



CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON

OFFICIAL
 MINUTES

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **27TH DAY OF APRIL, 2016** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 4.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Judy Prosper, Deputy City Attorney; and Jason King and Mike Cohen, Sergeants at Arms.

Item Nos. 405 and 411 were pulled for discussion and on a Y-4 roll call, the balance of the Consent Agenda was adopted.

COMMUNICATIONS		Disposition:
398	Request of John Middleton to address Council regarding impact of Portland Development Commission Increase Project and small business support (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
399	Request of Christina Albo to address Council regarding restorative justice in schools (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
400	Request of Mark Francis to address Council regarding standardizing sidewalk and intersection barriers for visually-impaired people (Communication)	PLACED ON FILE
TIMES CERTAIN		
*401	<p>TIME CERTAIN: 9:45 AM – Adopt the FY 2015-16 Spring Supplemental Budget and make other budget-related changes (Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales) 15 minutes requested</p> <p>Motion to accept Hales amendments to Police Bureau and Portland Development Commission funds as stated in April 25, 2016 memo: Moved by Hales and seconded by Fritz.</p> <p>Motion to accept Fish amendment to Water Bureau fund as stated in April 25, 2016 memo: Moved by Hales and seconded by Saltzman.</p> <p>Motion to accept Fritz amendment to Parks & Recreation fund as stated in April 25, 2016 memo: Moved by Fritz and seconded by Hales.</p> <p>Vote on the motions above as the ‘amendment package’: (Y-4) (Y-4)</p>	<p style="font-size: 24pt;">187696</p> <p>AS AMENDED</p>

April 27, 2016

<p>402</p>	<p>TIME CERTAIN: 10:00 AM – Accept the Quarterly Technology Oversight Committee Report from the Chief Administrative Officer (Report introduced by Mayor Hales) 30 minutes requested Motion to accept the report: Moved by Saltzman and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4)</p>	<p>ACCEPTED</p>
<p>403</p>	<p>TIME CERTAIN: 10:30 AM – Accept report of the Rx Play Program Review and Evaluation (Report introduced by Commissioner Fritz) 30 minutes requested Motion to accept the report: Moved by Fritz and seconded by Saltzman. (Y-4)</p>	<p>ACCEPTED</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mayor Charlie Hales</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Bureau of Planning & Sustainability</p>		
<p>*404</p>	<p>Accept a grant in the amount of \$12,000 from the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office, acting by and through Oregon Parks and Recreation Department to support the City historic resources program (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p>187692</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Office of Management and Finance</p>		
<p>405</p>	<p>Accept bid of Moore Excavation, Inc. for the Colwood Golf Course - Phase II Redevelopment for \$1,945,819 (Procurement Report- Bid No. 00000204) Motion to accept the report: Moved by Fritz and seconded by Novick. (Y-4)</p>	<p>ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT</p>
<p>406</p>	<p>Accept bid of MJ Hughes Construction, Inc. for the 2016 Deficient Structures Project for \$755,805 (Procurement Report- Bid No. 00000234) (Y-4)</p>	<p>ACCEPTED PREPARE CONTRACT</p>
<p>*407</p>	<p>Pay claim of the Estate of Lindsay Leonard in the sum of \$125,000 involving the Portland Bureau of Transportation (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p>187693</p>
<p>*408</p>	<p>Pay claim of Timothy Tamas in the sum of \$48,500 involving the Portland Police Bureau (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p>	<p>187694</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Commissioner Steve Novick</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Bureau of Transportation</p>		
<p>409</p>	<p>Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Oregon Department of Transportation for design of the Pedestrian Crossing at 4 Schools project (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 30003588)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 4, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Commissioner Amanda Fritz</p>		

April 27, 2016

Portland Parks & Recreation

*410	Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University to conduct research and co-create criteria and key data for measuring success of future youth programs for an amount not to exceed \$30,000 (Ordinance) (Y-4)	187695
411	Authorize an Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland State University to provide survey and research related services for a term of three years, for an amount not to exceed \$150,000 (Ordinance)	PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 4, 2016 AT 9:30 AM
REGULAR AGENDA		
Mayor Charlie Hales		
Bureau of Police		
S-*412	Authorize a competitive solicitation for Mobile Data Computer replacement laptops for the Portland Police Bureau (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested Motion to accept substitute ordinance: Moved by Hales and seconded by Fritz. (Y-4) (Y-4)	SUBSTITUTE 187698
*413	Accept and appropriate an additional \$30,000 from Oregon Impact for the 2016 DUII Traffic Safety and High Visibility Enforcement program for sworn personnel overtime (Ordinance) (Y-4)	187697
Office of Management and Finance		
414	Amend Utility License Law to include direct access electric services and establish minimum penalties for certain violations (Ordinance; amend Code Sections 7.14.040 and 7.14.110)	PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 4, 2016 AT 9:30 AM
Commissioner Nick Fish		
Bureau of Environmental Services		
*415	Authorize the Bureau of Environmental Services to execute easements with Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, as part of the SW 86th Avenue Pump Station and Appurtenances Project No. E09051 and Fanno Basin Pressure Line System Upgrade Project No. E10599 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested (Y-4)	187699
416	Authorize a contract with the lowest responsive bidder for the construction of the Cured In Place Pipe Southeast Rehabilitation Project No. E10682 for \$2,260,000 (Ordinance) 8 minutes requested	PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 4, 2016 AT 9:30 AM
Water Bureau		

April 27, 2016

<p>417</p>	<p>Accept contract with CivilWorks NW, Inc. for the construction of the Union Pacific Railroad East Portland Connection Water Systems Adjustment Project as complete, release retainage and authorize final payment (Report; Contract No. 30004438) Motion to accept the report: Moved by Novick and seconded by Fritz. (Y-3; Saltzman absent)</p>	<p>ACCEPTED</p>
<p>418</p>	<p>Revise ordinance to update engineer's estimate, issue a competitive solicitation, authorize contract and provide payment for the Road 10 Project (Ordinance; amend Ordinance No. 187133)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 4, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>419</p>	<p>Authorize the purchase of a capital project management software system not to exceed \$825,000 (Ordinance)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 4, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Commissioner Dan Saltzman Portland Housing Bureau</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">187700</p>
<p>*420</p>	<p>Amend contracts with JOIN, Home Forward, Northwest Pilot Project, and Transition Projects to add \$842,500 in rent assistance for people experiencing homelessness (Ordinance; amend Contract Nos. 32001167, 30004683, 32001166 and 32001169) 15 minutes requested (Y-4)</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Commissioner Steve Novick Bureau of Transportation</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">37206</p>
<p>421</p>	<p>Support Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery grant application to seek funds to design and construct Outer Powell Blvd Transportation Safety Project Segment 2 and 3 from SE 116th Ave to 162nd Ave, in substantial conformance with the 2012 Outer Powell Blvd Conceptual Design Plan (Resolution) 30 minutes for items 421 and 422 (Y-4)</p>	
<p>422</p>	<p>Amend Transportation System Development Charge Capital Improvement Project list (Ordinance)</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 4, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>423</p>	<p>Vacate portions of N Portsmouth Ave, N Van Houten Ave, N Monteith Ave, N Warren St, N Strong St and two unnamed alleys on the University of Portland campus subject to certain conditions and reservations (Hearing; Ordinance; VAC-10094) 10 minutes requested</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 4, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>
<p>424</p>	<p>Vacate portions of N Van Houten Ct, N McKenna Ave and three unnamed alleys on the University of Portland campus subject to certain conditions and reservations (Hearing; Ordinance; VAC-10094) 10 minutes requested</p>	<p>PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 4, 2016 AT 9:30 AM</p>

April 27, 2016

S-425	Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Metro for development of a Preferred Alternative Package, Locally Preferred Alternative and Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Southwest Corridor Plan (Second Reading S-381; amend Contract No. 30004541) RESCHEDULED TO APRIL 27, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-3; Saltzman absent)	SUBSTITUTE 187701
Commissioner Amanda Fritz Portland Parks & Recreation		
*426	Authorize a contract with Opsi Architecture LLP for design and construction administration services for new construction and renovations of the Mt. Tabor and Delta Park Urban Forestry Yard maintenance facilities and a bicycle / pedestrian path adjacent to Mt. Tabor Yard for a total not-to-exceed amount of \$980,000 (Ordinance) 10 minutes requested RESCHEDULED TO APRIL 27, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)	187702
*427	Authorize a competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest responsible bidder for construction of the St. Johns Community Center Roof and HVAC Replacement Project (Ordinance) RESCHEDULED TO APRIL 27, 2016 AT 2:00 PM (Y-4)	187703
428	Authorize a competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest responsible bidder for construction of the Sellwood Park Pool Bathhouse Roof Replacement and Seismic Upgrade Project for an estimated \$585,000 (Ordinance) RESCHEDULED TO APRIL 27, 2016 AT 2:00 PM	PASSED TO SECOND READING MAY 4, 2016 AT 9:30 AM

At 12:45 p.m., Council recessed.

April 28, 2016

A RECESSED MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **28TH DAY OF APRIL, 2016** AT 2:00 P.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Hales, Presiding; Commissioners Fritz, Novick and Saltzman, 4.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Kathryn Beaumont, Chief Deputy City Attorney and Mike Cohen and John Paolazzi, Sergeants at Arms.

<p>At this meeting and on May 11, 12 and 19 the Council voted to accept or reject the potential amendments to the City's new 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Substitute documents reflecting all amendments were considered June 9. The final vote was taken June 15, 2016. See minutes May 19, 2016 for list of Amendments Considered and Summary of Vote Outcomes.</p>	<p>Disposition:</p>
<p>430 TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 PM – Adopt new and amended supporting documents for an update of Portland's Comprehensive Plan; accept report of the Citizen Involvement Committee (Previous Agenda 394; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales) 2 hours requested for items 430 and 431</p>	<p>CONTINUED TO MAY 11, 2016 AT 3:00 PM TIME CERTAIN AS AMENDED</p>
<p>431 Adopt a new Comprehensive Plan for the City of Portland, Oregon (Previous Agenda 429; Ordinance introduced by Mayor Hales)</p>	<p>CONTINUED TO MAY 11, 2016 AT 3:00 PM TIME CERTAIN AS AMENDED</p>

At 4:30 p.m., Council adjourned.

MARY HULL CABALLERO
Auditor of the City of Portland



By Karla Moore-Love
Clerk of the Council

For a discussion of agenda items, please consult the following Closed Caption File.

April 27, 2016
Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript.

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

APRIL 27, 2016 9:30 AM

Hales: Good morning. Good morning. Welcome to the April 27 meeting of the Portland city council, would you please call the roll. [roll taken]

Fish: **Fritz:** Here **Saltzman:** Here **Novick:** Here **Hales:** Here

Hales: Commissioner Fish is away on city business, welcome, everyone, we are here for the morning session. We have some time certain items and folks signed up for communications. If you are here to speak on a council calendar item please let the clerk know and she will make sure that you get a chance to speak. We typically allow three minutes for testimony, it does not look like that will be difficult this morning. If you agree with someone's point of view and want to indicate that, feel free to give them a wave of the hand or a thumbs up, if you disagree, a polite hand gesture to the contrary is ok but we ask that we not make demonstrations or applause for our fellow citizens so that they get a chance to speak whether they are in the majority or the minority. We make exceptions for students visiting dignitaries, and such, so if you are one of those, you might get a round of applause, welcome, and we have some items on the consent calendar that have been pulled to the regular calendar. Let me announce those right out of the gate. One is 405, and the other is 411. Any other items to be pulled over to the regular calendar from the consent? Ok. With that, let's take item 398, please.

Item 398.

Hales: Come on up, please. Good morning.

John Middleton: Good morning. I am john middleton. 4924 --

Hales: You don't have to give us your address, that's fine.

Middleton: Thank you. I am here to speak in support of the ongoing funding for the increased project, the small, expansion program run by the pdc. I've been a part of the transport in Portland area for 18 years, and I was tasked with taking that over and expanding it. When the owner retired -- we are a successful business, but then I participated in the sba emerging leaders program, which is the same program, just a different name. Really kind of opened my eyes. Gave me a lot of good insight into how to run a business. Making it successful. Since then I took that class that grew us by 1.3 million that next year. I have expanded to the Seattle marketplace so we're doing that as well. It was something that I found invaluable and hopefully they have 10 people in the program right now. I actually went and spoke to them prior to the meeting or them getting started. It's a really good program particularly for the small business owner like myself and others. It really kind of gives us a chance to just move forward and it's basically an mba in a really compressed time. The people that I took the class with were still in touch. We get together every three or four months, and it's been two years now. It's super helpful. I strongly recommend it particularly being a person of color myself I was excited to see that class was focused on the minorities, women, people of color because I do believe that we all need a leg up and help sometimes, and this is something that's particularly helpful to me. So, I hope that you will understand that there are more entrepreneurs in Portland that could make great strides with their business if they are given an opportunity to support our opportunity. I had three minutes.

April 27, 2016

Hales: Great. Thank you very much.

Saltzman: Tell us what your business is, direct transport is.

Middleton: We are a same-day on demand delivery service focusing on less than load deliveries so anything from a box truck down to a car.

Fritz: How can somebody get in touch with you if they are interested in using your services?

Middleton: Just call direct transport and look us up or 503-783-2600 to call.

Hales: Thank you very much. Ok. Let's take 399 please.

Item 399.

Hales: Good morning.

Christina Albo: Good morning mayor and commissioners. I am Christina Albo, the director of restorative justice with resolutions northwest. I would like to request I give my time today to a principal at a school with one of the schools that we have worked with, Dan Kimbro.

Dan Kimbro: Good morning. Thank you mayor and commissioners. I am Dan Kimbro, the principal of hb Lee middle school. It's a school that is very diverse made up of students who speak over 30 different languages in their homes. I came today to share the purpose of restorative justice in schools and a bit of the benefit that we have seen for our students, staff, and community members so I thank you for the support and wish to ask for that to be ongoing support. I became acquainted with restorative practices through resolutions northwest two years ago when I took a team of teachers to a two-day training. We've been working as a school to implement more restorative practices across the building, not just when students find themselves in trouble but to provide a more inclusive and equitable environment in all of the classrooms. Some of the reasons for these initiatives are to reduce the number of out of school suspensions, to focus on repairing relationships in order to serve the educational needs of our students to reduce the disparities between discipline or exclusionary outcomes based on a student's background. To build our capacity to prevent discipline issues in the school and in the classroom, and so that the skills and mindsets of our teachers and staff might develop in such a way that we can address the root causes of the conflict, and therefore minimize the disciplinary incidents over all. Resolutions northwest has been an important partner for us in this work and they have helped us to support individual teachers and students in implementing community circles in their classrooms as well as through training and workshops for our staff. Beyond the school-wide strategies we're working with higher level student management issues to provide reentry procedures for students who are excluded through either suspension or expulsion and to inform our practice with a trauma lens knowing the background and the difficulties that some of our students have faced. It's a major shift not just for the students and staff but also for the community. I wanted to share an email that I received last night at 4:45 as I was preparing these remarks. Says hi, Mr. Kimbro, so and so shared with me a letter regarding their student's behavior success. I so appreciate your efforts regarding positive communication as well as all the team time, planning and cooperation you have used to keep her in school and to support her teachers. The village approach is a powerful one for her on a day-to-day basis but to me it seems it gives her an enormous message that these faceless institutions that feel impersonal and hostile are not.

Hales: Thank you very much. Question without obviously naming particulars or names, but I assume that you have seen the situations where if you had not had this set of tools you would have had to rely on the police bureau.

Hales: That's one of the fundamental items. Chief Day and other folks are here, so from our standpoint trying to understand how school resource officers work with the schools. The theory is but I question, my question for you is that working out in practice that there

April 27, 2016

are incidents and problems that would end up even if it's a non-emergency call having to bring in the police bureau but you are able to resolve them in another way.

Kimbro: Absolutely. We have brought in the police for incidents that require their notification but then we were able to follow up and solve those problems without juvenile justice or additional community resources.

Hales: Yeah. That's good to hear that's how it works in your school and others so thank you. Thanks very much.

Albo: Thank you very much for your time.

Hales: 400 please.

Item 400.

Hales: Mr. Francis. Ok. Give him a hand there.

Hales: Ok. All right.

Mark Francis: Ok. Perfect.

Hales: There you go.

Francis: Ok.

Hales: How are you?

Francis: Good. Thank you. I have got some handouts that will --

Hales: We'll get those from you.

Francis: Thank you. First of all thank you again for letting me come and talk to you. This is like the second time that I've been here with this issue. I didn't hear from anybody after the first time, and I was here in December so I was not sure, you know, what was going on regarding my request to have barricades standardized and also to deal with the noise at the intersections. I kind of don't want to be here. I would rather be at work or that. I would hope that this problem would kind of go away. It seems like every time that I travel around in Portland and turn a corner, there is a barricade or there is a noisy intersection and so it has an impact on my travels. If it was just my travels I could be ok with the way life is. I work at the Oregon commission for the blind, and a lot of our people that go through our center in southeast Portland are just learning to travel independently. So when barricades are not standardized or when there is a ton of noise at intersections it really has an impact on their lifestyle because it's very difficult to travel around when you have got good mobility skills, but if you throw in the fact you don't have that much experience it makes it even tougher. I just feel compelled for those people to try and make it a bit easier because learning to travel independently without vision is very difficult and very stressful. So if I can help take some of the stress, you know, from them. That's what they want to do and so you know I feel really compelled to bring this issue before you. Our rehab center is in southeast Portland on 12th and Washington. One of the big things happening around there is that St. Francis is making a development for low-cost housing and that. The whole block there is under construction. There is a lot of loud noise. A lot of our clients cross 11th and 12th and also on Washington. A lot of times it's very difficult for them to hear the cross traffic. If you cannot hear the cross traffic it is too dangerous to cross. It's -- it is so this problem needs to be addressed. I tried to point out some solutions that would be very economical, you know, and it would be -- it would give us the same accommodations that other individuals of Portland enjoy. I would like the same access to the streets and the intersections and the safe crossing of the streets that other people enjoy. I would like other people to have the same access. If you guys have any questions I would be happy to --

Hales: This is very helpful. We appreciate you raising the importance of this issue. I don't know, actually, if our commission on disabilities has looked at some of these suggestions yet or not. That's something that I think that we could make sure that happens. I know that there are bureaus involved as well.

April 27, 2016

Novick: Mr. Francis, I am so sorry that we have not gotten back to you. I remember you coming before, and these are issues that we should discuss with pbob. If you would not mind going to my office, it is just to the left as you leave the room. Talk to Laura Hanson or Erica neabal and we will see if we can follow up with you. Off the top of my head I think that the noise issue might be really difficult because obviously construction causes noise.

Francis: I understand. I don't expect for them to shut down but one of the proposals that I made is that if we could ask the people doing construction if they could have a lookout. When you see a pedestrian having difficulties they could help them. I know that a lot of companies are doing that. I've been around the construction sites. I have had trouble. Someone comes out and does that. But it's not on a consistent basis so I think that if construction companies were asked to have a lookout there I don't see where this is where you need to have legislation for it. Most of the time construction companies and that, they would be willing to do that. I don't see, you know, they need to be forced to do this by law. The first step that I would like to see taken is just a letter to them asking to be aware and making them aware of the problem and asking them to appoint someone as a lookout to look out for intersections. I know that there's been city crews, and they can do the same thing. I don't think that there needs to be legislation for this problem. If you want to look at some examples of barricades I think there is some up on Columbia Street. I think its Columbia between 4th and 5th or 6th or somewhere around there. They are wonderful barricades and I think that contractors would love them because they just snap together and you can reuse them over and over again so the setup time, teardown time and reusability would really be an economical advantage for them to do that. I understand that people and companies need to make money and that, and so I am trying to keep the solutions as economical as possible. I think that if people can be asked to do things before told to do things, I think they are going to do it more willingly. If they are going to do it -- I think they will be more willing. That's kind of what I am trying to work for.

Novick: Yeah. It is something that we can bring up with folks during the permitting process I would think so thank you very much.

Hales: You have done a good job raising this. It does not mean we can't do a better job or the challenge is there is so much construction going on and quite a few companies that haven't necessarily worked in this urban environment before so there is a communication need there as you pointed out for us to make sure that everybody knows what the goals are here. I think that there is an opportunity for us to follow up.

Fritz: It is also a public education component, and Mr. Francis I appreciate you speaking here today. 25 years ago when I was young and foolish I was crossing downtown and went against the light and was stopped by a police officer on a motorcycle who had explained the reason one doesn't do that is because people who can't see or children may not know that I am running across the intersection and that it wasn't safe to do so. So since then I have made a point of not jaywalking, and you are raising the issue of the noisy intersections as something that I had not really thought about before. Yet, you are absolutely right that people who can't see rely on that to sense to know when and where to cross and we need to be mindful of that.

Hales: Thanks for coming. If you would like Mr. Cohen can give you a hand on getting to commissioner novick's office while you are here.

Francis: I would appreciate that very much and thank you guys again.

Hales: Thanks for coming.

Francis: You are welcome.

******:** Ok. Right-hand side.

April 27, 2016

Hales: All right so let's move to the consent calendar again. There are two items being pulled over to the regular calendar 405 and 411. Unless there is any other changes let's take a vote on the remainder of the consent calendar.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye. [gavel pounded]

Hales: Ok. Let's move to the time certain item 401.

Item 401.

Hales: All right, Andrew Scott and his team are here. We have some amendments before us.

*****: Good morning, how are you.

Hales: Good.

Andrew Scott, Director, City Budget Office: I will get started while Jessica passes the amendments out. Good morning. We are here today to talk about the spring budget monitoring process, and you did have a work session last week. I apologize for having missed it but I did watch it. It seemed like it went well in record time. I might not be invited back so you can have 20-minute work sessions. I am going to walk through the bump on the table, and then as the mayor mentioned there are amendments being passed out and I will walk through the high level issues and packages to lay the groundwork. Spring budget monitoring processes are where bureaus come forward with budget adjustment and is yearend projections. A big picture focusing on the general funds. Prior to the bump we had \$1.1 million of unrestricted contingency in the general fund and 6.5 million of the compensation set aside. The proposed bump before you today would use about 400,000 of the general fund contingency leaving 700,000 remaining and use 6 million in the compensation set-side and half a million dollars remaining. In addition to those changes the supplemental budget also sets aside in a follows reserve 1.7 million for expenses related to the Columbia River levy project. I think you are familiar with that project. Is the city's share of that study? There was a request in 2016 and 2017, and there's been a question of whether that was debt or cash finance but it was carried over to use the 1.7 million in next year's budget so that's in there, as well. Finally as a technical issue but just to note \$345,000 is set aside to fund the general overhead model. It's something that we do every spring bump as we go back through so we balance the 2016-2017. I would direct your attention now to exhibit 4, which is the general fund reconciliation report. We usually go through when we talk about the bump. It's the easiest way to walk through the specifics of the changes I just talked to you about at a high level. I will go quickly but feel free to stop me and ask if you have specific questions about what's in here. In terms of the compensation set aside, \$6 million is being allocated. The four bureaus that requested, police, fire, bureau of emergency communications and parks all came forward with the compensation set aside requests and are granted with the exception of 215,000 for the parks because the bureau had realigned that out of personal services into the external materials and I think that that's going to be one of the amendments you are going to consider today is adding that 215,000 back in. There is a little over 500,000 remaining after the adjustment says. There is some risk with fire retirement payouts and overtime costs and the over expenditure ordinance we'll keep an eye on that to make sure that they can live within that but that half million dollars may be needed depending on the number of retirements that we see. Moving onto the mid-year reductions, we don't always have these in the spring bump but nice that we do because it adds some general fund. There is a small amount there dealing with tentative improvement reimbursements coming from the facilities fund over to the general fund and bureau of emergency communication underspending from the fiscal year 2014-2015, and they returned this in the spring bump. That's 331,000. There is 519,000 of general fund cash transit centers for the debt payments related to the fuel stations, so again you approved the fuel stations out of the

April 27, 2016

sears center and actually elsewhere in the city as well. We just haven't issued the debt so although the funding is in there the field station project is moving forward. We didn't need the money so we're returning it to the general fund. In addition to that 519,000 of general fund and 570,000 is going back to the non-general fund bureaus, their share. Finally just a bit under 800,000 is being returned to the general fund. You allocated that money in the fall supplemental budget for the improvements of the sears facility, but those will not be completed this year and we are on hold in terms of figuring out what the plans for that facility is so that's coming back to the fund. In terms of the new requests there are 415,000 of new requests and that does not include the 900,000 you will see in there for parks and arbitration costs. That was set aside in the fall bump and we were waiting to see what the costs are and they are at least the 900,000 so the full amount to be allocated to parks and the other 415,000 is broken down across the bureaus. 25,000 is going to the bureau of planning and sustainability for sustainable industries assessment per our agreement with the c40 climate leadership group. You will notice another part of that request was around coordination for the smart city technology and is not currently included in the bump. There is 40,000 going to planning and sustainability for the work on the inclusionary housing code. The city hall security packages are there from the off of management and finance. Those are being funded in the 2016-2017 budget which is why they are not showing up here in the spring bump. Currently it is not included 50,000 for the bcorp program but that may also be an amendment you are going to consider today. There is 156,000 for the arbitration award and another 65 in fire and rescue and another 65,000 for the housing bureau for work on the inclusionary housing policy. I mentioned the parks 900,000. 100,000 request for expanded ranger coverage in the summer currently not included again. I think that's another amendment that you will be considering. 75,000 to support the Saturday youth basketball program in the Portland public schools cost related to their janitors. Our feeling with it, the parks bureau had the ability to absorb that. There is a technical adjustment for the police bureau, 33,000 for the adjustment that they did get in the fall bump and council has approved the 25,000 for the Oregon endowments pulling that out of contingency. 40,000 for work on the spring water corridor. I think related again to the state of Oregon, Oregon solutions effort there and finally a 31,000 appropriation for air toxics study, which I think commissioner novick's office that involves Oregon state university. Any questions about the new requests? Quickly for the general fund 5.2 million of program carryovers are included here, and all requests came from bureaus were included with the exception of 130,000 in planning and sustainability's for the smart cities' initiative and requested new funding and carryover and the request for new funding was not included. There was 417,000 for housing bureau contracted funds, which I think will be encumbered. They will carry it overthrew an encumbrance of the contracts. 158,000 for the Portland development commission, small business working capital, and pdc believes they can encumber those before the end of the year. \$49,000 of unspent innovation fund dollars. Because that's supported with ongoing appropriation every year that remainder will follow with the balance, and a small portion of the office of neighborhood involvement requests for the noise program carryover funding. The very last section on technical adjustments -- those are mostly technical so there is not much to focus on. One of the things you will see here is the innovation fund awards of \$479,000 being moved out of the special appropriations into the bureaus where they were granted. Let me talk about non-general fund changes, the other major items that are happening in the bump. The bureau of development service is requesting and receiving position authority for 23.5 new positions. As the workload and fees increase they are increasing the size of the workforce. This is something that I will talk about as part of the budget. Bds is rapidly approaching the point where they were before the downturn, and I think it's

April 27, 2016

important that we -- and bds knows this and we talked to them, as well. There will be another downturn and again sort of what the optimum side of that bureau is. They are adding 23.5 positions.

Fritz: And we have the business continuity plan, so we know if we need to add on or subtract.

Scott: The housing bureau is requesting one position for the inclusionary housing policy work. Omf is adding one position, Parks has three limited term positions to regular and also adding the position and planning and sustainability is converting the non-general position for limited terms to regular for the recap project. Just a couple of large non-general fund items. The bureau of environmental services, the revenue and expense projections are such that the budget increase to their rate stabilization fund of 24.5 million. The fire and police and disability board is approving a \$2.6 million transfer in order to pay for \$2.6 million legal settlement. Finally there is an overall increase of charges for services in the city of \$32.5 million. 19 of which is recognition of service development charges in the parks bureau and the bureau of environmental services so again the sdc's continue to go up at a rapid rate. Bureaus are making those changes in the bump. With that I will take questions on what was filed and I think that there is some amendments that you have to do, as well.

Hales: Andrew and Jessica on the proposal as it came to us. So let's take up amendments for the proposals that I think that we have at least two and maybe three packages. I have a package of three, which I think has been distributed which is first funding some increased positions in the police bureau funded by fees for public records requests totaling 54,152. The positions are needed because of the increased time and effort associated with records management. Then \$75,000 in unrestricted contingency to the Portland development commission for our b corp. Initiative. This will be held in the program carryover set aside for the allocation into the 2016 and 2017 budget and there is an updated exhibit 1-5 that reflect this change. I would like to propose those amendments.

Fritz: Second.

Hales: We have amendments from commissioner Fish to increase the expenses in the water bureau fund 602 by 35,000 for maintenance and operations of the dodge park and other hydro parks. This is a cash transfer from the general fund unrestricted contingency that will be carried over into the water fund for expenses in the next year's budget in 2016-2017 and updated exhibits reflect that change. This amendment is prompted by our interpretation of the recent court decision that says, essentially, the general fund dollars need to pay for the operation of the facilities not water fund dollars. So I would propose commissioner Fish's amendment.

Saltzman: Second

Hales: Commissioner Fritz do you want to walk through yours?

Fritz: Thank you, mayor. The 115,000 to parks for the teen service program from the comp set-aside and they are coming with I believe your support and 100,000 to parks with six park rangers from April through September and that's what we did last year and with the understanding that most or all of that service is going to be on the spring water corridor.

Hales: Second that. Commissioner Saltzman I don't think you have any -- do you have any other amendments? Those covered all the ones that I know about Andrew, right? All those amendments that are before us -- we want to thank the staff and see if there is anyone that wants to testify on the amendments and on the spring bump as now proposed to be amended. Anyone want to speak?

Moore-Love: We have three people signed up. Please come on up.

Hales: Ok.

April 27, 2016

Joe Walsh: I'm Joe Walsh and I represent individuals for justice. Are you going to limit me to the amendments?

Hales: No.

Walsh: It is our understanding that you are now moving 65 million. You are also adding 27 jobs -- 27.5. I am not sure what the .5 job is. It must be a little job. But, you are here with 27 jobs. You are using \$65 million and allowed 15 minutes for this item. We are against this supplemental. We feel that the people of Portland understand what's going on, so when the mayor says hey, I took all these jobs from the city. I have you will these jobs and you are putting back 27 and nobody talks about it. 27 jobs is how much money? It could be under \$1,000 each with benefits. That's a lot of money. You guys throw around figures of 5 million here and 3 million here and 65 million there, and you just do it. It is supplemental. This is adding to the budget. I think you guys are almost comedians when you sit up there and do this stuff. Then you do amendments, and you do it under the emergency clause so nobody has anything to say and it accept today. We can look at the amendments -- we can't look at the amendments. We can't study them. We can't figure out -- people who are watching this today to write in and say no: I don't want you to do this until I understand where that \$65 million is. I know it goes to the fire department. I know it goes to the [cops. How much? And why are you doing 27 jobs? When you brag all the time about how many jobs you eliminated. You can't have it both ways, mayor. You cannot eliminate jobs and add jobs here because it's balancing out. You can no tell me about the 200 jobs but it's your word, and I don't believe anything you ever say. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you. Good morning.

Robert West: Good morning. I am totally against them charging for police records, which was one of the things that was on there. As far as the police records and stuff, that should be given to the public for free. Those are public records. Just because someone walks into the police department, they need some place. They don't have \$10 or I guess 15 or whatever you are going to raise it to. They don't get it. That's wrong. There might be some in that disability or something like that that needs a police reporter for the civil case or something like that. They can't get it because they don't have the money. Number two, I think all victims of crime should be able to get the police reports for free. They should not have to be charged for stuff like that. That's my personal opinion as far as adding more jobs to the police department. You have cut a lot of police positions. Police are constantly saying that they are stressed out, and I know that I add a bit of stress to them. As far as adding anything to traffic I think before we pay a penny more to traffic we need to ask the state because when the officer is writing the tickets that money goes to the state. It does not go to the city of Portland. So we need to ask the state to help us with our -- supporting our traffic division. That's what I got to say.

Hales: Thank you. Good morning.

Lightning: Yes. I am lightning and I represent lightning watchdog communications pdx. 100,000 to the public schools janitors -- I don't think we need to be funding the janitors at public schools. Another issue I have is on the dodge park maintenance fund. Again, I really think that we need to sell Dodge Park and not utilize that for entertainment purposes for the city employees. I would like that to be looked at real close on what is the purpose to hold Dodge Park in the water bureau. I don't see any purpose at all except for the entertainment purposes. I would like to have that appraised and sold and to go back into either a general fund or back to the water bureau, itself. Again on adding any more jobs to bds I absolutely disagree with that. Again I am having concerns on bds raising more fees to developers. I want to have these fees dropped. I want to have more incentives to the developers. I want to see these 23 jobs cut not put into place. Again due to the market

April 27, 2016

conditions currently I feel that we will not need them in the next year. I think that our market is beginning to cool off at a very rapid pace. A lot of developers from other states are looking very close at even if they want to put money into the Portland market any more. If we continue to increase more fees to the developers they will only put their money in other states. If we do not offer them the incentives right now and understand that the market is cooling off their ability to get certain amounts of money is getting very interesting at this time. They will put their money into other states. Again, I do not want any more bds employees hired, and I want fees to begin to drop to developers.

Hales: Thank you. Anyone else want to speak? Ok then it's time to take a vote on the amended ordinance.

Moore-Love: The amendments first?

Hales: We have to adopt the amendments first and then vote on the ordinance. Thank you. We put them on the table but the vote on the amendments as a package.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: I think commissioner Fish it's dodgy but I will still vote aye.

Fritz: Aye. **Hales:** Aye. [gavel pounded]

Hales: Ok now on the ordinance that's amended please.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: I want to thank the mayor for including \$31,250 in this for the Portland state university research, with heavy metals in Portland and soil and air. There will be an announcement about this project, but it's a partnership between the city, county, and psu. I think that we have had a lot of concern about Portland's air quality in the past couple of months, but a lot of citizens are following this issue and raising concerns for years to the city and county and legislature. This collaboration with psu is an opportunity to grow our shared knowledge base about the air and soil pollution of Portland, and we need information to better understand the problem, and I am pleased we can partner in this effort. Aye.

Fritz: Thank you mayor for this proposal and also for agreeing to fund the rangers and for your leadership on addressing the concerns on the springwater corridor and elsewhere for issues affecting neighborhoods. This is a very responsible budget amendment of 3.88 million. 27 jobs, or 23 in the bureau development services and four in police. And those, especially in the development services, are paid for by the increased construction happening and still trying to catch up on that. I appreciate that. I want to note that our internal materials and services have decreased by 2.2 million in the cost, primarily as a result of the lower cost of fuel leading to the decreases in fleet interagency agreements. So the low cost of gas is benefiting the taxpayers of Portland and being able to put more money into other services, and I appreciate that. I am very appreciative of this and also looking to your big budget being proposed in the near future of which this is cleaning up this year's budget to prepare for next. Thank you. Aye.

