



Grant Park

Neighborhood Association

Board Meeting

Tuesday, November 10, 2020

Virtual Meeting via Zoom, 8 p.m.

Board Members Present: Neon Brooks, Jane Comeault, Jessica Decker, Mary Cal Hansen, Laurene Mullen, Ron Laster, Ken Peterson, Stacey Tipp

Absent Board members: Marion Horna, Vivek Kothari, Lois Okrasinski, Marisa Morby

Guests: Guy Benn, Michael Hall, Glen Hanson, Jon Hill, Erik Kola, David Leland, Martin Leung, Peter Maxfield, Lisa Mckerlick, Andy Mones, Tamara Olcott, David Pietka, Kevin Valk-Holst

Agenda

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:01 pm.

2. Officer Roll Call

Quorum was achieved with a majority of Board members present.

3. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved.

4. Approval of Minutes of September 15, 2020

The minutes were approved.

5. Treasurer's Report

Ron Laster presented a Treasurer's report. See attachment. It was approved.

6. Central Northeast Neighbors (CNN) Report

Ron gave an update on CNN business. Mingus Mapps won the Commissioner seat, taking over from Chloe Eudaly. CNN is planning to put in a request with the City that Mr. Mapps take the role as head of Office of Civic Life given his previous work in the Department and CNN would also like to invite him to speak at a future CNN meeting.

7. Subcommittee on Race Conversations

Jane presented findings from the Subcommittee. Identified some qualified facilitators to run both a Board and Community workshop. Discovered that the City of Portland Office of Equity and Human Rights is able to provide facilitation and training for these two events at no cost. The Subcommittee recommended that we use the City of Portland facilitators for a 90 minute Board workshop to establish a common framework and common language (timing to be in February 2021), followed by a community workshop using the City's existing Racial Equity training materials and trainers. The recommendation was approved.

Jane will circulate proposed dates for both workshops to the board via email.

8. Newsletter - Propose 2/15 deadline

Given the current circumstances, we are looking at publishing three newsletters a year instead of the usual four. The next deadline will be February 15 for articles to be submitted, newsletters will be delivered beginning of March. This will allow for communication about the regular election in April.

Stacey expressed a concern that she and her neighbors did not get the fall newsletter delivered. *Laurene is going to contact Nadia to figure out some logistics around delivery. Jane will post latest newsletter on website.*

9. Land Use Update

a. Grant High Softball Field

Ron received five emails on this topic (all are attached to these minutes).

Erik Kola - being across from the field, it is impactful in his life. There has been an ongoing (years-long) challenge about whether or not to have lights on the field. This is not a new issue. The major change is that with the new Grant High School, the girls' softball program was not accommodated. The field must be modified and in order to share it for multi sports use it has changed master planning to open the door to even more changes. Biggest concern is not that they (the adjacent neighbors) are not supportive - they are supportive of recreational activities at Grant Park - but that the process of these additions have not adequately engaged adjacent neighbors. Major concerns around noise pollution, increased traffic, timing of lights turning on and off. The adjacent neighbors need the ability to have space in their homes to rest and recharge. They are trying to engage with Portland Public Schools (PPS) and Parks and Recreation (PPR) and want some answers about what they are going to do.

Ken Peterson provided input as GPNA Land Use Chair and associated involvement in the Design Advisory Group (DAG) - PPR and PPS are saying that they won't engage with any individual group. They will only have a process with the entire community. A Type Three land use process is lengthy and comprehensive and details of the proposal are apparently going to be made available imminently. It is not easy for anyone to respond until there is something tangible (i.e. a proposal) to look at.

Dave Pietka - Some of the mitigation he and his neighbors feel would be appropriate include: no commercial signs facing US Grant Place, notice of events, stands adjacent to US Grant Place should be locked at any time except when competitive event, dugouts should be locked as well. Want PPS to step forward and clean up mess that would be left after every event (litter, clothing, equipment, etc). At the last DAG meeting there was talk about using the amplification of sound for practices and they are not supportive of that. Lights - how long will they be on before and after events? What is the limit for practices? Can lights be turned off by 7 pm with no lights directed at US Grant Place? The current traffic study was for major events in the bowl said they would go from 28 to 33 events/ year - this is inadequate. That is not the issue. US Grant Place has become a parking lot - it's supposed to be a bike route and there are major safety issues.

