer. They sold tickets and Portland got excited. They sold 500 tickets on the first day. That's not very many. 500 is not very many season tickets. And then my next question, where is nike in all of this? They paid lebron james \$125 million. I think they could be real involved, like they don't have an

April 15, 2009

outpost in Portland and it could be Nike stadium or whatever, and there could be a source of money there. I think other avenues need to be searched.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony. I appreciate it. You did good.

Richard Potestio: Richard, I'm an architect in Portland. First I'd like to state I don't think I can really follow up on Governor Atiyeh or Doug Oblatz comments. They hit to the heart of the matter. I think Portland's legacy is based in the planning process and that's based in our public process. But what Portland is really uniquely known for is not endless meetings but the fact that Portlanders have always led their elected officials and this is with true vision and action. So in Portland, it's the citizens' legacy that led to projects like Memorial Coliseum, Pioneer Square, light rail, Tom McCall Park and so many wonderfully preserved buildings and parks we have. So I think the council must see its role and advancing the -- and I urge the council to consider the wording and intent of this ordinance, because based on plans presented at the open house last evening, it seems the only option is to demolish Memorial Coliseum. To provide space for a minor league baseball park. Destruction of the Memorial Coliseum is a destruction of more than a great building or historic memorial. It describes a civic act of hope, memory and community. So exemplary of Portland's -- exemplary. To tear it down is an act of vandalism. Long before people built Pioneer Square over the objections of their mayor and vested business interests, they have built the Memorial Coliseum. The Memorial Coliseum was and is to borrow or -- a riff on a metaphor, Portland Eight Family Room. It's a great unifying space with a grand concourse that brought a proud community together in shared expenses and the concourse was a promenade and still can be. Unless I sound too nostalgic. I want to -- many people spoke of this already. Who trades a 12,600-foot venue and exhibition complex for a 7,500-seat fair-weather single-purpose stadium? One can and is repurposed by definition and design hosting hundreds of different events every year. The other would be a static immobile structure hosting dozens of events, weather permitting. And finally as a cyclist, I find it deplorable what is of value in the Rose Quarter is its parking. I don't see the sustainability and sense and logic in this proposal and I ask you to reconsider it.

Adams: Thank you. Gwen.

Gwenn Baldwin: Good afternoon, Gwenn Baldwin representing the Lloyd Executive Partnership. You should have letters -- shortly will have letters, that are signed by members of the board. And I wanted to summarize this letter for the record. Both the Lloyd Executive Partnership and Lloyd -- maximizing the potential of dollars through the urban renewal district. That's scheduled to sunset. It's critical that every budget decision is one that creates that catalytic leverages. We remain committed to three primaries to create jobs. Headquarters Hotel, the Streetcar Loop and the redevelopment of the Oregon Convention Center area and Rose Quarter with an emphasis on sustainability. The hotel alone would create 2100 jobs and 820 long-term jobs according to KPMG. While the siting of the Portland Beaver's stadium at Rose Quarter wasn't a part of the priorities developed over the years, we actually believe it can be a strong added attractor to the entertainment district being planned by Blazers and Portage, as well as the Green District being discussed as an apartment of the Oregon Solutions Project which builds off the Lloyd Crossing plan. These efforts together can create a package of catalytic projects that will create jobs and establish an iconic sustainable neighborhood like no other. It's essential, however, that the entertainment district and the ballpark be sited and funded in a way that's agreeable to the Trail Blazers and Peregrine and makes both achievable financially and if at the end of the day, they exchange Memorial Coliseum for a ballpark, millions of public dollars will have been spent and a facilities district that attracts the civic events goes and not a vibrant neighborhood. That would be an adverse outcome to one truly enlivens the neighborhood. We believe it's possible to have a redevelopment plan that includes an entertainment district and a ballpark and a vibrant neighborhood. We would respectfully request the city council include clarity on funding, siting and operations for both the ballpark and

April 15, 2009

entertainment district in any finding agreements. Putting the word out. We do look forward to looking with the mayor and city council to achieve a dynamic future for the lloyd district.

Fish: Can I ask a question or two?

Baldwin: You may.

Fish: I had the pleasure last spring of meeting with the lloyd executive partnership. I guess the lloyd --

Baldwin: Both, we were in a joint meeting.

Fish: It was an interesting meeting and I got a full briefing on the core primaries of that organization. And what I was told they included headquarter hotel.

*****: Uh-huh.

Fish: Which had been planned for a long period of time.

Baldwin: Beginning of the urban renewal area.

Fish: I believe it was the first priority of that.

Baldwin: Indeed.

Fish: A streetcar loop which had been planned for considerable period of time and some kind of 24-hour district. Around the convention center so it would become a vibrant area that people would choose to recreate and engage.

*****: Uh-huh.

Fish: And I appreciate the fact that those are all initiatives that the organization has worked on for a long period of time and has extensive discussions and negotiations and process. Do you think that in one week we can address the concerns in your letter as to funding and siting with respect to the next generation for the rose quarter?

Baldwin: I don't know. You tell me. We put the parameters out and -- I don't know that it's a week. I don't know that it's five days, I don't know that it's 45 days. You know, the term of the inspection period. I don't know that there's a time specific. I do know there's an outcome. That we're committed to as a group and I think that the -- you know, the perspectives of what that necessary time and process could or should be can vary but this is what the group is very, very committed to. Is that it's important to enliven and to redevelopment the rose quarter and the area in a way that really creates the kind of 24/7 vibrant neighborhood that the city, I think, has been waiting for a very, very long time. And we would look to you to make that possible.

Fish: Thank you.

Adams: Thank you very much for your testimony. Really appreciate it. How much after that? Good afternoon, welcome to city council. Glad you're here.

Richard Mills: My name is richard mills. I didn't come here to make remarks but I realize there's something I would like to say. There's an old saying, haste makes waste and I fear you're in the process of making a lot of waste in the name of haste. As you've heard today, the only reason that the baseball stadium has been coupled with the soccer stadium is bay area because peregrine sports l.l.c. has coupled them. I respectfully urge you to consider decoupling these two items. There is obviously a lot of opposition to the plans to demolish memorial coliseum but I haven't heard any good reason or any reason at all why any decision on the coliseum fate has to be made right now.

Adams: Thanks very much.

Veronica Bernier: Hi. Veronica here from Portland state public health and community health education. Good afternoon, mr. Mayor. Good to see you. Today i'm struggling with bronchitis and i'm having voice failure. You know me from the past and I say hello, too, to commissioner Leonard, our favorite, the one with the most seniority here. And commissioner amanda Fritz.

Leonard: Can I get any more trouble -- i'm the senior citizen on the council.

*****: Let me correct that.

April 15, 2009

Fish: If I cannot, while I may not be your favorite. We're happy to host you on a regular basis. You're welcome to use the front of our office as your office and use the phone and apparently i've slipped in your estimation.

Adams: How much coffee cake has commissioner Leonard bought for you?

Bernier: Lots. I will take you up on that raincheck, mayor Adams, i'm serious. Anyway, commissioner amanda Fritz, that's a joke. It's good to see you, and I welcome your input because i'm a former nurse myself. 20 years and i'm here because of that, primarily. It's an interest in nurses and I also want to say hello to commissioner dan Saltzman, because he's my all-time favorite. I worked for him in the past.

Saltzman: You say that to all of the commissioners.

Bernier: And, of course, nick Fish.

Fish: I think the brand is getting diluted here.

Bernier: Commissioner Fish, your input in housing is well respected and you brought new innovated ideas. About the building, i'm a former cboc and represent five children who are two years old. One is oliver, he's with the [inaudible] group. And he's britain weren't a group and for a non-verbal child to write a book is amaze. And his friend is rick -- he calls him wicky -- and there's another one called tyler and all of those two-year-olds who are preverbal, agree they like it the way it is. I'm speaking to them directly because they took their first walks there. The first steps. And the first steps for a toddler are so important. As children are so important. And they liked that and so they sent me here today. I'm a lobbyist for a two year old group, pre-toddlers, and I want to share i'm a baseball fan and slow-pitch pitcher for the children's hospital memorial s.b. Team and I swing up to bat -- softball team and I like heritage things and older parts of the city and I love the twin towers. It's like an emerald jewel at night, very romantic and I continue to support it as a building in our environment. Thank you very much.

Adams: Thanks. Tom.

Thomas O'Keefe: Commissioners, mayor, my concern is getting rid of the name memorial. I'm a vietnam vet and I have concerns. And if a stadium went up, it be called memorial stadium. During the last review process, for the rose quarter, you invited the korean vets to sit in. During this process, no veterans organization was invited to sit in on those proceedings. And also --

Adams: They were.

O'Keefe: If you look at the list of the people involved, there isn't one veteran organization that sat on that.

Adams: They'll be speaking next. Just so you know.

O'Keefe: My concern is the money involved here. It's the naming rights and they're worth millions of dollars. P.g.e. Park sold for \$8.7 million for a 10-year contract. That expires next year. If you're not aware, p.g.e. Is not going to resign that naming rights agreement. Corporations come and go, veterans don't. So I would not name of civic pride that that stay like that. Also, for fund can the naming rights agreement, mayor katz, i'm sure you're aware, signed an agreement with p.c.l. After Portland family entertainment dissolved to take 3/8 of that money though that agreement wasn't instituted and rescinded at the last moment. And if you look at those records you'll see that too. So I have concerns about money coming ahead of veterans and if a new stadium goes in there, it's called memorial stadium and that monies -- stadium. And it doesn't become a taco bell stadium that we're seeing taking place across the country from corporate stadiums.

Adams: Thanks, tom. Good afternoon, gentlemen. Thanks for waiting.

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

Adams: Glad you're here.

*******:** Pleased to be here as well. Once again, I think probably if I may, i'd like possibly to go over that two minutes.

Adams: Absolutely.

April 15, 2009

Harley Wedel: I've heard several people speak this morning and this afternoon. Oddly enough, only three of them really addressed the reason why the building was there in the first place. It has been a memorial. There's no two ways about it. The one big problem is that the veterans have never been able to use it properly. If you -- I challenge anyone sitting up there or within the room to tell me how many memorial services have been held at the memorial coliseum in 50 years. How many veterans day, memorial day or fourth of July parades have begun or ended at that location? Zilch. Unfortunately, where we're at right now, there's a big to-do about removing a building. We're not trying to get involved in that, but we're saying that the veterans need a location where they can be more in charge of the events that happen. Something where they can control who's on the premises. The -- premises. The idea of making a memorial out of the new stadium, if a new stadium becomes -- or, comes in, that sounds great. And I don't -- I have no problem with it. The big thing is that we definitely need something on the order of a veterans' memorial park with buildings, places where we can display the names of every person that has not returned from our wars since the civil war, or since the territory became a state. So we're really interested in trying to do a proper job out of this. We don't want to take the steam out of anybody, but we just want to make certain that we've been doing our homework. We have seen the odba. They're in favor of this. We've talked to the united veterans group of Oregon and they're in favor of this and there will be letters to that effect very shortly. The whole thing is that quite frankly, everyone i've spoken to - - and i've spoken to -- let's say multi-hundreds -- when I come right down to it, there's been very, very few veterans when they know the entire thought process here, that we want to build a memorial park. There's very few veterans that are not aboard. I would say -- on board. I would there's a place that veterans can use is far more important than any other considerations. I'll stop there and thank you very much.

Adams: Thank you, sir. I appreciate all of your leadership. You've been a stalwart leader.