Hales: I want to I think that the council for making sure that we do the right things at the right measure of effort and cost in this budget, so I think it has been a successful collaboration on the council to manage the city's finances. I want to thank Andrew and Jessica for managing this process from the independent budget office, which of course is the source of the statistics that I cite like how many city employees there are. After this changed there is still 150 less than there were six years ago, but you can check my math and you will. This has been a good process. I appreciate the fact that we are putting more effort into the management of the spring water corridor. It's an urgent community need. Through the Oregon collaboration through the state other governments are stepping up and helping us. I talked with Clackamas county yesterday and they are going to be contributing people and dollars to make that a successful multi-jurisdictional effort. The

April 27, 2016

spring water is not just in Portland. It is also in Clackamas County and in Gresham and unincorporated areas. That's another case where this kind of adjustment over the course of the year let us do our work better. Thank you all for a job well done. Aye. [gavel pounded] ok, let's move on to item 402.

Item 402.

Hales: Come on up. Good morning.

Jen Clodius, Office of Management and Finance: Good morning, commissioner and mayors I am Jen Clodius, senior management analyst with the office of management and finance. Staff support for the technology oversight committee. With me today, I am delighted to say are three of our viewer representatives. Ken Neubauer at the end. He's commissioner Fish's representative and Josh Mitchell is commissioner Novick's representative and Dyanna Garcia is Commissioner Fritz's representative. The other two are Will and Mike, who couldn't be here today. We are here to present the technology oversight committee's quarterly report for January through March. We are going to project dashboards for each project. Each one has information from the TOC and from the quality assurance representative. Josh and Ken are going to discuss the projects, and Dyanna will give updates for what's happened since March.

Josh Mitchell, Commissioner Novick's Office: Ken has had his more than his fair share of this, so he's volunteered me to do the majority of the reading here. We're going to start with the information and technology advanced project for the bureau of development services. The project description in general -- this is a paperless permit and case management process. It allows complete online access to the permitting and case review services. The project deliverables include the digitization and online access of historical permits and property information and implementation of an updated permit and case review information management system, online case and permit application and review services, mobile online access for the field staff and implementation of an automated queuing system which is quite a mouthful to get all of that out. The overall status right now from our viewpoint is that this project continues to have -- we continue to have concerns around the project's duration, the budget and scopes. The overall performance of the project. While there have been small steps it's a large project that is challenging because of its size and scope. There were a few major accomplishments this quarter. The attempt to move towards a more agile opportunity for developing the software. And the project doc's implementation which is a component of the overall project is expected to go live in the spring. Vendor contract, is under work right now and is scheduled to be complete by the 13th of June. So upcoming milestones, there is a plan to rebase the project and she will talk about that a little bit more. It is a large amount of work that remains. That's our biggest concern. Do you want to go ahead?

Clodius: Diana.

Dyanna Garcia, Commissioner Fritz's Office: So with our April meeting again we heard updates on continuing to work with the vendor on what they are currently in and progressing against a plan that they have for that. We continue to hear that there is progress being made incrementally against that plan or against the plan. I think that we have all voiced the concern that we have over the size and how big we are -- this project is in deploying as one large unit but we'll continue to monitor and see how the project is going. I think those are the big ones that I have. Ken anything to add for today?

Ken Neubauer, Commissioner Fish's Office: I would say that they do seem to have a viable schedule now when they anticipate delivering the majority of the components. That is something that we have not seen -- haven't had confidence in. The schedule that they are proposing right now looks more viable than what we have had in the past.

Fritz: Has the schedule been reset? Is there now an understanding --

April 27, 2016

Nuebauer: I don't think its official. I think it's the proposed schedule they made available for us to look at and what they are planning to do. I think the baseline that they are setting for June will firm that up.

Fritz: In the next report, we may see things go from red to green because we'll be starting, basically we'll be starting the time line over again or not?

Nuebauer: I don't know that I would be that optimistic. I would hope that we might move to that.

Fritz: If we are starting the time line over again surely we wouldn't necessarily I am hoping that we are setting up a realistic time line so you could start with it, if you are starting at zero it would be green.

Garcia: I think it will be dependent on the negotiation and the conversations with the vendor and how that plan comes out. Until we really see that and understand what the plan is it's hard for us to say we believe that it will improve to a yellow or a green. It's one of those things that you cannot predict how it will go until we see what things are.

Fritz: So you would give it provisionary a yellow to start off with and then potentially if they were able to meet that in the next quarter then it might give you more confidence? Got it thank you.

Mitchell: Can I add one more bit? Paul did an excellent job doing a architectural overview for the technology oversight committee. In the three years we followed along this project -- of course it is a long project. That was the first time that we had dug into how complex it was. I think that really helps with us being able to evaluate it. We have stated that we would really like to see more of that as part of the way we interact in the future. It makes a big difference on us being able to give a valid assessment. The next project I will discuss is going well. The versa-dex system is operated by the city of Portland bureau of emergency communications and is used by public safety agencies throughout Multnomah County to connect the community and emergency service responders. It is past due for a life cycle replacement for the underlying hardware. The refresh project updates that system's hardware in a manner that meets the bureau's business requirements and also the bureau of technology services port requirements. Also more importantly alliance with the vendors recommended for technical specifications, and that's changed over time and they are pulling that into alignment. This project has been on track since the start and stayed that way. Major accomplishments this past quarter, the development of production development and production environments are completed and tested. The schedule was revised to build remaining environments in parallel which was a smart move. The training environment is complete. The disaster recovery test is in progress. The trailer environment build in progress. The plan is still for a full go live by May 11. They seem to be on track for that. The only concern that we had is the relatively short schedule. This is a straightforward project in terms of how they structured it and how they are working with the vendors so we've been impressed with it overall.

Garcia: The update from our march to April meetings was that they completed all the environments. They ended up completing ahead of what they had originally planned. So their May 11 go live is on track and everyone is pretty confident it will go live. I think that we're pretty pleased at how well this project went and how well things kind of came through and were executed. It was a good note. I think the only other thing that I wanted to add from the last April meeting is we did receive an update, the 90-day report on the pci project, and it was good to hear you got the compliance for that project. I think that we were very kind of pleased how the progress went, the latter half of that and the leadership provided to make that project successful. Just wanted to give an update that it was a good thing to see.

Saltzman: Did you say at attestation.

April 27, 2016

Garcia: Attestation.

Saltzman: What does that mean?

Garcia: It means you are pci compliant from a financial institution.

Saltzman: Ok. Thanks.

Clodius: Questions, comments or concerns?

Hales: Any others on this one? It does not look like it. Just two projects this time?

Clodius: This time yes. There are several coming.

Hales: Great. Thank you very much. We really appreciate your effort and diligence because there is real money and real functionality involved here. It's really important that we look carefully at how we're doing, so thank you for your outside eyes on that -- on those questions.

Novick: This has been the most reassuring of these reports that I have heard since I have been here.

Hales: Thank you very much. Does anyone want to testify on this item?

Moore-Love: One person signed up.

Joshua Mitchell: Actually, no, that's me not understanding.

Hales: All right. Going to have a motion to accept the report, please.

Saltzman: Move.

Fritz: Second.

Hales: Discussion? Let's take a vote to accept the report.

Saltzman: I want to thank the committee and particularly the new members, Miss Garcia and Mr. Mitchell. Thank you very much for your service and Ken Nuebauer for your ongoing service and dedication. Thank you very much. Aye.

Novick: Thank you so much for all the time that you put into this and your expertise. You are more than this, but you are an important security blanket. Aye.

Fritz: I want to thank you to the bureau of development services. I think you had maybe four or five commissioners in charge over the course of the project. Each of us has worked with you in bringing it forward, and I am glad to see that it is starting to move and that we will have a reset sometime over the summer. Thank you, also, to the committee members and Miss Garcia for agreeing to be mine. Thanks to commissioner Saltzman for bringing this committee together. Commissioner novick, I need to commend you on the fantastic service that the folks at the bureau of emergency communications and the wise choice we made in choosing that company in the essential service of the dispatch computer. Aye.

Hales: Good work and thank you very much. Aye. Ok if there is no objection I would like to take one item out of order because we have somebody here who will have to leave, and that is to take 413 from the regular calendar next, and then we'll move to the items we pulled and the rest of the regular calendar. Could you read 413 please?

Item 413.

Hales: Come on up, please.

Bret Barnum, Portland Police Bureau: Bret Barnum with the traffic division, Portland police bureau. This is the grant that we have had over the last 15 years from the Oregon impact. This is additional moneys. The reason we are requesting this so far is we have had 219 arrests for driving under the influence of the alcohol. 16 arrests for driving under the influence in drugs to include the marijuana impairment. We've been working the grant for four months now. We have got a substantial amount of money left but the additional money will be helpful so that we can complete the remaining five months of the grant. To date we are a little over half as much ahead of where we were last year. Last year we arrested 420 people under the Oregon impact grants so we're a little ahead of the game. This is good and bad. One that we're getting drivers off the road but bad in the sense that

April 27, 2016

there is an uptick in impaired driving. A big part of this, and I have talked to my colleagues at the state police, has been marijuana impaired driving. We're adding more drug recognition officers within the division to help to combat this problem a bit more. This also stays inconsistent and in line with the city of Portland. Pbot and with vision zero, and I won't forget, I am not trying to tax our people either, so we do this in such a format where I think that it's been proven now through the increase over the years, with the amount of arrests but we are keeping our people well rested and we are, actually, doing effective police work out there keeping in mind everybody's concerns.

Hales: A good report.

Fritz: I appreciate that and the thoughtfulness. My understanding from talking with Chief O'day is that the officers need to be trained for recognizing marijuana impairment and unless they are it is more difficult to make arrests. Is that correct?

Barnum: There is additional training which certainly helps with the testifying in court. Myself personally with about 23 years of traffic division experience, I am not a drug recognition officer but more than capable and comfortable making a drug arrest. In order to add additional evidence there can be a drug recognition officer brought in. Basically just puts another nail on the box so that we can make the case super solid. It does not mean the case goes away because I am not a drug recognition officer.

Fritz: The training does require resources to be able to get more and helpful to be providing that to you in the not too distant future. Thank you very much for your work.

Hales: Questions for the sergeant?

Saltzman: A question we hear a lot so much about opioid epidemics in every state and city in the nation. Is there such a thing as opiate impaired driving?

Barnum: Prescription drugs is a big part of the impairment, as well. We have seen that for years and years but traditionally the high volume of arrests come from alcohol related impairment as well as now marijuana related impairment. It doesn't preclude prescription drug cases from time to time where we do have an impaired driver that either one gets in a crash or two get stopped because of their driving behaviors or patterns.

Saltzman: So you are trained to recognize the distinction between alcohol and opioid --

Barnum: Absolutely, and the drug recognition program there is also what they might consider a little lesser training called a-ride. Advanced sobriety impairment training which can allow a regular trained dui expert grab a bit of extra training so that they can recognize and be that buffer. Do we call in a drug recognition expert or something that I can continue on myself? It's like being a junior dre but without the full credentials. It does allow you to have the additional training. These are also given to the basic police academy students.

Hales: Thank you very much. Anyone want to speak on this item? Thank you. Let's take a vote. It is an emergency ordinance.

Saltzman: Thank you, aye. **Novick:** Aye.

Fritz: Thank you for this thorough report and for your work aye.

Hales: Portlanders are losing their lives to suicide gang violence and traffic deaths. In each case the Portland police bureau is responding with focused effort and specialized training. This is just one more example that makes a difference. It is tragic what we have seen in terms of the deaths and the number of them that always this year and last year and any other year involve people under the influence. Really important work. Thank you. Aye. [gavel pounded]

Fritz: I just saw this morning that your, our police officers saved somebody planning to jump off of the 205 overpass so again thank you very much for your work.

Hales: Thank you. Thanks sergeant. Let's return to our other time certain items. And then move onto the rest of the agenda. 403 please.

Item 403.

April 27, 2016

Hales: Commissioner Fritz.

Fritz: Thank you, mayor. Portland parks and recreation is engaged in delivering innovative programs to the Portland community. Today we bring you a report on one of those programs, rx play. We have staff from the Oregon public health institute who wrote the report as well as representatives from intertwined, a local nonprofit entity exploring ways to extend and expand Portland's rx play model with us here today. Portland parks and recreation and key partners formed the rx play program in 2009. The rx play is an innovative response to chronic preventable health conditions often caused by childhood obesity. The program partners which healthcare provider who is write youth patients' prescriptions for recreation courses at Portland parks and recreation facilities. The bureau's budget request includes a one-time package to continue this program and transition into a long-term funding model. The Portland parks and director mike abbate will share the details and introduce the guests.

Mike Abbate, Director, Portland Parks and Recreation: Thank you commissioner, mayor. I am mike abbate, director of Portland parks and recreation and I am joined by Jean Rystrom with Kaiser Permanente who is now retired and tamie Arnold, the director of the youth obesity clinic -- obesity at Kaiser will join us and Adolfo Cuellar will come and share some of his results. Our tag line is healthy parks and healthy Portland. I am pleased to present an innovative way that we are helping to achieve this vision. It's called the rx play. As the health and wellbeing of the children are impacted daily by the environment in which they live and learn and play, the use of parks and other recreation spaces as a healthy venue is important to consider in a comprehensive view of childhood and family obesity prevention. Nationally we're seeing increasing commitment by parks agencies and help providers to look at synergistic ways the two can work to go to prevent childhood obesity. The bureau is committed to maximizing opportunities for the parks positively impact public health and our current plan includes the following goals. One expand active recreation opportunities by partnering with the public health community. Secondly to contribute to improvement health outcomes for youth through increased physical activity and improved nutrition. Today's presentation is a report to council on the findings gleaned from a survey made possible by a 2015 innovation fund grant. We greatly appreciate the council's support of that grant and of our rx play program. Rx play builds upon the role that parks play in the community and provide as tremendous opportunity for us to continue building strong partnerships with our friends in the health community. It's a collaboration with a licensed health practitioner writes prescriptions for children ages 6-12 to increase the physical activity, send those with family permission to a Portland parks and recreation outreach worker who connects with the family in a warm hand-off and invites them to come to a community center and find out more about the child's interests and what activities they would be involved in and present what options Portland parks and recreation has. We offer scholarships for low income families that cover the registration fees. Portland parks and recreation in partnership with the Oregon recreation and parks department, Kaiser Permanente, and Multnomah County and others through this program from a tiny kernel in 2009, and through that effort we have learned it is essential to invest in skilled outreach efforts and reducing the financial barriers. So those are some of the ahaha's that we have learned that outreach is critical to be success. It's a mutually beneficial relationship between our agency and our healthcare providers. We use economist's community investments in parks and recreation facilities to address the significant community problem through a partnership. We gain new customers, create new habits in our youth, and often that's from communities that may not have engaged Portland parks and recreation in the past. Healthcare providers gain a bridge to real activities in the local community. They can go beyond encouraging physical activity to

April 27, 2016

connecting children and their families to real solutions to combat chronic disease and promote wellness and community-based interventions are more cost effective and culturally specific. In the process patients and their families become more kecked to their communities, reducing social isolation and increasing civic engagement. An exciting thing about rx play is that it plays to our strength and is utilizes existing community assets or recreation centers and our pools and playgrounds and trails. It is funded through the end of June thanks to that grant, fund grant I mentioned. June of this year. The grant also funded the report that we're asking you to accept today. The report documents the lessons learned and highlights the practices that lead to success in helping kids get active and engaged through a partnership between the healthcare providers and kids and families. As Commissioner Fritz noted we're requesting a one-time budget support package for our rx play in our 2017 and 2018 budget, and I am pleased to have the opportunity to share this with you today and believe that the unique partnership could move into the future. So I am joined today as I mentioned by one of the originators of rx play, jean Rystrom, and although she has moved on from her role that she was playing when rx play was started in 2009 you will see the project has been a labor of love and a commitment to a vision about the synergy of parks and well science and healthcare. **Jean Rystrom:** Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here to all of you who have been helping with this project as well. My name is jean Rystrom, I am retired from Kaiser Permanente and I was the co-originator of rx play along with terry burgerson from the state of Oregon's parks and recreation department. Rx play is a collaboration, something that I want to really emphasize. It bridges the gap between what clinicians always do, which is to give advice about healthy activity and what we offer in our recreation systems, but it is so hard for people to make the behavior changes they are not already availing themselves of those services and facilities. It's so hard for them to get there. The idea is the clinicians continue to give the advice, and the recreation program continues to make available the programs and activities and we're bridging the gap for people. We are helping them from passing information from one organization to the other and that reaches out to the patient and smooths the pathway to affect change. So that warm hand-off is really important to how this works. There are lots of other park prescription programs nation-wide. That, actually, has been happening since we started. There were a small number and now there are lots of them around the country. One of the differences between those programs and rx play is this is a collaboration. This is absolutely a collaboration and it is not only between recreation and healthcare but also a collaboration within each of those because as the director abbate said we have several healthcare partners and we have another recreation partner, as well so this is a community-wide effort where we try to bring in as many people as possible. So ohsu, the Multnomah county school-based health clinics and legacy and providence, many, not just Kaiser Permanente. Key considerations here that collaboration and the coordination is very important to making this work. One of the things that happens at the end of the process where the clinician writes the prescription and it is sent to parks and rec and they make the outreach call. The person from parks and recreation makes a call back to the clinician and lets them know what happened. That turns out to be really important because they know what's going on and they know how to reinforce the messages and have faith in the program that it is working and etc. Feedback and coordination between the programs is important. This program also as was referenced before was designed to speak to those who are disadvantaged already. The people who know about parks and recreation, that's great. The people who don't know that's their program, those are the ones that most, we want to most reach. Offering those low or no-cost activities and being able to do that and until behavior has changed because it takes a while. Another aspect of what we can do with the grant. The last thing perhaps

April 27, 2016

the most pivotal of all is the dedicated staffing, having somebody who is especially trained and experienced and who is bilingual and you will hear all of that from Adolfo. Those are really important, not to mention being very enthusiastic. So there is kudos to many people for making this happen. We were the co-originaors but would have gone nowhere without a lot of people's help, and I want to call out Sue Glenn who has moved on from Portland parks, but who was a wonderful support to this program. There are sister programs going around the state of Oregon due to rx play, and that is not relevant but it's a point of pride nonetheless. Seaside is doing something that came out of this when I talked with providence. Grants Pass called me to talk about it because they set up on rx play program. There is one that's under study in Wilsonville and of course bend is looking at -- has been doing an rx play program for a long time and is looking at making it more stable. There is a strategic planning process which was happening parallel to the study that we are talking about today. The strategic planning process was underwritten by Kaiser Permanente and undertaken by Oregon's public health institute. I am sorry, I have gotten myself confused. That is the report. The strategic planning process was underwritten by Kaiser and it was the intertwined alliance that is working on that. We are looking to expand the program and expand it geographically and add more partners and expand the age range of people that we can serve under the program. So I am now going to move to the report itself. Over 100 clinicians have written prescriptions and over 800 kids have had the prescriptions over the history of the program. There are about 20 incoming prescriptions to Portland parks per month in 2015. About 40% or more are filled, in other words the prescriptions written, the kids sign up for a program. 30% of signing up for an additional activity after that one has ended. And then I just want to part with the concluding paragraph from the executive summary from that report funded by the -- funded by the grant. Over the past four years the Portland parks rx play program has facilitated hundreds of conversations between healthcare providers, youth and parents about the importance of physical activity and improving health. Thanks to our rx play recreation centers have become important health improvement resources for these youth, their families and their healthcare providers. Rx play's impact is not limited to physical activity. It is also introduced community members to parks and recreation as was already mentioned. Many participants had never engaged with Portland parks before rx play but the program's partnership and healthcare providers, successful outreach strategy and scholarships brought their doors for the first time. This shows the staff and other stakeholders have worked to create a solid foundation of partnerships, data collection and client engagement for the program and provide recommendations for how to build on these successes in the future. With that I will introduce Tamie.

Tamie Tlustos-Arnold: Good morning mayor haes and commissioners. I am Tamie Tlustos-Arnold and I am a registered nurse with Kaiser Permanente. I was hired in 2012 to pilot a pediatric obesity clinic targeting the highest risk patients considered severely obese and that have morbidities like insulin resistance, prediabetes, type 2 diabetes. Pcos, hypertension and psychological disorders.

Fritz: What is Pcos?

Tlustos-Arnold: Polycystic ovary syndrome. We know obesity continues to be an epidemic in this country and without intervention it will not get better on its own. As a healthcare provider I see on a daily basis the effects and lack of exercise and diet choice has on our families. In the clinic environment we are very limited with the resources that are available to our pediatric population. We are unable to offer exercise programming and the resources for our, are few for many families on a fixed income. A majority of the families that I work with are low income. Income in and of itself creates many barriers for families. The obvious barrier being that they cannot come up with the funds to put their

April 27, 2016

kids in -- in organized sports or participate in recreational programs. These family struggle to put food on the table, and many have two and three jobs and try to make ends meet which means that they have significant barriers. It's not uncommon for the children to come from single family homes with additional stress on their families. While rx play can't remove all the barriers it is a much needed bridge that helps to fill the gap for many of the families that I referred to the program. By providing a warm hand-off, outreach from pp and r, helps to provide some of that stress off the busy parent to find the time to connect with those resources. By offering low-cost and no-cost programming that helps to remove the barrier of the financial access. I have helped to connect hundreds of children to exercise programs at Portland parks and rec. Our families that utilize the program appreciate the experience and they enjoy it and they love the resources that are available to them. The program is an asset not only to the patients but the medical community as it gives us a tool that we would not otherwise have. Again, resources for children are so limited, which for me highlights the need for more resources, not less. The health and wellness of our children are at stake, and I just would like to share a quick story about one of the patients that I got to refer to this program. She was on the upper end of the spectrum with regards to age. She came from a single family parent. Mom was out of work and they don't -- they did not have access to a car, so we tried to problem solve around these issues because that's what I do is help them to figure out how to not only get the resource but get it. Mom was extremely motivated. Child was above the 99th percentile which meant that she was severely obese, and she felt kind of stigmatized about participating in anything in the school let alone exercise and felt very uncomfortable in her body. We made the resource connection with Portland parks. She was excited and wanted to make changes. Mom was excited. We had gotten them on the bus and they went to our one off Cherry Park. Participated to the full extent that they were able, and I am happy to report that she lost about 15 pounds and grew about two or three inches over the year, year and a half, made a significant change in the ladies' life, and not only that, her mother was so inspired that she started walking while the daughter was in the swim class. And they, actually, participated together as a family in the color run. So it was a real win-win situation for the whole family. The other thing that I would like to share with you is as I talk about my experience, it is also some of the experiences of our other clinicians and providers, we did an in-house survey of over 20 providers to find out what they thought of the rx play program, and overall I am very happy to say that they were extremely supportive of the program. They felt it met the needs of the patients and was easy to fit into the practice. It helps to promote health, financial barriers and are minimized and the process is easy for the family and the clinician, and these are direct words from some of our clinicians. 80% of the clinicians felt the program provided significant benefit and that they felt that the program was excellent and one of the best prescriptions that they have had the opportunity to write. The biggest issues are the program footprint which is the service area. Wouldn't it be wonderful if we had Portland parks and rec for not only this area but that's, that's the problem. I live out in East County and our resources are more limited, and the food desert says are greater and the needs are greater in the Rockwood area. It makes it difficult. Streamlining the process would be a benefit. Barriers identified by families include the ability to make time for participation. The costs or the concern about the cost, transportation, and just being out of their comfort zone, so those were the things that were noted by the providers. They greatly appreciated hearing back from Portland parks on the prescriptions that they sent out. They would love to have even more data because that's what we do in healthcare, the more the better. As well as the efficiency of the program. So some of the examples that they provide, one of our providers said that I have seen several children with elevated bmi whose family struggled

April 27, 2016

to incorporate activity into their routine, and the rx play activities gave them the support and the structure to change resulting in increased confidence in both children and patients as weight loss occurred. I think we all want the best for our children. We want them to be healthy and we want them to be happy, and sometimes, our desires and our abilities don't always match up. When it comes to programs like rx play they help to fill in that gap and connect our families with the resources and the community recreation that we need, that we need. We have to, as leaders in our community help our children not only thrive for themselves but for our community and our nation and I hope that you will allow there to continue.

Abbate: Thank you. One of the things that we have learned since 2009 is a critical part of the program is that we are calling it the warm hand-off. It is having dedicated staff that can reach out to families who received these prescriptions and invite them in a caring and compassionate way, and I have joining me is adolfo Cuellar who has been our outreach specialist and ask him to make a few remarks.

Adolfo Cuellar: Hello.

Hales: Good morning.

Cuellar: I will here today because honestly, so to speak, we all really lived this but I was the one making the outreach calls, so I had the opportunity to speak with the families and it's changed my life and changed who I am and the way that I go about speaking to people in general. Rx play basically made me a more understanding person regarding the human experience. When I first started I didn't really understand what the influence would be because I had a bigger picture idea. I realized that it has more to do with diet than with our daily life activities than it does with any kind of quick remedy I started making these calls, and I realized that this was affecting actual families. And these families are amazed to take their child to a swimming class that they had no idea about previously. The centers are across the city, and they had no clue whatever. So this is a really great example of the effect of rx play. She wanted to be here today but couldn't because she was working. She had two children. One was an older girl, very nervous and shy and would stand behind her. At this point her child reached 14, so was no longer in rx play but still taking music lessons and swimming lessons and has completed all the courses and, actually, herself she came up to the front desk and asked if there is any way that she can get into our lifeguard classes although she's not old enough which is fantastic. It is a complete turnaround, and at one point she called me and asked me what she should do because her child was being bullied. I realized that I am now the only connection that rosio even has to the city as far as she's concerned. She could have come up to the front desk and could have called the police but she did not feel as trusted in that scenario, so rx play at that point, or at least my role, left the realm of healthcare. It just gave a connection to somebody who typically would not have that. We need to know about community centers. Provide that connection to help for a scenario where she didn't know what else to do. I am really thankful for the rx play for the effect that it has had on my life and for the effects that it has had on countless families' lives. Rosio is fully Spanish speaking, and maybe I should mention that. On a bigger scale, I think that we can all notice the influence that naturopathic medicine is having on healthcare and stuff like that. We also see the recent attention that Kaiser has put onto preventative healthcare. On the note of what Jean was saying as far as other prescription programs happening, popping up all over the country, this one came up, I put a call into San Francisco and realized there is an association specifically for the parks and prescription programs so they are having conference calls once a month talking about where this is going. How they can get it there and that really helped me to see that Portland has a chance to be a leader in this movement. By pushing our rx play forward. Thanks.

April 27, 2016

Abbate: Thank you. This program started in 2009 and I would be remiss if I did not give a shout out to Lisa. She is the staff person who began this working with Jean and with the state parks. And over her career her 30-year career she transformed the organization through policies and systems that promoted professionalism and equality and equity and access, and most of all reflected her understanding of how important recreation was and could be in the lives of young people. After her retirement the program continued under the leadership of Sue Glenn and Daniel Sullivan in the audience today. I want to recognize their work, and it's a dedication of our park staff who have been willing to collaborate with others to make this possible. It represents both the strengths and weaknesses of our goals. It's a passion for innovation exploration and it challenges us with meeting current service levels while we try to retool for the future. We believe rx play has great potential to continue working with Kaiser and intertwined and other healthcare providers in the region to establish a workable and supportable model that could be sustainable. I mentioned the budget request includes a proposal to continue the funding at 120,000, and that request is just for the funds needed to the out-reach workers and the scholarships that we provide the people. This offers us the opportunity to establish the linkage between healthcare, cost reduction, and access. Thank you, I would like to invited Tamie and Jean to join us and pull up another chair and we would be happy to answer any questions that you have.

Hales: A great presentation. Questions.

Fritz: I don't know that we have any.

Hales: You did a great job and great presentation. Anyone's want to speak on this item?

Moore-Love: No one else signed up.

Hales: Ok. Please let's take a motion to adopt the report.

Fritz: So moved.

Saltzman: Second.

Hales: Roll call, please.

Saltzman: Thank you for a great report, and it's nice to see this connection between our healthcare providers and our parks and recreation departments are really connecting, and I guess it's not so unique. There is quite a few programs doing this rx play or prescription play, but it's really a connection long overdue, so it sounds like a lot of young people are on a path to more healthy and successful lives as a result of this connection. So I am very pleased to support it. And thanks for the ophi validation of this program. Aye.

Novick: I think one of Portland's goals should be to be the healthiest city in America, and this is a tremendous program of which both is improving people's lives and saving money for all of us. All of us are in the same health insurance goals, the healthier that everybody is, the better the bottom line for governments and families and businesses, and so, and that's good for the economy. Money we're not spending on unnecessary healthcare is money that could be invested in other things. So that's my clinical technical reaction, but also the stories are phenomenal and it's magnificent that this program is making a real difference I real kids' lives. Thank you aye.

Fritz: Healthy parks, healthy Portland thank you to our healthcare partners and parks staff for this report and for the program. I thank commissioner Fish who was in charge when it started in 2009 and former director Zari Santner. Again it's a great testimony to Lisa Turple. I'm struck by our parks staff Adolfo Cuellar starting off with what a difference this made for him and that's the case for many of our parks staff that the work that we do we love and we care about the community, we get as much coming to work each day as we give to those in the community that's partly why we do the work that we do, and it's important work, we need to figure out how to continue to fund it. The budget request is for one-time funding we are looking at that as we continue to look at healthcare funding. We need to

April 27, 2016

look at coordinated care organizations, being able to prove this has results in reduction in obesity and increase in health, that's health care dollars saved. We are looking for all of our health care partners including the Oregon public health institute, Kaiser Permanente, ohsu, doernbecher, national college of natural medicine and others in the alliance to help us figure out how we get this in the sustainable funding. It's clear today this is the right thing to do, the right direction to go. We need to expand it to many more families citywide and figure out how to pay for that. Of course it always comes down to how we're going to pay for it. I would like to thank Jean rystrom and Tamie Tlustos-Arnold for presenting today, and our wonderful parks Eileen Argentina and Matthew Calhoun and Daniel Sullivan and Lisa and many others who just recognize this is the right thing to do. As a retired registered nurse, it brings joy to my heart. Thank you. Aye.

Hales: This is a great program and this is a great report. We have to keep looking for ways to get upstream in the lives of our kids to change the outcomes. As the commissioner in charge of the police bureau who is haunted every night about calls from my bureau about gang violence, having healthy kids with access to recreation, we hope there will be less of those calls someday in the future. We know those positive pathways work out and you do. That's why you do this work. It's great validation to hear how this is working in people's lives and in our employees' lives. Kaiser, there are some corporations that have slogans and don't do anything. There's Kaiser that talks about healthy people and thriving. Then you step up and talk about funding the unity center and I want to commend your organization for being there as a partner to get to the outcomes that we all want. Kaiser deserves our thanks for being a partner and for backing your slogan with real effort, real money, real commitment. That's in noticed and appreciated. Thank you. Aye. Thank you all, great work. [gavel pounded]

Hales: Let's move on to our two pulled items from the regular calendar. We have 405, yes, we do have Christine here.

Item 405.

Moore-Love: Accept bid of moore excavation, inc., for the colwood golf course.

Fritz: I pulled this simply because of the size of the contract and it looks like a good contract. I just wanted Christine moody to be able to explain it to us.

Hales: Thank you, it was erroneously on the consent calendar, thank you for pulling it.

Christine Moody, Procurement Services: Christine moody Procurement services. We have before you a procurement report recommending a contract to Moore Excavation. The engineers estimate on this project was \$2 million. On February 18th, 2016, five bids were received and moore excavation is the low bidder at \$1,945,819, which is 2.5% under the engineer's estimate. The city identified six divisions of work for potential minority women and emerging small business contractor opportunity. The nwesb subcontracting participation on this project is at 29.73%, with work being performed in landscaping, surveying, drilling and traffic sign installation. I will turn this back over to council if you have any questions.

Hales: Thank you. Questions for Christine. Doesn't look like there are any. Thank you very much. Anyone want to speak on this item? If not, a motion to accept the report, please.

Fritz: So moved.

Novick: Second.

Hales: Roll call.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye.

Fritz: Thank you, chief procurement officer, Christine moody. I'm pleased to see over quarter of a million dollars going to minority women, emerging small business subcontractors, and just a quick overview of the project itself. We have completed phase 1

April 27, 2016

at colwood to convert the golf course from 18 to 9 holes, and the phase 2 developments includes improvement to the right of way project, decommissioned existing septic tanks, installing new pedestrian connections and constructing a new outdoor gathering area and driving range facility. Colleagues, i'm pleased to tell you that also the clubhouse at colwood is already becoming a vibrant community center and used for things other than golf. It's a testament to the work of this council to invest in colwood and put it into even more community use. Thank you. Aye.

Hales: This is a continuing raining down of good things from a wonderful proposal that came along from the trust for public land a while back, to make this acquisition to create a site where additional industrial development could happen, and it's led to great things for the neighborhood and opened the door to resolve a 25-year problem of where the post office should government it's a winner on every level. Aye. [gavel pounded]

Hales: Oregon, 412 -- i'm sorry, 411.

Item 411.

Moore-Love: Authorize an intergovernmental agreement with Portland state university to provide survey and research related services for a term of three years for an amount not to exceed \$150,000.

Hales: This was pulled --

Moore: Mr. Lightning pulled it.

Hales: Let's take a vote -- or move to second reading. [gavel pounded]

Hales: Now let's move to 412.

Item 412.

Moore-Love: Authorize a competitive solicitation for mobile data computer replacement laptops for the Portland police bureau.

Hales: Good morning. Speaking of new equipment.

*****: Good morning. I'm lieutenant [Inaudible] here with the Portland police bureau on behalf of assistant chief bob day today, he had to step away for another urgent meeting. The reason to be here today is to request to begin the process of authorize competitive solicitation for the replacement of our mobile data replacement laptops. Approximately 350 laments, the warrant is due to expire in 2017. We're looking for permission to identify what the replacement will be and start to cost that product.

Hales: So this will queue us up to make a purchase but not necessarily execute on that purchase.

*****: Correct.

Hales: For the computer, because it's off warranty doesn't mean it doesn't work. We might get more functionality out of new units, as well, I don't want to mean that we just limp along.

*****: Potentially. I brought my colleagues to answer more technical questions as far as the life span of those computers.

Hales: Will the new units not only be in warrant but substantially better? Because that seems to be what typically happens with technology, not always.

Mark Elwood, Bureau of Technology Services: Good morning, mark Elwood, I manage the police i.t. Division for pts. Well aware of Moore's law, things double every year and a half. Same thing happens with these. In addition to that we're looking to examine other kinds of devices and other solutions and still be a Microsoft-based platform. There are tablets now as well as laptops. We want to take a good look at what the alternatives are if they are more useful or affordable or portable, whatever it is.

Hales: What is the original year of the ones we're now using?

Elwood: 2013. But the original generation of those were from 2008.

Hales: This that's a long time.

