City of Portland, Oregon
Bureau of Development Services
Land Use Services
FROM CONCEPT TO CONSTRUCTION

Amanda Fritz, Commissioner
Paul L. Scarlett, Director
Phone: (503) 823-7300
Fax: (503) 823-5630
TTY: (503) 823-6868
www.portlandoregon.gov/bds

STAFF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL

CASE FILE: LU 14-249689 DM (PC# 14-139549)
Demolition Review for Washington Park Reservoirs #3 and #4 and the Weir Building

ADVICE BY: Historic Landmarks Commission
WHEN: Monday, March 30, 2015 @ 1:30pm
(rescheduled from March 23, 2015 @ 1:30pm)
WHERE: 1900 SW Fourth Ave., Room 2500A
Portland, OR 97201

REVIEW BY: Portland City Council
WHEN: Thursday, April 23, 2015 @ 2:00pm
WHERE: 1221 SW Fourth Ave., Council Chambers
Portland, OR 97204

It is important to submit all evidence to the Historic Landmarks Commission.

BUREAU OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES STAFF: HILLARY ADAM / HILLARY.ADAM@PORTLANDOREGON.GOV

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant:
Tom Carter, Applicant
Teresa Elliott, Applicant
City Of Portland, Owner
c/o Portland Water Bureau
1120 SW 5th Avenue Suite 600
Portland, OR 97204

Tim Brooks, Consultant
Winterbrook Planning
310 SW 4th, Ste 1100
Portland OR 97204

Site Address: 2403 SW JEFFERSON ST – WASHINGTON PARK

Underline indicates parcels directly affected.

Legal Description: TL 300 20.71 ACRES, SECTION 33 1N 1E; TL 100 24.03 ACRES, SECTION 32 1N 1E; TL 100 24.98 ACRES, SECTION 05 1S 1E; TL 100 8.16 ACRES, SECTION 04 1S 1E; BLOCK 13 LOT 1-32, WEST END; BLOCK 15 LOT 1-8, WEST END; BLOCK 16 LOT 1-8, WEST END; BLOCK 17 LOT 1-10, WEST END; BLOCK 18 LOT 1-8, WEST END; BLOCK 19 LOT 1-17, WEST END; BLOCK 20 LOT 1-12, WEST END; BLOCK 21 LOT 1-14, WEST END; BLOCK 22 LOT 1-6 LOT 7&8 EXC PT IN ST, WEST END; BLOCK 4 LOT 1, WESTWOOD HILLS; BLOCK 4 S 35.94' OF LOT 2, WESTWOOD HILLS; TL 200 9.57 ACRES, SECTION 04 1S 1E; TL 500 40.94 ACRES, SECTION 05 1S 1E; TL 600 2.00 ACRES, SECTION 05 1S 1E; TL 800 107.18 ACRES, SECTION 05 1S 1E; TL

	1200 3.65 ACRES, SECTION 05 1S 1E; TL 1100 6.89 ACRES, SECTION 05 1S 1E; TL 1400 60.69 ACRES, SECTION 05 1S 1E; TL 200 4.22 ACRES, SECTION 32 1N 1E; TL 200 21.12 ACRES, SECTION 05 1S 1E; TL 200 26.02 ACRES, SECTION 32 1N 1E; TL 1000 41.42 ACRES, SECTION 05 1S 1E; TL 700 2.38 ACRES, SECTION 05 1S 1E
Tax Account No.:	R941321370, R941330040, R991050830, R991041020, R892801070, R892801560, R892801640, R892801720, R892801820, R892801900, R892802070, R892802190, R892802330, R902100870, R902100890, R991040170, R991050020, R991050100, R991050350, R991050720, R991050740, R991050750, R941321360, R991050840, R941321350, R991050800, R991050820, R991050020
State ID No.:	1N1E32 00100, 1N1E33C 00300, 1S1E05 01000, 1S1E04 00100, 1S1E05A 00500, 1S1E04BB 06100, 1S1E04BC 05400, 1S1E04BC 05500, 1S1E05A 00400, 1S1E05A 00600, 1S1E05A 00300, 1S1E05A 00200, 1S1E04BC 05600, 1S1E05AC 00200, 1S1E05AC 00100, 1S1E04 00200, 1S1E05 00500, 1S1E05 00600, 1S1E05 00800, 1S1E05 01200, 1S1E05 01100, 1S1E05 01400, 1N1E32 00200, 1S1E05 00100, 1S1E05 00200, 1N1E32C 00200, 1S1E05 00700, 1S1E05 00500
Quarter Section:	3027, 3026, 3126, 3127, 3025, 3125, 3225, 3126, 3226
Neighborhood:	Arlington Heights, contact Shawn Wood at s.p.wood@comcast.net; Goose Hollow, contact Jerry Powell at 503-222-7173; Southwest Hills, contact Nancy Seton at nancyseton@comcast.net; Hillside, contact Peter Stark at 503-274-4111 Northwest, contact John Bradley at 503-313-7574 Sylvan-Highlands, contact Dave Malcolm at 503-805-9587;
Business District:	None
District Coalition:	Neighbors West/Northwest, contact Mark Sieber at 503-274-4111; Southwest Neighborhoods, Inc., contact Sylvia Bogert at 503-823-4592
Other Designations:	Contributing Resources in the Washington Park Reservoirs Historic District, listed in the National Register of Historic Places on January 15, 2004.
Zoning:	OSc, OSp – Open Space with Environmental Conservation and Environmental Protection overlays
Case Type:	DM – Demolition Review
Procedure:	Type IV, following a public meeting before the Historic Landmarks Commission there will be a hearing before City Council. The Historic Landmarks Commission may offer comments or suggestions, in the form of a letter or testimony, to City Council. City Council makes the final decision on this matter.

Proposal:
On behalf of the City of Portland, and in response to the EPA's Long Term Enhances Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2) and to address seismic concerns and landslide pressures, the Portland Water Bureau requests Demolition Review to remove three contributing resources from the Washington Park Reservoirs Historic District. These resources include Reservoir 3 (built 1894), Reservoir 4 (built 1894), and the Weir Building (built 1946). The proposed replacement system includes a below-ground reservoir with a tiered reflecting pool in the same location and approximate footprint as the existing Reservoir 3 and a reflecting pool and stormwater swale in the location as the existing Reservoir 4 but with a reduced footprint.

Because the proposal is to demolish Contributing Resources in the Washington Park Reservoirs Historic District, a Type IV Demolition Review is required.

***Important Service Bureau note*:**
If the Demolition Review is approved by Portland City Council, a Type 3 Land Use Review is still required, as well as building permit issuance for the new development, before a demolition permit will be released.

Approval Criteria:
In order to be approved, this proposal must comply with the approval criteria of Title 33, Portland Zoning Code. The applicable approval criteria are:
- 33.846 Historic Resource Reviews
- 33.846.080 Demolition Review

ANALYSIS

Site and Vicinity: The Washington Park Reservoirs #3 and #4 are located within Washington Park, due west of the downtown commercial core. The park was developed from 40 acres purchased by the City from Amos and Melinda King in 1871, and originally known as City Park. In 1912, it was renamed Washington Park following a visit from John Charles Olmsted, who recommended a more distinguished name. Washington Park is located in the hills directly west of the King's Hill Historic District, bordered by W Burnside to the north, and north of Highway 26. West of the Park is the Arlington Heights neighborhood, Hoyt Arboretum and the Oregon Zoo.

As the City's population continued to grow and issues arose from shortages due to high demand and poor quality water obtained from the Willamette River and other sources, the City took up the task of creating a new high quality water supply. In 1885, a 15-member Water Committee was appointed made up of prominent business and civic leaders, who took on the task of consolidating the existing water supplies, identifying and acquiring the rights to a new supply, and constructing a system that would provide clean and abundant water to the citizens of Portland. Ultimately, Bull Run Lake was identified as the preferred source as it could provide pristine water through a gravity-fed system, thus nearly eliminating the need for cost-prohibitive pumping. Mt Tabor and Washington Park were identified as the locations to build storage facilities due to their elevations within the city.

The reservoirs were constructed during the City Beautiful movement, which arose in response to the industrialization of cities, and aimed to promote health and civic virtue through the creation of beautiful and inspiring works of architecture and planning. The character of the reservoirs and their accompanying structures, articulated in a Romanesque Revival style, nestled into natural ravines within the landscape embody these values.

The reservoirs were designed by Ernest Leslie Ransome, featuring patented "concrete and twisted iron" poured concrete construction, with the twisted iron placed at 10-foot intervals in each direction, and the façades of the structures featuring decorative designs molded by wooden formwork and tooled and hammered to resemble rusticated stone. Ransome's design is notable in that it was one of the first uses of reinforced concrete for a major work in the United States, at a time when reinforced concrete was just beginning to be employed in construction projects. The ornamental wrought iron fences and lampposts were designed by Whidden and Lewis, and crafted by Johann H. Tuerck of Portland Art Metal Works.

In January 2004, the Washington Park Reservoirs Historic District was listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A and C, as a locally significant resource. The areas of significance include community planning and development, architecture, engineering, and entertainment and recreation. Listed contributing resources include Reservoir 3, Dam 3, Gatehouse 3, the Weir Building, Reservoir 4, Dam 4, Gatehouse 4, Pump House 1, the Generator House, and two water fountains, one of which is damaged and currently in storage.