Ron - most of these same issues arose 10-15 years ago with the Grant Bowl renovation. Propose that GPNA set up a subcommittee including board representation and neighbors from throughout our neighborhood. PPR and PPS might be more open to meeting with this group. Ron volunteered to serve on this committee, but can't take the lead.

Dave - Erik, Dave, Andy, George would all be happy to work with this subcommittee. Another thing he forgot to add is that DAG expressed excitement about having access to more field time. They are concerned about excessive use, especially for Parks use.

There was discussion about the possible use of a neighborhood survey. This could inform the subcommittee work. It would be important how the survey is structured, and who designs the questions to avoid bias.

A few questions were raised about the scope and composition of the subcommittee - what is the make-up of the subcommittee? Would it include perspectives of other members of the community? Has the community engagement process opened yet? Is this premature? Why not wait until there is a proposal on the table?

Ken clarified that it is possible that some of the concerns will be addressed in the proposal and will go away. On the other hand, we could be proactive and prepared to act. There was at one point a proposal to negotiate a good neighbor agreement, but it seems like the City is not creating these anymore and are not enforceable anyway.

Dave - GPNA needs to be involved so hearings officer will listen. Reasonable mitigation needs to take place. PPS needs to do traffic study now, and not wait.

Glenn- feels that PPS has actually done a good job of outlining their use, and it is a modest proposal. It is Parks who has not been transparent about hours of operation and other details. Wondering if it is a legal tactic, or maybe previous experience but they are not being straight about their use and he is skeptical. Worried that Parks will allow scheduling to 9 or 10 at night.

The board is open to calling a special meeting on this issue to dive deeper into the issue. Ken made a motion to table the discussion.

Brett Horner with Parks and Jamie Hurd with PPS were both invited but couldn't make it. Some remarks from PPS are included as an attachment.

b. Gordon's (Aircraft Factory)

Ken has been regularly communicating with Juliette Muracchioli of the City Graffiti Removal team. There was an agreement formed with the Owner in the summer to have murals painted on the entire building plus security lights. The City staff is overwhelmed - she is the only person in charge of graffiti in the entire city and this property can't be a priority because at least something has been done here. Don't see any leverage we have when can't even ask City to intervene any more. There has been informal discussion about new use of the building but nothing tangible.

c. Hollywood Transit Center

Guy Benn from TriMet, Kevin Valk from Holst Architecture, and Martin Leung from Bridge Housing gave a presentation.

Looking at making the Hollywood Transit Center become a hub for transit, equity and the community. Would include mixed use, mixed income, transit oriented development. This presentation is part of an ongoing community engagement since mid 2020. Construction aims to start Fall 2022 and would be about a two year construction period.

Bridge Housing is an affordable housing developer, owner, manager and service provider. In Oregon since 2013, mission driven non-profit. The conceptual plan includes transforming the sidewalk area into a vibrant public space (paseo or market street), maybe food trucks, farmers market, etc. Also for 105-215 permanent affordable homes over 6-13 stories (two scenarios) for folks with 30-60% of the area median income. Ground floor would be used for mix of amenities, parking and retail.

Another key aspect of the plan is a permanent memorial plaza to the May 2017 tragedy. There is wide acknowledgment that the existing memorial is a beautiful tribute and well-loved, this is definitely being taken into consideration in the design process. They are in the process of setting up a memorial committee.

For TriMET, the existing stairs are not user friendly and the ramp is not ADA compliant. Bus routes will change - the three routes that use this place as a transit center will move to in-street stops. Advantage, can take higher capacity buses. Earliest bus routes would change is September 2021.

For more information there is a website: hollywoodHUBpdx.com trimet.org/TOD and email: tod@trimet.org

Discussion

Parking would be for residents only, 15-20 spaces for 200 units. There was concern from some board members about how few spaces that is for that many units. Design team is conscious about this issue. It is meant to be a multi-modal building to encourage use of public transit, bikes, pedestrian.

What is the scale of 13 stories? The building at the end of the I-84 off ramp is a similar height.

What is the plan for the new bike ramp - can it accommodate cargo bikes and bikes with trailers because the existing ramp is inaccessible? It has not been designed yet, will look at multiple options.

Are the apartments going to be family friendly? The goal is to have 50% 2 bedroom and 3 bedroom able to accommodate families as well.

