

BURNSIDE BRIDGEHEAD CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Committee Meeting
September 12, 2006
Session Notes

~~~~~  
**BBHCAC Members in Attendance:** Jim Andrews, Lynne Coward, Frank DuFay, Joni Hartman, Tim Holmes, Bruce Murray, Chuck Willis, Brian Wilson,  
**Ex Officio CAC Members in Attendance:** Bruce Wood (Developer), Kia Selley (PCD .Project Manager)  
**PDC Staff in Attendance:** Trang Lam, Bruce Allen.  
**Others in Attendance:** Lee Purlman, Britney Kalberer, Mike Damon, Lisa Cohen, Peter Findley Fry, John Flinn, Lee Johnson.  
**Facilitator:** Sue Dicile.  
~~~~~

Note:

“Q” = CAC member question

“A” = an answer contributed by the previously noted presenter, unless otherwise noted.

“C” = CAC member comment unless otherwise noted. (Public comments are noted in separate sections)

The meeting convened at 3:00 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no opening public comment.

ADMINISTRATION

Review of July 11, 2006 Meeting Notes

- The notes were adopted without revision.

PROJECT AND PROGRAM UPDATE

Convention Plaza

Bruce Allen provided an update. Highlights included:

- The building is still operating. Those who wish to are being let out of their leases early, and are being compensated for their moving expenses.
- Of the ten leases extending beyond December 2007, nine have been successfully renegotiated. The remaining lease runs through 2013, and is for a Verizon cell tower located on the building. There are “no people” located at the building pursuant to this lease. Attempts are being made to work with Verizon toward a solution, but the City may have to use its powers of condemnation to address the issue.

Q: How long would a condemnation take?

A: Could be done before the end of the year.

Q: How have the early movers affected the budget?

A: It was anticipated that some tenants would leave early, and it had been figured into the budget. The financial impact is not significant.

Q: Are those leaving staying in the Central Eastside?

A: We don't know but we have provided them with information on other available locations.

C: It is unfortunate if those businesses are not relocating within the CES URA, especially if they are industrial, or otherwise Central Eastside-specific.

A: They are not. They are mostly traditional office. All of these tenants are being approached by numerous brokers, so they are being well-served relative to their relocation options.

Zone Map Amendment

Bruce Allen and Kia Selley provided an update. Highlights included:

- The zone map amendment, from an IG1 designation (Industrial) to EXD (General Commercial) has been approved.
- One portion of the property, at the north corner of the project, will remain IG1. (Block 69)

Q: What are the uses for the IG1 parcel?

A: The parcel could be used for parking or for loading for the flex area. An ODOT easement complicates uses of this piece.

Q: What about grandfathering a conditional use? The parcel is currently parking for a non-IG1 use.

A: This could be looked at, and may have been addressed already. The objective was to keep it industrial property.

Eastside Burnside/Couch Couplet

Kia Selley provided an update. Highlights included:

- PDOT has submitted a request for \$4.7 million in Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funds.
- The project is currently ranked second in the priority ranking for those funds. We believe the ranking process has unfairly impacted this project's evaluation and are seeking to have it re-evaluated.
- The CAC may be called upon to provide a letter of support.

C: The CAC should be present at the hearings on November 22, 2006.

It was proposed, and unanimously adopted, that the CAC Chair should do what he feels necessary to pursue advocacy in this arena.

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM UPDATE

Zone Change and the Eastside Burnside/Couch (B/C) Couplet

Bruce Wood of Opus Northwest noted that the zone changes are predicated on the added transportation system capacity provided by the B/C couplet. Without the couplet, the project doesn't move forward, and without the project the \$51 million district extension is not feasible. This illustrates the critical nature of the couplet.

Bruce asked if there is a question as to whether the URAC is supporting the couplet. Tim Holmes responded that the URAC supports the importance and urgency of the eastside B/C couplet, but has a concern as to whether there is the need to fund it through TIF. He noted that the URAC is in the process of prioritizing projects in terms of importance and timing, and that funding alternatives for the couplet were not discussed.

It was noted that a missing piece in the URAC's consideration is the importance of the couplet for transportation capacity, and that the current perception is that the purpose of the couplet is to support traffic flow, and provide amenities.

It was suggested that the CAC provide a bulleted statement of purpose for the eastside B/C couplet, explaining why the timing of the couplet is so important. It was further noted questions have been raised about alternative sources of funding for the B/C couplet. The statement of purpose should clarify whether or not alternative sources of funds exist.

It was noted that "who is paying for the ramp" was another topic brought up by the URAC. A statement on this topic is needed to bring clarity to these issues is needed. Kia Selley agreed to address this via a bullet-point summation, which will also be sent to the CAC.

A concern was brought up relative to the impact of the eastside B/C couplet on West Burnside capacity. In response it was noted that in adopting the zone change PDOT revised its plan for Burnside accordingly, so any change in West Burnside capacity is being managed within the plan.

At the conclusion of the discussion, it was noted that the eastside B/C couplet is one of a series of interlocking dependencies: the Burnside Bridgehead project requires a zone change; to accomplish the zone change the transportation system must support higher density; the couplet is key to supporting that density.

It was noted that there is strong public support for the eastside B/C couplet in general, but all the facts need to be made clear and known by all parties.

Site access and circulation plans and project schematics

A 14-page set of design diagrams was distributed, illustrating site access and circulation, and schematics for each project level.

