

The Oregonian

Portland's newest park: a \$15.1 million pathway to nowhere

*By Brad Schmidt
February 11, 2016*

As city council meetings go, there wasn't much unusual about this one. Public testimony. A long agenda. One proclamation from the mayor. Commissioners spent 50 minutes listening to an update about stormwater management. They even welcomed Commissioner Amanda Fritz's mother, who was visiting from England. Four hours later, the meeting was over.

But without any public comment and without a moment of discussion at that Nov. 3, 2010 meeting, the Portland City Council unanimously approved a deal negotiated in secret to take a toxic parcel of South Waterfront property off the hands of Oregon Health & Science University and a pair of the city's most prominent developers. The land would be designated for a 4-acre park serving the South Waterfront neighborhood.

Portland leaders gathered last June to christen that new park, hailing it as an example of urban planning at its finest.

"This is a huge win in Portland's history," said Mike Abbaté, director of the Portland Parks Bureau. "To redevelop a portion of old industrial land and make it now habitable for people, for fish, for wildlife. That's part of our DNA in this city. ... This is what Portland does."

But an Oregonian/OregonLive investigation found that the biggest beneficiaries of the South Waterfront Greenway were the developers who unloaded the land, converting a multimillion-dollar liability into a multimillion-dollar asset.

The city would ultimately spend \$5 million to remove more than 35,000 tons of waste – the worst of it bursting with cancer-causing materials like asbestos and polychlorinated biphenyl.

A deal negotiated in private and signed off by Commissioner Nick Fish transferred ownership from OHSU and the development firm Williams & Dame to the city.

And the deal stuck the city with nearly the entire bill for the environmental cleanup.

But if that weren't enough, the companies that turned over the toxic land were granted rights to develop on far more buildable property elsewhere in the South Waterfront. It was a move potentially worth millions of dollars, estimates show.

The new park ultimately cost \$15.1 million – 2 ½ times more than budgeted. It took six years longer than expected to complete. The city hopes that one day it will connect a network of pedestrian and bike trails to downtown. But today, the narrow ribbon of trails leads nowhere.

Greenway costs skyrocketed largely because of the extent of contamination unearthed on the property, records and interviews reveal for the first time.

Portland officials initially negotiated a contract to ensure that Williams & Dame and OHSU would pay to clean the land before it became a park.

City leaders knew in 2008 that the land was unacceptably contaminated and demanded that the owners meet their obligation and pay up.

But, then, city officials caved, according to records.

The development firm principals, answering questions only through email, said they had suggested building a scaled-back version of the park, which would require less clean up. But the city decided against it.

And when it came time to formally approve the deal at the Nov. 3, 2010 meeting, city leaders deliberately took steps to keep their decision off the public radar. None of the points of controversy made it onto the city agenda. Instead, the park project and its toxic legacy was buried in the portion of the meeting calendar reserved for the mundane and uncontroversial – what is known as a "consent agenda."

It's not typically the place to find a major environmental cleanup or a sweet deal.

The vision

The South Waterfront Greenway was carved from nearly 30 acres of land locked up by OHSU and developers Homer Williams and Dike Dame in 2002.

City leaders saw a bright future for the former industrial district, once home to shipbuilding, gravel crushing, concrete production and metal fabrication. They envisioned Oregon's highest-density neighborhood with condo towers, a streetcar, and an aerial tram transporting patients and workers to OHSU, the city's largest employer. In 2003, the city signed a deal with the developers and the university to make it happen.

At the heart of their vision: A 1.2-mile-long greenway along the Willamette River, stretching from the Marquam Bridge to near Johns Landing. It would offer a tranquil refuge to complement the city's bustling new urban neighborhood.

Plans for the greenway were part of a half-inch thick agreement outlining how tens of millions of tax dollars would subsidize South Waterfront development. The developers and OHSU were required to give the city land for the first phase of the greenway, a narrow quarter-mile long strip along the river. The city agreed to build the park and eventually budgeted \$5.7 million for the project.

In December 2004, the City Council approved a broad-brush design for the full 1.2-mile greenway without a plan to pay for it. Mayor Vera Katz declared that it would become "a gift to this community that you all will be terribly proud of."

"We have heard much talk about how this great design gets implemented and paid for," Dame told city leaders at the time. "My feeling is money follows good ideas. It will get figured out."

