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Floyd Query
Floyd Query, Secretary
OREGON STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION
MR. VICTOR D. WOLFE: Ladies and gentlemen, it is 2 p.m. January 14, 1971, which time has been established for this hearing to accept oral and/or written statements on the proposed elimination and closure of a portion of Harbor Drive lying basically between the Steel Bridge and the Hawthorne Bridge along Portland's west side waterfront on the Pacific Highway West (US 99W), lying within the city of Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon.

The hearings were advertised in the legal notice section of the newspapers of the area in conformance with State statutes and Federal regulations. The news media have been very cooperative to the end that the public must surely have been well informed that there was to be a formal hearing today preceded by informational sessions.

At this time 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 the council of such city within ten days after receipt of such letter, the Commission or its designated representative shall hold a public hearing at 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 Policy and Procedure Memorandum 20-8, issued as revised January 14, 1969:

"1. PURPOSE
   a. The purpose of this PPM is to ensure, 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 early and amicable resolution of controversial issues that may arise.

b. The PPM requires State highway departments to consider fully a wide range of factors in determining highway locations and highway designs. It provides for extensive coordination of proposals with public and private interests. In addition, it provides for a two-hearing procedure designed to give all interested persons an opportunity to become fully acquainted with highway proposals of concern to them and to express their views at those stages of a proposal’s development when the flexibility to respond to these views still exists."

I would appreciate very much in view of the inclement weather all the help I can get from the news media in my next statement.

In line with this Policy and Procedure Memorandum, you will be entitled to ten days from today to submit written statements reflecting your views on this proposal. This can be done by addressing a letter to the State Highway Commission, State Highway Building, Salem 97310. These communications will be made a part of the transcript of the hearing just as though the statement had been made here today.

So that you may know those of us at the front of the auditorium, starting on your far left Mr. Cecil Head, Assistant Secretary to the Highway Commission; Mr. Hal Versteeg, Assistant Metropolitan Engineer, Highway Division; Mr. Fred Klaboe, Assistant State Highway Engineer, Salem; Mr. Dave Moehring, Right of Way Engineer, Salem; Mr. Ernest Valach, Federal Highway Administration; I am Victor Wolfe, Administrative Assistant to the State Highway Engineer. (There were approximately 120 other persons present.)

At this time I would like to ask Mr. Klaboe to explain to you the proposal.

Mr. Klaboe, before you start, during the afternoon and evening you will see persons smoking up here. They have allowed us to do this. Those of you who wish to smoke, if you will go out to the foyer, feel free to do so at any time. Excuse me, Fred.

MR. FRED KLABOE: In the fall of 1968, Governor McCall created a committee consisting of nine members, three from the City of Portland, three from Multnomah County and three from the State, to study the possibility of establishing a Harbor Drive parkway on the west side of the Willamette River approximately between the Ross Island and Steel Bridges. This committee has been active for
the past two years. The results of their deliberations led to this hearing which is to determine the reaction of the public to the vacation of Harbor Drive along the west bank of the Willamette River and the institution of alternate facilities to handle the transportation demands that would be created by the removal of the existing route.

The reasons for holding the hearing at this time are twofold:

1. There are several studies under way in the downtown Portland area for improving the character of the city and the environment available to its citizens. It is the opinion of the Task Force that these objectives can be enhanced by the creation of a land bank as a given condition. The proposal you see here today creates approximately 22 acres of available space between the Hawthorne and Steel Bridges and 12 acres of open space between Harrison Street and the Hawthorne Bridge.

With such a substantial land bank as this at their disposal, the planners and their policy committees should be able to do a superior job on their assignment. I really do not know exactly how much these 34 acres are worth but, assuming a value of $25 a square foot, the land bank would be valued at slightly under $37 million dollars. Since the City and the State own almost all of the land involved, the value would serve to match substantial amounts of federal funds.

2. If Harbor Drive is to be eliminated and a substantial land bank created for the use of the City, it is most logical that the timing coincide with the opening of the Fremont Bridge and its interchange to the northwest with Thurman and Vaughn Streets. It is expected that this work will be completed in the early part of 1972. In order therefore to make the closure of Harbor Drive, if such is the desire, concurrent with the opening of the Fremont Bridge, we must proceed at this time with the necessary and required hearings so that we will have time to acquire the needed right-of-way and construct substitute facilities.

I must emphasize here that the State Highway Commission is holding this hearing and, if it is determined that Harbor Drive should in fact be vacated for the reasons stated above, they will consider very carefully the testimony given here today concerning the handling of traffic through this corridor. They will also confer with and be advised by those planners and policy makers who are now involved in the planning process for the future downtown plan.

We therefore feel that this hearing today is a two-part hearing—part one being the determination of the desirability of closing Harbor Drive and part two being the discussion of a plan to handle traffic that will be diverted from Harbor Drive after it has been closed, if closure is to be the decision.
On January 12, 1970, the Harbor Drive Task Force retained a consultant firm to make an analysis of the Harbor Drive proposal in accordance with this goal: "To create an inviting human space containing features to attract people, giving them pleasure and enjoyment and capitalizing on the natural asset we have in the Willamette River."

The purpose of the study was to determine the current and future traffic impact of alternate type of facilities required to replace the surface capacity of Harbor Drive in order to provide a land bank on the Portland waterfront.

The consultant's report indicates that Harbor Drive can be removed from the transportation facility at such time as the Fremont Bridge and its westerly approaches are open to traffic if related minor changes in the remaining street system are instituted at that time. It is suggested that these changes be approximately the plan you see before you today; that is, a First-Front Couplet with expanded capacity. This plan allows the creation of the largest land bank possible.

The report further states that sometime in the future, probably when the Mt. Hood Freeway is opened to traffic, additional capacity will need to provide to handle the demand in the north-south corridor. The State Highway Division has estimated that the Mt. Hood Freeway will not be opened to full use prior to 1976; therefore, the conclusion is that if Harbor Drive is vacated when the Fremont Bridge is opened in 1972, an improved First-Front Couplet will operate satisfactorily until 1976 or 1977 when some further treatment will have to be instituted.

The suggested plan, briefly stated, would connect the Interstate 5 freeway ramps to Front and First Avenues in the vicinity of Market Street and utilize these streets as a one-way couplet northerly past the Burnside Bridge and end the couplet by tying into the existing ramps to and from the Steel Bridge and the ramps to and from Front Avenue.

Revisions will be needed on First Avenue to provide more width under the Morrison Bridge ramps and more width and height under the Burnside Bridge. A minor shift in alignment will be required on Front Avenue to take two lanes on each side of existing bridge columns at the Hawthorne Bridge and the Burnside Bridge. In obtaining the needed additional width under the Morrison Bridge ramps, it will be necessary to eliminate the street connections to First Avenue which parallel those ramps. In order to provide a minimum of three lanes southbound, it will be necessary to remove parking from First Avenue throughout the length of the project. The connections between Front Avenue and Harbor Drive will be obliterated and the ramp over Harbor Drive for the connection between Harbor Way and Columbia and Jefferson Streets would be removed and a normal street connection built. Depending upon future development of the area, Harbor Way may have to be widened to four lanes.
Details of pavement removal, regrading, et cetera, will not be finalized until we have more knowledge of the ultimate use and development of the areas involved. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Fred. At this time I would like to call on Mr. Moehring in conformance with Federal regulations to explain right-of-way procedures and relocation assistance.

MR. DAVID MOEHRING: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. In the event additional property is required for the construction of the project, it will be appraised either by a member of the Highway Division's appraisal staff or by a fee appraiser, or both, and following a review of the appraisal background, negotiations will be undertaken with the owner of the property. All appraisals will be on the basis of "market value."

"Market Value" is defined as the price a willing buyer would pay for a property offered by a willing seller with neither party having any obligation to either buy or sell. This is known as the willing buyer-willing seller concept and is the basis for "market value."

For the State to pay less than market value would be unfair to the property owner. For the State to pay more than the market value of property would be unfair to the road user who provides the tax monies for road improvements.

The second session of the 91st Congress passed, and the President signed into law, the uniform relocation assistance and real property acquisition policies act of 1970. This law became effective on January 2, 1971, and it enumerates the benefits available to persons displaced from their homes, farms, or business locations by federally-assisted programs. The benefits are not a part of the market value of property acquired; but, rather, are in addition to payment for property.

The benefits include:

(1) Relocation advisory assistance to all persons, business, or farms displaced as a result of a public improvement.

(2) A moving payment and storage costs, when necessary to compensate individuals, businesses, farms, and nonprofit organizations for their actual and reasonable costs to move not to exceed 50 miles.

(3) Expenses incidental to the transfer of the real property such as: prorating real property taxes, payment of recording fees, transfer taxes, and miscellaneous items.

(4) Under certain conditions, displaced farms and businesses may be eligible for benefit payments in lieu of moving costs.
No one will be displaced from his home, farm, or business location without at least 90 days' written notice. 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.

Copies of the uniform relocation assistance and real property acquisition policies act of 1970 and the Federal regulations implementing the Relocation Assistance Program have not been made available to the Oregon Highway Division at this time. It is anticipated, however, that prior to the need of additional right-of-way, the federal requirements and benefits will be known.

The right of way agent will explain the program in full at the time of negotiations, and eligibility for the various benefits under the program will have been determined and will be explained fully at that time.

MR. WOLFE: Following our normal procedure on the conduct of hearings, we will start taking statements with official bodies, quasi-official bodies, civic groups, organizations, working our way down to individuals, and as always will continue the hearing, reconvening again this evening at 7:30, until everyone wishing to make a statement has had an opportunity to do so.

Following this procedure at this time, I would like to call on Mr. Clifford Alterman, Governor's Harbor Drive Parkway Task Force.

MR. CLIFFORD ALTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, myself, with Mr. John Mosser were selected by the Harbor Drive Parkway Task Force to give the report of that group. As the Chairman said, the Riverfront Committee, the Harbor Drive Parkway Task Force, was formed at the call of the Governor in 1968. I would just like briefly to review what has taken place within that committee since then.

On July 15, 1969, Governor McCall sent out certain minimum criteria, which he called for to be applied in this area. This was that any highway be no wider than 100 feet but not less than 180 feet of space available for use by the public should be between the highway and the river, that there should be some depression or effort made to minimize highway noise and interference and that private development of a mall-type should be encouraged within this area. The emphasis in the meetings of the Harbor Drive Parkway Task Force was that there should be an effort in the long run to create something in the available area which offered an opportunity for use by the public.
On October 14, 1969, there was a lengthy hearing with some 50 odd speakers at City Hall. There were certain consensus that came from that meeting. These were that it was desirable to eliminate Harbor Drive. That any plan used in the area should consider the maximum availability of use by people. That the number of persons who are concerned with the development should be increased. That planning should be integrated within the larger scope of the Metropolitan area. That financing other than bonding should be considered for the development and that independent professional consultants should be utilized to advise the committee in the interest of public bodies.

On October 23, 1969, Governor McCall endorsed a seven-point program which had been presented by the Portland City Planning Commission relative to Harbor Drive. This was in the order of the criteria to create attractive human space along the river, to create an environment which would stimulate significant building along Front Avenue, to provide opportunities needed to strengthen the core area and to create a symbol for Portland along the river, to provide a dramatic setting in space for the Rose Festival activities, to create a feature to provide entertainment and pleasure throughout the year, and to allow traffic to distribute in and out of and to bypass the downtown area.

In that same correspondence, the Governor also requested that there be an enlargement of citizen participation and asked the Highway Department to pledge funds for planning and for the implementation of the project, and generally outlined in areas stretching from the Ross Island Bridge to the Steel Bridge as the area of concern.

