

Gateway Regional Center URA Program Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

Date: September 21, 2005
Time: 6:30-8:00 PM

Location: East Portland Community Center
740 SE 106th Ave

In attendance:

Dorene Warner, Chair
Bob Earnest, Vice Chair
Beth Baltz
Tim Brunner
Dick Cooley
Andy Cotugno
Steve Dotterer
Ted Gilbert

Stuart Gwin
Arlene Kimura
Jerry Koike
Jackie Putnam
Alesia Reese
Linda Robinson
Fred Sanchez
Phil Selinger
Carol Williams

Dann Wonser
Staff and Guests in attendance:
Sara King (PDC)
Kevin Bond (PDC)
Jon Connor (PDC)
Karl Dinkelspiel (PDC)

Not in attendance:

Teena Ainsle
Susan Brady
Jackie Butts
Frieda Christopher
Jim Doig

Grace Fitzgerald
Renee Jensen
Dick Loffelmacher
Clyde Nelson
Lynn Powell

Duke Shepard
Timothy Treible
Aleta Woodruff

1. Welcome and Introductions

Dorene opened the meeting at 6:40 PM. All PAC members, new and old, introduced themselves as did PDC staff in attendance. Since the last PAC meeting, 10 new PAC members were recruited.

2. Street Plan Update

Sara went over the main objectives for the street plan:

- The Street Plan was adopted by City Council as part of the City's Transportation System Plan
- The Street Plan implements the Gateway Regional Center URA Plan Goal of Expanding and Improving Travel Options. The URA Plan explicitly states that a more complete street grid in the URA is a necessity for improving multi-modal movement in the district. The establishment of a street grid in the area will shorten trip lengths, disperse traffic

over a wider array of streets, permit more pedestrian and bicycle trips, enable additional storefront development, increase the parking supply with on-street parking, reduce the demand on larger streets and improve access to housing, services and parks. The URA Plan states that no redevelopment should occur in the Area without an examination of the adopted Street Plan. The URA Plan also recommends that PDC consider the use of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) funds to assist in the implementation of the Street Plan.

- The Office of Transportation (PDOT) is actively implementing the Street Plan at the Land Use Review level. Applicants for new development permits are informed of the requirements of the Street Plan and how it may impact their property and development.
- Actual development of new streets is challenging. Many property owners are unaware of the Street Plan's requirements and some are appealing the decision of PDOT review staff to the policy level. Their primary issue is with the cost of developing new streets and the negative impact that it has on the feasibility of their project (diminished development envelope).
- How can the PAC and PDC help? The PAC can reaffirm its commitment to the Street Plan and discuss ways that it might be involved in implementation. The PAC should also consider the possibility of using PDC tax increment funds to help defray the costs of developing new streets, relieving some of the burden placed on private developers.

Beth Baltz expressed concern that the street plan should address “multi-modality,” by including plans for pedestrian and transit connections, in addition to streets.

Sara stated PDC could set up a fund to assist property owners and developers with street improvement costs.

Alesia asked what kind of street amenities are planned, such as sidewalks, street trees, etc. Stuart from PDOT stated that in some cases, parking lot aisles would turn into full-fledged streets built to city standards. Some street improvements are years down the road and are contingent on private development.

Dorene reminded the PAC that the purpose of this discussion is to refresh the PAC on the street plan and review where the plan came from and why it is being done. The street plan is considered a long-range plan.

PAC members expressed concern about property owners getting stuck paying for improvements for both sides of the right of way. Half-street improvements are allowed so that property owners are responsible for the costs of improving the portion of the road on their side of the street, fronting their land.

Dorene stated the PAC would strive to maintain the street plan's vision without overburdening property owners.

Dorene then opened up the floor to public comment on the street plan.

