

MINUTES

MARINE DRIVE WIDENING PROJECT Design Review Workshop May 18, 1999

ATTENDEES

Bill Barber - Metro
Jim Bauman - CH2M Hill
Stacy Bluhm - City of Portland Office of Transportation
Mark Bransom - CH2M Hill
Bennett Burns - Walker & Macy
Sue Bullington - Nordstrom
Troy Clark - Friends of Smith & Bybee Lakes
Tammy Cleys - Bureau of Environmental Services
Mike Gemmett - Portland French Bakery
Lise Glancy, Port of Portland
Alanna Hein - facilitator
Tom Hjort - Port of Portland
Greg Jones - City of Portland
Dennis Keeps - St. Johns Neighborhood
Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland
Todd Lasher - North Portland
Nancy Hendrickson - Bureau of Environmental Services
Polly Knox - North Portland
Gerry Meyer - Port of Portland
Jay Mower - Columbia Slough Watershed Council
Frank Opila - Friends of Smith & Bybee Lakes
Bob Price - Columbia Corridor Assn.
Emily Roth - Metro
Dave Simmons - CH2M Hill
Peter Teneau - Kenton Neighborhood
Roger Whitaker - Noise consultant
Chris White - Port of Portland
Ken Willhite - Port of Portland
John Willis - CH2M Hill

1. *Operating Principles and Introductions*

Alanna Hein, facilitator, opened the meeting and reviewed the operating principles agreed to at previous meetings.

2. *Landscaping*

Bennett Burns of Walker & Macy presented plans for landscaping the proposed improvements, including the area along the 40-mile-loop. Essentials of the plan include:

- Street tree planting; starting with red oaks on the north side of Marine Drive at the project's east end, Norway maple on both sides of the road past Ledbetter, and red oaks at the west end;
- Marine Drive is already planted with some red oak and Norway maples;
- Throughout the resource area, landscaping will include native plants, as suggested by those attending the earlier round of meetings;
- An 18-foot planting strip adjacent to the preferred sound barrier option, planted with native shrubs;
- Use of landscaping along the wall to prevent graffiti and improve aesthetics;
- A sloping surface on the other side of the wall from the 40-mile-loop trail covered with shrubs and grasses.

She distributed a preliminary list of plant species that are low-maintenance and would enhance wildlife habitat.

Peter Teneau asked the landscape designers to consider the height of the trees at maturity. A truck stack is 13 feet high and is very visible, adding to the perception of noise. Mr. Teneau said that trees with flexible limbs create a "white noise," rustling sound that can help mask the highway noise.

Ms. Burns said that the landscape architects are conferring with the urban forester on the best kind of trees for the corridor. She said that oaks or big leaf maples may provide the kind of canopy that he suggests. In response to a question from Troy Clark, she said that red oaks and Norway maples, not native plants, would be planted on the north side of the project.

Frank Opila asked if non-native plants had the potential to spread into the resource area. Ms. Burns said that soil types would limit the spread. She said that she anticipates plantings on the south side to be of an open, meadow-like nature. At this point the whole area has not been planned, and further design will be done in cooperation with Metro.

Bob Price asked if vegetative densities would impair sight distance for trucks at the west end of the project. Ms. Burns said that landscaping in the area about which he was asking would essentially be similar to what currently exists. At some other points in the project there are distance requirements that assure good visibility for vehicles, and the design team will consider setbacks at all crossings.

Mr. Price asked if there's a chance that truck traffic would damage the trees planted on the south side. Ms. Burns said that the trees will be set back from the road by the bike lane and perhaps even farther onto the berm, but it is a consideration that the landscape architects will need to deal with.

Mr. Teneau asked about the design team's knowledge of turtle habitat. Ms. Burns said they are working with a specialist to get whatever information is available, which, she said, is fairly limited.

3. *Review of Options*

Stacy Bluhm presented several tradeoffs that should be considered before engineering proceeds.

The first issue is the width of the walking/bike trail. It is possible to reduce the path width from 12 feet to 10 feet in the resource area, keeping the project farther from the lakes. Generally, the department prefers a 12 foot width to reduce conflicts between walkers, bicyclists and other path users.

Mr. Price said he wanted to address stormwater issues. He wanted to know who is responsible for maintaining the underground stormwater retention facility. He said that is was his understanding that BES would maintain the contract, but that Emily Roth of Metro would prefer it be maintained under a separate contract. He also is concerned about the effectiveness of relying on a manual gate closure in case of spill, and questioned the adequacy of the spill storage unit.