April 27, 2016

Elwood: Two generations of the same devices so far. This will happen in 2017, that fiscal year.

Chad Lublin, Bureau of Technology Services: Mayor, I just wanted to say one thing. Chad Lublin. With the last iteration we saw quite a large break rate toward the end of the warranty period. The first time we went through this we saw a .07 break rate which is very low. Just in anticipation of our experience from the last go-around we want to be prepared for this one. In addition to that we have a limited number of spares because we wanted to be fiscally responsible during the last go-around. So those things start breaking on us our folks will be in trouble pretty quick.

Hales: Other questions?

Fritz: I hope you're including in this solicitation trying to use more hands free and talking equipment. I'm astonished at the complexity of the mobile units in the police cars. Even using a cell phone can be distracting. I would hope that the new models would be more talking to and voice commands rather than needing to look at the screen all the time.

Lublin: Do you mind if I answer?

Elwood: No, go ahead.

Lublin: We have a user group a technical group, mounting group, safety committee, all that. And we have published an rfi for our vendor fair may 3rd. We're going talk to them about these sorts of things specifically. We will wrap up the requirements and i'll make sure that's on there.

Fritz: I realize that officers have been using them for 20, 30 years, they are very used to doing that, but i'm sure there are safety improvements we could get to. I'm really excited to see this procurement going out. I do have a question about the substitute though.

Hales: We do have a substitute which I can move if you want. Substitute, moved, seconded. Yes.

Fritz: In it you've deleted item 6 which says funding will be from the 300,041,616 remaining in the replacement fund and the bureau general fund appropriations. Why was that deleted?

******:** I can't answer that. I know after talking to Katherine Ryland she said there is money left in the replacement account but there was a decision made, my bts in the 13-14 budget not to fund the replacement costs.

Fritz: I just want to make sure you're not coming with a \$2 million ask or such like from the general fund that this is going to be covered in the replacement fund.

******:** There will be an ask in the 17-18 budget cycle. We are going to be looking internally to see where we can minimize what that ask is but there will be an ask in the 17-18 budget cycle.

Elwood: The life cycle replacement program went away in the year we did the last replacement. So there is no new life cycle replacement funds.

Hales: So there is some money, still in the replacement fund but not enough.

******:** Right, correct.

Lublin: And that money will be used for this but there's just not enough.

Hales: I hadn't seen that, commissioner. We should check but I think the meaning is we will use the money assuming that they are there, but that's not all the funding that will be required ultimately for purchase.

Fritz: Mayor, as the police commissioner I will assume you would look into that. All the other bureau are required to pay into replacement so when our computers have reached end of life there is the money set aside. I think the police bureau should be no different.

Hales: I will look into that, thank you. Other questions? Dan?

Saltzman: We're estimate being \$2 million to replace 350 units.

April 27, 2016

Lublin: Yes. Based on historical figures. We won't know the actual estimate until about May, after the rfp responses are received.

Saltzman: I don't have a calculator in front of me but that seems to say we're talking about four to \$5,000 a unit? I realize they have to be rugged and durable but that seem as lot. The laptop market today, you can get a lot for \$5,000.

Lublin: That's one of the things we want to assess during this evaluation. If there's something out there that may be semi rugged it would be less costing. There is a requirement in one of the requirement sessions, our users say they would be okay with semi rugged devices so that's a requirement of ours. In addition to that, one thing to note, it's not just the computer devices. There's mounting hardware, keyboards, office software, things that have to be included.

Saltzman: This includes the software and the mounting?

Lublin: Yes.

Saltzman: Okay, thanks.

Hales: Other questions for the team. Thank you all very much. Thank you.

Hales: Anyone want to speak on this item?

Moore-Love: Mr. Robert west would like to speak.

Hales: Come on up.

Robert West: Yes, my name is Robert west from police 9-1-1. I wanted to bring up that the cost of those laptops that they are trying to get, weather they are hard or not, is very expensive. And we still -- the police department still has laptops that work. It's not a thing that they don't work anymore or anything like that, they do work. There's no reason to buy a whole bunch of new ones. Then what do we do with the old ones, you know? You got perfectly good computers that you're either going have dispossessed or destroyed or whatever. I just don't see any reason buying brand-new computers at that price when you could probably come up with a way of putting them in a protective shield in a police car, a metal protective shield, and put windows or mac, put a regular computer in there. I've seen officers taking the computers out of the cars every once in a while. I don't see why this they have to take them out of the car when the computers should be mounted in the cars. I also see the officers -- they will be driving up the street as they are doing this, you know. And I think that's a safety hazard. But what can I do about it? It's not -- until they hit a child or a lady crossing with a child or something like that, some disaster happens, then maybe change can happen. But -- and also the fact that Portland police will be going to digital pretty soon as far as their radios go. How will that affect their new computers? Will they need to buy new computers for these radios and stuff? Will the new hardware that they have with these digitals work with the computers or will -- you know, there's a lot of questions. I think the police ought to go back, look at -- they are going to be getting digital pretty soon. Will it work with the computers they are get? Is there cheaper ones to get? And stuff like that. Can they use a regular laptop? You know, they don't need military grade computers in their patrol cars. You know, they can have some kind of aluminum or metal protection on the back, something to hold it there. We're not in iraq, we're not -- they are not in Iraq or Afghanistan. We don't need to worry about mines and bombs going off and stuff.

Hales: Thank you, thanks very much.

West: Thank you.

Hales: Taking action on the substitute ordinance. Let's take a vote, please.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye. Thank you. [gavel pounded]

Fritz: Do we have to vote to accept?

Hales: We've moved the substitute, it was not an amendment, it was a substitute so we're okay. Let's move on to 414.

April 27, 2016

Moore: I was thinking that was the vote on accepting the substitute and now we need to vote on the substitute.

Hales: I thought we already had. Let take a vote on the substitute ordinance.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye. [gavel pounded] 414.

Item 414.

Moore-Love: Amend utility license law to include direct access electric services and establish minimum penalties.

Mary Beth Henry, Office of Management and Finance: Good morning, the purpose of this is to make electric and gas services subject to the utility license code. Energy suppliers operate throughout Oregon and in Portland. Energy suppliers provide wholesale service to business customers, bypassing local utilities for example in Portland. It might be pge, p p & I, and northwest natural. So business customers buy directly from alternative suppliers rather than the local utility. And the option of receiving this service directly from suppliers is called direct access. These direct access suppliers are not currently subject to the utility license law, thus revenues associated with their sales are not captured through utility license fees. Industry experts predict that the market share of energy suppliers will likely increase in the future. In terms of the process that we used to -- for this, we sent out notice in January to all of the utility licensees, as well as those energy suppliers that we are aware of in Portland. I have worked with the two energy suppliers that we are aware of, noble, America energy solutions and shell energy since January. And answered their questions, you know, can this be passed through, when will this be taking effect. The effective date of this is July 1st, 2016. I will say that normally when you deal with companies they are not thrilled with being taxed. But the representatives of these two companies have been just great and complimentary of the process, in the sense that we're giving them so much time to prepare for this. And in Hillsboro and Prineville they already - they have been doing this for several years. The other small tweak we're making is to the penalties, where we're establishing a minimum penalty of \$500 or 2% of the utility's gross revenues, mostly for administrative efficiencies. We don't actually use this portion of the code that much. We endeavor to get everybody to pay what they are supposed to do and follow the law from the very beginning. And I wanted to thank Danny Grady and Michael Armstrong of the bureau of planning and sustainability who helped me with the estimates. And i'm happy to answer any questions.

Fritz: I like hearing the numbers. What are the estimates of the revenue for this?

Henry: We think on the high end it could be a million dollars annually in general fund revenue. Because the information is proprietary we won't know until we know.

Fritz: Thank you very much. Do you know if the budget office has factored that into the budget last year?

Henry: I don't know if I definitely provided all the information to them.

Fritz: Once again, the office of community technology is really proving its worth and you as its leader, I very much appreciate it.

Saltzman: Are any of these providers providing renewable energy?

Henry: I actually don't know that, but I can check with my contact in planning and sustainability and see if someone else has a better idea. Now I have a great relationship with these two companies I can ask them directly. We'll follow up.

Saltzman: Thank you.

Hales: Anyone want to speak on this item?

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

Hales: It passes second reading. As the man said, a million here, a million there, eventually you've got real money.

Item 415.

April 27, 2016

Moore-Love: Authorize the bureau of environmental services to execute easements with Tualatin hills parks and recreation district and part of the 86th avenue pump station and appurtenances project no. E09051 and fanno basin pressure line system upgrade.

Scott Gibson, Bureau of Environmental services: My name is Scott Gibson with the bureau of environmental services. With me is Debbie Caselton. This is asking to enter into an easement agreement with Tualatin hills parks and rec. One of the easements is associated with the 2% set-aside for art on the project. And the other easement is in order to facilitate construction on the force main removals. Let's see. The reason I brought Debbie is so she could give us summary of where we are on the art. She's been our face in the public for the last five years on the fanno know pump stations. I'll turn it over to her to give you a short summary of what we're doing.

Debbie Caselton, Bureau of Environmental services: Thank you. It's nice to be in front of you with my actual job, thank you. [laughter]

We have been working with the public in the southwest area and the fanno basin area near the pump station for several years. We have a citizen advisory committee out there, and that includes Tualatin hills staff and members of the public that live in the area surrounding the pump station. And we've selected working with regional arts and culture council working with Peggy, the art manager for this, to emerging artists because it was very small budget. Most of the pump station is underground so we only do the 2 percent for art for aboveground structures. So the two emerging artists that we selected are David becklehide and Christina Conant. David actually lived in the area growing up so he's very familiar with the area. The site proposed is outside of the bes property where the north -- the southwest avenue pump station is, right off the trail about two feet. It's about 120 feet in length and the art is ranging from one to two feet, so it's not a safety hazard. It'll be interactive to the public and it's a sculpture. It references the -- they did a lot of research on this and worked with the public, referencing the elevation lines of the topography of the area, as well as the course of fanno creek. There will be also in consultation with thprd the native edible plants along the fence line so the public can actually interact with that. And that references the native people of the Tualatin tribes over there, and the first settlers who began farming in the area. The artists were very conscientious of the history of the area, and working with the public over there. And the selection committee worked with the local residents and we also met with the public with the artists to portray where we wanted to have it on site. And they mocked up a cardboard version of the art, a little bit of it, so they could see actually where we're proposing it, and asked for public comment, which we received in the mail or by email, and that was last May, almost a year now. We received I'd say 98% positive and support for the work with the one person who just hates us in general. [laughter] So we've received good support and I think everybody's excited and I liked having the actual public involvement piece working with the public on the art and the selection of the artist. We went through, like, I think a hundred resumes and proposals for the art. And since it's such a small budget we had such a passionate group of young artists that are really emerging, which is great.

Gibson: This item is here before you, it's an emergency that will help us facilitate coordination, we have to have the easements approved by Tualatin hills park board, as well. It's a no-cost easement. It requires mutual indemnification clauses and that's it. We're here to answer any questions.

Hales: Questions.

Saltzman: What was it for the budget for the art?

Caselton: It was \$30,000.

Hales: Great, thank you both very much. Anyone want to speak on this item? It is an emergency ordinance so we will take a vote, please.

April 27, 2016

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Thank you. Aye. **Fritz:** Great work. Aye. **Hales:** Aye. [gavel pounded]

Hales: Okay, 416.

Item 416.

Moore-Love: Authorize a contract with the lowest responsive bidder for the construction of the cured in place pipe southeast rehabilitation project no. E10682 for \$2, 260,,000.

Scott Gibson: Thank you. We're here to ask permission for a construction contract. With me is colleen herold, she has a very short presentation on the project that's similar to those that you've seen and i'll turn it over to her.

Hales: Good morning.

Colleen Harold, Bureau of Environmental Services: Good morning, Mr. Mayor and commissioners. My name is colleen Harold, we're here to ask you to approve an ordinance to authorize funds for the received cip rehabilitation sewer contract. This is for large scale sewer rehabilitation program approved in our current capital improvement budget. Just a recap of our large scale, there was a phase one that occurred and is complete and through construction. There's also a phase 3 in pre design currently and it's a line item which indicates these activities require a continuous reinvestment and that the bureau is planning for these activities. Currently on this slide is the entire program shown in purple. This map has 23 neighborhood project areas outlined. The project follows the system needs and targets the worst of the worst pipe in the city. Our project today, the cip southeast project, is shown in green. I'll talk to you a little bit about it on the next slide and why it looks so different. This project is located in tabor pal areas and has pipe brought in from east Moreland, a project not able to be done in that contract. Most of the time our projects use neighborhood boundaries, and are on the neighborhood scale this. Project was compiled with pipe that is defined by the construction method. We're going to cure in place this pipe and I couldn't stick to the neighborhood boundaries but the program did. The next slide indicates some pipe defects, the pipe that we're going to rehabilitate. It's highly deteriorated pipe, it has root intrusion, the usual broken pipe, rats and nests and we'll replace it and we're rehabilitating the sewer main -- excuse me, we're rehabilitating the sewer mains. Some of the laterals will be reconstructed and the manholes will be repacked. This will protect public health property and environment. Increase sewer system capacity and reliability, and reduce the risk of sewer releases to homes and businesses. This rehabilitation method is completely trenchless. This is what we're doing with the main line sewer pipe. It's a flexible liner that fits inside the existing main. It is like a sock being pulled into the pipe. It has a hollow tube, it is pressurized by air to that existing pipe, heat is added. It's cured in place and formed a rigid smooth surface. These are stock photos again from our website. We worked with a company -- they are two global companies with a very local presence for our work and we worked very closely with them to receive cured in place pipe. The cost savings of cured in place pipes as opposed to trenched pipe is about a third. Hopefully it adds even longer service life to our pipes and time will tell. The community impact, this has very little community impact because we're lining that sewer through the manholes. As the main line gets larger sometimes we do have to remove the cones of the manholes but it's very noninvasive. As you see in this photo one of the detriments of this is it has an off-gas that contains the chemical styrene. People who live near the project can sometimes smell this chemical odor. The odors from that line installed inside the pipe. The odor dissipates quickly especially if it's windy and the air is moving, once the installation process is complete. The amount of styrene produced is not a human health risk. Our project overview, some statistics about this project, a fairly small project for our large diameter program, its 29 pipe, 1.1 miles of length. It runs from eight-inch diameter to 36-inch diameter pipe. Much of the pipe, 93%

April 27, 2016

of the pipe is 90 years old, which is amazing that we can cure in place 90-year-old pipe still. There are five major streets, 17 located in the northeast with the rest in the southeast. And the public impact, I want you to know some key items. The Worthner Preston elementary school, we try to do work on schools when it's out of session. We have eight locations in our noise variance on this project.

Gibson: Those are the cure times can be long so they have to continue into the nighttime hours, they are very short duration, in and out in a week.

Harold: When night work is necessary we use this very respectfully and only use to it allow work to proceed past 6:00 p.m. Because you cannot stop once you start curing. You can't pick up in the morning, you must keep the heat and temperatures going to maintain that cure time. Again, one item of key issue is we have a sewer that has a manhole in I-84 in the far westbound lane. The upstream manhole is also located in Providence Hospital in their back road so we've been working closely with the hospital and ODOT to do a taper and lane closure. We have been working to minimize light and noise for the hospital solution. We can't stop, we're going to try and do this Saturday night through Sunday morning and try and make it very low impact. We have a talented and efficient outreach group. They do outreach for us to residences, businesses, neighborhood associations, business associations, schools of course, Trimet and again they have helped me with communication with Providence Hospital and ODOT on this project. Finally on budget and schedule, this is a \$2.3 million project. It has a high level of confidence at this point. We will advertise, award and begin working the fall of this year. And the construction duration will be eight months or less. If there are no more questions Scott has something additional to speak with you about.

Gibson: So this is -- the cipp technology in these diameters is not something that has an abundance of contractors. Colleen mentioned there are two major players in our market, in situ form and Michaels. Since there's not a lot of digging the sub opportunities are limited. Our experience has been this cipp work has a reduced level of participation opportunities for MWESB. When Christine comes back to talk to you about results, we're doing our best across the program to make sure we're making opportunities and doing our outreach. I personally have some concern about whether we'll meet our goals because of the type of work. We do have traffic handling and some other smaller opportunities, concrete cutting, et cetera. Two of our main opportunities are paving and the other one is trucking. To be with the trench would technologies, we would expect to see this is where we're doing and we're doing our best to manage it. That's all I have to say.

Fritz: I very much appreciate you being mindful and up front of those challenges. As well as, when you come back with whoever gets the contract, you can let us know what the company is doing to diversify its own workforce and encouraging Oregon trade women and other apprenticeships. I have one question, you had mentioned the styrene is not hazardous to humans. Is there any data it might be hazardous to smaller beings such as domestic animals, birds, bugs?

Harold: I don't know the answer to that. I assume that the noninvasive, non-environmental issues extend this far but I can't answer that. I will research it for you, though.

Fritz: If you could let me know. You've done such a good job it sounds like of notifying neighbors, and you will notify when you're going to use the variance if it's not necessary to put animals inside and things like that, we will get calls about what is this smell and why is it hurting my dog.

Hales: Anyone want to speak on this item? If not, it passes the second reading. 417.
Item 417.

April 27, 2016

Moore-Love: Accept contract with civil works northwest, inc. For the construction of the union pacific railroad east Portland connection water systems adjustment project as complete, release retainage and authorize final payment.

Teresa Elliot, Water Bureau: Good morning, I'm Teresa Elliot the chief engineer of the Portland water bureau. This is a project where we installed a 12-inch main replacing an 1890 -- i'm sorry -- a 108-year-old pipe. I forgot to do the math and see what year that is. Over in southeast Portland off of southeast 2nd. And resolution 36430 required us to do a post-project evaluation on any project that's over \$500,000. We've done that. We estimated the project when we started construction to be \$660,000. All total the project came in at \$562,000 and some change. And that is 15% underneath that engineer's estimate. We have 72% of the subcontracting dollars were used for mwbse participation or 16% of the total contract price. The work is complete, they have done all of the work according to the contract compliance as necessary. We recommend you accept the project as complete and authorize final payment.

Hales: Thank you. Questions. Anyone want to speak on this item? If not I need a motion to accept the record.

Novick: So moved.

Fritz: Second.

Hales: Roll call.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Thank you for the report, aye. **Hales:** Aye

Hales: Ok 418.

Item 418.

Moore: Revise ordinance to update engineer's estimate, issue a competitive solicitation.

Elliot: Again, I'm Teresa Elliott, chief engineer Portland water bureau. Last year we brought to you an ordinance to do some roadwork up in the watershed for road 10 project that was ordinance 187133. We had an engineer's estimate of \$889,000. We were -- because of the time constraints of when we can do workup in the watershed we were only able to do a portion of that work. We pulled a portion of that out and have combined it with this second project and are updating the project cost estimates. We're asking for -- we're updating the engineer's estimate to \$1.9 million and asking for your authorization to do -- solicit bids for competitive project.

Hales: Up to 1.9 --

Elliot: It's --

Hales: What was the --

Elliot: \$889,000.

Hales: That's a piece of change.

Elliot: Yes, it is. Originally it was one and a half miles and now it is three and a half miles.

Hales: Any other questions about this item? Anyone want to speak on this item? Okay.

Then this is a nonemergency ordinance passed to second reading. [gavel pounded] thank you very much. 419.

Item 419.

Moore-Love: Authorize the purchase of a capital project management software system no to the exceed \$825,000.

Hales: In your continued role as water bureau designated hitter.

Elliot: Yes. This project is to authorize purchasing a project management system that we can use during construction. We, in the last five years, we've been piloting a project management system on our large reservoir projects, each valuing over \$30 million and included after 2015 that we have been annually receiving about \$100,000 per project, per year, in reduced staff time by having this computerized project management system. We would like to continue using the computerized system because it allows us a lot of

April 27, 2016

projections in paperwork and is more sustainable. We have been talking to bts and have gone through their processes for using an alternative software system. We've done their hosting analysis and sap review. And then we went through the technology oversight committee review to decide whether or not it would fall in under their review or whether it would be one of those that had low impact. Yes, it has low impact and is exempt from the technical oversight committee review. And bts has endorsed getting this as an alternative project. We're proposing to get a web hosted system that we can share interactively with our project team, and on multiple projects. And we can be more efficient with that. The cost of this is -- we're asking for a five-year service contract and over five years it's \$825,000. We have funds in the 2015-16 budget for implementing it, and we're asking it in the next five years in our annual budgets, as well.

Hales: This will be in your capital budget? Or just in the -- yeah, not really a capital item.

Elliot: I don't believe it's in the capital. I think it's in our base.

Hales: Yeah, yeah, okay. All right. Questions.

Fritz: Can you explain a little more about the cooperative procurement method?

Elliot: From what I know of the cooperative procurement method, it is any time we have any -- any government agency has contracts that we can go as the city, if we don't have nothing in-house that we can tag onto, we can go to one of those other agencies and tag on our piggyback on to their contracts and negotiate the terms for our specific work as a task order, and that's what we're trying for do. We've talked to procurement and gotten their authorization to do a cooperative agreement process, and they will come forward with a report to council on what contract we actually go with.

Fritz: Maybe before next week I could get more information on that. Because my understanding was that it doesn't come back to council.

Elliot: Oh. My understanding was it did but I will find out.

Hales: We're authorizing a purchase on a previously budgeted line item --

Fritz: Right, \$825,000. It's a fairly major amendment to any previous contract. I'd like to know before the second reading vote next week. I'm not familiar with that.

Elliot: I'll get more information.

Fritz: Thank you.

Hales: Any other questions?

Saltzman: I apologize, I stepped out but walked back in when you said it was somehow determined it was exempt from our technology oversight committee. Who made that determination?

Elliot: The policy says that the bureau administrators from bts, omf and the bureau requesting it, in this case the water bureau, review the initial intake form for the technical oversight committee. It's a seven-page questionnaire where they go through and decide it is a low impact, and not under technical councils review.

Hales: Low impact means low potential for failure?

Elliot: No, low impact on bts staffing. It's a web based program hosted by another company outside of the city. There's no impact on the city staffing. That's my understanding.

Hales: That doesn't necessarily assure --

Elliot: I can get more information before that, too.

Hales: That would be helpful. I appreciate raising that concern. Just because the procurement method is different doesn't mean it danger level is different.

Fritz: Just because bts doesn't have anything to do with it doesn't mean anything. Good catch commissioner Saltzman.

April 27, 2016

Hales: Okay, other questions for Teresa? Thank you very much. Anyone want to speak on this item? If not it comes back next week for second reading with your follow-up, please. Let's move on to 420.

Item 420.

Moore-Love: Amend contracts with joint, home forward, northwest pilot project, and transition projects to add \$842,500 in rent assistance for people experiencing homelessness.

Hales: Commissioner Saltzman

Saltzman: In March of this year the city council amended fiscal year 2015-16 budget to fund several actions intended to address the housing emergency that city council declared in October of 2015. This included over \$1 million of funds for the housing bureau to contract existing nonprofit organizations to provide additional term rent assistance and client assistance. These funds will expand our resource capacity for people experiencing homelessness, and eviction prevention for people at I am imminent risk of becoming homeless. The housing bureau has obligated a significant portion of this to our nonprofit service providers under current contracting authority. The service authorizes the Portland housing bureau to dedicate the remainder of this \$1 million for nonprofits, including joint, home forward, northwest pilot project and transition projects for immediate use. These funds are a critical correct of our safety net. They will go towards permanent housing replace for becoming homeless. Thank you and I urge your support.

Hales: Anyone else want to speak on this item?

Moore-Love: Mr. Robert west.

Hales: Come on up, you can come up too, come on up.

Robert West: Yes, my name is Robert west, I'm from the police 9-1-1. I deal with the homeless a lot. I'm all for a program to house the homeless. The thing is, seems like joint and all these organizations have received a lot of money in the last year. And I would actually like to see where that money's going to, you know, is it going actual house 150 homeless or is it going to go into some director's pocket.

Hales: So this is money going out the door through those organizations to actual rent assistance to people that need it. Most of the money is actually going directly to pay rent for people vulnerable to becoming homeless.

West: That's what I wanted to make sure.

Hales: Good question. Thank you. Anyone else want to speak on this item? Come on up.

Crystal Elinski: Commissioners, mayor, my name is crystal elinski. Regarding this item, I noticed there was mention of the emergency declaration from October 2015, and yet the city council hasn't yet voted on that so it's still a proposal.

Hales: We did actually.

Elinski: It has no teeth and now looks like it's getting us in trouble, which is no surprise. When it was announced testified that many, many people were suddenly getting those things that were claimed to be -- the aim was to get rid of raising the rent suddenly \$200 or 35, 50%, 100%. A lot of these people just in regular old rentals, many in subsidized housing, many. Way too many. That happens to be a couple of these organizations you just claimed as good organizations. What was the term you used, they are proven. Well, for my experience, and i've been here for years and talked with you, dan Saltzman and before you it was nick Fish in housing. I would say northwest pilot project works. I just don't have direct proof of that because i'm not yet elderly. But those other organizations, and I speak for 10,000 at this point, there is just so many issues going on. So what Robert asked earlier, it would be really good to see this in detail and to get involved with this. It already looks like it's going to be passed all this money. But why reference, if you guys still haven't voted on this -- this emergency, how it's going actually fit in regular city policy

April 27, 2016

and what's going happen when it goes over to Multnomah County. If you're not allowed to talk about a current lawsuit, why would you even mention it? The housing bureau gets money handed to it all the time and there's been emergency's before but not on this level. I think it's time that we look at this in-depth and finish it. It looks like a sort of a half-assed job that's going on political. As far as the last item, it's interesting the big pipe keeps flowing over, they promised it wouldn't. Exponentially every year we keep getting more and more pollution in our rivers. An earlier item wanted to speak on was about the colwood golf course. I testify about that before. What we destroyed there with the habitat, we could have improved everything by saying stop it with the herbicides and pesticides. We worked on a project to get a little claim of land for the Columbia slough project. Now the rest is suddenly zoned over to industrial? A golf course? When we had a complete bypass for our ecosystem.

Hales: You've run out of time.

Elinski: Sorry I can't make to it your city hall as regular citizen --

Hales: Crystal, you're done. Thanks, thanks very much. Anyone else want to speak on this item? Let's take a vote, please.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye.

Fritz: Thank you mayor for your leadership one this and commissioner Saltzman for getting the money out the door to those folks who need it. It's been interesting to me to be out in the community where candidates are talking about what they would do to fix or problems and indeed we have the plan with the home for everyone and with the coordinating committee and we're implementing it quietly. I hope we can get the message out to folks about what we're doing and why. Thank you. Aye.

Hales: Thank you. This is making a big difference and with yesterday's news of a ranking we don't want to be number one in, that housing costs in Portland went up faster than any other city in the country, this is obviously much needed. Aye. [gavel pounded] okay. Let's take the next item, please. 421.

Item 421.

Moore-Love: Support transportation investment generating economic recovery grant application to seek funds to design and construct outer Powell boulevard transportation safety project segment 2 and 3 from southeast 116th avenue to 162nd avenue in substantial conforms with the 2012 outer Powell boulevard conceptual design plan.

Novick: Do you think we should do both of these at once?

Hales: Please, go ahead, 422.

Item 422.

Moore-Love: Amend transportation system development charge capital improvement project list.

Hales: Please.

Novick: Colleagues, I'm pleased to introduce these items today. We've identified exciting upcoming opportunities to move forward with four important transportation projects. The outer Powell transportation project, Sullivan's crossing and the southwest barber safety project. We're talking about adding these projects to the sdc list which will allow us to be fiscally smart with the transportation sdc's and leverage them while implementing critical safety improvements around the city. We are very hopeful that we might actually be able to get a federal tiger grant to help with the transportation safety project, which the action plan has identified for years as the highest priority in east Portland. We will be collaborating with odot on that. We will have someone here to speak more about our partnership in a few minutes. We have a very full agenda, we've asked staff to keep this brief. We've kept invited testimony to just three people and i'll ask you to talk really fast. We'll hear about information regarding these two items.

April 27, 2016

Hales: Good morning.

Art Pearce, Portland Bureau of Transportation: Thank you, commissioner and mayor, pleased to be here. This is something that we've been working on for a number of months trying to find opportunities to expend sdc funds to leverage partnerships both with community groups as well as with other institutions. I think we've come up with a package of opportunity investments that really allow us to be most ready to leverage outside grant sources and deliver some really exciting projects that community members have asked for, for quite a while. With me is mark lear, he leads up the resources team for pbot and I manage the projects group. We have staff in the audience who have diligently put all these pieces together, specifically I think cohen deserve as shout-out. She's chased a lot of details in making this all come together. Around the sdc process, last time we updated the sdc list was 2007. The list is now quite dated in terms of responding to immediate needs. We are about to update a much more robust full update to the list in 2017. So there's really strong support, we believe, for making these investments and making these projects move forward. And really can't expend these sdc's without partnership funds. One of the changes is how federal funding has come as we don't have the same match funding as we used to. Specifically the opportunity to partner with odot on getting outer Powell to move ahead was the spark that brought this conversation to you and to the council. We have a proposal to add four projects to the current transportation sdc list. As the commissioner mentioned that's outer Powell, David Douglas, Sullivan's crossing and southwest barber. We are able to do this without changing sdc rates or anything that contributors would experience.

Novick: We are having to bump some older projects off the list.

Pearce: I'll such on those individually. Here's a map of where those four projects are. We have a lot of emphasis of course on east Portland and the need to make sure weaver spending sdc's in east Portland. The first project, outer Powell transportation safety project, this is taking outer Powell from suburban innocent rural type of typology to urban which can provide safety and document a whole variety of users. There's a pretty remarkable stack of support letters coming in from a whole variety of directions in support specifically of this work and of the tiger grant. We feel like we're in a good place, the grant is competitive in Oregon and most competitive nationally for this. The process overall is \$50 million. What we are proposing to contribute is somewhere in the range of nine to \$11 million to help fulfill that overall package. They are asking for a \$15 million tiger grant. This contribution will be coming from savings from southeast barber welch and barber road, 136th to jenny. We believe those are good projects to remove some of the eligibility from in order to make this contribution possible. Next project is David Douglas, safe routes to school. This is a whole network of connections that help provide safer and more comfortable access to David Douglas. We talked extensively there with school groups and believe this is specifically a very exciting project and there is a letter of support from them also. We're using paper to demonstrate support rather than people. The cost of this project is \$8 million and we're proposing we would contribute roughly half of that amount through the sdc program, and be pursuing reasonable flexible funds in the upcoming round for the remaining funds. And the savings would come from gateway regional center which would still have plenty of projects ongoing. Sullivan's crossing is a relatively new idea but one that has gardened pretty tremendous supports. David is the head of oh group and they have done a feasibility study of the Sullivan's crossing study. They will have that report for your review today. This is a great opportunity, conducting between the Lloyd district and the century side. There's tremendous growth happening, particularly in the residential side of the Lloyd district but we don't have the funds to relieve that. Total cost estimate for this bridge is 13 million, we're projecting that we would pursue around 11

April 27, 2016

million from the sdc program and pursue additional funds perhaps either from regional flexible funds or the Portland development commission has ura on both sides of the bridge. Seems like a ripe opportunity to collaborate on supporting those developing districts. Burnside-couch east, a participating project, and Burnside-couch west, which is a radially revamped scope. Next project is barber safety improvements, a project you've heard extensively about in terms of requests for improvements along the bridge intersection, and the intersection also at capitol highway. The odot road safety audit is coming up with a proposed safety design. Out of the four million costs we would be able to meet them in terms of our project. We will hopefully work together with them to find the rest of the funds for that. So that's the overall package we have for you today. We have a couple invited testimony but we have heard pretty remarkable support for this. We did meet with sweeney last week and sweeney passed resolution supporting the funds being allocated for southwest barber, not here today but they pass on their support to you. Happy to answer any questions or thoughts on this.

Hales: Maybe after your invited testimony.

Novick: Our three invited guests are here.

Hales: Come on up. Good afternoon.

Hales: Kelly, I think you're on first.

Kelly Brooks: Okay. Hello, mayor hales, commissioners, thank you so much for having me today. Odot and pbot as you just heard are in the final stages of preparing a tiger grant to fund safety and livability improvements to outer Powell. While many of you have heard of statistics of Powell many times I think it's important to restate some of them so we understand why it's so critical. The segment of Powell that we are discussing between 116th and 162nd experience a crash rate three times what we see on similar arterials across the state. Between 2009 and 2014 there were 24 reported collisions, 24 involved pedestrians, six of those were cyclists and two pedestrians in a one-year time frame between 2013 and 2014 I believe did not survive those crashes. While odot has remained significant, safety over the years, tiger provides us an opportunity to do something really transformative here. To add the continuous multimodal improvements like sidewalks that are going help folks in the community access school, work and entertainment options. The importance of today's action to contribute funds to this project in barber really cannot be overstated. With your help we believe we're going to be able to complete not one but two. Your contribution is helping leverage a \$50 million project in east Portland. With your help we're also showing our friends in Washington that this project has sizeable and committed state and local match, which is really going help us compete well. With your help we're also showing the people of Portland that odot and the city can work together, to seize opportunities for the people that we serve. Thank you, mayor and commissioners for your consideration of this request. I'd like to thank my colleagues at pbot for our partnership on both this grant application and the road safety audit work we did on barber. And the partnership that we've forged is going to make both the project stronger and frankly in the answer of the tiger application, that will be today. Thank you so much for the opportunity to be here and for working with us.

Hales: Thank you. Good afternoon, who'd like to go next?

Kem Marks: I will. Good afternoon, mayor hales and commissioners. My name is kem marks, I live in east Portland off of Powell Boulevard. As commissioner novick said, I am a transportation activist in east Portland. Some of the groups that I am on are the Powell division steering committee, bus rapid transit, the Powell safety project, outer Powell safety project, and I was also on the midway neighborhood street plan advisory committee. I wish to speak in favor of the proposal to -- for the tiger grant and for the sdc additions to -- or to the sdc list. As you know, Powell Boulevard is the top priority for east Portland action

April 27, 2016

plan in either east Portland transportation activists. This plan will go far in making Powell a neighborhood street. And transferred into a safe place for people to do their actually transit and business. The other projects on the sdc are their very priority projects for east Portland. The lead are close to many of the schools of the David Douglas school district and will significantly improve access for the schoolchildren in that area, too schools. I urge you to strongly urge you to approve the tiger and the sdc transportation list addition. Thank you.

Hales: Thanks very much. Good afternoon.