Ken asked about overlap with the Portland Streetcar team, they seem to be planning on using this hub as a streetcar turnaround. Team: Yes, they have been in touch. The streetcar plans are at least seven years away, but most plans terminated around Broadway and not Halsey.

d. Discussion of Endorsing Proposed Gas Leaf Blower Ban

Tamara Olcott, member of Quiet Clean Portland together with Michael Hall, asking for GPNA endorsement of eliminating gas leaf blowers. Have already gotten endorsement from seven NAs and three neighborhood coalitions, would like to add GPNA to the list.

What is the cost of replacing gas powered leaf blowers? What would the impact on small businesses? It is about a one-year ROI, it could be done together with the Portland Clean Energy Fund to provide a suitable alternative. There is an awareness that there needs to be a mitigation of the up front cost. Endorsement is to do it - not necessarily now. Will be staged over time in a reasonable way.

The Board voted unanimously to endorse this work.

10. New Business

a. Request for procuring a Zoom account - Mary Cal

We have been using Mary Cal's husband's personal account. Also need to be able to connect it to the website. It is \$149 for one portal. Board voted to purchase a Zoom membership.

Mary Cal will pursue acquiring a membership.

b. Interest in forming a Grant Park Traffic Safety Committee - Stacey Tipp

Traffic safety is a recurring topic among neighbors. For example, the intersection at 33rd and US Grant, 33rd and Knott, pedestrian crosswalk on 33rd, speeding on Knott, etc. Stacey is wondering if anyone would like to form a subcommittee. Table this for next meeting.

c. Meeting schedule for 2021

Meetings will start at 7 pm.

Tuesday, February 2, 2021 - City Office of Equity and Human Rights facilitated workshop

Tuesday, April 6, 2021 Annual Meeting including board elections

Tuesday, June 8, 2021

Tuesday, September 14, 2021

Tuesday, November 9, 2021

13. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 pm.

Attachments

1. Summary of talking points from Jamie Hurd, PPS Project Manager, Office of School Modernization
2. Letter from GPNA neighbor, David Pietka (via email)
3. Letter from GPNA neighbor, Glenn Hansen (via email)
4. Letter from GPNA neighbors, Trish Vawter and Andy Mones (via email)
5. Letter from Erik and Debbie Kola, GPNA neighbors
6. Treasurer's Report

My apologies, but I have had an unexpected conflict come up tonight and won't be able to join the meeting. Below is a statement with talking points for use at the meeting. I have also included an attachment of the same. Please feel free to share or read out as needed.

Portland Public School is committed to a fair and inclusive process to gather public testimony and input from all constituencies interested in the future of Grant Park Upper Field. Below are a few key bullet points. Full project information including all meeting minutes and design information can be found at <https://www.pps.net/Page/14612>

- The land on which the upper field sits is jointly owned by Portland Parks and Recreation and Portland Public Schools.
-
- February 25, 2020 PPS Board of Education approved design and construction of an OSAA softball field and lights at Grant's Upper Field. This project will provide Grant High School Softball teams the ability to play at the school for the first time ever.
-
- The project is in design and expected to be complete in time for the 2022 spring play season.
-
- Lights are required to provide additional practice and game time since the field will be shared by different teams. In the fall Men's and Women's Soccer teams will share the field. In the spring Softball and Baseball will share the field.
-
- Youth and recreation leagues are planned to have use of the field through PIL and Portland Parks and Recreation.
-
- Field use and maintenance are managed by a Collaboration Agreement between Portland Public School and Portland Parks and Recreation that governs all shared-use sites. While Grant field use is included in the Collaboration Agreement, it is not the only shared-use site governed by the agreement, and the agreement is not being renegotiated specifically because of the Grant upper field improvement project. The Collaboration was last agreed upon in 2010. As a ten year contract, it has been in the process of being renegotiated as it comes to its termination date, with expected completion of a new agreement in 2021.
-
- Field use schedules are permitted annually between Portland Public Schools, Portland Interscholastic League and Portland Parks and Recreation.
-
- The project will be submitted to the City of Portland for a Type III Land Use review, due to the addition of lights to the field. The design team anticipates submitting the application on November 13, 2021. With COVID practices, this process is expected to take about 19 weeks. The public hearing is expected to be scheduled for late January or early February.
-
- During Type III Land Use the City will review the project for livability concerns, including lights, noise and traffic. When the review is complete, the project will receive feedback and guidance from the City as to how to proceed.
-
- Items related to changes in traffic and parking such as a neighborhood parking permit or restricting parking in certain areas are managed by PBOT and should be addressed outside of the upper field improvement project.
-
- Any questions or comments can be sent to schoolmodernization.com

Thanks,
Jamie Hurd
Project Manager
Office of School Modernization
Portland Public Schools
971-313-4945

=====

Dear Ken Anderson and Associate Members,

1) Please form a working group to investigate the impact of the Grant Bowl Master Plan (Phase 1- Grant Upper Field) proposed by PPS and PP&R. It's suggested an operational plan will be included in their Type III Land Use Review submittal. Its important the GPNA understand what is being proposed and its impact on Grant Park.