Tony Stacy: My name is tony spacey. In the past 30 days, we've reached the groups that we call splinter groups that belong to the -- we call splinter groups, the Oregon united veterans groups. The purple heart, the korean war veteran, the v.f.w., the daughters of the revolution. The vietnam veterans, world war I and two, the non-commissioned officers and northwest indians association and the department of defense, while the actions that are actually going on here, when it comes to the memorial, and we've gotten their response. The veterans understand that this is a time period of productivity, and the need for some progress. Few veterans -- the few veterans out there say that you're out to destroy or demolish the memorial. For the record, veterans decommissioned, we do not destroy memorials. We have the becoming of the Oregon department of veterans' fairs on looking into what we've taken to the paulson group and also the trail blazers on how we can memorialize veterans other than the walls that are currently there represent, which is a 12-mile radius of veterans from world war ii and the korean war. Our hope is to memorialize all veterans of all conflicts. As a buildings person, I intimately know the insides and out of the memorial coliseum. I've put together many events there -- the time has come for this building to taken a look at very seriously. When they say there are 150 events that do take place there, that's true. What they bring in is not enough to sustain the building. I know, I set up these events. I challenge the architect groups to come in and have an event at the memorial coliseum. I don't believe I can remember one event or meeting that was held there and i've done so also with the veterans groups. This thing has been going on for five years and resurrects every three to five years but only when somebody says it's time to move on and forward. In closing, we will continue to notify all these veterans groups as to how it plays out. We support any movement that shows it creates jobs, that brings economic stimulus and memorializes veterans. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you, gentlemen, very much. And thanks for serving on the mls taskforce. If it's ok for council, I have a human need to have a quick recess to use the restroom. I'd like to call a 10-minute recess.

April 15, 2009

Leonard: We're done with this and it moves to second reading?

Adams: We'll have additional discussion when we get back. In recess for 10 minutes. [gavel pounded]

At 1:27 p.m., Council recessed.

At 1:39 p.m., Council reconvened.

Adams: Council will reconvene. That's great news. Council will reconvene of. The two items under discussion and we appreciate the public testimony on it. Which is items 427 and 431. We'll be joined next week at I believe our time certain next week is at 10:00 a.m., is that right, Karla, on the 22nd?

Moore-Love: No, these do not have a time certain. We can give them a 10:00 a.m. time certain.

Adams: Perfect. And they'll be joined by the -- a resolution, a draft resolution on the siting issue. But today, aired out a lot of the good, a lot of the critical issues, important issues and a really appreciate all of the testimony. This is a difficult issue. There's no question about it. Commissioner Fish.

Fish: Thank you, mayor. I want to say first thanks for the emails, articles and phone calls and other materials. We have a mountain of stuff to go through and having a week to sift through it and collect our thoughts makes sense. This is a tough issue and reasonable people can disagree. I want to call out we have a tradition of not engaging in personal attacks on other commissioners and I want to call out commissioner Leonard, because I think he crossed the line. In the paper he was quoted saying that the coliseum is a nearly 50 year old building, 50 year old plumbing and 50 year odd heating and roof and is in a sad state of disrepair. [laughter] commissioner Leonard's tendency to speak in riddles and metaphors knows he was speaking about me. [laughter] and this was brought to my attention by someone who pointed out the following so-called coincidence. I happen to be 50 years old. My plumbing does not work the way it used to. [laughter] my heating and ventilation system needs to be replaced. And anybody who sees me bend over --

*****: Oh, no.

Fish: Knows that my roof needs a little work.

*****: Oh, ok.

Leonard: That was getting warm for a second. [laughter]

Fish: There are people in my life who have acknowledged or told me that i'm in a sad state of disrepair. But what I take particular exception to is that you went on to make the argument that this justified the coliseum's deconstruction and I want you to know, commissioner, I think we can debate this at a higher plane and I actually personally think i'm at the prime of my life. I'd like to place on the record and we can move past that nature of this.

Leonard: I humbly apologize.

Adams: We have three items all related to each other at 10:00 next week. Please read the title for council calendar item 428.

Item 428.

Adams: So commissioner Fritz and I took great interest in the details of this ordinance and have had an opportunity to grill staff. And so, could you please give us some detail on what this ordinance is about. And why it's an emergency.

Tom Feely, Office of Management and Finance: I'm from the office of finance. Financial management. It's been a long morning. With me is city fleet manager John Hunt. This ordinance would authorize the purchase of 61 police patrol vehicles. They'll replacement for vehicles reaching the end of their lifespan. There's some urgency to this in order to get the order in. It's a large fleet order and with uncertainty in the auto industry and reaching the end of the model year, we need to get the order in in order to be filled.

April 15, 2009

Adams: Questions from council? Thank you, gentlemen. Karla please call the roll on item 428.

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

Fritz: Thank you for your diligence and mr. Hunt, I have a nasty feeling this is the third time i'm going to reschedule my meeting with you. Nothing personal. I appreciate your understanding that things come up.

*******:** Well, we appreciate the opportunity to sit down and visit with you at some point.

Fritz: I'm sure it will happen. Aye.

*******:** Very good.

Adams: Aye. [gavel pounded] 428 is approved. Please read the title for 429.

Item 429.

Adams: Good afternoon.

Connie Johnson, Office of Management and Finance: Good afternoon.

Adams: Thanks for waiting.

Johnson: Thank you. Connie Johnson, project manager with [inaudible] facilities. Basically this is a maintenance project for smart park garages downtown. Coating the driving surfaces and the top decks. The garages are aging. And the driving surfaces particularly and water intrusion is causing problems so we want to do a system-wide recoating.

Adams: Questions from council? Karla, please call the roll assuming there's no one here to testify.

Fish: Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Adams:** Aye. [gavel pounded] 429 is approved. Could you please read the title for nonemergency 430.

Item 430.

Johnson: I'm also the project manager for that one. So basically Kleinfelder geotechnical engineers, we're remodeling fire station one and they had to be on-site during the jet grouting procedure and the time ran long for them.

Adams: Questions from council.

Fritz: I have a question. It says the total contract was \$86,000 or something. That's not including the jet grouting. Do you remember the total cost?

Johnson: It's \$9.7 million.

Fritz: That's what I figured. You did it nicely for \$87,000. Thank you so much.

Adams: This is a non-emergency and move to next week's calendar for council consideration.

Could you please call -- yeah, call the roll for second reading of council calendar item 432 after you read the title.

Item 432.

Fish: We had a chance last week to thank Anne Naito-Campbell and her family for their extraordinary generosity and the Parks Foundation for what they do. Aye.

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

Fritz: It's a terrific partnership with Portland Parks and Recreation, you did a great job with that bureau after Commissioner Saltzman's leadership and I appreciate the Portland Parks Foundation in particular, having experienced the benefit of their work in my neighborhood. Aye.

Adams: Aye. [gavel pounded] please call the roll for council calendar 433.

Item 433.

Adams: Please call the roll.

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

Fritz: I just have to comment it was interesting last week when it was said there were various names suggested and then the committee came up with the final one and it's a wonderful choice and it's delightful to have the park named after Elizabeth Caruthers. It's really nice. Aye.

Adams: Great work. Great name. Aye. [gavel pounded] 433 is approved. Could you please read the title for 434.

April 15, 2009

Item 434.

Adams: Would there be any possible reason why we wouldn't support this? [laughter] hearing none, could you please call the roll.

Fish: Matt, thank you for indemnifying the city in case there's any -- in the event there's any problem with the conveyance, aye.

Adams: It's a superfund site.

Saltzman: This is a properly purchased under the bureau of environmental services willing seller program and we want to thank the glasco estate. Aye.

Leonard: Aye. **Fritz:** Aye.

Adams: Aye. [gavel pounded] would you please read the title for emergency ordinance 435.

Item 435.

Saltzman: We operate about 9,000 of those publicly owned sumps east of the willamette and with water quality objectives by the state.

Adams: Any discussion on 435? Please call the roll.

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

Adams: Aye. [gavel pounded] 435 is approved. Could you please read the title for non-emergency item 436.

Item 436.

Adams: Sounds like a great deal.

Saltzman: I want to say this is a good deal and we want to thank fred meyers for their \$50,000 contribution to enhance the neighborhood around s.e. 38th and main by beautifying the streetscapes and putting in stormwater friendly landscaping.

Fritz: Do you know what the total cost the project is?

Saltzman: I don't know that. We can find out. I do know that linda from fred meyer was here earlier and she had to leave but we'll find out if there was a city match or not.

Fritz: Thank you.

Adams: Moves to a second reading. Can you read the title for the second reading 437.

Item 437.

Adams: Please call the roll.

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

Adams: Aye. [gavel pounded] council is recessed until thursday at 6:00 p.m. Thank you all.

At 1:51 p.m., Council recessed.

April 16, 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.

APRIL 16, 2009 6:00 PM

Adams: Call the roll.

[roll call]

Adams: Our agenda item is 438. Karla, will you please read the council item.

Item 438.

Adams: Thank you, Karla. Commissioner Leonard.

Leonard: Thank you, mayor Adams. And thank you to everybody that has come here tonight for this really truly very important discussion about permitting construction in Portland. I apologize for coming in late. But we literally were just printing off the latest versions of what we are going to be discussing tonight. The last few days, commissioner Fish, mayor Adams, myself, our staffs, and principals at the city have been discussing some of the concerns that we have heard, and attempting to reasonably address those that we agreed needed to be addressed, and those that we didn't think were reasonable, we have left in the original ordinance. So what we are proposing now as a substitute report, which there are copies of. Karla, you have. You have how many?

*******:** We set additional copies over there.

Leonard: There are some additional copies here. Karla has copies. But I will explain to you just in general terms the changes that the staff setting up the table in front of me will go into more detail on. But essentially, commissioner Fish and I and mayor Adams' office worked on these until just moments ago to have them ready. And the essence of the changes that we heard loud and clear, that a number of people were concerned, maybe not so much about the transfers of employs to the 1900 building but the actual literal reassignment of them to the bureau of development services. So what we are proposing here is colocation but they would report back to their original bureaus' chain of command but with some caveats. And the caveats are really performance measurements that paul and andy peterson up here will get into in some more detail along with ty but essentially part of the concern that has existed for years in development in the city is the inordinate length of time it takes to have some decisions made. And where that's unavoidable, it's unavoidable and we need to understand that. Where it is, as a result of factors that the city can control in terms of reducing time lines, we need to address that. And this report makes those requirements of those other bureaus to address specific time line concerns. And finally, we will meet back in one year, july 1st, 2010, to assess what happened in the upcoming year in terms of how well this performed. Assess at that time whether or not the system that we are experimenting with, starting this july 1st, works well. And if so, what needs to be done to improve it. But on july 1st, 2010, the city will make a final decision as to whether or not to proceed to full consolidation. I want to thank commissioner and his staff for their really creative thinking particularly today in helping us find this middle ground and ask commissioner Fish if he would like to say anything.

Fish: Thank you, commissioner Leonard. I am first want to begin by thanking and saluting you and mayor Adams for your leadership on this issue. As a number of impeach on the team that have done yeoman's work, I would like to thank them as well starting with paul scarlet and ty kovach, andy peterson, anna and hannah in particular. We would not be at the place we are today without your exemplary work. The proposal which we are submitting for consideration today I call colocation plus. It takes, it incorporates some of the best ideas that have been developed by a

April 16, 2009

variety of stakeholders, public and private. And my judgment it gives us the best path at this time to meet a number of the very ambitious goals you have set out for this process. And they include strengthening and improving our current permitting system. Creating new and verifiable performance measurements and enhancing the system of checks and balances, which ensures that the concerns of all stakeholders are addressed in the permitting process. Again, this would -- this particular proposal would not be possible without the leadership of mayor Adams and commissioner Leonard. I want to thank you both, and I am pleased to join with you in presenting this to our colleagues for consideration.