While all Portlanders should learn the remarkable story of how the Bull Run system came to fruition, it would be nearly impossible to summarize the history of these proceedings within this staff report. For a detailed history of the Bull Run water system and a detailed account of the individual contributing resources, please consult the Washington Park Reservoirs Historic District National Register nomination (Exhibit A-6).

Zoning: The Open Space (OS) zone is intended to preserve public and private open, natural, and improved park and recreation areas indentified in the Comprehensive Plan. These areas serve many functions including: providing opportunities for outdoor recreation; providing contrasts to the built environment; preserving scenic qualities; protecting sensitive or fragile environmental areas; preserving the capacity and water quality of the stormwater drainage system; and providing pedestrian and bicycle transportation connections.

The Environmental Conservation Zone "c" overlay conserves important resources and functional values in areas where the resources and functional values can be protected while following environmentally sensitive urban development.

The Environmental Protection Zone "p" overlay provides the highest level of protection to the most important resources and functional values. These resources and functional values are identified and assigned value in the inventory and economic, social, environmental, and energy (ESEE) analysis for each specific study area. Development will be approved in the environmental protection zone only in rare and unusual circumstances.

The Scenic Resource Zone "s" overlay is intended to protect Portland's significant scenic resources as identified in the Scenic Resources Protection Plan; enhance the appearance of Portland to make it a better place to live and work; create attractive entrance ways to Portland and its districts; improve Portland's economic vitality by enhancing the City's attractiveness to its citizens and to visitors; and implement the scenic resource policies and objectives of Portland's Comprehensive Plan. The purposes of the Scenic Recourse zone are achieved by establishing height limits within view corridors to protect significant views and by establishing additional landscaping and screening standards to preserve and enhance identified scenic resources.

The Historic Resource Protection overlay is comprised of Historic and Conservation Districts, as well as Historic and Conservation Landmarks and protects certain historic resources in the region and preserves significant parts of the region's heritage. The regulations implement Portland's Comprehensive Plan policies that address historic preservation. These policies recognize the role historic resources have in promoting the education and enjoyment of those living in and visiting the region. The regulations foster pride among the region's citizens in their city and its heritage. Historic preservation beautifies the city, promotes the city's economic health, and helps to preserve and enhance the value of historic properties.

Land Use History: City records indicate that relevant prior land use reviews include:

- LU 05-138520 HDZ – Historic Design Review approval for Phase 1 of security and deferred maintenance projects;
- PC 06-173417 – Pre-Application Conference for security and deferred maintenance projects;
- LU 07-137990 HDZ – Historic Design Review approval for Phase 2 of security and deferred maintenance projects
- EA 13-162228 APPT – Early Assistance Appointment related to current proposal; and
- EA 13-200312 DAR – Design Advice Request with the Historic Landmarks Commission for the current proposal.
- EA 14-139549 PC – Pre-Application Conference for the current proposal.

Agency Review: A "Request for Response" was mailed February 9, 2015.

The following Bureau responded with comments:
The Bureau of Parks-Forestry Division responded, noting that a tree preservation plan would be required, and suggested conditions of approval, including:

1. A tree preservation must be submitted to Portland Parks and Recreation/Urban Forestry for approval.
2. The applicant must include a tree protection plan and/or modified root protection plan (RPZ) per Title 33 and Title 11 requirements and specifications.

3. Mitigation plan for loss of canopy per Title 33 and Title 11 requirements and approved by Urban Forestry.

Please see Exhibit E-1 for additional details.

The following Bureaus have responded with no issues or concerns:

- Water Bureau
- Life Safety Division of the Bureau of Development Services
- Bureau of Environmental Services
- Fire Bureau
- Bureau of Transportation Engineering
- Site Development Section of BDS

Staff Response: Tree protection is not the subject of this review. As noted above, a demolition permit will not be issued until a follow-up Type III Historic Resource Review has been approved. The Portland Water Bureau intends to provide a tree protection plan with the Type III application. At that time, the proposal's effect on trees within the project area will be considered. Staff has not included these conditions as part of this review as the Type III Historic Resource Review application will most likely be submitted prior to completion of this land use review.

Neighborhood Review: A Notice of Proposal in Your Neighborhood was mailed on February 27, 2015. A total of 1 written response has been received from either the Neighborhood Association or notified property owners in response to the proposal.

Received prior to original staff report:

1. Susan Alpert Siegel, President of the Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association, on February 27, 2015, wrote **with concerns** regarding the routing of construction traffic through the neighborhood and the closure of Sacajawea Circle during the project's multi-year construction schedule. Please see Exhibit F-1 for additional details.
2. Nancy Seton, President and Land Use Chair of the Southwest Hills Residential League (SWHRL), on March 6, 2015 wrote in **support** of the proposal to demolish the existing historic reservoirs and with support for the proposed replacement development featuring reflecting pools a restored hillside, and improved access. Please see Exhibit F-2 for additional details.
3. Catherine Ellison, on March 7, 2015, wrote **with concerns** about Sacajawea Circle being closed during construction, stating it would be a tremendous inconvenience, and requesting that alternatives be considered. Please see Exhibit F-3 for additional details.
4. RoseMarie Opp, on March 8, 2015, wrote **with concerns** regarding the effect of buried reservoirs on health, cracks in the Powell Butte reservoir, negative impacts of construction on Washington Park, and concern that the Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association online calendar does not list the April 23rd City Council hearing date. Ms. Opp also provided a copy of the October 29, 2014 presentation to the Community Sounding Board and a copy of the City of Portland Public Involvement Principles, both received March 17, 2015. Please see Exhibit F-4 for additional details.
5. Katherine Stansbury, on March 9, 2015, wrote in **opposition** to the proposed disconnection of the Mt. Tabor Reservoirs, citing previous attempts to destroy the reservoirs and the City's failure to request extensions to the LT2 timeline, and requesting the Historic Landmarks Commission intervene to delay the project until after the LT2 review. Please see Exhibit F-5 for additional details.
6. Scott Fernandez, on March 9, 2015, wrote in **opposition**, noting the benefits of sunlight, oxygenation, and open air on drinking water and stating that the "landslide characterization issues and reasons for the changes to Washington Park reservoirs have been overblown and portrayed incorrectly." Please see Exhibit F-7 for additional details.
7. Ann Witsil, on March 9, 2015, wrote **with concerns** regarding the temporary closure of Sacajewea Circle, suggesting limiting its closing to certain times of day. Please see Exhibit F-8 for additional details.

8. Eric Nagle, Community Sounding Board member, on March 16, 2015, forwarded a January 27, 2014 memo from the Community Sounding Board to the Historic Landmarks Commission in **support** of the proposal. Mr. Nagle also noted the need for design features that discourage skateboarding to ensure the continued tranquility of the place. Please see Exhibit F-9 for additional details.
9. Katherine Stansbury, on March 19, 2015, wrote in **opposition**, requesting that the Historic Landmarks Commission make a request to the governor and the Oregon Health Authority to delay the start of the project until January 1, 2017. Please see Exhibit F-9 for additional details.
10. Beth Giansiracusa, on March 19, 2015, wrote in **opposition** suggesting that the City's drinking water be treated rather than buried. Please see Exhibit F-10 for additional details.

Received prior to March 30, 2015 Historic Landmarks Commission meeting:

11. Jeffrey E. Boly on March 19, 2015, wrote in **opposition**, stating that the applicant cannot meet the first approval criteria option and suggesting alternative options for Reservoirs #3 and #4. Please see Exhibit F-11 for additional details.
12. Susan Alpert Siegel, President of the Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association, on March 24, 2015, wrote **with concerns** that the proposed restoration efforts are not sufficiently described in the proposal drawings and suggesting the demolition permit drawing must also show the preservation work proposed. Please see Exhibit F-12 for additional details.
13. Joanne Stainbrook, AIA Historic Resources Committee, on March 20, 2015, wrote in **support**, stating the applicant had met with them three times and that they found the level of mitigation proposed is appropriate. Please see Exhibit F-13 for additional details.
14. Floy Jones, on March 29, 2015, provided the Washington Park Reservoirs Historic Structures Report. Please see Exhibit F-14 for additional details.
15. Mary Ann Schwab, on March 30, 2015, wrote **with concerns** regarding construction traffic and location of posting boards. Please see Exhibit F-15 for additional details.
16. Dee White, on March 29, 2015, wrote in **opposition**, stating that the citizen Involvement goal was not met as the public was never given the opportunity to discuss alternatives to demolition. Please see Exhibit F-16 for additional details.
17. Floy Jones, Friends of the Reservoirs, on March 29, 2015, wrote in **opposition**, stating that the applicant has not met Goal 9 Citizen Involvement, and has defied a 2004 City Council ordinance (#36267) which required stakeholder input on future plans for the reservoirs. Please see Exhibit F-17 for additional details.
18. Katherin Kirkpatrick, on March 30, 2015, wrote in **opposition**, stating that demolition of the resources results in a failure to preserve the historic character and function of the resources, and stating that the applicant has not met the EPA's public notification rules. Please see Exhibit F-18 for additional details.

