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COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: The Council will come to order. The clerk will call the roll.


COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Regular order.

CLERK: A joint hearing of the City Council and the Oregon State Highway Commission on the proposed closure of Harbor Drive.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: This meeting was called as a joint meeting between the State Highway Department and the Portland City Council. The Governors Waterfront Task Force recommended that Harbor Drive be closed in order that the downtown waterfront can be redeveloped for other uses. The City Council requested the Commissioner of Public Works to examine the recommendations of the Waterfront Task Force and the Highway Commission for the closure of Harbor Drive and report back. The Commissioner studied the proposals, met with various governmental representatives, and reported back with recommendations to the Council. Subsequently, public information hearings have been held by the City Council and the State Highway Commission on June 16th and 17th in the Water Service Building at 1800 S.W. 6th.

Today the City Council and the State Highway Commission have scheduled a public hearing to seek citizens' views and comments regarding the proposed closure. The Oregon State Highway Commission will be presenting a basic design for the closure based on data available today. The report from the Public Works commissioners recommends that before the closure of Harbor Drive takes place the Council adopt a detailed development plan and program for the downtown property.

The downtown plan would have priority over the design being presented today if there are any elements of the downtown plan that would differ from the basic data of the State's designed plan. I'd like now to call to the microphone Mr. Wolfe, representative of the State Highway Commission, who will explain the State Highway remonstrance procedure. Mr. Wolfe.
MR. WOLFE: Mr. Anderson, members of the City Council, I would like to read into the record ORS 373.015:

"Before the State Highway Commission acquires within any incorporated city any new rights-of-way or relocates or abandons any existing State highway within any incorporated city, the Secretary of the Commission shall, by letter, notify the Mayor of the City of the action contemplated by the Commission, and if any remonstrances or objections thereto are made by the Mayor or Council of such city within ten days after receipt of such letter, the Commission or its designated representative shall hold a public hearing in the City Hall in such city, after having first given written notice thereof to the Mayor at least ten days prior thereto, and at such public hearing persons who favor or oppose the contemplated action shall be given an opportunity to be heard."

Also, I would like to read excerpts from the U. S. Department of Transportation's Policy and Procedure Memorandum 20-8, issued as revised January 14, 1969:

"1. PURPOSE

a. The purpose of this PPM is to insure to the maximum extent practicable that highway locations and designs reflect and are consistent with federal, state and local goals and objectives. The rules, policies and procedures established by this PPM are intended to afford full opportunity for effective public participation in the consideration of highway location and design proposals by highway departments before submission to the Federal Highway Administration for approval. They provide a medium for free and open discussion, and are designed to encourage an early and amicable resolution of controversial issues that may arise."

Further, in line with the PPM, you will be entitled to ten days from today to submit written statements regarding the proposal. These written statements should be addressed to the Portland City Council.

Also, you are advised that upon completion of the evaluation of the statements given here today, information developed in support of the proposal will be available for public inspection and copying at the Salem Headquarters of the Highway Division.

At this time, Commissioner Anderson, I would like to call upon Mr. Klaboe, Assistant State Highway Engineer, to describe the State's proposal.

MR. FRED KLABOE: In the Fall of 1968, Governor McCall created a Harbor Drive Task Force consisting of nine members, three from the City of Portland, three from Multnomah County and three from the State of Oregon, to study the possibility of establishing a Harbor Drive parkway on the west side of the Willamette River approximately between the Ross Island Bridge and the Steel Bridge. In January of 1970, this
group retained a consultant firm to make an analysis of the Harbor Drive proposal in accordance with the following goal: To create an inviting human space containing features to attract people, giving them pleasure and enjoyment, and capitalizing on the natural assets we have in the Willamette River.

With the results of this study, a public hearing was held on January 14, 1971, on a proposal to close and/or vacate Harbor Drive and institute a couplet consisting of First Street and Front Avenue to provide for some of the diverted traffic. Implementation of this plan was to coincide with the opening of the Fremont Bridge in order to take advantage of the changes of traffic patterns that would naturally occur at that time so as to minimize the impact of the closure.

Testimony at that hearing produced a multiplicity of opinions, expressions and general opposition to the details as presented, mixed with a strong support for the fundamental issues. Use of First Street and Front Avenue as a couplet, loss of parking, taking of property, and implementation of the plan before the completion of the comprehensive downtown plan were all objections brought forward in these statements.

Further study and discussions with local officials evolved the plan before you today, which makes no changes in First Street or Front Avenue, leaves parking as it exists, takes no developed property, and is suggested for implementation after:

(1) The Council has adapted a detailed development plan and management program for the area.

(2) Council has approved a plan for the revised use of Front Avenue and its north and south accesses.

(3) Construction of the Industrial Freeway connection to the Fremont Bridge has been completed, including ramps and access to the northwest industrial and harbor areas, and Council has approved plans for the completion of the Industrial Freeway.

(4) Council approval and Tri-Met agreement for an improved bus circulation system for the downtown area.

(5) Five park and ride facilities to be committed for construction by Tri-Met and the Highway Division.

These should be accomplished by July 1973, which is the target date for implementation of the proposed closure of Harbor Drive.

The plan as indicated ties into the existing facilities in as simple and direct a manner as believed possible and with a minimum of expense.

In the consultant's report, it was stated that the major impact of closing Harbor Drive would be to increase peak period congestion on the Marquam Bridge and the East Bank Freeway. Diversion of Harbor Drive
traffic to these and other elements of the central area street and highway networks would be marginally tolerable and remain so until completion of the Mt. Hood Freeway. At such time as that freeway is open, the freeway system will become extremely overloaded whether Harbor Drive exists or not, and additional capacity or change in mode of travel, or both, will be required to alleviate the congestion. Comments on this and other facets of the project are included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement which has been provided for your information.

The project as presented today consists of elimination of Harbor Drive from approximately Everett Street on the north to Market Street on the south. The ramps from the Steel Bridge and Front Avenue on the northerly end would be connected to Front Avenue at Couch Street, and at the south end the ramps from the freeway would terminate at Front Avenue as connections to the Clay-Market couplet. Northbound traffic from the Ross Island Bridge area would continue to use the existing ramp, merging with the inbound traffic from the freeway to feed on to Clay Street or on to Front Avenue in order to better handle the traffic at this intersection. The existing southbound ramp which now carries this returning traffic would be eliminated since there will be no need for it. The existing structures for the Clay Street ramp and for the Harbor Way connection to Columbia and Jefferson will be removed and replaced with ground level connections. There will be minor widening of Front Avenue southerly of Harrison Street and between Market and Columbia to provide additional lanes; however, no developed property will be required for right-of-way.

From the connection at Couch on the north end southerly to the Hawthorne Bridge, it is not anticipated that any change will be made in Front Avenue in number of lanes or in parking restrictions. Signals will be added between Everett and Harrison on both Front Avenue and First Street where they do not presently exist in order to facilitate traffic flow and pedestrian movement across Front Avenue.

There will be no families, businesses or nonprofit organizations displaced by the project. The plan as indicated will provide approximately thirty acres of open space, with about twenty acres lying between the Steel and Hawthorne Bridges and ten acres lying southerly of the Hawthorne Bridge.

Details of pavement removal and regrading of this open space will not be finalized until more knowledge of the ultimate use and development of the area is available. However, if the development plan for the area is not ready for implementation at this time, the State Highway Division will provide for minimum temporary landscaping.

For those of you who did not take advantage of the informational meetings yesterday or the day before, or those who may still have a question on the details of this proposal, we have people in Room 321, to explain the various elements of the proposed closures and reconnections. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Commissioner Anderson, while it is anticipated with the plan as proposed that no private property will have
to be acquired, it is conceivable that based on statements made today, the plan could be revised to the extent that some private properties would have to be acquired. It is also possible that at some later date Federal funding might be desirous. Therefore, in order to follow procedures as outlined in the Federal Highway Administration PPM 20-8, I would like at this time to call upon Mr. Chatwood, Administrative Right of Way Agent for the State Highway Division, to explain right-of-way acquisition procedures and relocation assistance.

Mr. Ken Chatwood:

Mr. Ken Chatwood: Your honor, Commissioner Anderson, members of City Council, ladies and gentlemen. And this project has been approved and after money is available and programed, should it be necessary to purchase any parcels of land from private parties and should it be necessary to relocate any individual, business or special use property, the individual properties will be appraised on the basis of "market value". "Market value" appraisals are used to determine the amount of money to be offered the property owner for the parcels necessary for the re-construction of the project.

Also, at this time a relocation study is made to determine the eligibility for relocation benefits due each owner or tenant. Relocation benefits are not a part of market value but rather are in addition to the payment for real property. The Replacement Housing Policy for this section of highway will be in conformance with United States Department of Transportation Order Number 5620.1.

The relocation benefits include:

(1) Relocation advisory assistance to any individual or business displaced as a result of public improvements as well as adjacent property owners who suffer substantial economic damage resulting from highway acquisitions.

(2) A moving payment for those individuals, businesses, or non-profit organizations who are in occupancy on the first negotiating call for their actual and reasonable costs to move personal property up to 50 miles. As an alternate to actual costs of moving an individual or a family living in a dwelling are eligible to receive a $200 dislocation allowance and a schedule move up to $300 depending on the number of rooms of furniture to be moved.

(3) Under certain conditions, a displaced business may be eligible for benefit payments in lieu of actual moving costs, up to $10,000.

(4) For owner occupants of dwellings of more than 180 days prior to the start of negotiations, under certain conditions, an additional payment for the additional cost necessary to purchase a replacement house, to compensate the owner for increased interest costs in financing a replacement house, to reimburse the owner for incidental expenses to the purchase of replacement housing, the combination of which may not exceed $15,000.
(5) For owners and renters of more than 90 days prior to the start of negotiations who prefer to rent, a rental replacement housing payment up to $4,000 may be made to allow the rental of a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling.

(6) For owner occupants of dwellings less than 180 days and more than 90 days and renter occupants of dwellings of more than 90 days prior to the start of negotiations who elect to purchase a decent, safe, and sanitary house, an alternate benefit to apply on the down payment is available within certain monetary limits. An additional benefit is also available within monetary limits to defray the incidental costs necessary in the acquisition of the replacement property. The combination of these benefits may not exceed $4,000.

The Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and the Federal Highway Administration operating procedures are very complicated and complex. The dollar figures, just quoted, are maximum figures. You are cautioned that the benefits must be computed in accordance with these laws and regulations and on an individual basis. Usually, the benefits do not reach the maximum quoted.