It didn't. And then things got more complicated.

The denial

In March 2008, the Portland Development Commission sent a letter to Dame with alarming findings. Environmental testing on part of the greenway property had uncovered "unacceptable levels of certain hazardous materials." The city demanded that the developers and OHSU clean it up.

The Oregonian/OregonLive reviewed the contract that would require the developers to clean the property. The city believed the language was clear. The agreement "does not contemplate"

the city "bearing the costs of the environmental remediation," wrote Patrick Quinton, who at the time was the Portland Development Commission's manager of South Waterfront development. "On the contrary," he added, it "obligates" the owners to pay for it.

A city estimate, shared with Dame's attorney, established a low range of \$610,000 to a "worst case" \$1.2 million.

But Portland's agreement offered a huge loophole, documents show. The developers could refuse to clean the greenway property, leaving the city little leverage.

The developers ultimately said no, according to Quinton's letter, though the city has no record of the official rejection required by the agreement.

"Dike would have come in with an argument," said Quinton, who is now executive director of the Portland Development Commission. "I just cannot, for the life of me, remember what that argument was."

The missing paperwork is no problem, he said, because it's "obvious that they communicated their rationale in a meeting verbally."

"Dike Dame likes to have meetings to talk about things," Quinton said. "Dike Dame does not engage in email exchanges."

After initially agreeing to an interview, Dame declined to directly answer questions posed by The Oregonian/OregonLive, including why he wouldn't clean the property. Williams declined to discuss the project at all.

Mark Williams, OHSU's vice president for development, said Dame handled negotiations and that he couldn't remember specifics.

"It's very difficult for me to sit here and recall who said what," said Mark Williams, who is not related to Homer Williams.

Dame told The Oregonian/OregonLive that his company offered to build a scaled-back greenway.

"Our firm completes projects on time and on budget," he wrote in an email. "The city declined our offer."

Facing an impasse, Portland Parks Bureau officials acknowledged that they could have trimmed greenway plans to eliminate the costliest cleanup in the water and along the riverbank. But they wanted to stay true to their master plan and ultimately proceeded with extensive work that included creating a 25,000-square-foot shallow-water fish habitat.

Anything less, they told The Oregonian/OregonLive, would have represented "abandonment of years of work and community planning."

The secret deal

Dame insisted that the city went on to craft a deal with plenty of public input.

"The agreement was the subject of extensive public scrutiny and the approval of publicly elected officials in an open public process," Dame said.

But that wasn't necessarily the case. As negotiations were coming to a close in September 2010, records show that Dame's lawyer contacted the city's attorney requesting confidentiality to move forward with the land transfer.

Harry Auerbach, a chief deputy city attorney, replied that confidentiality was a "hollow promise."

"In order to get Council approval, this arrangement will need to be public (although I'll try to do it as discreetly as possible)," he wrote in an email.

Auerbach succeeded. He placed the plan on the City Council's consent agenda, where it was immediately approved with no discussion. Details of the deal, in which the city took ownership through condemnation, were not made public.

The plan as publicly described left out key facts: Instead of revealing that officials knew the land was badly contaminated and hadn't been cleaned, they wrote in city documents that any environmental concerns "may be satisfied" by approving the deal. City officials also wrote that there would be "no direct cost" to acquire the property.

But the final agreement, obtained by The Oregonian/OregonLive, assigned all cleanup liability to the city.

LaVonne Griffin-Valade, Portland's former auditor, said the City Council blatantly maneuvered around an open public process.

"When Council allows any kind of large contractual agreement to undergo significant changes without a public discussion, they leave unsuspecting taxpayers holding the proverbial bag," she said. "It's little wonder then the public often mistrusts elected leaders to be transparent or accountable in their decision-making."

In an interview, Auerbach defended the process.

He said he offered to be discreet because the city wanted to close its deal and didn't want to "make it difficult" for Williams & Dame. He said the plan wasn't misleading because the city's conclusion about what was "unacceptable" had changed. And he said that anyone unsatisfied with a lack of specifics in public documents could have requested more information.

"If in the final moments of trying to get to yes, in a responsible way, I overlooked something that might have been a better way of documenting or publicizing what we were doing, I'll own that," he said. "If I made a mistake – and I don't think so – I'll own that."

Fish, who oversaw the Parks Bureau at the time, signed the deal. He declined to be interviewed for this story.

