AGREEMENT

This document, consisting of three pages, memorializes the understanding of the several signatory parties.

This agreement was reached after negotiations conducted between said parties preceding the 11th of March, 1971, when the final understanding was consummated.

FIRST

The parties understand that the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 applies to the relocation of residents from the Emanuel Hospital Urban Renewal Project (ORE. R-20), and fully endorse the letter and intent of said Act.

SECOND

The parties agree:

That it is desirable to improve the Model Cities Area for residential purposes and to increase the supply of standard housing available within the Model Cities Area for persons of low and moderate income.

That the development of attractive and standard, Federally-assisted, low and moderate income dwelling units within the Model Cities Area is essential to the preservation and improvement of that area as a residential district.

That the area designated in the Emanuel Hospital Project Urban Renewal Plan for housing is suitable for development of Federally-assisted low and moderate income housing, including public housing.

That, at the present time there are approximately 180 existing housing units, the majority of which are substandard and of which approximately 135 are presently occupied. That the parties agree to cooperate in the development of the aforedescribed area within the Emanuel Hospital Urban Renewal Project with approximately 180 to 300 units of Federallyassisted low and moderate income housing, including public housing, and complementary residential and supportive use, subject to the terms of the Emanuel Hospital Project Urban Renewal Plan and applicable laws, rules and regulations governing the development of the Project Area and the development of low and moderate income housing.

That units to be furnished by the Housing Authority of Portland shall be in addition to those covered in its existing Cooperation Agreement with the City of Portland and shall be funded by resources other than those required to fulfill requirements of the Housing Authority's present, outstanding Cooperation Agreements with the City of Portland and the County of Multnomah and those program reservations for which the Housing Authority has heretofore applied.

That said development will be given the highest Project priority possible.

THIRD

The parties agree:

That, all of the parties will cooperate in providing Federally-assisted housing to achieve the goal of replacing all existing housing units demolished as a result of the Emanuel Hospital Urban Renewal Project with not less than an equal number of newly-constructed standard housing units located within the Project Area or as near as possible to the Project Area and all within the Model Cities Area. It is recognized that the development of such housing is dependent upon the desires of the citizens of the Model Cities Area in designating areas suitable for The parties agree:

That, the Relocation Program in connection with the Emanuel Hospital Urban Renewal Project will be conducted in accordance with the laws, rules and regulations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development including "freedom of choice standards" and assistance will be provided to residents displaced to relocate in type and location of housing according to the choiof the individual resident.

IT IS CONCLUDED THAT:

Each and every party agrees to the above principles and objectives and will devote the maximum energy and enthusiasm attainable toward achieving the above goals and improving the housing situation of Model Cities residents.

Association Persons

Senior Vice President

Housing Authority OÍ Portland Board oder anning emons tration Agency

Portand Development Commission

Dateu

Dated

MAR 2 5 197 Dated

Page 3 - AGREEMENT

106 N. E. Morris PORTLAND, OREGON 97212

Phone 287-3736

July 13, 1971

'JUL 1 4 19

because that of Factio Sitiety

Mr. John B. Kenward Executive Director Portland Development Commission 1700 S. W. Fourth Portland, Oregon

Re: Request for Information on Progress

of Planning for Replacement Housing, Emanuel Urban Renewal Project (R-20)

Dear Mr. Kenward:

The Emanuel Displaced Persons Association looks forward to the fruition of the agreement regarding housing, signed between representatives of EDPA, Inc., Emanuel Hospital, the Housing Authority of Portland, Model Cities Citizens Planning Board, City Demonstration Agency, and Portland Development Commission, on March 31, 1971.

Emanuel Displaced Persons Association,

To date, we have received no notice of any activities being undertaken by any of the signatory parties to that agreement, other than Emanuel Displaced Persons Association itself, regarding planning or execution of the agreement to provide from 180 to 300 units of low and moderate income housing to achieve the agreed goal of replacing all housing units demolished as a result of the Emanuel Urban Renewal Project, with not less than an equal number of newly constructed standard housing units located in the area. Our information indicates that all relocation housing has been obtained by "capture" from existing resources.

Emanuel Displaced Person Association is extremely anxious to proceed with the generation of the agreed units, and has not seen any proof or evidence of any steps taken to replace even one unit of housing so taken. To the best of our knowledge, every unit currently under construction or now in the planning stage, was either already committed at the time of our agreement, or has been the result of activities outside of and independent of the agreement mentioned above. The Emanuel Displaced Persons Association entered into the agreement in good faith on the prospect that the project might truly benefit the community through the provisions of the additional housing which is the subject matter of the agreement. The Emanuel Displaced Persons Mr. John B. Kenward July 12, 1971 Page Two

Re:

Request for Information on Progress of Planning for Replacement Housing, Emanuel Urban Renewal Project (R-20)

Association is not in a position to provide the financial and expert resources necessary for the vigorous and successful prosecution of the salutory purposes of the agreement and recognizes that fact. However, it is conceded that your organization does possess these attributes which are necessary to the commendable goals noted in the agreement. Accordingly, EDPA requests an immediate report of the status of the planning and preparation necessary to affect the purposes of the above noted agreement, to this date.