Leonard: At this point -- do you have anything -- do we need --

Adams: Do I have a motion? I don't know who to --

Fish: I would move the substitute.

Leonard: Seconded.

Adams: It's been moved and seconded to substitute the original council calendar item for this package. Is there additional -- well, we will have -- obviously the substitute means that discussion now is on the substitute. So, Karla, would you please call the roll.

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

Adams: Aye. [gavel pounded] motion is approved.

Leonard: Now I would turn it over to the bureau of development services director paul scarlett along with him is andy peterson, one of his top managers at the bureau, and my chief of staff ty kovach. Paul?

Paul Scarlett, Director, Bureau of Development Services: Good evening and thank you, commissioner Leonard. Paul scarlett, bureau of development services director. I am excited to be in front of you and to present on the report that has been revised, but a number of the elements and objectives are still in place. For many years, certainly 12, 15 years, we have heard from our customers, we have heard from the public about the permitting system, and the number of things that do work well and identifying things that haven't worked well or things that have been missing. And we have, through mayor Adams's resolution back in january, researched and really analyzed the current permitting and plan review system. And we're able to formulate a report that incorporated a number of factors aimed at efficiencies, aimed at increased coordination, aimed at accountability, aimed at conflict resolution, and aimed at enhancing training for staff in the form of policy coordination and solution-oriented approaches. The city, as you all know, we are proud city. We are known for livability. We are known for recycling. We are known for an environmental qualities. And as with a lot of other things, how we develop as a city and the regulations that are in place is tantamount to how successful and how attractive this city is. We have been in the business of regulating development since 1892. And the first building permit was issued in 1905. Just a way of context.

Adams: It took that long to approve the permit?

Scarlett: This is nothing new. We have been that the for some time. Certainly a lot of us have years of experience in this business. We also have years of experience in working with our customers, and trying to improve upon what's here. I believe one of the things that's real centered in this revised updated report is that there is mutual objective in achieving an improved system. And we have details about what that means in the recommendations to council. And with effective date being july 1st for some of the objectives. But really at the heart of this, we want to be known not just as the city that works but the city that works well together. And we have the opportunity in front of us to continue to work closely, as interagency partners, as customers, neighborhood associations, and the various entities that play a large role in how well the city is developed, how well the permitting and plan review processes are managed, and promoted. And so I would like to turn to andy peterson, who will go into some of the more details of the recommendation there front of you, and as well as ty kovach. Thank you.

April 16, 2009

Andy Peterson, Bureau of Development Services: Thank you, paul. Hello, commissioners. Andy peterson, manager of development services. Permitting services. Our recommendation this evening captures some of the key components of the initial report that was provided a week ago. The elements here I think are those that are in common. I think the interagency team that was formed as part of their original aspects of the resolution came to an agreement on many of these things, many of these issues in that there are concerns that can be resolved by having staff work more closely together, by working with consistent time lines, having a clear and transparent process, being able to find resolution to conflicts, all of those pieces are involved in the recommendations that we are providing here. I think the number of staff moving to the 1900 building remain effectively the same. I think there's a two or three individual difference. I think the intent is to have the work take place at the bureau of development services building at 1900 fourth avenue. The intent is to try to have people be able to come in, get their needs and concerns met in one spot for their development review process. As far as the recommendations that we are proposing at this time is to colocate people as opposed to transfer and absorb them into the bureau of development services. I think this meets and matches some of the concerns that were addressed early on or expressed early on by both interagency and oversight committees that were formed. Both those groups provided us with guidance and information and insight as to how that work could progress. We have taken that to heart. We've worked with commissioner Fish as well as commissioner Leonard's office, the mayor's office to come to meeting. Based on that our recommendations include colocation of the programs, accomplish those review processes that are inherently addressing the needs of the development review process. The development of the employ transition and support plan for folks that are moving to the building will continue to exist. It's important to us to be able to have those folks feel like they are not isolated, that they are able to enhance their own careers and their own objectives by working closely with the bureau of development services staff, and actually see a little bit different perspective from the development services staff including inspectors, plan review, set rae, get a broader gamut of experience in the development process. There was certainly mention of creating an effective conflict resolution measure. We wouldn't anticipate that to move forward in this revised process. As well as establishing turn around times and meeting those turn around goals for plan review for both building permits and establishing and meeting turn around times for public works permitting, which has been a concern that's been voiced from both the development community as well as internal staff in getting those permits moving forward in a timely basis and getting decisions made on those. There's expression of trying to get at least a standardized approval for systems development charges, whether it's so that as you come in the door you understand what you're expected to submit, what the programs can provide for the applicant as far as the same waiver programs for low-income proposals, -sdc deferrals and sdc financing. The cost associated with, again, the colocation as with the original proposal was to have those borne by the infrastructure bureaus, the bureaus moving into the bureau of development services building. That would remain the same. And a year from now we would report back to council on the effectiveness of this colocation experiment, trial run on this and see how well things have progressed, how the improvements have been made and to continue that in that vein or to look at efficiencies and effective measures for the forthcoming year. I think in essence that's kind of the resolution at this point is our recommendation as to try to move those pieces forward. It's basically the plan in a synopsis to try to pull together the benefits of consolidation without having those be retained within the bureaus, home bureaus, infrastructure bureaus as they exist today.

Leonard: Thank you, andy. Did you have anything to add?

Ty Kovatch, Commissioner Leonard's Office: The only thing I would add is in the broader context of this discussion, it has been -- high name is ty kovatch. I am commissioners Leonard's chief of staff. Thank you, sir. The broader context of this is that only in this room necessarily do

April 16, 2009

we consider that the permitting system is p-bought and bds and water and parks and all the various entity that is touch a permitted on its way through the system. And from the general public's perspective and from our customers' perspectives it is "the city." the endeavor we are trying to underday with this report is to address the stated concern that maybe there's another way to get to the goal that consolidation pursues which is a more functional permitting system and to agree that we will give that to that a shot but in concert with that, we add to that a series of steps that can be taken by the various bureaus that are involved to develop a system that, even if the bureaus aren't under a single authority, they have a fairly uniform and common approach to delivering their services, which to the public, appear to be relatively similar in making sure our infrastructure is developed in a thoughtful way and making sure our buildings are instructed in -- constructed in a thoughtful way and making sure they are done in areas of the city that are appropriate. And so in our thought this is a good opportunity for the infrastructure bureaus to really make the case that they have been making with their words so far, that we can get there without going to full consolidation by taking the steps that are outlined in the report. So we will just be ready for questions if you have.

Adams: Discussion from council. Commissioner Fritz.

Fritz: First I commend commissioner Leonard and commissioner Fish for coming forward with this proposal. There are any new positions created?

Peterson: Not in the scope of this proposal.

Fritz: Do we have an estimate for how much the moving costs will be?

Peterson: The estimate for the moving costs will be -- we do. Estimates for the moving costs including all the appropriate will be approximately \$250,000, which is tad less than what our original proposal was.

Fritz: Can you talk to me a little bit why land use reviews are included in the colocation proposal.

Peterson: Part of the reason for that land use reviews being included is that so those staff are there to actually answer the questions and work coordinately with the and cooperatively with the people that are doing the plan review, the people that are doing the land use reviews, that are compiling the land use reviews. Primarily the infrastructure bureaus provide information to the land use planner. To date, while time lines may be method, oftentimes the information is less coordinated than it could be. We are trying to improve on that. We are trying to look at this as a collaborated experience, a coordinated experience between the land use planners that are writing the report as well as those that are providing information to that planner. Having them back at the Portland building increases the chasm between that information flow. Frankly, it's difficult to have that information at hand at all times while those folks are back at Portland building doing, if they are working in that arena. So having them in the 1900 building gives them a proximity to the information and to the solutions that are being contemplated and finally concluded at that stage.

Fritz: And how do you see them taking their links with the policies being discussed in the bureaus?

Peterson: Very similar to how they are now. I think that the policy pieces are probably not moving in some ways as fast as the land use cases are. Therefore, a greater expanse between their check-in is probably sufficient. There's -- it's not like we are going to build a wall between those land use planners at the 1900 building and those at the Portland building. It's just that the day to day activities and the intensity of the work on the land use cases is relatively high and can be fast and needing frequent check-ins with the land use planner. So the latest rendition of the latest version of the proposal can be reviewed and commented on.

Fritz: On number three where it says "create an effective conflict resolution process to address policy and code conflicts between bureaus," might that include feedback from the development review advisory committee to the development review advisory committee to the planning

April 16, 2009

commission, to the storm water advisory committee, oversight? Is that part of what you are thinking in terms of concept, conflict resolution?

Peterson: I think that could be part of it. I think that there's an intent there to have the infrastructure bureaus expand on that. What is it that they can do now and what can they look towards in the future to help that work better atlantic it does today.

Fritz: As part of that discussion?

Peterson: Yeah.

Fritz: Ok. We don't have a time line for that? That's -- so that's part of the work promise?

Peterson: Part of the working plan for the upcoming year.

Fritz: Thank you. There's been some letters of concern about the forestry inspectors moving to the land use -- moving to the 1900 building. Wondered if you could address that concern. That they do other things other than land use reviews and permit reviews.

Peterson: Sure. In speaking with the tree inspectors from urban forestry and the parks bureau, we have had a conversation on some of their emergency response pieces, which was the only item that was highlighted to me from their concern. And I think we've reached a beginning of an understanding on the fact that their services much like others within the city, are on emergency basis, are necessary for the safety of the city, the occupants, the citizens here and we wouldn't want to impinge upon their first response to those emergencies. As much like our staff currently responds to floods and other disasters, not only here but in surrounding communities, we would anticipate that same occurring with urban foresters.

Fritz: Thank you.

Adams: Any further discussion with the council? All right. Are there any other panelists invited ?

Leonard: There is not.

Scarlett: No. Sorry. I wanted to, I was remiss in recognizing some of the committees that worked with us on the report. I want to first thank you, mayor Adams, and commissioner Leonard for your support and correction in moving towards developing a proposal for improving the permitting system. And commissioner Saltzman and commissioner Fritz and, of course, commissioner Fish, for your support as well. And we work closely with interagency team that was members from the infrastructure bureaus of water bureau, transportation, b.e.s., fire, and parks. And those were putting in work sessions over four months. As well we met with oversight committee that was made up of members of the community, with different interests focus, and that group was facilitated by rebecca esau who did a splendid job in facility take thing those discussions and compiling those concerns. That's part of what's been presented here. As well as alisa core who assisted in our communication work in with definitely be embarrassed to not mention and thank andy peterson who worked tirelessly over this period of time, put in various versions of the report together --

Leonard: Including evenings and weekends.

Scarlett: And weekends and I was there with him some of them. So thank you.

Leonard: Thank you both.

Adams: Thank you both very much. All right. Let's --

Leonard: Actually --

Adams: We have more?

Leonard: I did ask dctu if they would like to come up as a panel. Are those folks present? Mark?

Adams: Buzz? Thanks, gentlemen. Stick around. Welcome to the city council. Glad you're here. All you have to do is give us your name. You will have an unlimited amount of time to talk.

Mark Bello: Oh, ok. That's nice. My name is mark bellow, president of our address is coppea 536, Portland, 97207. Coppea is an interesting organization. Like the council we don't have one particular bureau that we represent or one particular bureau's interest or one particular classification. We have members in almost every bureau. Parenthetically, let me say you can ignore the

April 16, 2009

testimony that I am providing you in writing because it is no longer relevant. Those are all the good presents why did you what you may be doing tonight.

Fish: That's the first time I remember during my service that someone appearing before us told us to disregard their testimony. [laughter] I think we are setting a healthy precedent.