Tammy Cleys said that BES does not have its own maintenance section, but the city of Portland has a Maintenance Bureau. The Port would maintain the facility for three years, during which it would create an operations and maintenance manual and report routinely to BES. After the three years, maintenance responsibility falls to the city. Stormwater facilities adjacent to Marine Drive currently are maintained by the city.

Mr. Opila said he understood that current maintenance levels were less than adequate. Ms. Cleys said that she believes the system is working as it was designed to, but she acknowledged there are differing opinions on that issue.

Concerning emergency response, Ms. Cleys said that in case of a spill, both the Fire Bureau and the Maintenance Bureau are contacted. Whoever arrives first closes the gate. She said she is not aware of any other economically feasible way to handle spill response.

Dave Simmons said he understood that in parts of the system that don't have gates it is possible to intercept the spill at the outfall. Mr. Clark said he believed that had happened with a spill at Rodda Point that was captured before being discharged into Smith and Bybee Lakes.

Mr. Teneau asked about the possibility of an automatic shutdown using an electronic sensor that could detect high levels of toxic or hazardous substances. Ms. Cleys said she knew of no such automated system.

Mr. Teneau asked what happens in the case of an accident in which the train or truck operator would be injured and unable to notify anyone.

Sue Bullington asked if there's a way businesses could help with notification, such as training personnel to be aware of potential spills and making sure they know whom to notify.

Greg Jones said the most useful thing to do is notify the right agency. He said that the Fire Bureau wants to be on site to check out the situation before they close the gates so fire personnel know precisely the nature and extent of the spill. He also said that the Fire Bureau wants all systems throughout the city to be similar so there is no confusion in procedure when they reach the site.

He said the right thing to do is call 9-1-1. He said delays have occurred because people have spent time looking through the phone book for the right city agency.

Ms. Bluhm said that the other issue to resolve is how much buffer there should be between the path and the wall. There will be a two foot gravel shoulder, but in addition there could be a three feet landscaping area to keep people from being too close to the sound barrier. The two- foot shoulder is required by all design manuals and is a necessary safety feature.

Nancy Hendrickson asked what is required and what is preferred. Ms. Bluhm said that the City's Bicycle Master Plan standards call for a 10-foot width on the bike path, but they prefer 12 feet when it is available. The two- foot shoulder is mandatory.

Bill Barber said that the 10-foot width is consistent with other places where bike paths need to be narrowed. He said that in most cases, bicycle commuters, who are likely to go faster, will use the bike lane on the road, rather than the path. He said that signage might help direct faster riders onto the road.

Ms. Roth asked how this issue affects the wildlife area. Ms. Bluhm said the narrower bike lane creates two foot less encroachment into the habitat area.

Ms. Bluhm said that the City has not decided on what the path's surface will be, as the party responsible for maintenance should be involved in that decision. She said that chip seal is relatively inexpensive initially but is costly to maintain, while concrete is more expensive but requires less maintenance.

Jim Sjulín said that the chip seal has worked well on the Springwater Trail, but that conditions were ideal, which may or may not be the case in this part of the loop.

Mr. Teneau asked if anyone could forecast the mix of users on this part of the trail. Ms. Roth said that nobody walks there right now, and most weekend cyclists are pedaling fast on the road. Given that, Mr. Teneau said he thinks a narrower path might be a good idea to save space for wildlife.

Ms. Hendrickson asked where the bike riders go when the Marine Drive bike lane is phased out going over the bridge. Ms. Bluhm said that the design would need to include a connection between the bike lane and the path so that people who want to switch at that point can do so. She said, however, that bicyclists today tend to remain in the travel lane, and they probably would continue to do so.

Mr. Clark asked the width of the path along Marine Drive near the airport. Ms. Bluhm said it is 12 feet. Mr. Clark said that path accommodates a wide variety of users – bicyclist, pedestrians, skateboarders and dog-walkers.

Mr. Opila said that a recommendation about the Hayden Island Bridge called for 11 foot traffic lanes and no bike lanes on Marine Drive to the east. In that context, he asked if the bike lane could connect with the loop earlier to move the whole project further to the north and eliminate the bike lane on the road. Ms. Burns said that the new driveway and parking lot may be a point at which to route bicyclists off the road.