Wade Lang: Mayor, commissioner, my name's wade Lang and I'm vice president and regional manager for [indiscernible] test in Lloyd district. I'm also on go Lloyd, the Lloyd enhanced service district board, the Lloyd Eco board and the Portland streetcar board. I've worked in the Lloyd district for 19 years. I'm here today to voice my support for adding the sell van's crossing project to the amended 2007 project list. Making it safe for pedestrians and bicycles to move between the central east side and destinations north is increasingly important as both areas experience accelerated growth. The crossing will also leverage investment to bicycle infrastructure, and create a continuance bicycle corridor from Alberta Street to the central eastside and beyond. Sullivan crossing will serve to pull bicycles off grand and mlk both highly traveled vehicle and truck routes not sufficiently designed for bike safety. It will also serve to move bicyclists away from the 12th street Bridge which is a challenge for bicyclists and pedestrians to cross safely. Between the east side, north and south neighborhoods in the event of an earthquake, designed to allow for safe passage of emergency vehicles, it could be the only place. As we continue to support and promote alternative transportation options for those living in Lloyd as well as those just passing through. The members of the Lloyd district would like to thank art pearson for bringing us a step closer to our goal a much safer bicycle route on the east side of Portland. These other two projects, David Douglas and the Powell. Improvements there are going to be of benefit to the neighbors there. Thank you for your time.

Hales: Thank you all. Questions? Thank you. Any others here to speak on this?

Moore-Love: Mr. West left.

Hales: Any other questions for our staff?

Saltzman: What's the point about the bridge accommodating emergency vehicles? They will be able to accommodate fire engines, fire trucks, ambulances, all that?

David O'Longaigh, Portland Bureau of Transportation: This is Dave O'Langaigh, Portland transportation bridge engineer. We did design the bridge to be an active bridge in its everyday use, pedestrians on the outside and two bike lanes in the center. We have designed the bridge so it due carry a fire truck with the curve to curve. This bridge would have been cocompliant and could carry those emergency vehicles across.

Saltzman: I don't wanna tell you cause you're the engineer but It'll accommodate the load, too?

O'Longaigh: Absolutly It's ironic that when you design a pedestrian bride that's his long the weight off all the people stuck on that bridge is actually substantially higher than using it for traffic evening for fire trucks. It's ironic.

Hales: Same way with the Tillikum crossing. Other questions? Let's act on the first of these two items, the resolution, 421.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye.

Fritz: Commissioner novick and the director treat and bureau staff, this is really a stark moment. It's wonderful once again the city is saying we don't care who owns these roads, they are dangerous and they need to be fixed. I appreciate your dedication to saving lives and working on transportation challenges which have alluded us for decades. I want to

April 27, 2016

particularly call out that about it resolved, the city council gratefully acknowledges the excellent work and dedication of the members of the east Portland action plan, land use and transportation committee, outer Powell community advisory group and other community members who helped shape the planning for outer Powell boulevard, as well as others in the efforts to find and build this as a project. I know that counts for the southwest neighborhoods, groups and others. This is truly a community partnership including government agencies and I applaud you.

Hales: Well, i'm going to refuse a little bit of this because I think both of these items are great work. I had the privilege of spending the last week with the secretary of transportation and his staff. For our signature tiger project to be this one is exactly what this secretary is looking for from the communities. So I think we could make a strong case and I'd be willing to help the commissioner make that case to the administration. This is exactly what a secretary of transportation who just wrote a wonderful piece about what it means to be cut off from community by past transportation decisions, Powell Boulevard being a textbook example of that. This is perfect. And long awaited. I'm really happy that this is a priority that we have the community that's worked so hard for this idea not only behind it but seeing some forward motion. Great work. Aye. [gavel pounded]

Hales: 422 passes to second reading. Let's take a moment because I want to comment on 422, interestingly. Others might like to say something.

Hales: I'll start.

Saltzman: These are great projects, all four of them seem like a great use of our system development charges to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists and motorists too, and provide more access between north and south of Portland.

Novick: It's an opportunity to reflect on the fact that although all of this new development bring a lot of strain it does bring systems development charges which we can use for high priority projects looking for funding for a long time. Looking through the sdc projects and realize that get high priority projects can and should be designated as sdc projects. We really appreciate our governmental partners, thank you Kelly, wade and kem. Cross your fingers about the tiger grant but we're very hopeful and thank you all very much.

Hales: Commissioner, anything to add?

Fritz: Sometimes when there's not a whole bunch of community members here you worry that people don't know about it. I do see representatives of the community here and I would have heard about it if the community wasn't happy with this. I commend the new bureau of transportation and you're increased awareness to all communities in all parts of the city it's a crucial part of what we do together and you're seeing the results. Thank you very much.

Hales: Let me add some comments about a couple of these. One, this work on outer Powell and this work on barber and something I'm spending a large amount of time on, the comprehensive plan, all of us are, I work directly with the planning bureau on that. It really is time to take up again the questions of when should we take jurisdiction of some of these state highways. I know that's of concern to you, commissioner novick and of interest to odot. It's important to talk about this now while we are doing this work. When is the appropriate turning point to take jurisdiction of current and former state facilities? It's a topic we need to work on along with the plan. I just wanted to flag that. With respect to this Sullivan's crossing, again, reflecting a little bit on the trip, riding on a cold, blustery day that closed the bike system in Copenhagen with the secretary, you can see the value of this kind of a gap-closer project. There are designs in front of us that are elegant. We've learned with the tillikum crossing and the Columbia River crossing, the designs of public works that are beautiful get public support and those that are generic slabs have a harder time. If I can generalize from those experiences. This is a couple of really attractive

April 27, 2016

designs including the one on the cover here that'll make this a signature project of the city, something of great use. The other reason I want to pile on about this project, i've spent a lot of time on the central eastside industrial council. Recently with the urban land institute who came here to city it and say how do we keep this a viable small manufacturing district for makers. One way is to cure the transportation problem for the workers there, many of whom want to get there by bike. Their workforce do not need to park cars. There's a parking problem on the central eastside, yes, but there's also bike access and safety problem. Getting this kind of connection from the workforce to the north, and the work sites to the south across Sullivan's gulch will have a very salutary effect to the viability of central eastside which is exactly what we're all planning for. I'm a table pound burr this one. Look forward riding across it real soon.

Novick: Mayor, I forgot to mention that David has been stolen from pbot and I'm very bitter about that.

Hales: Sorry, we're still here, though.

Hales: Thank you all, great work, look forward to more.

Hales: I think we'll try to take 423 and 424 and maybe 425 before we break. Is it all right, Commissioner Fritz to, save 26 and 27 until after the break?

Fritz: Yes.

Hales: That's what we will plan to do. 426, 427, 428 will be added to the beginning of our afternoon calendar at 2:00 p.m. We'll take the other items first and start with 423, please.

Item 423.

Item 424.

Moore: 423, vacate portions of north Portsmouth Avenue, north van Houten Avenue, north Monteith Avenue, north Warren Street, north strong street, and two unnamed alleys on the university of Portland campus subject to certain conditions and reservations. **Hales:** Commissioner novick.

Novick: Lance lindahl, take it away.

Lance Lindahl, Portland Bureau of Transportation: Thank you, commissioner. Pbot, right a-way acquisition. Before you today a proposal to vacate a number of different streets and alleyways located in north Portland. This is one of the more complex proposals that we've received at pbot. We've broken it up into two separate ordinances. Item no. 424 vacates portions of north McKenna Avenue and three alleys. These go back to the university upon completion of the vacation. There are only minor improvements and puts us in place to have the vacation wrapped up and recorded pretty quickly. Item 423 vacates portions of north Portsmouth, houten, north Monteith Avenue and warren and two unnamed alleys. The conditions for these areas are more complex. It'll take a bit of time to address. Several of these street areas go back to properties not owned by the university. However, I have been in contact with all of the property owners and those people receiving property back all are in support of this vacation. Let's see. Also there will be emergency vehicle access easements retained over this second set of streets so that fire bureau can maintain access to the existing and future campus facilities in this area. One of the top concerns I heard from members of the public in this street vacation was the concern that access between Willamette Boulevard and Willamette River will be retained. It'll be retained, public streets will be kept and there's plans in place to improve those. Part of the street vacation process was to work with the planning office inside the parks bureau to look at future pedestrian and bicyclist access council to the river. There's definitely an identification of that as a need moving forward. At this point i'd like to introduce Mr. James Cuffner, the vice president of community relations for special projects at the University of Portland.

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

April 27, 2016

Hales: How are you?

James Cuffner: I'm fine. Thank you very much for this opportunity to be here. Jim cuffner, university of Portland, 5000 north Willamette Boulevard, Portland, Oregon, 97203. In the year 2000 the Portland city council approved the expansion across north Portsmouth for the first time in our history. Since then the university has built four residence halls, a new recollection and wellness center. And created two outdoor playfields. The five residence hall under the new master plan on the corner of Willamette Boulevard and north Portsmouth in the frontage zone. The package that you have before you have been carefully vetted with the university and with our neighborhood association. Everything contained in our current vacation request was envisioned and approved in our 2012 master plan. Your favorable consideration of the pbot staff report and recommendation will allow the university to continue its impressive record of success in north Portland and the city, and help us achieve the long term campus development vision embodied in our 2012 master plan. Finally, your support of the pbot report will validate an incredible working partnership established with the neighborhood association, University Park neighborhood association, and developing the university's 2012 master plan, which received unanimous approval from the city and was adopt without opposition for. That I want to thank you. I might also say that we had achieved a unanimous vote from your Portland -- commission on Portland planning and sustainability last July. Our upna neighborhood stood shoulder to shoulder with us in support of it. I want to publicly reach out and thank the neighborhood association for their continued work. I don't think we could have come as far as we did without their support. Also I might add this is a vision that is yet to be played out. Okay. There's a number of years before we would ever fully utilize those vacated areas. It's a street grid we use right now that's internal to the campus, it's used all the time. There's only a few neighbors' properties that are not university owned. We remain open to working with them whenever they are ready or motivated, we would certainly consider acquiring their properties. In the meantime we try our best to work with them. We understand it's not perfect but we really do the best that we can. We appreciate your support of it, it's been very important for us getting to this point. I was to thank you both for bringing it to the council.

Hales: Thank you both. Questions? Thank you very much. Anyone else want to speak on these items?

Moore-Love: We have some back there.

Hales: Come on up, I didn't hear you, come on up, please. Welcome.

Doug Mercer: Thank you. We've been sitting so long I didn't know if my legs were going to work.

Hales: Thank you for waiting. Mayor hales and city commissioners, thank you for hearing us today. We have written a few remarks we'd like to read.

Hales: Please.

Mercer: My name is Doug mercer and I oppose the vacating of streets proposed. My wife and I live on warren street one block from the proposed vacating. Our address is 5815 north warren. Our family built our home in 1948. It has lived there ever since. We have raised three kids there, as well. Our next door neighborhood and his family have been our neighbor all these years. My wife and I have both served for many years on the University Park neighborhood association board and have voiced concerns for years about the parking problems in our neighborhood, which have gotten worse every year. A few years ago the university replaced the parking under their multiblock rowhouse student housing on Warren Street, and they replaced it with university services offices. This not only eliminated parking for students but also brought in more staff who park up and down or street in the neighborhood as well. The university is now building even more multistory

April 27, 2016

dorms at the corner of Portsmouth and Willamette Boulevard without additional parking about three blocks from our home. This will bring even more cars parking in the neighborhood streets. The parking lot of the university build this year below the bluff, many blocks from the university, is too far away for students and staff to use. And it is always vacant. I sent a photo, lance, maybe you've been able to access of the empty parking lot two days ago. We have to parallel park in front of our house every day and we are lucky to find a place to park. Please see the attached photos on Warren Street on our block. If the proposed streets are vacated parking could be further eliminated, parking that's already parking could be eliminated, pushing more parking onto our street and into the neighborhood. We need the city of Portland to keep jurisdiction of these streets so they can enforce traffic and parking regulations. If the streets are vacated Mckenna street can become the only access to our block on Warren Street. Mckenna is very narrow only 12 feet 9 inches wide as they said earlier a fire truck is 12 feet wide. If a car parks on Mckenna or a traffic jam occurs emergency vehicles would not be able to get to our home or street fire trucks and ambulances could be delayed by life threatening minutes. We have had many bluff fires that threaten our homes, where fire trucks have had to respond on warren and Mckenna streets. In 2001 and 2002 five alarm bluff fires almost burned down many homes up and down warren and Mckenna lamit lane and threatened the university itself. In conclusion my family and I oppose the proposed street vacation and ask that portnad retain jurisdiction of the streets to maintain traffic and parking regulations for the safety of our neighborhood. We would also recommend that the university build parking on its campus that does not further extend into to the neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration.

Hales: Thanks. Good afternoon. Welcome.

Spencer Heinney: Yes, good afternoon. My name is spencer heinney. I live about a half block from monteith avenue, one ever the avenues to be vacated. After reading the notice of street vacation posted in my neighborhood this month of April 2016, I have concerns. As as a 50-year residents auto and parking has become so congested during the academic school year and special events. By vacating certain streets as in the university's notice I believe the auto traffic and parking will only become all the worse for my neighborhood. Where will all of this traffic go? Currently my mail carrier frequently has difficulty finding adequate parking to deliver the mail. He uses some of the streets in the vacation notice. Closing off these streets that are part of his daily route will only make an existing bad traffic situation all the worse for him. There are neighbors that drive to and from work and use existing Monteith Avenue in their commute. University of Portland students and employees also use Monteith Avenue to travel and park daily. First responder vehicles may find it challenging to answer their calls with inadequate street entry or exit. The weekly recycling vehicles also use some of the streets proposed for vacation and would find it very difficult to back their vehicles out around the corner of Warren Street and mckenna avenue if monteith is vacated. I'm here to voice my concerns. I'm totally against closing or vacating any streets, alleys or avenues in my neighborhood. These streets were established before the University of Portland or I existed. These streets and avenues were put here for a purpose. To allow people in my neighborhood to travel and commute easily. Without some alternative plan to alleviate the traffic congestion and that congestion being caused by the university of Portland, vacating streets and alleys is absolutely ridiculous. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you very much. Welcome.

Tom Karwaki: Tom Karwaki, vice chairman, chair of the land use committee and chair of when this master plan was done. The university neighborhood park neighborhood association strongly supports the vacation and has for the last four years, voted including

April 27, 2016

times when Stacey mercer was there and there was a unanimous club board vote. We have also testified before the psc on this. The individuals that spoke do not live, are not adjacent, are not involved in the specifics of these vacations and so they are nearby but not part of it. So that's kind of an important element there. We felt that the university actually would improve safety and pedestrian safety because of the improvements that the city can't afford for those streets, can be done by the university, and that will help pedestrians and their vehicles. I might note that even though they are not part of it, the public street where -- the university's actually put in two no parking places in front of their house. So yes, they parallel park. I guess that's the only way you're supposed to do on a street, but they actually have their own private parking spaces which is unusual on a public street. I just wanted to note there has been accommodations for the university, and we think that it would be a good thing to expeditiously and quickly pass these ordinances and process the street vacations as fast as possible.

Hales: I have a question. Maybe it's mostly for staff. Tom, you can comment on it as well as the others if you want. That is, as I understand it the property to the north of monteith is not university property, right? Have I got that right? In other words --

Mercer: Monteith runs north and south. I'm sorry, to the west. So --

Hales: Where does the university's property holdings ends and under the master plan -- goes further out?

******:** Yes.

Hales: Out to mckenna or beyond?

Karwaki: The master plan actually incorporates including property that the university doesn't control including the baxter mccormick property which goes to the railroad cut includes all of these streets. There was a cutout within the master plan that I think two houses were specifically exempted out. There's provisions that to the extent that whenever they decide to transfer their property the height limits are increased.

Mercer: Our houses are not in the master plan. They can't build there.

Hales: You own the property.

Karwaki: What it is, the master plan covers all of the properties involved including -- not subject to until the university controls it.

Hales: Okay. Appreciate that.

Karwaki: That's part of the Institutional map that you'll be seeing in front of the comp plan.

Hales: I needed that refresher. I was actually here in 2000. Took a little jogging of my memory to get that back. Thank you all very much. Are there others who want to speak on these items? Thank you. Then these will both --

Fritz: I do have a question for staff please mayor.

Hales: Come on back, please.

Fritz: I neglected to bring my copy of the current comprehensive plan with me. From recollection streets should be -- may be vacated if there's no current transportation needs for them. We just heard testimony about post office vehicles, garbage trucks, recycling and others using these streets and also about parking in the streets. Can you comment on the current -- from the aerial pictures that we were given it's obvious they are used for parking. First we want to know about foot traffic or reversing traffic using them then secondly about parking.

Lindahl: So the first concern about transportation uses, we followed the standard street vacation protocol. This is one that was petitioner initiated so it went through the full review process with the city both before and after the actual petition was sent out for signatures. Included in that list is transportation development reviews, transportation planning, and they did review the plans for this area and found the vacation to be consistent with formally adopted plans.

April 27, 2016

Fritz: That's not my question. It's currently being used for transportation purposes. So why should the city give up the public right of way when it's currently being used?

Lindahl: With campuses like colleges and universities and hospitals, there's a long history of the city allowing those streets to be transferred over to the private entity for maintenance. Assuming that they meet the various conditions required by the city.

Fritz: How would post office trucks and garbage trucks manage to serve homes outside this campus?

Lindahl: The streets by the homes that the people testified from today are going to remain open and public right of way. Some of the secondary access and access to the east will be changing, but all the streets that are approved and paved now are going to remain open to traffic. And in the future if the university comes in with development proposals they have to meet city requirements at that time for changes.

Fritz: Mr. Cuffner If I could have you come back up as well. What are the plans for parking in particular? From the aerial photograph obviously these streets to be vacated are currently heavily used for parking.

Cuffner: First of all, it will be as lance indicated those streets that grid will remain open for as long as the foreseeable future. If we decide to consolidate in any way we would have to present a plan that would provide continued access for that. Looking long, long term there's a possibility that all of these properties would be 100% ownership of the university. So services provided would be internal to the campus. We certainly accommodate now, we will continue to accommodate in the future post office vehicles, garbage trucks, et cetera. With regard to parking, we have a very significant and strenuous condition of approval in our master plan known as condition y. Don't ask me why. Condition y requires that the university maintain at all times a sufficient level of parking to accommodate the full-time undergraduate enrollment on campus as well as special events that exceed 4,000. We have consistently complied with that request. I'll be very candid with you, there's probably a faculty member or two who have a 9:00 class and they show up at 8:45 and they want to find a parking place by Buckley center. It's probably not going to happen but we'll have one for you in the gulch, the slope lot, behind the tennis center but they will be there. These street ones that you see are included in our parking inventory. There's probably upwards of 400 parking spaces that are on public rights of way now that pbot has allowed us for years to include those in our parking inventory. So right now we're operating with a surplus of about 98 paces. I know it's tight. There's no question it's tight where mr. Mercer and mr. Heine live. Thong on our way down here tom and I drove in front of mr. Mercer's house and sure enough, the two painted spaces were vacant. They are there. Pretty much private. Most of the people who come there every day probably recognize that. We realize that was an accommodation we made. We're trying to work with them. We know that they are one small properties left with a large institution. We're an institution with heart and we try to deal with these as best we can. We have been blessed with the overall neighbors who have signed off on our master plan and the vacation process. While it's true we can't be perfect to everyone we're sure trying and we appreciate your support on this. This is really, really important to us.

Fritz: Thank you very much.

Hales: Thank you both. These will pass to second reading next week.

Fritz: I just want to thank everybody who came. Certainly concerns that neighbors raised are some of the questions that I was going to ask about current uses parking and such. I am convinced that not only staff's response university park neighborhood association that there is a collaborative relationship moving forward. I think if this was a private developer coming in to ask for a vacation ahead of time I would be much more skeptical. Given that we have the master plan, given that the relationship between the community and the

April 27, 2016

university that they work so hard both sides work really hard to further I have confidence that for the foreseeable future there won't be anything different happening on the ground. When things are going to be different the university will work with neighborhoods. I very much appreciate your concerns. When we have public right of way we shouldn't be giving it up just because somebody asks. We should be very careful before we do that. I think you have all been very careful and I appreciate that.

Hales: I think it's really hard for universities in the neighborhood to grow and this master plan is an attempt to make that as feasible as possible for the university while being as mindful as possible of the neighbors. It's not possible maybe to achieve perfection but an awful lot of good work has gone into this over the years. We appreciate that. I hope everyone will continue to work on being good neighbors. Aye. We're not voting. Passing to second reading. I plan to vote for it.

Hales: Let's move to take second reading action on s425, then we will break until 2:00. Is that a substitute?

Moore-Love: Yes.

Hales: I don't think I have the substitute. Maybe we should wait until 2:00.

Hales: Let's save it until then. I'll have it in my packet. Let's just recess until 2:00 p.m. At which point we'll come back to finish the docket.

At 12:45 p.m. council recessed.

April 27, 2016
Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript.

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

APRIL 27, 2016 2:00 PM

Hales: Welcome to the April 27th, 2016 afternoon meeting of the Portland city council. Would you please call the roll? [roll call taken]

Hales: welcome, everybody, we have a few items left over from our morning calendar that we're going try swiftly deal with here and then get to the afternoon things that you showed up for. First item is 425, second reading. Let's take a vote on that, please.

Item S-425.

Moore-Love: A intergovernmental agreement with metro for the development of a preferred alternative package locally preferred alternative and draft environmental impact statement for the southwest corridor plan.

Hales: Roll call, please.

Novick: Here. **Aye.** **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye. [gavel pounded]

Hales: let's read 426, 427, and 428 together, please.

Item 426.

Item 427.

Item 428.

Hales: Commissioner Fritz.

Fritz: Thank you, mayor. In 2014 the Portland community voted to support a fix our park bond measure to issue up to \$68 million in general obligation bonds to pay for the most urgent capital repairs and improvements needed for existing parks facilities. Excuse me. These contracts are all procurement authorizations needed for park replacement bond funded projects. Item 426, will advance maintenance improvements at the mount tabor yard and the delta power yard. Collective these facilities house nearly 200 Portland parks & recreation staff responsible for maintaining the park system across the city. The bond funded work identified both maintenance facilities is an intended to correct the most veer safety and code related issues and will improve the working conditions for parks maintenance staff. I don't know if you remember the photograph we showed during the bond measure campaign but I need to add my particular thanks to the staff working in the appalling conditions and i'm glad we are finally able to correct them. Item 427, will advance roof and hvac system improvement at the st. John's community center. Again, thanks to the maintenance staff for keeping them going. These improvements will also increase the building's energy efficiency, reduce maintenance and operating costs and provide for a more comfortable environment for our community users. Similarly, item 428 will facilitate roof improvements to the 86-year-old sellwood park pool bathhouse. The current wood shingle roof is original from the 1929 construction and is far past its useful life. The community has to put a canopy over their ice cream stand even though it wasn't necessary because of the weather to, stop the bits from falling off the roof into the ice cream. So this is obviously we are dealing with the worst of the worst in the parks bond. We still have many projects which are not able to be funded, an ongoing challenge we are working to address. In the meantime we are very grateful to have this funding so we can start addressing the worst of the worst. I am happy to introduce Portland parks &

April 27, 2016

recreation bond measure director Mary Anne Cassin who will give a little information about these projects.

Mary Anne Cassin Portland Parks and Recreation: Good afternoon, Commissioner Fritz did such a good introduction I think I'll skip over the first few slides that talk about the context of the bond itself, and how important it is that traditionally we've funded the park system with bonds. There are seven focus areas in the projects we're here to talk to you today have to do with two of those. This most important one dealing with protecting workers, the professional and technical services contract that we're asking you to approve today, it went through a competitive bidding process in order to select ops architects. Our workers, as commissioner Fritz said, are working in much less than ideal situations. These are former horse barns and other just whatever you can throw together to keep things more or less and mostly less out of the rain. The contract that we're bringing to you today, because there are so many permit and other logistical issues, we are not expecting to complete this contract until spring of 2019. Our minority women and small business utilization rate on this particular contract is 27%. Just quickly, for a little bit of context on the right is mount tabor yard. That is south of the -- what most people think of as the park itself. We're doing just the very first step of the master plan that was before you in 2008. It's the first building, the oval on the right side. In addition we are going fold in a project funded with system development charge funds. That's a very, very important pedestrian and bicycle connection so that the south tabor neighborhood can get to mount tabor park without having to walk through the trucks and backhoes and everything else that's happening in the yard. That'll be part of the project, as well. On the left side is again, the first phase of improvements at the urban forestry headquarters in Delta Park. And just a few more of our glamorous photos of the working conditions. This will not only improve worker conditions it'll improve security. It'll get some of that equipment that we have to store in the rain, so we'll have longer shelf life for those things and deal with a lot of safety issues. The second category is this rest room and other urgent needs a lot of building type of improvements there. The St. John's community center has 17,000 in roofs over the years. There are five heating and ventilating systems on the roof that we're going deal with at the same time. This we anticipate going bid in early May with construction beginning as soon as July. Sellwood bathhouse, there are some pictures of those shingles. We have certainly got our use out of those. It's that wonderful old growth shingle, I don't think you could get 85 years out of that these days. It's time to move on. This one we're timing it so it does not begin until after the pool season. We'd like to get somebody under contract as soon as possible.

We are very cognizant of the fact that this kind of work can generate wonderful construction jobs. We're going above and beyond trying to get as much, again, minority and women business owned utilization as we can. So we are doing a number of different special outreach events. We had one that we had Nate McCoy was the minority contractors association organized for us last week. We're also going to have a special table set up at an event next week so that we can get the word out about these contracts. We know it's a busy season and we want to make sure they know what attractive work it is. With that I'm ready to answer any questions.

Hales: Good presentation, thank you. Any questions for Mary Ann? Anyone here that wants to speak on these items? Two of them we need vote on today, that's 426 and 412.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye.

Fritz: Thank you are very much for leading the staff in these works. And to Patty Howard who put a lot of work into passing the bond measure and I want to thank the Portland voters who passed it with 74%, the highest a bond measure has ever passed in park. Aye.

April 27, 2016

Hales: Thank you, Commissioner Fritz, and the bureau for systematically delivering on the from put these parks in better condition. It's just a pleasure for us to see these projects coming through and getting local firms involved in doing the work and being able to see the before, in some cases pretty appalling, and looking forward to see the after real soon.

Thank you, aye. [gavel pounded]

Hales: 427.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye.

Hales: Aye. [gavel pounded] 428 passes to second reading next week. We can move on please to 429.

Item 429.

Moore: Adopt a new comprehensive plan for the city of Portland, Oregon.

Hales: Let's welcome Eric up and remind folks that we're taking testimony today from those who signed up to speak on April 20th but weren't able to testify. We'll continue to accept written testimony until 5:00 p.m. On April 27th via email or traditional may or online through Portland maps. Eric.

Eric Engstrom, Bureau of planning and sustainability: Thank you, mayor hales. Just a quick reminder about what you're here to talk about today. We're focused on getting further feedback on possible amendments to the psc recommended comp plan published march 18th. Commissioners have published several additional amendments through memos posted on the bps project website. Today's hearing continued from April 20th. This is the third of several hearings devoted to the potential amendments. Testimony on the related item, the supported document to the comp plan finished up last week and we're not taking testimony on that tonight. It's just one item today. I also want to remind you about a few next steps. Tomorrow, April 28th, will be your first meeting to start discussing and voting on the amendments that you've put forward. And may 11th is the second of those meetings. At the conclusion of the May 11th session we will hopefully have a council amended plan ready for final adoption. At that point staff will go back and prepare the appropriate substitute ordinance and findings and come back to for right now what's on June 9th, and then a second reading and final vote on June 15th.

Hales: great. Thank you. Questions for staff. All right. Then let's move directly to continuing the testimony. And again, we have a sign-up sheet. Those who were signed up to speak on April 20th. We hope most of them and therefore you were able to be here today.

Moore-Love: I believe we have about 28 so far right now. No. 40, 45, 47. [names being read]

Hales: I guess I have a few more things I need to put in the record. I want to acknowledge receipt of an additional bundle of testimony that was collected through the online map between April 15th and today and that's also being added to the record of this proceeding. Welcome, and take it away.

Steve Kilduff: Ladies and gentlemen, of the Portland city council, I lived on southeast lambert street for 15 years. My house is in the area under consideration for amendment m74. I'm here to address the amendment allowing rezoning of r7 west will put ever-increasing pressure open the properties east of 36th street to be divided into small parcels. I recommend the zoning change not be made. These houses are some of the most affordable houses in the area. To illustrate this point in the last two weeks I personally have received unsolicited letters from seven development companies asking if I would sell them my house. They know they can buy my house, demolish it and replace it with one or two more expensive houses. Demolishing houses east of 37th will only increase. It's also likely the demolition of houses in east Moreland proper will continue with the only change being the new structures will be larger and more expensive still. Couple of examples:

April 27, 2016

Former senator newberger's house was demolished because it didn't fulfill the desires of today's home buyers. Senator ron wyden bought a house that replaced a much smaller house. In each case the neighbors were not thrilled with the change. Zoning won't change that reality. We all can agree market value will determine what will happen to the existing structures in this area. Changing east more land property zoning will only increase the pressure on properties as they exist to be destroyed and their lots split. Construction after destruction will continue. Having been a u.s. History teacher and principal in second dairy schools for over 30 years, I have every confidence in the system of our wonderful city. I hope that your decision will allow more of the modest homes that now exist in my neighborhood to continue to exist as long as possible and not be even more quickly destroyed.

Fritz: Thank you very much, that's a really good point. That's why we're doing a comprehensive plan is that the zoning one place does affect what happens to the properties adjacent to it.

Hales: The goal in places like east Moreland or ladd's edition or buck man, or a wonderful pocket of i-84 called Euclid heights. If the goal is to try to preserve those historic structures, and if what we've been hearing is that if the underlying zoning is typically a fraction of the average lot size, what that fraction might be, that's what creates this -- exacerbates the demolition. You're right, there are going to be situations where there's going to be one for one replacement where a house is demolished and replaced with a new house. There are regulation about that and we have a project underway to look at the building envelope size of the new house, what it might be. That would probably put more of a damper on that. Some of that will continue to happen, I take your point.

Kilduff: Sure.

Hales: The community's goal is to reduce that hemorrhaging, what would you have us do with the properties of 36th?

Kilduff: I guess if the issue is the historic value of the area, and I'm not disagreeing, east Moreland is --

Hales: Without a formal designation.

Kilduff: Then help the individual homeowner get it designated. That'll slow down the developer, he's not going get in the middle of that. If you can help the individual homeowner designate their property historically, I think you slow it all down. My house was built in 1950, the electricity, it costs \$350 for wire that house in 1950. I don't know, it's a great old house but it's not going to be historic. My neighbor on one side is being taken down, on the other side just sold their house for \$450,000. I can't figure it out. If the issue is history let's promote history. I taught history, let's promote it and help these people say, does your house have significance? Let's keep it. If it doesn't, the rooms are small, the heating system is inadequate, there will be a lot of reasons why somebody is going come in and take it down rather than trying to reclaim it.

Hales: Thank you, that's helpful.

Kilduff: Thank you, guys.

Hales: You bet, thank you.

Kilduff: I appreciate what you all do.

Hales: Thank you.

Curt Hugo: Thank you, mayor hales and commissioners, I'm Curt Hugo and I'm here to testify against amendment 73, the citywide ban on drive-thrus. I am a franchisee with Dutch bros for over 13 years. I have six locations and over that 13-year period of time I have served approximately six million cups of coffee or transactions. We have not had one single pedestrian, automobile accident in that period of time. The amendment addresses the safety concerns of pedestrians interacting with cars. But the combination of

April 27, 2016

pedestrians going to the walkup window or even the drive-thru window as needed does not create any more unsafe situation than any parking lot, whether it be a parking garage a parking lot at the grocery store, the trimet stops or a max station. In addition, many of the drive-thrus in the area are locally owned because we have smaller building designs and models. Locally owned business operators tend to start in those drive through models. Other customers with disabilities, moms with kids in their cars, other people who don't have the time or effort or ability to get out of the car, we are serving those needs. Wow, that was quick.

Hales: You have more time.

Hugo: The fact that we're actually able to maximize density due to the lack of need for large progress and the ability to utilize underused parking lots. Again, we actually -- actually the reason we have so many cars and lines is because that's what the customers want. The customers need and want drive-thrus. We don't generate additional trips to our stores. Our customers are pass-through traffic. Destination stores which generate more trips are actually more of the sit-down model. You get rid of the drive-thrus you're not going to decrease the dependence on automobile usage, we're pass-through customers.

Hales: Thank you. Good afternoon, welcome.

Brad Perkins: Mayor Hales, commissioners, Brad Perkins, Sullivan's gulch trail committee founder. I'm in support of getting the Sullivan's gulch trail mapped. The concept plan in July 2012 was passed, the sgt committee thought it was put on the map. Over the past four years we have had a trail plan with no significance or enforcement powers when dealing with nearby developers. Not only do we need safe routes to schools but safe routes to work, home, stores, recreation, et cetera. Better yet, live or work in a building built above the safe route. For safest routes side street greenways and off-street trails are the best. Any greenway on the street with vehicle speeds over 25 miles per hour are dangerous. Commissioner Steve Novick, as head of the transportation department for three years, I believe you don't practice what you preach about supporting safe routes. Others have approved bike lanes throughout the city but no support for sgt trail. The city of Portland ODOT and a driver are now facing a \$3.6 million lawsuit filed last Wednesday bicyclist Martin Greenhouse's family because his death was caused by a poorly designed bike lane that stopped under the 42nd avenue viaduct on Lombard, forcing bicyclists in the right lane of 45 miles per hour traffic. The suit accuses both the state and city failing to take action to improve the road for bicyclists when they knew of the problem for over a year. The fatality occurred four months ago on December 12th and still nothing has occurred to improve the problem. And also, commissioner Novick, last Wednesday you were asked about commissioner Fish about Sullivan's gulch trail about engineering money and no engineering money has been raised. And there's an email in there from your staff that addresses some money that went to Sullivan's gulch trail.

Hales: Yes, thanks.

Perkins: Those four items have not been allocated for money. And there's a plan in there, too --

Hales: Thank you.

Perkins: -- what we suggest as to how it should be funded. We're not just blowing steam, we have a plan and we'd like to have the city's support and private money we want to raise is part of that plan. Thank you very much for your time.

Moore: Next three. [names being read]

Hales: Welcome.

Matthew Hogan: My name is Matthew Hogan and I'm here to oppose amendment m-42. My home which I've lived in for 22 years is part of a block of five homes all built between 1900 and 1910 that would be up zoned from r-1 to cm2 by the spot zoning. Under the

April 27, 2016

original comprehensive plan north Fremont was to remain residentially zoned r-1. This was in keeping with the findings of the system transportation plan from 2007 which clearly designated north Fremont as a local street. North Fremont should not have commercial development claiming it is designated as a local street. M-42 directly contradicts these findings. As a result of testimony in January by a loan neighborhood property developer, he testified that the proposal shared wide neighborhood support by submitting a petition that was utterly fraudulent. There were 20 properties listed on the petition, four for addresses that did not even exist for. 17 affected properties in m-42 there were only two signatures. One of these property owners testified that he did not sign the petition despite having been listed as having done so. The petition was presented to him as being anti commercial development on Fremont and that is why the second person signed. Three other residents said even though their names are on the petition they did not sign for it. A large property at 311 north ivy owned by the petitioner was signed for instead by a member of the north-northeast business association who is not a resident of the neighborhood. We have not encountered a single property owner in the proposed zone that supports this amendment. It is disheartening that such a fraudulent document was not vetted by the city and presented to us by a city planner as proving neighborhood support for this proposal. This is the first step in a negligent process that has followed this amendment for a long time. Increased density will focus on providing low-income housing. The current zoning r-1 already provides for this and there's no reason to change it. Thank you for your time.