Received at the March 30, 2015 Historic Landmarks Commission meeting:

19. Chris Kent, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in **support**.
20. John Czarnecki, on March 30, 2015, provided oral and photographic testimony in **support** and suggesting that the maintenance structures east of Reservoir 4 should also be removed.
21. Scott Fernandez, on March 30, 2015, provided oral and written testimony in **opposition**, stating that the landslide and seismic concern are not as bad as have been presented and the negative effects of buried reservoirs is of greater concern.
22. Joe Walsh, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in **opposition**
23. RoseMarie Opp, on March 30, 2015, provided oral and written testimony in **opposition**, stating that buried reservoirs result in negative health effects and with concerns regarding construction traffic.
24. Floy Jones, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in **opposition**.
25. Dee White, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in **opposition**.
26. Jeffrey Boly, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in **opposition**, stating there was less consensus among the community stakeholders than has been presented.
27. Beth Giansiracusa, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in **opposition**.
28. Eileen Brady, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony encouraging the Historic Landmarks Commission to attend the Mt. Tabor Appeal hearing at City Council.

29. Mark Wheeler, on February 17, 2015, wrote in **opposition**. These comments were forwarded by Teresa Elliott, Portland Water Bureau.

Staff Response: While construction traffic is a valid concern, staff does not believe that the Type IV Demolition Review is the appropriate review in which to address these concerns, as this review is primarily concerned with whether or not the proposal to demolish the historic resources is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, demolition of the resources is ultimately contingent on final approval of a Type III Historic Resource Review for the replacement facilities, which must be obtained prior to the issuance of any demolition permits. Review of the construction plan and potential neighborhood impacts of the demolition and construction may be more appropriately reviewed at the time of the Type III review when the details of the proposal can be provided with more specificity and potentially mitigated through conditions in the final decision. Additional concerns have been addressed in the comments below.

Procedural History: The application was submitted on December 15, 2014 and deemed complete on January 26, 2015. The initial Notice of Proposal and Posting Notices identified a City Council hearing date of April 23, 2015 and a Historic Landmarks Commission meeting date of March 23, 2015. The March 23rd meeting had to be rescheduled to March 30, 2015 for lack of quorum. Notices were reissued with a new Historic Landmarks Commission meeting date of March 30, 2015. At the March 30, 2015 Historic Landmarks Commission meeting, four Commissioners were present. Following the staff and applicant's presentation, public testimony was received. Two members of the public spoke in support and nine spoke in opposition. The Commission deliberated with one Commissioner wondering why we would demolish historic resources and then build something new in an active landslide area when we have enough drinking water storage capacity, suggesting the reservoirs could be preserved for aesthetic purposes. He also noted that the reservoirs have been allowed to deteriorate amounting to demolition by neglect and expressed concern for the long-term preservation of the other resources. The majority of the Commission noted that the presentation and communication from the Water Bureau has been outstanding, comprising several meetings with the Historic Landmarks Commission and noting that the current proposal is based on feedback received, is reasonable, and the level of mitigation is impressive. The Commission voted 3-1 to accept the staff report and to write a letter expressing their support and concerns. This letter is included in the record as Exhibit

ZONING CODE APPROVAL CRITERIA

Historic Resource Review
Chapter 33.445, Historic Resource Protection Overlay Zone, and
Chapter 33.846, Historic Resource Reviews

33.445.010 Purpose of Historic Resource Review
This chapter protects certain historic resources in the region and preserves significant parts of the region's heritage. The regulations implement Portland's Comprehensive Plan policies that address historic preservation. These policies recognize the role historic resources have in promoting the education and enjoyment of those living in and visiting the region. The regulations foster pride among the region's citizens in their city and its heritage. Historic preservation beautifies the city, promotes the city's economic health, and helps to preserve and enhance the value of historic properties.

33.445.030 Types of Historic Resource Designations and Map Symbols
C. Historic District. This type of resource is a collection of individual resources that is of historical or cultural significance at the local, state, or national level. Information supporting a specific district's designation is found in the City's Historic Resource Inventory, its National Register nomination, or the local evaluation done in support of the district's designation.

33.445.330 Demolition of Historic Resources in a Historic District

Demolition of other historic resources within a Historic District requires demolition review to ensure their historic value is considered. The review period also ensures that there is an opportunity for the community to fully consider alternatives to demolition.

Historic Resource Review Approval Criteria
Requests for historic design review will be approved if the review body finds the applicant has shown that all of the approval criteria have been met.

33.846.010 Purpose
This chapter provides procedures and establishes the approval criteria for all historic reviews. The approval criteria protect the region's historic resources and preserve significant parts of the region's heritage. The reviews recognize and protect the region's historic and architectural resources, ensuring that changes to a designated historic resource preserve historic and architectural values and provide incentives for historic preservation.

33.846.080 Demolition Review

A. Purpose. Demolition review protects resources that have been individually listed in the National Register of Historic Places or are identified as contributing to the historic significance of a Historic District or a Conservation District. It also protects Historic Landmarks and Conservation Landmarks that have taken advantage of an incentive for historic preservation and historic resources that have a preservation agreement. Demolition review recognizes that historic resources are irreplaceable assets that preserve our heritage, beautify the city, enhance civic identity, and promote economic vitality.

B. Review procedure. Demolition reviews are processed through a Type IV procedure.

C. Approval criteria. Proposals to demolish a historic resource will be approved if the review body finds that one of the following approval criteria is met:

1. Denial of a demolition permit would effectively deprive the owner of all reasonable economic use of the site; *or*

2. Demolition of the resource has been evaluated against and, on balance, has been found supportive of the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and any relevant area plans. The evaluation may consider factors such as:
   a. The merits of demolition;
   b. The merits of development that could replace the demolished resource, either as specifically proposed for the site or as allowed under the existing zoning;
   c. The effect demolition of the resources would have on the area's desired character;
   d. The effect that redevelopment on the site would have on the area's desired character;
   e. The merits of preserving the resource, taking into consideration the purposes described in Subsection A; and
   f. Any proposed mitigation for the demolition

   Findings: The site is designated a contributing resource with a National Register Historic District. Therefore, demolition of the existing building requires Demolition Review approval.

The applicant has chosen to address Approval Criterion 2, therefore, the proposal has been evaluated against the:
1. **Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies document [Oct 1980/November 2011];**
2. **Scenic Resources Protection Plan [1991], incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan;**
3. **Washington Park Master Plan [1981]**
4. **Washington Park Reservoirs Historic District [2004].**

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

GOAL 1: METROPOLITAN COORDINATION
The Comprehensive Plan shall be coordinated with federal and state law and support regional goals, objectives and plans adopted by the Columbia Region Association of Governments and its successor, the Metropolitan Service District, to promote a regional planning framework.

Findings: While this goal speaks to the coordination of the Comprehensive Plan with state and federal law to promote a regional planning framework, rather than the coordination of specific projects with state and federal law, Policy 1.4 *Intergovernmental Coordination* states: "Insure continuous participation in intergovernmental affairs with public agencies to coordinate metropolitan planning and project development and maximize the efficient use of public funds.

In addition to addressing structural concerns, such as seismic liability and landslide pressures on the aging reservoirs, the proposal to demolish the historic reservoirs (#3 and #4) at Washington Park, in part, is in response to the Environmental Protection Agency's Long Term 2 Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (LT2). This federal regulation requires that all public water systems that store water in open reservoirs must either cover the reservoirs or treat the reservoir discharge in order to reduce the incidence of disease associated with pathogenic microorganisms. Because the proposal for demolition of the existing reservoirs includes replacement with a new covered reservoir, this proposal complies with federal and state law.

This goal is met.

GOAL 2: URBAN DEVELOPMENT
Maintain Portland's role as the major regional employment, population and cultural center through public policies that encourage expanded opportunity for housing and jobs, while retaining the character of established residential neighborhoods and business centers.

Findings: The policies and objectives for this goal are primarily related to the development and use of urban lands for housing, employment, and transportation. However, Policy 2.6 *Open Space* states: "Provide opportunities for recreation and visual relief by preserving Portland's parks, golf courses, trails, parkways and cemeteries…" The proposed replacement development, as discussed during three Design Advice Request and described in the narrative and drawing set, includes increased public access to the walkways surrounding the proposed reflecting pools, as well as increased public access to the historic resources proposed to remain. Currently, the public lands immediately surrounding the reservoirs are closed to public access. The proposed redevelopment will open these lands to the public, providing more passive recreational opportunities within Washington Park.

This goal is met.

GOAL 3: NEIGHBORHOODS
Preserve and reinforce the stability and diversity of the City's neighborhoods while allowing for increased density in order to attract and retain long-term residents and businesses and insure the City's residential quality and economic vitality.

Findings: Policy 3.5 *Neighborhood Involvement* states: Provide for the active involvement of neighborhood residents and business in decisions affecting their neighborhood and business associations…" Prior to application of this Type IV Demolition Review, the Portland Water Bureau participated in a more than year-long public outreach process. This process provided the opportunity for the PWB to inform the public of the challenges of site, their approach to these challenges, receive feedback from the public and various stakeholder groups, and receive

design advice from the Historic Landmarks Commission on the proposed replacement development and recommended mitigation for the loss of historic resources. Through the course of this project, this policy has been implemented.