Bello: We are pleasantly surprised. So we represent members, professionals and environmental services, transportation, water, as well as development services, not parks. We in our testimony and still do support the January resolution that called for improving development review. We thought we could provide the most value to you tonight by basically being a little bit administrative in thinking and talk about that resolution, and how we grant success or get to success. That resolution is about timeliness, predictability, consistency, transparency and accountability. Auction to us is an important issue that was most likely to be hurt in the sense of not thinking out the whole process of colocation consolidation. And that's because accountability is a very tricky issue. You have auction, meaning the city to both the permit seeker and to the neighbor, to the neighborhood. And a sustainable sense to future generations because so much developments has elements of sustainability versus short-term profit. So our comments were that we think that colocation and the process where a neighborhood advocate or an environmentalist, person who is very interested in sustainability and sees some flaws or some possibilities perhaps in an adjustment request, which is a request to vary the code can talk not just to the implementer, the b.d.s., but have the conversation with the environmental engineer and those, say, in b.e.s. Who may have been interested in storm water issues. So we thought there was a danger in the original proposal in saying we will get two too process oriented, we will not be able to have that conversation about not just what is best for the process, what is the fiscal aspect of this project but what happens if we don't go for perhaps that storm water proposal what longer time frame and a longer payoff? So we thought it was really important that you consider providing for that. And I think this proposal, I celebrate the proposal because I think it provides very measured way to address those administrative issues. And in terms of consistency, we still look to blueprint 2000 to be fully implemented. There were so many difficult issues there about coordination that the funny thing about blueprint 2000 was, of course, as part of it we built the building up the hill so we automatically decreased coordination. The number of times in which there was one planner one place and an engineer in another place, and you simply can't get together, is a problem. So we think that this next year will really provide an opportunity to solve some of those physical problems. I thank you for reducing the cost because as you know copia has put on the table a proposal that we work fewer hours for less pay in an attempt to help the city with its budget concerns and we think spending money wisely is much more available than laying people off. And finally, and the reason I gave you this rehashed or rephrased presentation is, I have to tell you that unfortunately, coppea and our members were not part of the process. It was very disappointing. Managers were invited. Managers are not part of coppea. My members often had very legitimate concerns and ideas that they were not actually part of the conversation. So we have a specific request that coppea be part of any oversight committee, not just be allowed to attend, not be told that's the union's position because I guarantee that we will put on our administrative hat and we will help the city succeed. Because as professionals, we really want to get past the hurdle. We really want to provide better service to not only the development community but to the neighborhood and to our members, you know, in terms of career advancement.

Adams: Mr. Beetle. Thank you for that.

Richard Beetle: My name is richard beetle. I am business manager for labor's local 43. I want to thank the mayor and the commissioners for allowing us to step forward and talk about this issue. I would like to put a little correction in. I want not the spokesperson for the dctu. That's james hester. He is a colleague of mine. I am not him while I greatly admire him. The secretary treasurer of the dctu. I am here to speak in the interest of labor's local 43 and our concerns. We have three

April 16, 2009

contract with the city. We have the rec contract. We have the dctu contract and we have the seasonable contract. And so within those interests that I am concerned. And my concern is mainly anxieties and fears because of the unknown. I would like to look at new proposal. It sounds like it might address some of my fears and anxieties which I hope it does but let me share with you the reason I was concerned. I represent eight forestry inspectors currently work at urban forestry in the parks bureau. I understand that three of those eight forestry inspectors were due to be transferred to b.d.s. The permit consolidation report did not address the impact of the consolidation has on our urban forestry services. Here's where 43's concerns lie. Urban forestry now performs multiple jobs. Expert technical advisers, coordinators and instructors for parks, street managers, for community groups and property owners. Inspectors reviewers of public and private tree plans, utilities, buildings, land use permits, tree removal and planning permits. There are -- they are also the first responders to a tree emergency. The three forestry inspectors who would go to b.d.s. Now respond to city wide community and property owners' needs. But in the future it would focus on more development and permitting. Compared to other bureaus that are involved, this looks like a big impact on a small but very important program. Who will help communities clean up after wind didn't falls and after the next big storm? The park bureau's budget advisory committee ranked tremayne nance as the third highest priority of the 31 park services in the proposed '09-10 budget. While improving permit services, we hope the council will also prioritize keeping this basic city service intact. It's in light of the oversight committee's many concerns that council may wish to take more time to refine this proposal, which it has, which I champion. Whether the council decides to take more time or to act now on full permit consolidation local 43 would respectfully request that you carve out the urban forestry component until we have more time to assess the impact on this valuable service. We want to make sure that in the process of improving one bureau, we are not destroying the ability of another to respond to emergency services. This is my more narrow view of this consolidation. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you, gentlemen. Appreciated it. Now we can go to it sign-up. So you will have three minutes tonight. But trust me, you can say in two minutes very effectively what can be said in three. [laughter] just eliminate all the prepositions. Welcome to the city council. You only need to give us your first and last name.

Bridget Bayer: I'm bridget bayer. I work part time for the Portland community college small business development center. And I am a business owner in Portland. I have been for 12 years. I had bridge's cafe on m.l.k. Many of you may have been there. It's doing well. Thank you. It was a huge struggle to open the restaurant. I was a first-time small business restaurant owner. I had been in the business for 28 years already so I had a lot of experience there but not in owning and developing a business. It was a real eye opener and a huge challenge. I did have a great bit of support actually from the city of Portland getting it open even the inspectors. It was a huge challenge. Right now, what I do for a living is, I work with small business owners starting their business, expanding, growing their business. Our center in Portland has 30 advisers right now I have 40 clients. We served over 900 clients last year collectively in the year 2008. The economy has forced a lot of people out of a job but into the small business ownership role. And so in the last three months, we have already served 450 clients in our center. And we help people open their business. We send people to the city of Portland, as well as many other resources here that are available to assist business owners. So I want to encourage you to consolidate the permitting process. It will make a huge difference in their success.

Adams: We are going to set the clock for two unless you tell us you want three and if you want three we will give it to you.

Jim Labbe: I'll go with three. [laughter] my name is jim labbe. Good evening.

Adams: Welcome. Glad you're here.

April 16, 2009

Labbe: My name is jim labbe. I am on staff of audubon society. A six-year member of the johns creek water council. I haven't had time to look certainly at the proposal, the new proposal, and haven't had a lot of time to look at the original one either but I am here to really impress on you the importance of maintaining independent review. Technically form and grounded in the knowledge of the community in the review of development applications. Particularly as it relates to enforcing the city's environmental safe guards. I have been working, I serve, I am chair of the land use committee with the watershed council and review a lot of development applications from across the five cities and two counties that cover the watershed and I can't impress upon you more the importance of having this connection to local knowledge of the community around these natural resources and b.e.s. Staff, they provide a real critical, in the development review process, a critical source of technical knowledge, harbor technical knowledge related to the watershed. I'm a liaison to the watershed council's local knowledge, and I -- numerous occasions I have experienced situations where b.e.s. Staff that's located in the bureau where they are doing a lot of range of planning and restoration work can bring to bear information from the watershed council from their technology that is really critical to identifying unmapped streams, seeps, areas, things that wouldn't have been identified, guarantee if it was up to b.d.s., so having that separation of powers, having the sources of information, having the community, the process liaison to the community to provide that information is one of the real values of the existing process. And I understand that there's always this press to make the development review process go faster. The natural processes that the city is trying to protect and safe guard through applying some environmental rules are operate over decades or centuries or more. It is worth the time to get the information to make sure development happens a way that doesn't degrade the environmental values of our urban watershed and our investments, substantial investments we are making in enhancing and restoring those watersheds. So I think a lot of the delay problems have to do with understaffing and I think there's other solutions that really need to be explored. Thank you. 8.

Adams: I appreciate your testimony. And the desire to achieve the city's goals and policies related to the environment, both the natural environment and the built environment, are really important. And a key motivation for me to seek reform. And one thing that's not on the list but is in the sort of accompanying material that is city doesn't have performance measures for attainment of our policies related to the environment. And we only keep on the in terms of permitting, and my expectation with this reform is that bell start to do that. That it shouldn't be solely based upon independent judgment. And we have got great folks in our system. So I expect that to move forward. And the other thing just to sort of put out there is, as someone who wants us to be not just the greenest city, the most sustainable city in the nation which we are ranked consistently near the top, but there are a lot of cities and regions nipping at our heels, you know, and I want us to push further on international standards. Is some of the complaints I get the loudest and most consistently are from some of the greenest developments that developers seek to undertake here in the city. So my hope is that with this change and this is a great change, that we will see progress on both accountability against goals, environmental goals, and we will also see the ability of our system to better deal with the innovations around sustainable buildings. Thank you for being here today.

*****: Hi. I think I can do this in two minutes.

Adams: Great.

Darise Weller: My name is darise weller. One of my greatest concerns is the cost of the project. It would seem to at a time's budget crisis that it's not wise to consolidate under b.d.s. All permitting and planning services and incur a large expense in doing so. The low estimate of \$640,000 which I just heard was revised down to \$250,000 for the actual moving expenses only included \$40,000 for the technical cost of that move, which could be greatly more. And I have heard of estimated costs to actually operate that consolidation have been \$2 million to \$3 million. I don't know if that's a correct figure or not but it just seems that to be ludicrous to me at this point when considering our

April 16, 2009

education system, our transportation system, and our immediate need to attain sustainability, our attention for sustainability in order to save our planet, all desperately need to receive greater priority than this consideration. My second point was rendered moot by the amendment. Thank you for that. Although I might like to add that as far as being in two buildings, I think the u.s., as I can well attest to, needs exercise and walking between those two buildings might do us all some good. And another point is if you do drive, and you were lucky enough to get a three-hour parking meter, you probably are still going to have to move that car so again it warrants moving. And my last point would be that there needs to be review done by the development review committee, the planning commission along with community input to the validity of this as to whether or not the process will meet the goals. Serious discussion needs take place before the consolidation of the departments proceed and a potentially huge and I guess maybe not reversible but great expense to reverse it, expensive mistake occurs. I think we need to get our priorities straight. Let's try to save our planet first.

Adams: Thanks for your testimony, all of you. Appreciate it. Karla?

Fish: If I may, mayor, I omitted a person of my initial thanks that I regret. I want to just acknowledge the work of sarah petrocini. She was instrumental to the work we did this afternoon.

Adams: Thank you, sarah. Welcome to the city council. Glad you're here. You just need to give us your first and last name.

Carrie Schilling: I am carrie schilling. I am testifying today on behalf of the development review advisory committee as the present vice chair of that committee. We have issued written testimony, which I believe you all have, in the form of a letter signed by myself and the committee chair, steve.

This outlines the majority opinion of support of the development review and permitting consolidation plan dated april 9th. This letter speaks to our approval of the plan and acknowledges the concerns voiced in opposition of a few members of our committee. I am also testifying today personally as a practicing architect and development team member. Citizens and professionals have been working for years to encourage a consolidated and have expressed concerns surrounding problems that this plan aims to do. Other plans have been proposed only to fall short due to bureau resistance. We now have a mayor and commissioners that have brought this important issue to the surface and have been initiated the step in the right direction. Consolidation shifts the burden of conflict resolution off the applicant. The bureau's customers, and on to a body with proper abilities to effect resolution. Under the current system, applicants faced with contradicting bureaus must work through a silo system of regulators using a system of appeals and lobbying methods. Often working amongst controversial issues and within process was no time lines or concerns of impact outside their own regulations. As we of the city move forward, toward a denser urban fabric those areas of conflict between the bureaus will only become more pronounced. This transition will be difficult. Bureaus' cultures will shift and clash and folks will be forced to work through some issues. Those same issues and conflict that the bureau expect the applicants, their customers, to deal with at every turn today. Please take this step toward more effective review process. It is long overdue.

