This document represents the official meeting record of the October 29, 2014, Portland Development Commission (PDC) Board of Commissioners (Board) Meeting held at 222 NW Fifth Ave., Portland, OR 97209. The full video recording of this meeting can be found at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xVVouXZ8wpA&list=UUsXKnmpwO4bSn0JNszjhSRw.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Tom Kelly called the meeting to order at approximately 3:04 p.m. Ms. Gina Wiedrick, PDC Board recording secretary, called the PDC Board roll:

Chair Tom Kelly PRESENT
Commissioner Aneshka Dickson PRESENT
Commissioner Mark Edlen PRESENT
Commissioner John Mohlis PRESENT
Commissioner Charles Wilhoite ABSENT [see note below]

Chair Kelly stated that Commissioner Wilhoite would join the meeting a little later.

Chair Kelly stated that Item 9 on the agenda has been removed from this meeting for future consideration.

2. Commissioner Reports

Commissioner Mohlis
- Recently, met with Sean Robbins and other Business Oregon staff.
- Last week, attended a Unico Life Insurance Company lunch.

Commissioner Dickson
- On September 21, attended a June Key Delta fundraising event.
- On October 10, attended a REACH dinner.
- On October 28, attended the Portland Business Alliance Business (PBA) Leadership Evening event.

Commissioner Edlen
- Over the past two weeks, has had various meetings with PDC staff to get updated with his duties and other happenings at PDC.
- On October 28, attended the PBA Leadership Evening event.
- On October 1, attended the Portland City Council (City Council) meeting in which he was confirmed as a PDC commissioner.

Chair Kelly
- On October 10, attended the Pacific Northwest College of Art Skybreaking Event.
On September 23, had a meeting with the N/NE Business Association.
On October 13, along with Mayor Charlie Hales and Executive Director Quinton, participated in a tour of Centennial Mills.
On September 23, attended the City of Portland’s (City) Economic Development Strategy Steering Committee meeting.
In the last six weeks, attended several briefing meetings with Mayor’s Office.

3. Executive Director Patrick Quinton Report

On September 15, the United States (US) Department of Commerce announced that PDC will receive a $300,000 grant as part of the Market Cooperator Program.
On September 25, attended and spoke at the Startup PDX Challenge inaugural event, announced the six winners and four merit award winners, and toured the new space.
On October 1, PDC issued a Request for Information for six properties in the Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area (URA), five of which are PDC-owned; have held several open houses, with the next one scheduled for November 5. For more information go to http://www.pdc.us/our-work/urban-renewal-areas/lents/current-projects/lents-rfi.aspx.
On October 5, the Belmont Goats moved into their new space on PDC-owned property in the Lents Town Center URA.
On October 8, Canpotex announced that they are investing up to $140,000,000 in new equipment and infrastructure at their port site.
On October 14, United Kingdom-based Impero Software, announced that it would open its US headquarters in Portland.
On October 28, the Portland Business Journal wrote that Lattice Semiconductors plans to relocate their headquarters to the US Bank Tower.
On November 20, Council of Development of Finance Agencies will be giving PDC an award for Distinguished Development Finance Agency.
On October 21 – 23, attended the Urban Land Institute conference in New York, where it was announced that one of the 2014 Global Awards for Excellence was awarded to the Brewery Blocks project, which was developed by Gerding Edlen.
On October 22, the Chicago Tribune had a great article on PDC’s export work with the We Build Green Cities initiative.
PDC is moving forward in deliberate fashion on the Natural Grocers project on Martin Luther King, Jr. and Alberta Street. PDC has convened a project working group to review design and community benefits issues.

5. Public Comment for Items Not on Agenda

Chair Kelly called forward guests to testify.

Connie Ashbrook, Executive Director of Oregon Tradeswomen, Inc. Ms. Ashbrook thanked PDC for its support of their work and highlighted what that support yielded over the past year, and presented the PDC Board with a plaque. Flyers were handed out and can be found in Attachment 1.