Policy 3.1 *Physical Conditions* states: "Provide and coordinate programs to prevent the deterioration of existing structures and public facilities." Policy 3.4 *Historic Preservation* states: "Preserve and retain historic structures and areas throughout the city." The structural stability of the reservoirs has been continuously compromised by a landslide that was triggered during the original construction of the facility. Over the past 120 years, the PWB has repaired sections of the basins and parapet walls of the reservoirs multiple times; however, the persistent pressure of the landslide continues to damage the aging facilities. The PWB has indicated that even if the City opted to cover the existing reservoirs in place (in response to LT2), the landslide would continue to damage the basins. The Exterior Building Assessment (Exhibit A-4), prepared as part of this application by Peter Meijer Architect in consultation with AECOM, on page 25 states, "Given the degree and type of damage to the parapet basin walls, combined with the amount of previous repairs as a result of landslide damage, the basin walls cannot be effectively repaired."

As stated above, prior to this application, the PWB engaged the Historic Landmarks Commission for advice on the proposal, appearing before the Commission a total of four times. The Historic Landmarks Commission expressed a strong desire to mitigate the loss of Reservoir 3 and Reservoir 4 with preservation and restoration of the other contributing resources within the district, including the dams, gatehouses, Pump House 1, fencing, lighting, and the drinking fountain. Much of this work is described in Table 1.1 on pages 13-19 of Exhibit A-1, the Washington Park Reservoir Improvements Project Application for Historic Demolition Review (revised January 26, 2015 and included in the record as Exhibit A-7). Implementation of an interpretation program and restoration of historic views was also recommended by the Historic Landmarks Commission; these aspects are briefly described on page 43 and pages 88-90 of Exhibit A-7, with views indicated on Sheet 3.0 Preliminary Design Concept. Ultimate approval of the proposed restoration and interpretation activities will require Type III Historic Resource Review approval; however, the proposed work, as indicated above, is based on the recommendations of the public, stakeholder groups, and the Historic Landmarks Commission. In addition, the Historic Landmarks Commission has indicated that the relatively utilitarian 1946 Weir Building is incongruous with the rest of the contributing resources on the site, which are designed in a Romanesque Revival style, noting that its demolition would not compromise the integrity of the historic district.

While Policy 3.4 states that the City should retain historic structures throughout the city, the practicality of preserving structures perpetually compromised by the overwhelming forces of nature should also be considered. The Washington Park Reservoirs have served the City well for over 100 years, however, this service has not been without complications, as is evidenced by historical reports of landslides, cracking, and leakage from the beginning, as described in Section 1-3 of Exhibits A-1 and A-7. As noted above the proposal for demolition of Reservoirs 3 and 4 and the Weir Building, also includes, as mitigation, restoration measures for the six (6) contributing structures to remain as well as development of an interpretation program.

On balance, and with consideration of the unique natural forces undermining the structural stability of the historic reservoir basins, staff believes that this goal is met.

GOAL 4: HOUSING

Enhance Portland's vitality as a community at the center of the region's housing market by providing housing of different types, tenures, density, sizes, costs, and locations that accommodate the needs, preferences, and financial capabilities of current and future households.

Findings: This goal applies to the development of housing opportunities, not the redevelopment of existing open space or utility infrastructure.

This goal is not applicable.

GOAL 5: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Foster a strong and diverse economy which provides a full range of employment and economic choices for individuals and families in all parts of the city.

Findings: This goal applies to the development of employment opportunities, not the redevelopment of existing open space or utility infrastructure.

This goal is not applicable.

GOAL 6: TRANSPORTATION
Develop a balanced, equitable, and efficient transportation system that provides a range of transportation choices; reinforces the livability of neighborhoods; supports a strong and diverse economy; reduces air, noise, and water pollution; and lessens reliance on the automobile while maintaining accessibility.

Findings: Objective E of Policy 6.22 *Pedestrian Transportation* states: "Develop a citywide network of pedestrian trails that increases pedestrian access for recreation and transportation purposes and links to schools, parks, transit, and shopping as well as to the regional trail system and adjacent cities." As noted above, the existing reservoirs are largely restricted from public access for safety, liability, and water quality reasons. However, the reservoirs were originally designed with promenades around their perimeter, as was common in the era of the City Beautiful movement, which aspired to encourage civic pride (and moral virtue) through the construction of beautiful public works that indirectly promoted healthy social engagement through the beautification of the city. The proposed redevelopment will restore access to the site, as shown in Figure 36 on page 81 of Exhibits A-1 and A-7, providing increased public access for pedestrians and non-motorized vehicles adjacent to the reflecting pools and throughout the reservoirs historic district. This will allow increased opportunities for pedestrians and bicyclists to experience the historic resources proposed to remain through physical proximity as well as the interpretation program proposed as part of the mitigation. It will also increase the choices available to pedestrians and bicyclists with regard to routes through the park, as well as viewing and resting opportunities within Washington Park.

This goal is met.

GOAL 7: ENERGY
Promote a sustainable energy future by increasing energy efficiency in all sectors of the city by ten percent by the year 2000.

Findings: Objective K of Policy 7.2 *Energy Efficiency in City-Owned Facilities* states: "Where practicable, exceed the energy efficiency standards of the Oregon building code for new municipal buildings, facilities and major improvements. Cost-effective energy efficiency measures shall be taken, such as energy efficient lighting, high-efficiency motors and appliances, district heating and cooling systems, and the use of renewable resources." The Washington Park Reservoirs were listed in the National Register of Historic Places, in part, due to their innovative engineering as gravity is the primary force providing water from a mountain water source 30 miles east to residences and businesses within the city. Thus, the existing water system is extremely energy efficient and, because pumping is limited, also cost-effective.

In order to address the landslide and seismic concerns of the existing aging reservoirs, as well as respond to the LT2 regulations, the existing reservoirs are proposed for demolition so that a

new buried reservoir can be constructed within a significant portion of the existing Reservoir 3 footprint. While other sites were analyzed in 2002 as potential locations for new underground reservoirs on the west side, the existing site was determined to be the most practical with regard to energy and cost efficiency in part because much of the area for the new underground reservoir will require relatively little excavation and the presence of the existing conduit infrastructure.

In addition, demolition of Reservoir 4 allows the opportunity to reinforce the western hillside with additional earth mass in order to slow the continued movement of the landslide and provides an area, adjacent to the reduced footprint Reservoir 4 reflecting pool, to construct a bioswale for stormwater retention and filtering, thereby avoiding the need for a more energy-consumptive response to stormwater management.

This goal is met.

GOAL 8: ENVIRONMENT
Maintain and improve the quality of Portland's air, water and land resources and protect neighborhoods and business centers from detrimental noise pollution.

Findings: Goal 8.5 *Interagency Cooperation – Water Quality* states: "Continue cooperation with federal, state and regional agencies involved with the management and quality of Portland's water resources." The Environmental Protection Agency's LT2 regulation requires that all open reservoirs be covered or treated at the point of discharge. Despite a protracted effort to obtain either a variance from this regulation or an extension to the agreed-to deadline for compliance, the City was ultimately faced with the responsibility of ensuring its compliance with this regulation, thus the {Portland Water Bureau moved forward with application for this proposal. Although LT2 compliance is a factor in the proposal for demolition of the Washington Park Reservoirs, geologic forces play perhaps a more significant role in the request.

Policy 8.13 *Natural Hazards* states: "Control the density of development in areas of natural hazards consistent with the provisions of the City's Building Code, Chapter 70, the Floodplain Ordinance and the Subdivision Ordinance." Also, Objective B *Slope Protection and Drainage* of Policy 8.16 *Uplands Protection* states: "Protect slopes from erosion and landslides through the retention and use of vegetation, building code regulations, erosion control measures during construction, and other means." As noted above, construction of the reservoirs in 1894 triggered an ancient landslide that has, since that time, been the cause of persistent damage and resultant maintenance concerns. Indeed, a December 30, 1894 Oregonian article entitled "Cracks in Reservoir" noted within days of the reservoirs' first watering, cracks that had apparently been noticed, but not reported, prior to the water being turned on.

> *"The water was run out as rapidly as possible. The examination which followed showed many cracks in the cement, near the bottom of the sides on the west side, from the dam to the buttress. In some places the earth had the appearance of being pushed out. In places on the bottom the cement was squeezed or buckled up and cracked clear through, and some water escaped by reason thereof. It is certain the water does not come from below, for that is impervious to water. There is one of two causes at work.*
> *"First – Either water is collecting under the lining, and not being able to escape forces its way through the cement; or,*
> *"Second – The whole mass of earth on the west side, resting on an underlying stratum of clay, is sliding in. The pressure is due to a lateral or horizontal force and must be one of the two above mentioned.*

"If it is due to the former, the remedy will be by drainage and heavy retaining walls; if to the latter, the remedy will be hard to find for the pressure will be almost resistless."