Adams: Thank you very much for your testimony. Martin.

Martin Medieros: Hello. My name is martin, and I am here today speaking on behalf of the small business, on behalf of the small business advisory council as its chairman. The express purpose is to identify and review regulation, policies and issues that effect small business formation, capital formation, job creation, growth, and prosperity. The current b.d.s. Proposal seeks to incorporate suggestions and those of other partners. This believe this node will help create and retain family-wage jobs, help small businesses and their development, and aid the city's economic recovery by delivering a development permitting system that increases responsiveness, efficiency, accountability, and is also clear, concise and understandable for users of the system. Why is this consolidation being proposed now? Because time is running out for some businesses. These are

April 16, 2009

businesses that are considered -- considering locating in Portland but decided to go elsewhere because of the current defused permitting process made it impossible for these businesses to get information they needed to make informed decisions in a timely manner. Defused permitting is unfair. Ambiguity and owe paucity in fee setting is oppressive in general. If fees cannot be determined by asking a series of consolidated questions, then they cannot be evenly applied. And that is unfair. The s beck approaches it will not be an easy task. It I take time and require interagency cooperation but s beck has worked with many of these agencies to solve other problems and believes the city is up to the task. In this budget cycle and business cycle, many bureaus are concerned with delivery of service. Paul scarlet who leads b.d.s. Use as different phrases heard today, customer service. He knows that his customers will lead the way out of this recession. Any agency that sees business as an adversary has not been to a meeting who can listen to people like paul. The s beck is focused on problem solving as are the agencies that regularly attend these meetings. Therefore s beck fully supports any proposal by b.d.s.'s leadership that shares our mission and understands the role of small business in restoring prosperity to the city with job growth. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony. Hi.

Alesia J. Reese: I am alesia reese. And my comments were written before the many amendments. I represent the woodland park neighborhood association and I am originally opposed to the permit consolidation ordinance. The neighborhoods have not been informed of the impacts the ordinances will have or the impacts to the bureaus and their operations in relationship to neighborhoods. The cost of the organize sew -- reorganization is really not a consolidation. It's now we know quarter of a million dollars. As they have been identified. What percentage, for example, will come from the parks bureau budget? How will this reorganization influence neighborhood land use committees? Parks committees? Transportation committees and urban renewal advisory committees? And at what cost will these neighborhood groups be impacted? Where will these additional expenses come from? The process for the reorganization has not really been completed, as we have witnessed tonight, with a coming hot off the press. And the outreach to the neighborhood coalitions, schools districts, and east Portland business association, has not been performed. The major question is, and with regards to my neighbor, the major questions i, why? And why now? What emergency exists which bypasses the acceptable and best practices of the current outreach system? While woodland park has experienced both successes and challenges from the current permit and enforcement system, there's been no emergency demonstrated where circumstances steam rolling this ordinance today for such a swift and measured action. Hold on. Slow down. And consider the users, all of the users of the system before you dismantle it and expect bureaus to continue operating normally with this extensive retro fitting of personnel. Who will pay for it? And thank you again for having an evening meeting.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony. Karla, the next three. Good evening. Welcome to the city council. Glad you are here.

*******:** Evening.

Adams: You probably know the drill.

Douglas Klotz: I will try for three. Douglas klotz. I am a long time pedestrian advocate in the city. And I had quite a few concerns about the proposal up until tonight. Still have some concerns. But certainly a lot of concerns are relieved by this proposal tonight. Especially, of course, I am concerned about how transportation permitting decisions will be affected by this colocation. And it's certainly not as much concern as the previously but it's -- the interaction between the folks doing the permitting and all the other folks in pdot are one of my main concerns. I don't think any of the very few transportation permitting decisions, some minor ones but a lot of them draw from several different disciplines. You talk -- the permitting official has to know transportation engineering, and construction, and pedestrian design guide, title xvii, there's a lot of decisions that a lot of influences

April 16, 2009

from other sources that I understand that the permitting staff deal with regularly including most of their colleagues. So I still have a concern they will be many blocks away. Hopefully that can be worked through. And the pedestrian advisory committee of which I am a member has been working closely with Kurt Krueger and the permitting staff on making sure that we get the best pedestrian facilities with construction permits that we can. Kurt's also been working on an initiative to try to come up with a coherent way to deal with infill construction and sidewalks and hopefully he can work on that now without the distraction of this other issue which is now been somewhat relieved by this proposal tonight. So I thank you for proposing this proposal that we see and hopefully all these concerns can be kept in mind.

Adams: Thanks for your testimony. Hi.

Kendra Smith: Hi. My name is Kendra Smith and I am a professional ecologist, a small business owner here in the city of Portland. Citizen and also a member of the urban forestry commission. I was as a member of the urban forestry commission, I have been asked by my colleagues to speak today to you about the consolidation plan. After working closely with planners for over 15 years, developing natural resource policies and projects up in Washington county, and successfully permitting and building my own ecofriendly home, did it through b.d.s. without a problem, I think I have some relevant insight regarding the ordinance and regard to the consolidation and permitting in review at b.d.s. I applaud the desire to streamline and be efficient. I believe very strongly in that as a citizen. But the reality is that building high quality sustainable communities takes time. And planners are geared towards balancing the interests of those that participate in the development process. They are not experts in this field of natural resources, parks, storm water, forestry, transportation, or even the fire code. It's the experts that, they are created within the respective bureaus because they are surrounded by the collective wisdom of the organizational unit that's designed to address the need. So it's really important, I think, that you take into consideration the need to retain the autonomy of the expert, and this shift will erode that. Also looking at maintaining the staff at their respective bureaus because when you take them out of context, they lose a lot of their expertise from their surrounding individuals. And then also the need to accommodate the ebb and flow of the development demands and being able to accommodate staffing. So I will stop there.

Adams: Thank you for your testimony. Yes.

Fritz: As a member of the urban forestry commission, can you comment on the issue of the forestry folks going into development services being absent from parks?

Smith: Sure. That was actually the main thrust for the urban forestry commission. They were concerned about both what the role we would play now, because we normally get access on for tree cutting on public property. We are not sure what role the commission will play now and in the future. And the other big concern was the loss of boots on the ground in terms of both inspectors being shifted over to permitting. So those were two aspects. So the commission did request, as of 10:30 this morning. I don't know if they are still there now with the new proposal but they were requesting for a deferral of the decision until adequate time was given for public review.

Fritz: Thank you very much. I want to thank everybody both for being here tonight and also those of us, many of you who sent in testimony ahead of time which I think has been helpful in helping to shape this. I don't know if there's an opportunity, I hope there's always an opportunity to continue developing things as we move forward. So that's certainly something for us to consider. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you. Corky.

Corky Collier: My name is Corky Collier. I am executive director of the Columbia Corridor Association. I will abbreviate my remarks because recent changes and because I am hungry. First we would really like to strongly, loudly applaud the efforts to streamline and consolidate the review and permitting process. That's wonderful. At the same time we request extreme caution as we

April 16, 2009

move forward. The current system is a very complicated path through checks and balances. Of course, we want to lose the complication and keep the checks and balances. And we urge you to add in some additional review, additional analysis over the coming year to make sure that we have the best system possible for permitting and review. And that's basically it. We have some concerns over the cost, as I am sure you do especially at this time. But we do ask you add additional analysis and encourage to you move forward on streamlining.

Adams: Thank you all very much for your testimony. Karla. Linda had to leave so we have one more. Mr. Meyer. Good evening. Welcome to the city council. We are glad you are here. Bonnie, why don't you start.

Bonny McKnight: Good evening. My name is bonny mcknight and I do want to tell you that I was on both the permit consolidation oversight knee and I am a member of drac for whatever credential that is. After commissioner Fish challenge need throw out all my testimony I am not going to do that but I will put a giant hole in it and pass out what I had previously planned to say. I do appreciate commissioner Leonard being willing to modify this. This is much closer to what there was a lot of unanimity about. Commissioner Saltzman, good job on that and commissioner Fish, I appreciate the role you played. Thank you for holding the hearing in the evening so more citizens could be heard. That is good first step and engaging a broader discussion of tonight's comprehensive change to the development decision-making process. I am an advocate for open public process for several reasons that I define as practical. For good idea, careful public process builds advocates and long lasting support. For a bad idea, careful public process identifies things that should be changed to make it a good idea, and reduce or I will illuminate long lasting suspicion and opposition. For most ideas which are a mix of both good and bad public procession helps identify the valuable portions and gives time to reevaluate the more contentious and less valuable. Tonight's proposal, like my most complex approaches is a mix of both good and bad and we have haven't had time to sort out everything through a careful public process. In my view development is a long-term planning for our future. And we have to get beyond it being a customer service transaction because it is so much more. Every new street we build is a choice to add one more maintenance step for ourselves and those that follow. Every market rate house we build is ignoring the growing disparity of city residents. Every tree we cut down to build a allergy house is a reduction of the watershed values that provide so much livability for our community. I appreciate the fact you are taking an approach that moves forward incrementally. It's equally important, perhaps more important, that this council remain engaged in the issues that are not on the table. We have to decide as a city how we want to grow. We have to decide as a city how we can balance what we wish to do in a reasonable way to protect public good, and we have to, I believe, take an inventory of the assets we have that we want to maintain and protect as we grow. And I hope you can do that. Finally, because neighborhood folks often are the litmus test for development decisions, both good and bad, because everything comes together where we live, it's important that we have an earlier stage of involvement for neighborhoods in the process. Currently at least in land uses review our role is at end of the s developers don't like us because we say no at wrong time. The system is cumbersome. It leaves us to the last minute. It's much smarter investment to do it before all the money starts costing everybody time and effort. And I would like to suggest that maybe this council could look more at one of the things that isn't on the table right now but is part of the proposal. That we define a much broader early contact with meaning so neighborhoods and developers and appropriate staff can define an outcome and so that the applicant can take that outcome and run it through a faster, speedier, and more direct process.

Adams: Thank you for your leadership as well on the city wide land use committee. Really appreciate it. How many years running now? A few?

McKnight: Oh, 75. It's probably about 10. Well, for my role it's about 10. There were people before me.

April 16, 2009

Fritz: Thank you for your service on all the committees that you serve on. Does -- how long have you been on the development review advisory committee?

McKnight: This is my second term.

Fritz: How does the committee have an annual report to the council?

McKnight: Not to my knowledge. You will get a report on the discussion finally. That there's a subcommittee that's done that. A subcommittee spent over a year looking in sustainable development. I believe they brought that report to the council in partnership with commissioner Saltzman's report on the same issues. A little different approach but they brought that report. I am not sure we do an annual report anymore. There was discussion at drac meetings we should.

Fritz: You could. We don't need to stretch that. You can do that. I remember when commissioner Leonard and you and I worked on setting up the development review with a balanced set of element actives that we were looking for input on policy conflicts. And have those been brought to drac and could they be brought to drac?

McKnight: They should be brought somewhere. Because the problem with the one size fits all code in my view is we can only fix little stuff. And when we fix little stuff usually do it by a small fix, which bumps over into some other little stuff, which makes it into a bigger policy discussion. There's no body right now where we can bring those policy conflicts or even priorities to city council. And we do that on a site by site basis when once rarely you hear an appeal. It's not a good way to make policy. So.

Adams: Terrible way to make policy.

McKnight: It's probably the worst. Right? It would be nice to have a way of doing that. Whether that's drac or some other body, drac planning commission, I think the planning commission has a role that's never been really well served as well.

Fritz: That can come under the number three, develop an effective conflict resolution.

McKnight: I think that makes sense.