Roger Gertenrich, lives in South Waterfront in the Meriwether West Tower. Mr. Gertenrich stated that after the dissolution of the urban renewal advisory committees, PDC formed two umbrella committees that are tasked with overseeing the URA projects, but he is concerned these committees are almost
entirely comprised of business members and no longer have community members. He finished by recommending that a member of the neighborhood association be allowed a voice in budget and decision-making on how money will be spent in the North Macadam URA.

Mary Ann Schwab, a veteran community activist. Ms. Schwab expressed concern that, due to the loss of staffing at PDC, public participation process is lacking. She also wanted to make sure that the dollars that had been previously set aside for the Washington Monroe community center are still being set aside. Ms. Schwab finished by saying that when PDC sells land and signs contracts with developers, that there is a stipulation that the developer will adhere to City Construction Noise Ordinance.

4. Meeting Minutes

Chair Kelly called for a motion to approve the August 13, 2014, PDC Board meeting minutes. Commissioner Mohlis moved and Commissioner Dickson seconded the motion.

AYES: Dickson, Edlen, Kelly, Mohlis
NAYS: None

Chair Kelly called for a motion to approve the September 10, 2014, PDC Board meeting minutes. Commissioner Mohlis moved and Commissioner Dickson seconded the motion.

AYES: Dickson, Edlen, Kelly, Mohlis
NAYS: None

CONSENT AGENDA

6. Action Item: Resolution 7076 – Authorizing an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability and Portland Bureau of Transportation in an Amount Not to Exceed $322,272 for the Central City 2035 Plan and Related Central City Transportation Management Plan Work

With this action, the PDC Board authorizes the Executive Director to execute an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for $322,272 between PDC, the City Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS), and the Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) to complete the final year of a multi-year planning effort culminating in the Central City 2035 long range plan, related Comprehensive Plan and Title 33 changes, and an update to the Central City Transportation Management Plan, which outlines transportation components of the Comprehensive Plan. This IGA is the fourth such agreement since 2007 related to BPS’s and PBOT’s work to update the 1988 Central Portland Plan and related work; since PDC’s total cumulative project funding exceeds the Executive Director’s signature authority, PDC Board approval is required.

Chair Kelly called for a motion to approve Resolution 7076; Commissioner Mohlis moved and Commissioner Dickson seconded the motion.

AYES: Dickson, Edlen, Kelly, Mohlis
NAYS: None
REGULAR AGENDA

7. Action Item: Resolution 7077 – Authorizing an Intergovernmental Agreement with Portland Bureau of Parks and Recreation for the Construction of Gateway Urban Plaza and Neighborhood Park in the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area

PDC staff presenting this item:
Trang Lam, Neighborhood Manager
Susan Kuhn, Sr. Project/Program Coordinator

With this action, the PDC Board will authorize the Executive Director to execute an IGA between PDC and Portland Bureau of Parks and Recreation (PP&R) for the construction of Gateway Urban Plaza and Neighborhood Park (the Park). The planned three-acre park is located in the Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area (Gateway URA) at the southwest corner of Halsey Street and NE 106th Avenue. The Park is part of a larger four-acre site jointly owned by PDC and PP&R; the balance of the site will be developed as a mixed-use project through a PDC disposition process. This IGA will provide up to $1,000,000 to PP&R to construct the Park.

This action is the first major step in the implementation of the Halsey/Weidler Commercial District Investment Strategy, a comprehensive approach to i) build capacity and identity, ii) foster business development, and iii) stimulate commercial district improvements addressing safety, business development, and redevelopment along one of Gateway URA’s major commercial corridors.

Chair Kelly called forward guests to testify.

Nidal Kahl, owner of Furniture Plus, LLC, on NE Halsey Street and 103rd Avenue, board member of the Gateway Area Business Association, and co-chair Halsey-Weidler Group. Mr. Kahl spoke in favor of this project, stating that the Gateway URA is large and needs focused work to revitalize it. He added that he has been working with Ms. Kuhn on updating his storefront, but his changes will not make a difference if his is the only revitalization taking place.