The time required for right-of-way acquisition and relocation is estimated at 12 months from date of authorization of the project. This will permit adequate appraisal and negotiation time and provide at least 90 days for relocation of the displaced person affected after notice of acquisition. In addition, no persons or families will be displaced until they have been relocated to decent, safe and sanitary housing, obtained the right of possession of adequate replacement housing, or have been offered decent, safe and sanitary housing which is available for immediate occupancy. No owner occupant would be required to move until either he has been paid for his property or the money has been deposited in the registry of the court.

Should it become necessary to displace a family, alternate housing for this project is readily available. A search of the residential market reveals that in excess of 200 dwellings are placed on the market in the Portland area every week. Also, a search of the rental market reveals that an average of 25 single-family dwellings and dwelling units in multiple housing are available each week for rent. Newspapers in the area carry many advertisements for sale and rent. Further studies indicate this amount of housing can reasonably be expected to be as many as indicated here during the foreseeable future.

The replacement dwellings mentioned are decent, safe and sanitary, functionally equivalent and substantially the same as those to be acquired: Fair Housing--open to all persons regardless of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, in areas not less desirable than the dwelling to be acquired in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities, reasonably accessible to the relocatee's place of employment; adequate
to accommodate the relocatee in an equal or better neighborhood; and within the financial means of the displaced family.

Should the person being relocated feel he is being unfairly treated, an appeal procedure is available whereby he can appeal in person before an established appeal board or he can make his appeal by letter.

The right-of-way program for this project will be under the supervision of Mr. Louis Grothaus, whose office is located at 5821 N. E. Glisan in Portland, Oregon. The telephone number is 229-6995. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Anderson, this completes the State's presentation.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you very much. Prior to this hearing the Council had transmitted to us a recommendation of Commissioner of Public Works with reference to this proposal. Mr. Klaboe has in fact read in substance the major elements of that recommendation. Very quickly they are as follows:

(1) That by resolution, the Council, Multnomah County, and the Highway Commission agree that Harbor Drive be closed as it is presently designed. The Council endorse the re-use plan of development for Harbor Drive area for waterfront oriented activities.

(2) That before the closure takes place, that the Council adopt:

a. That the Council adopt a detailed development and management plan for the waterfront area.

b. That the Council approve a plan for the revised use of Front Avenue and its north and south access.

c. That the construction of the Industrial Freeway, that is, the freeway up in the Montgomery Ward area and its connection to the Fremont Bridge, including ramps and access to the Northwest industrial, area be approved and that adequate access be provided and funded by the State Highway Commission.

d. That the Council approve and Tri-Met agree to an improved bus circulation system for the downtown area. This very probably will mean the development of exclusive bus lanes in the downtown area in accordance with the preliminary plan prepared by Tri-Met.

e. That the Highway Commission commit itself to fully fund, design, and construct two park-and-ride facilities adjacent to I-205 with interstate funds. The 8% local matching to be supplied by the State Highway Commission if legal, by Tri-Met if not; Tri-Met commitment to construct three park-and-ride facilities
designed by the Oregon State Highway Commission; and Council approve the schedule for this construction.

(3) That the City establish July 1973 as the time by which the above must be accomplished. If the State fulfills its commitment by that date, the facility will be closed.

That then is the recommendation to the Council with the recommendation that the Council adopt this and that matter is for the Council today. At this point, I would like to call upon two staff members of the City of Portland for their comments and recommendations. First, I'd like to call on the Traffic Engineer, Mr. Don Bergstrom.

MR. D. E. BERGSTROM: Mr. Commissioners, members of the Council, Commissioner Anderson's report to the Council dated May 5, 1971, concerning the closure of Harbor Drive contains a statement covering my position on the Harbor Drive closure. It reads, and I quote "The closure is opposed on the basis that trucks and other traffic problems have not been and probably cannot be solved.

For the record I would like to explain my reasons for opposing the Harbor Drive closure. From a traffic standpoint, the traffic conditions on Harbor Drive should be considered and broken down into two time periods: First, is the short-range period extending from the time the Fremont Bridge is opened, scheduled for sometime in 1972, until the Mt. Hood Freeway is connected to the Marquam Bridge, which at this time is scheduled for 1977; the second period would be the long-range extending from 1977 until 1990.

With regard to the short-range period, the consulting firm of DeLeuw, Cather & Company, after studying the Harbor Drive question found that Harbor Drive could be closed after opening the Fremont Bridge, and that traffic conditions would be marginally tolerable during the period 1972 to 1977.

The State Highway Department, in reviewing the Consultant's findings, and with independent study, has indicated in their report, and I quote, "It should be emphasized that the proposed connection to Front Avenue is not intended to provide a substitute for Harbor Drive. It will, in fact, accommodate less than approximately one-half of the traffic utilizing Harbor Drive today."

My staff and myself reviewed both of these studies, and I would agree with their findings and at the same time point out that the period from 1972 to 1977 is a very short one and the effect of the Harbor Drive closure, of course, is permanent extending far beyond 1977.

With regard to the second time period, that is the time period from 1977 to 1990, good traffic planning dictates that traffic conditions in 1990 be considered and solutions recommended at this time. Previous data available from the 1990 Portland-Vancouver Metropolitan Transportation Study indicates that all of the facilities in the central business district corridor extending from the Stadium Freeway on the west to Union-Grand Avenue on the east are operating at capacity levels and that portions of
the freeway system, including the Marquam Bridge-East Bank Freeway, are extremely overloaded. This factor has been recognized and is under current study by the Highway Department.

A solution to the 1990 problem will be extremely difficult if the Harbor Drive closure is approved, and as I view it today, the solution might be impossible, because of the impact of additional freeway facilities and river crossings will have on the CBD core area.

The consultant, DeLeuw, Cather & Company, recognized this and suggested as one of their alternates that the Harbor Drive facility be included in the waterfront development project. I agree with this because it was the only alternate that accommodated the traffic at an adequate level of service.

In summary, it is my recommendation to the City Council and the State Highway Commission that Harbor Drive not be closed until such time as both an interim and long-range 1990 traffic plan has been developed for the central business district corridor. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you. Are there questions by the Council? The next staff member that I would like to call on is Lloyd Keefe.

MR. FRANCIS IVANCIE: I want to just ask a question.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Alright.

MR. IVANCIE: Mr. Bergstrom, when you mentioned that an alternate was mentioned in the DeLeuw Cather Report as far as mixing traffic and Harbor development, are you talking about a cut-and-cover or are you talking about some other type of accommodation there?

MR. BERGSTROM: That would be one way. I think there are any number of ways which this can be done. The point I was trying to make is that it has not been given any consideration to date that I know of. Instead, I believe Task Force recommendation was simply that Harbor Drive be closed and that no consideration be given to a joint or multi-use of Harbor Drive and the waterfront.

MR. IVANCIE: How do you read the DeLeuw Cather Report, for or against closure?

MR. BERGSTROM: I don't think I could answer that. They weren't asked that question. I don't believe they responded to it, if they did, I don't find it in the report, as such.

MR. NEIL GOLDSCHMIDT: Mr. Bergstrom, would your statement as to the conclusion about Harbor Drive change at all if the Council approaches the closure of Harbor Drive as a question of shifting our priorities away from the movement of traffic by automobile, that is in effect you're dealing with - that there is a transportation system, at this point an alternate mass transit projected to carry a certain percentage of the traffic that's moving, and you're saying that given what
the remainder is that I think Harbor Drive ought to stay open to deal
with that problem, but if you treat the Harbor Drive question as a
first commitment by the City Council toward moving away from accommodating
the automobile in the core area, do you necessarily reason to the same
conclusion or is there any way for you to cope with that problem given
the fact that you can't project any loads?

MR. BERGSTROM: The 1990 transportation study plan
that I referred to did not include mass transit or what might be done by
1990. This we know is under current study by Delew Cather. Their
report is due in February of 1972. At that time, it would be possible
then to answer your question as to whether mass transit could in effect
replace and do the job that Harbor Drive is now doing. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you. Lloyd Keefe.

MR. LLOYD KEEFE: Members of the Council, on June 2 at
a regular meeting of the City Planning Commission, the City Planning
Commission discussed the State's announcement of this design hearing.
It also discussed the recommendations of Commissioner Anderson to the
Council. The Planning Commission passed the following motion unani-
mously - that the Planning Commission endorse the contents of Commissioner
Anderson's letter dated May 5, 1971, to the Council and that it recommend
that the Council adopt recommendations in the letter. Briefly, I would
like to elaborate just a minute on point 2a in Commissioner Anderson's
recommendations which reads:

(2) Before the closure takes place, the following must be
accomplished:

a. Council adoption of detailed development plan and
management program for the downtown riverfront
property and a schedule for initiation of redevelop-
ment to accomplish the plan.

As you know, there is a downtown planning program under way. It
has not yet reached the point of designing the riverfront space, and since
such a plan has not yet been prepared and since it hasn't been presented
to the various advisory groups, which are part of this downtown planning
effort such as our new downtown citizen's committee which has only had
two meetings so far; to the downtown committee which is composed of
property owners and tenants of the downtown area; to the downtown tech-
nical committee which is composed of the engineers and Tri-Met and
others who are concerned with the plans in the downtown area; since it
has not been presented to the Planning Committee nor the Council we
cannot recommend approval of the plan for the specific lands and recon-
struction that are shown at this time.

It is not a foregone conclusion that the strip between Front and
the Harbor Wall will be adequate for this riverfront development. The
riverfront development may have many elements in addition to open space.
There may be apartments, there could be museums, there could be restaurants,
there could be shops. And of course, the adjacent area is an area which
probably qualifies for urban renewal. That is the area west of Front.
Neither is it a foregone conclusion that all of the space would be needed for a downtown riverfront development. So we are in a position of not really being able to recommend that you adopt anything specific about the handling of the Baldock Freeway as to where its connections ought to go or the handling of the Steel Bridge as to where the connections are to go into Front Avenue. Maybe this will be a plan that will be quite adequate. At this particular time, we just cannot recommend that you get that specific. So, the Planning Commission does endorse the principle of closing Harbor Drive, but that is as far as it can go at this time.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: Commissioner Anderson, I have a question.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes, Commissioner Goldschmidt.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: Mr. Keefe, if the State Highway Commission on one hand says that they are prepared to adopt a plan within reason, at let's say the July 1973 date, which if I'm not mistaken is the date that you used, Commissioner Anderson. A closure by that date and then in effect also say in response to your objections as today, you adopt whatever plan it is that we can agree on that is reasonable then we are also pledged to keep up whatever we put in and then to move on from there at the point and time the plan is done. Does that meet your objection? For example, it's going to require a ramp moving the Steel Bridge southerly access off of Harbor and on to Front and there is going to be maybe a half a million dollars in just that project. And if they feel that they can amortize that investment over the next three or four years and at the point and time the downtown plan is ready to move they are prepared to assist us financially in doing what has to be done with that access, does that solve your objection? Reach your concern?