Following this request and in accord with it, a Citizens Committee, now not all members of this committee met at all times at all meetings. The committee included the following: William Roth, who was suggested by the American Society of Landscape Architects; Marvin Witt, who was suggested by the American Institute of Architects; Robert Keith and Richard Ivey, who was suggested by the American Institute of Planners; V. F. Booker, the President of the Freedom Bank of Finance; Mr. Dudley Jones, suggested by the Chamber of Commerce; Mrs. Arlene Schnitzer, who was suggested by the President of the Portland Art Association; Robert Oringdulph, a distinguished architect with the firm of Broome, Selig and Oringdulph; Miss Nancy Keyes, an interested person from the League of Women Voters, whose name was suggested to me by Robert Frasca; Althea Williams, a social worker at that time with the Portland Public School System who has since left this community; Harold Pollen, who was one of a group suggested by the Riverfront for People Committee; Mr. Dennis Voss, who is a student at Portland State, and appeared at the hearing; before the city council, Henry Bergman from the Art Department of Portland State, who was suggested by Professor Hidell; Thomas Christy, an international representative of the machinists; Mr. Melvin Nygaard of the Junior Chamber of Commerce; and Mr. Tai Funatake and George Hoffmann who was suggested by the professional engineers of Oregon.
Now on January 8, 1971, the Task Force and the Advisory Committee met. At that point, the decision that faced it was whether to proceed in steps and first close Harbor Drive or whether to postpone any closure of Harbor Drive until all final alternatives were considered and adopted.

The Committee considered in balance the desirability of creating a landbank now, of changing habit patterns, of preventing new and heavier habit patterns, of acquiring land which would be utilized in any future plan, and the amount of time which would take place before any plan which was adopted finally was in effect and constructed. And the decision of the committee was that the way to close Harbor Drive was to close Harbor Drive, make minimal traffic adjustments and improvements. The Committee as such did not endorse any particular program or alternatives.

The members present, the Task Force and those members of the Citizens Advisory Group that were present, adopted a policy statement which was prepared by Mr. John Phillips of Lewis and Clark College. With your permission, from this point I would appreciate it if the presentation of the Task Force could be made by Mr. Mosser.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Alterman, and I would then call on Mr. John Mosser, also of the Governor's Task Force.

MR. JOHN MOSER: Mr. Chairman. The following is a statement which was adopted by the Harbor Drive Task Force and the Advisory Committee at its meeting on January 8, 1971, to be presented to this hearing. The vote at that meeting among the members of the Task Force present was unanimously in favor of it and of the Advisory Committee members who also voted there was one dissenting vote and the remainder were in favor of it.

It is now two years since this Task Force was called into being. From our first meeting two years ago, it has been altogether clear to everyone concerned that the key which would unlock the door to any kind of riverfront development along the west bank of the Willamette River was the removal, relocation or diversion of all surface traffic from the area immediately adjacent to the river between the Baldock Front Avenue Junction and the Steel Bridge, that is the Harbor Drive area.

After probing various alternatives, including tunnels, cut and cover schemes, lateral movements of Harbor Drive and others, the Task Force went on record as favoring the closure of Harbor Drive and conceded the need for a thorough study of all the alternate traffic solutions by a qualified group of controlling engineers. That study has now been completed and the thrust of the resulting report appears to offer a practical and effective means to achieve the most precious first step toward any comprehensive riverfront development, the removal.
of surface traffic adjacent to the river by simply closing Harbor Drive and diverting the traffic to the freeway loop system and other downtown streets.

This proposal appears to be completely consistent with goals which the Portland Planning Commission has set for the Harbor Drive area. It also appears to be consistent with the long-range freeway planning of the State Highway Commission.

Therefore, this Task Force again restates and reaffirms its earlier commitment to secure the closure of Harbor Drive at the earliest possible date. At the same time, it appears prudent for both the Task Force and State Highway Commission to allow a period of 90 to 120 days for such interested agencies as the Multnomah County Planning Commission, the Portland Planning Commission, the Port of Portland, and the Portland Development Commission and the downtown planning group to review and digest the contents of the report, to make their views known, and to reach common agreement among themselves before reaching a final decision concerning the specific program for effective accommodation of the traffic which must be relocated from Harbor Drive including the interim use of Front and First Avenues.

This procedure will permit everyone to work together in the same direction, that is working on the common assumption that Harbor Drive will be closed, and on or before May 15, 1971, to lay firm plans to deal effectively with the problems created by that closure. That's the end of the formal statement.

I might add a few remarks to be sure the intent of it is clear, and to express some of my own feelings. There was considerable discussion in the Task Force as to whether Harbor Drive should be left open while downtown planning proceeded further and the real thrust of our vote was that it should not be left open but should be closed coincident with the opening of the Fremont Bridge.

It was the feeling of the majority again with one dissenting vote that to leave it open was to invite traffic to establish itself both on the waterfront and on the Stadium Freeway-Fremont Bridge which would later make a relocation that much more difficult. It was also the feeling that any interim traffic patterns which could be created at this point on First and Front would be of much lower volumes of traffic that could easier be relocated if the downtown plan comes up with something that makes that desirable.

So we do not endorse that specific plan which is on this board calling for a use of First and Front Avenue; we do say close Harbor Drive, that this gives us the land bank that at least is far more than anything that looked like would be possible as we went in to our deliberations two years ago and at a very minimal cost to the public.
Now to emphasize one of my own feelings. This plan I think accomplishes very well the creation of the maximum land bank on the river with minimum traffic relocation. I think, personally, that it might be more desirable to have a little less land on the river at the north end of this project to leave some of the traffic (if I can have a pointer) on the waterfront as it goes under the Burnside Bridge and get the traffic split in the neighborhood of the Morrison Bridge so that we do not start routing traffic on First Avenue through the old town area by the Skidmore Fountain.

In other words, I would leave the ramps coming off the Steel Bridge, go under the Burnside Bridge then up onto Front Avenue and at this point paralleling the already existing ramp, come up through here with the southbound traffic on to First Avenue.

I'm not sure this is the best plan. I offer it merely as an alternative and I would hope that the discussions during this hearing and particularly in the deliberations between the County, City and other local planning groups and the Highway Commission would give ample opportunity to consider alternatives that might be best in relation to the downtown planning but consistent with the Harbor Drive Task Force, your very strong feeling that this project should go ahead, that Harbor Drive should be vacated coincident with the opening of the Fremont Bridge. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Mosser. Homer Chandler, Columbia Region Association of Governments.

MR. HOMER CHANDLER: Gentlemen, the statement that I would like to read was approved by the Executive Committee of the Columbia Region Association of Governments in their meeting of December 21, 1970, and was reaffirmed by their Advisory Committee on Transportation at a meeting held the day before yesterday and the statement is:

The Columbia Region Association of Governments hereby recommends that the Highway Commission postpone any decision concerning the elimination of or alternatives for Harbor Drive until it is possible to evaluate what impact such actions will have on the Regional Transportation System, the development of a Mass Transit System, and a Downtown Portland Plan.

At the present time studies are underway which will propose a Mass Transit System, and a Downtown Plan. It is the position of CRAG that until information and concepts coming from those studies can be reviewed and evaluated, a decision at this time on the future of Harbor Drive would be premature and might impede the orderly development of the Portland Metropolitan Area.

I'd like to enter this into the record then for your consideration.
MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Chandler. Mr. Lloyd Keefe, City Planning Commission.

MR. LLOYD KEEFE: My name is Lloyd Keefe. I am Director of the City Planning Commission. The Planning Commission has a statement here, which I would give to you for the record, and then I would like to make one or two remarks as a member of the downtown planning task force.

Gentlemen:

This is addressed to the State Highway Commission.

The attached letter dated December 29, 1970 from Herbert Clark, Jr., to Glenn Jackson represents the position of the Portland City Planning Commission, the agency responsible for preparing the Downtown Comprehensive Plan and this position is with respect to the proposed closure of Harbor Drive.

The Planning Commission members met January 5, 1971 and decided by unanimous vote to adopt this letter by Mr. Clark as the official position of the Commission and instructed that the letter be submitted for the record at the hearing January 14, 1971.

Mr. Clark, Chairman of the City Planning Commission, further instructed that the attached memorandum dated January the 12th, 1971 from himself to Lloyd Keefe also be submitted at the hearing for the record. This memorandum summarizes a telephone conversation between Mr. Clark and Mr. Jackson, Chairman of the Highway Commission.

Very truly yours,

Lloyd T. Keefe
Planning Director

I will not try to read from all of these two communications but I think portions are pertinent and I would like to read from them. One is the letter which Mr. Clark wrote to Mr. Jackson dated December 29, 1970.

If the traffic can be diverted to alternate routes satisfactorily we feel that the decision to close Harbor Drive is a great stride forward for the City of Portland and the State of Oregon. The land that can be released by the closure of Harbor Drive can be devoted to a higher and better use for the Downtown Core Area.

We do request that you instruct your staff to delay their planning of the use to which Front and First Avenues will be put until the completion of the Comprehensive Planning Effort now under way.

We also feel the effective date for the closure of Harbor Drive should be held in abeyance so Harbor Drive can continue to be used while sufficient time is allowed for the Comprehensive Planning
of the Downtown Core Area (including the highest and best land use for the land occupied by Harbor Drive, Front Avenue, and First Avenue), and for the determination of the best alternate traffic routes to serve the traffic now being carried by Harbor Drive. The best alternate traffic route cannot be determined until we have completed the Comprehensive Plan and Harbor Drive should not be closed until these alternate traffic routes are actually available for use. Premature closure without available alternate routes could cause unnecessary traffic congestion.

The Comprehensive Plan that is now being developed for the Downtown Core Area should decide the use to which Front and First Avenues will be put. We caution you, and we would appreciate your cautioning your staff, not to allow preliminary alternate plans being studied to be implemented or carried to a degree of commitment or of "no return." For example, the expenditure of several million dollars to hook up the north and south ends of Front and First Avenues would close several of the alternatives and options available to the Comprehensive Planning for the Downtown Core Area.

I would also quote now from the memorandum January 12. It was the purpose of the telephone conversation for Mr. Clark to clarify some of the information which Mr. Jackson had mentioned at the Waterfront Task Force with respect to building these facilities and if the comprehensive plan decided that they did not fit in what the disposal of them would be. And Mr. Clark does quote from the conversation.

Mr. Jackson stated clearly that the alternate routing of the traffic in accordance with these present plans for Front and First will not be allowed to jeopardize the long-range planning effort in any way. This means, he explained, that the improvements to be made will themselves amortize in a period of approximately four years and the hook ups on the north and south ends of Front and First can be demolished and changed in accordance with the master planning when it is accomplished and is a fact.

These are the two things which will be filed with you as part of the record.

I do want to briefly go into this problem of timing as to the planning effort that has been brought up by the Waterfront Task Force and I also want to state that the risk involved in the going ahead with this alternate plan or any other plan which involves sizable expenditures obviously, if they are not removed or if there is no prospect of being removed they will determine the size and the shape and the functions of this riverfront area and will close several of the options which are now open in the planning of the downtown district.
We feel there is no need to be hasty in making a decision of the future status of Harbor Drive, as no difficulties will result if it remains open after the Fremont Bridge is completed and in use. The whole thrust of comprehensive planning effort is to consider the whole area at once. This is the reason why the Waterfront Task Force a year ago backed away from planning only for the waterfront and for Harbor Drive. To participate a decision on Harbor Drive at this time would defeat the orderly approach toward preparing the downtown comprehensive plan.

I have a map here, which we can unroll and show you, just by way of illustration. This, if you could unroll it just a little bit more, Dick there is a D symbol over there. This happens to be D plan which was preceded by A, B, and C which was prepared for discussions and considerations by the Waterfront Task Force. It is dated September 1969.