2) Please sponsor a survey of neighbors to gauge concerns. A robust survey can provide data that documents people's concerns and weighed against the loudest or most frequent delivered voices.

The working group's review of the PPS and PP&R proposal can validate that the operational plan is transparent and is consistent with GPNA's vision for the future of Grant Park. Based on the working groups findings and recommendations to the GPNA board, a formal endorsement or mitigation recommendations would be submitted to the Hearings Officer overseeing the Type III Land Use Review.

Fundamentally, GPNA needs to decide what Grant Park will become. Will it stay as a neighborhood park or transition to a regional park? What is PP&R's long term plan for Grant Park? Does PP&R do strategic planning and can they share their vision of Grant Park's future? Does PP&R see Grant Park transitioning to a regional park?

- A Neighborhood Park serves local citizens and serves as the recreational and social focus of neighbors.

- A Regional Park has features that include: (1) high population participation rates, (2) high user volumes, (3) draw residents from across the city, (4) support competition level play facilities.

New synthetic turf and lights at the Grant Park fields enables year round operation and extend operating hours. Unlimited use of Grant Park fields moves in the direction of a regional park.

Athletes need field time, but neighbors also need peace and solitude afforded by their local park. Both are attainable if a shared approach is taken.

Thanks,

Glenn Hansen

Hollyrood Neighbor

David Pietka

From: David Pietka <david@frec.us>
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2020 8:50 AM
To: andymones@gmail.com; Erik Kola (ekola@comcast.net); 'Ron, PrintResults'; kbppdx@gmail.com; gmhpbpr@yahoo.com
Subject: Grant Park Field Improvement Discussion

Ron—Please share with your board in advance, I do not need to read this for the record. Several neighbors will be joining the zoom meeting tomorrow night. Thanks, DEP

HISTORY

During 2019 design plans were developed for the Bowl and Upper field. Early on the goal was to add lights in the bowl for games; the goal shifted over time to allow Softball to practice and play games on campus. Conflicts were evident regarding multiple sports sharing the facilities. Eventually in the fall of 2019 PPS developed a plan to redesign the upper field adding lights and sound. Neighbors requested that an operational plan be developed so that impacts on the neighborhood could be addressed and mitigated. Neighbors were told that an operational plan had not been developed and impacts on the neighborhood would only be addressed in the Type 3 city land use process.

Without an operational plan, the School Board in early 2020 authorized an expenditure of \$1,500,000 for the creation of a softball field in the upper field. The money would pay for expanding the field, dugouts, lights and sound system.

During the spring and summer of 2020 a Design Review Group was formed that addressed field/ dugouts / fencing / and other design issues. During the process it was learned that the school was intending to use the field with lights and sound as late as 9 PM to accommodate soccer, lacrosse, baseball, softball, football, and other sports as needed. It was also learned that even though PPS would not discuss operational issues with neighbors, that an 80 page agreement was being negotiated with the Parks Department regarding use. The Park's representative said in the last meeting that there was a shortage of fields and they were looking forward to the use of the lights year round.

THE NEIGHBORS IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA SUPPORT STUDENT USE OF THE FIELD SUBJECT TO 1) SOME RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE LIGHTS AND SOUND, AND 2) DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN TO ADDRESS IMPACTS. WE DO NOT SUPPORT ADDITIONAL HOURS OF USE BY THE PARKS DEPARTMENT. WE UNDERSTAND THAT WE ARE NEAR AN ACTIVE SCHOOL, BUT WE ARE A RESIDENTIAL AREA SEEKING SOME QUIET TIME.