MR. KEEFE: If there could be absolute assurance that that would happen, yes, but as an advisor to the Planning Commission to the Council it is rather difficult for me to recommend that any public agency, be it our money or the State's money, be spent on such a short term program. Even $500,000 will go a long way toward further needs so it's rather difficult to recommend when the time involved now is a matter of months rather than years, it's rather difficult to recommend that even go that far.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: What do you mean in your description of a detailed development plan? What is a detailed development plan? What precisely would this City Council be adopting at the point in time when we have that submitted to us?

MR. KEEFE: I think it would be a plan for the use of this area designating specific activities to occur on riverfronts, specific land uses, specific ways of handling access to the area, specific ways of access from the rest of the downtown area, specific ways of renewing the adjacent areas to the riverfront developed, the extent of the riverfront development, the shape of it.
MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: I have this concern in what you're describing that with a downtown study project which one could hardly say is over financed, that it is partially private money and partially public money with the combination of public bodies that are involved, that there is every possibility that the completion of whatever study phase that the plan is in now, that you may submit something we don't find adequately workable, that is simply because we have underfinanced the study ourselves. And I'm concerned about that because these areas that you describe as potential for urban renewal west of Front, the area south of the Hawthorne Bridge which has been speculated on other occasions for development, the remainder of the Urban Renewal Development that needs to go on near the auditorium, all of these things in effect will be apparently awaiting some of the decisions that we're being asked to make now, that is, a part of this planning composition of things we need to be concerned about and much of it is in private hands.

And I guess when somebody is saying, well what you need to do is set a definite line, but we need to set it with the assumption that we won't have a deadline unless x, y, and z happens, why would I have any better belief that the study will be done in time than I would that the Highway Commission will do what they say. All of these things we're doing we have to take a little bit on faith.

Are you sure today that that study is going to be done? Are you so sure that we're going to get the kind of detailed development plan that we need that we ought to take your advice and not adopt closure with the specific proposal the Highway Commission has. Those are the sort of things that come back to haunt us.

MR. KEEFE: Well, I think the best way to answer your question is, why make the decision until you do have all of the blocks out in front of you that go together to build the whole, and all the pieces out in front of you before you decide how to put them together.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: As a transportation matter, I gather it was suggested that it might be logical to do it because at the time of the opening of the Fremont Bridge we provide people with some alternative method of travel. That is, they were just saying this is a good time for people to learn to go some other route. You don't buy that as being very significant, I guess? Because that by itself wouldn't be enough for you to do it, to close it.

MR. KEEFE: Oh, I can see the advantage in, say closing it at the time the Fremont Bridge opens up, but I don't really see the disadvantage of having Harbor Drive still functioning as it is today, even when the bridge is opened up. So there might be some advantage in that.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: Would you be less concerned if we just put barricades up, that is in other words, we didn't spend anything, we just put barricades up in the road and say you can't use that one anymore. People coming in off the freeway couldn't come down into Harbor and the people who are coming in off of Barbur couldn't get down there?
MR. KEEFE: I think it would be a noble experiment.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Are there other questions by the Council? If not, thank you very much. There is a gentleman or so in the audience walking up and down, and if any of you have any statements that you would like to make. These cards are being collected and brought up to me and I will read them as they come up here. There are, of course, others that have indicated they are in attendance and some of the information, at least from these hearings, I presume, would be transmitted to these people that have indicated they do want to testify, is that correct? The first name here is Walter Daggett, representing Tri-Met.

MR. WALTER DAGGETT: Commissioner Anderson, members of the Portland City Council, my name is Walter Daggett, 4314 S. E. 17th Street in Portland, Oregon, representing Tri-Met. The statement is as follows on behalf of the Tri-Met Board: In the early 40's, Robert Moses was commissioned to do a comprehensive plan with the City of Portland. In that plan, he strongly suggested that no highway primary or secondary be located along the west Harbor wall of the City of Portland. His suggestion was not followed. He was a man not in the building of expressways and freeways himself.

Since that time many parking studies and other related traffic studies have been made, hence we have in the Central Business District of Portland wider streets, more parking spaces, narrower sidewalks, more traffic congestion, and less and less alternatives to the automobile. Tri-Met, as conceived by the 1969 Oregon Legislature, is dedicated to make mass transportation one of the alternatives to the automobile in our core area all the time, and on our freeways for those four peak driving hours a day when the automobile ceases to be a functional tool of transportation. Tri-Met realizes that in order to accomplish even a part of this goal it must make mass transportation more comfortable, more convenient, faster and less expensive than an automobile or we will not convince anyone to make use of an alternative. At the same time these positive steps are being taken, we must make the automobile less comfortable, less convenient, more expensive, and possibly slower than the alternative in the core area and on those freeways during the peak driving time.

The Tri-Met board supports Commissioner Anderson's recommendations regarding the closure of Harbor Drive. Harbor Drive is the one segment of a total land use plan that will help turn our metropolitan area around from its seemingly present automobile oriented position to one committed to the individual and one which bases its conclusions on what is good for people. Tri-Met is presently studying various proposals for improved bus circulation in the downtown area.

We have met with representatives of the Oregon Highway Commission, Commissioner Anderson's office, The Columbia Region Association of Governments and our own consulting firm and it was agreed in principle at least on the park-and-ride facilities that would make it possible to maintain the high access necessary to the Central Business District. We look forward to continued close communication and cooperation with all parties involved in land use planning and congratulate Commissioner Anderson on his stand at this time. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Are there questions by the Council?

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: Mr. Daggett, if you couldn't finance the park-and-ride facilities between now and the time when this was supposed to be implemented, (the Oregon State Legislature accomplishes or somebody there accomplishes an effective rate of that agency and it has been tried in this last session and stopped) would you then suggest that we ought not to close Harbor? That is, are you so convinced that we need your park-and-ride facilities that we're so interlocked there that if something happens to you then it no longer becomes a good decision?

MR. DAGGETT: No, I agree with Robert Moses.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: That's before my time, Wally, He didn't write on a tablet that time, Sir.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Are there other questions by the Council?

MR. IVANCIE: Mr. Daggett, as you know we have the same consultants working for Tri-Met and the Highway Commission. As I understand the report of the consultant relative to the future bus riders, they don't seem to be too optimistic as far as the bus replacing the automobile. Now, how does that jibe with the argument of our Traffic Engineer that this should be closed?

MR. DAGGETT: No one ever assumed, at least on the part of Tri-Met, that the term alternative meant the replacement of anything. We hope that the automobile can and will remain as the basic tool of transportation. We have no dreams, even in the wildest predictive models that we can put on the statistics that we have available, that the bus as such will replace anything but it will be an alternative that will allow traffic and movement in core areas and on freeways in those peak driving periods to move as they should move. This does not in any way conflict with either report, in fact, it's very compatible.

MR. IVANCIE: Deleuw, Cather, and Company does not take a position on the closure of Harbor Drive, the consultant for the Highway Commission. You understand that?

MR. DAGGETT: I am aware of it. I understand that's true.

MR. ANDERSON: Are there other questions from the Council? Thank you. Stan Goodell, Portland Association of Building Owners and Managers.

MR. STAN GOODELL: Commissioner Anderson, members of City Council, gentlemen. Portland Association of Building Owners and Managers has supported and will continue to support the closure of Harbor Drive. But before that happens, we think some things have to be tied into that closure. A question was made earlier about what if a ramp off the Steel Bridge went to Front Avenue. This would have a tendency, we think, of forcing more through traffic into the downtown
street grid. It would give the through vehicle additional alternatives that would, we think, force a percentage of through traffic through the downtown area. We don't think the downtown is in a position to cope with additional through traffic.

The other point is about the closure of Harbor Drive and barricading it. We feel that Harbor Drive should continue generally in business as it is today until alternatives are found that are long range and far reaching as to the closure. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Are there questions by the Council? Thank you. I'd like for the record to indicate that we have here a letter from the Port of Portland indicating its support of the closure of Harbor Drive and at the same time expressing concern for the need for the development of adequate access into the northwest industrial area and to Front north of the railroad crossing. A letter from the Portland Rose Festival Association generally indicating an interest in the development of this area for non-highway use and indicating its interest in using a part of it for the activities associated with the Rose Festival. A letter from Portland Commons indicating support of the closure of Harbor Drive. (letters at end of transcript) LeGrande P. Marchant, Port of Portland.

MR. MARCHANT: Commissioner Anderson, and members of the Council, gentlemen I merely wanted to make this statement verbally here that the Port of Portland does support the proposal to close Harbor Drive and perhaps to answer any questions that you may have. The Port, of course, is particularly concerned with N. W. Front Avenue access and the timing of closure of the Harbor Drive with more convenient access than would exist if it were closed with something - .

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Are there questions by the Council? Thank you, Sir. Gary Boshears, Associated Oregon Industries. When you appear before the Council would you please give your name and address prior to your statement.

MR. GARY BOSHEARS: My name is Gary Boshears, the Local Government Director of Associated Oregon Industries, 2187 S. W. Main, Portland. AOI basically favors the concept of utilization of Harbor Drive area for higher purposes other than that under which it is now operating as a major arterial highway.

This area could be one of Portland's greatest assets. However, we have several areas of major concern that we feel should be met prior to closure. I think Commissioner Anderson has outlined several of those areas and I would like to add a few more. We would concur with Items 2a, b, and c of Commissioner Anderson's report. The first, that there must be a detailed development plan so the people of the area will know what is going to take place with that ribbon of concrete. This plan should be approved by the Council, should include the additional accesses that we have already heard discussed and the proper connections to the Fremont Bridge.

In addition, we feel that the project area as has been shown does not really extend far enough to the south. The southwest industrial area
in the Macadam area has very serious problems of basically truck access but also employee access that is going to be made more difficult by the closure of Harbor Drive. We discussed this somewhat with the Highway Engineers. They indicated that they are continuing to study this, but we would like to see this made a part of this project that proper access be made to this industrial area. In particular, in the connections onto the Stadium Freeway.

If through traffic from the northwest to the southwest industrial areas is expected to use the Stadium Freeway, then there must be some means of getting on and off the southwest industrial area. We would also like to see the results of studies or further study given to the possibility of retaining Harbor Drive in a cut-and-cover type method. We have not seen data that would indicate that this is not feasible and since this is a major arterial, we would be most interested in seeing if there is a possibility of maintaining some sort of through traffic on a different Harbor Drive.