At that point on the proceedings of the Waterfront Task Force, they had concluded perhaps this strip between Front Avenue and the Harbor Wall really wasn't wide enough and it is not perhaps the total acreage involved that's the problem and the best use of this area, it is the width of it, which is about 235 feet wide when you take out Harbor Drive. So the instructions to us were to see what could be done perhaps about extending it further west into the downtown area realizing that that area undoubtedly would be available or eligible for urban renewal.

Now this particular plan only represents an idea. It is nothing that the Waterfront Task Force adopted. Nobody adopted it. It was done to stimulate discussion and actually, as you can see, it makes use of Front and First, not in the manner showing the alternative here but in one place by bringing them together, to preserve some of the historic buildings on Front Avenue up near the Burnside Bridge and then spreading them apart a little farther to the south and preserve some of the historic buildings down there, which are on the east side of First Avenue.

Of course, this kind of plan would mean a change from that alternate insofar as how you would handle the reconstruction at the end of the Burnside Bridge, at the Morrison Bridge and at the Hawthorne Bridge. Now this is just an idea. It does represent what the downtown planning task force will be getting in to and there will be several alternates looked in to. That is the main reason why we feel that it's not quite timely to make a decision on just how the traffic is to be handled if Harbor Drive is closed.

I think that we shouldn't forget that the very reason why Harbor Drive is up for consideration for closure is for a riverfront development. Therefore, the development should be determined first and then the traffic rearrangements can be decided accordingly rather than the other way around.
Now as to the timing the Waterfront Task Force says 120 days to consider alternates and to reach an agreement. The schedule which has been worked out and which DeLeuw and Cather, who are participating in this downtown comprehensive plan, and Cornell, Hayes, Howland, and Merryfield and the staff of the City Planning Commission are following started the first of November, 1970. It's supposed to be a 15-month work program, and the core area alternate plans are to start this part of the planning period now, of course, we're in the data-gathering period and the survey period and the core area alternate plans just to arrive at the concepts is to start May 1 and will extend through a period ending September 1, 1971.

Also in this period when DeLeuw and Cather will be testing these alternate circulation plans as to the impacts they will have on various streets if some of the functions of some of the streets have changed from vehicular to all pedestrian or say all transit or perhaps some of the ideas that may come up. Now the 120 days ends on May 7, just 6 days after the scheduled date for the beginning of what is really the crucial planning period. So this is a basic difficulty which we want to definitely bring to your attention.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Keefe. Does that complete your presentation?

MR. KEEFE: We do have a copy of this schedule here, the chart if you would like to have that as part of the record. I would be glad to leave it with you. It's a big map, does it have dates on it?

MR. WOLFE: Charles Olson, Portland Development Commission.

MR. CHARLES E. OLSON: Mr. Chairman. I would like to place on record the communication from Mr. Ira Keller, Chairman of the Portland Development Commission to Mr. Glenn Jackson, Chairman of the Oregon State Highway Commission. A brief summary statement is as follows: The Portland Development Commission concurs in principle with the goal of uniting the Willamette Riverfront with the downtown area. We do not, therefore, object to the closure of Harbor Drive. We do, however, strongly object to that portion of the proposed closure of Harbor Drive south of the Hawthorne Bridge.

Our objections are based on the disruptive effects on existing redevelopment based on a publicly recorded plan approved by the City of Portland, the Portland Development Commission and the Federal Government. And the complete conflict between this plan and new redevelopments scheduled for construction early this year.

We request that this closure plan, which has a totally adverse effect on property within the south auditorium urban renewal.
project, be reexamined and an alternate solution found which would not disrupt private and public lands in the area south of the Hawthorne Bridge. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Olson. Martin Davis, Oregon Environmental Council.

MR. MARTIN DAVIS: I am Martin Davis, Chairman of the Environmental Planning Committee of the Oregon Environmental Council. The Council now represents over 55 planning, sportsman, and conservation organizations throughout Oregon and a total individual membership of over 1,400 environmentally aware Oregon citizens. We maintain our office at 1238 N. W. Glisan in Portland.

We favor the idea of closing Harbor Drive and are encouraged that this once unthinkable idea has now gained general acceptance by the Highway Commission.

However, the Oregon Environmental Council is seriously concerned about the timing of this decision, and the proposal to divert Harbor Drive traffic onto Front and First Avenues. The comprehensive downtown plan has only been underway for about two months. The data collecting period is now essentially over and this data is being analyzed. It will be at least six months to a year before the planners engaged in this study will be able to rationally suggest some solutions to the traffic problems in the area as a whole. If we are to get the imaginative plan which we so desperately need, we must not allow the Highway Commission to independently determine the shape of the most crucial part of the area.

The decision to use Front and First Avenues as a couplet system with connections to the Freeway System south of Market Street has been made without adequate consultation with those groups responsible for developing the comprehensive downtown plan. These groups include the City Planning Commission and its staff, the Downtown Committee and its consultant, CH2M, and the City Council. The Harbor Drive Task Force hired the traffic engineering firm of DeLeuw Cather and Company to suggest alternative routings for automobile traffic displaced by closure of Harbor Drive. This report apparently has been hurriedly finished in time for the hearing and was not available for review by those most intimately involved in the preparation of the Comprehensive Downtown Plan.

A decision now to route heavy traffic along Front and First Avenues would shut out probably the most desirable solution to the relationship between the downtown area and the riverfront. This solution would provide for direct pedestrian access at ground level to the riverfront from an intensively and diversely developed frontage to the downtown area located on the east side of First Avenue. These buildings could be serviced from the west, along Front Avenue.
An entirely car-free zone would then extend from First Avenue to the waterfront, providing Portland with a really exciting people oriented gathering place.

The Council feels the people of Portland are tired of having their city planned by traffic and highway engineers. Quite naturally, they think only in terms of moving cars. Let us have a city planned for people. After all, the automobile is an obsolete and extremely inefficient method of transport and we know that if our cities are to survive at all, alternative methods of moving people in downtown areas must be found. Therefore, what is the hurry? Why must we go on providing room for ever-increasing number of automobiles, automobiles that with their noxious exhausts are slowly poisoning us.

Although the Council agrees that Harbor Drive must be closed eventually, we urge the Highway Commission to defer any decision on its closing and the use of the First-Front Avenue couplet until the comprehensive downtown plan is further advanced and request that the Commission consider more thoroughly the environmental effects of its actions in its future plans. Thank you.
MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Owen McComas, Portland Center Development Company and Portland Center Association.

MR. OWEN L. MC COMAS: Mr. Chairman, the statements I will read to you and leave for the record if you desire are the statements that are made after consultation with my company and members of the Portland Center Association.

I am Owen L. McComas, General Manager and Chief Executive Officer of the Portland Center Development Company and Portland Center Building Company. I might add that we are responsible, our company is responsible, for the development of approximately 28 acres in the South Auditorium Urban Renewal Area, that area that we are seated in right now, from here south to the freeway in between First and Fourth.

The geographic area represented by our company is bounded on First Avenue on the east Market Street on the north, the freeway on the south, and Fourth Avenue on the west. We are speaking on behalf of 1,014 permanent apartment residents, a future 1,500 additional residents that will be coming into the area within the next 24 months, and 2,000+ office and retail personnel only in this Portland Center area, that I referred to.

First, we commend the governmental agencies involved in developing a master plan for city beautification, vehicular traffic control, pedestrian safety, and noise abatement.

Second, if the closing of Harbor Drive accomplishes or assists in enhancing these human environmental elements, we will support the plan.

However, should this closure mean more vehicular traffic is routed on Front Avenue, First Avenue or Fourth Avenue, Lincoln Street, Harrison Street or Market Street (in this area), we will strenuously oppose and resist the plan by any means necessary or available.

The noise of trucks and autos roaring past and through our beautiful residential, shopping and working area would be intolerable. Even more important, the danger to our residents from exposure to this additional vehicular traffic while driving in and out of the area increases constantly and the entrance of two of our buildings are on First Avenue plus the entrance of other buildings in the area.

Perhaps of the most importance the pedestrian traffic which flows across Harrison and First Avenue would be hard pressed to dodge errant and careless drivers. During the summer months, this pedestrian traffic coming from people strolling through the malls, visiting our residents and shoppers represents thousands moving about the area each day. And on one count last summer on a Sunday, we had an excess of 7,000 people in this immediate area.
We would agree to any plan that:

a. Did not disperse more traffic into the Portland Center and city core street grid system, and
b. Preserved the objectives of our city's beautiful and proud Urban Renewal Area, plus the benefit of removing our rat infested riverfront empty buildings, junk yards, and air and water polluting industries, and replacing them with peopleized parks and beautiful living areas for every citizen.

And I might add that I guess what we are doing is we're speaking in behalf of those buildings that have only been built for 5 years, and they're sort of historical themselves right now and we want to keep them. Thank you very much,

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. McComas. Richard

MR RICHARD NORMAN: Mr. Chairman. I'm Richard Norman, Architect, Chairman of the Art Commission. In addition, I am this year's President of the Portland Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. And also my office and the building that I own is on First Avenue between Morrison and Yamhill,

I have a statement here which is from a letter addressed to Glenn Jackson on January 7 I would like to read into the record. From the Art Commission. At the Portland Art Commission's meeting last Wednesday, it was voted to request that no final conclusions or decisions be made following the hearing on Harbor Drive which is scheduled for January 14.

In light of the current planning process for downtown Portland and the waterfront, we feel that any decision could be detrimental to the optimum planning of the city. Considerations of the alternatives for Harbor Drive must be related to the total development. Again we urgently request that no final conclusion be made following this hearing.

I'd like to have a couple other comments, I have gathered from now that no questions are asked at hearings. Is this correct?

MR. WOLFE: What is your question?

MR. NORMAN: The basic one that I haven't been able to have satisfactorily answered and this is sort of the sacrosanct timing of the Fremont Bridge opening together with whatever is done with Harbor Drive or is not done. What is this particular timing of the Fremont Bridge opening as related to Harbor Drive. I have heard that it is logical to have it happen at that time. I might believe this is true if you are considering traffic alone but if you are considering all of the facets that make up a downtown, the people, the use of land, then it doesn't seem logical to me that it has to tie itself into that time,
MR. WOLFE: Mr. Klaboe.

MR. KLABOE: From a traffic standpoint, we are giving to the motorists a new facility - the Fremont Bridge and the Stadium Freeway. We feel that that time and again from a traffic standpoint that at the time you are given something new it is probably the most logical and best time to take something away from them.

MR. NORMAN: So it is an arbitrary decision though as far as this date is concerned. I mean you have your own reasons. You are involved with traffic. We think that the closure - the Art Commission - the architects think the closure of Harbor Drive is fine. We can see no reason that its closure should tie itself into the Fremont Bridge. We see a very logical reason why it should tie itself into the conclusions of the studies for downtown Portland. A layman corollary, the traffic count increases in direct proportion to the width of the thoroughfare, regardless of where the road goes and conversely that it mysteriously disappears when the road is gone. You might give some thought to the proceedings and the fact that maybe nothing is needed after Harbor Drive is closed and to follow the corollary and maybe prove it is the increased traffic on the Banfield which almost makes it obsolete and the converse part is the history of the Ash Street Overpass which was so direly needed at one time 4,000 cars a day. When it was defeated there were still 4,000 cars a day and they mysteriously disappeared when the cutoff was closed. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Norman. David Lewis, City Club of Portland.

MR. DAVID LEWIS: I'm David Lewis; I was Chairman of the City Club Committee, which prepared a report on the Journal Building Site and riverfront development. That report which was adopted by the City Club recommended, among other things, that no action be taken on Harbor Drive other than the possible widening in the vicinity of the Journal Building until adequate studies had been completed of alternate plans.