While the reservoirs remained empty for the first ten years of their existence while the City attempted to dewater the hillside and slow the progression of the landslide, it has not ceased entirely. Removal of the existing reservoirs will provide the opportunity to restore the earth slope to the west of Reservoir 4, which will help to slow the movement of the landslide due to the reintroduction of earth mass at this location. Reinforcement of this slope will also help protect upland resources including the International Rose Test Garden and the Japanese Garden which are located within the footprint of this slide, as is shown on page 21 of Exhibits A-1 and A-7. Demolition will also allow the opportunity to construct a new buried reservoir with a footprint shifted slightly east of the existing Reservoir 3 footprint which will allow space between the new reservoir and the hillside to introduce a compressible material which will serve as a cushion for the persistent landslide, extending the life of the new reservoir. Removal of the existing reservoirs and construction of a new earthquake-resistant buried reservoir will also protect downslope residences and the city's water supply from a potentially catastrophic earthquake event. In addition, demolition of the 1946 Weir Building will allow access for the construction of the new buried reservoir in the proposed location in a manner that minimizes impacts to other historic and natural resources on the site.

Policy 8.14 *Natural Resources* states: "Conserve significant natural and scenic resource sites and values through a combination of programs…Balance the conservation of significant natural resources with the need for other urban uses and activities through evaluation of economic, social, environmental, and energy consequences of such actions." In addition, Objective F *Pruning to Maintain and Enhance Views* states: "Actively manage the pruning and cutting of trees and shrubs on public lands or on non-public areas with scenic designations to maintain and enhance scenic views which may be impacted by vegetation." While restoration of the scenic views noted in the Olmsted Plan or the Scenic Resources Protection Plan is not contingent on demolition of the historic resources, it is worth noting that this aspect of the proposal meets this policy.

This goal is met.

GOAL 9: CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

Improve the method for citizen involvement in the on-going land use decision-making process and provide opportunities for citizen participation in the implementation, review and amendment of the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Findings: Policy 9.1 *Citizen Involvement Coordination* states: "Encourage citizen involvement in land use planning projects by actively coordinating the planning process with relevant community organizations, through the reasonable availability of planning reports to city residents and businesses, and notice of official public hearings to neighborhood associations, business groups, affected individuals and the general public." Prior to making application for this Type IV Demolition Review, the Portland Water Bureau embarked on an extensive public outreach campaign which included stakeholder interviews, nine Community sounding Board meetings, four meetings with the Historic Landmarks Commission, American Institute of Architects Historic Resources Committee Briefings, several walking tours, and face-to-face as well as online open houses. This engagement process helped to shape the design concept presented as the proposed replacement for the existing reservoirs. During this process several key values were identified, including the retention of large expanses of open water, retention of as much historic character as possible, provision of interpretive elements, quiet spaces, and habitat, and responsibility for ratepayer's money. Section 1-4 *Public Involvement, Community Values & Design Options* in Exhibits A-1 and A-7 further details this process.

In addition, as part of this process the Bureau of Development Services issued notice of the March 23rd Historic Landmarks Commission meeting, later rescheduled to March 30th, and the April 23rd City Council hearing to neighborhood associations, business groups, and neighbors.

This goal is met.

GOAL 10: PLAN REVIEW AND ADMINISTRATION
Portland's Comprehensive Plan will undergo periodic review to assure that it remains an up-to-date and workable framework for land use development. The Plan will be implemented in accordance with State law and the Goals, Policies and Comprehensive Plan Map contained in the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Findings: This goal relates to the periodic review and implementation of the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with state law. As such, it speaks to a higher level of planning and is not applicable to this specific land use application.

This goal is not applicable.

GOAL 11: PUBLIC FACILITIES
Provide a timely, orderly and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services that support existing and planned land use patterns and densities.

Findings: Goal 11E *Water Service Goal & Policies* states: "Insure that reliable and adequate water supply and delivery systems are available to provide sufficient quantities of high quality water at adequate pressures to meet the existing and future needs of the community, on an equitable, efficient and self-sustaining basis."

Policy 11.26 *Quality* states: "Maintain the quality of the water supply at its current level, which exceeds all state and federal water quality standards and satisfies the needs of both domestic and industrial consumers." While the City maintains water service of exceptional quality, largely due to the protections on the Bull Run Watershed which provides our source water, the federal government has mandated additional protections for water quality, requiring our reservoirs to be either covered or treated at the point of discharge. As such, the proposal to demolish the existing reservoirs and construct a new buried reservoir in approximately the same location is, in part, a response to this regulation.

Policy 11.28 *Maintenance* states: "Maintain storage and distribution facilities in order to protect water quality, insure a reliable supply, assure adequate flow for all user needs, and minimize water loss." Despite the federal regulations, there are other factors serving as impetuses for the proposal. Specifically, and as noted above, construction of the reservoirs in 1894 triggered an ancient landslide that has ever since created significant pressures on the reservoirs due to persistent sliding. This has created considerable maintenance concerns over the past 120 years, which grow ever more concerning as the seismically susceptible reservoirs continue to age. It has been noted by the Portland Water Bureau that retrofitting the existing facilities to withstand the continued pressures of the landslide would be costly and inefficient as the efforts would ultimately be futile. As such, a new replacement facility is proposed slightly further east of the existing Reservoir 3 and significant fill is proposed to reconstruct the slope of the hillside above and within a portion of the existing footprint of Reservoir 4 in an effort to slow the encroaching landslide.

Policy 11.29 *Storage* states: "Maintain city storage capacity of at least three times the average daily use of city users. Additional storage capacity contracted by outside-city water users will also be maintained." The Portland Water Bureau has indicated that their current water needs are met, even without replacing the capacity of Reservoir 4 on the site. The new buried

reservoir to be located in approximately the same location as the existing Reservoir 3, combined with other storage sites within the City, will be sufficient to meet the city's needs.

Policy 11.31 *Design and Community Impact* states: "Design water facilities to be compatible with the area in which they are located." The design of the proposed replacement development is the result of community participation and advice from the Historic Landmarks Commission and other stakeholders. The proposed development includes a buried reservoir with a cascading reflecting pool in approximately the same location and footprint as the existing Reservoir 3. This reflecting pool will ensure that visible water is present adjacent to Gatehouse 3 and the Dam and at approximately the same elevation as with the historic condition. Similarly, at Reservoir 4, while there will be no buried reservoir, there will be a reflecting pool adjacent to Gatehouse 4 and the Dam in order to preserve the historic character of these features.

In addition, staff notes that the reservoirs are currently restricted from public access due to liability concerns. The proposed redevelopment will incorporate greater connectivity to the visible water features and the historic resources to remain, as well as increased opportunities for passive recreation throughout the site. An interpretation program will be developed to tell the story of the Washington Park Reservoirs and the Bull Run water delivery system. These aspects of the proposal will ensure that the new facility will be compatible with the area in which it is located - a public park, where nature, beauty, and opportunities for passive recreation are part of the essential character.

Policy 11.36 *Water Pressure* states: "Provide water at standard pressures (40 to 110 lbs. per square inch) to all users whenever possible." By proposing to locate the new buried reservoir in essentially the same location as the existing Reservoir 3, existing water pressure will be maintained.

This goal is met.

GOAL 12: URBAN DESIGN
Enhance Portland as a livable city, attractive in its setting and dynamic in its urban character by preserving its history and building a substantial legacy of quality private developments and public improvements for future generations.

Findings: Policy 12.1 *Portland's Character* states: "Enhance and extend Portland's attractive identity. Build on design elements, features and themes identified with the City. Recognize and extend the use of City themes that establish a basis of a shared identity reinforcing the individual's sense of participation in a larger community." The Washington Park open reservoirs have served our City for more than 100 years, providing an essential service as well as beautiful vistas of the intersection of architecture, utility, and nature. The structures have become symbolic of Portlander's appreciation and embrace of nature and are much beloved by the majority of the population aware of their existence and a source of pride for the City.

Unfortunately, the overwhelming forces of nature have not been kind to these structures and the preservation of these facilities has been an ongoing challenge since before their initial completion. As described above, the continued preservation of the existing historic reservoirs, with the persistent landslide pressures continuing to compromise their structural stability, appears to be unsustainable in the long run. As such, it may be prudent to consider this goal, with an appreciation for our past, but with an eye to our future, and accepting our limitations in the face of Mother Nature. Through cooperation with the Community Sounding Board, the Historic Landmarks Commission, and a number of other stakeholders, the Portland Water Bureau has proposed a replacement facility that is both attractive and engaging, providing the opportunity for the City to build a new legacy. The proposal reconnects us with the reservoirs in a new way, through restoration and reconnection with the historic resources to remain,

through educational programming, and through restored views toward the Bull Run watershed, referred to as the Olmsted View.

Objective B of Policy 12.1 states: "Preserve and enhance the character of Portland's neighborhoods. Encourage the development of attractive and unique characteristics which aid each neighborhood in developing its individual identity." While the reservoirs, as publicly-owned facilities belong to us all, they are located within the Arlington Heights neighborhood and are a rather unique characteristic of this neighborhood and a part of its unique identity. Members of the Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association, as well as members of neighboring neighborhoods, participated in the Community Sounding Board discussions and have helped to shape the development of the proposed replacement facilities. Throughout this process, the participation and cooperation between the public and the Portland Water Bureau, has demonstrated the best of collaborative community planning.