We would concur that one of the hopes is that we will see this asset developed to the point that it can alleviate some of the congestion that is going to be caused by getting rid of Harbor Drive. However, we realize those studies still are not completed and we would feel that setting a date and definite plans to close Harbor Drive should be delayed until we see the results as to what will happen. We still feel a little bit squeamish about the actual plans of handling the employee type traffic, the commuter type traffic to both industrial areas as well as the truck traffic. I guess you could say that we support the concept, but we would like to see some of the specifics before the actual closure occurs.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Are there questions by the Council?

MRS. CONNIE McCREADY: No, I might make a comment, Commissioner Anderson. There are those who feel that Tri-Met might have been able to spend a little more time working on their traffic patterns and how to cope with them if hadn't spent much time fighting for their lives in the legislature this past session.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you. Jane Cease representing the League of Women Voters.

MRS. CEASE: Commissioner Anderson, and lady and gentlemen of the Commission, my name is Jane Cease and my office address is 732 S. W. Third and my home address is 2625 N. E. Hancock. I'm the president of the League of Women Voters of Portland, representing 612 members, and we want to present to you our position on the proposed Harbor Drive closure. We support Commissioner Anderson's May 5th recommendations, in part, but we do have some reservations.

What I did in order to make our final decision on what we could say within our consensus position, we did appoint a special committee to look at this and had people who've worked on the Metropolitan Transportation Study and people who had worked on the Urban Planning Study
and someone very knowledgeable in taxes and we had people from the Air Pollution Committee. We started on Harbor Drive and by the time we wound up we were in Vancouver and East Washington County and East Multnomah County and we sort of like, today Harbor Drive - tomorrow the world, but it wasn't quite that bad. Anyhow, we did feel the closure of Harbor Drive has a lot of very complicated, far-reaching effects and that the total picture should be considered before you make a final decision on whether it should be closed.

Now, there are several problems that we see that arise in connection with the closure. In the first place, we're concerned with slowing traffic on Front Avenue which would be increased air pollution from vehicular emissions along that street, and it's our understanding that there will be four additional stop signs placed along there and that these will be added in order to provide pedestrian access to the waterfront. We do applaud the use of the waterfront for people and pedestrians, but we are concerned that the slower traffic will add to air pollution and we wonder if the increased traffic will, in fact, discourage pedestrian crossings, and we wonder if other types of pedestrian access, bridges or things like that, are being considered.

Now, we have a joint support position with the Leagues of Women Voters of East Multnomah County and East Washington County, Hillsboro, Lake Oswego and Milwaukie-East Clackamas County. In other words, most of the leagues in this metropolitan area. It calls for the development of an efficient, convenient, non-polluting transportation system in the entire metropolitan area, and then it also states that in order to emphasize mass transportation and to reduce automobile traffic, we oppose construction of more urban freeways and core parking, and endorse peripheral parking and so, therefore, we would like to ask that transit studies be made which would look at beginning and end-of-trip locations for the present Harbor Drive traffic so that these peripheral park-and-ride stations could be placed so that the people who're using Harbor Drive will actually use the transit facilities.

And then we are concerned, also, at what will happen to the Stadium Freeway traffic since it is already at times very difficult and then consequently if Harbor Drive is closed before the Industrial Freeway is opened. What will happen at that end with the traffic that would go along that proposed Industrial Freeway route, and then as well as what would happen on the Fremont Bridge, and we even began to wonder if Harbor Drive closure could create a need for another urban freeway along the proposed Rose City Freeway route which would be in northeast Portland.

We feel very very strongly that the downtown plan should be further along before a decision is made on the Harbor Drive closure. We understand that the downtown plan guidelines hopefully will be developed by February of 1972 and we therefore ask that you reconsider whether to close Harbor Drive after that date.
We also want to see a development of a people-orientated waterfront that has both public and commercial accommodations. We feel that this will be more attractive, that it will upgrade property values in the areas between the central business district and the waterfront.

We are a little concerned over the fact that there is a proposed $100 million development with a 22-story building in the area on the waterfront in the area south of the Hawthorne Bridge, and we feel definitely that development of that area could be a vast improvement over the way it looks now, but we do feel that you have to look at the whole downtown plan waterfront area before you make a decision on that basis.

Then last I'd like to say that we're very happy that you finally have appointed the Citizen's Advisory Committee to the downtown plan, and we would very much like to ask you to give great attention and consideration to their recommendations and we'd also like to ask for more citizen input besides the Citizen's Advisory Group, and then the most important thing that we would like to ask for is that in the end the Council actually adopt a good downtown plan and implement it. Thank you.
MR. NEIL GOLDSCHMIDT: Mr. Anderson, I have just a comment. I think it ought to be said in reference to that particular development which you mentioned that the individuals apparently interested in developing that property have been in touch with the Downtown Planning Task Force and with the Chairman of our Planning Commission, probably our staff as well, and I know they've talked to the Council and know that they're interested in coordinating it in that way; it's a good point.

MRS. CEASE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you. I'd like to emphasize again here that for those people filling out cards whether they speak or whether they do not speak will be mailed transcripts of the hearing. In addition to that, for ten days following today additional statements may be filed for the record and will become part of the record with reference to this hearing. I'd like to file now a letter from the Department of Environmental Quality with reference to the closure of this facility signed by Kenneth Spies. (Letter at end of transcript.) Ray Polani.

MR. RAY POLANI: Mr. Anderson, members of the City Council and the Oregon Highway Department, and ladies and gentlemen. My name is Ray Polani, I live at 8311 S. W. 3rd Avenue in Portland, I speak as a private individual, I have made a statement in January on the Harbor Drive closure and at that time I was mainly concerned about the timing of the closure. I felt very much in favor of the concept, but I felt that the timing should be after the downtown comprehensive studies have reached a point where they can materially affect the decision. Well, I'm very pleased to note that what I observed and what I thought was consensus from many other people and organizations testifying at the meeting has been taken into account by the Highway Department. I think the fact that they are prepared to move the closure date to the middle of 1973 is very heartwarming. I feel the fact that they have abandoned the concept of the Front-First Couplet with the attending cost of about $2 million dollars. I feel that that is a very encouraging development, as well. I feel that we have definitely moved in the right direction; I feel that this should be very heartwarming for the younger people in our society. The fact that there is a possibility of being heard, there is a possibility of carrying weight, there is a possibility of having comments and wishes adopted and made a part of decisions. I'm somewhat in agreement with the concern of the City Planning Commission about the finality of this present proposal. I am also a little bit concerned, I have here the copy of the information distributed at the information meetings, and I noticed that there is talk of the possibility of right-of-way acquisition perhaps in the amount of two parcels at approximately $130,000 as compared to a similar estimate in the Front-First Couplet of $1,785,000. At that time, if I remember, there was talk about $2½ million dollars so we're talking about another
$800,000 perhaps, which I'm assuming would have been in the construction of approaches. It would be interesting to know what the cost will be in the present plan approaches. Hopefully, it's substantially reduced but I can see the concern of the City Planning Commission about foreclosing possibilities of altering even this plan. On the other hand, I thought I heard Commissioner Anderson earlier, and I would like him to correct me if I'm not right, at the opening remarks at one point I think he said something to the effect that the downtown plans should have priority over this present design. Is it correct? Did I hear you say that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I better look back and see.

MR. POLANI: it's a very important point.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: Well, I think that quite obviously that any kind of a redevelopment plan that takes place on the waterfront needs to take into account the kind of planning that's being done in the central area and that the two need to fit together. So, I think it's clear then that in the development of a precise plan for that area, or a redevelopment plan for that area that it can't be the tail wagging the dog, but rather the downtown plan, and it needs to harmonize and obviously the downtown area is the heavyweight.

MR. POLANI: Yes, now will any downtown plan - any conclusion of the downtown plan be able to change this present plan. I think this is something that we need to find out. We need to find out how final this plan is, particularly, as it regards the raised ramps providing access to and from the west end of the steel bridge.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: By this plan you mean the system proposed for closing Harbor. This proposal here.

MR. POLANI: Yes, I mean this proposal here, right. Again, I think it's a question of cost.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: Well, in my judgment, I'm just one Council member, it's not permanent at all if the downtown plan dictates that it be changed. The problem is getting commitments in advance to see that we can finance those changes when they need to be made.

MR. POLANI: Well, I think this perhaps then the question should be addressed to the Highway Department and see how final they consider the present plan and how willing would they be to amend and change the present arrangement as it appears on the map.

MR. FRED KLABOE: If I may answer his question, Mr. Chairman, the State Highway Commission has said in the past and I'm sure that they would say it today again, that this plan is an interim plan. If it does not adequately fit the downtown plan the State Highway Commission will certainly give strong consideration and though I can't guarantee three years or five years ahead what's going to happen. They're
very receptive to changes that will fit the downtown plan. Please also remember that what we're putting into effect with the plan you see on the wall here is the very minimum type of facility. It's going to be just like Third or Fourth or Fifth or Sixth Streets so the State Highway Department again is not making a substitution for Harbor Drive. All we're doing is connecting up the ends of this plan so that the transportation system will work to serve the downtown Portland area. Without these connections, it's very difficult to get to the downtown Portland area.

MR. POLANI: I think it should be very important to keep in mind really that the objective is really to serve downtown with traffic but not necessarily automobile traffic. I think it would be interesting if you have available to know the approximate figure that you are assessing for the cost of these elevated ramps to and from the west end of the Steel Bridge. Do you have that figure?

MR. KLABOE: Yes, the total cost of everything you see in the plan here today is somewhere in the neighborhood of three-quarters of a million dollars.

MR. POLANI: $750,000. What would be the portion that would be relating to these elevated approaches to and from the west end of the Steel Bridge?

MR. KLABOE: In the neighborhood of a half of that.

MR. POLANI: Of a half of that. I think this is interesting because the other approach is in to Clay and Market and I believe Jefferson and the other streets seem to be level approaches so I would imagine that there the cost is really minimal.

MR. KLABOE: Well, it's not an expensive plan.

MR. POLANI: Well I think then that I would like to make one more comment. I think that might be all, and I would want to address myself specifically to the City Council. I think that what we're witnessing here is again a discussion of priorities of goals, of commitments. I think that what we're being asked for here is a statement of what the public policy shall be of the City Council for the City of Portland. I think what we want to hear, at least what I want to hear and I would hope that there's a lot of people that agree with me, what I want to hear is a firm commitment to us orienting to people and to use by people of the waterfront.