Hales: Thank you very much. Thank you.

Dominic Anaya: Good afternoon, thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Dominic Anaya, I am just one more voice in the neighborhood in opposition of amendment m-42. This is a small residential neighborhood that is already book-ended between two major areas of development, north Mississippi avenue and the Vancouver Williams corridor, with over a thousand living units and 50,000 square feet of retail space that have yet to be filled. People have already talked to you about the traffic complaints which I can't stress enough. I don't want to repeat all the concerns so let me just add the concern of subsidized housing units that are at risk because of this rezoning. There are several units of subsidized housing units at elroy gardens that are right in the rezoning area that I feel may be lost by any new development that would come in. And at a time when homelessness and affordable housing are such concerns I would hate to see even more resident of this rich and diverse neighborhood displaced. You've already heard a number of voices about this, I don't want to drone on but I worry this potential rezoning could erode an already challenged neighborhood.

Hales: Thank you very much. Welcome.

Brian Richardson: My name is Brian Richardson, I'm testifying in support of the amendment 2 dated April 12th, to previous amendments s-21 and s-22 that would result in r5 and r-2.5 zoning in the areas of southeast and 30th avenues and Belmont and stark streets. The comprehensive plan is very specific to this 4 x 4 block area while leaving surrounding areas of southeast Portland with nearly identical blocking are not changed. Many of us seem to agree on the need for middle density housing but we should face these changes together. Rental housing in my neighborhood is relatively affordable due to a mix single-family homes, duplexes, tri-plexes, and small apartment buildings. There's a potential for 45 foot tall apartment buildings next to or replacing single family homes. My area is not appropriate for the proposed increases. We're certainly not a commercial center, we don't have a grocery store unless you count plaid pantry. Stark Street to the north is not a commercial corridor in the way Burnside or Hawthorne are. Belmont to the south is notably undeveloped residential through this section. The Sunnyside

April 27, 2016

neighborhood association opposes changes in the zoning. We are not afraid of growth or density, we know the city is changing but we feel like we're singled out for large changes to our neighborhood while not asking the rest of the area to chip in. I ask for your support in maintaining the existing single family zoning in my area while working on more forward thinking policies on middle density housing that includes other neighborhoods.

Hales: Thank you, that is very helpful. One of the striking things is the age of those houses.

Richardson: Almost all built between the late 1800s and early 1900s.

Hales: Thank you all. [names being read]

Hales: Good afternoon, go ahead.

Michael Robinson: My name is mike Robinson, I'm here on behalf of providence health and services. I've given you a letter today and I wanted to make three points for your consideration. First of all, we appreciate the map amendment. That's map amendment m-67 that keeps an existing small multifamily residential project as a conforming use by not changing the campus to a 2 zone. Secondly we appreciate the policy amendment to policy 6.57. I think that encourages collaboration between neighborhood groups and providence. We think that's a good model, it helps us develop better plans and open lines of communication is a good thing. Lastly, we'd like to you keep thinking about how to make the transportation demand management policies work. We've suggested one policy amendment in our letter dated January 7th. Rather than submit any more amendments we would encourage to you take another look at that. As you go forward with land use regulations we will have more thoughts on how to make pdm majors most efficient for big campus institutions like providence. We especially thank staff for the time they have taken to work with us on this.

Hales: Thank you, appreciate it.

Gabe Adoff: Good afternoon, my name is Gabe adoff, I live on northeast 8th avenue between knott and brazee. Tsp 40116 would designate the area as a greenway and install traffic diverters in several points along 7th avenue. According to estimates from two years ago the green line designation requires 1500. 4,000 car as day will be diverted this. Could dramatically increase traffic on nearby streets. 8th through 14th are all single lane and about half as wide as 7th. They are home to families with kids who walk and bike to school. The proposed diverters would direct cars to martin Luther king boulevard. But we know firsthand how determined drivers are to avoid martin luther king. When 7th is closed to construction even with detour signs at the ends of our block we still get dangerous level of cut-through traffic. 7th does need safety improvement, but not at the expense of nearby streets. I urge you to make the greenway the, a 9th avenue greenway improves access to the park. North of the park it's a straight shot all the way to Woodlawn. It doesn't push dangerous levels of traffic onto adjacent streets. Finally, I know that 7th avenue greenway supporters have cited support by neighborhood associations and the bta. I think these groups have done a great job listening to people who live on 7th and a very poor job of listens to folks who live on adjacent streets. My neighbors opposed a greenway on 7th. The Albina head start and director ron herndon also oppose, because it would limit access to their streets. Thank you for your time.

Hales: Thank you.

Hales: I've got to look at this again and i'll do this later. Help me out. If it were 9th as you've suggested, and if it has to be 7th going through the Lloyd district, where do you make the transition?

Adoff: You know, I didn't get a lot of details about what happens south of Broadway. Pbot held a meeting and gale force the handout I gave you. But they kept the discussion

April 27, 2016

focused between Broadway and Alberta. So they didn't show us the plan for what happens that way.

Hales: I'll quiz them about that. Obviously we just had a presentation this morning about this amazing new bridge we'll be building we hope over the banfield at 7th.

Adoff: Okay.

Hales: That pretty much dictates where it's going to be at that point. If we're not on 7th north of Broadway we have to get a connection here. I'll take that up with them.

Adoff: Thank you.

Hales: Thank you very much. Welcome.

Ron Ebersole: My name is Ron Ebersol, I'm a high noon board member and chair for high noon. I'd like to p-25 and m-70. Basically great idea on restoring the neighborhood center for p-25. We think it would be more consistent with the character of the island but it needs a lot of actual work. We'd like to suggest that in order to help make it a better neighborhood center that we'd see the extension of the light rail out to Hayden Island. This has been a real thorn over the years that it stopped at expo. We also say that at this point in time the Hayden island plan needs to be significantly updated or redone. It's still based around former crc concept, has some really problems. And needs to be reflective of where we are right now. So we'd like to see that be redone. We'd also like to see the height limits reset to the previous 45 feet, before the Hayden island plan. And there's four parcels with 75 to 120-foot heights that would be real inconsistent with the idea of a neighborhood center and with the general character of the island. Finally, we think the local -- a local auto bridge for Hayden Island is a bad idea, primarily because it would essentially turn Hayden Island into an on ramp to i-5 for truck traffic in that area, coming from marine drive. And it would also want an alternate route for heavy truck traffic. If you look at the areas and the way that works, and I used to do a lot of commuting from downtown in the evening, essentially everybody is looking for a way. And that seems to be a bad idea. I'd like to see some additional work. But instead we would prefer to have the light rail extended and add pedestrian. And bicycle.

Hales: Thank you very much.

Fritz: When we talk about an arterial bridge, it could indeed be some of the ones we were discussing an arterial bridge with light rail transit and bikes and pedestrians and not necessarily other things. So just as the proposal for putting in the arterial bridge in the constrained list, to specify that it's to east Hayden island from the expo center, it's not in the west Hayden island plan that conforms with the now not going happen terminal on west Hayden island.

Ebersole: We understand it's not all set but we're trying to get our words in now.

Hales: That's helpful. Thank you very much.

Moore-Love: Next three are: [names being read]

Hales: Karla will give you a hand with our somewhat arcane a/v system.

Hales: Why don't we let Dana go?

Dana Krawczak: Just words. Mayor hales, members of the city council, Dana Krawczak. I'm here on behalf of Broadmoor golf course testifying in favor of amendment m-33. We provided testimony and I just provided another copy. This golf course has been owned by this family for over 100 years. They have no intent to redevelop it at any point in the future. This comp plan process provides the opportunity for the next generation, if and when they decide to develop some industrial land, it's feasible to develop and has flat land that could be desirable for industrial developer while maintaining and preserving the highest quality resources on site. There's been a lot of attention paid to this amendment recently. As you consider this amendment I want to make sure you keep a few facts and issues in mind. The comp plan designation will not allow industrial zoning tomorrow, next

April 27, 2016

week, next year. You'd still have to rezone the property which is a very robust public process where appropriate mitigation measures could be imposed. This is just a comp plan designation. It does not change the existing environmental overlay zone or the crp overlay zone which was recently updated. The portion of the plan for comp plan designation does not have a crp overlay. In this airport futures update there were not quality resources on that interior area to be designated with protection. This is really perceived as a potential swap with the riverside designation. This is 42 acres roughly on Broadmoor, roughly 86 acres at riverside. We have not seen a comparative analysis that says that Broadmoor is somehow superior from an ecological perspective. They were ranked equivocally. As a layperson I see 80 trees at Broadmoor and 764 at riverside. Riverside provided testimony about wildlife corridor opportunities that riverside provides. I encourage you to take a close look at the benefits and the values. The rest is in my testimony.

Hales: Thank you very much, thank you.

Hales: Okay. Thank you. Tamara, are you all set?

Tamara DeRidder: My name is Tamara Deridder, chairman for the rose city park neighborhood association. I would like to represent myself as a professional land use planner. I am requesting that -- it's my obligation to inform you that ethically the Oregon land use laws are broken when it comes to air quality. The planning form that we are using in the comp plan placed the most disadvantaged group right next to high toxic corridors. I am requesting to include two of the deq modeling maps, one for diesel and the other for benzene. Both of these illustrate the combustion that happens along our high density corridors. And currently there is no mitigation as was promised by the Portland -- by the planning and sustainability commission in 2009 with the Portland plan. They decided not to reverse the planning forum at that point in time but to mitigate for the toxicity. Currently there's no language in the plan that deals with the toxicity mitigation. What I provide is mitigation through vegetation, design, construction materials, as well as indoor ventilation. So that's my first testimony.

Hales: Thank you.

Deridder: The second is on behalf of the rose city park neighborhood association. We are recommending a transportation system plan, blue ribbon committee to be formed to vet the plan and the tsp's implementation assumption to reduce single occupancy vehicles to 25% of all trips by 2045. The success of this plan hinges on the reduction of the traffic volume. Transportation demand management is an unproven methodology at this scale, the entire city. We strongly urge you to get this implementation correct, right, in this plan because we are dependent on its success for our communities and our children. As last is the Euclid heights should be downzoned to r5 because it contains numerous steep slopes and should not be designated r-2.5. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, welcome.

Samuel Pastrick: Good afternoon. My name is past pastrick, I'm here with the citizen's utility board amendments 11-68 and p65. Ensuring neighborhood and urban vitality relies on so much more than just solving land use issues. It's also a framework to use innovative city planning in policy arenas once thought to be throws do with land use and more to do with transportation, for instance. The connection is given but that wasn't always the case. The ubiquitous broadband access has become essential to daily life. Connecting communities requires clear policy around transportation. The same idea is now true for open data and digital inclusion. Now it's akin to land use transportation. While private utilities and internet service and technology companies provide services to owners, the city does regulate some aspects of those facilities such as the siting of those facilities. The deeper resolution is the digital equity action plan. The city has displayed a pretty strong

April 27, 2016

track record of promoting fair and equitable access for all Portland residents. More specifically by removing key language from policy 2.11 around open days and 8.117 and 8.118 investing technology and communications infrastructure. Neither the city's comp plan as it concerns digital inclusion carry really the needed teeth in our opinion. We can't precisely know what Portland will look like in 10 or 20 years. I would argue it's a safe bet but internet and data driven will play a large part inequitable communities. You can either charge or bring up the rear on data inclusion policy and that's why cub opposes amendments p11, p68 and p85. Thank you.

Hales: You have submitted that letter in writing?

Pastrick: No, but I will.

Hales: Would you? Please. Thank you all. Thank you very much. [names being read]

Hales: Welcome, good afternoon.

Susan Lindsay: Hi, Susan Lindsay, I'm here to -- I was going to read my notes but it's going to be tough. I'm here to urge support for amendments s-20, s-21 and s-22. We're very grateful those were entered in as amendments. There were many, many zoning changing proceeded for the buckman neighborhood and these are the only three we stepped up to say, you know, not here. There was a reason for that. S-21 and s-22 are in the area that already had had extensive work and trouble for a national historic register. I believe you've go at letter from the landmarks commission supporting that it remain r-5. The buck man neighborhood is the oldest eastside neighborhood in the city of Portland. Back in the 1970s there was an effort to kind of mow down many of the houses and put in apartment buildings. What you see now is kind of a hodgepodge of remaining historic houses because activists came forward to stop that. And there's a lot of apartment buildings, too. We'd like to retain the zoning there for s-21 and s-22. For s-20, that's a bridge area between 15th and Belmont on Morrison. There's a lot of up zoning taking place on Belmont and Morrison. There we'd like to maintain it the same. There's some comments, one little comment from bps about that area is all commercial and in fact it's not at all. There's many, many residences in there. It remain as place of affordable housing options and we hope that it can change and when it develops out it'll be able to develop in situations that are not just studio apartments. That's what we're seeing going in. Very small 400 square foot studio apartments running for between 13 and 1400 dollars a month. When we push back on developers and said no, we want you to build up the r-1, we've seen some townhouses and families being able to move into the area. That bridge between colonel summers park and the school, we ask it for to remain the same. Finally in my last one second i'm going oppose p-45 for two reasons. One, there's a lack of -- nobody really knows about it, there hasn't been a full discussion on it. And second of all, buckman is doing middle housing. It's a great concept and we think it should be applied citywide. There are wonderful close-in neighborhoods like Laurelhurst and sellwood and the inner northwest and southwest hills that that concept might be applied to have walkable neighborhoods and give more options to people that are more affordable.

Fritz: I don't understand why you would be opposing the middle density housing amendment.

Lindsay: Thank you. The reason we're opposing -- we're not opposing it, right now we're opposing it because there's not been any process around it. We were shown by planning, by the planning department, details that really essentially where it goes into is in the buckman and a portion of the -- it's all residential buckman and a portion of the east side of the -- west side of the Sunnyside neighborhood.

Fritz: Just to clarify, having the policy and the comprehensive plan then allows us to have discussion thereafter about what is it, where is it, how is it done. It's not putting this policy in means it's going to happen everywhere tomorrow. I think what we are intending is that

April 27, 2016

yes, buckman is a great neighborhood, let's look at are there other neighborhoods that could have a benefit from a mixture.

Lindsay: Because we're already doing it. But I didn't get that. I'm glad you're explaining to it me. I have to tell you, nobody gets it. That's what i'm saying. I'm not saying it's a bad concept, nope, we need to talk about it more.

Fritz: We have input saying let's do this. We're putting the concept in the comprehensive plan so we can discuss what is it, where is it, how is it.

Lindsay: So you're not imposing it.

Fritz: No.

Lindsay: Again, nobody understands that.

Fritz: My comprehensive plan speech I make once in a while, it's a broad policy direction. It gets implemented by the zoning code and by administrative rules and building permits. It's a hierarchy. Strictly speaking, unless there's something in the comprehensive plan that references a policy, we shouldn't be doing zoning code. We shouldn't be doing anything in the city that's land use related without having that comprehensive plan. That's the reason in response to the community input during the process, council thought this should be looked into. It's already happening in buckman and other places. Let's explore fit should be happening elsewhere.

Hales: And we will. I think her point is very important. If we don't build the foundation for that concept in the comp plan it's pretty hard to build the rest.

Fritz: I appreciate you bringing up the concern. There are several things in there, people are like, what does this mean? We don't know what it means. We have the board policy and then a follow-up.

Lindsay: We work to read just about everything we can in addition to doing our full-time jobs. And we know you're in the same position. Just letting you know I think this is something that needs a lot more conversation citywide.

Hales: Definitely agreed. Thank you, sue.

Fritz: Thank you.

Hales: Good afternoon, welcome.

Gretchen Hollands: Hi, thank you, I'm Gretchen Hollands representing the sylvan highlands neighborhood association opposing m-14. We in the sylvan highland neighborhood association do not feel that luxury condominium developers are underrepresented in Portland. M-14 changes the zoning for a single property at 6141 southwest canyon court so the owner can build 11 luxury condominiums this spot zoning ignores neighborhood input and doesn't seem like a good use of the opportunity that the comprehensive plan provides. Thank you for the setups, Commissioner Fritz. Planning staff agree with us and do not support this amendment. And the staff did not support the previous zone request change made by the property owner last summer to be included in the comprehensive plan. We were here in December supporting the august draft of the plan and all of the changes it made for our area. This is the only amendment that we don't agree with. Last week neighbors testified against this zone and the sylvan highlands neighborhood association is also opposed to this amendment. We respectfully request the amendment be rejected and that the property owner be directed to use the regular zone change process. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you. Welcome, good afternoon.

Mike Connors: Thank you, mayor and commissioners. I'm mike Connors, I'm here on behalf of space age fuel to testify in opposition to p-32, as well as the mixed use designation proposals for my client's property. Space age fuel is a local company that operates numerous gas service stations around the city, four of which the city is proposing to redesignate and rezone to mixed use. Back in November of 2015, we submitted

April 27, 2016

comments requesting that the city council delay adoption of the comprehensive plan amendments because you can't adopt mixed use designations without knowing what the mixed use standards are going to be. And those mixed use standards are coming in the mixed use zone project, just now being considered by the planning and sustainability commission. Part of our concern was potential impacts on or restrictions on gas service stations or more broadly, drive thru facilities of which a gas service station is under that umbrella. Our fears have been realized. The code amendments published thus far, c.m. 1, c.m. 2, c.m. 3 zones. C.m. 2 and 3 allow for some redevelopment opportunity but for a gas service station it's not going to properly work object allow to redevelopment. It seems to be an impetus for those code amendments but it eliminates drive-thru petitions in our corridor areas. The redevelopment opportunity, the ability to redevelop a former gas station into a different kind of use is far more challenging than any other kind of use. One of the stated objectives of this whole process was to avoid or minimize adversely impacting uses or property values. It's going to do both for my clients. They are strongly in opposition to p-32 as well as the mixed use designations from what we've seen of the draft that's been published.

Hales: I'll read your letter obviously. You have suggest what had designation you want?

Connors: Well, retain or pull it out of the mixed use area. In the letter we've identified some of the issues that we see with those designations in that area. For instance one particular area is three properties designated as part of a civic corridor area. And other properties. But quite frankly, mayor, my client was not concerned or objecting to the concept of any kind of mixed use designation, so long as those designations of standards with it don't impact the business.

Hales: As it exists.

Connors: Correct.

Hales: I think we probably share that objective. I would assume the scenario we want for older gas stations wouldn't to be able to have them be nonconforming uses until such time, and then have the zoning designation to be generous enough in terms of redevelopment intensity to make it financially possible to deal with contamination on the site and still build something. I think that's what we were aiming for with this effort. Keep selling gas for as long as the family wants to. One of these days, it's a half acre are or whatever it is on the main street. We want there to be a development up side so its fob do the mixed use thing when the owner wants to do it. I thought that's where we were with those designations. We really need to know what you think it should be designated.

Connors: In terms of designations it's maintaining the existing designations. Not amending it and incorporating it into the mixes use designation concept.

Hales: but that's---most of the commercial property in the city one way or another is getting redesignated.

Connors: If you look at the maps they are in outlier areas, either grouped in with one or two other properties or they are on the outskirts of the area where the city is proposing to change to it mixed use designation. For those properties, if you look at them on the map it's perfectly appropriate to keep them where they are. We've explained the reasons for that. But the real issue, mayor, I guess we have a different read or interpretation of the mixed use standards. They don't I believe do what you've believing that they do.

Hales: There's checking on my part but you've given us the addresses and that helps so we can check that with respect to the map. Good, all right, thank you very much.

Connors: Appreciate your time.

Hales: Thank you all. Thank you both. [names being read]

Hales: Good afternoon, welcome.

April 27, 2016

Mike Westling: My name is Mike Westling speaking as a homeowner in the Concordia neighborhood and representative of city club. City club recently published a list of housing types in the city's neighborhoods. The closer you are to good schools and active parks and well-paying jobs the greater your chances for success. As such a discussion about affordable housing can't be about how much housing we have but where that housing is located. Research shows kids from poor families who live in mixed income neighborhoods do better in schools and earn more money in their lifetime over kids from concentrated poverty. They learn more that help them succeed later in life. By reducing the need for people to commute long distances mixed income neighborhoods can reduce traffic congestion and improve movement of freight throughout the region. Unlike the vast majority of other affordable housing solutions it doesn't cost a dime. Not to see say we don't need those other solutions, as well. I'm courage beside p-45 encouraging the development of housing. It's a good start. Specifying areas within a quarter mile of designated centers and within the ring of a city. Middle housing in its many different shapes and forms has an important role in making all of our neighborhoods more accessible and helping to build vibrant centers and corridors for the future. Thankfully there are parts of the zoning code that allow for different flavors. To adjust zoning of parks and overlay zones allowing for a greater array of housing types. Lastly, in addition to those I recommend you take a look at the proposal from the Concordia neighborhood association to create a new overlay zone allowing for any r5 residential property to have multiple units as long as it otherwise conforms to the building envelope at others of its specific zoning.

Rick Michaelson: I'm Rick Michaelson here first to thank commissioner here fits to thank mayor Hales and commissioner Novick which allowed my property to be zone c.m.65 instead of rh3 to match the rest of the property around it and allow ground floor retail. I think that's a good move for that district. I really want to talk about middle housing. I've spent a long time supporting infill housing in residential neighborhoods and have done a number of projects myself. I think it's the right way to go to increase the amount of housing we have. When we were on the planning commission we did a couple of steps. We eliminated parking garages. We allowed courtyard housing as an idea although it hasn't worked out very well. I think it's time to make the next step, to probably change the way we measure density in middle zones from units per acre too far. I have a site in northwest Portland where I'm doing a condo project to. Make a profit on it I have to maximize the building envelope. I will put six 2,000 square foot units on that site. If we measured by far instead, I would do 8 to 12,000 smaller units but because the number of units is really what controls and drives people to build the biggest, most specify units as possible. I think that's an easy change and part of the next step of this process.

Hales: That's an interesting suggestion, thank you.

Hales: Welcome.

Mia Reback: My name is Mia Reback and I'm here to speak on behalf of 350 pdx and the climate action coalition to support amendments p-43 and p-46 to allow policies to reduce emissions. Portland set itself apart as a climate leader by placing a ban on fossil fuels. Thank you all for voting yes to support that policy. Thank you for implementing it in the strongest way possible. We think that policy in the comprehensive plan is a great way to do so. While our challenge is great, we think there are also great opportunities and gains that we can have the transforms this crisis demands of us. We think we can do more with this policy to set the stage for our renewable energy future by amending the policy to low carbon and renewable energy economy, unless the reduction of a renewable pop is suggested. Those who have been historically left out are the first to benefit from this transition to renewable energy and post fossil fuel era. This is just one of many reasons

April 27, 2016

we're supporting the anti-displacement coalition and their support on amendments and measures including opposing downzones and high opportunity neighborhoods. We're committed to adjusting of the housing cites and making sure our city is available to all people. I'd like to thank mayor hales and the bureau of planning and stability for their work on reducing carbon emissions, and to build a robust economy in Portland. Thank you all for your time and please vote yet on p-43 and p-56.

Hales: Thank you, thanks very much. Okay. [names being read]

Hales: Good afternoon, welcome.

Jeff Geisler: Good afternoon. I'm jess Geisler, chairman for Hayden Island. Thank you mayor and commission force having so much patience to deal with this huge problem called a resolution to so many problems. We are against m-70 on Hayden Island, the high noon. We do not want any auto land bridge to Hayden Island. We never saw a viable bridge plan through the crc. We'd like to you remove this amendment for any auto connector bridge to the island. However, high noon may offer support for a tillikum style bridge, light rail, pedestrian, bicycle. And in conjunction with that we are accepting p-25 which designates us as a community center, a neighborhood center. If we had a light rail bridge that came in and landed on lottery road, it's eliminates our problem there. We'd have more housing and get our community neighborhood center back instead of lottery row. The neighborhood industries quite large allowing for more housing up to a 45-foot level. We also are interested in saying yes on p19 and p16. We're no on p-32. We appreciate our drive-thrus and we like our Starbucks. We're no on six, p-81. The trail around the island that's 30 feet wide. That brings us to p48 preserving the manufactured home community that. Trail would basically jeopardize 112 mobile homes and eventually because that is a large number of their income, it probably would affect the other 460 homes in that park. Thank you very much.

Hales: I think the only Starbucks I know of on Hayden island requires that you park in the Safeway and walk in.

Geisler: There's one at the drive-thru?

Hales: When I go it's to safeway.

Geisler: There's three drive-thrus over there.

Hales: Thank you.

Carol McCarthy: My name is carol McCarthy, I'm here to urge you to keep the record open for the city council amendments beyond today. Amendment p45 is on the agenda for tonight's Sweeney board meeting. Closing the record today will not allow the outcome of a Sweeney vote on p45 to become part of the record. The vote tonight will be taken at the earliest possible time given the March 18th rollout council amendments. For the vote out to be omitted from the record is inconsistent with the provisions of the current comp plan city code and goal one. The use of the phrase "wear appropriate" to specify where middle density housing would be allowed is not defined. It leaves us at the mercy of possible corrupting forces stack with people who may have financial interest with people who may stand in direct opposition to protecting the character and liveability. The planners should have been more transparent and applied zoning code to "wear appropriate" through the map at the outset of the 2035 comp plan to allow citizen involvement. Neighborhoods remain largely the same under the concept. Some redevelopment can occur under a mix of housing types such as row houses and accessory dwelling uses that distinguish between slightly more compact inner neighborhoods and slightly larger lots of outer neighborhoods. If you live in an established neighborhood, whether in the part of Portland or Gresham or Beaverton, your neighborhood should continue to look and function like it does now. It's the most important aspect of the 2040 growth except. The amendment

April 27, 2016

language offers no guarantees that it will be affordable. It could increase housing costs in our neighborhoods. Please vote against p-45.

Hales: You're asking that we keep the written testimony open until --

McCarthy: It might take us a week to get the other in, i'm thinking a week.

Joe Daniels: We'll see how much. I'm Joe Daniels, I am privileged and pleased to be part of the sellwood neighborhood. We live in a 115-year-old house. I am not that old but it's nice to have the benefit of that. All I have to do is use that as an example of the bigger picture and focus on, since there's only a couple minutes, not the planning part so much as the sustainability. One of the things i'm concerned, as someone who's been around the neighborhood for a while, is where are these pieces coming in? Obviously needs to be changed. How are they coming in? It makes sense to say we've got corners, let's leverage that. Let's use this in a way that's beneficial. So it's harder to say this is really going to work out to go from maybe 10 people living in 12, 500 spaces, it's getting tougher and tougher to walk through that neighborhood and do things that way. The other thing relative to sustainability, I think in my lifestyle, someone in his mid-50s right now, normal is what you're used to. Everyone will walk and go to max. I beg to differ. I came from the bay area. When I noticed there was everyone drove their car and when they weren't able to do that they drove it somewhere else further and further and further away. I, we, my family think yes there does need to be a change and a different density. They are going to more likely lead to afternoon an amazing increase in the bottleneck that's occurring there. The thought I would lining to leave you with is a question. I think the bps is doing a great job. I think you all have been doing a very good job. I work with international standards myself. You gotta see the bigger picture. Hence my question. Are these overall plans and specific amendments the type of things you yourselves would like to see in your neighborhoods and that you're promoting there, and we're all going interact with each other. Thank you for your time.

Hales: Thank you very much. Thank you for your time. [names being read]

Hales: Good afternoon.

Nancy Oberschidt: Good afternoon. I'm Nancy oberschidt im standing in for rick Johnson, both members of the buck man community association. We support the following amendments. P-20, 21, 39, 42, 44 and p-53. We also support these amendments: S-20, which eliminates the proposed comprehensive plan change 62, which changes zones in blocks 16-19 along Belmont and Morrison from r-1 and r-2.5 to mixed use. There's many properties with truly residential uses. Changing this zone would encourage demolition and erect a wall essentially through the heart of our neighborhood. We are supporting s-21, elimination of proposed comprehensive plan changes. No. 348, changing the zoning of the 6.5 block area from r5 to r-2.5. This area of 63 lots has 11 multifamily structures, five 6-12 unit properties and redevelopment would result in a loss of density. 13 single-family houses on lots larger than 3200 square feet are also at risk of tear-down since the minimum lot size on our 2.5 is 1600 square feet. And the mayor's memo listed six properties in this category. We suggest that allowing an adu on a locality with a duplex to increase density, rather than the proposal of allowing density up to r-1 standards on lots with structures less than 75 years old. We support s-22, elimination of proposed comprehensive plan change 92. Changing the zoning on a half block area to r-1. These properties, a 10-unit apartment building, housing authority of Portland, a duplex. Changes the zoning would tear down with a net loss of units.

Hales: Could you leave us a copy of that?

Oberschidt: The essential, it's all in there.

Hales: Oh, i'm sorry. [talking at once]

Fritz: Very helpful.

April 27, 2016

Hales: All right, thank you. Tim, good afternoon.

Tim Ramis: Mayor Hales, members of the commission, Tim Ramis here on behalf of doctor Rizzole in favor of commissioner Novick's amendment n-14, a shift from the suburban style zone, large lot zone, to r-5, single family zone. Contrary to earlier characterization not a multifamily zone. The effect would be to allow a net addition to 5 single housing. It's a site located three minutes' walk from a transit station and three minutes from the amenities in Sylvan. Historical context may be important to you. There was a time when Sylvan long ago was a part of the city of Portland. Then in 1914 our supreme court worried that it be removed. For the next 70 years that area was developed under a county rural suburban paradigm resulting in lot sizes of roughly a half acre to five acres. Some of the neighbors got together and got the area reannexed. I was one of the people who knocked on doors and canvassed for annexation. Multnomah County never really engaged in community level planning. There was recognition within a five-minute walk of a transit station and all the Sylvan retail, there was a tremendous amount of redevelopable land and that it need to do be looked at within the lens of modern land use plan the doctor's property is a remnant of an old way of zoning. That request that some be allowed there, a three minutes' walk from a transit station seems to be not unreasonable given modern planning principles. The service consideration comment you've received in the record argues that we need to fear traffic congestion in 2035. The traffic study says we're talking about nine additional peak our trips. Bus and rail and bus infrastructure there, seems to me that's not nurture are of a decision.

Hales: Thank you very much.

Amy Greenstadt: I'm a resident of northeast Eighth Avenue between Knott and Brazeo. I'm testifying to oppose tsp40166 to turn northeast 47th Avenue into a greenway, an alteration of the original plan, to make northeast Ninth Avenue a greenway. The city defines neighborhood greenways as residential, first explains the character of these streets. Vehicles should travel 20 miles per hour or less. There should be a daily average of approximately 1,000 cars per day with the upper limit set at 2,000 cars. Northeast 7th Avenue is inappropriate for this type of use. It's a two-lane street which was designed from the beginning as far as I can tell as a neighborhood artery that now accommodates at least 5500 cars daily. To turn it into wheels means for me to shunt 4,000 cars a day or more onto neighboring streets, one lane. There's nothing to -- we've seen there's been introduction on 7th, and then we. My cat was killed by one of those cars, people's kids are working down the street. It seems very dangerous and we don't see any evidence there's not a plan to deal with that situation. We support the plan as originally conceived, to turn 9th Avenue into a greenway. We do agree that 7th Avenue has too much traffic on it and we think there should be traffic calming measures to help the residents there.

Hales: Thank you very much, thank you all. [names being read]

Hales: Good afternoon. Who'd like to go first?

Gary Miniszewski: Looking at me, okay. Gary Miniszewski. I'm here to talk about material I submitted last week. That material had attachments this material does not. All right. I'm here to talk about middle housing or moderate density housing and affordability. I'm also here to talk a little bit about solar. In February 2nd, 2016, a memo to you, Mayor Hales, from planner Engstrom, five options were suggested to the Mayor for consult consideration. I recommend the first two approaches be further pursued. Those are reevaluate zoning in the inner southeast Portland area and evaluate r-2.5 comp plan areas not yet zoned r-2.5. In addition -- and that staff report is attached to my testimony -- in addition, I'd recommend that the consult have planning staff further evaluate the potential for additional land area to be designated r-1, r-2 and r-2.5. Designating more vacant or underdeveloped land as r-1, r-2, r-2.5, is a more legally viable process than allowing for

April 27, 2016

additional density to middle housing in full families. Providing opportunities for low cost housing is not a matter of supply and demand economics. It'll barely reduce the cost of those units. The private real estate market, and mayor Hales, you know this very well, determines the mixed quality and cost of what gets built. The city council needs to develop a 21st century mix of economic incentives and reduces in providing affordable housing. This is my personal request to protect my own investment in solar panels. I request that the city council develop a policy protecting existing homeowners' right to sunlight. The policy in implementing code should affect all forms of new housing in moderate and residential, existing zones. I mean not only for solar panels which everybody likes to talk about but for yards and windows as we had to as planners in New York way back when in tenement houses.

Angela Zehara: I really appreciate this process and it's one of the many things I really like about Portland. I think we do this really well. However, I'm here --

Hales: Put your name back in the record.

Angela Zehara: Angela Zehara I live in Sellwood neighborhood that's gentrifying at lightning speed. We can't identify how fast things are happening in Sellwood as residents. I'm here to talk about displacement. People quite literally being thrown on the sidewalk in that this gold rush that's happening in Sellwood. It's incredibly fast the way it's developing and people are just pushing through things before anybody even knows what's happening. And I feel like when finalize this process. I don't think council has on their radar screen what I would call under housing. You have the amount of homeless, a huge number of people in my own personal acquaintance, which is actually quite small a lot of people are under housed. They are not on the radar screen of being homeless because they are in a temporary substandard or transitional or couch surfing or living in a garage or having to move 45 minutes away from work and school and community and so forth. There's just -- it's constant. Just this morning I opened my email and our friend called me saying her daughter who's a single parent of two kids is desperately seeking a place because she's being no cause evicted. I brought my friend here and she will talk more about this.

Hales: Welcome.

Katherine Hampton: I'm Katherine Hampton and I am homeless, come September I will turn 70. I was living in a six-unit apartment building where we were all evicted including a couple that live directly above me with a brand-new infant son. I've been known to sleep in Sellwood Park in the doorway on Milwaukie Avenue, here and there, wherever. There is no housing. I have my stuff in storage in a storage unit. I was told "to you get rid of my stuff, unload it because there is no place and isn't going to be one for a very long time.

Hales: Hmmm.

Hampton: I've met other people who are also seniors that are homeless on the street. Not all of us out there are into the drug scene or alcoholics but we are definitely homeless. I've met veterans, one in a wheelchair, shot up in Afghanistan who can't get the medical help he needs and he's homeless in a wheelchair. Something's terribly wrong.