Tom Badrick, Chair of the Parkrose Heights Association of Neighbors (PHAN). Mr. Badrick spoke in favor of the project stating that the Park would be a fantastic improvement and would make a big change to the community. He added that the streetscape improvements will also be a great step forward.

Christopher Masciocchi, a member of the Hazelwood Neighborhood Association, and a homeowner living close to the park. Mr. Masciocchi stated that the Park will make a huge impact to him and to his neighbors. He added that a large percentage of students live east of I-205, therefore this is a wise and valuable investment, and the impact will be profound. Mr. Masciocchi finished by saying that the Gateway URA needs a great focal point, and this park will be a huge advantage to this area.

Commissioner Dickson asked if the various associations mentioned are good representative of the communities which reside there. Mr. Kahl responded that he feels that the Halsey-Weidler Group is well represented and have had 10 months to grow; there are no fees to be a member, and they encourage as much community involvement as possible. Mr. Badrick added that the board of PHAN is keenly aware of how the neighborhood has been changing and is working with the City’s Office of Equity to encourage participating and reach out to all.
Commissioner Edlen asked the following questions:

- Does PDC assess penalties for late delivery in its contracts with PP&R? Ms. Lam responded no.
- Should PDC have something in place? Ms. Lam responded that PDC staff works closely with its bureau partners to make sure that projects are delivered in a timely basis, but things do come up, especially when there is public process involved.
- Recommended that PP&R provide quarterly updates. Ms. Lam responded that this is included in the IGA.
- Recommended that PP&R give reasons for the slipping of the timeframe and that this be communicated to the community. Executive Director Quinton stated that PDC staff will make sure to let PP&R and other bureaus it works with know that this is of particular concern to the PDC Board.
- With regards to design and construction, does PDC’s Equity Policy apply to PP&R work? Ms. Lam responded yes.
- How much is budgeted for programming and maintenance? Ms. Lam asked PP&R staff to come up and respond. Lauren McGuire, Capital Projects Team Manager, PP&R. Ms. McGuire responded that they have approximately $240,000 per year set aside for the operations and maintenance of this project.
- Is it the intention of PP&R to have programming and activities for this park, beyond the delivery of it? Ms. McGuire responded yes, but will have to get additional approval for funds to cover those programming activities.
- There are two line items, one for construction for approximately $5,000,000, and one for design and technical for $3,100,000. Assuming hard costs are roughly $600,000, where does the remaining of the $3,100,000 go to? Ms. McGuire responded that there is the addition of the community benefits plan which costs one percent outright in addition to staff time to implement, construction management general contractor fee (these are preliminary estimates), environmental contamination contingency, right-of-way improvements, utility improvements, Park features, landscape architecture fee of 12 to 15 percent, project staff, Percent for Art, prevailing wage fees, permitting fees, and project contingency.
- Would like to see a breakdown of all of those costs. Ms. McGuire responded that they do have a preliminary breakdown of the costs and will forward to the PDC Board.

Commissioner Wilhoite arrived at approximately 3:58 p.m.

Commissioner Dickson asked what the process for selecting a general contractor will be and how the community benefits part will fit in. Ms. McGuire responded that this will be part of the Request for Proposal process, which will be open to all.

Commissioner Mohlis voiced a concern, urging PP&R that as they move forward, to look to stay within budget so that PDC does not have to provide additional funding.

Commissioner Edlen requested that the Resolution be amended to include language addressing the requirement for a detailed budget to be provided, and understanding the costs built into the soft costs.

Chair Kelly called for a motion to amend Resolution 7077; Commissioner Edlen moved and Commissioner Wilhoite seconded the motion.
AYES: Dickson, Edlen, Kelly, Mohlis, Wilhoite
NAYS: None

Chair Kelly called for a motion to approve amended Resolution 7077; Commissioner Mohlis moved and Commissioner Edlen seconded the motion.