Objective C of Policy 12.1 states: "Enhance the sense Portlanders have that they are living close to nature…Design new development to enhance the natural environment that is so much a part of Portland's character." Objective H states: "Preserve and enhance existing public viewpoints, scenic sites and scenic corridors. As new development occurs, take advantage of opportunities to create new views of Portland's rivers, bridges, the surrounding mountains and hills, and the Central City skyline." As noted above, the proposed replacement development will provide increased pedestrian access to the water features. Within the footprint of the redeveloped Reservoir 4, a grassy swale will provide additional wildlife habitat adjacent to the lower reflecting pool. The City's Scenic Views, Sites, and Corridors Resource Protection Plan lists certain scenic views, sites, and drives worthy of protection. While some of these are within Washington Park, none specifically describe views that include the existing reservoirs; therefore these designated views and drives will not be affected by the proposal. However, as noted above, the Olmsted view to the Bull Run watershed area will be restored.

These policies are met.

Policy 12.3 *Historic Preservation* states: "Enhance the City's identity through the protection of Portland's significant historic resources. Preserve and reuse the historic artifacts as part of Portland's fabric. Encourage development to sensitively incorporate preservation of historic structures and artifacts." It is without question that the Washington Park Reservoirs, along with the Mt. Tabor Reservoirs, are among the City of Portland's most significant historic resources. The construction of the Bull Run water delivery system in 1894, with the reservoirs serving as the grand finale, helped provide clean and safe drinking water to citizens of our rapidly growing city. Indeed, the reservoirs were one of the first and grandest public works projects initiated and completed by the City. As the National Register nomination states:

> *"The layout of the reservoirs, on the east and west side of the Willamette River, was one of the early connections to the two sides of Portland divided by the river. The result of a government-business paradigm for public works, funding the creation of Portland's Bull Run water system, of which the reservoirs are an integral part serving as the water storage and delivery system, was a landmark process for Oregon's legislature that illustrated a commitment to public health and an adequate supply of high quality water using a cost effective delivery design. Consequently, subsequent and similar public-private investments ensued, such as the funding and construction of Portland City Hall in 1895, the development of park planning, and the installation of public drinking fountains, the Benson Bubblers in 1912, in downtown Portland."*

Consideration of the future of the reservoirs has been a decades-long question, with the 1981 Washington Park Master Plan noting the federal government had previously urged the covering of all open reservoirs, and therefore, acknowledging this was a possibility. As reported in the

December 30, 1894 Oregonian article "Cracks in the Reservoir", one alarmist suggested that *"nothing could save either of them and…it would be better for the taxpayers to shut them down."* Instead, the City did its best to keep the reservoirs in service for over 100 years. These same techniques could probably continue to extend the life of the reservoirs a few more decades, however, the federal government is now requiring that the water in existing open reservoirs be either covered or treated at the point of discharge. Given these options, and with consideration of the history of nature's influence on the site, the decision was made to seek approval for the construction of a new buried reservoir and reinforcement of the hillside, with demolition of the existing historic reservoirs as a consequence.

While the basins and parapets walls of Reservoirs 3 and 4, and the Weir Building, are proposed to be demolished, the applicant proposes restoration activities to the contributing resources proposed to remain, as well as educational programming, and increased accessibility as mitigation. The proposed restoration activities include the following: rehabilitation of the Dam 3, including repair and reconstruction (as needed) of the parapet wall and balustrade, and removal of unnecessary piping and equipment; rehabilitation of Dam 4, including repair and reconstruction (as needed) of the parapet wall and balustrade, and removal of unnecessary piping and equipment; restoration of windows to Pump House 1, affording interior views to "Thumper"; structural upgrade, roof replacement, replacement of non-historic metal doors with more appropriate doors, and removal of unnecessary equipment to Gatehouse 3; replacement of non-historic metal doors with more appropriate doors and removal of unnecessary equipment to Gatehouse 4; cleaning of the Generator Building and all other buildings and structures to remain; plus patching of holes, and crack and spall repair on all contributing buildings and structures to remain. In addition, retention and rehabilitation of the historic fencing along Dams 3 and 4 and along the east and south edges of Reservoir 4, rehabilitation of the historic light post ironwork, renovation of 3 decorative concrete urns, and removal of non-historic incompatible lighting and introduction of new visually unobtrusive lighting is also proposed. While Reservoirs 3 and 4 and the Weir Building are proposed for demolition, the remaining historic resources will be rehabilitated and incorporated into the new design.

Objective A of Policy 12.3 states: "Preserve and accentuate historic resources as part of an urban environment that is being reshaped by new development projects." As noted above, the remaining historic resources will be rehabilitated and incorporated into the new development. While a significant portion of the new development will be underground, new reflecting pools, pedestrian paths, and lighting are proposed. These new elements will be juxtaposed against the remaining historic resources, adding contrast while still being compatible. In addition, interpretive programming, proposed as mitigation, will highlight the historic resources, informing the public of their history and significance.

Objective B states: "Support the preservation of Portland's historic resources through public information, advocacy and leadership within the community as well as through the use of regulatory tools." This Demolition Review meets the regulatory aspect of this policy. Active preservation of the historic resources to remain and the development of interpretive programming, as is proposed as the mitigation for the loss of Reservoirs 3 and 4 and the Weir Building, meets the other aspects of this objective. It should be noted however, that because of deferred maintenance, portions of the Dam 3 and 4 balustrades will need to be reconstructed, rather than preserved, whereas had more concerted preservation efforts occurred earlier, this would not be the case.

Objective C of Policy 12.3 states: "Maintain a process that creates opportunities for those interested in the preservation of Portland's significant historic resources to participate in the review of development projects that propose to alter or remove historic resources." The Type IV Demolition Review process affords the public the opportunity to comment of the proposed demolition and replacement development. A subsequent Type III Historic Resource Review will provide additional opportunity for the public to comment as the proposal continues to become

more specific and refined. In addition, to the official processes, the Portland Water Bureau engaged in an extensive public outreach campaign to help develop the general concepts of the proposal. That outreach, combined with design advice by the Historic Landmarks Commission, helped to shape the current proposal.

Demolition of the historic Reservoirs 3 and 4, as well as the Weir Building, when considered out of the context of the overall development proposal, appears to not meet the City's Historic Preservation goal. However, in conjunction with the proposal to rehabilitate the remaining historic resources, implement interpretive programming, and increase public accessibility to these remaining historic resources, and *only when combined with these mitigation provisions*, can staff affirm that the City's Historic Preservation goals are met. The Historic Landmarks Commission has previously stated that the City should lead by example with regard to maintaining and preserving the historic resources which it owns. That said, it is worth noting that until this proposed demolition, these historic resources have been allowed to deteriorate to the point of potentially requiring reconstruction of portions of those resources to remain. The language of the Historic Preservation policy and its objectives, specifically the use of the word "leadership", imply that the City should be proactive in preservation efforts, rather than merely reactive by proposing preservation as mitigation for another action.

These policies are both met and not met.

Objective B of Policy 12.4 *Provide for Pedestrians* states: "Enhance the environment occupied by Portland's pedestrians. Seek to enrich these places with designs that express the pleasure and hold the pleasant surprises of urban living." As noted above, the redevelopment proposal includes increased pedestrian accessibility to the proposed reflecting pools and the historic resources to remain, as well as introduce interpretive programming and provide additional routes for pedestrians and bicyclists. Currently the reservoirs and much of the land around them is restricted from public access due to liability concerns. As a result of the proposed redevelopment, these lands will be reopened, affording new opportunities for passive recreation and surprise.

On balance, and with consideration of the unique natural forces undermining the structural stability of the historic reservoir basins, as described under Policy 12.1 above, staff believes that this goal is met.

WASHINGTON PARK MASTER PLAN

RECOMMENDATION 3: RESERVOIRS

A. *Move the chain-link fence around the reservoirs to a less unsightly position lower on the slope.*
B. *If the reservoirs are covered, flood the covered area with shallow water to preserve their traditional attractive appearance.*

Findings: Currently, chain link fencing remains along the upper elevation portions of Sherwood Avenue. Some fencing was replaced with iron fencing in 2005 and 2007. The Portland Water Bureau has indicated that portions of the existing chain-link fencing will be moved and the resultant development will allow for increased accessibility along the proposed replacement water features and the historic resources proposed to remain. As noted under "B", covering of the reservoirs was anticipated more than 30 years ago. As suggested, the resultant development will include a reflecting pool over a new buried Reservoir 3 as well as a reflecting pool adjacent to the Reservoir 4 dam and gatehouse, in a reduced footprint of the existing Reservoir 4.

These criteria are met.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Unless specifically required in the approval criteria listed above, this proposal does not have to meet the development standards in order to be approved during this review process. The plans submitted for a building or zoning permit must demonstrate that all development standards of Title 33 can be met, or have received an Adjustment or Modification via a land use review prior to the approval of a building or zoning permit.