Site access

The diagram illustrated project ingress and egress, bike routes, and truck loading. It was noted that the turn sequence that currently provides access to I-84 will be eliminated. Truck access to I-84 will be east on Burnside to Grand northbound.

Q: Where will small trucks come in for deliveries?

A: Small truck delivery will be addressed via loading zones as the buildings are designed. It will function like any other tower in the Pearl district.

Q: Where is the loading space for the flex space facing onto 2nd Ave.?

A: There will be a shared loading dock and elevator for the flex space, as it is not practical for each to have a separate space.

C: A concern was noted about truck and freight access to retail and industrial areas of the project.

Q: Where will the code-required retail loading be?

A: At the lower level, but a smaller loading area at the retail area will also be provided for convenience.

Q: Could there be street level loading at non-retail hours?

A: Possibly but not known now.

Project Schematics

It was noted that this design is similar to the original proposal, with added office space, the same amount of flex space, but less housing (both market and affordable). The affordable housing will address a range of income levels.

Q: What is the size of the "affordable" units?

A: Between 744 – 1362 sq ft are shown in the diagram, but that is approximate for now. There is a total of 50,000 sq ft, from which the goal is to derive about 80 units.

C: A concern was expressed as to whether the entrance to the units, through an entrance hall, would be pleasant.

C: Appreciate the alternative that has been provided via the tower with underground parking. There had been concern in the Buckman neighborhood about the streetscape impact of above-ground floors of parking. Also glad to see the return of flex space on 2nd Ave. The overall design details are looking good.

Q: What are the plans for greenspace and outdoor space?

A: That will be developed as planning moves forward.

C: Concern about how the glass wall fits with the character of the area.

A: Honoring the character of the neighborhood is important. At the streetscape level, we expect the façade to be brick and/or stone.

Next Steps

The following next steps were noted:

- The budget process will allocate the \$51 million, via the FY 06-07 Amended Budget and 4-year forecast.

- On 9/21 (changed from original 9/27 date) the URAC recommendations on project and program priorities for the \$51 million investment strategy will be presented.
- The City Council will discuss budget priorities on 10/24.
- The PDC Board will discuss Board and City Council feedback on proposed FY 06-07 Amended Budget and 4-year forecasted budget on 11/22.
- The PDC Board will review and approve the proposed FY 06-07 Amended Budget on 12/13.

Funding Discussion

There was an extended discussion about the priorities that are being established for the \$51 million. Highlights of the discussion included:

- The URAC has set priorities. The priorities were set in terms of overall value for the district, amount of funding, and timing. Sidewalks to the river and economic development are ranked as the highest overall priorities. Burnside Bridgehead is at the top of the priority list, but not for funding. The B/C couplet is also ranked as a high priority.
- All recognize that without the Burnside Bridgehead the TIF funds plummet. Burnside Bridgehead is seen as a top priority by the neighborhood. But there is a sentiment that the Burnside Bridgehead project should be held to the \$6.4 million originally proposed in the RFP.
- The developers have a significant concern that if the \$51 million is diverted to longer-term projects other than the couplet, the couplet timing will impede the Burnside Bridgehead project.
- There is a misunderstanding that the Burnside Bridgehead needs the B/C couplet for “niceties”. There isn’t an understanding of the capacity issue.
- There is concern that dedicating 30% (of the \$51 million) to affordable housing is not appropriate for the Central Eastside, where 15% might be more appropriate. The District Extension Committee suggested \$3 million for affordable housing.

Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) Update

Kia Selley noted that drafting of the DDA will begin in October.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Johnson:

Speaking relative to concerns of the freight haulers, they wish to express interest in the capacity issues relative to the zone change. Concerns include “who” did the traffic study, what lane widths are accommodated, how much additional traffic will be generated and what types of shops will be included in the mix. An example of why these issues are important can be viewed at the Bridgeport Plaza, which has no parking for trucks, making it “a nightmare” for deliveries. A surcharge for those shops are being considered.

(Kia Selley noted that PDOT will have more information relative to these issues in 30 – 60 days. It was noted that the hiring of a design consultant for the B/C Couplet is in process. CAC members had additional questions about freight movement. Bruce Wood stressed that the project developers are very concerned about ease of freight movement. It was noted that PDOT could address these issues more accurately and would be invited to the CAC.)

UPCOMING DATES

- There will be no meeting in October.
- Members will be notified via email of dates when public testimony will be taken. The facilitator will send a cover letter with the notes to other CAC members asking them to review the notes carefully and weigh in with any design concerns they may have, and not to wait until the November meeting.

PRIMARY OUTCOMES OF THIS MEETING:

- **The CAC voted to empower the Chair to take whatever advocacy measures he deems necessary in representing CAC support for funding the Eastside Burnside/Couch Couplet with MTIP funds.**
- **CAC members informally expressed support for the design elements to-date, with comments and/or reservations as noted in these meeting notes. Members not in attendance are encouraged to weigh in with the developers or PDC staff with any concerns they have prior to the November meeting, as progress on the design is moving forward.**

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Handouts distributed at this meeting:

- Site access and bicycle routes diagrams and project schematics and elevations.

Respectfully submitted by facilitator Sue Dicile

If you have comments about the notes from this meeting please direct them to the facilitator at 503-287-9345 or:
sdicile@aol.com