Fritz, who is now in charge of the bureau, voted for the deal. Asked if she knew Portland was taking on the cleanup, she said in an email: "We didn't look into the liability issue."

The developers paid a relative pittance to settle up.

Williams & Dame negotiated a complicated deal to pay Portland \$476,000.

But the developers didn't simply hand over that amount in cash. Instead, they received credit toward city development fees – transferable credits they could use to reduce fees on future projects by the exact same amount: \$476,000. They also were given the option to sell the credits at a discount to other developers.

And that's exactly what happened.

Williams & Dame sold one of their riverfront parcels to a California developer, Mack Urban, including \$36,000 worth of credits in the purchase price. They sold the remaining \$440,000 worth of credits to OHSU, recouping \$396,000.

Bottom line: Williams & Dame ultimately paid 10 cents on the dollar toward the cleanup – a total of \$44,000. The city would be on the hook for the rest.

The costly cleanup

Once the city owned the land, cleanup costs shot up tenfold.

Two months before the council vote in November 2010, parks officials privately told elected officials that the project would cost \$7.9 million, including environmental cleanup costs of \$470,000 for all beach, bank and park work. A memo said the risk of more cleanup was "low" but couldn't be "ruled out."

But two months after the city approved the deal, environmental costs went through the roof. Parks officials told the City Council in January 2011 that the project would now require \$8.1 million, with cleanup rising to nearly \$1 million.

Looking back, park officials could offer no explanation for the dramatic increase other than to say they relied on estimates that had changed.

Fish and parks officials used the word "risk" 16 times at the 2011 meeting, according to minutes, and a parks employee called the new estimate "conservative." But the council voted to go ahead, even though the city had not conducted environmental testing on the full site.

Through 2012, the project estimate climbed to \$9.4 million as design details were nailed down. Construction began that summer under a \$4 million contract. But it covered only half of the work.

City records show two significant price increases attributed in part to "excessive volumes of contaminated soil and debris" and new rules for soil disposal. Neither of those price increases was discussed in public, although the city now requires such transparency.

Ultimately, most of the 35,000 tons of contaminated soil removed from the site posed no risk to people but was considered potentially dangerous to wildlife. But some of it was potentially more dangerous to humans. Crews found nearly 48 tons of hazardous waste, with high levels of lead and polychlorinated biphenyl, and about 200 tons of asbestos tiles in the dirt.

"If we had crystal balls and X-ray vision, it probably would make everybody's life easier," said Rebecca Wells-Albers, who monitored site conditions for Oregon's Department of Environmental Quality. "But they really did everything they could to try and head this off at the pass."

In February 2014, the City Council voted to increase the contract to \$11.1 million, a decision made in the open. The project ultimately cost \$15.1 million, including consulting and management fees.

Until The Oregonian/OregonLive asked, no one at the city had calculated the full cleanup costs. Parks officials said they could provide only an estimate: \$5 million.

"If there were mistakes made," Fritz said, "they won't make those mistakes again."

The developers' coup

While the city dug deeper into its coffers to pay for the park and cleanup, the developers thrived.

Taking advantage of an arcane city rule, Williams & Dame and OHSU walked away with the right to construct extra-large buildings elsewhere in the South Waterfront District in exchange for transferring the greenway land.

The true value of the deal isn't known, but estimates suggest those development rights were worth at least \$6 million. And now OHSU is using those rights to reshape Portland's skyline.

"The City of Portland is fully capable of negotiating an agreement that protects its interests and the interests of the public," Dame said in an email.

Auerbach said he doesn't remember discussing with city leaders how Williams & Dame and OHSU capitalized on development rights.

They did so by taking advantage of rules approved by the City Council in 2002 to encourage density in the then-barren South Waterfront.

The developers knew that by turning over about 190,000 square feet for the riverfront park, they could get the rights to develop more than 900,000 square feet elsewhere.

They could use those development rights to exceed zoning. For example, the developers could construct a five-story building where current rules allowed for only four stories.

A 2007 city report says transferable development rights were worth \$6.50 to \$18 a square foot.

Dame declined to say what value he placed on the rights, but city figures conservatively suggest that more than 900,000 square feet would have been worth an estimated \$6 million.