I think we need to definitely depart altogether from the concept of moving automobiles, of accommodating traffic. This is the concept that still predominates into mind of the Traffic Engineer and rightfully so. This is his function, but I think that his function would be and should be subordinated to what statement of policy, general policy, will come from the Council. I think not only should you state public policy but you should also promulgate the necessary legislation or regulatory measures that are designed to implement such policy. I think we've had
a question similar to this that came up in conjunction with the moratorium on parking structures and other construction in the downtown area. I think again, because of a lack of an underlying goal in policy statements there was a wavering and a lack of directness in your decisions. So, I think that this probably is where you should first start. Commit yourself to what really you are setting out to do. What is your conception of the goals and of the necessary objectives to be accomplished in order to make the Harbor Drive and the downtown core area a place for people.

There are a multitude of statements in the draft that I have seen that would tend to go that way, but I think they need to be reinforced by a definite commitment by the City Council in the name of the citizens of the City of Portland. I don't know, I've been looking in the paper and I have read on many occasions editorials, statements by the President where again a discussion of public goals and public commitments was indicated. It is a question really of - and this brings up, of course, also very much so the role of mass transit, the role of Tri-Met. I think that, as I said, after you have adopted resolutions of goals and approval of decisions then you need to implement, you need to pass regulation and legislation in that context.

I think Tri-Met is probably expecting from you a preferential treatment and rightfully so. I mean preferential in respect to the treatment that you accord to the automobile. As long as we're still thinking of the automobile as the primary transit by automobile, transportation by automobile, commuting by automobile. As long as we think of that as being the paramount goal then, of course, we're just treading water here really. So, I hope that this is what you would keep in mind and I hope that you will come up with these goals first and with the necessary action to implement them. Otherwise, I don't think there's any question.

I'm in favor, yes, of the closure of Harbor Drive. I'm very much in favor with the timetable and comments that came out of the Department of Public Works and Commissioner Anderson. I think that sure there needs to be consideration to the completion of Fremont Bridge, of the Stadium Freeway, and of the Industrial Freeway. I think, though, that we must definitely decide that Harbor Drive and Front Avenue and First Avenue are not through routes; they are only designed for access and egress to the City, to the downtown core, and also that this access and this egress probably should come more through mass transit than through private automobiles. Sure, you will have to implement regulation that will force people to use these alternative modes of transportation, but I think that it is feasible and I think that there is a growing awareness that we need these alternatives. This will solve the problems of pollution that was mentioned with the increased signalization on Front Avenue. That's going to slow down, but the slowing down of traffic as long as the traffic is directed to downtown where it eventually it stops, I don't think that this is a critical factor. Well, this will be all - I thank you very much for giving me your attention.

HON. MAYOR T. SCHRUNK: asked to be heard.

Thank you, Sir. Mr. Bullwinkle has
MR. BEN BULLWINKLE: 
Mayor Schrunk, members of the Council, my name is Benjamin B. Bullwinkle, I live at 4437 S. W. Twombly Avenue, I'm here by education and training, I'm a registered professional engineer, I'm here representing only my own interests as a citizen of Portland for over fifty years. It is my understanding that this hearing is to determine or consider plans for rerouting traffic upon the closure of Harbor Drive. In all of the presentations and summaries of drafts handed out the past two days by the Highway Department, the assumption is implied that there is a great need to close Harbor Drive. It is stated that the Harbor Drive Task Force appointed by Governor McCall has requested the Oregon State Highway Department to close Harbor Drive in order to establish a land bank for future use by civic center planners. But nowhere do I find any supporting information for the conclusions arrived at by the Harbor Drive Task Force. There is no statement showing the demand for an open people-orientated waterfront. Nor am I able to obtain a copy of their report, if any.

There is presently a park along the seawall as well as considerable open space between Harbor Drive and Front Avenue. Closure of Harbor Drive can contribute a little more grass area but no more open space and not much better access because the present Harbor Drive traffic will be partially funneled down Front Avenue and people will then have to still cross this traffic. The present park is little used because few people live within walking distance and parking within walking distance is expensive.

Another reason for the present lack of use by many people is that it is a gathering place for the skid row vagrants with their wine bottles. The summary handed out gives no reasons or requirements for the closing of Harbor Drive other than the Task Force's request. The summary states on Page 9 that little formal data has been assembled as to the impact other than those relating to traffic in the core area.

Whereas, as a matter of fact, Harbor Drive is a part of the innercommunication system of the entire City. Freeways are wonderful for relatively long distances and the I-5 Stadium Freeway, the Eastside Freeway Loop around the core area are fine for the through traveler or one coming from a distance into the core area. For example, if you're going from Tigard to Troutdale or from Tualatin to OMSI, the freeway system is wonderful. I love it, but for the relatively short haul from East Moreland to Terminal No. 2 or from Hillsdale where I live to Albina where I work, it is not possible to get onto a freeway, either present or contemplated, nor is it easy enough to compensate for the slower travel because the freeway distance is longer. In other words, you have to use some methods of innercommunication in the City other than freeways.

All of the statements this afternoon have been aimed on the fact that we're talking about downtown, the core area. Portland is like any other metropolitan city in the United States or the world in that we're decentralizing very rapidly. Industry is moving north, they're moving east, they're moving west, they're moving south. Tualatin is a large industrial area now. Beaverton area is a large industrial area now. The Port is developing the rivergate property as industrial area. We're moving out of the core area. Mr. Lloyd with the Lloyd Center proved that shoppers will go to where they can find parking. We are getting
more and more decentralized parking areas so we need the innercommunications. I am very much in favor of Tri-Met. They're fine, I would love to use them. It is very difficult for me to use the bus system to go to work, plus in my work I need to travel about the City, and it's almost impossible to do it in the time allotted. The bus system just cannot economically produce a transportation system that will allow a businessman to travel about the City as required. The Highway Department, all their members drive automobiles. Members of the City Staff drive automobiles. They have to get about the City, so you cannot use Tri-Met or any other transportation system to conduct their normal business. This is over and above the business of getting people from home to work. There just has to be alternate routes, and they all cannot be freeways.

Harbor Drive is one of those alternate routes and partially it has been developed and maintained as virtually an expressway without signals nor cross traffic. It is the connecting link between the closed in four quadrants of the City. For example, from southwest to north, from northwest to southwest or southeast. If you go by automobile from those areas you will generally go down Harbor Drive.

Actually, Harbor Drive is the quickest route from southeast area. For instance, the area around Grand Avenue and Hawthorne to the north location such as the City Water Department's map over on Interstate Avenue. The quickest way is to go across the Steel Bridge, down Harbor Drive and across the Hawthorne Bridge rather than to get tangled up with freeway traffic such as this morning where we had a truck jackknife in the middle of it.

Throughout the presentation of the Highway Department, throughout the summary of Commissioner Anderson's statement, throughout all of the statements that have been made, the impact of the closure has been stated as: (1) some slow down is anticipated, (2) closure of Harbor Drive may be counterproductive to that usual planned highway development to expedite traffic, (3) the result of closure would be to increase peak-period congestion on the Marquam Bridge and the East Bank Freeway.

Another impact will be to operate at a marginally tolerable level of service of the freeways. The fundamental issue remains, areas where congestion now develops will experience an increase in problem magnitude. The statement has been made that the plans for the reuse of the area have not yet been prepared. The City Planning Director leaves a decision to wait on completion of a waterfront development plan. The Downtown Planning Staff were supposed to make the plan, want traffic diversion problems to be solve first. Everybody's pointing to somebody else.

The people who are opposed other than myself are the Highway Department because the closure will result in lowering of serviceability of the street and highway system to a marginally tolerable level. The City Engineer is opposed on the basis of cost; a very good economic reason. The Traffic Engineer is opposed because it creates traffic problems that cannot be solved. Fire and police have indicated their opposition because public safety will be diminished.
The air pollution authority says that it will quite likely increase the pollution level in downtown Portland. I only have one say: keep Harbor Drive but let's improve the area. The area can be improved between the Morrison and Hawthorne Bridge, widen the southbound traffic lane at least one lane. We can get better access to the present promenade along the seawall by building additional pedestrian overpass bridges, and from a safety standpoint erect permanent fences to prevent jaywalking such as was done during the Rose Festival for safety reasons.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to make this statement. If anyone has any questions, I'd be very pleased to try and answer them.

HON. MAYOR SCHRUNK: Are there questions of Mr. Bullwinkle? Thank you, Sir. Council want a recess? Council will be at recess ten minutes. Council come to order, the hearing will continue. Mr. John J. Mathews has asked to be heard.

MR. JOHN J. MATHEWS: Your honor, gentlemen, I'm John J. Mathews, Chairman of the Board of the Oregon Draymen and Warehousemen's Association. Our association represents approximately 110 member companies, operates about 3,000 motor trucks in the State of Oregon, most of which are based here in Portland and operate on the Portland City streets.

Our association has no objection to closing Harbor Drive or any other main arterial provided some alternate of approximately equal carrying capacity is provided. The association is certainly not in love with Harbor Drive as a means of getting to and fro because it has perils of its own. For example, at the north end it requires that we cross railroad tracks in very heavy traffic. Moreover, I think our members can fairly be said from their own records to show that they have a considerable concern with the environment both social and physical of this town as well as anybody else does.

There are certain problems that we would like to draw to your attention. however, they all arise out of this basic fact that the so called alternates that are being offered to Harbor Drive as a traffic arterial are not in fact alternates at all. If you look at them they really get down to about three in number. One is the East Bank Freeway. Anyone who travels the East Bank Freeway knows that already today with Harbor Drive still in existence the East Bank Freeway will not tolerate additional volumes of traffic at the heavier hours.

Secondly, the Stadium Freeway has been suggested. As a matter of fact, the heaviest flow, and this is born out by the Highway Department's own studies, the heaviest flow of truck traffic that uses Harbor Drive moves between the northwest industrial area and the southwest industrial area. All right, if you attempt to use the Stadium Freeway to carry that traffic load you find you can enter rather easily at the northwest end but there's no way practically to get off at the southwest end. There is one ramp that goes up at Sixth Avenue and if you attempted to put approximately 2,000 truck movements a day up that ramp you might as well close the ramp and forget it. There's simply no way.
Now the Stadium Freeway as things stand right now simply is not a way that you can get those truck movements back and forth between the northwest part of town and the southwest part of town.

The third alternate, so called, that has been suggested is Front Avenue. Well as a matter of fact, the engineers who are concerned with the project readily conceived that there is no way that Front Avenue, as it will be resignaled and as it will be relaid out, can carry anything resembling the present volume of traffic nor can it carry it at anything resembling the present speed.

Now the consequences of this absence of present alternates, and by present I mean even up through the opening of the Fremont Bridge, until some other alternates are offered at least identifiable to this extent.