Emanuel Displaced Persons Association feels that the agreement above noted was the first concrete and substantial step towards the purposes expressed in Section 1441 of the 1949 Housing Act, namely, "the realization as soon as feasible of a goal of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family", and accordingly we are extremely concerned with the apparent lack of any activity to see that the purposes of the 1949 Housing Act are attained.

Your earliest response to this inquiry would be very much appreciated.

Copies of this correspondence have been provided to members of the Oregon Congressional delegation for their information.

Very truly yours,

1.1.1 (Mrs.) Leo Warren Chairman

4/1/1125 alint. Holman J, Barnes, Jr of Counsel for EDPA

mhrc

METROPOLITAN HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

Multnomah County — City of Portland 317 City Hall
Portland, Oregon 97204
228-6141 × 250

August 13, 1971

Russell A. Peyton Director Vernon Summers Assistant James R. Sitzman Assistant Gloria Johnson Secretary

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE METROPOLITAN HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I feel you should be brought up to date regarding our proposed public meeting with the Emanuel Displaced Persons Association. First of all, I have deferred the holding of the meeting until the Commission can take further formal action. Additionally, I have serious reservations as to whether we should proceed with the meeting as I will discuss below. Finally, I am compelled to be out of the city on August 18, the date of our next regular meeting, and feel that a complete report is due you. Because of the extent of activity and feelings aroused, this report is more detailed and lengthy than I would desire.

Following our last regular meeting, Jim Jackson volunteered and I requested Rosemary Scott to act as a committee of two to monitor the proposed form of meeting. When I made that request of them, I did not contemplate that the matter would move quite as rapidly as it would or that their limitations with respect to meeting times would hamper the progress of this matter. More importantly, I was directly contacted by John Kenward, Director of the Portland Development Commission regarding our conducting the hearing and serious questions were raised with respect thereto. I did not feel that it was appropriate to slough what should be the Chairman's responsibility under such circumstances onto a committee and felt that I should continue to work directly with the staff on this problem.

You will also remember that we concluded our discussion at the meeting with particular concern as to the structure of the public hearing. On July 28, Russ and Vern met with Bob Nelson, Mrs. Leo Warren, President of EDPA, Jim Barnes, of Legal Aid and attorney for EDPA. The format of the hearing, room arrangements, etc. were discussed and agreed upon. Bob Nelson was asked for specific complaints and promised to proAugust 13, 1971 Page Two

vide them. He was most anxious for the hearing to be held on August 12. The staff was, frankly, reluctant to have the meeting as early as that because of problems of setting it up. Accordingly, Bob Nelson met with Vern Summers and me on August 2, and Bob convinced me of the soundness of conducting a public hearing at the Matt Dishman Center on August 12.

We all agreed to a "tight" format for the hearing. We spelled out that the Commission and representative members of the EDPA would be arranged in a semi-circle on the stage, that there would be some introductory remarks by the MHRC chairman and opening remarks by Mrs. Warren on behalf of EDPA. Four statements, already in being, would be read by members of EDPA. The EDPA presentation would be concluded with a summary and specific proposals by Jim Barnes. PDC would be provided the opportunity to respond and the members of the public present would then have the opportunity to question or speak through the chair.

I indicated to Bob at our August 2 meeting my concern with regard to the matters that were to be presented and that I wanted to be acquainted with them and to see the affidavits and statements that were to be read. Bob promised that he would have them to me promptly. I also wanted to have an inkling of the recommendations that Jim Barnes was to make.

Subsequent to this meeting, John Kenward called and expressed great concern that our Commission would schedule such a hearing, in effect trying another public agency, without inviting that agency to the meeting in which the determination was made. Frankly, without respect to my own concerns as to the urban renewal program, I was compelled to agree that we had acted somewhat injudiciously in determining to have the hearing without inviting PDC to come before us at a specific time to present its side of the issues raised. It was agreed that the interested principals would meet and try to come to some resolution of the outstanding issues and make some determination as to whether we should go forward with the hearing.

The first time mutually convenient to all the parties was noon on Monday, the 9th. Obviously, if we continued with an August 12 proposed meeting schedule, we would either have an ill-prepared meeting, or could not meet in good faith with PDC on the basic issue of having the meeting. Accordingly, and after consulting with staff, and with Jim Barnes' approval, the meeting time was postponed to August 19. August 13, 1971 Page Three

Russ, Vern, and I met with Ira Keller, the Chairman, John Kenward, the Executive Director, and Allie Norville, the counsel, of PDC, together with Jim Barnes at lunch on Monday, the 9th. Several things became immediately apparent:

(1) Jim Barnes' particular thrust was in the direction of the implementation of the outstanding agreement on housing and he had no specific input to make with regard to the relocation process.

(2) The four affidavits that Jim had previously prepared and which were going to be the basis of Bob Nelson's presentation were rather old matters of concern and had previously been given to PDC. The problems therein were, essentially, solved.