AYES: Dickson, Edlen, Kelly, Mohlis, Wilhoite
NAYS: None

8. Action Item: Resolution 7078 – Public Hearing on Budget Amendment No. 1; Adopting Budget Amendment No. 1 for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2014, and Ending June 30, 2015; and Making Appropriations

PDC staff presenting this item:
Tony Barnes, Budget Officer

With this action, the PDC Board will formally amend the current fiscal year (FY) 2014-15 Adopted PDC Budget for the first time in the following ways:

(1) Adjust beginning fund balances to match actual FY 2013-14 year-end fund balances;
(2) Adjust individual project and real estate management budgets using updated information on property management expenses and staff time;
(3) Adjust program budgets based on committed loan and grant carryover, or allocation of new funding; and
(4) Adjust the Portland Housing Bureau (PHB) Set Aside Budget to match updated FY expenditure estimates from PHB.

In summary, FY 2014-15 Budget Amendment No. 1 increases the total PDC budget from $246,023,647 in the FY 2014-15 Adopted Budget to $301,486,384 including Transfers, Contingency, and Reserves. Excluding Transfers and Contingency, total budgeted expenditures increase from $190,376,243 to $210,380,254.

Commissioner Edlen made a request to receive a budget tutorial from PDC staff.

Chair Kelly called for a motion to approve Resolution 7078; Commissioner Wilhoite moved and Commissioner Edlen seconded the motion.

AYES: Dickson, Edlen, Kelly, Mohlis, Wilhoite
NAYS: None

10. Information Item: Update on the Portland Development Commission 2016-2020 Strategic Plan

PDC staff presenting this item:
Kimberly Branam, Deputy Director
The purpose of this report is to provide the PDC Board an update on the current effort to create the PDC 2016-2020 Strategic Plan. Upon adoption in spring 2015, the Strategic Plan will guide and prioritize PDC’s work, budget, and staffing for the next five years.

Commissioner Wilhoite asked if the Strategic Plan Steering Committee will be broken down into subgroups to focus on specific aspects of the Plan. Ms. Branam responded yes; there will be work sessions in December and January in which subgroups will delve deeper.

At approximately 4:22 p.m. Chair Kelly called for a break. At approximately 4:44 p.m. Chair Kelly called the meeting to order.

11. Information Item: Update on the Centennial Mills Project in the River District Urban Renewal Area

PDC staff and others presenting this item:
Lisa Abuaf, Central City Manager
Bruce Wood, Real Estate & Construction Manager
Sarah Harpole, Sr. Project/Program Coordinator
Will Thier, Sr. Project/Program Coordinator
Jordan Schnitzer, President, Harsch Investment Properties

The purpose of this report is to provide an update to the PDC Board on the status of the Centennial Mills project in the River District URA, including proposed strategies for redevelopment, roles and responsibilities, and budget implications. In addition, staff requests guidance and direction from the PDC Board on priorities and next steps given that the scope of public investment associated with the currently-proposed site plan greatly exceeds the amount of resources PDC has budgeted for Centennial Mills. Staff would like to use the PDC Board work session to elicit feedback on these questions:

1) What is the appropriate scale of public investment given budget availability and other River District URA projects?
2) What are the PDC Board priorities or amenities based on this investment?
3) What should PDC staff look for the developer to contribute?
4) Next steps / next PDC Board check-in.

Mr. Wood began with an introduction and an explanation of what is different today, which is the immediate need to move forward with the project given the conditions on the site. Ms. Harpole provided background information including a history of the site.

Mr. Schnitzer gave an overview of the work Harsch Investment Properties (Harsch) has done so far, looking at what can be restored of Centennial Mills in an effort to try to preserve what is most realistic to keep for the legacy side of the project. He noted that the more needs to be built, the more public resources will be needed. Ms. Schnitzer went through a series of charts showing the different options Harsch had looked at, with a price comparison, and their final recommendation.

Chair Kelly asked what the City’s investment would be for completion of Harsch’s preferred site plan. Mr. Schnitzer responded $38,000,000 for PDC, of a total project cost of $115,000,000.
Mr. Thier gave an overview of the conceptual site plan, the project approach, component costs, and project schedule.

