

What is your vision for the district and if elected how would you implement that vision on city council?

Do you favor moving I-5 (either placing it underground, moving it farther east or not replacing it at all) or just leave it in place?

My vision for the district is one that provides for vibrant and productive businesses providing goods and services to residents and workers and visitors to the area. In terms of specifics, that vision has to be developed in conjunction with the folks who are already in the district. But I'm sure that vision includes better parking, better access to the district by public transportation, improved streets and opportunities to start and grow businesses, including manufacturing businesses. While I understand the concern about pressure to become the next Pearl District, I think the residents and businesses in the area need to determine the nature of their district and how it presents itself to the rest of the city and the world.

I currently have no position on any future action with I-5. I am open to a variety of configurations depending on the needs of future development of the district and the cost variables for potential plans.

What is your position on eliminating the BIT/BLF?

I support the current plan adopted by the city to reform the BIT/BLF. I find it interesting that an excellent analysis of the loss of wealth and jobs from the city comes down to a question about the BIT and BLF. While the amount of these two items are important factors in the ability of small businesses to grow and thrive, I would place two other factors above the BIT/BLF in impacting the city's ability to create and retain jobs.

First, I find it very concerning that Portlanders cannot point to the two, three or four industries that will drive our economy for the next 10 to 20 years. We need these industries to provide a stable underpinning for our business "ecosystem," if you will, so that all Portlanders can enjoy opportunity and prosperity. I have a background working with clean energy industries and believe that a focused effort in terms of workforce investment and highlighting existing infrastructure can grow this industrial sector for Portland. Indeed, the CEID already has Oregon Wind located within its boundaries. We need similar focused efforts to grow other industries to make Portland a key part of their operations.

Second, I believe the way that the city interacts with the business community overall is a key element to creating a healthy business environment. What I hear from most businesses I talk to is a desire for consistency and predictability. They want to know what it costs to do business in

the city so that they can make solid financial plans and they want to know that the city will work with them to get permits and the like as quickly as possible with a minimum of run-around.

Making sure that these two elements are addressed, along with continuing on the current path with the BIT/BLF, will make Portland a market businesses want to enter.

Do you support spending 1.5% (45 million) of the entire city budget on road maintenance or are you willing to return, spaced over five years, to using the utility tax (now \$60 million per year) to fund road maintenance?

While I do not know the right level of spending to maintain our road and street infrastructure, I do believe that we must dedicate some portion of the city budget to this purpose. We find ourselves today in a situation where this key part of our infrastructure is literally crumbling. I support the proposed Safe, Sound and Green Streets project and its proposed funding mechanism. However, I have a concern that, as we make the slated improvements, we are going to find ourselves in much the same place in another decade or two unless we do change our commitment to ongoing maintenance. I believe that every budget process needs to include an examination of what maintenance and investment needs to be made to this infrastructure and then plan for it. I also believe that the issue of some portion of the franchise fee to fund the upkeep should be on the table for discussion. While I understand the current council's unwillingness to include the franchise fee because it does fund such a significant part of other city activities, it nonetheless needs to be included in the debate over how we maintain our roads and streets.

With the CEIC success in increasing jobs over the last two decades would you support maintaining and protecting our industrial sanctuary?

I would support maintaining and protecting the industrial sanctuary of the CEID with the underscoring that we must emphasize an ever-improving approach to running industry in a cleaner and more efficient manner and recognizing that this particular industrial sanctuary can have tremendous impacts on its neighboring residential areas, the river that runs alongside it and the downtown area just across the river. I do believe, however, that Portland is the place where we can demonstrate how a strong industrial sector and high quality of life can go together.

Do you support the creation of Satellite URA locations?

Do you think Government has a higher moral standard to follow the spirit and intent of the law and not take questionable legal positions to push pet projects?

How much influence should City Hall have in setting UR budgets and should the budgets favor TIF creating projects?

I do not support the creation of satellite URA locations. There is questionable legal underpinning for that course. If it made sense to advocate for a change in state law to enable this kind of approach, I'd consider it. However, I believe there are more straightforward ways to accomplish what we seek to do with the proposed satellite URA approach.

I do believe that government has the obligation to follow the spirit and intent of the law, just as private businesses and individuals do.

I supported the charter change that brought the PDC's budget-setting function under the closer purview of the city council. Prior to the change, I do not believe there was adequate accountability from the PDC and giving the city council a larger role in its budget-setting process was an appropriate way to increase that accountability. The budgets set and adopted for TIF-centered projects should be used for the stated purposes and areas defined by the TIF. The city council should guard against the temptation of making a particularly successful renewal area a source of ongoing cash.

What could City Hall do differently to move the Burnside Bridgehead project ahead?

The Burnside Bridgehead project is indeed a key project for the CEID and the city as a whole. I think that the current market conditions unfortunately means more delay for the project. I supported letting the memorandum of understanding between the PDC and Opus Development expire no matter what the current economic conditions because I think that provides the opportunity to explore a greater range of options to move forward. I think that the key to moving the project forward is having a clear picture in mind of how the district as a whole wants to develop and what key industries to pursue. Then we will be able to focus on recruiting an anchor tenants, not just for a single project but for the district as a whole. Overall, the project is far enough behind that I think we need to take it as an opportunity to rethink the entire approach.

Do you support Metro's housing growth policy for the district and how would you position City hall to resolve the conflicts when these two needs collide?

How do you resolve to protect and increase the industrial land base in the City?

We need a better understanding of the needs of today's manufacturers and other industrial players. In the 1970s, our industrial lands were dominated by properties next to railroad tracks. However, as the high-tech industry became a major industrial player, the needs shifted to more campuslike sites that were preferred by those industries. We are in a similar seismic shift in terms of identifying the needs of the next generation of industrial players. This brings me back to

my key point of being clear first about what industries we are trying to attract and then trying to create development around fitting the needs of those particular industries.

What would you do to support the CEIC in protecting and expanding parking for trucks and cars in the district?

Three things need to be done to relieve parking pressures in the district. First, priority must be given to working vehicles in the area making deliveries or picking up items to be transported. Second, to allow that sort of priority to occur, both workers and visitors to the area must have alternative transportation choices to get into and out of the area that do not require a car. Third, we need to examine the level of regular workers in the area and determine the adequate number of parking spaces for those workers along with a better analysis of the parking needs of customers and other visitors to the area.

What is your position on creating a Bridge Authority to manage/own all publicly owned bridges over the Willamette and Columbia Rivers in our Four country region (includes Clark county)?

The potential creation of a Bridge Authority needs to be discussed. Currently, we have several different owners of the bridges and no coordinated approach in maintaining or improving the bridges. The trouble is that creating that type of authority is a complex undertaking as it finding the best way to provide its funding. But if initial discussion and examination indicate that a Bridge Authority would utilize dollars more efficiently to maintain and improve these key infrastructure assets, we should explore its creation.