Just like they transferred fee credits, Williams & Dame were allowed under city rules to sell their development rights to South Waterfront land. They took advantage of those rules to transfer 273,000 square feet of rights to Mack Urban, the same California-based developer that had bought the fee credits.

The company paid \$7 million for a 1.7-acre parcel that overlooks the greenway. A company spokeswoman, Kym Michela, said she could not quantify the value of those rights because they were factored into the overall deal, although the rights would be worth about \$1.8 million according to the city's estimates.

OHSU ultimately obtained more than 665,000 square feet of development rights from the greenway transfer.

Mark Williams, the OHSU vice president for real estate, said he couldn't put a monetary value on the rights because they were factored into land purchases and not broken out separately. OHSU paid about \$26 million buying land from Williams & Dame over the years. Applying the city's own figures, from the 2007 report, would translate to at least \$4.3 million.

In 2006, OHSU built the 410,000-square-foot Center for Health & Healing, tapping about 55,000 square feet of development rights from the greenway. That allowed OHSU to add the equivalent of two floors to the 16-story facility.

University leaders are now planning to redeem 160,000 square feet from the greenway for two new building, leaving them with about 450,000 square feet of development rights for future projects.

The future

Taxpayers are still paying for the greenway.

Residents of the affluent South Waterfront District now have two parks to visit. But the greenway's soaring costs left less money for other park projects in the central city.

The 4-acre greenway is also one of Portland's most expensive parks to operate and maintain, at nearly \$500,000 a year compared to \$327,000 for its northern neighbor, 30-acre Tom McCall Waterfront Park. Parks officials say its not fair to compare costs because they calculate greenway expenses differently, and because the greenway's complicated design and shallow-water requirements make it unique.

State officials also want Portland to test sediment beyond the park boundaries and clean up any contamination discovered in the river. City officials say that's not their responsibility, and the situation remains unresolved.

Expanding the greenway to a full 1.2 miles – from near Johns Landing to downtown – will cost more, too. Officials struck a deal last year to extend the path north, through South Waterfront property, at a cost to the city of \$11.7 million.

The half-mile extension is projected to cost less than the shorter greenway because the adjoining land has already been cleared of any contamination and because the project won't involve shoreline work.

Even so, the extension won't be complete for at least a decade, according to current projections. There's no money or schedule for plans to extend the path south toward Johns Landing.

Jerry Ward, a Portland architect who spent a decade monitoring South Waterfront projects as part of a city committee, said he's flabbergasted that details of the greenway remained hidden from the public for so long.

"It's demoralizing because it's a moral bankruptcy for the citizens of Portland," he said. "And it really only benefits a chosen few."

The Portland Tribune

Cully Park one step closer to reality

By Jennifer Anderson

February 11, 2016

For the past four years, neighbors in Northeast Portland's Cully neighborhood have been raising funds for a park of their dreams. This week they got a little closer, as Portland City Council approved a half-million-dollar grant to help develop the 25-acre Thomas Cully Park on a former

sand and gravel mine and construction landfill at Northeast 72nd Avenue, north of Killingsworth Street.

The money comes from a Land and Water Conservation Fund grant from the Department of the Interior, awarded by the National Parks Service.

City leaders call it a significant boost for the public-private partnership that will create a park close to 405 families who currently don't have access to a park or nature area within a half-mile of their home.

"We're tremendously excited and honored that our community's hard work and vision are being realized," says Alan Hipólito, executive director of Verde, the community-based nonprofit group that is leading the efforts of the 34-member Let Us Build Cully Park! coalition.

"This has been a whole lot of work by a lot of people," Hipólito adds. "We're really excited to see the finish line."

Supporters have raised \$6.1 million of the \$9 million needed for Phase 1 of the project since 2012, and construction already has begun to take shape.

Hipólito says the goal is to secure the rest of the funds by the end of this year, at which point the park could see a 2017 opening. "We're entering a period of significant opportunity," he says. "We hope to secure investments in upcoming budget cycles, at the local, state and regional level."

The latest grant will help pay for restoring wildlife habitat as well as developing an accessible playground, a walking trail with exercise equipment, scenic overlooks, an off-leash dog area, a youth soccer field and an Intertribal Gathering Garden that will be open to the public.

The Gathering Garden will offer opportunities for honoring and educating residents about indigenous cultural values and ethics through holistic, culturally significant garden design and maintenance.