Commissioner Dickson asked the following questions:

- Taking into account PDC work versus Harsch construction, how will permitting, design, and the whole process work together? Mr. Thier responded that PDC and Harsch will work together throughout the whole process, with PDC primarily responsible for the horizontal elements and site preparation, and Harsch primarily responsible for the vertical elements, basically the private components of the project. However, in order to obtain the necessary permits, City bureau partners will need to know what Harsch intends for the site.
- Who is doing the water aspect of the construction? Mr. Thier responded that it is the keystone for the entire project and, due to the multi-layered jurisdictions, will be primarily driven by PDC.

Commissioner Wilhoite stated that he is wrestling with what has been presented and wondered how the parties will complete the project from a financial perspective. Mr. Schnitzer responded that this is merely an informational session, no decisions need to be made; all of this is an overview of all the different possibilities. He finished by stating that the next step would be to obtain public input. Mr. Wood added that there are many aspects that need to be understood, including what needs to be demolished, dealing with the flood plain, the environmental remediation, the greenway above the flood plain, and how everything adds up; once all of these various aspects are reviewed and decided upon, the partners can proceed.

Commissioner Edlen expressed interest in an additional two-hour work session with PDC and Harsch staff to more thoroughly review the various options being considered. He also was concerned about waiting until 2016, noting that he was struck by the level of deterioration of the past two years. Chair Kelly asked if there was any way PDC staff could go to City Council and obtain a declaration of emergency.

Ms. Abuaf gave an overview of the River District URA budget, and Mr. Wood went through next steps, touching on project management, public process, and PDC Board resolution.

Chair Kelly asked if PDC staff needs direction from the PDC Board as to what general budget dollars should be set as a goal. Mr. Wood responded yes.

Chair Kelly called forward Patricia Gardner to testify.

Ms. Gardner, President and Planning & Transportation Committee Chair of the Pearl District Neighborhood Association, expressed support of the renovation of this project, stating that it is important not just for the Pearl, but also for the entire region, and that it is an opportunity for the community to connect with the river. She realizes that there are budget constraints, but stated that this not a site to go cheap on, but rather go all out.

Mr. Schnitzer stated that Harsch has been waiting since April for a development agreement with PDC. He also agreed that they have not received enough public input, expressed concern with the timing, and recommended moving forward before the site further deteriorates and costs increase. However, there is a big need for more public meetings and opportunities for public input.
Chair Kelly asked if there is PDC Board support for the $38,000,000 PDC investment concept, or does the PDC Board think staff should head in a direction where there are fewer public dollars needed. As it is, he stated that only about half of the dollars budgeted, and staff would have to look into where there remaining dollars would come from.

Commissioner Wilhoite asked if there is someone out there that can legitimately save those buildings, or does the PDC Board need to decide to get rid of them; a decision needs to be made on the future of these buildings, especially those that are not needed for the various scenarios proposed by Harsch. However, he noted that while there needs to be more public exposure and input before the PDC Board can make a decision, action needs to move forward on some of the buildings for practical and safety reasons. To continue to move the timeline forward, PDC staff should continue to work on the project with Harsch, but in the meantime also obtain public input.

Commissioner Dickson asked the following questions:
- Is there a cost estimate for the immediate needs on the site? Mr. Wood responded that there are estimates for installing protective caps on the roofs. PDC has also met with contractors to see what can be done with the water issues. The cost is moderate with huge benefits. However, the question is whether we spend the money on these repairs, when we are considering to possibly demolishing these buildings later.
- How much time will making these immediate repairs buy? Mr. Wood responded that it will stop the water from entering the building, but the challenge is that there is a long process to proceed with demolition and there has to be a vision before permits are granted.

Commissioner Wilhoite asked if there are experts that can give an answer to the question of whether a building should be renovated or not, looking at whether the cost to renovate a building is higher than building a completely new one. Mr. Wood responded that the challenge with renovation historic buildings is that the cost is usually higher than building new ones, and noted that in Harsch’s proposal it is keeping and renovation the two iconic buildings, but because the other buildings are practically falling into the river and are not part of the renovation proposal, they could be demolished.