(3) Jim Barnes took little or no specific issue with PDC's present relocation policies and practices in the Emanuel area. There are individual personality problems and conflicts between PDC representatives and the residents, but these are, to some extent at least, to be expected under the circumstances and did not, apparently, stem from the practice or policy of PDC. To the contrary, Messrs. Keller and Kenward expressed a genuine concern about improving the attitudes of their representatives. One individual, in particular, seems to be the primary source of contention.

(4) PDC has taken numerous, and some substantial, steps to implement the housing agreement. These were delineated in a memorandum from Mr. Kenward to his board which was furnished to us, together with a letter calling for a meeting of interested persons with respect to housing problems. A copy of that correspondence is attached.

I was now in this situation: There were two concerns expressed at our Commission meeting that were to be aired at the public meeting: (1) relocation and (2) implementation of the housing agreement. (You will recall that it was agreed that we were not going to examine the general urban renewal process, the Portland Development Commission in general, or the general relocation process.) With respect the first matter, relocation, I have not yet been presented with any evidence of current problems of any source whatsoever, even though both Russ and I have been promised documentation with regard to this matter many days ago by Bob Nelson. To the contrary, the only evidence that I was aware existed was, apparently, out-dated. The individual in whom I had the most confidence, Jim Barnes, appeared to express an attitude that the basic relocation problems were under control and subject to being negotiated and administered fairly with PDC. As to the second concern, the housing agreement, some significant effort has been made and holding a public hearing on this matter seemed unwarranted.

August 13, 1971 Page Four

Accordingly, it was unanimously agreed among Russ, Vern, and myself that we had no cause for a hearing. Russ so informed Bob Nelson on the afternoon of the 9th and Bob requested a meeting with me the next morning. I met with him, together with Russ, Vern and Ron Buel, Neil Goldschmidt's Administrative Assistant, and we thoroughly reviewed the matter. Bob Nelson and Ron Buel were extremely disappointed in our conclusion that we should not go forward. Ron was most upset and walked out of the meeting expressing, for himself personally and not for Neil, great disappointment in the three of us. Bob left with the idea of calling his own meeting and inviting the Commissioners to attend. (He subsequently obtained from Russ the names and addresses of all members of the Commission.) Before leaving, I reminded Bob that he had not yet furnished us with any evidence of complaints with respect to the relocation process. He finally handed me a file of papers and stated that I could read them then and there but that he wasn't going to leave them with me for fear of the use I would make of them. I refused to submit to such a suggestion.

Russ, Vern and I concluded that it would be appropriate for Vern to conduct an investigation on behalf of the MHRC in the Emanuel relocation area. At this time he is conducting that investigation. He will report to the next meeting of the Commission.

While I am still unaware of any reason for the holding of the public hearing, the issue must, of course, be settled by the Commission. The staff has polled the Commissioners and found no more than five or six available for our regular meeting. It is my further recommendation that, since we cannot meet at the scheduled time, the staff determine the first available time when a quorum is assured and that a meeting be scheduled at that time to reconsider the entire matter. In addition to Vern's report, I think it would be appropriate to invite a representative of the PDC and a representative of the EDPA to such a meeting for their input as well.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD J. BROWNSTEIN Chairman

RJB/lr cc: Mr. Ben Padrow Mr. Neil Goldschmidt

PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL COMMUNICATION REQUEST Wednesday Council Meeting 9:30 AM

20 2016 Council Meeting Date: Todav's Date AUDITOR 03/28/16 PM12:26 Name Address Tellan IAM Email perfins realty acomen Telephone _ Reason for the request: Nisinn⁷ (signed)

- Give your request in writing to the Council Clerk's office to schedule a date for your Communication. Use this form or email the information to the Council Clerk at the email address below.
- You will be placed on the Wednesday official Council Agenda as a "Communication." Communications are the first item on the Agenda and are taken at 9:30 a.m. A total of five Communications may be scheduled. Individuals must schedule their own Communication.
- You will have 3 minutes to speak and may also submit written testimony before or at the meeting. Communications allow the Council to hear issues that interest our citizens, but do not allow an opportunity for dialogue.

Thank you for being an active participant in your City government.

Contact Information:

Karla Moore-Love, City Council Clerk 1221 SW 4th Ave, Room 130 Portland, OR 97204-1900 (503) 823-4086 email: Karla.Moore-Love@portlandoregon.gov Sue Parsons, Assistant Council Clerk 1221 SW 4th Ave., Room 130 Portland, OR 97204-1900 (503) 823-4085 email: Susan.Parsons@portlandoregon.gov Request of Brad Perkins to address Council regarding Sullivan's Gulch Trail (Communication)

APR 2 0 2016

PLACED ON FILE

MARY HULL CABALLERO			
Audit	or of the City of Portland		
By	auti		
	Deputy		

Filed _____ APR 1 2 2016

COMMISSIONERS VOTED AS FOLLOWS:			
	YEAS	NAYS	
1. Fritz			
2. Fish			
3. Saltzman			
4. Novick			
Hales			