

October 1, 2008

Editor  
The Oregonian  
1320 S.W. Broadway  
Portland, Or, 97201

Dear Editor,

I was surprised by both the content and tone of your editorial regarding the rezoning of Colwood National Golf Course from open space to industrial.

Your opposition to the position of the Hearings Officer and Council seems primarily based on expectations for job creation and the presumption that Colwood is ideally suited for industrial development. Unfortunately, this is just not the case.

First of all, Colwood is not close to transit facilities. There is no MAX or bus service serving the property or within ½ mile of the property. Although, the transportation consultants serving the property owners attempted to liken Colwood to the development at Cascade Station, this assertion was roundly rejected by the Oregon Department of Transportation. In general, ODOT found the consultant's findings to contain "several questionable assertions" and "misleading statements".<sup>1</sup>

Second of all, the existing road system cannot support significant development at the Colwood site. Due to the constraints of the I-205/Killingsworth interchange, industrial development could only be allowed on the Colwood site within out a significant cap on generated auto trips.<sup>2</sup> ODOT was unable to identify any developer-funded improvements that could remedy this problem. Which means that enabling industrial build-out at Colwood would require a significant taxpayer expense on par with improving the Airport Way interchange (\$19 - \$200 million depending on the alternative). This reality is one of the key reasons why the North Northeast Business Association opposed the rezoning.

Finally, with regard to development on the site, the only thing we know for certain is that the Port of Portland wants to acquire over 1/3 of Colwood if it is rezoned industrial<sup>3</sup>. We know that they have been unclear on how or if they would use the property in the near term and that a third runway is not permanently off the table. Further, we know that among the many acres of vacant land that is already zoned industrial and ready for development in the City, the Port of Portland is sitting on hundreds.<sup>4</sup> How will adding Colwood to the Port's growing land surplus suddenly result in more jobs?

---

<sup>1</sup> September 12, 2008 letter to Council from ODOT Planning Manager Elaine Smith.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> April 11, 2008 letter to the Hearings Officer from Portland of Portland General Manager of Long Range Planning & Noise Christopher Corich.

<sup>4</sup> For example, go to <http://www.portlandmaps.com/> and review the zoning and development data associated with these properties: R314209, R317082, and R317194 – a these are just three vacant Port properties. Further, as noted at [http://www.portofportland.com/Prop\\_Home.aspx](http://www.portofportland.com/Prop_Home.aspx), there are of vacant

The bottom-line is that the Hearings Officer and the Council weighed the questionable economic development assertions for rezoning Colwood against the impact of rezoning Colwood on the City's Comprehensive Plan goals for open space and environment, statewide Planning Goals for Open Spaces and Recreational Needs, applicable neighborhood plans, and our ability to meet Metro's environmental requirements.

The evidence could not have been clearer. They made the right choice not just for Cully but for the City and the region.

All the best,

Tony Fuentes

---

parcels up to 100 acres in size in the Port's Rivergate facility – in fact much of this has been vacant for decades.