We of the committee and generally of the City Club were pleased with subsequent actions which provided for comprehensive planning of the downtown area and which was designed to bring together planners of the various disciplines that are needed in developing a practicable and imaginable plan for a downtown development of this magnitude.

We think that the proposal that you are making has no basis for really a judgment on its over all merit. We of the committee haven't had an opportunity to study that and we wouldn't feel competent at this time, however, the total downtown study is underway. We see no reason, however, for the necessity of making this development for abandoning Harbor Drive before the downtown plan is either completed or far enough along that the planners who are working on that plan under Mr. Baldwin's
supervision, could say that either this plan that you propose does not conflict with the planning as they see with the total development so while we obviously are pleased with the proposal to abandon Harbor Drive, we feel that it would not be prudent or appropriate to proceed with any alternatives until the downtown plan is far enough along to see that your construction will tie in with the proper downtown development.

I'd like to leave with the Secretary our report in which I will just outline that part of the recommendation of the City Club with regard to complete planning before any action is taken. (Report on file in General Files, Salem)

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Roger Shiels, Portland Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

MR. ROGER SHIELS: Mr. Chairman, my name is Roger Shiels. I am a representative of the Portland Chapter American Institute of Architects. I'd like to read a statement that has been adopted by the Chapter.

The Portland Chapter of the American Institute of Architects favors the closure of Harbor Drive, however, we are concerned about the effect that traffic resulting from that closure will have on our City especially on the downtown core. We believe the problem of increased traffic flow on downtown streets that might occur as a result of Harbor closure are a part of the downtown planning groups responsibility.

We have studied the Highway Commission's proposal to reroute part of Harbor Drive traffic to a First-Front couplet. We understand that this proposal is being advanced as an inter-method of handling traffic so that the Harbor Drive closure can occur simultaneously with the opening of the Fremont Bridge. We understand that later modifications can be made when and if an alternate traffic plan evolves out of current downtown planning activities. Although we have other reservations about the Highway Commission's couplet proposal, we will limit our comments on that proposal on the basis that it is a temporary measure.

We understand that the cost of the temporary solution is in excess of $2.5 million dollars. We urge the Highway Commission to seek design alternates that are truly temporary and less costly. We suggest that a system of existing streets and temporary blockades be used to accomplish temporary rerouting.

We urge that once a temporary rerouting method is agreed upon the Highway Commission work closely with the downtown planning group in compliance with that group's present work program and time schedule to arrive at an acceptable, permanent solution to rerouting Harbor traffic. We understand the downtown planning work program allows approximately 12 months for careful analysis of downtown traffic flow. A permanent solution to this as well as other street traffic problems could be intelligently made at that time. This would allow a permanent solution to Harbor traffic rerouting at the earliest possible date.
In the end all that we are asking is that the Highway Commission work closely with the many groups and individuals committed to and involved in the downtown plan and to allow maximizing of a fantastic opportunity to bring our downtown to the waterfront. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Shiels. Mr. Robert Belcher, Riverfront for People Committee.

MR. ROBERT BELCHER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief personal comment before I read the Committee's statement. Mr. Mosser, a member of the Task Force, pointed out that one of the reasons to move rapidly is not to allow a new line of desire to develop along Harbor Drive when the Fremont Bridge is open.

I think I disagree with this. I think that there is a serious likelihood that by the proposed interim couplet on First and Front that could well create a new line of desire which, in fact, could be equally or more difficult to changing the future than to keep Harbor Drive open until a plan is really achieved for the whole area.

Now our Committee's statement is much in line with what we said at a public hearing a year and one-half ago. I must admit that many of us are surprised that the Task Force is not here, but we hope you will be responsive to a number of the comments that are being made.

We agree that all people concerned with the riverfron redevelopment applaud the Task Force for announcing that Harbor Drive is to be closed. There is no clear agreement, however, that this must happen by May 15th. There is a real danger that this action will adversely affect comprehensive studies for downtown transportation and renewal now underway - studies which at this point in time are costing taxpayers almost $400,000.

Unless the Task Force works collaboratively with other directly related planning efforts, it will obstinately serve its most narrow purpose - to the detriment of Portland. The closure of Harbor Drive is not a legitimate substitute for the main objective - to achieve a magnificent riverfront as part of a comprehensive city plan.

What are the main reasons for designating early May as a deadline? Available funds are not the answer - we called the State Highway Commission's programming department and found this project can receive flexible funding and timing. The traffic report leaves important matters unanswered. And I might mention that today we are looking at one of five proposals in that traffic report. I raise considerable concern that not any of the others were raised if this is an information meeting - we're not getting much information. The interrelated consideration of land use, access, implementation, and how the riverfront relates to downtown are not available today. It is not reasonable to assert that we must have everyone agree by early May because the rocket fires off then - regardless of how well its parts function together.
We reject replacement of the existing Harbor Drive with a new Harbor Drive made of Front and First and called an interim plan. It is easy to feel the frustration of some Task Force members after two years activity. You may well believe that no plan will be perfect, and other downtown matters will look after themselves. But this is not a matter of fish or cut bait. We ask you to recall how this city has critically needed more resourceful planning and policies for too long a time.

Our position in summary is that:

1. The Task Force should set the date for closure of Harbor Drive in agreement with other responsible planning groups.

2. The Task Force should support and strengthen other planning efforts.

3. The Task Force should weigh and coordinate its traffic proposals with the important considerations of the downtown planning and transportation studies.

4. The Task Force should give its advisory committee an opportunity to advise.

5. Today's meeting will be premature and costly if the points above are not followed.

I would like to leave this if I may as a copy for the record. Thank you.

MR. JACK REMINGTON: I'm here representing the Izaak Walton League, which is a national organization, concerned with the wise use of all of our natural resources.

In the October hearing, I submitted a statement on downtown riverfront development from the Izaak Walton League. Today our concerns are still the same.

We don't want a barrier between the people and their river, either the present traffic on Harbor Drive or the same traffic just shifted into the downtown area. Surely there is some better alternative, such as using the east side freeway to divert it from downtown and the west bank.

We want the people of Portland to be able to enjoy part of the river bank and the river as a recreational resource. Too much of this land has already been abandoned to industry and automobiles.

Closing Harbor Drive to traffic is the first step in restoration of the waterfront, and we request that it be done as soon as possible.

That will allow the beginning of the next step, restoring a significant stretch of river shoreline to a nearly-natural state, something that we desperately need in the downtown area.

We would prefer that restoring the river front as a recreational resource be part of an overall plan. But whatever kind of plan is applied, it should consider, first of all, the needs of people on foot, not in cars. People wanting green open space, native trees and shrubs, and access to the water for boating and fishing. And perhaps it isn't even asking too much to expect that some day people can again swim in the Willamette River - in downtown Portland. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Remington. O.O. Thomas, Oregon Trucking Associations, and he marked his card no. All right, I apologize; I misread it. Mr. Drake, Portland Commons.

MR. MITCHELL DRAKE: My name is Mitchell Drake; I am President of the Portland Commons. We are in the process of developing two blocks in the north extension to the urban renewal area. They are located between Front and First and Clay and Jefferson Streets. I have a question. I have not had an opportunity to review the present program in its most complete form. I had seen a preliminary drawing of this some time ago. My question is regarding the parking, the deletion or the parking permission on First and Front Street in the particular areas that our firm is involved in developing. Will that parking under this program be permitted or not permitted at curb?

MR. KLABOE: It will not be permitted on First Avenue. Some parking will be permitted on Front Avenue.
MR. DRAKE: Much has already been said about Harbor Drive, the elimination of it. I won't touch on that. I think its practically been spoken to. I will specifically state, however, that from what I can see at this time that the present program would very adversely effect the multi-million dollar plans that we have for the development of these two blocks. I do not have a written statement to give you but I believe there is ten days in order to make a statement and I will so respond. Thank you very much.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Drake. Mr. Drake that can be done simply by addressing your communication to the Oregon State Highway Commission, Highway Building, Salem, Oregon.

Stanley Goodell, Portland Association of Building Owners and Managers.

MR. STANLEY A. GOODELL: Mr. Chairman. I represent the Portland Association of Building Owners and Managers, which supports the premise in an expanded waterfront open area, can be made possible only by the closure of Harbor Drive as presently constituted. As to timing, however, we request that no decision be made regarding alternate traffic routes until that decision can be made in concert with downtown planning.

Further we question the wisdom of any plan that would create an arterial through couplet with the ability to attract ever-increasing vehicular traffic between the riverfront and the downtown and urban renewal areas, and I can't stress our concern about that last point, the ability of a supposedly through bypass to funnel ever additional traffic into the downtown area. We do not think this is a positive thing for the downtown. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Goodell. Charles Gadway, Patriot Party.

MR. CHARLES R. GADWAY: I'm Charles Gadway of the Patriot Party and we would like to say right now that the Patriot Party is completely and unalterably opposed to this proposal. I say this representing particularly the residents in the southeast area of Portland and especially those due to be moved out by the Mt. Hood Freeway.

It's quite clear that the people in Portland have had enough of highway building. There is enough highways in Portland to last us. They aren't solving our transportation problems and people know it.

This proposal is quite clearly and transparently an attempt to worsen the traffic situation in order to justify future highways by the Highway Department. The people have a right to decide what highways will and won't be built in Portland. We don't see here a proposal of all the highways that the Highway Department intends to build to replace the traffic that is presently using Harbor Drive, and there is a great deal of traffic using Harbor Drive.
Now one of the problems that the Highway Department is known to have is the Marquam Bridge, which is supposedly designed not only as a crossing of the Willamette River for Interstate 5 but also and there is a blocked-off roadway there now, where the Mt. Hood Freeway is supposed to take off of it. Yet it is becoming increasingly apparent that the Marquam Bridge is already obsolete and isn't designed to handle the traffic that's on it now, let along thousands of cars more from a ten-lane freeway.

Okay, so this is the reason why the Highway Department is sending up a smoke screen and creating a need for another bridge to cross the river. And that is what is in the work, another bridge between the Marquam Bridge and the Ross Island Bridge. There is no need for such a bridge. There is no need for a Mt. Hood Freeway, and the elimination of Harbor Drive is designed to create a need for a bridge in between those two structures so that the foreplanning of the Highway Department with respect to the Marquam Bridge can be disguised and kept from the people.

Now we say that if the Highway Department is going to keep building highways, they had better submit a plan which includes all the highways they're planning to build and let the people know about it and decide if they want it. That's just basic democracy; basic sense of fair planning.

In addition, the Federal Highway Act of 1968 requires that any highway building be designed to last for at least 20 years into the future. Now listening to you gentlemen talk about this removal of Harbor Drive, nobody mentioned a date farther in the future than 1976. Now it's clearly in violation of Federal Law; it's the kind of lack of planning, piece-meal attempts to force the public to swallow the plans of the Highway Department that has been going on every since the Highway Department started.

The Highway Department had better wake up and start listening to the people, and had better make their proceedings public. They had better submit to the people of Portland everything they have in mind instead of one piece at a time with hopes that they can get one piece built and that will make the next piece in the puzzle necessary. This is our city and the Highway Department had better learn to respect it and consult the people.

Now as far as recreational benefits of this waterfront thing, we should also consider the environment and the recreational facilities of the people in the neighborhoods of Portland that are going to be blotted out by new freeways that the Highway Department so freely draws on the map. 6,000 people are going to be displaced if the Mt. Hood Freeway goes through. What about the environment for those people? Forced by an ever-increasing housing shortage to move to a place where they do not want to live.
It's time that the Highway Department should consult the people, otherwise, it should go out of business and quit making roads that people don't need and quit eliminating roads that they do need.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Gadway. Albert Owen, ILWU.Local, Portland, Oregon.