MAJOR ISSUES NUMBER 1--PARKING AND TRAFFIC ISSUES

The current parking and traffic study is inadequate. It addressed the increase in use from 28 to 33 events that would attract more than 1500 people. The true issue is that when the gym was moved south closer to US Grant Pl. and increased the number of gyms in the school, US Grant Pl became a parking lot, not a street. Additional use of the upper field will add traffic volume to the street. The street is not safe for pedestrians or bike riders during events and active times. This has not been addressed.

MAJOR ISSUE NUMBER 2-- MITIGATION OPPORTUNITIES

Steps need to be taken to address litter, crowd control, bus idling, clean up of facilities after events and practices, use of lights and sound, security patrols to prevent loitering, etc. PPS has refused to put on the table an operational plan regarding hours of operation or a plan to mitigate impacts.

PROPOSED ACTION BY GPNA

This project will affect the livability of not only those people living adjacent to the school but also the entire neighborhood. Whereas the neighborhood should and will continue to support student activity, there is no compelling reason why this residential area should be subject to SPORT COMPLEX impacts and additional Parks Department use.

It is requested that the GPNA develop a resolution that it will oppose the use of lights and sound on the upper field until which time all operational facts are known and until a reasonable implementable mitigation plan is developed that will address safety and livability issues.

Thanks, David Pietka

David Pietka
First Real Estate Consulting
503-206-1071



11/09/2020

3504 NE US Grant Place Portland, OR

Dear Ken Peterson & Association Members,

My name is Andy Mones and I live directly across the street from the Grant HS upper field with my wife Trish Vawter and our two teenage boys. I am writing to echo the concerns that many of my neighbors have voiced in emails and letters to your association. We are in agreement and support the concerns that Dave Pietka outlined in his letter to the association.

I would highlight that one of our main concern is the impact that extended hours of operations would have on our neighborhood along NE US Grant and around school property. We believe strongly that the space should be reserved for school activity and not extended to Portland Parks and Recreation.

From my perspective, lights that allows for student activity should be the focus. But without mitigation measures there will be activity beyond a reasonable hour and beyond school events. That would likely result in worsening parking issues, more littering, and noise pollution.

Changes to any open space, park, or school will inevitably happen, but it should not be at the expense of some members of a community. I would never ask any individual or block in our Grant Park neighborhood to sacrifice their livability for my benefit. We are asking for a fair process that finds compromise and balance and maintains livability for everyone.

Thank you for taking our concerns seriously. I am requesting that you lend a letter of support as we enter into the Type 3 process.

Warm regards and thank you for all the hard work you do,

Trish Vawter & Andy Mones



ERIK AND DEBBIE
KOLA



EKOLA@COMCAST.NET
DEBBIEHINESKOLA@GMAIL.COM



503-5778757(ERIK)
503-9392092(DEBBIE)

3434 NE US GRANT PLACE
PORTLAND, OR
97212

DEAR KEN PETERSON & ASSOCIATION MEMBERS
GRANT PARK NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Dear Ken Peterson & Association Members,

My name is Erik Kola, and I live with my wife Debbie and our two children (Aiden and Mason) in the Grant Park Neighborhood. We are writing this letter to the association to add our voice to concerns raised about changes in our neighborhood. The changes to Grant Park have the potential to have significant impact (both positive and negative). We are in support of improvements to the park to assure access for recreation activities but have concerns about limited neighborhood voice in assuring that changes do not have an undue effect on the livability of Grant Park.

Although we would not expect the association to endorse all of our concerns as proximal neighbors to the park(after all you represent all of GPN), we would ask that you would offer a position of support related to a fair process. We believe that this fair process would include ensuring the planning committee addresses neighborhood concerns and engages in fair compromise to balance impacts of changes to the park and our lives. We are all consumers of these spaces and would hope that the planning committee would be empathetic of our concerns and come to the table with a good faith effort to find a balance.

The support of the association will go a long way in ensuring that the Type 3 hearing is not one sided and can be an avenue for reasonable compromise.

Thanks in advance for your consideration.

Erik and Debbie Kola



**Grant Park Neighborhood Association
Treasurers Report**

Grant Park N/A November 2020			
Wells Fargo Bank			
Beginning Balance:	\$7,111.75		
Total	\$7,111.75		
withdrawals pending	Amount	Name	Purpose
	\$866.00	PrintResults	Fall newsletter 12 pages
		paid Susan Shepperd \$120	Fall Newsletter
Total A/P	\$866.00	own Hook	Net team
Accounts Receiveable			
Total A/R			
Ending Balance	\$6,245.75		
Petty Cash	\$16.02		