Commissioner Edlen made the following points:
- There has to be a way to do selective demolition that does not get in the way with what Harsch is proposing to do.
- Public process and input is important.
- Most of the conversation today has been around the cost, about having a project that costs more than PDC has budgeted for. All partners need to dig into that side of the equation; until there are answers to that, he is not prepared to continue the conversation.

Commissioner Mohlis agreed that there has to be a way to do selective demolition sooner rather than later, and that without some form of work session and public input, the question of “What is the appropriate scale of public investment given budget availability and other River District URA projects” cannot be answered.

Jillian Detweiler, Policy Director, Office of the Mayor, acknowledged that Harsch has made a tremendous investment on this project, and because there is not a development agreement in place asked what is needed to secure Harsch’s position in this project. Mr. Schnitzer responded that he would like to see a development agreement with a placeholder as to the subsidy. Executive Director Quinton added that there is a need for more information on budget and cost and project details, but explained
that this is multi-layered in that there is a cash flow dynamic to the budget in addition to the actual appropriation of money that PDC staff and the PDC Board will get into during the upcoming budget season. He stated that PDC staff needs direction from the PDC Board as to whether to go ahead with a development agreement knowing that we have neither a firm development plan nor a firm idea of what PDC’s financial contribution is. Executive Director Quinton went on to say that being as PDC is the owner it can proceed with the selective demolition in anticipation of a development scenario.

Chair Kelly asked if it would be possible to go through the necessary process to have a draft development agreement by the next PDC Board meeting. Executive Director Quinton responded that PDC staff does have a draft document that it can share with the PDC Board and receive their guidance on how to finalize that document.

Collectively, the PDC Board asked if it was possible to have a phased development agreement. Executive Director Quinton responded the type of disposition and development agreement that PDC is talking about here feels more like a district scale development agreement where it outlines what various partners have to do and in what order.

Mr. Schnitzer stated that the challenge Harsch is facing is that without a development agreement PDC and Harsch are not establishing how all of these meetings and continued work gets paid; Harsch staff have overspent the initial cost by approximately $800,000 and he wonders how time needed to prepare and present at the various public meetings that are needed will be compensated for.

12. Adjourn

There being no further business, Chair Kelly adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:53 p.m.

Approved by the Portland Development Commission on February 11, 2015

Gina Wiedrick, Recording Secretary
2014 WOMEN in Trades Career Fair

A report on Oregon Tradeswomen, Inc.'s 22nd annual event that is changing the face of the next generation of tradesworkers

A Career for Women Day attendee learns to climb a utility pole in Portland General Electric's workshop.

A group of middle-school girls work to stop a simulated water main break in a workshop with the Portland Water Bureau.

A high school girl learns to operate a jackhammer from Ada Aranda, Apprentice Coordinator for the Oregon & Southern Idaho Laborers-Employers Training Trust.

Oregon Tradeswomen, Inc.
3934 NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Suite 101
Portland Oregon 97212
503.335.8200 x 21
info@tradeswomen.net
www.tradeswomen.net
A SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Oregon Tradeswomen, Inc.'s 22nd Annual Women in Trades Career Fair

Oregon Tradeswomen, Inc. (OTI) has produced the annual Women in Trades Career Fair since 1993 with the goal of increasing diversity and the overall number of women working in high-paying, high-skill careers in the construction, mechanical, technical, utility, and highway trades. The Fair offers authentic, hands-on workshops and activities designed to provide realistic experiences, leaving a lasting impact on students, educators, and career seekers alike.

In partnership with dedicated industry sponsors and participants, the event serves to introduce school-age girls to career options they may not otherwise have an opportunity to consider. The Fair also connects aspiring tradeswomen with opportunities for apprenticeship training, employment, and careers.