MR. ALBERT E. OWEN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission and ladies and gentlemen. I'm here to represent the International Longshoreman and Warehouse Union Local 8 of Portland, Oregon, and between 35 and 40 thousand men and women that are driving up and down Harbor Drive everyday. I've listened to quite a few speakers here, and I have to say that the percentage has been against the people that are actually interested in this movement on Harbor Drive, the people that have to drive up and down here everyday and spend their time sitting in the car burning up gasoline, polluting the air while they cuss out the Highway Commission for not designing better highways.

One of the problems that is being created here, I think, is the fact that we have an overall Commission in the State of Oregon that has just been created in which the Highway Commission and the Dock Commission and the Transit Commission all belong in the same family. They're all in a position where neither can criticize one of the others because if they do, somebody's head is going to fall.

I'm going to mention the Public Docks here, but I assure you that I don't represent the Dock Commission because they are a part of your family as you well know. The Portland Public Docks are now in the midst of a vital fight for survival. Our competition with other ports in this area is so close that the costs are figured in the fraction of a penny on per ton. And the movement of cargo between any part of the State of Oregon or the State of Washington to any port on the Columbia River, these costs per ton are what determines what port it's going to go to.

And at our desire is to maintain the cost in the Port of Portland as low as possible, and we feel that closing Harbor Drive is not going to help us in this manner. If you close the Harbor Drive to the trucks that are serving the docks, it means a chance of losing this vital tonnage, where the comparison between their cost in Portland and their cost in either Vancouver or Longview are very similar, we stand a chance of losing it there, because trucking companies are notorious that if their trucks can't get through and this guy is sitting at a stop light waiting for four thousand cars ahead of him to get out of low gear and move down the street, they're not going to send them on that route. They are going to send them some place else because this truck represents a lot of money and they expect a fair return on that money.
Some action of the Commission will effect every person who works in the Northwest area. Now whatever you do on your decision on the movement of automobiles up and down Front Street is going to effect everyone working in the Northwest area, regardless of where they work or where they live, and this is because of the closure of Harbor Drive will of necessity increase the traffic load on every street in the Northwest area. And this increase in traffic will be on streets already overloaded with both cars and trucks.

And if any of you have been out in the Northwest area around 5 o'clock at night, I'm sure you can't disagree with me. Now these Northwest streets cannot stand much of an increase in traffic in today's standard if it is to move at all during the rush hour. Now we all know what happens when you come up to 21st and Lovejoy in a big truck and trailer rig wants to make the curve there, he's tied everything up for at least one light if not two lights until he can get around and someone can get by him.

So you're talking about increasing the amount of truck traffic in the Northwest area to allow them to get on the Stadium Freeway because they're going to have to stay off the Harbor Drive route which you are talking about now.

And not only will the rush hour traffic be increased in large numbers, but traffic every hour of the day will be heavier. This will include hundreds of the heavy trucks traveling to and from the Northwest area to the Stadium Freeway. And this also includes the trucks that you people granted a license to in which they run them up to a hundred feet. Now that's three trucks to a bunch and up. If any of you have passed them on the highway, you know what a problem that is. Never mind trying to get around on a city street. I don't know how they could ever make the turns up there in the Northwest.

Traffic on Harbor Drive is heavy most of the day, but between 6:45 a.m. and 7:45 a.m. and between 4 p.m. and 5:30 p.m., it is practically bumper to bumper traveling at speeds of up to 50 miles per hour. Now this is moving a lot of traffic in short order. And this is traffic that will have to go through three lights on Front Street and about 12 or 14 lights on First Avenue going southbound. And this is traffic that now travels 50 miles per hour, and if you can move them down Front Street at faster than three miles an hour, it will be a surprise to everybody working in the Northwest area.

When anything interrupts this slow of traffic on Harbor Drive today, whether it's a stray dog or a pedestrian trying to get across there or whatever it is, somebody has to slam their brakes on, the reaction takes place that goes back to anywhere from a half a mile to a mile and a fellow 50 to a 100 cars behind where the incident took place he comes to a direct stand still, and this backs up until sometime you're in the middle of the Ross Island Bridge because somebody wanted to cross Front Street and the traffic had to stop to let them across.
Now you're talking about taking that same traffic and moving them to the traffic lights in both directions. This don't add up to our people. If you want a fair example, you removed part of the lights on Front Street here several years ago because of the fact that they tied up all the Front Street traffic. You still have one sitting down here by the Steel Bridge and gentlemen if you want to see what a traffic tie up you can occur with a few traffic lights, take your car and park down there some night and just press that button about five times in a row and have your helicopter tell you how far back the traffic is backed up. It will probably be somewhere around Schnitzers or Gundersons.

And you're talking about putting these automobiles down on First Avenue and mixing them up with foot traffic and running across against lights; cross traffic in town is going to try to feed itself across; you're creating a situation where an accident in the south of the Hawthorne Bridge could tie up all of Front Street, which in turn could tie up all of the downtown area in just a natural cessation of the event of things before you could ever get it stopped. That doesn't take much of an accident. And a little bit of snow and the four hours that it takes to get home now once in awhile when it snows out there, it will be minor; you probably wouldn't get home until 2 o'clock in the morning.

We hope that the Highway Commission will do some more serious thinking before they make a move about the overall effect of increasing traffic on the downtown streets. In speaking for our people, most of us are taxpayers, and we wonder if the taxpayer of Portland will want to pay all of the future bills for repair and maintenance for these city streets that are caused by the extra movement of trucks and automobiles over these streets and what effect will this parking have on the downtown area. You gentlemen have said here today that you are going to stop parking on First Avenue and partially on Front. Now there are quite a few cars parked down there. Especially on Front where they park all day and I wonder if somebody has a little interest in a parking lot up town and it isn't full and they would rather fill it because this is the only place that they have to go.

We wonder what will be the percentage of traffic accidents that are increased because of the mixture of traffic and pedestrians on First Avenue and Front. You're talking about a park down here that people can come to and I'll be perfectly honest with you, I don't believe that anybody is going to come down there any more than they do now and just the winos to sleep it off underneath a tree, if you provide him with a tree. Because by the time they wrestle there way across that traffic, they have had to park, there's no parking on Front or First Street, they've had to park way up town in a parking lot and you expect them to walk three or four blocks downtown across all of this traffic to get out there and lay on all of this grass or watch the river go by.
I don't believe that this is in the cards. I think that this is a wonderful dream but I don't think that you are taking care of the people that are actually paying the bill for you gentlemen to build these highways and that's the taxpayer that is driving that automobile from the Northwest area to the southeast, to Oregon City, to Milwaukie, to all of the parts of the country that they travel on.

Now we wonder what is going to happen with the triple trailer rigs that will be traveling down Front Street if they do and he stops for a light at Morrison Street, how many automobiles are going to be able to get past him after that red light? Be lucky if there is anybody that gets by so, that you've had a truck and trailer rig that occupied the whole light fixture.

Now we wonder too about how many of the manufacturing concerns in the Northwest area that manufacture extra long products. Now we have a few of them out there, there aren't very many but these represent substantial employers. People that employ thousands of men and now you're going to tell them to move that 90-foot pole that you have or that 120-foot bridge abutment and we'll give you a special permit to move it through the city streets and take it up on the Stadium Freeway and all you have to do fellows is make about five 90 degree turns and you can get it on the freeway providing that you don't run over somebody.

There are only a few of the questions that our people have been asking and feel should be answered before any closure of Harbor Drive is contemplated by the Highway Commission. Now as a driver that uses Harbor Drive five to seven days a week and I travel from 35th and Powell southeast of the Public Docks, for and back nearly everyday and I know only too well how little of a foul up it takes to delay me 15 to 30 minutes in either direction.

The result is that I have to allow at the present time, I allow 30 minutes for delays in either direction and if you close Harbor Drive, I am going to have to allow an hour and thirty minutes. This means that I will be getting up again before the paperboy can get here with the morning paper.

Now like many other drivers do sometimes when Harbor Drive is backed up bad, I will hunt an alternative route to come home but for all practical purposes there are no alternative routes available to me. To travel from N. W. Front to Ross Island Bridge by the new Stadium Freeway is a nightmare of traffic lights, cross traffic and pedestrians running in all directions, kids, dogs, baseballs and what have you. During the rush hour, every traffic light in the Northwest area has cars and trucks backed up at least one to five blocks behind them trying to get through that particular light and just because you get one green light doesn't mean that the next one will be green.
You finally get on to the Stadium Freeway and you head for the Ross Island Cutoff and this means that it is necessary to cross a lane of high-speed traffic that fellows have worked all day out in Beaverton; they fight their way over the Canyon Freeway and down there they're coming between fifty and seventy miles per hour and their interested in one thing and that is to get home.

They aren't interested in my crossing that lane to get over to the Ross Island Bridge. But I've got to cross that lane and go into a second high-speed lane that is coming down off of, I think, it's 16 ramp down to get on to the freeway to get up onto the Ross Island. Meanwhile I have no way of knowing whether that fellow in the car ahead of me who doesn't have any tail lights on and got his windows all closed and steamed up whether he is going to go up the approach to Broadway, whether he is going down the freeway or whether he is just going to slam on his brakes and stop in the middle of the thing.

So I think that what you've done with a situation of this time, you have increased my chances of an accident about 50 percent in this particular area and I've driven for pretty near 40 years now and I've got a pretty good accident record, I think I've had two accidents where I was hit head on on my side of the street and I'd hate to get entangled with one where I hit somebody in the rear end up there on the Stadium Freeway because I think before it was over with I would probably be run over and my car would be scrap iron.

Now every traffic light between Southwest Broadway and Lincoln to Southwest Avenue and Southwest Arthur which is where the last light is, before you go across the Ross Island Bridge southbound, is packed solid with cars today. I don't think that you could get another 100 cars during the rush hour period in there without running them up there on the sidewalk. It's pretty hard to clear the intersection there so that the people going northbound can get across the street and this is certainly not an area to be adding more traffic without first making possible a complete change in the flow of the traffic. Something besides bringing it to a stop and this gentlemen is what our people are afraid that you are going to do. We wonder how many minutes it will take to completely paralyze traffic in the core area with one small accident.

You gentlemen I'm sure are probably better aware than I am of the accidents in Los Angeles, that was a start of the Los Angeles Freeway madhouse in which a small accident about 4:45 one night in the core area involving a street car and an automobile, paralyzed the City center of Los Angeles so that it was necessary to take people out over the tops of automobiles in stretchers, that ambulances, fire trucks, or nothing could reach the center core of the City of Los Angeles and it took them until 11 o'clock that night to straighten that mess out and get in to where that original accident had happened.
And you have a set up here in the City of Portland with your proposal here that could very well do the same thing. Our personal belief is that you've got to separate the north and south traffic between the Northwest district and South district from all cross traffic. Any cross traffic whatsoever breeds danger; it breeds accidents and it sure breeds delay.

Now an examination of the proposed route does not show any new provisions for southbound traffic seeking access to the Ross Island Bridge and there are at present two streets leading from Southwest First Avenue to approaches to the Ross Island Bridge. During this rush hour traffic both of these intersections are a complete mess. You are lucky if you can get across in any direction, never mind to get onto the Ross Island Bridge.

Even today the cars are backed up for several blocks and we can only imagine what the addition of this route on First Avenue will be when hundreds of cars that are now going up Front Street and zigzagging across on the approaches to the Ross Island Bridge to get in the right-hand lane or the left-hand lane what the addition of those cars on First Avenue are going to do to that situation and also the addition of the hundreds of trucks that are running on that route everyday.

I would like the Commission to remember and mark it down well that practically all of the Southern Pacific's car freight that is going by truck is moved across that Ross Island Bridge in a period from four o'clock to seven o'clock at night. Now these are trucks that are necessary to be in San Francisco if possible by noon the next day and they don't like the delay and not only that they are getting so thick that they're going to run right over the rest of us.