First of all, there is going to be a tremendous increase in the amount of time consumed in attempting to make deliveries between the northwest and the southwest parts of town. This will be particularly aggravated in attempting to serve the stores and office buildings in the southwest portion of the city. The immediate result of this is going to be, first of all, service is going to deteriorate rapidly and secondly the charges for providing the service which are based largely on a matter of time are going to sharply increase.

It was stated earlier here today that the physical cost of closing Harbor Drive was only something like $750,000. I'd like to point out that the best judgment of our association is that the immediate result of closing Harbor Drive would be at least one million dollars a year and that's every year after year increase in the charge of providing service to downtown Portland. I would point out in addition, that as I said earlier since we are concerned with the environment it seems inescapable that if our equipment and the private automobiles with whom we compete for parking space and driving space are slowed down to the degree that seems inescapable, the air pollution in the southwest part of this town is going to be vastly increased. Mayor, do you have any questions?

HON. MAYOR SCHRUNK: Are there questions the Commissioners have or the Highway Commission?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: With reference to your statement about access from northwest Portland to southwest Portland and your concern over access you indicated that the access in northwest Portland is satisfactory but the problem is in the southwest area. When you're talking about southwest, do you have reference to the area of access to the central business district or further south?
MR. MATHEWS: Commissioner Anderson, our prime concern is one of getting the heavy truck traffic from the northwest part of town into what's called the Macadam Avenue or Macadam-Harbor industrial area. As far as getting into downtown is concerned, if we're going to enter downtown anyway, I don't think that the closing of Harbor Drive is going to materially affect that. It may slow it down as far as getting there. The problem's going to be that if you generally congest the area once we're into the area you see we're slowed down.

As far as this through movement that I described from northwest to the Macadam Avenue area, this is presently insolvable unless we have offered to us some alternate such as an on-ramp and an off-ramp to the Salem Freeway somewhere in the vicinity of Gibbs or Pennoyer or some such address as that. Have I answered your question?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes. I did have another one, and that is generally what is your attitude on your organization's attitude towards the increased use or commitment to the development of a mass transit system in the metropolitan area.

MR. MATHEWS: I think we're entirely in favor of it, Commissioner, because it recognizes as I said a moment ago in a sense our vehicles are competing with the private vehicle for the use of the streets and each truck carries many times the amount of merchandise or property that would be required for the same property to be moved by private vehicles. If those vehicles are reduced in number because there is better mass transit, it helps our situation.

HON. MAYOR SCHRUNK: Further questions of Mr. Mathews? I wonder whether the State Highway Staff would have any comments with reference to his concern about this access into southwest area?

MR. KLABOE: Mr. Chairman, we've analyzed the things the gentleman has said and I've appeared before his group and explained these possibilities to him. He has, I think, put it very clearly. There is poor access using the Stadium Freeway from the northwest industrial area to the area of the Alaska Junk Yard and that industrial complex down there.

The alternate routes that they would have to use and consider if Harbor Drive is closed is to use the Marquam Bridge, the East Bank Freeway, and the Fremont Bridge in order to get between these two areas or to use Front Avenue or to use a complex system utilizing the Sixth Avenue ramp on the Stadium to get back and forth which is a very poor way because it goes through urban renewal area. Now, we're continuing to look for solutions to this problem, Sir, as I've told you but we've not found a good one yet.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, I'm certainly not here to argue with the engineering judgment of the Highway Department. As a matter of fact, I'm glad that they're continuing to look. I think the
important thing for the Council to have in mind is that the problem is very real and it's very large and it's one that simply can't be swept aside with a vague promise that we're going to keep looking for a solution hopefully, and maybe we'll find one.

HON. MAYOR SCHRUNK: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Roger Shiels.

MR. SHIELS: I'm Roger Shiels, 737 S. W. Vista, a member of the Portland City Club Committee charged with preparing a report on the Portland waterfront and its development. I have been asked to make a statement for that committee regarding the current Highway Division proposal for abandoning Harbor Drive.

Our committee issued an interim report in August 1969, which, among other things, cites the advantages that can be accrued to our city if Harbor Drive is vacated. I will not dwell on those advantages but will make some observations about the current Highway Division proposal.

This proposal offers three advantages over the Highway Division proposal presented last January. First, traffic lights have been proposed along Front Avenue which will allow more workable pedestrian access to the waterfront area.

Second, the idea of a First-Front couplet has been abandoned and together with the introduction of pedestrian-traffic signals, through traffic will be encouraged to seek alternate routes around the downtown core. There is no longer a threat of unreasonable traffic increases on downtown streets due to the closure of Harbor Drive.

Last, and in my opinion most important, the current Highway Division proposal for rerouting Harbor traffic has been substantially reduced in cost from their previous proposal. Proposed ramps and connections will more likely be considered temporary. Therefore, it would appear that the Highway Division can meet its stated need for timing Harbor closure with the Fremont Bridge opening while still allowing the downtown planning team time to consider more permanent and perhaps more imaginative solutions to traffic flow in and around the downtown core. We believe that the current Highway Division proposal is consistent with the goals outlined in the City Club interim report and urge the City Council to adopt this closure proposal. Thank you.

HON. MAYOR SCHRUNK: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Oakland has requested to be heard.

MR. OAKLAND: I'm Sam Oakland, I live at 3446 N. W. Thurman in Portland, Oregon. I'm a clerk at the Bicycle Lobby. I have a short statement to read. I'm tired of seeing the same old tired designs.

Well, first I must say that I support the closure of Harbor Drive and then I'll say I'm tired of seeing the same old tired designs coming
from the same old tired designers. That is piecemeal, hindsight approaches to serious traffic problems in the City. I'm tired of the philosophic position that says well they're here, the automobiles, we should accommodate them or we might as well fight the battle and do a good job as long as we are there, and this avoids the question of whether or not it's a good thing that they or we are there. We, after all, don't have to sink with the boat as it's going down just because we're on it. We would try to figure out how to get off. We could face the problems.

The good Japanese, Finnish, or Swedish architect goes to live on his cabin site for a number of weeks. He tries to find out where the winds blow from. What smells and what doesn't. What the life style of the property is. He doesn't bulldoze the land flat, dig basements, erect pink cottages, plant shrubs then to cover the sidewalks. He gets the feel of the land first and then he builds his cabin in and with nature. We now have a design problem with Harbor Drive and we have a number of problems in Portland. We have something called the so-called waterfront and what's going to happen to that and our designers, of course, will not go and sit on the site, that's ridiculous. They would choke, be blinded by the smog, be deafened by the sounds of the traffic if they managed to make it through a whole afternoon. If they did make it through the afternoon, they could wait for people to come by in passing cars and throw things at them as they were sitting there. If they made it to the evening or the night they might enjoy themselves at three or four. Then, if they could still hear, see, and feel they might discover a most delightful spot; a most delightful city if they weren't arrested for using a public park after hours.

Now, Portland has one of the most beautiful city sites in the United States. Most of it has been already ruined. Much more of it will be ruined if the City Council does not do some things like closing Harbor Drive and putting automobiles where they should be in two or three parking lots.

Very slowly we are bulldozing, very carefully we are carpeting everything with asphalt. We have already destroyed one side of the river. It's a gross, sterile ribbon of glaring white nothing. It could have been a usable, gentle green strip; now it's a horizontal elevator for moving unseen and unfeeling automobiles and people as quickly as possible through the City of Portland in steel envelopes. The designers say we need a park, we need grass, we need to be able to see the polluted water of the Willamette and feel it. We must be humane in our approach to the waterfront, we must build a park from Burnside to Hawthorne; a beautiful park, it will be thousands of feet long and fourteen feet wide. We will also then build beautiful red connectors, as the map shows, to Front Street to hook up so that thirty to fifty thousand cars can carry 1.2 people each day along that fourteen foot stretch of grass and there will be traffic lights to stop so they can stop, look, and litter while making their three-minute run, four-minute run, or five-minute run.
Now, I'm sorry about the design. I'm sorry that the downtown plan isn't done already. I wish it were, but what I ask you is make a downtown plan for the people - not a downtown plan for the automobile. You might even make a downtown plan for the bus, I'll support you on that. Make a waterfront for the people, not a parking place for automobiles. It's almost too late, there's not much time left. We have a very little bit of the City left. The river's not a very pleasant place to boat on or to sail on. You only have a few hours left to think about the problem.

The Bicycle Lobby supports the closure of Harbor Drive and would ask that you would move the automobiles completely out of the downtown core area. Make provisions for delivery trucks; that's very, very important. We have to keep the downtown alive but move the private automobile out and I would also urge you to someday get rid of all of the parking pollute stations we have downtown.

MR. IVANCIE: Mr. Mayor, I'd like to ask Mr. Oakland a question.

HON. MAYOR SCHRUNK: Yes, Mr. Ivancie.

MR. IVANCIE: Where do you see the 14-foot green strip here on this map?

MR. OAKLAND: Oh, the green strip? That's right along the river. That's the 14 foot green strip. That's an illusion 14 feet. You see, how long it is compared to the depth.

MR. IVANCIE: Well, how wide is that strip in your estimation?

MR. OAKLAND: Which one? You mean all of Harbor Drive and all of Front? It changes, it keeps going from side to side. What I'm talking about is the illusion. I'm talking about - look how beautifully long it is. Now, you put automobiles right next to that beautiful long strip, and you have destroyed the beautiful long strip.

MR. IVANCIE: No, you said it was 14 feet.

MR. OAKLAND: Whether it's a hundred feet or whether it's two hundred feet.

MR. IVANCIE: You said it was 14 feet. I just wondered where you got that figure.

MR. OAKLAND: Exactly. Oh, 14 feet is an illusion number.

MR. IVANCIE: Well, no, it's not an illusionary hearing.
MR. OAKLAND: It's thousands, it's thousands
of feet long.

MR. IVANCIE: No, you said it's 14-feet wide.
Now, do you mean that or don't you?

MR. OAKLAND: No, no, no, that's a figure of
illusion.

MR. IVANCIE: All right.

MR. OAKLAND: Thank you very much.

HON. MAYOR SCHRUNK: Thank you. Mr. Martin Davis has
asked to be heard.

MR. MARTIN DAVIS: I'm Martin Davis representing the
Oregon Environmental Council with offices at 1238 N. W. Glisan, and I'd
like to say that the Council supports the closing of Harbor Drive but
has a few reservations on the scheme as presently before the City Council.

Certainly, this is a much better scheme than we saw in the January
hearing when you had the First-Front Couplet but generally I think my
position would be similar to that of Lloyd Keefe of the City Planning
Commission. We would like an evaluation by the Downtown Planners of this
Highway Department scheme and suggested alternates before construction
on this proposal starts. Now, I'm wondering can the Downtown Planners
suggest a date if July 1973 is too soon for them to have an alternate
to this scheme. I don't like the idea of this scheme being accepted
now by the City Council and the possibility that this scheme might be
considered binding.