So far, project leaders have restored the north slope of the site, planting on the landfill cap and converting it to wildlife habitat. They've rebuilt Northeast 72nd Avenue with stormwater management improvements and new trees. And they spread 70,000 cubic yards of dirt on the site last year.

Hipólito says it's been the coalition's goal all along to do more than just make environmental improvements, but also educate youth, improve health, create jobs and support local businesses.

Phase 2 of the project includes construction of multiple sports fields, improvements to access from Northeast Killingsworth and building a parking area off Northeast Killingsworth and 75th Avenue.

The funds, so far, for Phase 1 include nearly \$5 million raised by the coalition; an Oregon Parks & Recreation grant of \$473,000; and \$1.25 million secured by parks Commissioner Amanda Fritz from parks system development charges (raised from development fees).

Sen. Ron Wyden, D-Ore., helped secure the latest chunk of funding, which is part of a new competitive grant program called the Land and Water Conservation Fund Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership. There were eight such grants awarded nationally.

Portland has been trying to develop the Thomas Cully property for more than a decade. The city purchased the 25-acre site in 2002, created a master plan in 2008, partnered with Verde in 2011, approved an agreement in 2012 with Verde for developing the park, and installed a community garden at the site in 2012.

Students from nearby Scott School helped design the adjacent Northeast 72nd Avenue Community Garden, and gave input on the design of the playground.

Sixty percent of residents within the future Thomas Cully Park's service area belong to traditionally underserved communities. Forty-five percent earn a household income of \$40,000 or less.

Central Northeast Portland has the second-highest need for parks and natural areas in Portland, after the area east of I-205.

Sources: Fish has questions about scale of new apartments

By Jim Redden

February 11, 2016

Some neighborhood activists accuse the City Council of favoring density over livability. But as it turns out, not every member of the council is happy about the proliferation of new apartment buildings in every part of town.

During the council's Feb. 2 work session on the Comprehensive Plan update, Commissioner Nick Fish questioned the scale of some of the new apartment buildings on North Williams Avenue. He said they overwhelm the space — including the streets and sidewalks — and asked the staff of the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability why they are so much larger than those on Southeast Division Street, which Fish called more “humane.”

The answer is the blocks on Williams are bigger than the blocks on Division, allowing for bigger buildings under the current zoning codes.

Strangely, according to city staff, new buildings along Williams are subject to a design review process intended to address such concerns, while those along Division are not.

The issue may come up again as the council continues working on the state-required plan that will guide growth in the city for the next 20 years. Portland is projected to gain 123,000 more housing units by 2035, which translates to somewhere between 240,000 and 260,000 new residents, depending on who's doing the counting.

Separating viable from nonviable candidates

Some candidates complain when they aren't getting invited to participate in campaign forums, like the one recently held by the Regional Arts & Culture Council that included only five of the 21 candidates currently running for the City Council. But sponsoring organizations figure they need to make choices to keep the events manageable, even though their invitation lists may seem inconsistent.

Incumbents running for re-election are obviously viable candidates. And so are candidates who have been elected to another office. Beyond that, the ability to raise money shows a certain level of public support. And having an office and campaign staff is a sign of commitment.

By those standards, three council candidates who deserve to be invited to at least some forums are Sarah Iannarone, who is running for mayor, and Stuart Emmons and Fred Stewart, who are running against Commissioner Steve Novick. Others may emerge when they begin reporting campaign contributions. But only Emmons participated in the RACC forum.

Protected bike lane pops up on Broadway for one day

*By Jennifer Anderson
February 10, 2016*

Portlanders on Thursday will get to see what a protected bike lane would look like on Southwest Broadway Avenue, one of the most important commuter thoroughfares in the city.

The Portland Bureau of Transportation will hold a one-day "pop-up simulation" on Broadway, between Taylor and Salmon streets.

From 6 a.m. to 7 p.m., PBOT has permits to keep Southwest Broadway at three travel lanes, with parking removed.

Better Block PDX, a Portland nonprofit that creates street "re-imagining" pilot projects, will install planters and traffic cones to mark the space and add a striped buffer.

The existing bike lane will be enhanced and tucked next to the curb between Taylor and Salmon.

Alta Planning & Design and Denver-based nonprofit PlaceMatters are also supporting the effort.

The action is part of the national New Partners for Smart Growth Conference, held at the Portland Hilton this week.