Most of the reasons advanced for closing Harbor Drive seems to be involved with ecology and it is hard to visualize any benefits to the majority of the taxpayers especially if the exhaust of the cars and the trucks is going to be doubled in this area because they are taking twice as long to travel through the area. Now if we're all going to park three or four wide on Front and on First Avenue waiting for a traffic light why the gas is just as liable to kill all of those trees that you are planting down there. Everybody wants a park in the green areas. I think the Long Shoremen are noted for wanting to get into the outdoors and into the green area. We wonder here what is being created. Are you going to create a park that our families are going to have a chance to enjoy especially after we have spent an extra hour getting home at night trying to get through the traffic, it will be pretty dark by the time we get home and can get our families most of the year. Is it going to be something that is going on now down on Front Street where the winos are sleeping underneath the trees with a paper over them. Are these the people who are going to benefit?
Many thousands of us feel that the sums of money that will be spent on this project will be mostly wasted money as far as the benefits to the majority of the people in this area. It has even been suggested that the Highway Commission could well use the extra money that they seem to have to rectify some of the present trouble spots in this area and it is a foregone conclusion that a change of this magnitude is going to create some terrible traffic problems in the very near future and in listening to people talk up here I just can't see relief from it.

I heard a man here say that the automobiles that use to make the left-hand turn downtown just disappeared but they didn't disappear; I crowded in some place else and moved somebody else out. If I could find a little old lady, who was scared of driving, I got in ahead of her and so I could get to work on time and this is what happens to the automobile and the automobiles that are traveling on Front Street and the trucks are not going to disappear. They're going to multiply.

They might talk with a hundred of our members and other workers in the Northwest area, I get one message from everybody and it is that the proposal actually sets traffic back 20 years before the construction of Harbor Drive. You're going back to what you had years and years ago when you have 10% of the automobiles running back and forth that you have here today and some of the things that these people asked me to bring to you were the following statements.

Please do not create any more traffic bottlenecks. Design us a rapid transit system that will get us off the streets and to our destination faster than we can drive. Don't ask us to ride stinking overcrowded buses that cannot move us faster than traffic and then wonder why we all drive our cars. Design a transit system for the common worker and the taxpayer, one to fit his needs and desires, forget the special interest for once. These people that are all hollering for this stuff, they aren't the ones; I don't think that any of these people were ever down on Front Street in the traffic tie up where you couldn't move for two or three hours, where an illness or anything else would put you in an awful shape that you just can't get out of. Do not enlarge the credibility gap and run roughshod over the average taxpayer. For once give him his money's worth and design a Harbor Drive that will not only move traffic faster but allow green grass for those who want it.

I think gentlemen that you are all well-educated men; you all have engineering degrees from some of the universities. There is no doubt in my mind that some of you have several of them and I know it is within your capabilities of designing a system that will take care of the traffic between Northwest area and the Southeast area or the South area and I believe that as taxpayers, that our people who have the right to demand that you use this knowledge and create us something that we can use and live with. Thank you.

Mr. Marshall Cheney: I'm Marshall Cheney. I'm appearing on behalf of American Linen Supply. I have a letter directed to the State Highway Commission concerning the statements and feelings with regard to this proposal that is before us today briefly.

American Linen Supply does not oppose the closing of S.W. Harbor Drive. We do strongly oppose the proposed changes in the street system, especially the First Avenue-Front Avenue couplet in the vicinity of S.W. Harrison Street. Our feelings are the same really as those of the Development Commission and Mr. McComas and more specifically we are upset about the temporary, until 1976 modifications primarily because you intend to build a tunnel directly under the American Linen Supply property.

This may be temporary but it is going to have a severe effect on our traffic patterns and the use of the trucks that American Linen Supply needs in its business. It is going to reduce the parking, which now meets the Portland Development Commission standards for the urban renewal area.

American Linen Supply is one of the few facilities that pre-exists in the South Auditorium Urban Renewal Site and has spent over $100,000 in bringing its facilities up to conformity with Development Commission's standards. The necessary interruption of its facilities and the taking on this proposed tunnel, and I can't see how you can avoid some taking, may drop us below these standards.

And one thing that has not been mentioned by anyone here today that proposal tunnel goes straight through the main steam line that supplies steam not only to American Linen Supply but to a large proportion of the buildings in downtown Portland and any severance of that is going to have a severe and lasting economic effect on our operation.

Other than that, I will submit the written statement and let you be on with your work. Thank you. (See end of transcript for written statement.)

Mr. Wolfe: Thank you, Mr. Cheney. Molly Weinstein, Portland Branch, American Association University Women.

Mrs. Weinstein: Gentlemen, I was very happy to hear your stated principles and citizen participation. I hope your heartened by the number of people that turned out today. I wish Mr. Jackson was here to hear us too.
I'm Molly Weinstein; I'm here to speak for the Portland Branch, American Association University Women. Our branch has about 600 members and it has two groups which are particularly interested in studying the problems that we're discussing here today and we call them Our Beleaguered Earth and The Human Use of Urban Space to give you some idea.

We subscribe to the principle of the riverfront of our city being returned to the people rather than held for the use of cars. Therefore, we support the eventual closure of Harbor Drive. However, we are also committed to the principle of comprehensive planning for our urban core. We feel it essential that the closure of Harbor Drive be accomplished only in conjunction with the approval of a comprehensive plan, and that no construction commence until the plan has been established.

We are concerned with the testimony here today for the delay will be constructed to mean we oppose the closure of Harbor Drive and be used by the Highway Commission as rational at a later date to continue the division of the downtown area from the river. Please do not let that happen. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mrs. Weinstein. We are recording the statements today. They will be transcribed and be studied by all Commissions interested. This panel today does not make the decision. So that Mr. Jacksons not being here, does not mean that he won't be aware of what went on today.

MRS. WEINSTEIN: But I would like to meet him sometime.

MR. WOLFE: Mr. Kasal.

MR. RICHARD T. KASAL: It's Richard Kasal. I've been a participant in the original Parks for People Riverfront for People picnics which were held a year ago down on Harbor Drive with all the traffic going by, and I sympathize strongly with their aims and hence was very pleased to see in the newspaper the article describing the fact that it was to be closed which I think is a commendable action on your part.

I also sympathize now that I've heard them, I couldn't understand at the time why the planning departments were somewhat lukewarm about your proposal. I do understand it now. They would rather integrate the thing together, although I think that idea of yours, the closing of Harbor Drive and the opening of the new bridge is a very clever and wonderful idea. I want to commend you for that. I think that is an excellent way to take something away and give him something else at the same time, but I do sympathize with the representative from the Longshoremen's Union, who feels that by taking Harbor Drive away, you're going to confound and produce additional traffic congestion in the area that you have studied.
My only comment on the whole thing is that I think you haven't studied the problem of what to do when you close Harbor Drive far enough away from the area affected. It's not logical to run trucks, cars, commuters, down a several mile stretch of river to get to an area in the Northwest which needs a highway link for trucks through some of the nicest riverfront area in the city. Therefore by proposing your alternate route down First and Front Streets, you haven't gone back far enough. I think you have got to recirculate this traffic that you're going to stop by closing Harbor Drive further back on the east side of the river preferably or divert it before you get to the freeway so that it can take the underground length to the Northwest around the freeway.

Now don't understand the problem of why trucks would be harassed by taking the new freeway that's going over the bridge. Why would they not be able to get to the Northwest dock area as was suggested by the representative from the Longshoremen Union?

MR. KLABOE: They will.

MR. KASAL: You're going to have exit ramps in that area so that traffic if it was diverted to the freeway, what do you call it, that underground thing that goes down to about 14th Street?

MR. KLABOE: Stadium Freeway.

MR. KASAL: The Stadium Freeway, there will be an exit from there into the Northwest area at the foot of the bridge, the new bridge.

MR. KLABOE: Yes, there will be several exits.

MR. KASAL: Well, in that case, trucking from the Southwest certainly wouldn't be held up any by routing it in that direction rather than along First and Front Streets. I should think that either that or if you provided a link over the Steel Bridge or the Broadway Bridge for this heavy Northwest trucking traffic to get to the Northwest, this would answer any objections that he has to the closing of Harbor Drive. I just would like to see, have you made any studies of alternate cutoff points, other than this one that is presented?

MR. KLABOE: Yes. Have you talked to the gentleman in the foyer out there? They have the information; they can explain what happens to the traffic on Harbor Drive.

MR. KASAL: Well, have you studied an alternate cutoff point than the one shown on your map and why have you rejected them if you made any other study? In other words, your proposed red lines on this map are in my estimation too close to the area in question, have you made studies that routed traffic in alternate routes further from the point of Harbor Drive where your present red lines show that?
MR. KLABOE: Yes and what I was trying to explain to you. If you will talk to the people in the back, they will explain to you there are alternate routes for trucks and traffic to use other than this First-Front, only a very small portion of traffic now on Harbor Drive would use First-Front.

MR. KASAL: Oh, well this I failed to understand because it wasn't presented in the proposal, and I think maybe a lot of other people have missed this point too.

MR. KLABOE: We have held informational hearings for 12 hours yesterday and since 10 o'clock this morning, right in the foyer, right out there, and you could ask those questions.

MR. KASAL: Well, that wasn't in the papers, so I missed it. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Kasal. Commissioner Lloyd Anderson, City of Portland.
MR. LLOYD ANDERSON: Gentlemen, I am Lloyd Anderson, Commissioner of Public Works, City of Portland. The closure of Harbor Drive can be a significant step in the improvement of the quality of our central area. It can turn attention again to one of our great natural features, the river. Traffic, of course, doesn't disappear. In this instance, the shift of some 40 thousand cars a day to First, Front, the Stadium Freeway and the East Bank Freeway.

Some serious questions are raised about the timing of this proposal and its effect on the transportation system in the central area. As the Highway Commission is aware, the core area studies beginning for the City of Portland which is expected to be completed in some 15 to 18 months. There is a good likelihood that this core area study will support the notion that the development of the waterfront for purposes other than highway is desirable.

Of a more serious concern is the ability of the streets that remain when the Harbor Drive is closed to handle the traffic at that time. These concerns are not eased by the consultant's report on page 11, which reads as follows:

"In summary the major impact of Harbor Drive closure in 1972 would be to increase peak period congestion on the Marquam Bridge and the East Bank Freeway. Diversion of Harbor Drive traffic to these other elements of the central area streets and the highway network would be marginally tolerable and would remain so until the completion of the Mt. Hood Freeway. At that time modification of elements of the central area freeway system or other improvements would be required in order to maintain a reasonable level of traffic service in the Portland area freeway system." We need to know the extent of these modifications and improvements and their costs in order to properly judge the proposal at this hearing. It's our hope that following this hearing the Highway Commission will transmit a summary of its reports and findings for consideration by the council and that these findings include the implications of all good courses of action with particular reference to their cost.

It's our hope that any action that is taken will be taken with sufficient time for the city to review not only the report, we should receive the middle of December, but also the results of the testimony given here today and that out of this analysis can come a mutually agreed to program which will be of advantage to the citizens of Portland and to the Metropolitan area. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson. Mrs. Elsa Coleman. Thank you. Ray Polani. Mrs. Herbert Bagley. Mrs. Susan Ackerman. Henry P. Bergman. Mrs. Selma Bradley. Mrs. Alvin Ackerman. I'm sure that everyone here knows, unless there are those who came in late, that you have ten days from today to submit a written statement either as an original statement or in addition to statements you have made here today, it will become a part of the transcript of the hearing just as though it had been made here today.
The weather is moderating at least it was when we arrived here and hopefully this will encourage more people to come out this evening when we reconvene at 7:30. Mr. Pierce, your card is not marked either way, do you wish to make a statement?