Hales: Thank you for being here.

Hampton: And this is my little friend here, he's homeless with me.

Hales: Hi, there, guy. Thank you for coming. I hope that you've stopped by my office to let our folks know who you are and how to get hold of you, upstairs.

Hampton: Thank you.

Novick: I have a question miss Hampton?

Hampton: I've seen you at qfc.

Novick: What happened to your apartment?

Hampton: We were all -- it was. [talking at once]

April 27, 2016

Hampton: 1414 southeast Lambert, we were all evicted, given a paint job and they moved new people in and quadrupled the rent, of course. And in fact the people bought it are from Vietnam and not even Americans. They came knocking at my door just a few days wanting my birthday and social security number, probably for nefarious reasons, I didn't give it to them.

Novick: The building is still there.

Hampton: 1414 southeast Lambert.

Hales: They just moved out the tenant and raised the rent substantially.

Hampton: Quadrupled it.

Hales: Thank you, thanks for being here.

Fritz: I think it's important for the people to know that 20% of the people living outside are 55 or over.

Hampton: Oh yes..Its not fun. Cause I'll be turning 70.

Hales: Thank you, thanks for coming down. Do stop by my office and let my staff zack or one of them know how to get a hold of you.

Hampton: Thank you

Miniszewski: Just an antidotal thing. Check out the housing on 156th and Glisan in Gresham. Metro Habitat is doing that. And I helped them get it through the city of Gresham planning process, but I also helped to build it.

Evan Heidtmann: Thank you my name is Evan Heidtmann. I am in favor of tsp amendment 0116. This is the amendment that recommends a greenway on northeast 7th from Broadway to Sumner. You've heard testimony from several people, I'd like to focus specifically on why 7th is the best alignment for a bikeway. In Portland we make it really easy to get around by car, we drive in a car try to find a highway all you have to do is go towards it so big signs and it points you in the right direction. If you want to ride a bike the situation is different, you have to know which streets are suitable and which ones are not. Which intersections have traffic lights, which ones do not. Whether which streets you're on connects to the next neighborhood. We have great bike maps to help with this, but my concern is if you need a map to use the system then the system is not good enough. If we're serious about reaching our goal we have to make bicycling as easy and approachable as we make driving today. I believe easy to follow bike paths are a huge part of that. All this is to say a greenway on Ne 7th would be a great bike way for one simple reason. It doesn't take a map to understand. It's straight and direct all the way from 184 to Sumner. Like other successful bikeways in our city it's parallel to a major arterial in our city and it's easy to find and follow. The only problem with 7th today is that it's dominated by traffic we need a robust greenway for this street to reach its potential as a successful bikeway connecting to the northeast neighborhood to the central city. And its projects like this that we must embrace if we want to see 30% of the commute trips made by bikes by 2030. Also there would be a two-block detour, we don't ask drivers to find the way around the park so why should we ask the same of people who want to use a bike? Thanks for your time.

Hales: Thank you. Welcome.

Andrew Neeman: I am Andrew Neeman. And I am the land use chair for the King neighborhood association, and also a small business owner. I am also here to testify on paper of the tsp amendment, 40116, which would designate the avenue as a major city bikeway, and I would like to start out by saying that this is a chance to do something world class on a budget. It's not often that the best option is the cheapest that I have. The bike plan for 2030 was adopted six years ago, and the goal is 25% of the bikes, only 14 years from now, and if we are going to live up to the aspirations I think the time is done to make some bold moves. There is really no contest between 7th and 9th in terms of the root

April 27, 2016

quality. And the concerns about traffic are legitimate but none of us want to see the adjacent street. That's a design issue to be dealt with at a later phase. The reasons why these have been listed by people as a street shot, their existing signal crossings and the existing infrastructure from the Lloyd district, and as the mayor mentioned the bridge going in, you are going to see a flood of bicycles. I think that we should serve it where they are.

Hales: Thank you, thanks very much.

Fawn Aberson: Greetings, mayor hales and commissioners. Thank you for your time today. I have come here today presenting the north, northeast business association, as the outreach coordinator but I am a long-term resident in northeast Portland, and i've been a long-time employer for -- the employee at several small businesses in northeast, including the local lounge, and the queen of sheba international foods. And I am here today to testify in support of the comp plan for the m-42, which would change the zoning on north Fremont. It's something who has worked in the community for six years, having conversations with many small business owners, and I am excited about this because I think it fits well with the five-year plan that the city did for the wealth creation for disadvantaged and minority communities, which thank you very much for that plan, as well. In particular, I am speaking on behalf of one of the business owners that will be affected by this change, and he will be allowed to develop a mixed use property of residents and commercial. And I will say that that's an area that already is very well populated with really cute, quaint businesses. There is a grand central place and spin laundry and the second story, which does amazing technology work, and a couple of yoga studios, and then on the other end of it, is obviously new seasons across the street, and a food cart, so I think that letting [inaudible], who has been developing and in northeast Portland, for 30 plus years as a business owner, has done great projects, plus he's very cognizant of bringing the ethnic and minority communities as business owners. Something that, something that area needs very much. So I am excited to see alem, and alem donated the boise Elliot community garden for years and I think he wants to play on that, and there are many great examples such as what the lindeman feed store did called decorum street doorways, so I think what alem uses his vision is the long-term vision he's had as a resident and business owner there, but still, keeping the really quaint micro-cobbler community involved. He's not looking for a mini-mart or something. If you know anything about this business owner he's going to bring something organic and great just like he's been continuing to bring, and this is going to be the best first step -- maybe not the first but one of the steps in creating wealth For communities of color and disadvantage, and I think that he should be allowed to do it and he could set a trend for many other minority property owners there, as well.

Hales: Thank you very much.

Moore-Love: The last two are Jennifer and alem.

Hales: Come on up, please. There is other folks that came in, if you signed up to testify on the 20th and you were not able to be called then you are on the list, and we can add you onto the end here. Jennifer, go ahead, please, or whoever would like to go first. Go ahead.

Alem Giebrehiwot: Good afternoon, mayor hales, and thank you for allowing me to speak today. My name is Alem Giebrehiwot and I am the owner of the queen of sheba international foods. It has been on mlk for almost 25 years. I have been in the neighborhood for over 30 years. And when I come to this neighborhood, I came as a refugee, I have come to love as much today. Since the day I moved in, I have built in the neighborhood my home and my business. [inaudible] into the neighborhood looking to take -- I am destined into my home, and over the duration of my time, in the neighborhood, I have acquired the property, all of which I have used to affect the lives of others in a positive way. I have employed anywhere from six to 15 employees at a time. Always,

April 27, 2016

families of their own, who live in our, in the neighborhood. My longest employee has been with me for three years, and [inaudible] employee has been with me for 14 years. As an owner, I have -- [inaudible] to attractive, and mixed use spaces, and a good example is the Russian street, the corner of Russell and Rodney that was brought into the crowd when we see today. As a homeowner, in the neighborhood, I have contributed by maintaining and improving my property in a way that improves the neighborhood ability. For over 20 years, I have donated the use of my rent to be used at the Boise Elliott community garden. I have a street that has been serving the community for 20 years, as a community center. We are not really trying to sell the neighborhood, I am [inaudible] to look good and serve the need of our community, and that needed to be improved. Thank you.

Hales: Thank you very much.

Jennifer Gomersall: Hi, I am Jennifer Gomersall lived in the pearl before it was the pearl for 25 years. I came today to thank you, and especially, the mayor for sponsoring the m-58. That's going to save the houses on main street, and I had a whole thing prepared about the underrepresented group, the historic district but I agreed to be hijacked by a bunch of teenagers that I had for fortunate, unfortunate job of having in my car for a couple of hours trip. Starting in the beginning we went by the -- there was a metal building that was being torn down on a Saturday morning, Which started a discussion, which started a bunch of questions, and I ended up having to go through the private property rights and how, you know, things are done for planning and question after question, way more than my confirmation level was going to handle. That got very spirited, and they wanted to come and testify, but by then they had an exam and it was closed so I agreed to offer for your consideration -- three points that they wanted me to suggest am first one, it seemed to them that Portland is great now because the people who have lived here in the past and currently the voters and the taxpayers, the community, and the neighbors, and etc., and that is being torn down for the benefit of people not yet here, or the values being taken from the neighborhoods or transferred to the developers, not benefiting the whole city, and all of the current people. The second thought, is why is constant growth good. Will there ever be a point where enough is enough or will we continue to overcrowd it until no one wants to live here anymore and we tore down all the interesting houses and the buildings for nothing. And then third point that they wanted me to offer, for this was if we take the industrial land for housing all of the new people that are coming up here, won't we have more homeless because no industry type of jobs like welders, that pay well for people who are different learners, for people who are different learners, so they did Not go to a regular type of college, but still, want to supported is a family, they won't have anywhere to work they wanted you to consider those things when you are deciding, as they pointed out, their future, because we'll all be dead, which I also wasn't quite ready for. And we are really frustrated because it was like, the metal building, and it was just being torn down, and I had an hour and a half in the car with them. I could not just say, get your sister or something. To consider it is built by people who are here, and not wreck it, for people who aren't here or were expecting, and the thing that was hard for me to answer, because I have an mba, and I get into the economics and all of that, but I kind of had a point, when do we just say Portland is closed now

Fritz: and how would we say that?

Gomersall: It was quite the discussion.

Hales: Thanks for being there for the teachable moment.

Gomersall: And they were all under 16, so there was a lot of civics going on, as well.

Hales: You did well.

Fritz: What a perfect way to end our hours and months of testimony. Thank you very much.

April 27, 2016

Hales: Thanks for bringing their wisdom here and keep the good luck with that discussion and more caffeine next time.

Gomersall: Yes.

Hales: Walter, we have got your letter, so thank you very much. Did you need to speak to it or should we just put it in the record?

Walter Valenta: I would be happy to speak to it but I was not on the list.

Hales: we have got it and you are always clear with us, so I think that we have got to let this were you familiar, the wonderful teenagers have the last word. So therefore we are going to close the verbal testimony and the question is, how long do you want to keep the record open to accommodate any requests for late-breaking written testimony?

Engstrom: There is a certain amount of symmetry in that last testimony, when we started this process, a number of years ago, and one of the first workshop questions that we asked is where is everybody going to be and what are they going to be doing in 2035 and a big section of the room looked grim. One advice that we have from the staff is tomorrow, we're planning at 2:00 to begin deliberation on a number of the amendments, and we would suggest it is not good to have the record open while you are doing that amendment because you will start to get play by play testimony, which can be a bit challenging to deal with, and it's maybe easier for you to have --

Hales: Keep the record open until then and ask Multnomah neighborhood to communicate their discussion and recommendations from tonight, maybe.

Engstrom: We thought noon tomorrow was a reasonable deadline.

Hales: Is that ok with everybody? Does that sound good?

Saltzman: We're not taking any more verbal testimony.

Engstrom: We are just leaving the email and the written letters and we believe our map application Online on until noon tomorrow.

Hales: Yeah, that sounds fine, and I think all around, if someone would please let them know so she can get back to us based on their discussion tonight. Anything else that you need for us to do at this point?

Engstrom: We'll see you tomorrow.

Hales: We are going to close the hearing and keep the record open until noon tomorrow and we'll begin discussion on the amendments tomorrow afternoon. Thank you very much. Milestone.

Fritz: Congratulations.

At 3:47 P.m. council recessed.

April 28, 2016
Closed Caption File of Portland City Council Meeting

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised City Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript.

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

APRIL 28, 2016 2:00 PM

Hales: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to the April 28th meeting of the Portland City Council. Would you please call the roll?

Saltzman: Here. **Novick:** Here. **Fritz:** Here. **Hales:** Here.

Hales: Would you please read the two items we have on the calendar this afternoon?

Item 430.

Item 431.

Hales: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, welcome. Let me see, should I cover any of this procedural stuff first? I probably should.

So, the decisions being made today and on May 11th are for the purpose of establishing a, quote, "as amended plan" so that staff can prepare final documents for our consideration. The final vote on the as amended plan is scheduled for June 15th. We have developed agendas for today and May 11th to make decisions on amendments that have already been offered. New amendments offered after today will potentially impact the adoption schedule.

I want to make it clear that the votes today and on May 11th do not indicate or prejudice the vote we cast on the findings and on the final plan. In other words, voting to adopt amendments does not commit to you vote for the as adopted plan, but I hope, obviously, that we'll work our way towards one that we all support.

As we consider the potential amendments, some will be bundled together for consideration of related items as a group. If any one of us wishes to have a bundled item considered individually, make that clear as we go.

As we make motions today, I ask that all of us refer to the amendment numbers printed in the original BPS amendments report from March 18th -- which I have in front of me and I hope we all have in front of us -- so that we can be straight about which issue we're talking about. If you're referring to further amendments or amendments to those amendments, please reference the appropriate supplemental memo by date and item number. Ask staff for help if you have trouble doing that, as I probably will.

So, for many of these items, I'll ask the Council Clerk to read the descriptions of what we're talking about so that we stay on track. And for purposes of getting us on the track and going in the right direction, I'll turn it over to Susan and the team.

Susan Anderson, Director, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: Thank you so much. I just wanted to start by thanking you and your staff for all your diligence, perseverance, and really thoughtful review of the document and all the amendments. It's been quite a process and your staff -- all of them -- have been just wonderful. We've worked to make this process very clear, very transparent, and I hope that that's been helpful to you all.

All of us, and Eric in particular -- you've gotten to know him much better over the past few months -- we've worked to compile the list of amendments before you today and the layout we think is in a really easy to understand method, very straightforward, and it should help you be able to track each of your decisions.

April 28, 2016

Also wanted to note that we have maps with us, lots and lots of maps. We have background materials, whatever you need to help illustrate any of the issues that you're talking about. Just ask and we can show you particular locations or we can discuss it in more detail any of the policy issues. And with that, I just want to turn it over to Eric and I want to wish Commissioner Fritz a happy birthday.

Hales: That's right -- Happy Birthday, Commissioner Fritz.

Fritz: If it's a tie, I get the tie-breaker, right? [laughter]

Anderson: What better present --

Fritz: No, really. I'm a planning geek, so this is the best. [laughter]

Hales: There's no better present than that -- have her way with the comp plan for a day.

Anderson: There you go.

Eric Engstrom, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: I wanted to take a few moments to go over the material in front of you so you can get oriented to how this will go. The operative document is the one that's dated today, entitled "agenda for amendment consideration." Beyond the cover page is essentially a run of show for consideration of amendments. They're itemized as individual motions that you can consider.

On page 14, it starts the second part of the document which is the reference things that relate to each of those motions. So, when a motion refers to more than one policy, those policies are printed in order of the motions in the back half of this document. So, if you -- for example, with motion three, which relates to minor amendments, map amendments in Northwest and Southwest Portland, there's a list of specific properties on that page 17 that's corresponding to that motion. We'll put those things on the screen as we go to help. I wanted to orient you there.

There's also at the back of this packet a list of the items that are tentatively on the May 11th agenda. And obviously, any further things you pull today or don't get through today will be forwarded to that agenda as well. So, if there's an amendment you're looking for and don't see it, it's likely it's on that May 11th agenda. We did hold some items for the benefit of Commissioner Fish, who couldn't be here today.

You also have the March 18th document on your desk, so if we refer to any page numbers in that, it looks like this. It has the original -- it's the way the public is going to be able to see this, basically, because that's what's been published on the website. We've also provided copies of all of your supplemental memos over the last few weeks with any additional things that came up after the publication of that document. So, that report and your memos essentially constitute all the source material for these amendments that we'll be referring to.

When we get into site-specific map issues, we also have a PowerPoint with some slides and maps that we'll put on the screen at that point and go over with you.

Hales: So, it's your hope and expectation that we will get through all 32 amendments to the supporting documents and 12 motions on the plan itself today? Have I got that right?

Engstrom: You've got -- you have -- up through item 32 is our aspiration for today. We'll see where that --

Hales: Oh, OK, that's as far as you hope to get today. Bite off more than we can chew.

Engstrom: Right, and we're starting with more general amendments that have largely been already pulled of the things you wanted to talk about individually but you of course can add an item that you want to pull.

Hales: OK.

Engstrom: You've also got a copy of the economic opportunities analysis on your desk because the first motion is related to accepting the revised version of that. And I'll highlight the specific pieces of that when we get to that, but that's the other document you have on your desk.

April 28, 2016

Hales: OK.

Engstrom: Any questions about the general layout before we --? So, the basic idea is that the Mayor -- or if there are other volunteers -- can make the motions and then we'll go through the usual process of considering the motion.

Hales: Aright. Since I have that script in front of me, unless the Council has a concern with that, I'll just make the motion in each case and somebody can second it and then we can get into it. OK. You want me to make the motion first on number one?

Engstrom: The first grouping, the first couple relate to the supporting documents. The first one was related to employment -- economic opportunity analysis.

Hales: OK. So, I move to tentatively accept the changes to the economic opportunities analysis. And should we have Karla read the item?

Moore-Love: Tentatively accept changes to the economic opportunities analysis prepared by staff dated March 2016. This motion includes direction to staff to update any tables and charts consistent with subsequent map amendments we may make today or on May 5th, and bring back appropriate findings and the updated EOA for consideration on May 25th. The Council will vote again on the ordinance to accept the final version on June 15th.

Hales: Is there a second?

Fritz: Second.

Hales: Alright, discussion or presentation? Wanna walk us through this -- what changes we are making to the EOA by this?

Engstrom: The primary change was based on the work session earlier last month to reformat and readjust the document to account for the amendments that were on the table to employment-related land, and then also reorient the document to strive for the medium range commodity forecast rather than the low. So, the version before you has been adjusted to do that. Also, I believe that Commissioner Fritz's request has incorporated some changes related to how we referred to the decision on West Hayden Island.

Fritz: If I might just read that partly to gloat and partly so people at home know what it is? It says the plan accommodates the medium cargo forecast for 150 acres of marine terminal land demand by 2035 without annexation and industrial development at West Hayden Island. And then it further says, the medium cargo forecast of 150 acres will be met in the existing harbor access land's geography described in EOA sections one to two. Also, an additional 50 acres or more of industrially-zoned land is potentially available to support marine terminal development that lies just outside of the harbor access lands geography. West Hayden Island is not relied upon to meet future demand for marine terminals in the next 20 years.

Hales: That's very clear.

Fritz: That's important because there is a commitment to keep looking at the industrial lands, as required by the state and so we want to be very clear that the direction of the Comprehensive Plan is not to be developing West Hayden Island.

Hales: Other questions, discussion before we take action on this amendment? We don't have to take testimony at this point because we took testimony before, right? So, we don't break for anything other than our own discussion at this point. OK, so, are we ready to take a vote on this amendment?

Saltzman: I guess -- I am curious, it seems like there's -- I thought we had a 16-acre surplus for industrial lands and if we take Broadmoor out, that puts us in a deficit. And if we keep Riverside out. So, yeah, what happens?

Engstrom: The current language as written -- that's partly why we worded the amendment to refer to subsequent changes you make because we're gonna have to update the tables that are in the document once you've made your subsequent map amendments. But where the starting point is in this draft is assuming Riverside coming out and Broadmoor goes on

April 28, 2016

and we will adjust those tables accordingly. The outcome kind of depends on the combination of votes you make on those different individual parcels.

Saltzman: So if we end up passing a comp plan that has a deficit of industrial lands, does that mean LUBA will remand it to us?

Engstrom: We would raise that to you before you get to that point and then talk that through.

Fritz: Because there are other decisions that aren't -- industrial lands that are not on the river, too. There's the ones in northwest and some of the other ones that would also factor into that.

Saltzman: Thanks.

Hales: OK, any other questions? Ready to take action? OK, roll call please on amendment number one on today's agenda.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: Now, next motion. I move to amend the citywide systems plan as described on page 112 of the March 18th amendment report. I don't know if there's any need to describe that any further than that, right?

Engstrom: Just a reminder the citywide system plan is a companion document to the comp plan and it is where the infrastructure planning documents are that support the land use.

Hales: And that doesn't include the TSP, right?

Engstrom: You'll take a separate vote on the TSP --

Hales: Second vote on the TSP later on in the process, right? 'Cause obviously there are still some questions about projects in the TSP that we got a lot of testimony about.

Fritz: Just for folks watching at home, the changes in this one truly are minor, such as changing "wastewater collection system" to "wastewater treatment system" and the bulleting and such and adding an "and" here or there. I appreciate the attention to detail of staff.

Hales: OK, any other questions or concerns? Let's please take a vote on that motion.

Moore-Love: Sorry, who seconded?

Fritz: I'll second.

Hales: Sorry. Thank you.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: Now we're on to minor map amendments. The first of these is a motion. Move to adopt the minor map amendments list for Northwest and Southwest Portland. These items are on pages 52 and -- sorry, 54 and 92 of the March 18th amendment report. Is there a second?

Saltzman: Second.

Hales: Let's take a moment to look at those if anybody else needs a refresher like I do.

Fritz: Just for each of these, for folks who might be watching at home wondering when theirs comes up, maybe you could just read the map ID list? Would that work for making sure that people know whether we've covered their stuff or not?

Engstrom: Sure. This includes, as was mentioned, both Northwest and Southwest Portland. And I could have it on the screen. It includes amendments B116, B89, B96, B95, B118 and B90.

Fritz: Thank you.

Hales: Any further concerns or discussion on those minor amendments? In northwest and southwest. OK. Let take a vote please on that motion.

Fritz: You've moved them already?

April 28, 2016

Hales: I did.

Fritz: OK.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: Now, more minor map amendments. These in parts of northeast. So, I move to adopt the minor map amendments list prepared by staff for North and Northeast Portland. These items are on pages 58 and 65 to 66 of the amendment report. This excludes item B21 on NE 84th, which has been pulled for individual consideration. Is there a second?

Saltzman: Second.

Engstrom: Want me to read those again, then?

Hales: Yes, please.

Engstrom: In North Portland, it was amendment B106, B16, B19, B20 and B115. And in Northeast Portland, it's a slightly longer list -- B103, B105, B36, B67, B26, B49, and B27.

Hales: So, a lot of these were split parcels, right? Not all of them, but a lot of them were.

Engstrom: Split designations and nonconforming densities is the theme of these minor amendments. B30, B35, B32, B33, B65, B66, B73 and B74.

Hales: OK. And you pulled 84, which we'll take up -- I'm sorry, B21 on NE 84th we'll take up for individual consideration because there's still a dispute about what the designation should be?

Engstrom: I think one of your colleagues has an amendment to offer to that.

Hales: Alright. So, does anyone have others they want to pull off or any other concerns before we take action on this package?

Fritz: The issue with B21 is that we received a request for an adjacent lot to be included.

Hales: That's right, yeah. That's right, OK. Alright, any further discussion or concerns? Let's take a vote, please, on this motion.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: OK. Now, a motion to -- I move to adopt the minor map amendments list prepared for staff in East and Southeast Portland. These items are pages 70 to 71 and 81 to 85 of the March 18th amendment report. Is there a second?

Fritz: Second.

Hales: OK. Anyone want to pull anything off that list?

Engstrom: Read that, if you'd like. This is a longer list. Starting with the east, it's B3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 45, 13, and 117, and those were all in East Portland. And then moving to inner Southeast Portland is 68, 106, 108 -- sorry, 107 -- 43-1, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 87, 69, 40, M41, M56, B80, B31, 39, 75, 76, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 97, 98, 109, 110, 113, 114, 77, 38, 104, 99, 100, 101. And again, those were mostly split lots that we're correcting or some nonconforming densities and a few open space corrections and adjustments to incorporate land at the adjusted urban services boundary.

Hales: Huh, OK. I just noticed one of these and was surprised. Waverly Country Club we're designating as open space?

Engstrom: As part of our negotiation to adjust the urban services boundary to -- as part of periodic review, we work with other budding jurisdictions to adjust that service line. The service line reflects the area of land where we are able to provide urban services and possibly annexation. And Waverly is receiving sewer service from the City of Portland and as part of that negotiation from Milwaukie, it was discussed to shift that within our urban services boundary although there's no annexation proposal.

Hales: But they could annex now.

Engstrom: They could.

April 28, 2016

Hales: OK. Yeah, there were some other parcels along the Clackamas County line with Portland that I discussed with the Mayor of Milwaukie and City staff. I think we've rectified all those, or?

Engstrom: Yeah, and that separate instrument to memorialize that agreement will come before you some time in the next three to six months for your ratification. If in the event it changes further after today, we can include an accompanying amendment to these designations.

Fritz: You'll notice, Mayor, that B104 is to remove Elk Rock Island from the urban services boundary.

Hales: Yes, that was another point of discussion in that meeting.

Engstrom: That's a City-owned property but it's currently within Milwaukie.

Hales: Good, I'm glad we're making both of those right. Other questions, concerns, points to ponder here? Let's take a vote on that motion, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: We'll send the deed to Milwaukie now -- to their island.

Fritz: Not yet --

Engstrom: You still own it.

Fritz: We haven't got there yet, we're working on it.

Hales: [laughs] Looking forward to that. We're going move on to minor policy amendments and errata. Not that we ever make a mistake around here, but we did. I move to adopt the minor policy amendments and staff errata list. Karla, would you please read that description?

Moore-Love: This includes the policy errata identified on the November 13th, 2015 errata memo from staff and following amendments. P-4, 6-7, 10, 12 through 14, 17 through 19, 22, 22-67, 29, 31, 53 through 54, 61 through 67, 69, 74, 76 through 83, 86 through 88, 92 to 93, 95, 97, 100, 102 to 103, 104, and 107 to 109. This also includes changes to table 10-1 as described in item six of the Mayor's April 11 memo.

Hales: Second to that?

Novick: Second.

Hales: Any discussion?

Fritz: Hang on just one second, because on 67, the way I amended it wasn't quite what was written here so let me just look at that.

Throughout the document, colleagues, I've been really concerned about the use of the word "ensure" which we should only say we're going to ensure something if we can actually do it. So, my amendment had taken out that word. But yeah, we should be ensuring that it minimizes, it doesn't say that we're gonna -- it says when aggregate resources are developed, ensure that development minimizes adverse environmental impacts and impacts on adjacent land uses. And through zoning code and other, we should be able to ensure that -- the minimization. We can't ensure the complete avoidance, but we can ensure the minimization. So, that's OK. Thank you.

Hales: Other questions, concerns about this one? Let's take a vote --

Fritz: Oh, there's one more. So, on number 76, right-of-way vacations. That actually needs to get pulled because it depends on our other -- our discussion as far as -- so, what it says now is maintain rights-of-way if there's an established or future need for them, such as for transportation facilities or other public functions as established in policies 8.3828.43.

I had asked for consideration of adding another public function as part of the list of the rights-of-way which involved parking. So, I'd like to pull that one so that we can add it to couple with your decision later on whether you agree with me that we should, when considering street vacations, look at whether it's used for parking or other functions.

April 28, 2016

Hales: Alright, good catch. We'll pull number 76 from the package that we're now considering and take that up separately. Any others like that? I don't think I have any.

Fritz: Give me a second. The bulk of the work that I've been doing for the last six months is here, I think.

Hales: Yeah, there's a lot on this list. Right.

Fritz: Again, it gives me great joy to see many of these changes we worked really hard on.

Kathryn Beaumont, Chief Deputy City Attorney: Mayor Hales -- it's me. Hi.

Hales: A disembodied voice out there --

Beaumont: I know. Just for purposes of clarity in the record, since you've already moved and seconded the motion as read fully, to include that policy I think you need a friendly amendment and motion to pull that one policy out.

Hales: I'll accept a friendly amendment to my own motion to remove item number 76 which Commissioner Fritz moves and someone seconds.

Fritz: I think it was seconded before --

Saltzman: -- [inaudible]

Hales: So Dan seconds that. We'll amend this item by removing item 76, right? Need to take that vote -- is that what you're saying, Kathryn? OK. So, we'll take the vote, please, to remove item P76 for separate consideration. Roll call on that.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: Aye.

Fritz: This is an adequate birthday gift, thank you very much. Aye.

Hales: We can do better than that. Aye. OK, let's see if there's anything else in that package -- you're right, there's a lot there. Most of the policy items. OK, I think I'm good. Does it look alright, Amanda?

Fritz: Yep. Thank you.

Hales: OK, then let's take a vote please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: OK. Now, next motion -- speaking of get birthday gifts, this is one I'm pretty happy about. I move to adopt the historical preservation policy amendments list. Karla, please read the description.

Moore-Love: This includes the following policy amendments: P20, 21, 28, 30, 34 through 42, and 101. This also includes a modified definition of historic resources as noted and further corrected in the Mayor's April 28 memo, item two.

Fritz: Second.

Hales: OK, yeah. So, this is a whole series of policy strengthenings about historic resources, which I'm very happy to have included. And P33 we're taking up separately, OK.

Fritz: Do we have anything in here about petitioning the state? We got under P35 the policy 4.55 within statutory requirements for owner consent. Is there anywhere in the plan that says could we work to get rid of some of the restriction that we have from the state?

Engstrom: Not to my knowledge yet.

Fritz: So, we might want to pull that one.

Hales: Which one are you looking at?

Fritz: It's on page 31, P35, policy 4.45. It's your --

Hales: Right. Within statutory requirements for owner consent. Right. Yeah, we had discussed whether -- [trails off]

Fritz: Could we end -- what's the amendment process here? I can add an amendment on the fly.

April 28, 2016

Hales: Can we?

Fritz: So, could we add another sentence that would say, “work to strengthen state protections for historic resources”?

Hales: Hmm. Is that alright?

Engstrom: Yeah, or you could make that a separate policy. There’s a number of policies that in the historic section refer to the statutory limitations, so it might make sense to have a separate one that says work to strengthen --

Fritz: Yeah.

Hales: Alright. Instead of amending this, why don’t you craft that as an additional policy, bring it back, and we’ll consider it separately? But I think it’s a good idea.

Fritz: Thank you.

Hales: OK. Anyone have any concerns or further questions about this package? If not, then let’s take a vote, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye.

Hales: A very enthusiastic aye. OK, alright, now we’re gonna move on to transportation. I move to adopt the transportation policy amendments list. Karla, would you please read the description?

Moore-Love: This includes the following policy amendments: P16, 23, 24, 25, P89 as further amended by the Fritz memo dated April 13th, P96, and 98.

Hales: Is there a second?

Fritz: Second.

Novick: Mayor, I would move to pull P96 for separate consideration, although it might be fairly brief consideration. Transit funding.

Hales: P96.

Novick: This is Commissioner Fritz’s amendment, new policy after 925 on transit funding.

Fritz: Where’s that?

Hales: You want to pull that one and do some work on it?

Novick: Yes.

Hales: OK. So, Commissioner Novick moves to pull P96 from the package. Is there a second?

Saltzman: Second.

Hales: Roll call do that.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Fritz: I can’t find it.

Hales: It’s on page 39. So, we’ll get back to it.

Fritz: OK.

Hales: Any others in this group? Steve, are you comfortable with all these? I assume you are. I think most of them were yours.

Fritz: Give me a minute here, please.

Hales: Yeah, no, that’s fine. No hurry. The document is going to be around for a couple of decades, take all the time you need.

Fritz: Exactly. So, it doesn’t include drive-thrus --

Hales: No, the drive-thru is pulled out --

Fritz: -- parking.

Hales: 23 is --

Fritz: Wait a minute -- oh, so, yes. P24. PBOT had had some concerns about my proposed language -- this is on western neighborhood trails. I had suggested, “develop pedestrian-oriented greenways and enhance the western neighborhood’s distinct system

April 28, 2016

of trails to increased safety, expand mobility, access to nature, and active living opportunities.” We need to change the word “greenways” because PBOT is concerned that means specifically bikeways, and that’s not what I was intending. How about --

Beaumont: Paths?

Hales: Pathways? All pathways are pedestrian-oriented.

Fritz: How about “connections”? “Develop pedestrian-oriented connections and enhance the system of trails.” Does that work?

Novick: Wait a minute, which amendment is this?

Hales: This is P24. It’s on page 17.

Engstrom: We have PBOT staff here if you’d like help with that.

Fritz: Yeah, Courtney, help us.

Hales: Any thoughts about that?

Fritz: The goal was to recognize that in some of the southwest neighborhoods, biking is really difficult and we don’t want to lose the fact that we may have pedestrian trails that are not recreational.

Courtney Duke, Portland Bureau of Transportation: [inaudible] -- pedestrian connections or paths are fine. We were just concerned that the greenway definition and the greenway report and the rest of the document was more specific to bikeways with some ped. So, I liked what you had said about pedestrian connections.

Fritz: OK, thank you.

Novick: Commissioner, I’m informed that actually we meant to pull this.

Fritz: That’s what I’m --

Duke: That’s what she’s doing.

Fritz: That’s why you meant to pull it.

Duke: Yeah.

Novick: OK.

Hales: OK. So, does that word solve the problem, do you think?

Duke: I think it does -- unless you’d talk about it more, Commissioner Novick.

Saltzman: I guess I’d like to pull for further consideration the off-street parking language Commissioner Fritz has proposed in her April 13th memo.

Hales: OK, well hang on, we’ll get to that in a second --

Saltzman: Oh, OK.

Hales: So, I’m going to accept the change of the word “connections” as a friendly amendment. We don’t have to take formal action on that. So then, which one are you talking about, Dan?

Saltzman: Policy 1.97, off-street parking, the amendment proposed by Commissioner Fritz in her April 13th --

Hales: OK, where does that show up --

Engstrom: I think parking has already been pre pulled, and it’s on the list that’s -- it’s not part of the list.

Hales: It’s not part of this package.

Saltzman: Oh, it’s not? Oh, OK.

Hales: OK, there you go. That doesn’t include that one --

Saltzman: Considered later.

Hales: Yeah, it does not include that one --

Fritz: I want to talk about it, too.

Hales: Yeah, OK.

Fritz: So, could I ask a clarification on P23 about eastern neighborhood -- neighborhood site development? It says require this land be aggregated into larger site before land

April 28, 2016

divisions and other redevelopment occurs, and then require site plans which advance design. I'm not quite sure what this is saying.

Hales: Well, the purpose of this was to disincentivize flag lots and other peculiar site design arrangements that don't do much for street life and connectivity, which is something that is a particular problem in East Portland because of an incomplete street grid. And so, this was saying there are going to be situations in which site development might be technically possible under the zoning code, but there's gonna be encouragement to go ahead and aggregate additional sites to make the project more coherent.

Fritz: But if they don't own the other sites --

Hales: Right. That's why we can't require that they --

Fritz: But that's what the policy says, is require.

Hales: Oh --

Fritz: So, I wanna -- could you change it to "consider whether land could be aggregated"?

Hales: Yeah, we did use the word require. Refresh my memory.

Engstrom: We have in some plan districts had a requirement for that and so what it does do is block an individual property owner from subdividing until there's a larger contiguous set of parcel --

Hales: We had intended to require and we can require, right?