"This project will provide a short-term demonstration of the opportunities for quickly enhancing city livability, pedestrian and bicyclist safety and downtown visitor amenities," PBOT leaders say.

Portland has no permanent protected bike lane.

Better Block PDX has worked since 2013 to create temporary improvements areas throughout the city. Some have led to permanent change.

The group has worked with PBOT to improve access to Naito Parkway in an effort called the Better Naito project; launched a three-day Complete Streets demonstration that led to a permanent public plaza in Old Town in 2014; created public spaces called "Popcorn Plazas" at Southeast 26th Avenue and Clinton Street; and hosted PARK(ing) Day in 2013 to temporarily convert parking spots into public space.

Willamette Week

Portland Funded Program Controlled by Mayor Charlie Hales' Wife After All

*By Beth Slovic
February 10, 2016*

Mayor Charlie Hales declared after he won election in 2012 that he would show no favoritism toward the program his wife, Nancy Hales, runs at Portland State University.

After the mayor took office in 2013, the city cut off its funding for Nancy Hales' First Stop Portland, a program that brings delegations to the city to study its sustainable infrastructure and practices.

Under former Mayor Sam Adams, the city had given First Stop between \$12,000 and \$25,000 annually.

But it turns out Charlie Hales actually kept city money flowing to First Stop, WW has learned from recently obtained emails.

A city agency that Hales controls, the Portland Development Commission, contributed \$20,000 to First Stop in 2014-15. That money equaled nearly 10 percent of First Stop's budget.

In a statement, Hales defended the expenditure. "It's completely appropriate for the Portland Development Commission to compensate Portland State University for services provided," Hales says.

The Portland Mercury

Hall Monitor

Legal Camping Is Rational

*By Dirk VanderHart
February 10, 2016*

ON MONDAY, Mayor Charlie Hales' office unveiled a series of proposals more dramatic than anything Portland's seen since declaring a housing emergency in September.

Upending years of using blanket sweeps as a strategy for fending off visible homelessness (a hammer Hales was happy to wield earlier in his tenure), the mayor's office is now pushing sanctioned camping on city land.

The olive branch comes in several forms—in organized encampments, which the mayor will furnish with special "pods," in tents allowed on some city property as long as they're taken down in the morning, and in small groups formally allowed to sleep under tarps on city sidewalks.

It's hard to overstate what a change this is in a city that has fought, repeatedly and forcefully, the idea that it shouldn't criminalize people for sleeping outdoors (an argument officials won

again just last year). Monica Goracke, the lead attorney with the Oregon Law Center's Portland office and a legal advocate for the homeless, called Hales' plan "the most comprehensive, progressive, and deeply rational proposal that has ever come from city hall on this issue."

Lots of advocates agree. And, of course, a hell of a lot of people don't.

As I write this, some Portlanders will be sitting, red-faced, pouring invective into online comment sections about how Hales wants to turn the city into a Rio de Janeiro slum. Even more will offer a shortsighted argument often raised when sanctioned camping is brought up: that it doesn't fix things.

"The Overlook Neighborhood Association continues to believe that camping is not the answer to Portland's homeless challenges," Chris Trejbal, a board member with that association, wrote recently on Blogtown.

Here's some news: No one thinks that camping is the answer to Portland's homelessness. Who suggested it is?

The fact is, Portland has more than 1,800 people living unsheltered on any given night. That's according to the best metric we have, which is probably an undercount. You know what Portland doesn't have? Enough shelter space and open housing to get all those people indoors.

The region is working toward fixing that. We've detailed the plan in these very pages ["Cutting Homelessness in Half," Feature, Nov 18, 2015]. It involves huge investments in shelter, housing, and rental assistance, among other detailed suggestions. Will it work? No one knows, but to the extent that there's any "answer to Portland's homelessness challenges" being floated these days, that's it.

In the meantime, there are those 1,800 unsheltered people who haven't gone away despite years upon years of blanket sweeps, and who—guess what—have to sleep somewhere.

Hales' experiment doesn't get rid of sweeps. If anything, it will result in an uptick in enforcement as police and city bureaus establish the new expectations, and crack down on the most problematic camps.

But it also offers some semblance of order for hundreds of people caught up in the chaos of houselessness—a sense that, as Portland pursues actual, meaningful solutions, they have a place they can go.