Fritz: My final question, what's your comment on whether land use reviewers belong in the Portland building or belong in the 1900 building or doesn't it matter?

McKnight: I don't know. I think of all the interface I have with the staff at the b.d.s. Building, by far my most rewarding is with the land use review staff. And specifically rebecca who leads very customer friendly from the neighborhood perspective part of the bureau. Well, she does.

Fritz: And also pointing out neighbors are customers, too.

McKnight: Absolutely. I think the reason I hesitate to say that is this is not as simple as one thing is the same as another thing. I think the interface -- I was worried about consolidating all the staff portions of development process under one single entity. Because I think you get great extra free -- not free, but extra service from the bureaus as they participate within their bureaus, discussing the issues. So where they move to is irrelevant. I think it's less relevant now that everybody, if you will investment money in it, should be hooked into a functional computer system that can actually put all the data together and get something logical auto of it. Not just for people working in the system. For people trying to figure out the system. It would cut down -- I think it would be cost effective. That will be next year's report.

Fritz: Thank you very much.

Adams: We invested three, four years ago in expanding the functionality of that system.

McKnight: Well, and the trouble is some of the systems aren't the same. You know what the problem is. I don't need to identify.

Adams: Yes. You are right. Thank you. Hi.

Erin Kelley: Hi. Good evening. I would like three minutes, please. My name is erin kelley and thank you for holding this evening meeting. I have an officer of the willamette pedestrian coalition and a member of the city of Portland advisory committee, a pedestrian advisory committee.

Moving pbot, b.d.s. and other person involved to the 1900 building will result in the declines in the

April 16, 2009

goals of city and the goals. Using the bureau of transportation as an example, first, moving the land use staff from their home infrastructure bureaus willing lead to a disconnect and eventual degradation of their ability to meet those bureaus' missions and goals. The land use planning session provides the obvious of the bureau of transportation. They consult with our work groups in pbot when requiring improvements triggered by new development. When decide whack and when to require improvements colocated transportation staff at the 1900 building the not have the collegion connections to be able to get advice from pbot staffers in transportation planning, street lighting, traffic signals, traffic investigation, permit engineering, and from the pedestrian and bicycle coordinator. They will be isolated transportation staff sitting in the building department. Next, newly hired staff in the 1900 building, as well as the moved or colocated pbot staff will have a decreasing knowledge of the current transportation bureau policies, regulations and philosophies and the recent developments in the field. Over time these staff would lose the base knowledge and skills to confidently carry out their duties and responsibilities. Eventually, land use responses that relate to pbot made only by these moved employees will not reflect the knowledge and commitment currently provided. Further, this proposal sets a dangerous precedent. If full consolidation is recommended in 20 10 the checks and balances having various departments under commissioners would be gone allowing one commissioner to hold too much control. This means one commissioner's pet project could get pushed throughout without council agreement which is not in the best interest of Portlanders. Ultimately hard fought battles by advocacy organizations such as the willamette pedestrian coalition to improve the number and width of sidewalks required and pedestrian connectivity required could have to be refought where these moved staff and a new nontransportation economizers. The willamette pedestrian coalition urges you to vote against colocation and later consolidation of the bureau.

Adams: Thank you. Hi.

Joe Meyer: Good evening. I am joe meyer and this proposal makes me nervous. Randy Leonard took over b.d.s. Some six years ago. And he's quoted in the tribune saying when when he is in charge staff will not be able to interpret codes so rigidly. His chief of staff further clarified they expect staff to look to find solutions, to look at the code book in a creative way and don't latch on to the letter of the law. I realize the effect of these changes when a developer proposed to put in large condo across the street if my house. I feel like b.d.s. Would bend over backwards, and I couldn't understand with the simple reading of the law how they could do what they did. So I believe that the result of randy Leonard's six years in b.d.s. Needs to be looked at before we hand him more power. Personally, I think the result is clutter of unwanted buildings and a lot of mistrust on the part of citizens. When I see a headline in the paper that says "why can't a man in business in chinatown get more breaks as powerful developers" I can't help but be suspicious. I urge to you look at the record and what's on the table. I think randy has made large chase already. Why don't we take a look at those six years before we hand him more power. Thank you.

Adams: Thanks for your testimony. I appreciate it. Karla. Good evening. Welcome to the city council. You are experienced testifiers. We have one more? Go ahead.

Richard N. Ross: Richard ross. Mayor Adams and commissioners, I am the vice president for save our elms and a former member of the urban forestry commission and I really appreciate the council's efforts for a seamless permit system with 25 years of battle scars from being in community development. And dealing with many of the issues that the city is tackling. Like player Adams, those save our elms wants to push the envelope on building a green city. We have six affiliates, in laurelhurst, eastmoreland, ladd's addition, grant park and richmond neighborhoods. We are on the front line in the gray to green initiative when it comes to planting the next 50,000 trees, and also when it comes to keeping our mature tree canopy and keeping Portland's largest neighborhood elm groves healthy. So our concerns and our focus, a as you might guess are, on the forestry services and unintended impacts of this proposal. We don't know what those are because it wasn't assessed

April 16, 2009

in the proposal. So we would like to see some assessment, a broader assessment of this in the consolidation report or some follow-up to tonight's action. This looks like a big impact on a small program to us. Forestry is doing a great job now with some very thin resources compared to other bureaus. And really appreciate the partnership that they have with our groups and with numerous groups across the city in the gray to green initiative. And I want to thank Richard Beetle, local 43, for expressing many of our concerns so I won't restate them but forestry inspectors now do a multitude of jobs. And that's where our concern lies. We believe that it's not a good time to cut unintentionally, a basic city service like Tremayne Nance. And I think that was the point of the parks bureau's budget advisory committee in placing this at the top, near the top of their list of all the park services. So assuming the council is going to act on this proposal tonight, or soon, what we would like you to do is to get an assessment of the impacts, perhaps this could be part of the budget process. I am not sure. But we would be happy to participate with you and looking at what this does with our six affiliates and I am sure other forestry stakeholders would, too. Thanks for your efforts to make a better permit process. But we don't want to sacrifice other things while we are doing that.

Adams: Thanks for your testimony. Dixie.

Dixie Johnston: I'm Dixie Johnston, co-land use chair of Collinsview neighborhood association. I am very cautious in endorsing this proposal this evening. I think it's a fairly good compromise. My major concern was addressed in it but I do have other concerns. I think we could use extreme caution. I am concerned about the cost. Mayor Adams, I do appreciate your addressing the issue of performance measures. I think that would be important and helpful. Especially in environmental services. A lot of us very much support sustainability and I think we need to be very careful. If we rush to judgment on some of these developments, I am concerned that there could be some danger and some damage being done. And especially in the west hills. So I just want that to be mentioned. Consolidation has been tried before. B.D.S. staff, a few years ago, some of the staff members were moved concerning working in codes and housing, dangerous structures and so on. They were folded into O.N.I. I only lasted about a year. It just did not work. So kind of keep that in mind. I endorse Bonnie McKnight's statement especially about early neighborhood contact. That would help address the issues of some of the developers wanting to get things through. I would like to finish up with a couple of sentences written from Gary Blackmer's 2005 audit. He was talking about two previous audits. We believe that a more concerted effort is needed to ensure that interbureau coordination and cooperation is achieved in the city's development review process regardless of the organizational structure in place. Achieving this cooperation will require consistent leadership and a firm commitment to mutual goals and objectives by city council and the bureau directors. Thank you.

Adams: Dixie, I wanted to compliment you for your, as well, Bonnie and others in the room for your consistent advocacy on this regard. I want to make it really clear and associate myself with some of your comments in terms of the number two, none one or number two most complaints over the years, couple of decades I have been focused on this comes from neighborhood associations and business associations that are as much victim as a bad process as anybody else. And late notices, gobbledy gook, can't get together with the technical folks, all kinds of bureaus, it's, you know, so the other performance measures we need in this was talked about in the original language on this is performance measures on outreach and neighborhood association input and business association input. So hopefully -- I am confident that the step we are taking tonight will lead us towards those kinds of improvements. Thank you.

*****: Hi.

*****: Hi.

Karen Karlsson: Karen Karlsson. I am a principal of a small business K&K consulting. A significant amount of the work that I do is obtaining regulatory approvals for projects large and

April 16, 2009

small. These include land use approvals, building permits and public works permits. And although I was aware that the city was look at improving processes -- and potentially consolidating permitting it was only early this week that I found out the city had published a report last week and was planning to bring this report to council. I downloaded the report. I did a quick review but made calls to few other consultants who like me frequently obtain regulatory approvals and I found that none of them were aware this report had been published, nor that the council was going to be hearing on this report today. So my main concern is how quickly this process has happened. And I came here today to say if you could please listen to those of us who work in the trenches, if you could give us some time to read the reports, in particular, the proposals made, the new proposals tonight as well, that we haven't heard until we came here. Allow us to give you our opportunity to give you better feedback.

Adams: Thank you very much. Each of you, for coming tonight. Karla. Good evening.

*******:** I get six minutes?

Adams: Fat chance. Here's margot. Welcome to the city council. Each you know the rules. Glad you are here. Rick?

Rick Michaelson: Thank you. I'm rick michaelson, I was a member of the substantial minority of the draft committee that voted against the previous proposal. I have to say what struck us today is not what I would use a compromise but a terrific improvement over the product that he with saw just 48 hours ago. My testimony about that proposal was going to be -- was that I have real concerns about the process. It's much too fast. We only saw it last week and we are acting on it today and there has not been time for citizen involvement. By the way, I don't like the proposal. In honesty I have to say today the process is too fast, there's not been enough involvement, and even though I love the proposal, I think there's a aspects of this that nobody has any time to discuss. For instance, the review of the s.d.c. charges which is a brand-new issue that wasn't in the previous report. So I would urge you to go forward with this and expeditiously work to improved process but also expand your outreach over the next few weeks and months as you're moving towards the colocation. I think you have the right answer. I think it will make a big difference. I think we need everybody to buy in on it. Thank you.

Adams: Thank you very much.

Bob Sallinger: Good evening. My name is bob sallinger, the conservation director for Portland audubon society and I chair the watershed science advisory committee and I am on the citizens overnight committee for this consolidation process. I wanted to really commend you and thank you for the compromise that you reached tonight. I really applaud this decision and I think it's a real step forward and substantive step forward. I also want to note paul scarlett. I have haven't worked with mr. Scarlett before but I was very impressed with the very difficult job he had to do to balance a difficult process. And as I want to stress my appreciation to him. And also to dan because I think dean amazing amount of work getting people background information and trying to tease out details. I would note that the report on the consolidation committee list two types of people on that committee. People that agreed with the proposal, people that sort of agreed with the proposal, and people who didn't have enough information to make an informed decision. And I guess you would include me in that since I was opposing it. And at first I found that kind of offensive but actually on second thought, I think we all don't have enough information to make a truly informed decision about something that dramatic. And so that's why this decision tonight I think is a great step forward. It gives us time to think about things. Are more steps we need to take? I am open to more steps and audubon is as well. There needs to be a lot of tweaking in either direction. And I really hope what I wanted to impress upon you tonight is I really hope you will use the expertise that's out there. I certainly on a lot of city committees as we got a handle on this thing, a lot of good ideas, ideas that weren't on the table earlier on. I think there's a real enthusiasm for improvement. I don't hear anybody say they don't want improvement in the system. I hope you use that. There are a

April 16, 2009

couple of details that came out tonight that I think that are highlights, the forestry issues, the new issue about s.d.c.s and the checks and balances which is something the business community and the environmental community both embrace now. Checks and balances are very important. Thank you very much for your decision tonight.

Adams: Thanks for your participation.