Ms. Bluhm said she was not familiar with the recommendation about 11-foot lanes to the east. She said that she thought the existing roadway to the east could, if desired, be restriped to allow for on-street bike lanes in the future. She said that she did not want this new project to the west to preclude having bike lanes on Marine Drive. Mr. Clark informed her that the Hayden Island Bridge recommendation Mr. Opila referred to was the second Kittelson report.

Todd Lasher said that he frequently rides in the traffic lane on Marine Drive where there is no bike lane. Forcing bicyclists off the bridge is not a good idea.

Ms. Knox said that in Seattle the paths have good signage that could be applied to reduce bike speed and reduce conflicts between users.

Mr. Barber said he thinks the idea of sometime restriping the lanes on the bridge is a good one.

Ms. Hendrickson asked if the soft shoulder could maintain landscaping. Mr. Willis said that there could be grass and gravel, but the idea is to keep the area clear for the safety of people using the path. Mr. Teneau said he would like to see the idea of some landscaping preserved as an option.

Mr. Opila asked if there are any other opportunities to reduce the project's impact on the wildlife habitat area, and he asked about specific dimensions. Ms. Bluhm said that the three-foot vegetative buffer would be useful to protect the wall and that the 18-foot planting strip on the north side can't be any narrower. She clarified that there is an option to eliminate three of the five feet between the path and the wall.

Mr. Willis clarified a chart that indicates the comparative impact of each noise barrier alternative on the wildlife area. In the berm/wall alternative, there is 59 feet between the existing south curb to the wall in the middle part of the project near Nordstrom.

Ms. Hein asked the members to provide their thoughts on the best width of the path and whether or not the project should leave room for a three-foot landscaping area between the soft shoulder and the wall.

- Mr. Price: The path width should be minimized, consistent with reducing lane widths and other modifications to accommodate wildlife habitat. The buffer between the path and the wall should be maximized.
- Ms. Bullington: The path width should be 10 feet, but must there be an 18-foot planting strip? That requires building too far into the resource area. Ms. Bluhm said that the 18-foot dimension must remain, as providing a steeper slope would not allow the area to be planted.
- Ms. Roth: A 10-foot bike path and a 5-foot buffer, because the vegetation there will be very important.
- Mr. Opila: He can't make a suggestion until he knows what is left untouched after construction. He would prefer routing the bike lane onto the loop trail to reduce road size and having the trail 12-feet in width, with a 5-foot buffer. If that is not possible, he would prefer a 10-foot path with a 5-foot buffer. Ms. Bluhm said that eliminating the bike lane on the roadway doesn't gain that much, because the travel lane would remain at 14 feet.
- Gerry Meyer: 10-foot path, 5-foot buffer.
- Ms. Knox: 10-foot path, 5-foot buffer.
- Ms. Hendrickson: 10-foot path, 5-foot buffer. She asked if all lanes are narrower by one foot, and Ms. Bluhm said they are. She wondered why they can't build an 11-foot travel lane much closer to the curb (by eliminating the bike lane). Ms. Hendrickson said they should try to keep the bike traffic on the 40-mile-loop trail. Greg Jones explained that state law requires either a 14-foot shared lane or a bike lane for new road development.
- Ms. Cleys: 10-foot path, 5-foot buffer.
- Mr. Sjulín: 10-foot path, 5-foot buffer. But the narrower path only works if there is a bike lane on the street. If high speed bicyclists will be using the path it must be 12 feet. And the path should return to 12 feet in width immediately after emerging from the resource area.
- Mr. Teneau: The wall should be as far north as possible. Is it possible to have a 12-foot path and a 3 foot buffer? Mr. Sjulín said that under those circumstances, any vegetation would encroach on the buffer, which would not be acceptable. Mr. Teneau said he would then advocate for a 5-foot buffer, because it is important that vegetation cover the wall.
- Mike Gemmett asked if vegetation could cover the wall in a one-foot space. Ms. Burns explained that would not be possible. The two-foot mandatory shoulder would be made of gravel, about 10-inches deep, and is required to remain clear of vegetation. Mr. Gemmett voted for a 10-foot path and a 5-foot buffer.