Now, we've heard that it possibly could be changed if the Downtown
Planners come up with an alternate scheme, but I'm worried that if it is
accepted it will start further creative thinking by the Downtown Planners
in this area. I have another point to do with one of the contingencies
on the closure of Harbor Drive and that is with respect to the Industrial
Freeway, the I-505 I think it is called. There are some people who are
concerned about that freeway and they are studying proposals that would
get the traffic from the freeway ramps into the industrial area where
60% of that traffic wants to go without building the I-505 Freeway, so
I would not like to see that Harbor Drive closure contingent on the
building of that industrial freeway.

And, lastly, Neil Goldschmidt mentioned to the Traffic Engineer where
the other means are being considered in the City's traffic planning and
it does appear that automobiles and traffic are synonomous in the thinking
by many of the City officials. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I would like to comment if I may,
your honor.
HON. MAYOR SCHRUNK: Yes, Mr. Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: With reference to the I-505, I think that recommendations, at least associated with the Harbor Drive closure and the development of access into the northwest Portland area, we're talking more about access that would be off the Fremont Bridge and off the Stadium Freeway and isn't necessarily contingent on the I-505 being extended out past Montgomery Ward and into that area although there is a committed alignment for that facility. What we're discussing now on it is the access to and from that facility as you had noted.

MR. DAVIS: Yes, good, I'm glad that that is not considered as a final solution.

HON. MAYOR SCHRUNK: Thank you, Sir. Marlene L. Stahl requests to be heard. Mrs. Stahl.

MRS. STAHL: Mayor Schrunk, members of the City Council, and representatives of the Highway Division. My name is Marlene Stahl, I live at 2235 N. E. 28th Avenue in Portland. I am a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee appointed by the City Council on May 20th to participate in the Downtown Planning effort. The purpose of our 18 member lay committee is to generate community interest in the Downtown Plan, to solicit citizen suggestions on the various phases of the plan as they are developed, and to advise in the setting of goals, determination of priorities, and the selection of alternatives for action and implementation by the Downtown Plan.

We are deeply concerned about the Harbor Drive issue, and the pivotal role the riverfront plays in the health and the very vitality of the entire downtown area. This question was discussed and brought to a vote at a meeting held last night and I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of Citizens Advisory Committee.

First, we wholeheartedly endorse the concept embodied in Commissioner Anderson's recommendations to the Council. Our committee wishes to stress that a definite policy commitment for the closure of Harbor Drive as is presently used should be made at this time. In particular, we endorse Recommendation #1 in full and I would like to quote from Commissioner Anderson's report: "By resolution, the City Council, Multnomah, County, and the State Highway Commission agree that Harbor Drive will be closed as it is presently designed. That the Council endorse the re-use of Harbor Drive area for waterfront-oriented activities compatible with the development of the central business district as a whole".

The consequence of this commitment will permit us to plan today for that time when we can redeem the waterfront for the use of public and pedestrian activities.
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Second, the committee would like to offer this observation regarding the Environmental Impact Statement that was prepared by the Highway Division on this proposal. While we carefully read and considered the draft summary, and it does present the effect of the plan on the movement of automobiles in considerable detail and the effect that that would have on the City, we didn't feel that your presentation on the other environmental concerns were in the kind of depth that we needed as a committee to be able to judge what these impacts might be. Certainly this type of decision will be far reaching in many areas of concern to the people of our city and should be examined beyond just the movement of cars.

In conclusion, our committee looks forward to making a very meaningful contribution to the planning effort by fostering the broadest possible interest in the future of our city by the people of Portland. Our committee itself represents a very diverse variety of interests, occupations, and ages, and we are unanimous in our conviction that the development of the waterfront area will play a very central role in the downtown plan as it is finally brought to completion. We'd like to thank you, Mayor Schrunk, and members of the Council for the opportunity you've given us to serve our city and we hope to do the kind of job you expect of us. Thank you.

MAYOR SCHRUNK: Thank you, mam, and we certainly appreciate your willingness to serve and make a meaningful input. Thank you. Mr. Robert Belcher has asked to be heard.

MR. ROBERT BELCHER: I'm Robert Belcher, 1533 N. E. Stanton, I'd like to make a few comments on behalf of the Riverfront for People Committee. We commend Commissioner Anderson's report to the Council as a thorough and unusual effort to bring together viewpoints of all responsible officials and to set forth a clear plan of activities making a multi-purpose redevelopment of the riverfront a practical possibility.

In particular, we would like to support the reports calling for a joint commitment to the closure, the closure date, and its clear recognition that a development plan and traffic reassessment are key urgent matters which should be affected before closure of Harbor Drive. We have one basic question, however, and that's whether the closure should await all the related program steps that should be taken as outlined in Commissioner Anderson's report by the Highway Commission and or by Tri-Met.

I had a few questions here which I think our committee felt needn't be answered today but these were questions which occurred to us. Is it correct that preliminary agreement with the Highway Commission and with Tri-Met to take such steps has been reached and we're particularly concerned that the July '73 date seems like a reasonable date for them to accomplish the recommended steps. Is the Portland Planning Commission responsible for the detailed waterfront plan and is it agreeable to the July 1973 closure date?

If the Planning Commission is not entirely responsible, will the plan clearly be completed by others by the closure date, and that question
really has reference to Commissioner Anderson's point that there should be a market feasibility study? We're wondering who would do this, we're not wondering who would do this but am wondering if this can all be accomplished by July '73? If there is a Federal or a State Highway construction delay, what will the City Council position be? Should there be no clear agreement that all parties can adhere to the July 1973 closure date we would today favor the Council considering July 1973 as a definite date for closure without waiting for all the suggested steps to be completed as outlined in Commissioner Anderson's report. Thank you.

MAYOR SCHRUNK: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Alex Pierce has asked to be heard. Now if there are other cards in the audience if you'll hold them up why I'm sure that one of the Highway people will pick them up.

MR. ALEX PIERCE: My name is Alex Pierce, address 405 N. W. 18th, gentlemen I'm very perplexed that the whole matter of this question is not really being put into proper perspective. What are the goals of planning the downtown? Are they the movement of traffic or are they the pedestrian amenities, the attraction to the downtown area? I don't think that this question has been answered by anyone to date. If you are going to put this into proper perspective, then there has to be the decision as to how important the automobile becomes. And as stated in the report, perhaps the problem of traffic can never be solved at 5 o'clock or 8 o'clock in the morning. I really have doubts that this is possible.

Nor can the pedestrian traffic be solved and we have unfortunately no pedestrian department to testify to that point. But if it appeared that your priorities have to be established, and I think in establishing those priorities I would urge you immediately to resolve to set into resolution that Harbor Drive be closed, period. Of course, following certain design that would come after it. I think that it is important that you establish yourself with the fact that you will close Harbor Drive which I don't think has been stated to this point. I may be incorrect in that but I don't believe that I am.

I feel that the presentation as offered in the map to my right is very inadequate as a long-range solution or even perhaps a short-range solution. I think that it just takes the problem of Harbor Drive and moves it over and you still have separated the waterfront to a degree, or to quite a sizable degree, from the downtown and from the pedestrian having access to the waterfront. The question of closing time that's announced in the report titled, "Draft and Environmental Impact Statement", I think is fallacious. I do not agree that the timing has to be in some relationship to the opening of the Fremont Bridge.

I see no reasonable argument related to the closing of Harbor Drive. I think that it is more important that when Harbor Drive is closed the proper plans have been prepared to solve as best as possible recognizing that there must be compromises.
I feel that in attending meetings of the State Highway Department that it's much like buying a cheap suit. Because I find myself being shown one suit after another and to the point that I am gradually worn down just by exhaustion, and I wonder whether there are going to be 15 or 20 more proposals on the wall for the public to come in to see. I think it's ridiculous that you call the public hearings without some very positive and appropriate plan.

Now that's a, that adjective, of course, is very broad. I think that you gentlemen can recognize if you meet with the Planning Commission and you find that the Planning Commission is against it, and if you meet with certain Commissioners and they are against it, and other representatives of the public are not really in accord with the plan, then there is no reason to get everybody together and discuss it. I would rather you bring forward a plan that has gone through some preliminary consideration by responsible officials and then at that time, we really sit down and say this should be and this should not be.

MAYOR SCHRUNK: Then Alex you would accuse us of not having a citizen's input that we would try to give you a packaged program. We now are soliciting the general public's thoughts and ideas. And then we hope to crystalize based upon this - a plan.

MR. PIERCE: I think the public's idea should not be at a State Highway meeting. I think that there are other ways for input of public ideas in and after that public idea has been generated then to act upon a plan which has some merit. I can't see that just bringing on a minimal plan and then compromising and making another step and another step until finally the general public is worn down, and perhaps by the sixth time, the sixteenth plan shows up at the Council hearing that there be nobody in the audience because they have been through this many many times before and I feel that this is what does happen at State Highway hearings.

MAYOR SCHRUNK: Now, this is a Council and State Highway hearing.

MR. PIERCE: I recognize that.

MAYOR SCHRUNK: We want the input, the people of Portland.

MR. PIERCE: Uh huh.

MAYOR SCHRUNK: I personally, publicly, said many times. I hope we can develop a realistic program to recapture that waterfront for public use, pedestrian use, things of that nature. That's my idea, my thoughts. I have talked to a lot of people about it including you, and I think the Council wants the thoughts of everyone rather than just try to come up with a plan and say, this is it, take it or leave it.

MR. PIERCE: I sense this, and I think other people sense that this is the procedure, that we will try this plan and if they don't accept that plan then we'll go to another one, and if that doesn't
work then we'll keep on down the line until eventually one will get by, and I don't think that's the proper way of planning. And I recognize, Mr. Mayor, your sentiments in this and I appreciate them. I would like to have you gentlemen act upon a resolution which will say positively we're going to close Harbor Drive.

MAYOR SCHRUNK: That's the point we're trying to get to, but we also want to know what people think. You know how you draft plans in your profession; sometimes your client wants to change them. You make suggestions and that's what we have thrown out here.

MR. PIERCE: But I feel, for instance, this plan which has so many contradictions, or let's say has so many arguments for and against, is not prepared to the point that it's ready for public exposure. I feel that there has got to be a lot of study beyond what is proposed.