Margot Barnett: Hi. My name is Margot Barnett and I live in southwest Portland. I have previously served on the urban forestry commission. Thank you for holding this hearing today at a time that's more accessible to the public. I really do appreciate that. I came here tonight very concerned about the proposal that, and the report that I had read online. And I am pleased with the changes that were brought forward tonight but also concerned about the process. It's really hard to comment when you receive the update at the meeting. And we really haven't had time to review this. And I do question just the speed at which this kind of sweeping changes really is being pushed forward at this time. I'm not sure why there's such a push to get it through so quickly. The cost of implementing this new strategy aren't really clear. There have been many recommendations in the past for improving permitting which I think really needs to happen. But many of these improvement projects have never been fully explained so I am not sure why this consolidation is being viewed as so urgent now. Funds allocated to this process are going to be taken away really from other services that really need to be provided in a city right now. I am very concerned this is being done at a time where we are really covering under so many budget constraints. So that's something that does -- I really am concerned about those aspects of this. I was pleased to see the move towards colocation rather than full consolidation right now. And particularly concerned, though, about some of the issues for bureaus like the parks bureau, forestry program where he feels that the movement of staff to really is going to create a loss of service to the public potentially and it really needs to be fully evaluated and I didn't see that evaluation in the report. Despite the assurances of monitoring and cross training this colocation is removing many of the checks and balances between infrastructure, staff, policy development and implementation. So I'm just not sure that also that I don't see the full documentation of additional costs monitoring. And evaluation included in this report. And that's something else that I would like to see more on. I urge to you slow down and evaluate the implications of this and allow for more input from the community.

Adams: Thank you.

Fritz: I have a question and comment for the three people in front of us. I spoke with Rick Michaelson on the planning commission, started the city parks commission with Margot and know she served on the urban forestry council. We have a tremendous wealth of citizen expertise before us and indeed in the previous panel heard from a consultant who also wanted to be able to give input into how this moves forward. So I just want to raise a question for my colleagues to consider, as we continue to look into testimony, in that the resolution or the recommendation talk about the interagency team will do this and the interagency team will do other stuff. And I am not sure whether there would be involvement of people who are offering for free their expertise and advice on how to make this work. I am hearing a lot of folks talking about concerns, either about the product or the process, and also offering to help us. And so if we can be concerting more that would help, that would help me. Thank you very much.

Adams: Thank you all very much. 10 minutes each. Going once.

Jeff Fish: Thank you. I am here to testify in favor of full permit consolidation of the various bureaus. As a member of the permit oversight committee and a member of the development review committee, I have heard the concerns of other parties outside the development community and weighed those concerns. Additionally heard more of those concerns today. My problem is I have been a home build inner the city of Portland for 37 years, and have been involved in the permit process and involved in trying to make that process function better. The current system is broken and repeated attempts what I consider partial consolidation have not worked. Shortly after the

April 16, 2009

bureau of buildings moved into the Portland building, the director at the time, David Beckman, cornered me in the hallway and asked me what I thought of the new building and system. I told him it seemed all we did was stack the bureaus on top of each other with still no communication which was a desire to be inside that building, have everything in one building. Welch worked on this under blueprint 2000, and other internal efforts over the time and the city auditor's report in May of 2007 and August 2007 that the city officials are slow to establish interagency agreements and they are only partially implemented. What concerns me also about this issue is, there's some decisiveness between, division between what the public sees and what the developers see. This is not an intent to push permits through without regulation. This is more about problem solving, decision-making, auction, customer service, and solutions to issues all in a timely manner. We in the building community recognize that we have to do things right. And the problem is right now as we have a system that doesn't get to the heart of resolving, and getting solutions. Some process managers on your permit don't have the authority to get some people together and butt heads, whatever it takes to move along in a timely manner. Finally this is not about putting money into developers' pockets as some individuals have expressed to me. Nor is it about developing a culture to issue permits. Inherent in issuing permits is the assumption to get a permit you request conform to the regular regulations in place. You either have a system that does not require permits like going to the store or you have a system like obtaining a building permit that requires meeting the existing regulations. All we are asking for is removing untimely delays. We as builders remodel e. And developers pass our costs on to the end users, the citizens of Portland and they are the ones affected. If we don't pass on those expenses we don't stay in business. For me as an entry level builder this is about reducing costs to my purchasers in the hope we can offer affordable entry level homes and apartments inside the boundaries of the city of Portland. Thank you.

Adams: Can I ask you a question following up on Bonnie McKnight's comments? Which I -- we have long wanted to incent, require, what have you, really participation or early consultation between developers, especially infill or all developers and neighborhood associations and business associations. How would you suggest we make that happen? And do you agree that that early consultation is valuable for your side of this endeavor?

Jeff Fish: I think the industry is willing to do that. Where we push back against that is unreasonable requests get tied up in dealing with those. I had a situation some years ago out on off of Burnside where today meet with the community and the push back was that I only had 10 parking spaces for a 10 unit apartment and when I finally explained to them that I only required three, because it was on the right line they thought I was a pretty good guy. They also said why do you force this high density on us? I said I am not forcing anybody's high density. I'm meeting density at the lowest amount I can meet. Most of us have, there's a disconnect between the community and the development community. I actually at request of Commissioner Fritz about four or five years ago visited the Southeast Community Uplift meeting on a Saturday. She had to talk me into it because I didn't want to go out there and get beat up. What I learned we were on the same wave length but one of the problems we have is we end up in a forum like this where there's a planning commission or city council, I got two minutes, maybe three minutes to get my viewpoint across and the other party has the same time on the other side. We end up not compromising. We end up throwing our worst case scenario at you and they throw their worst case. Yes, I think if we can sit down with meaningful discussions I am not against doing that as long as somebody sits there and says you are being a little ridiculous. This guy cannot do this because you guys zoning codes and that's where most of us have a problem.

Adams: Thank you very much.

*******:** You bet.

Dean Gisvold: I'd like three minutes, please. I am Dean Gisvold, Irvington neighborhood and I would like to associate myself with this gentleman. I have never met this gentleman but his

April 16, 2009

comments are right on because that's what we do every day in the irvington neighborhood and the land use committee. We fight with developers because it's too late. We put notices in our newsletter. We, my name is on the application. Nobody calls me. Nobody wants to talk to me. But then when we get into a confrontation, then, it's a confrontation. There's no chance to work it out. And I would, I think his comments are appropriate and I think they are -- and I would agree with them. We came here, I came here tonight to oppose the Leonard proposal. I haven't had enough time to review the one-pager that I received. My only immediate comments are that we need more time to review it. You need more public input on this alternative solution. Let's delay this adoption until that occurs. I would comment on what I did read in the one-pager. There's no public process in that one page. It's all bureaucrats. And I don't see where there's any public involvement in whatever the standards, the fees, the schedules, et cetera are being developed. Maybe there's going to be a process but I just don't see it in the writing. And there's nothing about costs in this one-pager. And maybe you all know what that is but I don't. I would like to associate myself with the comments of bonnie mcknight and richard ross. Those of us who are at the neighborhood level and I have been doing this for 40 years, you know, we need to get this working a little better. Because I don't like going to the design commission, the landmarks commission, the adjustment committee. I usually lose, frankly. But every now and again we win. And I think we preserve the neighborhoods that I am familiar with and the compatibility of those neighborhoods are important to the city in the long run. If you are going to do something significant you are going to design a project, then let's do it right and make it last. Not immediate.

Adams: Thank you very much.

Jeff Fish: Can I clarify something? I want to make sure that the neighborhood associations don't understand me to say that everything ought to go through design review. I think the measures that are set up are adequate. I just think 59 times when they are in design review there's clashes because there's no common way to work those out. For a single family house to go through design review especially in entry level price bracket is extremely expensive. But I think there can be points where we work better together.

Adams: Thank you very much. Could we have staff come back up and see if there's any questions from council for you? Any questions from council? I want to you remain seated. Are there any discussion or actions from council?

Fritz: I have a suggestion for a friendly amendment. And that would be to add -- which end was the intent -- to include more public process. Number three at the end, it currently says "create an effective conflict resolution process to address policy and code conflicts between bureaus." add "including the development review, advisory committee and planning commission." then in number four, the interagency team defined in exhibit d is only staff and so that would be amended to say the interagency team defined in exhibit d shall work with the development review advisory committee too. And then the intent by the way is if the development advisory committee already has stakeholder groups so that folks would have in the development community consultants, environmentalists, neighbors, there's somebody on the development review advisory committee who represents each of those stakeholders and I will commit as the commission inner charge of the office of neighborhood involvement, to help publicize what the development review advisory committee is doing and make sure that my neighborhood constituents are informed about that. And then finally, under number five, that would also be amended to say the interagency team will work with the development review advise me committee and under number 7, about the report back to council by july 1st of 2010, add a sentence saying this recommendation should be informed by the development review advisory committee city wide land use group, planning station and community stakeholders. So again committing to a full public process before july of 2010 to make sure that we all have input into how this is going.

April 16, 2009

Leonard: I have a question. I understand most of the additions but I am not understanding why the planning commission is included with the development review advisory committee.

Fritz: Under number three because some of the code conflicts come up at the planning commission level and the planning commission reviews code conflicts. So it would be helpful for them to be informed what the problem is.

Leonard: Ok.

Adams: I would just include labor in number seven.

Leonard: Yeah.

Fritz: That's good. So adding labor after land use groups.

Fish: Commissioner Leonard, as the commissioner in charge of the bureau do you view those as friendly amendments?

Leonard: Yes. Those are things we would do anyway so putting them in writing is a good idea.

*******:** S it's usually adding so if there's gouge vote taking. I think whether I would joust not all.

Fritz: An amendment? Move just what I said as an amendment?

Leonard: Second.

Scarlett: Excuse me. Like clarification on labor. Does that include the union?

Leonard: That's what that means.

*******:** Ok.

Adams: Moved and seconded. All those in favor of the amendment as read into the record please call the roll.

Fish: Appreciate the constructive suggestion of commissioner Fritz. I vote aye.

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

Fritz: Thank you. Aye.

Adams: Aye. [gavel pounded] amendment approved. Unless there's further council discussion, Karla, can you please call the roll on the report. We have to have a motion.

*******:** Yeah, to accept the motion.

Adams: Been moved.

Leonard: Second.

Adams: Been seconded.

*******:** Could I add --

Adams: To accept the report. Go ahead.

Peterson: One clarification on the bullet number one where it says second line there, issuance of all permits, we just want to make sure it's understood those are all development-related permits which is the intent of the entire report. There are other types of permits that are issued that we never intended to be included and want to make that clear as we move forward. Sorry. A dog walker permit will not be --

*******:** Friendly initiated.

Adams: So clarified. Karla, this is on accepting the report. This will be our final vote on this matter.

Fish: Tonight we have an opportunity to build on the important and pioneering work of the player and commissioner Leonard to further an agenda of reforming and improving our development review system. And I want to compliment both of them for the work they have put into this effort for a long period ever time. I believe the mayor said he's been working on this for 18 years.

Adams: A long time.

Fish: And commissioner Leonard, almost as long. And the system is better for their service. I have heard from lots of citizens in the last few weeks through emails, phone calls and correspondence and essentially I have heard the suggestions that we do one of three things. One is do nothing. Two is that we collocate. And three is that we move towards full consolidation. I consider the proposal that we are voting on tonight to be collocation-plus. It incorporates in my judgments the best

April 16, 2009

elements of a very thoughtful report as well as a number of additional ideas of some of the key stakeholders public and private in this process. I believe it will strengthen accountability and result in a more efficient system. And it will also save taxpayer dollars. Most important to me it will ensure that the essential checks and balances which currently exist continue so that the concerns of all stakeholders, all customers in this system are considered. This would not be possible without the leadership of commissioner Leonard and the support of the mayor. And of the hard work of a very talented group of dedicated professionals who have worked to carve this out. And I want to acknowledge all of them for their good work. Randy will have a few more words, I no doubt, to talk about his team. But I want to express how grateful I am that hannah kuhn is on my team and I am pleased to vote aye.