Engstrom: In Pleasant Valley, that's a requirement now. The idea was to apply that requirement in --

Hales: That's right, we did it by plan district before, but we haven't done it -- we didn't do it in the outer southeast community plan or anywhere else. Thank you.

Engstrom: There's a relief valve in the sense that you can also redevelop without a land division through other mechanisms.

Fritz: It says in other redevelopment in this policy. Should we pull this one and think about it? That might be the --

Hales: OK, yeah. I think it is trying to carry out real change here, not just showing what we are doing. So, Commissioner Fritz moves and I'll second that we pull item P23 for separate consideration. Take a vote on that, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: OK.

Fritz: Alright, that's -- [trails off]

Hales: Alright, so drive-thrus, parking -- those are all gonna be considered separately.

Fritz: So, for P89, goal 9A, Commissioner Novick and I had talked about amended language. Because that one was not -- so let's just clarify. When we have a packet like this, even if staff is recommending no change, are we saying that we accept recommendation or that we accept the amendment?

Engstrom: This I think is a staff error here. What I should have written is as amended through your further -- yeah, because the item on page 49 of this packet is the actual print, the text of your further amendment to that. And I forgot to reference it in this description.

Fritz: 49 is --

Hales: 49 of today's agenda packet.

Engstrom: Yeah, so that includes the policies that we were just talking about. Goal 9A I think is what you were talking about. Commissioner Fritz, you had proposed an amendment to the language there that's right below it from your memo on April 13th.

Fritz: Right.

Engstrom: So I think what you want to do is make it clear that you're deciding to incorporate that second version, not the first version.

Fritz: I'm not sure what everybody else has.

April 28, 2016

Hales: I assume we all have the same language, which has been significantly amended. It says, the City achieves the standard of zero traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries. This is achieved through engineering, education, enforcement, and evaluation.

Novick: Although, the word "equity" was supposed to be added before "engineering."

Fritz: Correct.

Engstrom: It is added in that.

Beaumont: In the second box.

Fritz: That's the modification. That's what we're --

Engstrom: The second box is the one that says item four from Fritz memo dated April 13th is I believe the most recent version.

Fritz: Right. So, just a bigger picture question -- where there's an amendment on the table and staff recommends no change, if we vote aye on the notion accept, am I voting to accept the amendment or am I voting to accept staff recommendation?

Engstrom: The amendment.

Fritz: OK. That's helpful, thank you.

Engstrom: And staff supports the revised version, just for the record.

Fritz: For this particular one. This is a helpful clarification before we get too much further down the line.

Hales: Right. So that will be the standard, then.

Engstrom: And the standard should be whenever I've encountered an item that has been amended, I should have note it in the motion myself, but I failed to do that in this case. That's part of the confusion.

Anderson: This is why we're starting with these instead of some of the heavy hitters.

Hales: Good idea. So, any concerns for the rest of this?

Fritz: Give me a minute. I think I'm good.

Hales: OK. So, having pulled P23 and added a word or changed a word in P24, let's take a vote --

Fritz: And pulled 96 as well.

Hales: And pulled 96 as well, thank you. Let's take a vote on the rest of that package as revised.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: Now, I move to adopt the economic policy amendments list. Karla, please read the description.

Moore-Love: This includes the policy amendments P43 as amended in item two of the Mayor's April 11 memo, P44, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, and 84. This also includes changes to policy 6.6 as noted in item five of the Mayor's April 11 memo.

Hales: Is there a second?

Fritz: Second.

Engstrom: As a housekeeping measure, I just wanted to note that similar to the last one, starting on page 51 is the printout of these individual policies -- 51 of your packet today.

Hales: For that package. You know, I understand the objective, Dan, in your amendment in P44 about providing adequate land supply to accommodate a full spectrum of grocery stores. I don't want to change this, I just wanted to note it. I think it -- I've had some conversations recently with some folks from the grocery industry and this is -- some things are going to have to change for this policy to be realized -- namely, sites they think they have to have. Because I don't think regardless of policy that they're going to be available. Seven-acre sites for grocery stores are not going to be made available by City policy or anything else. So, I mean, it's a challenge.

April 28, 2016

Fritz: Are we setting ourselves up for something like providing enough industrial lands that, since we're not expanding the urban growth boundary, we may not have the capacity to provide?

Hales: Well, I would say not. Because it says provide adequate land supply to accommodate a full spectrum of grocery stores. That does not necessarily -- I mean, maybe it's good to get some of this in the record -- that does not necessarily mean that the development format of past grocery stores is required in order to develop a full spectrum of grocery stores.

Fritz: Right.

Engstrom: That's why staff supported this language. We felt like the policy was good. In practice, it may be in different formats in the future.

Fritz: Yeah. There's a number of different grocery stores that are now going several stories with parking underneath and all those kinds of things.

Hales: Right. The stadium Fred Meyer is kind of an extreme example. You know, there's a new format grocery store. It's still a full spectrum -- it's still at that end of the spectrum of large, one-stop shopping grocery stores, but it's not the same format as Mr. Meyer had in mind when the first was built.

Fritz: Right. That's helpful.

Hales: Alright. Anything else in this package that needs attention? If not, then let's take a vote, please, on this package.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: I wanted specifically to call out my support for strengthening our carbon emissions policy by specifically referencing the role buildings and transportation contribute to our city's carbon emissions. Aye.

Fritz: Aye.

Hales: I'm happy with the carbon provisions here, very much so. Aye. Moving forward. I move to adopt the employment map amendments list. Karla, would you please read that description?

Moore-Love: This includes map amendments B14, B15, B17, B22, M31, M36, M37, M38, M52, M53, M59, M64, M67, and M68.

Hales: As it says here, this bundle does not include M33 or 34, which is Riverside and Broadmoor; S9, which is 122nd's K-mart site; S16, which is Lewis and Clark College; S72, which is Rossi Farm; M47, which is on NW 29th; all of which have been pulled for individual consideration. I also withdrew M49 for the Pepsi Co site in my April 20th memo, so that's also not included. So, look through this to see what is included but it's not those because we'll be talking about those individually.

Engstrom: In the back of your document it starts on page 55 if you want to see the specific items.

Hales: Yes, please. 55. OK.

Fritz: I will note there's a couple of items in this package that does increase the employment capacity. The ESCO site and the post office both allow for more intense employment development. So, that'll help when we get to some the other questions.

Hales: Right, right. And the Adidas campus, as well, I think.

Fritz: Mm-hmm. Yeah, that's significant.

Hales: That's right. What have we done with the post office site with respect to the EOS?

Engstrom: This item refers to the post office near Rossi Farm near 122nd --

Hales: Right, I'm talking about the big post office.

Engstrom: The big post office is part of the Central City Plan, so we have not changed land use on that site with this Comprehensive Plan. That would be taken --

April 28, 2016

Hales: No, I know we haven't changed land uses -- probably CX already, right? But I'm thinking about the economic opportunities analysis. It doesn't change the land inventory but it might change the yield in terms of jobs.

Joe Zehnder, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: And it might just change the location of jobs. We have so much capacity in the central city for employment uses. It's tied more to the forecast than the land supply.

Hales: Yeah, OK. Good. I think that might not be an abstraction much longer. [laughs] Any day now, I think. OK, let's see.

Fritz: Just a question on M67. 4609 to 4615 NE Hoyt. It's retained a multi-dwelling zone on this hospital-owned residential property rather than the new institutional campus. Can you just tell me the reason for that?

Engstrom: That was at the request of the hospital. It's in residential use and would be more easily managed as a residentially zoned property.

Fritz: Thank you.

Hales: Alright. Any other concerns about this package? Has everybody had time to look through the list? I don't remember B15. Multidwelling 2000 to industrial sanctuary.

Engstrom: This is a small property that's Union Pacific property next to the railroad, and it was zoned residential but it's cut off from the residential neighborhood. It's a tiny fragment.

Hales: Ah, OK. Alright, no wonder this was noncontroversial. That makes sense. I don't think it was ever going to have apartments built there.

Engstrom: I think we only gained a thousand square feet of industrial land with that change, though.

Hales: OK. Ready to proceed on this?

Fritz: Second.

Hales: I think there was a second, but thank you --

Fritz: Thanks for keeping track, Kathryn.

Hales: OK. Let's take a vote, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: I particularly want to call out my support for M37, which extends the campus institution designation for the National College of Natural Medicine in southwest with the support of the neighborhood. Aye.

Fritz: Aye.

Hales: Aye. Now, let's move to the map. I move to adopt the mixed use map amendments list. Karla, would you please read that description?

Moore-Love: This includes map amendments B1, B2 as corrected in item nine of Mayor's April 28 memo, M11, S15, M19, M22, M23, M24, B24, M26, M27, M28, M29, B34, B37, M39, M40, M43, M44, M46, M48, M50, M54, M54, F55, M57, M61, F62, M65, M69, M70, and M76.

Hales: There's a lot in this one.

Saltzman: Second.

Hales: Thank you.

Engstrom: Specifics start on page 59 of the same document.

Anderson: I guess I did want to point out just for anyone watching these proceedings at home that this is not the first time you're skimming through these.

Hales: Right --

Anderson: You have had a lot of time, and your staff has spent countless hours with our staff reviewing each one of these items. And so just in case it looks that way, it is absolutely not that way. [laughs]

April 28, 2016

Fritz: I've never been in a hearing like this where there's so much quiet time where we're all reading diligently. I appreciate you saying that, Susan, because for me now I've got my staff's recommendations and I'm looking at every single one to make sure we try to get it right. As was noted earlier, it's possible that we will find that we need to go back and revisit. The Mayor's favorite "measure twice and cut once" I think is very --

Hales: Right, it's always a good idea.

Fritz: I wanted to call out M170 --

Hales: Yeah, I was just looking at that --

Fritz: And that's Hayden Island. This is where the staff recommendation is to change from mixed use disbursed to mixed use neighborhood, which implements a corresponding policy amendment in figures 3.1 and 3.3.

Staff's recommendation is to support with a caveat that a secondary bridge with access to the island is added to the unconstrained portion of the TSP list -- the transportation system plan list. We do that in a separate amendment, right? We did have testimony yesterday from Hayden Island residents concerned about that. And I understand there is an errata from the Mayor to specify that that would be to East Hayden Island and we also wanted to put in the record to explore the possibility of it being transit, pedestrians, and bikes only. That would happen in the next design phase.

Hales: I agree with all that. Yeah, that was good testimony and the point is access to the island, not one more way to get in the queue to go north on I-5.

Fritz: Correct. And also, that it -- although the Hayden Island plan identified a bridge to West Hayden Island, that was when both the Columbia River Crossing and the terminal were being considered. And so, when funds ever are available for this, we'll have to go back and revisit the Hayden Island plan as well.

Hales: Yeah. I disagreed with some of the testimony we heard on this issue, but maybe that's a fairly minor disagreement, which is about the intensity of development. But as mixed use neighborhood, this allows potentially five-story buildings -- yeah. Which to me, for a scenario of redevelopment in that strip mall portion of East Hayden Island, is appropriate.

Zehnder: And then the East Hayden Island planned originally -- we didn't have that neighborhood designation yet, but what was described in there pretty much matches it, honestly -- that level of development in that mix.

Engstrom: I would also note that staff's concern about access is also related to emergency access. That's one of the biggest issues for new development out there. So in terms of exploring what modes are considered in the future, we should include emergency access.

Hales: Yes. So, as heard in another presentation yesterday, a pedestrian and bicycle bridge can also accommodate the emergency access. That is possible. OK. Any other concerns about this package? Anyone need more time to look through? There's a lot in this one. I'm satisfied with this package, I think it's good. Let's take a vote please on this package.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Novick: Mayor, may I interrupt the procedures for a brief and somewhat subdued celebration of the slightly improved revenue forecast?

Hales: Yes. Yeah, there is a slightly improved revenue forecast.

Fritz: Not the humungous Saltzman bump we were hoping for?

Hales: No, the Saltzman rule is this is a La Niña year instead of an El Niño year. So, I don't have the numbers in my head but it's a modest improvement in the ongoing and almost no improvement in the one-time, mainly because Josh Harwood pretty much nailed

April 28, 2016

it the first time. So it's not that economic conditions have degraded, it's that he was fairly aggressive in his previous forecast and he was about aggressive enough. So, makes our task -- doesn't make our task any harder but doesn't make it a lot easier. Yeah, it's still a good forecast. We all remember budgets that were nowhere near this well-supported. So, good situation.

OK. Let's move on to the next item which is number 12. I move to adopt the residential map amendments list. Karla, would you please read that description?

Moore-Love: This includes map amendments B4, M21, B23, N24, B25, M25, N25, M30, M32, B42, M51, M60, M62, M63, F68, B70, F71, B71, B72, M75, B78, F81, B86, B88, B91, B93, B94, B119, B120 and B121.

Hales: Again, there's a lot here so let's take a few minutes to look through. It's important to note we've got a lot of testimony on some other proposed amendments which this bundle does not include -- namely S12, which is 17th and Insley; M14, which is 6141 Canyon Court; 518, which is 4345 SW Humphrey; 15 which is 822 SE 15th; S21, which is a large area of Buckman; S22, which is 1910 SE Stark; M45 and 71, which are like the 60th Avenue; M58, which is SW Main and St. Clair; M74, which is Eastmoreland; B92, which is SW 25th. So, a lot of those have had a lot of public input. Those are going to be considered individually. Is there a second?

Fritz: Second.

Hales: Let's take a look.

Fritz: I'd like to just comment on a couple of these amendments I'm supporting. There's M75, which is changing a single dwelling 2.5 zoning within Eastmoreland to single dwelling 5000 square foot, which is R5. That's on Woodstock and Chavez. The reason I'm supporting that is because nearby, we had a land use case where it wasn't feasible or reasonable to put the 2.5 density and that kind of called into question that area.

And secondly, B88, which is in Eastmoreland again, and that is being proposed for downzoning from single dwelling 5000 to single dwelling 7000. These two specific sites are where staff analysis shows that the downzoning is appropriate and will better manage both traffic and development in the area and result in better development. And throughout the plan, there was various downzonings for hazards, there's downzonings for better neighborhood balance and with really good rationale that's supported in documentation for that support beyond whether neighbors would like a different zone or not. So, that's why I'm supporting these two particular changes in the zoning and I won't be supporting the more widespread downzoning that some have been requesting. Of course, others' votes on this doesn't prejudge what their vote on the pulled items might be.

Hales: OK, we can all rest easy, the Terwilliger Plaza amendment is in here. It's a tough crowd.

You know, we could have probably saved ourselves some trouble because there's this boilerplate language in the staff analysis box that says, you know, East Burnside is expected to be over capacity at this location in 2035 during the p.m. peak. We could have put one box in it in the beginning that says all streets are expected to be over capacity in 2035 --

Fritz: [laughs] Right.

Hales: [laughs] It's important to note that that caveat is in place in many cases, but that is not driving our decision-making and that's very good. Places that are designed for street capacity are not good places.

Engstrom: I would add also that sometimes that note appears where you're down designating and so are hopefully making it a little better.

Hales: Yeah, in some cases. OK, this package looks good to me. Anyone else have questions, concerns, or need a little more time? If not let's take a vote, please.

April 28, 2016

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: Really appreciate staff's work on this. Aye.

Fritz: Aye.

Hales: Aye. OK, now we're going to move to the transportation system plan. I move to adopt the TSP project list amendments. Karla, please read the description.

Moore-Love: This includes the amendments from Commissioner Novick and the Mayor listed on pages 100 through 110 of the March 18th amendment report as well as the TSP errata on page 111. This also includes the clarification noted in item 10 of the Mayor's April 28th memo clarifying that the Hayden Island bridge is to commercial area on East Hayden Island, not to the Port's West Hayden Island property.

Hales: Is there a second?

Fritz: Second. I'm not sure that I have your memo from today, Mayor.

Hales: Yeah, I'm looking for the background material for this section here because it's not in your packets.

Engstrom: I'm sorry -- you have to go back to the 18th document. It's a large set of spreadsheets at the back of the document.

Hales: Starting on page what?

Engstrom: Starting on page 100 of Commissioner Novick's amendments to the transportation project list, and then your own amendments are on page 110.

Hales: OK. Wow, it's a good thing Commissioner Fish isn't here to note the typeface. [laughter] That's good, I'm glad we're taking that out of there. We're taking out extending the streetcar from OMSI station to Moody via the Tilikum bridge. It's done.

Engstrom: A number of the changes were because we finished the project.

Fritz: Where --

Hales: This all starts on page 100, yeah.

Fritz: I don't have a page 100.

Hales: It's in this one.

Fritz: Oh, OK. Got it.

Hales: So anything else noteworthy here, Eric, that you might want to point out?

Engstrom: There were a couple themes here. One theme you already noted, which is to remove projects that are completed. I think we're also removing the bridge itself now that it's done. There are a couple projects in residential areas that were removed because of lack of local support as we were fine-tuning.

And then another category was there were a few projects that were broken into smaller pieces so that an earlier phase could be built earlier and get more done quicker.

Hales: Now, the NE 7th Avenue neighborhood greenway is here, right? In this list?

Fritz: It says 9th.

Hales: Right, 7th slash 9th. We got a lot of testimony about that. I had some questions about that, so I'm not sure if I'm toward take action on that one.

Fritz: I'd like some clarification because it's got 9th in as a project as well as 7th as a project.

Hales: Courtney, do you want to help us out with that?

Duke: I can try. There's both a project in the TSP list related to 7th and 9th. And then at Planning Commission right now is incorporating the bike master plan into the Comprehensive Plan. So, there's been some testimony that I think is both related to the classifications of 7th and 9th that is actually at Planning Commission right now, as well as concerns or questions about how to actually build the facility on 7th and 9th. That's how I've interpreted the testimony, others can let me know if they have read that same.

April 28, 2016

We put in the 7th and 9th as a project in the TSP because of a variety of reasons. And then again, we are making changes to the clarifications in the next stage of the transportation system plan that's at Planning Commission. Generally, we've talked about -- and I believe have briefed with some people with -- is that when we actually design and build the 7th and 9th, there will be a lot of decisions made about exactly what that looks like where it goes, how wide things are, where striping is. And there's a public process and public involvement component of that design. And so, I believe that we have decided related to what we're at Planning Commission is to leave it as is in the classification description, which I believe is 9th.

Fritz: Well, there's two different projects listed. There's one that's listed just for 9th and there's one that's listed for 7th and 9th.

Duke: Right. And so I think we've left that in to have that flexibility for when we actually get any funding to be able to decide where that goes.

Fritz: So we're officially not deciding now.

Duke: That is my understanding, right --

Hales: When do we officially decide that?

Duke: I believe when the gas tax passes and we have gas tax money to actually build the project. [laughter]

Engstrom: Typically, at the project description stage at this level, the project doesn't necessarily need to pick exactly what street it's on.

Duke: Correct.

Engstrom: Sometimes, projects are whole corridors that have their own planning process to figure out their final alignment.

Duke: Similar to the 20s and 50s and 70s bikeway --

Engstrom: Right.

Duke: -- it's a similar conversation that we had and that's the same when the bike master plan was developed in 2010 about looking at 7th and 9th as a corridor. I think that's why we put it in the project list as both, and then we're looking at classifying one at a higher level. But again, design can be decided -- the classification is important in terms of its design but it will not be the only dictation as to how it's built and how it's designed.

Novick: Courtney, the project on 40116, where I think we have most of the testimony, the project name is NE 7th/9th, which seems to leave it open, and the project description is "design and implement a neighborhood greenway" which seems to leave it open, but the project location description says "7th Avenue from Weidler to Sumner Street, 9th Avenue from Sumner to Holman" which it makes it sound like we are deciding exactly how it runs. Or am I misunderstanding?

Duke: I think it's giving a generalized description of where it could go on either street.

Fritz: But then there's 20122, which is just 9th --

Hales: [sneezes] -- excuse me --

Duke: [inaudible] -- sorry, I'm just trying to find that exact language.

Fritz: Should we maybe pull this until later?

Duke: That's fine with us. I mean, we --

Hales: Let's do that -- [speaking simultaneously]

Duke: [indistinguishable] -- and there's people much more versed in the design and the decision making about 7th and 9th than I am.

Hales: I don't think we need to pre design the projects here, but I do want to make sure I understand what possibilities we've positioned it for --

Duke: Agreed. That's fine.

Hales: -- based on the testimony. So, Commissioner Fritz moves and I'll second pulling that one out of the package there.

April 28, 2016

Fritz: Well, both of them --

Novick: 20122 and 4016 --

Hales: Yes, both of those. Thank you. Roll call to pull those two out for second consideration? They can be together when they come.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Fritz: And then there are separate items on the Sullivan's Gulch trail and Brad Perkins testified yesterday we never actually put it on the map. Is that correct? Are we adding it to the map now?

Engstrom: The project list doesn't change the zoning map in terms of development review requirements, it's just a funding list. So, the separate action of classifying and putting the little stars on the zoning map that signify a trail is still at the Planning Commission.

Fritz: So, it's coming. We know we're getting there.

Engstrom: And he's been at that commission, too.

Fritz: Got it. Good, thank you.

Engstrom: Commissioner Fritz, did you want to add the language to the Mayor's Hayden Island bridge description to explore the feasibility of transit and bicycle emphasis?

Fritz: Please.

Hales: OK, I'll consider that a friendly amendment and add that language. Slightly off topic, but, Steve, I assume the wonderful Sullivan's Gulch bridge project that was at Council yesterday is already accommodated in the list and the map? Must be.

Novick: That's a darn good question. Have we quickly added that to the list?

Duke: I believe that is in our proposal that's at Planning Commission right now in terms of adding those classifications, but we can confirm that and if that's something you want to hold off until May 11th to talk about, we can have clarification. I believe the answer is yes --

Hales: Let's just check.

Duke: OK, we can check.

Engstrom: And a reminder that these are just the amendments to the list --

Hales: Right, so if it's already there, it's fine.

Duke: We believe it's there but we'll double-check.

Hales: Yeah, I'm assuming it's already there if we're that far down the road to designing it.

Zehnder: It's been there for a while, actually.

Hales: I think it's just a fantastic project. OK. Anyone have any more questions or items to pull or need more time to look through this? I think I'm good. Alright, then let's take a vote please on that package.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: OK. Now, I'm going move into this list of individual items, right? Is that where we go next, Eric? To item 14?

Engstrom: Right. So, you're moving now from the bundles into the individual items and so those policies as we go or the map descriptions are just printed right under each item.

Hales: OK, so it's just a matter of I move amendment number 14, is that it?

Engstrom: These are just the language as they existed when they were pulled, so I think the Commissioner who wanted to pull these should probably offer the --

Hales: Oh I see, they were pulled out.

Engstrom: They were pulled out, so the Commissioner who pulled it should probably offer what the interest is and there should be some discussion of how you're changing it.

Hales: Commissioner Novick, then you have the floor to talk about item number 14, which is the prioritization.

April 28, 2016

Novick: Well, first of all, I'd like to thank my colleagues and especially Commissioner Fish for working with me and the disability elder rights community to move the ADA language to a separate policy where it fits better.

There's one amendment I'd like to make this this, which is on the fourth and final bullet point on the next second page, there's a language that says, "rationale is provided if modes lower in the hierarchy are prioritized" and the words "policy based" were there and I'd like to restore them. So, I'd like to move to amend this to restore the words "policy based" in that fourth bullet point.

Hales: Second that. Anybody know why they were removed?

Duke: Just a typo in the process of working on everything. Things got crossed off and added.

Fritz: What would be a non-policy based rationale? [laughter]

Duke: [laughs] Agreed, but we got a number of comments that people wanted to make sure we said policy basis in there.

Engstrom: A non-policy based would be engineering or something.

Duke: Engineering or we made it up, I guess. I don't know. [laughs]

Hales: Alright. Let's take a vote on that amendment, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: Aye.

Fritz: I appreciate the discussion with Commissioner Novick and have become convinced that the prioritization and the ordered list is correct. Aye.

Hales: Aye. All we've done sort of is add back the word "policy-based" I think. Anything else we need to change in this? I like it. OK. So then let's take a vote, please, on policy 9.6 as printed and further amended today.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: Woo-hoo! Aye. [laughter]

Fritz: Aye.

Hales: Aye. Good work. Policy 8.3. Commissioner Fritz?

Fritz: 43, I think. So, this one is about commercial uses and I want to further amend it. I wanted to add language that said restrict the size of signage in the right-of-way, not commercial signage. I wanted to delete "commercial" because obviously we can't discriminate based on content. This is billboards and large moving image signs, Mayor.

Hales: Yeah. Are they -- they're not always in the right-of-way of course, but that's where this policy applies, right?

Fritz: That's a really good point. Maybe we just have to say this policy -- hmm --

Engstrom: This policy is in the public facilities chapter and the right-of-way section, so it really is about --

Fritz: We may need to have it somewhere else as well.

Hales: Yeah, OK. But you'd like to remove the word "commercial"?

Fritz: Yeah, and have the amendment say, "restrict the size of signage in the right-of-way."

Hales: I'll accept that as a friendly and I'll second that. So, that actually is very helpful because one of the perpetrators of bad performance on this issue is the City of Portland with some signs that we happen to own at the Rose Quarter. So, I'm glad you mentioned that. That will make them contrary to policy, which is a good start at getting rid of them.

Novick: Without wanting to put you in an awkward position, what I understand is that BPS staff would still, even after the deletion of the word "commercial," recommend against this amendment?

April 28, 2016

Engstrom: I think our initial reaction was there is a whole separate sign code that's outside of the land use code. But the biggest concern was stepping on the commercial constitutional issue.

Fritz: Thank you.

Saltzman: Taking out the word --

Hales: We're taking out the word "commercial." Further discussion about 8.43 as amended with the removal of that one word? Let's take a vote, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: Number 16 is a couple of changes requested for emphasis on air quality. So, there's a recommended change to policy 4.36 regarding diesel emissions that said, diesel emissions, encourage best practices to reduce diesel emissions and related impacts when considering land use and public facilities that won't increase truck or train traffic, and added language after that saying advocate for state legislation to accelerate replacement of older diesel engines.

And then policy 7.5, air quality, which said improve or support efforts to improve air quality through plans and investments, including reducing exposure to air toxics, criteria pollutants, and urban heat island effects. Consider the impacts of air quality on the health of all Portlanders and new language added that says coordinate with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality to incorporate up-to-date air quality information and best practices into planning and investment decisions. OK. So any comment, questions about this? Concerns?

Engstrom: I think this is one where, as far as I know, there are not further amendments to this language but it had been pulled to be able to discuss.

Hales: Very timely. Probably won't be a short-term phenomenon, even though it's very timely right now. OK, so do we take these as separate votes here on these two or just take amendment 16 as a package? I'll move amendment 16 as a package.

Fritz: Second.

Hales: Further discussion? Let's take a vote please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: An enthusiastic aye.

Fritz: Obviously, all of this is based on citizen input and there are multiple places where citizens have made a huge difference. I particularly want to call out Tamara DeRidder and the Rose City Park Neighborhood Association being one of several who were absolutely outstanding as part of this process. Aye.

Hales: That is true. Aye.

OK, item 17, which is P33, protect defining features. I was trying to enhance the language here that said -- originally said protect defining features, protect and enhance defining places and features of centers and corridors, including land marks, natural features, historic and cultural resources through application of zoning incentive programs and regulatory tools. So, this was trying to give us more leverage to maintain the built environment for their historic or cultural or natural elements that we want to save. Any further questions or discussion about that?

Fritz: I would just like staff to explain how this would then get implemented, say, in Multnomah Village. How does this language help you in crafting centers and corridors and others that are still unique and respect the history?

Engstrom: Thank you for the question. This is playing out within the mixed use zoning map discussion at the Planning Commission right now. There's a proposal on the table to use a three-story zone rather than the middle density four or five-story zone in some of the

April 28, 2016

oldest corridors or oldest sort of old towns, if you will, of some of our corridors where you have an older usually continuous store front character and where there's a concern about the scale of new development interrupting that scale. And so we've applied that and it's under discussion at the Planning Commission right now.

In Multnomah Village, for example, the CM1 three-story zone was used in that core main street and then the CM2, the middle scale zone, is used sort of on either end of that. So, you have sort of the old town and then an opportunity area for newer growth on either side. That's a form discussion happening with the Planning Commission.

Fritz: Thank you.

Anderson: Also by adding the incentive programs there, there's an opportunity for public-private partnerships that I think in many places throughout the code here we've sort of identified those areas and opportunities.

Hales: OK, further discussion? Is there a second to that motion?

Fritz: Second.

Hales: Roll call, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye.

Novick: Aye.

Fritz: I particularly appreciate your staff, Mayor, and mine working together with staff to get to this, which I think does get to what Multnomah and other neighborhoods were really concerned about. Aye.

Hales: Yeah, this is -- as it gets implemented through the map and the code, this is really important and I think it'll do a lot for the character of those neighborhood main streets. Aye. OK, number 18, campus off-site impacts. Commissioner Novick, you wanna talk about this one?

Novick: Yes, thank you, Mayor. Colleagues, I offer this amendment to a policy governing the new campus institution designation. We've heard concerns about how we will implement efforts to minimize off-site impacts of development, especially through new requirements about using transportation demand land management tools, also known as TDM.

As we grow, TDM will be increasingly important not just for large institutions and campuses, but also in mixed use zones because these tools encourage people to walk, bike, take transit, and carpool whenever possible rather than driving, reducing parking and traffic congestion. I know PBOT has been working to develop policies to include in the TSP prospective TDM. We're monitoring development of this policy. We need to strike the right balance to ensure the policy benefits development and matches the values of the city. I appreciate BPS and PBOT staff that have worked on this policy.

Fritz: Second.

Hales: Moved and seconded. Further discussion about change to policy 6.57? Roll call, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: OK. Number 19, which is an individual map amendment. Commissioner Novick?

Saltzman: Didn't we move a lot of these to the 11th in an earlier vote?

Hales: Right, these are -- we're not doing these today? Or we are?

Engstrom: These are the ones that we preliminary thought we could continue doing today. There's a whole batch that have been moved to the 11th. But if you want to remove any of these to the 11th, feel free to do that.

Saltzman: I thought we did in an earlier vote. I saw a whole bunch of these listed saying they were removed to the 11th.

April 28, 2016

Engstrom: We removed them for individual conversation. Now, we're getting to the --

Hales: Individual consideration -- [speaking simultaneously]

Saltzman: Oh, I construed that to mean the 11th.

Engstrom: If you wanna have that consideration on the 11th, you're free to do that.

Anderson: Part of the issue is the 11th -- you'll look at the last page 76 and 77 in the document, and we have 25 items, about. And many of them -- if you think a lot of those will go fast because you've already discussed them pretty thoroughly, then we can add more on.

Hales: Hmm. Some of those are gonna have a robust discussion.

Saltzman: Yeah.

Anderson: Thought I'd toss that out.

Engstrom: You can pass over any of these you'd like to.

Hales: Yeah, I mean, if there's something -- yeah. I think I may practice this myself. If there's one or more in here where you just want some more time or still would like to delay it until the 11th or otherwise, don't hold back 'cause we gotta be comfortable with the proceeding on these.

Novick: On this particular one, are any of my colleagues undecided as to how they'd vote on it?

Saltzman: Uh, I sorta am.

Hales: You wanna hold this one then, Dan?

Saltzman: I'll ask the sponsor. What's your preference?

Novick: Well, I actually think I was going to back off on this one myself and defer it to BPS. I thought it was appropriate to have a discussion about land that's zoned R20 because R20 is a rather unusual designation. I think it's reasonable always to question whether something should be in an R20 zone in an urban area. Given that there's a request for this change, I thought it was worth having a Council discussion. But now that the idea has been floated and BPS staff still thinks that this is not an appropriate amendment, I was willing to withdraw it. However, I also thought that if I was still for it, I'd be overwhelmed. So, if Commissioner Saltzman wants to think about it further, I wouldn't mind that.

Saltzman: Well, I had some of the same thoughts that Commissioner Novick did. R20 in the middle of the city -- even though this is on the western edge of the city, it's still very much an urbanized area. I guess I disagree it's got poor transit access. I mean, I think testimony showed it's not very far from a bus line -- nor from westside MAX, for that matter -- nor that the services weren't there. I just thought that -- I feel most of the opposition to this really comes from people who don't want other people living near them with their cars and keeping it hard for them to get from point A to point B. So, I guess I'm inclined to think this is R20 in the city in close proximity to services just doesn't make sense.

Hales: The request is to go to R5, right? So it'd be dividable into -- I don't know how big it was, but, some number of R5 lots.

Fritz: The question is, if that's the case, then we should be looking at the whole area. We should not just be looking at one law.

Hales: Well --

Saltzman: I don't know why we're not.

Hales: Talk about that, please. There is not that much undeveloped -- well, that's not true -
-

Saltzman: I don't know if it's a lot of R20 up there.

Hales: I don't know that close to 26 or to Skyline, I'm not sure how much R20 there is.

Engstrom: The zoning pattern on the screen shows the site in black. There's a big -- pretty much all of 61st to the north is R20 for some distance. And it's fairly steep and hilly,

April 28, 2016

and I think that's the rationale. That's also an area where it's outside the city limits but within our zoning jurisdictions. So, our comp plan applies but yet to be annexed along 61st, so that's partly why the R20 is there still.

Hales: There is a weird situation because there's very large multifamily just to the west, right?

Engstrom: Correct.

Hales: Accessed by the same street. Granted, it's not directly on transit, but it's a pretty easy bike ride from there to the zoo stop. Not to mention I think that there is a bus service, Skyline.

Saltzman: Yeah. We heard testimony there was bus service along Skyline.

Hales: So, I guess --

Saltzman: And it's pretty flat compared to the property to the north, relatively speaking -- the R20s.

Hales: Right, this one was flatter.

Engstrom: This is an air photo. There is a water tank across the street.

Hales: Is that our water tank or someone else's?

Engstrom: I believe it's ours. There's also a school to the block to the east. This is a site photo. There's a pretty large retaining wall that separates this site from the Sunset Highway.

Fritz: It actually fronts on a different street.

Engstrom: Really, the only feasible frontage is 61st because --

Hales: Oh, I see, because it's elevated.

Engstrom: -- there's a huge wall --

Hales: Yeah.

Engstrom: But as the testimony pointed out, there are sidewalks on the street below.

Saltzman: So I guess I'm -- in light of this, I'm still inclined to support this.

Hales: I think that I am, too.

Fritz: I'm not.

Hales: Steve, what do you think? Otherwise we might have to delay this. It may be a hung jury here.

Fritz: Well, since it's controversial, maybe it would be good for Commissioner Fish to weigh in --

Novick: Yeah, I don't mind another couple weeks to go back and forth.

Hales: Alright, let's pull this off. Commissioner Fritz moves and I will second that we pull this off for individual consideration. When do we have to do when we do that -- it's not in a package -- we will just delay this and set this over. Let's move onto number 20.