MR. ALEX PIERCE: My name is Alex Pierce, 405 N. W. 18th. Gentlemen, I think the meeting here today is a sham and I'll tell you why I think it is a sham.

Some while back when the idea of the Harbor Drive development came about and the Governor accepted the idea, he set up what I thought was a pretty reasonable structure at least he did this by letter. He suggested that a Task Force be assigned and that also citizen participation be brought in to this study. I've talked with members of the Citizen Advisory Committee. I think they may have had three calls, I know of two that were attended, and the Citizens Advisory Committee informs me that they were not given information. They were not filled in on the details. They were really not asked an opinion.

Mr. Jackson made the statement that Harbor Drive was going to be closed. Following Mr. Jackson's statement, I made several calls, found to my astonishment that some of the Highway Department didn't know about this and there was question by those in the Highway Department whether the Highway Engineers knew about this. I cannot say whether Mr. Jackson was alone in this conclusion but it seems at least in my thinking that maybe he was.

The State Highway Department engaged DeLeuw Cather to do a series of studies of which there were a number of alternates I believe. These have never been shown to my knowledge to the public but instead a plan, which I understand, was the product of the State Highway Department has been produced and offered to the public. I'm not interested in the plan. I am interested in the process because I think once the process breaks down the plan is a natural folly thereafter.

Who is to make the decision in this matter? Since DeLeuw Cather, who are considered somewhat experts in this field, have not been asked for an opinion of their alternate conclusions and the City Planning Commission has not been asked or I think has not even been invited to participate in the discussion of this question, just who is the authority that is going to make the plan.

Well, I believe that the State Highway Department is going to make the decision. In fact, I believe the decision has already been made, therefore, I call this a sham.

It does not relate to the comprehensive plan. There has never been any argument that I have heard today or prior to today why the deadline must be immediate to this decision and I think you have heard several people speak to that point earlier.

I would believe that if the State Highway Department were honest in their effort to deal properly with the citizens, they would sit down with the people and begin explaining what they are going to do in an orderly, inductive sort of manner, and not all of a sudden come forth with a plan the day before and say you have had
12 hours to review it and now you are going to make the decision. I think this is ridiculous. I don't know what happens from this point with the minutes. You say that they are to be read by interested parties. I doubt very much if anybody reads them. Therefore, I think the whole matter is redundant. This has all been concluded so I suggest that we go home. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Pierce. The hearing today is for the sole purpose of taking statements as to whether or whether not Harbor Drive should be closed. I might also indicate that by State statutes no street in any city can be closed without the concurrence of that city. Are there any more cards? We will take a 15-minute recess. (Recessed at 4:10 p.m.)

MR. WOLFE: (Reconvened at 4:50 p.m.)
Gary Michael.

MR. GARY MICHAEL: This will just take a couple minutes. First of all I am very sympathetic with the idea of closing Harbor Drive. I think this will be a tremendous opportunity for all of us, however, I am concerned about what appears to be a lack of coordination between the Highway Division and the people charged with the preparation of the comprehensive downtown plan.

The form of development that may take place near or on the waterfront, the traffic patterns in the core, the major parking structure locations, all these are elements that will require from eight months to a year and a half of study. Yet the State Highway Division is suggesting 2½ million dollars, maybe more, be spent on an interim solution before these downtown planning studies are complete.

I do not accept the argument that unless Harbor Drive is closed when the Fremont Bridge is opened, we may never be able to close it. But if there is a good reason to close Harbor Drive then or sooner, I suggest that a truly interim plan be developed with the planning with the downtown planners which will require a minimum expenditure of public money and which will not limit the options available to the planners.

In addition, very careful consideration to the Skidmore Fountain area must occur before this proposal or any other is implemented. I believe that the removal of parking on First Avenue and a drastic increase in traffic will be very harmful if not disastrous to that very sensitive area.

The DeLeuw Cather study states that environmental considerations should be treated at least as equally important as to traffic service and the cost considerations. We must allow time for the environmental considerations to be made. By working together with the City, the downtown planners and the citizens, you have a wonderful opportunity to make a fine asset. Thank you.
MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Michael. We will adjourn and reconvene promptly at 7:30 p.m. (Adjourned at 4:55 p.m.)

MR. WOLFE: Ladies and gentlemen, it is 7:32 p.m., at which time we said we would reconvene this hearing. (Same statement as at afternoon session. See Page 1. The same persons were in attendance except in place of Ernest Valach was Robert Simpson. There were approximately 26 other persons present.)

Assuming that those of you in the auditorium were not here this afternoon, at this time I will ask Mr. Klaboe to explain to you the proposal. Fred.

MR. FRED KLABOE: (Same statement as at afternoon session. See Page 2.)

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Fred. At this time in conformance with Federal regulations, I would like to call on Mr. Moehring to explain to you right-of-way procedures and relocation assistance.

MR. DAVID MOEHRING: (Same statement as at afternoon session. See Page 5.)

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Dave. From time to time you may notice one of us smoking up here. We've been given permission to do this because we can not leave our table up here. If there are those of you out there who wish to smoke feel perfectly free to leave your seat and go out in the foyer and do so and then return. At this time we will start taking statements. The first person is Ray Paloni.

MR. RAY PALONI: Thank you very much, gentlemen. My name is Ray Paloni and I live at 8311 S. W. 3rd Avenue here in Portland. I attended the earlier part of the hearing this afternoon but unfortunately I had to leave about 3:30 and this is an apology for not being here when my name was called.

MR. WOLFE: We're sorry that you couldn't speak when you were here the first time.

MR. PALONI: Thank you. On the other hand, it is probably just as well because it gave me a little while to mull over what was said here and think about and kind of formulate or confirm or change some of the judgments that I had arrived at.
Something that interested me very much was some remarks that were mentioned as being part of the Federal Statutes or directives if not statutes at least. I can think of one point that was said that the Federal, State and local goals and objectives are to be considered. Well, of course, this could bring up the question of what goals and objectives should be set and undoubtedly various peoples and various groups have different ideas of what goals should have priorities and what should be considered first, what would be more important than other things.

Something else that was said again in the statutes or regulation that there is to be the broadest public participation and there is to be extensive coordination with public and private interests. Now private interests, I would hope that it includes the general public as well as organized groups.

I think this afternoon earlier, I got the impression that of those that came here and gave testimony and read into the record, it seemed to me that there was basically quite a broad consensus that Harbor Drive was to go. There was some opposition and I will touch on that later, but basically I think most groups were in unison about the removal of Harbor Drive and that it was something good.

But I think also that practically the same groups were questioning the time table, some were in favor of the needed elimination, others said that it should wait. Most, however, again we're in agreement that the construction of permanent or semi-permanent other facilities for moving the traffic on the Front-First Avenue couplet should wait. It seemed to me that the consensus was that they should wait, the Highway should wait, at least until the downtown comprehensive study plan was completed. Checking with the City Planning, I was told that the study is underway, that it originated on the 1st of November 1970 and that the time table was fifteen months.

It would seem that it would be possible to wait that long before going ahead with the improvements that are contemplated in the maps here or some similar improvements, the cost of which would oscillate somewhere between 2½ and 4 million dollars.

One of the parties that spoke at length, if not vigorously for not doing anything or at least for not vacating Harbor Drive and for not creating an alternate on the couplet, was someone representing the ILWU and I think the man spoke at great length of the hardship at driving to work and from work for the Longshoremen and for people employed on the waterfront.

I think the man said that he was living at 35th and Powell and I would expect that if you tried to cross Ross Island and it would appear that he was going and then continuing either on Harbor on Front on the couplet or what. I don't doubt that he would have a lot of problems but it would seem to me that the man had alternatives
That he had not considered. It would seem to me that living on the east side it would be much more logical for him to continue to the Steel or Broadway and cross at that point, not to say anything about the Fremont Bridge that will eventually be operating which would probably be a good place to cross. Unless he wanted to cross on perhaps the Marquam or maybe even on Ross Island but why not use the Stadium Freeway, which I think would be much more natural than trying to use the downtown section.

I think the idea is, and I think this is what the Governor had in mind, that the waterfront (the riverfront) in the proximity of the downtown core area could be put to a much better use than just to move cars. And I think that this is very important. I think that this may be more important than the convenience, the absolute convenience, of the people who might work on the waterfront which have alternatives, who have alternatives.

One of the things that the gentleman chose to overlook entirely was that in the future, I agree perhaps not at the present time at least not to a great degree, but in the future there are plans being made which are also a part of the downtown study, for rapid transit for improved service by Tri-Met, for an expansion of the transportation to the core area and undoubtedly to wherever there will be need for transportation. Tri-Met is now a public or quasi-public body, which will be much more responsive to the desire and the needs of the area in that it is, as we know supported by community dollars.

I think that Harbor Drive at the present is not too congested except perhaps at peak hour but it seems that at peak hour every freeway any place is congested.

So in my opinion, I would hope that while there will be no changing of the idea of vacating Harbor Drive and returning it to a more high and valuable use, that is the land returned for more valuable use, I would hope that the construction of the other facilities and the commitment of the other facilities will wait at least until the comprehensive downtown study is completed.

I think at that point, as I understand it, the downtown comprehensive study is financed. I think at this point they have about a 400 thousand dollar budget I understand, which is made up of all sorts of contributions, businesses, groups, I think Tri-Met is involved. It seems to be really a very sound community effort to do something about downtown Portland. And I would hope that the Highway Department would not foreclose the possibility of all alternatives being fully explored. That's about all I have to say. Thank you very much.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Paloni. Phillip Mayer, Metropolitan Area Perspectives, Inc.
MR. PHILLIP MAYER: My name is Phillip Mayer. I live at 1510 N. E. 19th Avenue, apartment number 4, and I'm here as a citizen and as President of the Metropolitan Area Perspectives, a citizen organization interested in the better provision of governmental services in the metropolitan area.

I'm concerned about the once again what appears to be a piece of piece-meal action and would urge that the action on the - I agree with the previous speaker that the blocking of Harbor Drive and its use for other purposes seems good but until a comprehensive plan for downtown Portland is finished, it seems to me if there is anyway of doing it, the decision as how to use Harbor Drive and how to inter-connect it and so on should be deferred. I would like to urge that that be done. It seems to me that if this is not done that planners for downtown Portland will be confronted with a major restraint. I am concerned if Front Avenue and First Avenue are used in lieu of Harbor Drive that access to this could be very useful piece of property, much better use than its present use, access to it will be achieved. It seems to me that there is just a host of problems that would be better handled if the action was taken in the light of the long-range plan. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Mayer. Robert Belcher.
MR. ROBERT H. BELCHER: Mr. Chairman. Since I spoke this afternoon, I appreciate the chance to ask just one or two questions this evening.

In the statement read this afternoon by John Mosser reflecting the vote taken Friday by the Task Force, there was no mention of any particular rerouting solution that they had selected. I'm interested I think in Mr. Klaboe's statement that it is now suggested that this be the proposal we consider. And my question really is, who is it that is proposing this now, surely not part of the vote taken, the statement issued following Friday's Task Force meeting.

MR. WOLFE: The hearing today is to take statements either for or against the closure of Harbor Drive. The plan shown today, I believe Mr. Klaboe indicated, is one of several plans that might be developed. This is not a plan that you have to take or nothing. And I believe that this was clearly stated, and I know in my opening statement I indicated that we were here for the sole purpose of taking statements on closure or not closing Harbor Drive.

MR. BELCHER: It seems to me nevertheless this is the suggested thing we're hearing about today, and I'm not trying to answer my own question. It seems this could be very confusing to many people here really having information about one proposal.

MR. WOLFE: Just a moment, Mr. Belcher. Maybe Mr. Klaboe would like to expand on my answer to you.