Saltzman: I want to thank everybody who came out tonight to testify or just observe. I want to thank commissioner Leonard for bringing forward this substitute. Thank commissioner Fish, commissioner Fritz, mayor calms for all their hard work. I do think this is the appropriate step that we could take. I think this colocation plus is the way we should deal, assess it in a year, see what fine-tuning needs to exist if any. Die have some concerns about the tree inspectors but again, in the spirit of this move forward, we will see how things shake out. I think that's the way to go at this time. So again I think this is a great compromise that I think will improve our efficiency in serving the development community but also protect through checks and balances our shared values over environment, pedestrian access, and other transportation issues as well. So i'm pleased to vote aye.

Leonard: Well, when I received this assignment nearly seven years ago, it was a different bureau. The one thing that I used to tell people, because nearly every phone call I got at that time, in any of the assignments I had, were complaints about the bureau of development services. The bureau of development services includes lots of employees including those who we think of employs who try to make sure houses don't have nuisances on them and I remember dealing, for instance, with one complaint of an elderly woman who was actually home bound who had a gutter that was hanging off the house, had been the object of a complaint. And she, for a variety of reason, couldn't comply with the bureau of development services order that she repair the gutter and had \$10,000 in leans against her house. And that was just representative of dozens of if not hundreds of kinds of complaints I was getting. So as I was beginning the process of trying to sort out what would cause a group of otherwise very well intentioned, highly trained, intelligent people to assess an 80-plus-year-old woman who was home bound \$10,000 for a gutter that was hanging down as opposed to calling a contractor for her and have it repaired for at most \$200, then go ahead and lean the house for that, when I got back was that's not what the rules allow us to do. So as people would come to me with complaints, poor and rich, I would say, I will assure you of one thing. The bureau of development services treats everybody the same. And that's not well. And we are working to improve that. And I cannot begin to describe to you the different building that that is today than it was seven years ago from the director paul scarlet, andy peterson, rebecca, hank mark donald sitting out here and these are all a new generation of leaders who are, I would stack up against any managers anywhere are the most progressive, thoughtful, problem solving people in the world. That is often been interpreted by people to mean that they do whatever developers want. And it just, it breaks my heart on their behalf when I read those things. Because they are anybody who has dealt with them knows they are anything but those kind of folks. That they would in no way compromise the integrity of our system, in fact, just the quite the opposite. They are problem solvers who look for solutions to problems that neighborhoods have that individuals have, and, yes, even developers toe try to make sure that we treat people with respect, that we are kind, that we make sure that if somebody has a problem we try to see what it is that we can do to help them with that problem. It leads to, however, as we heard here testified tonight, well, you know, randy, let this condo get built from right across the street from my house. And that I have learned is the kind of

April 16, 2009

criticism that is inevitable that comes with this assignment because when you have a building code that allows certain things to get built and neighbors call and sigh seay, oh, my god, randy, they are powering a foundation across on my house on a vacant lot I have enjoyed being vacant for a long time. You have to stop it. I have to tell them I can't stop it. The code allows it and it becomes you just let them build it and you didn't do anything about it. That comes with the territory. But there are things we can control. We can control good development. We can control environmental regulations and be sure and quick about them while still being predictable. Those aren't contrary goals and there seems to be a thought that in order to have predictability, in order to have good environment allled a here reasons, you have to have dysfunction. Because without dysfunction Portland couldn't exist the way it is. I am here to tell you that's just not true. We can have everything we have in Portland, we can have the quality of life we have in Portland, we can have the best environmental standards and if we had some of the most green developers who have built, don't want to be here today but talked to me and said I am the greenest developer I know of in the region and I can't stand to do stuff in Portland because of the time it takes me to get through a process here compared to anywhere else. You can have all of those things and still treat people with respect and still return their phone calls and still give them some assurity as to what their costs are going to be. Those aren't mutually exclusive goals and now we have a year to prove it. And I have 100% confidence this team you see sitting in front of you is going to accomplish that. In an effective way, in a way that addresses the fears that people have because those are fears that I have not been concerned as I have read that the various concerns because I am -- I know that those are fears founded on lack of knowing what may happen. And when we finally see at the end of a year the performance that's going to occur, I think people will be pleased. I know the employees will be very gratified working around the professionals that mark represents and others represent up the bureau of development services who are the best employees in this city. They are independent. They are thoughtful. And a randy Leonard or nick Fish or amanda Fritz called up and said you didn't approve a project a, and I would like you to reconsider that, wait for a phone call in about five minutes from nigel jaquiss, from nick budnick, from jim mayer sitting out in the audience because believe you me that's the check and balance in the system. You don't tell professionals to approve something that the law doesn't allow them to approve. And the folks up there know that better than anybody. So I really appreciate the work that the group has done this last few months. It has been under trying circumstances with a lot of things being said that has attacked their integrity particularly the people that the b.d.s. That is disturbed me greatly. But in the end, I appreciate commissioner Fish sitting down with myself and mayor Adams, pointing out the areas of agreement, pointing out the areas that we need to work on more and helping us find a middle ground which moves Portland forward, makes us I think a better city, makes us a city that I think is more attractive to get good green businesses to come here. Because that's the bottom line. We want to do what we can to get good businesses to be here, to provide family-wage jobs but, yes, to also do our part to promote a greener economy. So for all those reasons and all the work that everybody did, bonnie and others, bonnie I greatly appreciate everybody's perspective and work and we are going to move forward from here and make this work. Aye.

Fritz: Thank you all for coming tonight. Everybody who is in this room cares about land use planning and cares about getting development done right. And cared enough to spend the whole evening here. In fact, there's probably a lot of people at home watching on tv and they could have kept slipping throughout channels and gone to espn but they decided to keep watching this because we care about how Portland develops. So thank you and again thank you to everybody who sent in emails and made phone calls in the past couple of weeks. This motion accepts a report that direct the bureaus to colocate and I would note that it's not an ordinance. So this should be some ability for the great staff that we have to continue working together to sig fig out the best way to do things and presumably the changes will be accomplished through interagency agreements and those can be

April 16, 2009

structured so that maybe not all of the person's time is spent in the 1900 building. That something that we are investigating the office of healthy working rivers which will we will be talking about in a couple of weeks. Perhaps there's advantage for staff being in one place for most of their time but time in their home bureau to make sure those connectioners made. I will encourage you to continue looking at the forestry folks, the other staff who do things, do other things and need to maintain those connections with their home bureaus and I am sure that you will do that. I am a little concerned about the cost with the estimated moving cost of a quarter million dollars. I know that when the neighborhood inspection was 17 staff that moved from the office of neighborhood involvement back to the development services building, and that cost considerably more than that. So I am concerned that we are spending money on this rather than other basic services, especially at a time when we are struggling to find money and look at massive cuts in the office of neighborhood involvement, the bureau of planning and sustainability, the housing programs, you know, these are tough times and we do need to prioritize and I am assured by our mayor we will continue to work on those things. Every member of the council, every one of my colleagues participated constructively in coming to this conclusion and reaching this consensus. Mayor Adams and commissioner Leonard were willing even at the very last take to rethink what they had been work on in some cases like mayor Adams for 18 years and, yes, we could do it differently. Commissioner Saltzman proposed the alternative that moved us along. Commissioner Fish met separately with mayor Adams and commissioner Leonard because we are very mindful we cannot meet in public and provided a lot of leadership in responding to citizens and helping each one of us reach this place where we can all agree on this proposal. And I thank each one of you. And thank you, citizens. You made the difference here. You and thank you to staff. We have so many dedicated staff throughout the city government in development services, in planning, in transportation, in environmental services. I actually got stopped by a staff person in the barbur transit center getting home after dark, and just wanting to let me know first all of that he appreciated my taking transit but second of all could we talk about development services and the permitting process? [laughter] that's dedication. And it takes all of us. Particularly want to thank my chief of staff who is one of the reasons I am sitting here today. 18 years ago I started participating in city issues because of the land use review process. Because I saw that it was a fair process where citizens and developers could get the rules straightened out and they could figure it out together as one of the testifiers put it very eloquently, that planners are geared towards balancing the interests of expert within the development review process. That's what planners do. That's what our land review process is supposed to do and I am confident that with this consensus proposal that we can continue to do that and maintain the integrity of the system with the checks and balances. I appreciate my colleagues accepting the amendment to make sure the development review advisory committee, the planning commission, other stake horforders, organized labor continues to be involved and involved in deeper ways. I want to remind the representatives from the development review advisory committee that I would very much like personally to get an annual report on how you think things are going. The planning commission is supposed to send an annual report of how we are doing and compliance with the comprehensive plan. And I would actually suggest bonnie, we include the city wide land use group that it would be nice to have presentations once a year for each of these important volunteer advisers to let us know how this is going. Because as you have heard today every one of us up here cares about that. And we appreciate the volunteer time and expertise that former land use, I have to now count myself as a former land use geek. But because --

Adams: No, you are still a land use geek.

Fritz: I guess once you are a land use geek you are a land use geek.

Fritz: Recovering. A lot better tonight, thanks, as I said, to each of my colleagues to the staff and citizens who worked so hard on this. Thank you very much. Aye.

April 16, 2009

Adams: I want to thank the city council for this is one of five major improvements we seek, we are accomplishing in terms of city services that was set forth in the January resolution. I want to thank specifically commissioner Leonard and his team for taking on this very difficult task. I want to thank all the employees that have been involved, the citizens, the folks that agreed to serve on the task force. I want to thank skip Newberry in my office who is involved with this. And hopefully what -- I am enthusiastic in my support of this tonight. And underscore my thanks to commissioner Fish and his team for working with commissioner Leonard and myself and our teams, and coming up with what I am voting on today. Really appreciate your help and I just want to underscore what a thankless task it is to be the commissioner in charge of the bureau of development services, to be in charge of and work for the bureau of development services. Everyone's mad at you all the time. [laughter]

Fritz: How's that different from everybody else?

Fish: That was a preexisting condition.

Adams: When you are the parks commissioner everybody loves you. Pretty much. No, I'm kidding. Our intention here is to be more holistic, to be more integrated, and to be more robustly accountable. We do not have measures in this city for our policy goals. We make thousands and thousands of decisions through this system and we have no way of tracking whether those decisions -- individually, on the whole, within bureaus, within whatever unit you want -- are leading us towards our pedestrian goals, our transportation goals, we don't have it. We have turnaround time and we have cost. We don't have anything related to performance measures related to outreach and effective outreach to stakeholders, to business and neighborhood associations. But what I have seen since commissioner Leonard took over the bureau of development services with his team is some amazing improvement in that area. And now we hope to extend that improvement to the other areas of the city. I have been in charge of two significant regulatory bureaus, and they are staffed with incredibly talented people. Just fantastic people who are trapped in the system that is, has been incredibly dysfunctional and everybody pays the price. So this is not about saying yes to more business applicants necessarily. This is not about trying to, this is about fairness and bam, being holistic and hopefully integrated and hopefully continuous improvement. And I really like to underscore the report sort of what I see, on number three and elsewhere the commitment to continuous improvement. We have got to do that. We got to do it together. I am really pleased at what we have accomplished here. Thank you, everyone, for your hard work on this and it's the beginning of a lot more hard work. So thank you. Aye. We are adjourned. [applause]

At 8:02 p.m., Council adjourned.