- Mr. Clark said he wished he had more information on the extent of usage of the path. The Marine Drive East path is very heavily used and wouldn't work well if it were narrower. If the Marine Drive West area gets more heavily used, the wider path will be necessary. But given that it's not currently "view property," like the eastern part of the path, he assumes that 10 feet will be adequate. However, he noted that the rest of the path outside the resource area should be 12 feet and should have good signage to caution bicyclists to ride slowly.
- Ms. Lasher said he thinks a 10-foot path will be adequate. He would prefer a 3-foot vegetative buffer and no shoulder, but understands that is not possible. He asked Ms. Burns to be sure that the trees have deep roots to prevent interference with the path.
- Mr. Barber: 10-foot path and a 5-foot buffer. He noted that bike lanes act as a "breakdown shoulder" for truck and cars, an important safety feature for a busy road. He said that as the region continues to encourage alternative transportation use, bikes will be an important option for keeping cars off the road and leaving more room for trucks.
- Dennis Keepes: Wants 12 foot of path to serve conflicting users, such as skateboarders and rollerbladers. He sees this path as an important way to link Kelly Point Park and Pier Park. He also thinks there should be adequate room (5 feet) between the path and the wall to allow skaters, etc. to "crash and burn."
- Tom Hjort: 10-foot path, 5-foot buffer.

Ms. Hendrickson said the reason to reduce the path width is to preserve the resources in the area. Mr. Jones agreed that this statement will be important when the issues are considered by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Keepes said that his goal is to accommodate all users and achieve a balance of conflicting interests.

Ms. Hein said that 16 of those voting supported the 10-foot path width, and 14 people voted for the 5-foot buffer.

Mr. Sjulín said that it should be understood that the group's decision applies only to the part of the path going through the resource area. The rest of the path should be 12 feet wide.

4. Minutes

Ms. Bluhm said it is important that the minutes accurately reflect whatever was said at the meeting, so she asked everyone to review carefully what they are quoted as saying. Any corrections on minutes of the first two meetings should be submitted to Chris White at the Port within 10 days of the meeting. Submit corrections on the final meeting minutes to Ms. White within a week of receiving them.

5. Remaining Issues

Outfalls. Ms. Bluhm said that participants had requested an illustration of existing sewer outfalls into the lakes. Mark Bransom distributed a map showing outfalls from different sources. In response to a question from Mr. Opila, Mr. Bransom said that the water from the city sewers was stormwater from the roadway. Private outfalls are shown in brown, and the red lines indicate Port-generated stormwater primarily created by business development.

Mr. Bransom said that a goal is to treat as much water as possible before allowing it to be discharged. He said the consultants do not have further information at this time on the number of outfalls they can impact.

Title 10. Ms. Roth read from a document clarifying Title 10 responsibility. This "Title 10" refers to Metro's parks and open space responsibility. It is not one of the sections of Metro's Functional Plan. The passage clarifies Metro's role in any decisions affecting water discharged into Smith and Bybee Lakes.

Ms. Roth said that Charlie Ciecko, Director of Metro's Regional Parks and Greenspaces department, said he prefers that any stormwater reaching the lakes meet federal standards to prevent further water quality degradation. The lakes are already listed as 303D, and Metro is required to create a water quality management plan for them. Metro will not assume any more liability for water quality in the lakes. She said that Metro has enforced a similar action at Blue Lake.

Mr. Jones said that the involved parties – the Port of Portland and BES – need to sit down with Metro and DEQ to see if a permit will be issued to allow discharge into the lakes. Mr. Barber suggested including Rosemary Furfey of Metro, who is working on Title 3 issues related to riparian development.

Ms. Roth explained that some water quality issues are not addressed by the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) limits established by DEQ. Ms. Hendrickson said that BES applies all DEQ standards, but the DEQ guidelines do not affect wildlife habitat and other issues.

Mr. Jones said that normally PDOT would apply to BES for approval of the stormwater system, but if there is a jurisdictional conflict, BES would represent the city in discussions with Metro and DEQ. Ms. Cleys said that the BES permit does not preclude the issuance of other permits.

Ms. Roth explained that Metro, as owner and manager of the receiving bodies, would require its parks director to sign off on the system.

Ms. Hein summarized the discussion by saying that the issues need to be resolved in another forum.

Traffic speed. Mr. Teneau had suggested lowering the posted speed on Marine Drive by at least five miles per hour. Ms. Bluhm said that the state has jurisdiction over all speed limits.