MR. KLABOE: Yes. The first question, Mr. Belcher, was whose proposal was this. The consultant engineer for the Harbor Drive study initiated this as one of the plans or a possibility for handling a part. Now I hope you remember a small part of the traffic that is now on Harbor Drive, the remaining portions of it and if you have been to the desk in the back and talked to the people, the remaining portions that will be diverted to other facilities, the Fremont, the Stadium, the Eastbank, and so forth.

MR. BELCHER: Yes, I realize that. I think some of the other proposals however really pointed out that in an incremental fashion the traffic presently on Harbor Drive can be added say to the revision that is proposed in 1975 or 76 on the East bank. I think it's extremely important that the many people for two years that have been concerned about the riverfront realize that there are other carefully studied proposals by your consultants. I wonder how anyone hears about these alternatives. This is our first opportunity in two years to participate. I think I said this afternoon, I was astonished to find two members of the Task Force sitting in the front row leaving after a half an hour. I didn't intend to make that kind of a statement. I think many people feel the same way I do. There is a tremendous gap between how we can effect the course of this, how we can reach the Task Force. If you have the kind of awareness that I have about the Advisory Committee meeting just twice in a year and a half, I think that you
can at least sense there is a lot of frustration in trying to effect the course of decisions in this matter.

My other question is what happens next? Can we anticipate more information, more vital discussion from other consultants in May when the Task Force has at least attempted to establish that the other planning groups should come forth with their views, what they have to say affecting Harbor Drive closure. Can we expect a full public hearing? I might add with better publicity than this public hearing today has had.

MR. WOLFE: I have no desire to get in an argument with you at this time, but I thought that the news media had done a rather good job of advertising this hearing. Mr. Klaboe, do you wish to comment on his second question?

MR. KLABOE: Yes, this is a corridor hearing. We're trying to establish the vacation of Harbor Drive. This is a possibility for instituting a couplet as we have said before, there is a possibility there are other areas that might be used. We have been instructed, as you know, Mr. Belcher, to work with the planning agencies, and after we work with them and the instructions have been to work with them 120 days, depending on the outcome of this hearing, after we have finished these things, there will probably be another hearing if this plan is changed.

MR. BELCHER: There will be no further discussion if there isn't a change in mind, is that correct?

MR. KLABOE: In order to go ahead with any plan, of course, we must have the concurrence of the County and the City involved.

MR. BELCHER: Will there be any opportunity for the public to know what kind of discussions are taking place among the various responsible agencies working in other planning efforts downtown? Will there be any reflection about the types of agreements or disagreements that are now going to take place with these other planning groups?

MR. KLABOE: We work with the planning groups, Mr. Belcher. If you want to discuss it with us or them at any time, we will be free to discuss it with you.

MR. BELCHER: I'm really interested in not having a complete silence, for a year and a half which has been the case. If there is no further public hearing, let me conclude simply by saying that we would be highly interested in finding out what is happening and what's being discussed as you move toward May 7th. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Belcher. Have all the cards been collected? There is a lady back there with a card, John. I might advise that all persons who have been here today and submitted a card will receive a copy of the transcript of the hearing. The last name is Buel. What is the first name? Would you come up and make your statement? What was your first name?
MRS. BUEL: Merrie.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you.

MRS. MERRIE H. BUEL: My name is Merrie Buel, and I am a housewife here in Portland. I'm speaking just as a citizen. I have a couple of questions. One, if this alternative were used as a couplet, what would you do along Front and First as far as providing access to the waterfront after it were developed? Would there be stop lights at every block or what?

MR. KLABOE: There would be stop lights at every block on First avenue. Front Avenue, possibly, a stop light every other block.

MRS. BUEL: The Front Avenue would be the harder one to get across though, wouldn't it?

MR. KLABOE: I think they would be equally difficult if you want to put it that way as far as traffic goes, but there would be opportunity at least every other block for traffic signals. Now bear in mind again some of the statements, we've been making here, that we've made no decision or anything at all, what will be done with Harbor Drive. It's up to the planners in town to make a decision with what they want to do with that. It they want pedestrian overcrossings, separations, this is fine and this is what will be done.

MRS. BUEL: Well particularly in light of this, I am opposed to this couplet or anything being done until the downtown plan is developed. And it seems to me what you just said would, you know, even reaffirm that, that nothing should be done until the downtown plan is presented and the people do know what's going to be with the waterfront in the whole downtown area. Thank you.

MR. KLABOE: That's what we're asking testimony for.

MRS. BUEL: Pardon.

MR. KLABOE: That's what we're trying to find out what the reactions of the people are.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mrs. Buel. Jon Schleuning.

MR. JON R. SCHLEUNING: My name is Jon Schleuning. I live in Portland, and I represent an informal group of citizens that have been working with the city and the public agencies trying to bring about more active citizen participation towards a comprehensive plan for the city of Portland. I'm extremely disturbed and I think our group is on this sort of eve of beginning a comprehensive plan for downtown Portland.
As we see these kind of isolated decisions or proposals being made, you know the great hope of comprehensive planning especially for downtown is the whole concept of cooperation of agencies, the cooperation of the city planning with the Highway Department and people finally getting together airing the alternatives and discussing them thoroughly.

At this hearing, this proposal, our group is concerned, I'm concerned personally, but we just haven't had that seeming cooperation. Now maybe it has occurred, if so, I think it should be made more public, but as one of the previous speakers said, where is the Task Force; how are these things coordinated into the fabric that is going on in the downtown plan now?

We know that the request for 120 days study does not coincide with the downtown plan. These things are of concern, and I think that if we are going to embark upon comprehensive planning, if Government agencies are going to work together, then we do need this cooperation. And we need it starting with Harbor Drive and starting with what has to be the greatest asset that this city has and that's its waterfront. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Schleuning. Are there more cards, John? I would remind you again that you have ten days from today to either submit a written statement or submit a written statement in addition to an oral statement made today. Once again, simply by addressing the communication to the Oregon State Highway Commission, State Highway Building, Salem, Oregon, zip code 97310.

At this time I would like to ask is there anyone present who might have marked his card no who has not made a statement who wishes to change his mind and make a statement. Would you come up to the lectern and give me your name and address, please?

MR. AL BERRETH: My name is Al Berreth. I'm a student at Portland State University. I live at 3637 S. E. Kelly. I didn't want to make a statement because I have quite a few muddled thoughts on something like this, but largely that is a result of my major, which happens to be urban planning.

One thing about this hearing is that it has pointed out to me the textbook sort of approach this has taken. But to get away from that since everyone has pointed that out before, I, in looking at this design map you have here, I have some thoughts about it that might be relevant.

Number 1, the traffic flow on First Avenue. I notice that down here on First Avenue is a very small circle, it is just below Ash, between Ash and Burnside and that's Skidmore Fountain, I believe. It seems to me that Skidmore Fountain for one thing is a Portland landmark and under this plan would be terribly isolated. Now that's a small thing, I realize, but what it points out is that there would be a very large traffic flow along First Avenue and I just wonder what the total effect not taking into consideration the comprehensive plan would be on First Avenue itself and would the Commissioners themselves think about this.
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MR. WOLFE: Mr. Klaboe, do you wish to attempt to answer that question?

MR. KLABOE: Well, I'm not sure I understand. I'll try. I can't speak for the Commissioners or for the Task Force on what their thoughts are. First Avenue would be controlled every block by a signal under this concept here or some other concept. It would merely be another city street, Fourth Avenue or Third Avenue or something else. There will be more traffic on First Avenue than there is now because we will be adding capacity of two/three lanes on it under this plan. There are plans that are possible plans too that could be used. Some have been suggested here. Mr. Mosser suggested one, which would eliminate the conflict of the Fountain, and certainly that will be looked into like any other suggestion made by the people here.

MR. BERRETH: One last question and I'm only asking because I hadn't been able to attend the afternoon hearing and perhaps it has already been stated but am I to assume if, say if there were no hearings held, and if perhaps there were no opposition to this plan, no one came forward, no one said anything and everyone assumed that it was going to be all right would this be implemented within say the next six months?

MR. KLABOE: No.

MR. BERRETH: No construction would begin prior to say--

MR. KLABOE: No construction, excuse me. I thought you meant traffic circulation. We had proposed that alternates be instituted at such time as the Fremont Bridge is opened to traffic which will be about a year from now, a little over.

MR. BERRETH: Which would probably coincide with the comprehensive plan, the downtown comprehensive plan.

MR. KLABOE: It would coincide with the opening of the Fremont Bridge is what the proposal is here.

MR. BERRETH: I see.

MR. KLABOE: Close Harbor Drive and open the Fremont Bridge concurrently.

MR. BERRETH: I see. Thank you.

MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Mr. Berreth. Is there anyone else present who has not made a statement who does wish to make a statement? I have his card, John. There being no further statements, I will declare this hearing officially closed at 8:20 p.m. I thank you for being present.
COMMENTS ON CARDS RECEIVED AT HEARING

MOLLY WEINSTEIN: I am here to speak for the Portland Branch American Association of University Women. Our branch of 600 members has two groups. Our Beleaguered Earth and The Human Use of Urban Space that particularly study problems that are under discussion here today.

We subscribe to the principle of the riverfront of our city being returned to the use of people rather than cars. Therefore we support the eventual closure of Harbor Drive. However, we also are committed to the principle of comprehensive planning for our urban core. We feel it essential that the closure of Harbor Drive be accomplished only in conjunction with the approval of a Comprehensive plan, and that no construction commence until a plan has been established.

We are concerned that the testimony here today for the delay will be construed to mean we oppose the closure of Harbor Drive and be used by the Highway Commission as rational later to continue the division of the downtown area from the river. Please do not let this happen. Thank you.

ELSA COLEMAN: The closing of Harbor Drive will be advantageous, but permanent changes should be postponed until the Comprehensive Plan is ready.

MRS. HERBERT F. BAGLEY: Leave it as is. Unnecessary expense to tax payers.

MRS. SUSAN ACKERMAN: Do not want to see downtown area separated from waterfront area by major traffic arterial.

Would like to see alternate plan developed for the traffic routing in the riverfront area (underground, monorail-rapid transit system, etc.)

Would like to have State Highway Division wait until comprehensive downtown plan is completed.

SEIMA BRADLEY: I would like to see the downtown and inter-city area left as free for use and enjoyment of the people who live in and around Portland as possible.

Why must Highway bisect and divide cities? Ought they not by pass as much as possible? Wouldn't this be less expensive also?

RAY PALONI: Why the hurry? Okay to vacate Harbor Drive but the other part of the plan can wait till the comprehensive downtown plan is completed thirteen months hence!

MERRIE BUEL: I am opposed to the Front Avenue couplet and feel any decision should be held until completion of the downtown plan now being developed.

ROBERT PEIRCE: Opposed to acting before downtown plan is completed.
MRS. H. K. SCHNOOR: Strongly urge the city to preserve Willamette River frontage for park and for public use. Throughway doesn’t need to run along parallel to Harbor (on First and Front) - Why not nearer the foothills? Give city planners time!

Have you ever seen a European city on river? Beautiful!!!

JAMES HUGHES: While I strongly favor the ultimate closure of Harbor Drive, I just as strongly urge you to delay this closing until it can be coordinated with the Comprehensive City Plan.

RALPH COLEMAN: The closure of Harbor Drive should be coordinated with the comprehensive plan for downtown Portland. Closing of options now open to the planning commission through the construction of access ramps to Front and First Streets, should be avoided.

DONALD HAYASHI: I am interested in making Portland, especially the downtown core area, livable, and for people. Any physical change which would prevent this is not in the city’s better interest.

BUSSIE J. BAGLEY: We don’t need this change. It is a waste of tax payer’s money.

DONALD ARVIDSON: Let the downtown Portland Comprehensive Plan be finalized before undertaking any further traffic pattern changes affecting the downtown core area.