Developer Gordon Jones expressed his concerns about funding for the street plan. Gordon stated the URA plan indicates that street funding is to come from urban renewal district money. Assembling lots for new street right-of-ways would negatively impact property owners, leaving unusable pieces of lots. Gordon stated that nowhere in the URA plan does it say developers should help fund new streets and right of ways. Gordon stated developers are now expected to pick up more of the tab because the URA spent all its money on a few big projects, none of which contributed to street improvement funds. Gordon stated street improvements should be paid for through urban renewal area money, not developers and property owners. PAC member Dick Cooley asked Gordon which specific projects he is concerned about. Gordon stated he could name several projects, but all projects in Gateway are affected by this. Gordon pointed out some land he has been assembling along NE 97th Avenue below Glisan Street.

Developer Joseph James owns property along SE Ash Street around 97th and 99th Avenues. Joseph stated property sales fell through twice when potential buyers found out they would have to pay for city-required street improvements on the existing unimproved, gravel streets. Dorene pointed out that Joseph's concern had more to do with city codes, than a concern with the URA street plan.

Ex-officio PAC member Phil Selinger of TriMet asked if there are any city precedents for funding new streets. Sara stated that there are no precedents specifically for an area like Gateway. The Lents Town Center URA is improving existing streets. Gateway's situation is not like the Pearl District. Gateway's street plan most closely resembles what is going on in the South Waterfront URA, where new streets are being built.

Dick Cooley asked what city policy is regarding development occurring near or along new streets citywide. Dick stated he understood that developers pay for street improvements. Dorene stated the concern is with city policy, not urban renewal. Street improvements benefit property owners. Urban renewal helps defray costs when money is available via public-private partnerships.

3. Prunedale Strategy

Sara gave an overview of the Prunedale Strategy:

- Concept Plan excerpt: "The NE 102nd and Burnside Station Area. This area is envisioned with the most new development, as a mixed-use area of office, flex space, housing and civic space. The Prunedale area retains some of its industrial flavor with the addition of office/flex buildings that serve both front and back office needs and many types of tenants. Two new attractions, an Education Center and Civic Center, are also proposed for this sub-area."
- Project Plan (Draft)

- Introduction: The Opportunity Gateway Concept Plan and Redevelopment Strategy targets the “interior” of the Gateway URA for significant redevelopment. Specifically, the area between NE Glisan and SE Stark Streets and 102nd Avenue and the I-205 freeway is characterized today by signs of stagnation: few new businesses, a lack of parks and open space, unimproved streets, aging building stock and poorly maintained residential and commercial properties. Relatively low land and building values, coupled with high density, central city zoning designations provide the greatest opportunity for near-term positive change in Gateway. As the URA matures, a development strategy with broad-based community support and a clear, cohesive vision for the future is necessary to guide PDC investment in Prunedale.
- Objective: Create a redevelopment vision and strategy for the Prunedale area by Fall 2006 for a cost not to exceed \$100,000.

Sara stated that one of the challenges facing Prunedale is how to transition the area from existing uses (especially single family residential) to EX zoning. PDC staff will fully develop a project management plan soon, as well as a public involvement plan.

PAC member Alesia recommended extending the established street concepts for the 102nd Avenue improvement project to the rest of Prunedale to make it more “Gateway-like” and maintain consistency in street design.

PAC member Beth Baltz suggested that the PAC may want to consider renaming the Prunedale area. Beth stated the name Prunedale “doesn’t have a lot of zing” and most people don’t relate to the Prunedale name. Beth and other PAC members indicated there is no strong attachment to the name.

4. URAC Policies

This agenda item postponed until the next PAC meeting, due to time.

5. Public Comment

The time allotted for public comment occurred during the street plan discussion.

6. General Announcements

Dorene is looking for PAC members (especially new PAC members) to help re-staff various PAC committees.

A 1-page handout regarding the urban renewal line item on property taxes was distributed to the PAC and interested attendees. The handout was prepared in response to a question by PAC member Duke Shepard at the previous week’s PAC Orientation session.

The Gateway Transit Center garage/clinic project is going smoothly. The park & ride arrangement with the Elks Lodge has worked out well. It was hoped that Providence

Medical would locate a facility on the ground floor of the garage, but “the numbers didn’t work for them.”

Dorene adjourned the meeting at 8:00 PM.

The next Gateway PAC meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 19 at the East Portland Community Center located at 740 SE 106th Avenue. The meeting will begin at 6:30p.m.