Posted speed east of the project is 40 mph, which would add support to the case for lowering the speed to 40 mph in the project area. However, the state will require a velocity count, and if the actual speeds traveled are higher it is unlikely that the state will agree to lowering the posted limit.

Mr. Teneau said that source control, in this case slower speeds, is a good way to control noise. He recommended that the City use the fact that part of the road is posted at 40 mph in its argument to the state for lower speeds.

Ms. Bluhm said that a five mile an hour drop reduces noise by 3 decibels, which is deemed "barely noticeable" by noise standards. Mr. Teneau said it would make a difference. He said it also is a safety issue.

Ms. Bluhm said that signs don't really make a difference in slowing traffic speeds; it is the design of the roadway that would affect speeds (i.e.; narrower travel lanes tend to encourage slower speeds).

Ms. Roth said that the only new signal in the project is at T-6. She said that with new development at Ledbetter there will be many more cars, creating a potential safety issue. She said it appears that slowing traffic speeds would increase safety.

Ms. Bluhm said that the City hopes that the County will install a traffic signal at Ledbetter, if the jail siting proceeds and creates enough traffic demand to justify it. She said that traffic signals don't actually result in slower traffic.

Mr. Lasher said that 11-foot lanes all the way through the project may create a good justification for slower posted speeds.

Ms. Bluhm said that the major factor the state will consider is the existing speed on that road, and that most likely prevailing speed is well over the current posted limit. She said that as the area develops and becomes more congested, speeds are likely to become slower.

Ms. Hein noted that the meeting was running past the agreed-upon time of 7:15, and she asked the committee's approval to continue the meeting until 8:00. All but one person agreed.

Berm extension. Ms. Roth asked what the group felt about extending the berm all the way to the rail crossing. Ms. Bluhm said she thought there was support for this, but Ms. Roth said it wasn't clear from the minutes what the consensus was, and not everyone spoke to the subject in the previous meeting.

Mr. Price said he had understood that the berm would be removed once the overpass is completed, in Phase 2 of the project. Ms. Bluhm said that the extension would cost \$100,000 and might ultimately be thrown away, as it may have to be eliminated when the overpass is built. Mr. Price said the berm could be used as fill.

Mr. Clark said to eliminate the term "throw away" from the discussion, as the berm could be used for fill. He said it should be made clear that this is a necessary part of the project, not a "throw away."

Ms. Bluhm said that she thought a benefit of having the road built over the rail line in the future was to allow wildlife to pass under the road to access the area north of Marine Drive. However, building a berm/wall to the tracks now would direct all wildlife east of the tracks to the west, to get around the barrier. Thus, wildlife will not be allowed free access north and south of Marine Drive in the future unless the barrier is removed when the overpass is built. This is why it is referred to as a "throw away." Mr. Clark said that wildlife will not go over the road. Animals will go under the new bridge, as they do under the existing bridge. Ms. Roth said that crossing the rail is better than crossing the road.

Mr. Hjort said that extending the berm and the wall will be difficult to justify if there is no use for it after the overpass is completed.

Ms. Bluhm noted that this is an advisory group, and staff will make sure its recommendations are passed on to decision makers, but there is no guarantee that all the recommendations will be accepted.

Mr. Gemmett said he supports extending the berm, not the wall.

Mr. Keepes said the group was put in a difficult position. They don't know when Phase 2 will be built, and they had no say in the phasing of the project. He said it's hard to know the right answer without knowing more about the timing.

Ms. Hein asked for a vote on extending the noise barrier. There were 11 votes to extend the berm/wall combination, 1 vote for the berm only, and 2 votes for no extension.

Ms. Knox noted that \$100,000 only represents one percent of the total project costs.

6. *Financing*

Susie Lahsene of the Port of Portland presented an overview of funding options to pay for the project.

Currently, available funds are:

Port of Portland - \$9 million

Multnomah County (if jail is sited) - \$1 million

City of Portland (contingent on an increase in state gas tax) - \$1 million

Federal dollars from the Metro allocation process - \$2 million

This totals \$13 million. The total project cost is estimated to be \$15.5 million, \$2.1 of which includes design and public process, and the remaining \$13.4 is for construction.

Currently, they are approximately \$2.5 million short of being able to complete the project as designed. Ms. Bluhm said that she is looking for cost-savings in a variety of ways. However, as design proceeds, if they cannot shrink the gap sufficiently it may be necessary to sequence pieces of the project.