CONCLUSIONS

The Washington Park Reservoirs were constructed in 1894 within a natural ravine in what was then called City Park. Unfortunately, the shape of the natural ravine was enhanced with excavation that led to the awakening of an ancient landslide that has exerted its pressure on the reservoirs, resulting in cracking and compromised integrity since before they were even completed. Herculean efforts were undertaken that have allowed the reservoirs to serve the City for over 100 years; however, the force of gravity persists compromising the reservoirs' ability to withstand a more unpredictable events such as a significant earthquake. In addition, the Environmental Protection Agency has mandated that drinking water in open reservoirs be either covered or treated at the point of discharge, which ultimately has prompted the City's proposal to demolish the reservoirs and build a new buried reservoir at this point in time, rather than at some later point in time.

Prior to this Demolition Review, there have been only two other Demolition Reviews in the City's history. In both of those cases, LU 09-171259 DM and LU 14-210073 DM, City Council indicated that in order for a Demolition Review to be approved, the replacement development must provide a significant public benefit in order to make up for the loss of the historic resource. In this case, the significance of the historic resources is undeniable and the public benefit must be comparable. As outlined above, the construction of a new buried reservoir will protect downslope properties from a potentially catastrophic event such as an earthquake, while the reinforcement of the slope west of Reservoir 4 will help to slow movement of the landslide, thus protecting upland resources such as the International Rose Test Garden. Both of these aspects of the proposal are not possible with retention of the existing reservoirs. In addition, decommissioning of the existing reservoirs and construction of a new buried reservoir slightly east of the existing Reservoir 3 will require less maintenance over time as it will not be subject to the persistent force of the landslide compromising its integrity. In addition, as mitigation, the City proposes substantial rehabilitation work on the existing historic resources proposed to remain, interpretive programming, and increased accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists, which will bring the site closer to the public than it has been for the past several years. On balance, the proposal to demolish Reservoirs 3 and 4 and the Weir Building and redevelop the site as proposed in the applicant's narrative (Exhibits A-1 and A-7), has been found to meet the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and therefore warrants approval.

TENTATIVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION

(May be revised upon receipt of new information at any time prior to the City Council decision)

Approval of demolition of Reservoir 3, Reservoir 4, and the Weir Building in the Washington Park Reservoirs Historic District, subject to the following conditions:

A. As part of the building permit application submittal, each of the 4 required site plans and any additional drawings must reflect the information and design approved by this land use review as indicated in Exhibits C-1 through C-3. The sheets on which this information appears must be labeled, "Proposal and design as approved in Case File # LU 14-249689 DM. No field changes allowed.

Procedural Information. The application for this land use review was submitted on December 15, 2014, and was determined to be complete on January 26, 2015.

Zoning Code Section 33.700.080 states that Land Use Review applications are reviewed under the regulations in effect at the time the application was submitted, provided that the application is complete at the time of submittal, or complete within 180 days. Therefore this application was reviewed against the Zoning Code in effect on December 15, 2014.

ORS 227.178 states the City must issue a final decision on Land Use Review applications within 120-days of the application being deemed complete. The 120-day review period may be waived or extended at the request of the applicant. In this case, the applicant did not waive or extend the 120-day review period. Unless further extended by the applicant, **the 120 days will expire on: May 26, 2015**

Some of the information contained in this report was provided by the applicant.

As required by Section 33.800.060 of the Portland Zoning Code, the burden of proof is on the applicant to show that the approval criteria are met. The Bureau of Development Services has independently reviewed the information submitted by the applicant and has included this information only where the Bureau of Development Services has determined the information satisfactorily demonstrates compliance with the applicable approval criteria. This report is the recommendation of the Bureau of Development Services with input from other City and public agencies.

Conditions of Approval. If approved, this project may be subject to a number of specific conditions, listed above. Compliance with the applicable conditions of approval must be documented in all related permit applications. Plans and drawings submitted during the permitting process must illustrate how applicable conditions of approval are met. Any project elements that are specifically required by conditions of approval must be shown on the plans, and labeled as such.

These conditions of approval run with the land, unless modified by future land use reviews. As used in the conditions, the term "applicant" includes the applicant for this land use review, any person undertaking development pursuant to this land use review, the proprietor of the use or development approved by this land use review, and the current owner and future owners of the property subject to this land use review.

This report is not a decision. This report is a recommendation to the City Council by the Bureau of Development Services. You may review the file on this case at our office at 1900 SW Fourth Ave., Suite 5000, Portland, OR 97201. Your comments to the Portland City Council should be mailed c/o Portland City Council, 1221 SW Fourth Ave., Portland, OR 97204.

You will receive mailed notice of the decision if you write a letter received before the hearing or testify at the hearing, or if you are the property owner or applicant. This Staff Report will be posted on the Bureau of Development Services website. Look at www.portlandonline.com. On the left side of the page use the search box to find Development Services, then click on the Zoning/Land Use section, select Notices and Hearings. Land use review notices are listed by the District Coalition shown at the beginning of this document. You may review the file on this case at the Development Services Building at 1900 SW Fourth Ave., Suite 5000, Portland, OR 97201.

City Council Hearing. The City Code requires the City Council to hold a public hearing on this case and you will have the opportunity to testify. The hearing will be scheduled by the City Auditor upon receipt of the Hearings Officer's Recommendation. You will be notified of the time and date of the hearing before City Council. If you wish to speak at the Council hearing, you are encouraged to submit written materials upon which your testimony will be based, to the City Auditor.

If you have any questions contact the Bureau of Development Services representative listed in this Recommendation (823-3581).

Recording the final decision.
If this Land Use Review is approved the final decision must be recorded with the Multnomah County Recorder before the approved use is permitted and before any building or zoning permits are issued. A few days prior to the last day to appeal, the City will mail instructions to the applicant for recording the documents associated with their final land use decision.

The applicant, builder, or a representative may record the final decision as follows:

- By Mail: Send the two recording sheets (sent in separate mailing) and the final Land Use Review decision with a check made payable to the Multnomah County Recorder to: Multnomah County Recorder, P.O. Box 5007, Portland OR 97208. The recording fee is identified on the recording sheet. Please include a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

- In Person: Bring the two recording sheets (sent in separate mailing) and the final Land Use Review decision with a check made payable to the Multnomah County Recorder to the County Recorder's office located at 501 SE Hawthorne Boulevard, #158, Portland OR 97214. The recording fee is identified on the recording sheet.

For further information on recording, please call the County Recorder at 503-988-3034.

Expiration of this approval. An approval expires three years from the date the final decision is rendered unless a building permit has been issued, or the approved activity has begun.

Where a site has received approval for multiple developments, and a building permit is not issued for all of the approved development within three years of the date of the final decision, a new land use review will be required before a permit will be issued for the remaining development, subject to the Zoning Code in effect at that time.

Applying for your permits. A building permit, occupancy permit, or development permit may be required before carrying out an approved project. At the time they apply for a permit, permittees must demonstrate compliance with:
- All conditions imposed herein;
- All applicable development standards, unless specifically exempted as part of this land use review;
- All requirements of the building code; and
- All provisions of the Municipal Code of the City of Portland, and all other applicable ordinances, provisions and regulations of the City.

Planner's Name: Hillary Adam
Date: April 13, 2015

EXHIBITS
NOT ATTACHED UNLESS INDICATED

A. Applicant's Statement:
   1. Application for Historic Demolition Review, dated December 2014 (98 pages)
   2. Changes Over Time (4 sheets)
   3. Original Drawings (3 sheets)
   4. Exterior Building Assessment
   5. Pre-Application Conference Summary Memo, dated June 9, 2014
   6. Washington Park Reservoirs National Register nomination
   7. Revised Application, received January 26, 2015 (98 pages)

8. Revised Proposed Demolition sheet, dated January 23, 2015
9. AIA Letter of support
10. Community Sounding Board Letter of support, dated January 27, 2014
11. Comments forwarded from Jason Allen, at the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), dated March 9, 2015, stating that SHPO found the demolition to adversely affect the historic district, but did not believe the demolition would affect the district's listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

B. Zoning Map (attached)
C. Plans & Drawings:
   1. Existing Site Conditions (attached)
   2. Proposed Demolition (attached)
   3. Preliminary Design Concept (attached)
D. Notification information:
   1. Request for response
   2. Posting letter sent to applicant
   3. Notice to be posted
   4. Applicant's statement certifying posting
   5 Mailing list
   6. Mailed notice
   7. Revised Posting Notice
   8. 2nd Certification form
   9. Revised Notice
   10. Revised Notice Mailing List
   11. Map of Posting Notice Locations
E. Agency Responses:
   1. Bureau of Parks, Forestry Division
   2. Water Bureau
   3. Life Safety Division of BDS
   4. Bureau of Environmental Services
   5. Fire Bureau
   6. Bureau of Transportation Engineering and Development Review
   7. Site Development Review Section of Bureau of Development Services
F. Letters:
   1. Susan Alpert Siegel, President of the Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association, on February 27, 2015, wrote with concerns regarding the routing of construction traffic through the neighborhood and the closure of Sacajawea Circle during the project's multi-year construction schedule.
   2. Nancy Seton, President and Land Use Chair of the Southwest Hills Residential League (SWHRL), on March 6, 2015 wrote in support of the proposal to demolish the existing historic reservoirs and with support for the proposed replacement development featuring reflecting pools a restored hillside, and improved access.
   3. Catherine Ellison, on March 7, 2015, wrote with concerns about Sacajawea Circle being closed during construction, stating it would be a tremendous inconvenience, and requesting that alternatives be considered.
   4. RoseMarie Opp, on March 8, 2015, wrote with concerns regarding the effect of buried reservoirs on health, cracks in the Powell Butte reservoir, negative impacts of construction on Washington Park, and concern that the Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association online calendar does not list the April 23rd City Council hearing date. Ms. Opp also provided a copy of the October 29, 2014 presentation to the Community Sounding Board and a copy of the City of Portland Public Involvement Principles, both received March 17, 2015
   5. Katherine Stansbury, on March 9, 2015, wrote in opposition to the proposed disconnection of the Mt. Tabor Reservoirs, citing previous attempts to destroy the reservoirs and the City's failure to request extensions to the LT2 timeline, and requesting the Historic Landmarks Commission intervene to delay the project until after the LT2 review.