OTI extends immense gratitude to the businesses, organizations, and individuals who support the work of OTI through participation in the annual Women in Trades Career Fair, as well as our year-round programs to encourage girls and women in their exploration of career pathways in the trades as viable and gratifying options for their futures.

The 2014 Women in Trades Career Fair
By The Numbers:

1,997 Women and Girls Attended the Fair:
   620 Students on Middle School Girls' Day
   629 Students on High School Girls' Day
   192 Educators on School Days
   556 Attendees on Careers for Women Day
   78 Schools from Oregon and SW Washington
   114 Volunteers contributed 644 hours

35 Hands-on workshops & 72 Exhibitors, including:
   15 Apprenticeship Training Programs
   14 Government Agencies
   9 Manufacturing Firms
   7 Community / Technical Colleges
   6 Construction Contractors
   4 Health & Safety / Public Safety Organizations
   4 Utility Companies
   3 Fire and Rescue Organizations
   2 Construction Suppliers
   2 Trades Employers
   1 Employment Support Organization
   1 Union

A middle school girl learns the “torch down” roofing technique in a workshop with the Oregon & SW Washington Roofers & Waterproofers.

A high school girl learns to operate heavy equipment in a workshop with Goodfellow Bros.

High school girls learn to wire a light and switch in a workshop with the women of NECA IBEW Local 48.
What Educators, Students, and Career Seekers Said About the Women in Trades Career Fair

- "I liked that I got to use tools that I had never used before." - *Middle school student*

- "I learned that even if we don’t go to college, we can have a cool and fun job." - *Middle school student*

- "My favorite part of the Fair was seeing women in the same field as myself." - *High school student*

- "I liked seeing women doing traditionally men’s jobs and how all the women loved their careers." - *High school student*

- "It was fantastic listening to other women speak about their experiences and the overall outlook into the jobs, education and training, money, benefits, hours, etc. Great active learning!" - *Educator*

- "My students were impacted by the exposure to careers and strong independent women making positive choices for their futures." - *Educator*

- "The excitement of the tradeswomen while working with my kids was great, and the words spoken during fashion show about how much they love their jobs and how much they earn had real impact!" - *Educator*

- "I appreciated all of the information and enjoyed the hands-on experiences." - *Job seeker on Careers for Women Day*

- "I liked learning about all of the different options for my future. It made me think more about what I can do." - *Job seeker on Careers for Women Day*

- "It was great for me to get the information needed to pursue careers in different trades." - *Job seeker on Careers for Women Day*
Thank you to the Sponsors of the 2014 Women in Trades Career Fair!
You made the Fair possible!

Platinum Sponsors
Bonneville Power Administration
City of Portland: Bureau of Procurement, Bureau of Environmental Services,
  Bureau of Transportation, and Water Bureau
IBEW Local 48
KGW Northwest NewsChannel 8
NECA-IBEW Electrical Training Center
The Oregonian
Portland Development Commission
Portland General Electric
UA Local 290 Plumbers, Steamfitters, & Marine Pipefitters Training Trust /
  Plumbing & Mechanical Contractors Association

Gold Sponsors
Oregon & Southern Idaho and Northwest Laborers-Employers Training Trust Funds

Silver Sponsors
ODOT/BOLI Highway Construction Workforce Development Program
Oregon Electric Group
Sheet Metal Training Institute
Slayden Construction Group, Inc.

Bronze Sponsors
Daily Journal of Commerce
Eileen Fisher
Gunderson, LLC
Hamilton Construction Company
Hoffman Structures, Inc.
Howard S. Wright
I.U. Operating Engineers, Local 701
Metro
Mowat Construction Company
Multnomah County
Northwest Line Construction JATC
NW Natural
Oregon & SW Washington Roofers & Waterproofers JATC
Pacific NW Regional Council of Carpenters /
  Pacific Northwest Carpenters Institute
Pacific Power
PCC Bond Program
RR Donnelley
Skanska USA Building, Inc.
Stimson Lumber Company
Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue / IAFF Local 1680
Vigor Industrial
Walsh Construction Co.