They will continue to work on getting more solid estimates and looking for cost reductions, but if the gap remains too wide, staff will return to this group for suggestions on ways to sequence the construction in a way that is compatible with community goals.

Mr. Price asked about the availability of federal money. Ms. Lahsene said that all available federal money came through Metro and had already been distributed.

Mr. Teneau asked about an earlier \$1.7 million request. Mr. Jones said that it had been a request for \$1.79 million, and with the matching funds it equaled \$2 million.

Mr. Clark said that if the project is sequenced, the only flexibility available is to delay environmental mitigation. Ms. Bluhm said if it is necessary to sequence the project there may be other options, such as not widening the road as much at one time. However, she said, there will be another meeting if necessary to discuss these.

Mr. Keepes asked if the public would be cut out of the decision-making process if there isn't enough money to complete all aspects previously agreed upon. He said the participants should be kept involved all the way through until the bids are in and the contractor selected.

Mr. Jones said that the project planners began with an estimate of \$18 million and have found ways to reduce costs to \$15.5. He said the estimates are conservative and they have left a lot of room in the budget for contingencies. But it may be necessary to look for further cuts, in which case there will be another public workshop.

Ms. Hendrickson said that if traffic estimates are based on demand in the year 2015, it sounds like improvements in the resource area (40-mile-loop trail and the left turn lane) should be completed first. Ms. Bluhm said that with estimated inflation at 8 percent, it makes sense to build as much as possible as soon as possible to make the dollars go farther.

Mr. Opila said that Commissioner Hales and Port Executive Director Mike Thorne gave Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes written assurance that all critical environmental items would be handled in Phase One.

He asked if the traffic forecasts prepared in 1985 were still accurate.

Ms. Bluhm said that there are new figures which indicated a drop in projections, but still called for two lanes in both directions. She said she didn't think this single projection was enough to change the project substantially.

Ms. Bullington said that if the City is waiting for the outcome of legislative decisions on the gas tax, it is possible that the project could be another \$1 million short. Mr. Jones said he is optimistic about increased gas tax revenues.

Mr. Teneau asked if they would need a traffic forecast for 2020. Ms. Bluhm said Rivergate is expected to reach build-out by 2015.

Ms. Bluhm said that the City should receive the 50 percent design in mid-July. If the budget gap remains, they will reconvene the group at the end of July. Other milestones are

- End of June 1999, initiate Type III review (Pre-App)
- an open house for the general public in the fall
- request for approval by City Council after the workshop
- December 1999, final design and design review
- December 1999/January 2000: City Council asked to approve Intergovernmental Agreement
- Early 2000, open house on construction issues
- Jan./Feb 2000, open the bidding process.

Mr. Teneau asked if there would be an opportunity for public testimony at the City Council hearing in the fall. Ms. Bluhm said there would be. Mr. Teneau asked if there also would be an opportunity to testify when Council considered the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA). Mr. Opila said that his group had been promised the opportunity to testify throughout the process.

Ms. Bluhm said that if everyone is in agreement with the proposed IGA, staff would request it be placed on the consent agenda. If there are outstanding disagreements, it will be placed on the agenda for a public hearing.

She said she would like to start building as soon as possible in 2000. However, there may be some delays. For example, if property owners are dissatisfied with the City's approach to right-of-way acquisition, the process could be slowed significantly. She said that in all likelihood, we will have one more design workshop to look at the 50% design costs. This will happen sometime in the summer, probably July or August.

Mr. Price asked how long the Type III review was expected to take. Ms. Bluhm said about three months, possibly a bit longer.

7. Evaluation

Ms. Hein asked the participants to indicate what they thought worked well or needed improvement in the workshop process. Participants said they thought the meeting went well, they felt there was more lightness and humor expressed in this meeting over previous ones, and they appreciated having a sense of the timing and goals of the project into the future.

**North Marine Drive Widening
Design Workshop -8/31/99**

The final North Marine Drive Design Workshop will occur on Tuesday, August 31 at Granpac Foods. Granpac Foods is located in the Rivergate Industrial Park in North Portland, west of the Smith/Bybee Lakes parking lot, on the south side of the road. The address is: 7124 N. Marine Drive. We will be meeting from 5:00-8:00 PM, and again be providing dinner. You may park in the parking lot next to the building. Please be on time!

Please call Chris White at the Port of Portland (731-7056), to RSVP.