Engstrom: We just went about four blocks to the east from the last site. This is on a forested slope opposite the zoo, essentially. It's got access off of Humphrey, it's a site that has had a number of development proposals over the years, none of which are currently active, I believe. The surrounding sites -- the zoo obviously is zoned open space. The surrounding land is mostly in the R20 category -- again, in this case, because of the slope. There's also a staff concern here about land hazards because it's a pretty steep slope with some history of landslides that go out onto the highway.

Hales: So this was a property owner request, right?

Saltzman: Right.

Hales: And the request was to keep it at R10?

Engstrom: Right. This was within an area of recommended down designations from R10 to R20 due to slope hazards and related issues. This is sort of the inverse of the centers and corridors strategy, which is also to reduce density on some of the most constrained and difficult to develop on sites.

April 28, 2016

Saltzman: So those recommendations -- concerns about the slopes are being raised by the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability?

Engstrom: Yeah, we did an analysis that looked at landslide history and access issues with emergency services and with slopes and landslide hazard, and mapped areas that were far from center and corridors that had these constraints and came up with a package of down designations -- again, with the larger idea of relieving density pressure on these harder to serve locations.

There's areas in outer southeast, south of Foster, there's some areas south along Tryon Creek that were subject to this treatment, and a small area on the south side of Council Crest which is really steep coming above Hillsdale. That's also where this approach was taken. So, there's about a dozen areas of 20 to 50 properties each where we were essentially taking the density down a notch due to these hazard concerns.

Hales: I haven't been down this street to look at this one, but I assume --

Saltzman: It's steep.

Hales: It's usually steep, it goes all the way down to the freeway, but the only development scenario that's even practicable would be to build another house next to the house that's there on Humphrey, right? There's a house on Humphrey.

Engstrom: Yeah, there's a house there. There have been PUD proposals on this site for 15 to 20 lots in the past and that's, I think, the interest of the applicant on this.

Hales: How big is this site? It looks huge.

Saltzman: It's pretty big.

Engstrom: It is pretty big. I don't have the figure in front of me.

Anderson: So, the Bureau of Emergency Management worked with us on this, just so you know that.

Saltzman: Oh, OK. Right.

Anderson: They were the ones that helped us work through all the technical issues.

Hales: Your recommendation is to keep the downzoning 'cause --

Saltzman: Do the downzoning.

Hales: Do the downzoning, keep the downzoning proposal, which takes it from R10 to R20. And that basically says, "We're done there. That house is there but there won't be more."

Engstrom: Even with R20, there are more houses allowed. As you said, it's a pretty big site.

Hales: It's a big enough parcel that they could divide it.

Engstrom: They could still divide it into more than two but wouldn't be as many houses.

Hales: Alright, yeah. One more house or so there properly engineered wouldn't be the end of the world, but eight or ten or 15 is a crazy idea in my opinion -- not having done the geo technical analysis but having seen this.

Saltzman: So, I appreciate -- I did put this forward at the request of the property owner but I appreciate the analysis by Emergency Management and BPS, so I am comfortable with the recommendation of the bureau.

Hales: OK. Anyone else ready to vote on this? Let's take a vote please on amendment 20.
Roll.

Saltzman: Am I voting no?

Hales: You're voting yes, right? Which is it? Oh, no -- so retaining the 10,000 would be going against the staff recommendation.

Engstrom: Yeah, so the amendment was to undo the down designation. So you want to vote no if you want to leave the staff recommendation and yes if you want to adopt R10 zoning.

Saltzman: OK. So, no.

April 28, 2016

Novick: No.

Fritz: That's a nice change -- no.

Hales: No. Maybe the first unanimous "no" vote on this Council. I don't remember another one. I don't think we have ever done that before. [laughs] Alright. So, let's go to 21, 17th and Sherrett.

Engstrom: This one is a couple properties in the vicinity of 17th and Sherrett that we are proposed to essentially widen the mixed use designation at a node there. You have a lot of testimony about this amendment, so that's why we recommended considering it individually. Quite a few neighbors testified against it, as well as the neighborhood association.

Hales: Testified against it.

Engstrom: The specific areas are -- essentially, there is a mixed use corridor on 17th already and this would take that mixed use zoning another half block on both sides of that node.

Fritz: There's not really any point in having mixed used zoning if you don't have a frontage.

Hales: Well, it does have a frontage, right?

Engstrom: I think the intent was to develop a more significant node here that went beyond just the immediate frontage. It is a short distance from the orange line on the right side of the map.

Zehnder: And where we were able to expand these nodes to make the sites actually more flexibly developable, we were looking for that opportunity. When you have the mixed use or some of these more intense zones squeezed in, you have less ability to design around the site and have a building that fits in better.

Fritz: But then there's no transition between the mixed use and the single family. Previously, there was a transition zone --

Hales: Right, right. I see that. Part of this area is vacant, right? There's a vacant parcel at 17th and Sherrett that's already mixed use.

Engstrom: As you can see, there's an existing building on the west side, and you can see on this photo on this left side, there's part of a vacant lot there that goes back a distance. I think it is related to making, as Joe said, the site more feasibly developed under one zone. You did get testimony from the neighbors on the abutting single family lots who were concerned about shade and impact to their gardens.

Hales: Right. So, if we don't adopt the amendment the pattern would be mixed use neighborhood to the same depth along that whole portion of 17th, right?

Engstrom: Right, and what's --

Hales: The parcels that are highlighted in the rectangles would be what designation?

Engstrom: They would remain as R2.

Hales: As R2. So, the pattern of mixed use on 17th and step down with R2 to the adjacent single family would be maintained if we do not approve the amendment? And staff's recommendation is which?

Engstrom: We recommended support for this due to the proximity of the orange line and the feasibility of having a more coherent node here because it is in control of one property owner where there's potential for a coherent development plan.

Zehnder: A good example to think about, although it's slightly different, is the mixed use building at NE 11th and Broadway where it's residential along Broadway transitions down to the townhouses, parking in the middle, part of which is a very successful transition. Part of what makes it that, though, is the uniform zoning across the whole site so things can be shifted around. It was simply a move like that.

April 28, 2016

I'm not really sure -- Eric, given our new mixed use code, what's the scale difference between R2 in the back and what we might be putting on the mixed use in the front?

Engstrom: The R2 allows the 45-foot high development and the mixed use is limited to 45. The reality, though, is that the adjacent property owners are a little bit lower than that.

Zehnder: Right. So, that's why we went for the larger node. The physical kind of transition would be the same.

Engstrom: There are 2.5, which is the orange color on the map, is 35-foot height.

Hales: Steve, do you have some thoughts about this one?

Novick: Well, I used to live at 17th and Nehalem, and I'm very bitter about -- although I like living where I live, I'm bitter about the fact that I'm not able to use the orange line and I think as many as possible should be able to. So, I support the amendment.

Hales: Yeah, I guess I'm still sort of rethinking the question of what the practical effect of this will be. You got a fairly, fully developed -- I guess, I hadn't realized this was like long strips on either side of 17th with, what 10, 12 parcels involved? Right? I think I'd like a little more time on this. Let's hold this one over for more work. OK, M47. Number 22. I'm trying to remember this.

Engstrom: This is up behind Montgomery Park --

Hales: Oh, right.

Engstrom: -- where Nicolai and the Broadway come in. There's a section that's zoned employment that's south of Nicolai, starting to go up the slope towards the residential area. There's a registration problem on my map here -- the red box should be over on top of the crosshatch box, and the whole box should slide to the left.

Hales: Yeah, so this was the question of the back portion of that property, if you look at the Nicolai frontage as just being the front. The back portion fronts onto Wilson, right?

Engstrom: Yeah, so the original amendment -- this has two layers. The original amendment was to add the solid square, the crosshatched square on Wilson, which is -- in this photograph, I'm looking east on Wilson towards Montgomery Park, and the site was to the left, and there's existing townhouse development to the right. And so, it would be this site here. The proposal was to change that from employment to R2.

The further variant on that, which I believe came from Commissioner Novick, was to extend that and change the larger, dotted square to EX to provide a larger transition. And the concern raised by staff was that EX allows housing, and so we were concerned about the erosion of the buffer between the residential and the heavy industrial zone to the north, and Nicolai is a heavy freight street at that location.

Hales: But that idea is not before us in this amendment, right?

Engstrom: Both are before you in this amendment, so you have to decide if you want to do one or both or something else.

Hales: Oh, alright.

Engstrom: So, there's the original amendment and the further amendment in the box below it.

Hales: Yeah, I don't think housing fronting Nicolai to me doesn't make sense. Housing fronting Wilson makes sense. Have I got that right from your standpoint, staff?

Engstrom: We supported the change to the one parcel facing Wilson.

Hales: But leaving it -- so, the -- well, is it in the industrial sanctuary on the Nicolai portion?

Engstrom: Yeah, all of it is industrial sanctuary.

Fritz: I do think we need to be very careful about industrial lands and employment lands here.

Novick: My concern was that this has been underutilized for years and years and years. And the developer, the potential developer has worked closely with the Northwest District

April 28, 2016

Association, which supports the changes in the amendments. And I know there's a concern about if there's industrial uses next to residential, then at some point the residents complain and say they want the industrial uses to go away, but they don't have an absolute right to do that. I would think that we can make sure that the new residential users will know that there is nearby industrial uses that they're expected to put up with. I don't think that we should leave a piece of land undeveloped forever because of concern about that possible tension, which I think could be diffused by telling people, "Hey, look, you're in an industrial area."

Engstrom: This is a picture on the screen now. Just looking from Nicolai to the right is the lower portion of the site.

Hales: I guess I don't remember the testimony about the Nicolai frontage. I remember it about the testimony about the Wilson frontage. Camille, you got some thoughts on this? You can come up, sorry. There's been a lot of work on this.

Camille Trummer, Office of Mayor Charlie Hales: Camille Trummer, policy advisor, for the record. So, we did not receive opposition to this. Actually, the northwest neighborhood association supported this.

Hales: Both pieces.

Trummer: Both pieces. So, I have not received any testimony against.

Fritz: So, what's the impact on Guilds Lake industrial sanctuary, and what's the impact on the employment lands numbers?

Anderson: Tom's going to come up.

Hales: Yeah, and I guess while you're thinking about this -- so I guess I'm not as clued in on the second piece of this proposal as I should be. So, the original proposal regarded Wilson, I got that. And then the second proposal was to change the designation to EX in the remainder of the parcel along Nicolai, but it doesn't quite make it all the way to the R5 area to the west.

Engstrom: That's the mistake I pointed out earlier.

Hales: OK.

Engstrom: Everything between 29th and this was supposed to be circled there. There's a registration problem in my map making here. So, it's this section.

Hales: It doesn't extend across the curved section.

Engstrom: Not as currently proposed.

Hales: So you would basically take that whole little area there from the curve onto Nicolai all the way over to the R5 area, and if this was approved, that would go from IH or whatever it is now -- what is it now? -- to EX, right?

Engstrom: It is IH now, I believe.

Zehnder: Mixed employment.

Hales: That's what the property owners requested and we had no opposition to that, right?

Engstrom: Sorry, it's currently mixed employment, EG.

Hales: So, what's the difference between it being zoned mixed employment and being EX? Possibilities? The difference is housing?

Engstrom: The difference is housing and larger retail. EG limits -- the new EG does not permit housing and retail and is more limited because it's primarily an employment zone.

Hales: The question is, what do we want to see here, right? I understand the property owner would like flexibility, but from a long-term planning standpoint, from one side of the ledger I would say those parcels aren't important to the industrial sanctuary. The real industrial sanctuary starts on the other side of Nicolai and goes for miles in terms of large scale industrial development.

On the other hand, having housing across the street from heavy industry is rarely a success. You can see the conflicts over the years with ESCO. So, I'm just trying to think

April 28, 2016

this through out loud, which is always dangerous in a Council meeting. So, what do we want to see there? Do we want to see retail? Who would that be serving given the further out on a Nicolai there's not much in the way of customers?

Fritz: It looks like Tom Armstrong has an answer.

Tom Armstrong, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: Tom Armstrong with BPS. I don't have a clear answer, but I will say that the small box, the one that faces Wilson -- we were originally OK with that because it's only a half-acre. It's a transition site, we could see that.

In terms of the industrial capacity for the stuff that fronts on Nicolai, I don't have an estimate as to what that means for industrial capacity. It probably is not that much because it's already developed as an industrial building, so we're not counting on it in terms of the billable land inventory for future employment use, but it does support a certain amount of employment use today.

So, I think you go back to the Mayor's question about what is it that we want to have the south side of Nicolai to look like? And I think one of the reasons we were supportive of at least the small piece going to housing -- you know, we're nervous about more housing close to the industrial sanctuary but there's a lot of housing right there anyway. That's the same sort of debate question you face across the street for the Montgomery Park about whether it should be employment or EX mixed use.

Hales: Yeah, to me, that's the easier call. There's no guarantee it will be done well, but there are two or three-story townhouses across Wilson from this site. So obviously, whoever builds the housing on the smaller site is going to design it in a way that it opens towards the neighborhood and puts its back to whatever it is behind it. But I'm still wondering out loud about whatever's behind it. You go further down St. Helens road, you have giant warehouses and industrial stuff to the north in the heart of the industrial sanctuary, and you've got these little workshop-y industrial businesses on the south side of the roadway. On this particular site, there's some low value buildings with what appear to be relatively marginal businesses in them. So again, I'm trying to think through -- what do we want to see there? I'm pretty sure I don't want to see retail.

Zehnder: See, that's one of the issues with the EX. It's a wide open zone and allows a lot. And I think in general, we were trying to be conservative with the change away from industrial or at least employment land. This kind of space could be makerspace --

Hales: I was gonna say, could this be potentially be small scale makerspace in the future?

Zehnder: Absolutely.

Hales: We're seeing that in the Central Eastside, but maybe that won't be the only place -- you know, we hope that won't be the only place in the city where small scale makerspace is possible.

Zehnder: And you know, we really are interested in having places where businesses that find it increasingly inconvenient or too expensive to stay on the Central Eastside can find a buyable location in the city. We're trying to do that in Gateway and this could be one of those, as well.

Fritz: So what's the best zone for that?

Zehnder: It's mixed employment, which is what it is. What we're really doing -- and even in the EG, which is a mixed employment, we're tightening it up so that it's clearly employment zone. That's the move we're trying to make citywide to once again be as conservative as we can. Where we're going to put that zone, we want to preserve it for employment uses.

Novick: I understand that Commissioner Fish has an interest in this as well, and given that we don't have a unanimity on this I suggest that --

Hales: Yeah, let's hold this one as well. I think I would feel more comfortable with where I am on it, but let's hold this until Commissioner Fish is back.

April 28, 2016

Anderson: While you're thinking about that between now and the next meeting, think about a bit about the residential piece here are the things that Tamara DeRidder and others were trying to put forward. One of the ways you would enact that policy looking at this being a big diesel sort of area and putting housing right on it kind of going against that.

Hales: You mean on Nicolai? Yeah.

Anderson: I'm just trying to give a real example of what she was talking about.

Hales: Yeah, we'll vote when we vote, but my feeling is keeping this as make or space on the Nicolai side and allowing the housing on the Wilson side -- that's to me where I'm likely to end up. We can hold this until May 11th and decide if we're not unanimous about that. OK, we'll hold it until the 11th. If there are the non-controversial amendments -- [laughter] God help us. OK, 2815, SW Barbur.

Fritz: If I might speak to this, the latest on this -- this is of course the site where Under Armour is currently leasing -- they are not the property owner -- next to Duniway Park. And they are under construction with an improved design review and they don't have plans right now to do any more. They would -- we heard testimony that they'd like to be able to do one more story. We looked into the height that they would need for one more story and they would need an extra two feet of what -- compared -- from the CM1, the neighborhood commercial. And Eric informed me yesterday that that height is adjustable and even in the new zone, it's adjustable up to 10 percent. So, I believe that my amendment still gets Under Armour what they want and it's more reflective of the fact that it's not in the downtown core and that three more stories would tower over the park and make the it look like the park belongs to the adjacent property.

Hales: Let me make sure -- mixed use neighborhood would allow them to add a story?

Fritz: Yes, with a two-foot adjustment.

Hales: Ah, they would have to get an adjustment.

Fritz: They'd have to get an adjustment.

Hales: OK. But that's possible, it's adjustable?

Fritz: Yes, it is adjustable.

Hales: OK.

Saltzman: How do you get an extra story with only two feet of height?

Fritz: They've already got capacity -- they're not building to the full capacity of what they have now. They're not building to 45 feet now, they're building to whatever it would be. All they need is 47. And this is my understanding.

Hales: I haven't talked to them. Do you think that is anathema to their plans or is that acceptable?

Fritz: Unfortunately, I didn't know this was coming up today. I haven't had a chance to connect with them. But my understanding that would -- that's what they need, they're not planning to add three or four stories. Besides which, it's not their property.

Hales: They're in demolition now and in the permit process now.

Fritz: Not planning to do it as part of this --

Hales: Project.

Fritz: They're not planning to do it as part of this project, they're just looking to the future.

Engstrom: What they're doing now is going to happen before this plan goes into effect. So we're talking about the potential later additions.

Zehnder: They're preserving the next phase or capacity to be able to do this. But I don't know what their reaction would be to this specific proposal.

Fritz: We can hold it over so I can check with them. It was at request of the neighborhood association and pointing out that it is kind of a dispersed parcel. All the other parcels nearby are not given this designation.

April 28, 2016

Saltzman: I guess would look beyond the current lessee, too. I mean, this is a 20-year plan. I think as noted, this will be on the high capacity transit line, so I think that a higher density zoning for the long-term is appropriate here.

Novick: I agree.

Hales: We may have three votes to proceed on this one. I think we should go ahead --

Fritz: It's my birthday! [laughter]

Saltzman: You already used the birthday one! [laughter]

Fritz: So, if I could just check with them. I think it's -- as the Parks Commissioner, I think it would be really detrimental to light and air and shade on the park. I think that would be significant opposition from Terwilliger Plaza. So for those of you who were concerned about Terwilliger Plaza, I think that they would be very concerned about the change to the neighborhood. And I don't know that we're going to get high capacity transit there in the next 20 years.

Hales: Let's hold it to the 11th and give you the chance to have that conversation. We won't outvote you on your birthday, but we might still outvote you.

Fritz: I thought I found such a good solution.

Hales: It might be. And you're right, it is important to note this is a redevelopment project with a tenant. I'm happy about the tenant. Under Armour is a tenant. Their plans and the future of the building aren't necessarily the same thing.

Fritz: But even more so, look at the whole area. Let's not spot zone that particular one. If it's appropriate for that, then why is it not appropriate for others?

Hales: Yeah, OK. Of course, it's a weird site. It's surrounded by open space on one side. OK, we'll get back to that one. Let's go onto 24, SE Henry Street. 5401 SE Henry.

Engstrom: This was one that came up through the supplemental memos, it wasn't in our initial amendment report.

Saltzman: Basically at the dead end street, there is concern by the neighbors about the public safety access so they want to keep it at R5.

Engstrom: Right, they're asking that you amend the plan. It's currently 2.5. The reason this came up is this is one of the areas subject to whether or not the zoning, which is currently R5, should be bumped up to the current R2.5 comp plan designation. So, it's a place where the comp plan has 2.5 and the zoning is lower. The Planning Commission is debating the zoning question, but the comp plan is currently at 2.5.

As you said, the neighbors brought up the issue of it being a dead end. Staff did go out to the site with the Fire Bureau, and there is a fire hydrant at the beginning of the street. It's not in this picture. And that the street is fully improved. So, the emergency folks didn't have a concern about the R2.5 here, but we did get testimony expressing concern about the lack of dead end -- there's not a cul-de-sac at the end of the street.

Saltzman: Mm-hmm, it's just a dead end.

Hales: Can you go back to the zoning map for me for a second? So, the parcels involved are all those parcels?

Engstrom: The ones surrounded by the dark line, yeah. The requested amendment would take those parcels back to the R5, which is this lighter color.

Hales: They're now R 2.5?

Engstrom: They are currently comp planned 2.5 and zoned R5. So, they're currently zoned R5 but there's a longer term 2.5 comp plan designation.

Fritz: What is -- [inaudible]

Engstrom: The larger lot to the east is I believe a church. You can see it there.

Hales: Right, and there's a large older one-story apartment complex.

Engstrom: At the beginning of the street, right.

April 28, 2016

Hales: Occupying much of the north side of the street -- or the -- yeah, the north side of the street.

Fritz: Would that become nonconforming if we make --?

Engstrom: No, that apartment would remain R2.

Fritz: Yeah.

Engstrom: So, it's really just the rest of the lot. Another factor that was pointed out is that several of the lots are already flag lots, so the redevelopment potential on those would be limited anyway because they're already limited access.

Hales: So the whole street is fully developed.

Fritz: Yeah. I found the testimony pretty compelling. I support the amendment.

Hales: I think I do, too. Are we ready to vote on this?

Saltzman: Yep.

Hales: Roll call, please, on 24.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: OK. Some of these are easy. 25. Oh, yeah, this is Main and St. Clair. So this is the historic buildings currently being used as offices, right?

Engstrom: Deborah Stein is probably better qualified to describe this situation for you.

Deborah Stein, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability: There have been some offices located in these structures for a long time. They were previously approved through a revocable permit, and my recollection is that the provision about continuation of those permits is not -- the rules have been changed about how to continue those offices. So, we were first looking at a way to continue to allow those offices in the historic structure but the R5 does not allow those. So, if the uses were dormant, they wouldn't be revived.

We're trying to look at a way to allow them with a code change, but I think our current proposal here is that we would just support the testimony, which was favoring retention of the R5, and let the uses continue as they can. If they go away, then they go away.

Hales: Plenty of time to work on the code change but the danger of losing the structures.

Stein: Right. So while we were trying to be creative, I think the testimony against that was concern that the buildings might be redeveloped, and that was not our intent at all. We wanted to preserve the structures. So, I think keeping the R5 is the best way to do that at this point.

Hales: OK.

Saltzman: So the office uses can continue as long as they continue uninterrupted, is that what you're saying?

Stein: That's my understanding.

Hales: They're nonconforming uses and have been for a long time. If they keep operating -

Stein: If they go away and there's a lull, then they wouldn't be able to be revived.

Hales: For more than two years, right?

Stein: I think it's three now and we're talking about continuing it to five --

Hales: So, it's generous.

Stein: I think that there's still a possibility --

Hales: So, one law firm --

Saltzman: Can go away for three years before you lose your --

Stein: If they were vacant, right.

Hales: So, one law firm or whoever it is could move out in six months or a year and a half year later and somebody else could move in -- you get to keep using the house as an office

April 28, 2016

Stein: The overwhelming testimony was to keep it at R5, including the property owners, so we said "OK."

Engstrom: It is plausible that the economics of them reverting to residential would be favorable at some point, too.

Hales: Yeah, and that's not the hope. The hope is these are great old buildings and we don't want to lose them.

Saltzman: Right.

Hales: Any questions about that one? This one might be easy, too. Roll call, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: Number 26, which is several properties on SW 25th.

Engstrom: Let me explain this one. This is again one of the areas where the staff had recommended some down designation from R10 to R20, and that's on the map on the screen the crosshatched area. And originally, the square up here on 25th was part of that, and it was the only -- there were only these four parcels that were being down designated on 25th.

We had some compelling testimony that we hadn't realized that these were subdivided already when we initially proposed the down designation. So, an early staff amendment pulled this off of this square and kept it only in the shaded areas. You got testimony more recently from this property owner, wanting to also revert to R10, and the difference is that they actually have been R20 all along. So, it's a bit of apples and oranges, but they piggy-backed on to the fact that we were amending right here already. So, this southern property here is the question.

Hales: The northern one is already done?

Engstrom: No, the northern one is the amendment that staff put forward. The further amendment is to add the southern property to that list.

Hales: So, both of those are incorporated into this amendment?

Engstrom: No, not yet. Only the northern one is the amendment as written, but you --

Hales: So, 10040, 46, and 48 are up there.

Engstrom: Yeah, and you got a request to add 10500 to that amendment, essentially, which is, which has not yet been done, but that's the request.

Saltzman: Is there any harm to doing that, in your opinion?

Engstrom: Staff would recommend against because it's kind of in the middle of a longer forested buffer that was down designated kind of as a corridor. It connects the park to the left with a corridor that's more to the right. So, staff does not support changing that parcel.

Hales: Is it undeveloped?

Engstrom: It has one house on it in the picture, but the property includes a lot of wooded area to the right.

Hales: So what's the development potential, a flag lot or something?

Engstrom: It would be dividable into two I think with R10, but not with R20.

Hales: But again, the amendment before us is the northern parcel, right?

Engstrom: The amendment before you -- if you just vote on the amendment without any further amendment, it's just that square to the north, but --

Fritz: And I had been interested in the southern parcel, but now that you've explained it I can see your rationale.

Hales: Are we comfortable with voting on this one?

Engstrom: So vote without any reference to further amendments.

Hales: Right, if we vote for it as printed, we deal with the northern parcel. OK, roll call on that.

Roll.

April 28, 2016

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: OK, 27. The first of a couple of Portland Nursery properties.

Saltzman: I would like to actually refer this one to the 11th.

Fritz: Yeah, good call.

Hales: OK. And 28, Lewis and Clark College. I thought you said we were doing the non-controversial ones today. [laughs]

Engstrom: We're starting to --

Hales: -- into some controversial territory.

Novick: He wanted to warm us up.

Hales: It's working.

Saltzman: I don't know if it matters, but as the sponsor of this I would basically vote against it having heard the testimony and becoming more aware of exactly where this parcel was. I think I thought it was somewhere else on the other side of Boones Ferry. So, I don't support this amendment that I brought forward.

Fritz: You can just withdraw it, right?

Saltzman: Can I?

Engstrom: You can either withdraw it or you can all vote right now.

Hales: Why don't we vote? Or do you not want to vote?

Saltzman: I'll be happy to withdraw it.

Hales: Alright, he withdraws it. Done.

Fritz: Thank you, Commissioner Saltzman.

Hales: Yes, thank you. 29, SW Gibbs.

Engstrom: So this is an amendment that has two parts. One part was to change this from mixed use dispersed to mixed use neighborhood and the other to extend it to add the little tail that goes up the street a bit further on Gibbs.

This is the commercial zone node essentially beyond OHSU on the hill. That's what it would look like with the amendment in place. This portion right here is currently, I think, R1. This amendment would change that little section to R1 and it would change this larger section from the dispersed mixed use to the neighborhood mixed use. So, the difference being density and scale of the development. The neighborhood would allow the four-story mixed use without restriction on size of retail and the dispersed would allow only the lower scale mixed use.

Hales: The property is currently developed, right? It's got -- it's got something on it.

Engstrom: There is. Yeah, there is something there.

Fritz: What's the Homestead Neighborhood Association's position on these?

Engstrom: They are against these. One of their concerns was the potential for the commercial zone -- the more intense commercial zone to be too big -- well, also, that somebody could build commercial parking in those zones.

Fritz: Oh, right. And they could, right?

Engstrom: Unless we were to do some sort of amendment to the plan district. We could -- there is a plan district here so we could make a special provision to not allow that here if that was the only concern.

Saltzman: So, you're supporting this amendment -- BPS?

Engstrom: We initially support the amendment. Part of the logic of this is that it would allow more needed housing and commercial services up on top of the hill, allowing that community to be a little more self-sufficient. It's hard to get up and down there.

Saltzman: Yeah, I share that perspective. I guess if there's some way to deal with the neighborhood's concern about the commercial parking, I'd like to do that as well, but I think that this area needs more services and more housing.

April 28, 2016

Fritz: Couldn't we just change the housing, then? Why do you want the whole thing mixed use?

Engstrom: All but this tail is already mixed use.

Hales: "Is already" -- you mean in the proposed plan?

Engstrom: And the current zoning is commercial as well.

Hales: It's CM.

Engstrom: Yeah -- CS.

Fritz: And what's the -- ?

Engstrom: The new area is currently R2 and would go to the mixed use here. And that came in as testimony at the request of the property owner, I believe.

Hales: It would extend for that whole block all the way up to 12th?

Engstrom: Right, it would take one more block on the north side.

Zehnder: And Eric, how does the current CS compare with the two designations we're talking about, dispersed and the neighborhood mixed use?

Engstrom: Let me just confirm what the current is, if I check them.

Hales: Right now, there's kind of an older apartment building on one corner and then a vacant lot, right? That's what's there today. It's an interesting mixture up there, mostly multifamily, right, in the mixed use zones.

Engstrom: Currently -- and this is the zoning map proposal I'm looking at, so it does not yet reflect any of these amendments. So, if you didn't act on this amendment, this is kind of what it looks like. It is currently storefront commercial in that area and it would go to CM1 as currently proposed by the staff --

Hales: And the neighborhood supported that, right?

Engstrom: I believe so. What they don't support is the additional extension and then the upgrading which would allow us to consider applying a CM2 zone there.

Hales: Thoughts about this one? Are we ready on this one? I'm not sure.

Fritz: It's very constrained up there.

Hales: Yeah. Do you think the original -- this, as we see it here, is that right?

Fritz: I think that that's right.

Hales: Not go farther?

Fritz: Right. That works out.

Hales: So, we could take action on this amendment because the amendment would just extend it in that tail, not --

Engstrom: No, actually, there's two pieces to this. Right now, the amendment both extends and upgrades it, so you might have to modify the amendment to clarify that if you only want to do one aspect of that.

Zehnder: Just to clarify, Eric, the upgrade is which part?

Engstrom: The whole thing, the whole polygon going to the neighborhood mixed use, which is the medium scale mixed use instead of the small scale. And then it's also being extended in geography with that tail. So, the current amendment the way it's worded does both those things.

Zehnder: And the difference between the two is basically scale of development.

Engstrom: And the amount of commercial use.

Fritz: Another reason that we did South Waterfront was because it was recognized that the hill was really constrained and that adding a lot more people up there was probably not feasible. The more commercial properties you put up there, the harder it is for each of them to make a go of it.

Hales: Yeah, I think so. Do people feel comfortable about moving on this one? Let's take a vote then, please.

Roll.

April 28, 2016

Saltzman: So again, I'm not sure what the right yes or no is here if I'm in consensus with the discussion here.

Engstrom: Yes would be to adopt the amendment to extend the geography of this mixed use and upgrade it, and no would be to leave it as is, which is dispersed mixed use and would have the lower scale zoning, most likely.

Saltzman: OK. No.

Novick: I'm going to defer to staff on this one and vote yes.

Fritz: No.

Hales: No. Alright, let's move on to number 30.

Engstrom: Number 30 was on the memo from Commissioner Fish dated April 12th. It was a series of BES properties, and his staff expressed an OK for you all to consider this amendment today because it's a fairly straightforward correction to add open -- or correct some open space designations on BES property. He introduced it as the BES Commissioner. So, you should turn to the Commissioner Fish amendment memo on -- it has a table on it, so you'll recognize --

Hales: Is that in the packet?

Engstrom: You should have a pile of the amendment memos on your table. The April 12th memo, it looks like this. It has a series of site numbers and addresses and changes.

Hales: Got it.

Saltzman: Sounds good.

Hales: Fine with all these? Most of them going to OS? OK, any further discussion on number 30?

Fritz: So, we're looking at 84th, right?

Hales: No, no, this is --

Fritz: The previous one, OK.

Hales: We're still on number 30, which are all these BES properties.

Fritz: Sorry. Lost track.

Engstrom: Basically this is cleanup and correcting some BES properties.

Hales: Roll call on that, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: OK, now we're to the parcel on 84th which is number 31. Parcels.

Engstrom: The original amendment here was this blue parcel in the middle of the screen - - if I can get my cursor back -- but you can see it. That was to change to R2 because it has an existing 10-plex on the site. So, this was a non-conforming density minor cleanup issue, but we discovered there is one parcel outlined in red that is on the same street next door. If you look at this next screen, it's a shot from Google, and the street doesn't actually go through and this red parcel is an isolated parcel, it's the last thing that you can get to on that street. So, the rest of the street is R2 except for that parcel and the property owner came forward and said, doesn't it make sense for the last parcel on the street -- instead of being an isolated R2.5, how about R2 there?

This is a photo of the beginning of the street. You actually can't get very easily get down the street because it's gravel and Google doesn't go down there. But the site is beyond the house you see at the back of this picture. So, staff supports this as a fairly minor cleanup to just round off that blue on the map and not leave an isolated one parcel with the unique zoning on the street.

Hales: That's vacant, right?

Engstrom: Yeah.

Hales: In between the apartments and the houses.

Engstrom: It's the same ownership, too.

April 28, 2016

Novick: Eric, is this the issue where the property owner named Stan Warnock said he thought there was an additional -- [inaudible]

Hales: [sneezes]

Novick: -- of property that he wanted to add R25 1426?

Engstrom: Yeah, so the property in red here that I've circled is the added property.

Novick: Oh, OK. I thought that there was another tiny piece. That this is R2.5 1427 and Mr. Warnock was identifying a tiny little .06-acre parcel adjacent to the east side of the property.

Engstrom: That's what the red --

Novick: That is the red, OK.

Hales: Just a different number. OK, any concerns about this one? Let's take a vote, please, on the amendment 31 -- item 31.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Hales: OK. Number 32, which F61, 50th and Hawthorne.

Engstrom: This was an area at the end of Hawthorne where we had suggested that we taper down the density after most of the traffic and the bus turns right on 50th there. You have sort of a separated street, and it gets to be a smaller scale street more residentially-oriented beyond 50th. And originally, the civic corridor, which is a fairly dense designation, had extended all the way up to that end and the amendment suggests pulling it back so that at the very end after you pass 50th would go down to the neighborhood scale. So, that's the amendment. And then I believe Commissioner Fritz had raised a question about whether that should be the geography of the amendment or whether it should include the additional two parcels all the way to 50th.

Fritz: Right. That was my intent. And then also to direct you to use CM1 as the zone.

Engstrom: Which is what we've currently proposed.

Fritz: OK.

Engstrom: So, as written, this amendment just covers what the black box is showing and so we should probably make a note that you're essentially further amending it to be to 50th. So, 50th is right here.

Hales: So, you'd carry that CM1 all the way down to 50th?

Engstrom: Right. So, this parcel would shift and this one here. And this one here is already developed so there's not much --

Hales: Right, it's got a two-story mixed use building on it. It looks like everything between there and 50th is developed.

Engstrom: Right. They're developed so there probably wouldn't be a change, other than you might discourage redevelopment of those sites, which in this case is probably OK.

Hales: OK. Questions or concerns? Let's take a vote on that one, please.

Roll.

Saltzman: Aye. **Novick:** Aye. **Fritz:** Aye. **Hales:** Aye.

Anderson: Well done.

Hales: Wow.

Fritz: That's it? Woo!

Engstrom: That was our list today. We saved the hard ones for next time.

Anderson: The warm up.

Hales: Gave us a little bit of a work out today. Thank you very much. We will carry forward the ones we carried forward and take up the rest of the agenda on the 11th. And we are adjourned.

At 4:30 p.m., Council adjourned.