6. Scott Fernandez, on March 9, 2015, wrote in opposition, noting the benefits of sunlight, oxygenation, and open air on drinking water and stating that the "landslide characterization issues and reasons for the changes to Washington Park reservoirs have been overblown and portrayed incorrectly."
7. Ann Witsil, on March 9, 2015, wrote with concerns regarding the temporary closure of Sacajewea Circle, suggesting limiting its closing to certain times of day.
8. Eric Nagle, Community Sounding Board member, on March 16, 2015, forwarded a January 27, 2014 memo from the Community Sounding Board to the Historic Landmarks Commission in support of the proposal. Mr. Nagle also noted the need for design features that discourage skateboarding to ensure the continued tranquility of the place.
9. Katherine Stansbury, on March 19, 2015, wrote in opposition, requesting that the Historic Landmarks Commission make a request to the governor and the Oregon Health Authority to delay the start of the project until January 1, 2017.
10. Beth Giansiracusa, on March 19, 2015, wrote in opposition suggesting that the City's drinking water be treated rather than buried.
11. Jeffrey E. Boly on March 19, 2015, wrote in opposition, stating that the applicant cannot meet the first approval criteria option and suggesting alternative options for Reservoirs #3 and #4.
12. Susan Alpert Siegel, President of the Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association, on March 24, 2015, wrote with concerns that the proposed restoration efforts are not sufficiently described in the proposal drawings and suggesting the demolition permit drawing must also show the preservation work proposed.
13. Joanne Stainbrook, AIA Historic Resources Committee, on March 20, 2015, wrote in support, stating the applicant had met with them three times and that they found the level of mitigation proposed is appropriate.
14. Floy Jones, on March 29, 2015, provided the Washington Park Reservoirs Historic Structures Report.
15. Mary Ann Schwab, on March 30, 2015, wrote with concerns regarding construction traffic and location of posting boards.
16. Dee White, on March 29, 2015, wrote in opposition, stating that the citizen Involvement goal was not met as the public was never given the opportunity to discuss alternatives to demolition.
17. Floy Jones, Friends of the Reservoirs, on March 29, 2015, wrote in opposition, stating that the applicant has not met Goal 9 Citizen Involvement, and has defied a 2004 City Council ordinance (#36267) which required stakeholder input on future plans for the reservoirs.
18. Katherin Kirkpatrick, on March 30, 2015, wrote in opposition, stating that demolition of the resources results in a failure to preserve the historic character and function of the resources, and stating that the applicant has not met the EPA's public notification rules.

G. Other:
1. Original LUR Application
2. Incomplete Letter, dated January 14, 2015
3. Applicant Drawing Set for Historic Landmarks Commission meeting March 30, 2015
4. Applicant's Supplementary Materials

H. Historic Landmarks Commission meeting March 30, 2015
1. Staff Presentation to Historic Landmarks Commission, dated March 30, 2015
2. Applicant Presentation to Historic Landmarks Commission, dated March 30, 2015
3. Chris Kent, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in support
4. John Czarnecki, on March 30, 2015, provided oral and photographic testimony in support and suggesting that the maintenance structures east of Reservoir 4 should also be removed.
5. Scott Fernandez, on March 30, 2015, provided oral and written testimony in opposition stating that the landslide and seismic concern are not as bad as have been presented and the negative effects of buried reservoirs is of greater concern.
6. Joe Walsh, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in opposition
7. RoseMarie Opp, on March 30, 2015, provided oral and written testimony in opposition, stating that buried reservoirs result in negative health effects and with concerns regarding construction traffic.

8. Floy Jones, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in opposition
9. Dee White, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in opposition
10. Jeffrey Boly, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in opposition, stating there was less consensus among the community stakeholders than has been presented.
11. Beth Giansiracusa, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony in opposition
12. Eileen Brady, on March 30, 2015, provided oral testimony encouraging the Historic Landmarks Commission to attend the Mt. Tabor Appeal hearing at City Council.
13. Mark Wheeler, on February 17, 2015, wrote in opposition. These comments were forwarded by Teresa Elliott, Portland Water Bureau.
14. Portland Water Bureau Memo to City Council, dated April 9, 2015
15. Portland Water Bureau Public Involvement Summary, dated April 2015
16. Type IV Land Use Hearing Meeting Packet, dated April 23, 2015
17. Application Materials resubmitted for City Council hearing
18. Historic Landmarks Commission letter to City Council, dated April 13, 2015
19. Staff Report and Recommendation to City Council, dated April 13, 2015

The Bureau of Development Services is committed to providing equal access to information and hearings. Please notify us no less than five business days prior to the event if you need special accommodations. Call 503-823-7300 (TTY 503-823-6868).

City of Portland
Historic Landmarks Commission

1900 SW Fourth Ave., Suite 5000 / 16
Portland, Oregon 97201
Telephone: (503) 823-7300
TDD: (503) 823-6868
FAX: (503) 823-5630
www.portlandonline.com/bds

April 13, 2015

Portland City Council
1221 SW 4th Avenue
Portland, OR 97204

RE: LU 14-249689 DM – Washington Park Reservoirs

Mayor Hales and City Commissioners,

The Portland Historic Landmarks Commission (PHLC) is providing this letter in support of the Washington Park Reservoirs improvement project. The PHLC held a public meeting on 3/30/15 to review the demolition proposal and the Commission members in attendance voted 3-1 in favor of supporting Staff's recommended approval of the demolition of the two reservoir basins and the Weir Building. In light of the need to structurally improve the resource and cover our public drinking water, the majority of Landmarks Commissioners concurred with the Staff Report findings that the proposed demolition and redevelopment/restoration of the property with a new structurally-stable underground reservoir, reflecting pools, access paths, lighting, site interpretation, building restoration, and other enhancements better meets the Comprehensive Plan goals when compared to retaining the site in its current condition and configuration.

The land use process for the Washington Park Reservoirs has so far included one briefing and three Design Advice Requests before the PHLC. If City Council approves LU 14-249689 DM, the Applicant will come back before our Commission for a Type III land use review for the improvements and alterations to the site prior to the issuance of the demolition permit. The Water Bureau and their knowledgeable consultants incorporated feedback and specific requests made by the PHLC at each of the Design Advice meetings. Their submittals have been clear and comprehensive. They have responded to our request for appropriate mitigation (in the form of restoration and rehabilitation of certain aspects of the site such as the outbuildings, metal fencing, and lighting) to offset the loss of the deep reservoir basins and the Weir Building. We are supportive of the scope of improvements that are planned for this site and believe that the enhanced access will be a great public benefit. This project demonstrates a clear commitment to rectifying the site issues at the Washington Park Reservoirs and to make this an outstanding public space for Portlanders to enjoy for decades to come.

During our public meeting on March 30th we heard from Staff, the Applicant, and a number of citizens who provided testimony. Two individuals testified in favor of the proposal and approximately ten people testified in opposition to the proposal. Those in favor had positive things to say with respect to the project design, improved access to the historic resources, and the public process. Those in opposition to the proposal cited concerns around 1) the lack of public involvement and Water Bureau transparency; 2) negative impacts to the neighborhood caused by construction activities; 3) Water Bureau track record for property stewardship; and 4) loss of historic fabric. We also heard from individuals who questioned whether the landside was truly a threat to the reservoirs, whether this project was actually unnecessary due to the available capacity of other reservoirs, and

from those who objected to their drinking water being covered. As the Commission charged with protecting our City's historic resources, most of these concerns and objections were outside our purview. We suggested that City Council would be the more appropriate venue for citizens to discuss areas of concern that were not related to the site's historical nature.

One PHLC commissioner did not feel comfortable recommending approval for the demolition due to 1) insufficient evidence that this was the only solution to the drinking water problem at hand, and 2) concerns related to the Water Bureau's track record for preservation and upkeep of all the historic resources on the reservoir properties. The dissenting opinion was that the reservoirs are highly significant historic resources in Portland and other alternatives should be explored that do not involve demolition.

Again, in light of the needed upgrades for this site to continue to function as a public drinking water reservoir, the majority of Landmarks Commissioners are supportive of the Applicant's request for demolition and look forward to having them back for a Type III review for the proposed improvements.

Sincerely,

Brian Emerick
Chair

Jessica Engeman
Vice Chair