Now, I sense that if the public were in approbation of this plan today that the State Highway would feel that, yes this is it, and will go ahead and do it. Now I might be wrong in that but that's the way I feel in that matter, and I feel that the general public when they come to this meeting come because they feel that this is the last chance to be heard on this matter. And if they don't come then the thing is going to happen and someone will say, well you had the right to speak up, and I don't believe that's the way that it should operate. I think there should be more preliminary discussions and designs before the plan is brought forth and we say that this is a plan.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Alex, when you're talking about this - is the plan - are you talking about the waterfront itself or the facilities marked in red? In other words, I don't think that there's any representation at this hearing that there's any plan of development for that area that's marked in green.

MR. PIERCE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I think the feeling is that if the public reaction is strongly against the closure of Harbor Drive and that concept, then we ought to drop it and leave the facility open. But I don't think it can be done as easily as you're talking about because you've got a whole series of complex things that are associated with this closure. If you close it, and besides that, what happens to the access to some of the areas that John Mathews testified about as far as industrial traffic is concerned? They become kind of the guts of the city as far as service is concerned. Three percent of the people in this city use mass transit as a means of moving around the city so if we're to make a commitment of shifting the three percent to let's say twenty percent then it's done gradually. It isn't done by just closing Harbor Drive and taking no other action. There's a whole series of things that need to be done.

MR. PIERCE: No, I hope that I didn't imply that. I don't intend to such a simplistic solution as that. I say that I think
you should resolve that Harbor Drive will be closed and then work in every manner to the solutions of these problems. Now you're stating that you feel that all the solutions should come forth before you make such resolution.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, I don't think so or you would have a detailed plan of that area marked in green if you had all the solutions worked out ahead of time.

MR. PIERCE: No. I'm relating to the traffic solution.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, I don't think you can solve all those.

MR. PIERCE: I don't believe you can either.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Still, at the same time we need to have enough understanding of what's going to happen in that area where Harbor Drive is now to have a feeling that if we're going to do some trading, that is, we're going to close an expressway facility we want to know what's going to happen in that area to replace it. If, for example, it were to be simply left in grass I would oppose its closure.

MR. PIERCE: I would too.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I think that there's a lot more exciting things than that can happen to that Harbor Drive area to make it productive, to close it, because we're looking at 20 million dollars worth of facilities in there.

MR. PIERCE: Yes, I thoroughly agree with you. I hope that my statements weren't contradictory to that philosophy.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT: Alex, I missed the early part of your statement but I'm curious. Commissioner Anderson has listed or is discussing a number of things that need to go on and need to be accomplished if closure is going to occur. My question to you would be that if the Council adopts his recommended position which is we ought to take a position that it's going to be closed in July and October of '73, or whatever the date is, assuming these other things happen, what's your attitude and what's your position going to be if at the point in time when let's say something doesn't happen like the Industrial Freeway doesn't get completed in time, or whatever one of these components is and the Council announces another discussion as to whether we ought to close it all. Do you get my point?

That is, we're committed to closing it but here's some conditions that are being suggested we ought to adopt. Do you feel strongly enough about any one of these conditions to say that if they don't quite make it by that time we ought not to close it. That is to go back and look at it again. I gather you're saying just decide to do it and work toward those solutions.
MR. PIERCE: Yes, first off, I do not feel that you're going to solve all the traffic problem. I don't think that you're going to solve it even if you leave Harbor Drive open, you're not going to solve this city's problems but I think if you set a goal, say we're going to do this, and from that point on work and I am not saying that '73, I don't know if that's soon enough or late enough, but if you set the goal and then work to that end. I think that this is the positive way to act and I do agree with this outline of goals that have been stated in this letter from Mr. Anderson. Thank you.

MAYOR SCHRUNK: Thank you, Mr. Pierce. Is there discussion? Are there other cards in the audience? Is there any discussion by the Council at this time? Council will stay in recess until 7:30. Thank you all for participating. (Recessed at 4:38 p.m.)

Meeting Reconvened at 7:30 p.m.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: This is a continuation of the hearing that was held beginning at 2 p.m. this afternoon. The information with reference to relocation and other background information that is required to be provided will be a part of the transcript and those here that wish to obtain that information may do so by requesting a copy of the transcript following this meeting. Are there any here that would care to speak with reference to the proposed closure of Harbor Drive? Mr. Gellatly would you care to be heard? Would you care to give your name and address here and the information that you will testify to either for or against will become a part of the record and will appear in the transcript with reference to this hearing.

MR. HAROLD GELLATLY: Thank you, my name is Harold Gellatly, I reside at 1810 S. W. Canby Street in Portland. I'm sorry I didn't get here a few minutes sooner to look at some of this information that was just handed to me. However, I am speaking in protest to the closure of Harbor Drive. I think it is a mistake for the Highway Commission and the City to take this action. I have written to the Highway Commission under date of January 22 to Mr. Fred Klaboe and that letter of mine was made a part of the hearing which was held, I believe, at the Civic Auditorium in January. I have nothing new to add but is this previous letter a part of it - would it be possible to read it into the record of this meeting?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: You can file it if you'd like here and it will be a part of the record if you file it with us, whether you read it or not.

MR. GELLATLY: I don't have an extra copy with me, but I will leave this copy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: We'll have a copy of it made right now if you'd like and give you the original back. (letter at end of transcript)

MR. GELLATLY: In my letter of January 22nd, I believe the date was, I set forth three reasons why I feel it's important to leave Harbor Drive open for people who live in the northwest part of town and have occasion to drive into that area. First of all, I come from the
southwest part of the City. Either from the freeway or Barbur Boulevard and
in either event as soon as I enter the area of Harbor Drive I'm on a
limited access street which is close to 40 miles an hour. I can travel
three miles from there to the Steel Bridge in a very short period of
time which is far less air polluting and since ecology is a part of this
problem it's far less air pollution for me to travel at 40 miles an hour
than it would be to go through some other route of First Street or Front
Avenue or First Avenue at a much reduced rate of speed and entail traffic
signals and things of that nature.

I have yet to see any information as to how the traffic from the
Stadium Freeway will get down into the area of northwest Front Street which
is where I'm concerned. They have ramps under construction which will
carry the bulk of the traffic westerly. I believe it will go into the
other local traffic which is then going to continue to cause local traffic
congestion. Had they planned to put ramps from the north end of the
Stadium Freeway directly into Front Avenue or N. W. Front Street it's
officially called, I believe, then they would have eliminated a hazard
of traffic and made it suitable access to get in and out instead of getting
into local traffic which by the time you get down on the ground again is
going to be a considerable distance from N. W. Front Street. Is there
anyone here that can answer my question about the possibility of ramp
construction other than those high ramps which are in existence at the
present time partly unfinished?

MR. KLABOE: I'm Mr. Klaboe who you referred to a
minute ago. There will be ramps constructed from the Stadium Freeway
and from the west end of the Fremont Bridge down to ground level at
21st Street temporarily. Later on there will be additional ramps con-
structed to connect the local streets at 22nd and 23rd. These ramps
will provide access to the dock area that you're speaking about via 21st,
22nd, and 23rd Streets.

MR. GELLATLY: And what part of those avenues will
it come down? Will it be close to Front Street or will it be a half a
mile away or so?

MR. KLABOE: It will be between Vaughn and Upshur
Streets.

MR. GELLATLY: Vaughn and Upshur, and it still makes
the problem of getting over on the north side of the railroad tracks, the
switching yards and so forth.

MR. KLABOE: There will be some inconvenience at
times when the railroad is switching, that's true.

MR. GELLATLY: Yes, I'm very familiar with those
inconveniences. That's one reason I am opposed to the closure of Harbor
Drive. I realize that that may sound a little contradictory because
Harbor Drive and N. W. Front Street do have a problem at the Steel
Bridge at times and other switching tracks but it's not anything com-
pared to crossing the main switching yards and the main line going
through the northwest part of Portland. I have nothing further; I
thank you for hearing me.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you, Sir. Are there others here who would care to be heard? (Pause) I see no particular reason for continuation of the meeting -

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Anderson -

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Yes?

MR. WOLFE: Just for the record would you announce one more time that people will have ten days from today to submit written statements.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Those who wish to file a written statement in addition to the testimony that they may have given, or independent testimony, will have ten days following today to file those statements either with the City or the State Highway Commission and that information will be taken under consideration when we're evaluating what action the Council and the Highway Commission will take. Seeing no further requests for testimony with reference to this hearing, I declare the Council hearing recessed until Monday and this hearing closed. Thank you.

Meeting Closed at 7:40 p.m.
The Department generally agrees that the closure of Harbor Drive will increase traffic density; that reduction in motor vehicle speed and continuity of travel will increase carbon monoxide emissions from individual motor vehicles; and that the closure of Harbor Drive will have an adverse effect upon air quality.

Because of the projected adverse effects on air quality, the Department concludes that it must oppose the closure of Harbor Drive until plans for traffic flow and projected control of motor vehicle emissions are more definitely established to prevent adverse air quality effects.

The Department would point out that should the open space for people oriented river-front development be established in terms of a public use facility, the traffic density in that area could substantially increase beyond that currently projected.

The Department will be pleased to provide any additional information available.

Very truly yours,

Kenneth H. Spies, Director
Department of Environmental Quality

KHS:HMP:h
Based upon air quality measurements and population, the Portland Interstate Air Quality Control Region has been proposed as a priority I Region in respect to the contaminant carbon monoxide, the primary source of which is the motor vehicle.

Sub-part C of the proposed implementation plan regulations pertaining to situations provides:

"(a) The Governor of a State may, at the time of submission of a plan to implement a primary standard in a Priority I Region, request the Administrator to extend, for a period not exceeding 2 years, the 3-year period for attainment of the primary standard in such region.

(b) Any such request regarding an interstate region shall be submitted jointly with the requests of Governors of all States in the region, or shall show that the Governor of each State in the region has been notified of such request."

Air quality measurements made by the Department on a continuous basis on West Burnside indicate that in order to achieve the Federal primary standard relating to carbon monoxide, controls approximately equivalent to a 60% reduction in traffic density will be necessary to meet the standard. The Columbia-Willamette Air Pollution Authority has also conducted measurements which indicate that carbon monoxide levels are excessive in other downtown areas.

While it is apparent that additional studies to further define the problem would be necessary, data does suggest that traffic densities of 32,000 vehicles per day are problem areas relative to carbon monoxide under adverse meteorological conditions in the core area.

It is also projected that under the implementation plan requirements, present control measures will not result in reaching the objective of the primary standard for carbon monoxide of 10 milligrams per cubic meter for 8 hours or 40 milligrams per cubic meter for one hour by 1977, the time required by the implementation plan, if a 2-year extension is obtained, without additional traffic flow control or additional individual motor vehicle control equipment.