

# BARBUR CONCEPT PLAN

*Creating a Long-Term Vision for Barbur Boulevard*

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #2 SUMMARY

January 4, 2012  
9:30-11:00 a.m.  
1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 7A

### **Introductions/Announcements/Schedule Review**

Jay opened the meeting at 9:35 am, and led off the introductions. Attendees introduced themselves.

### **Update on Existing Conditions Report**

Morgan provided a quick summary of changes to the existing conditions report, noting the breakdown of information by Barbur Boulevard segment, updated economic info, and map revisions. Dave Unsworth asked for a summation of the key take away findings from the existing conditions. Chris Yake asked whether a market analysis would be done as a next step. CJ Gabbe noted that the corridor showed large variability in the market rates, and that the Envision Tomorrow tool would provide a high level market analysis. Jay also noted the variability in the demographics throughout the corridor as well, that the numbers show a predominantly white, wealthy population, but there are areas of concentrated lower income and/or more diverse demographic. There is also some disparity between segments of the Barbur Corridor such as Lair Hill vs. West Portland Park.

### **Preview of Consultant's Envision tool**

CJ Gabbe (Frego) presented an intro to the Envision Tomorrow tool. Lidwien Rahman asked whether the tool would take into account constraints such as slope and slide hazards. CJ responded that predevelopment and site prep costs could be added to the model, if certain cost assumptions could be made. Dave Unsworth asked what percentage of amenities lead to what sort of increase in building prototype feasibility. CJ responded that there is an ever expanding body of literature about how amenities affects rents or property values. Lidwien added that some areas have no improved streets, let alone amenities, for example West Portland Park. Marianne Fitzgerald mentioned street trees are also an amenity, along cited concern with on going maintenance responsibility. CJ mentioned again, that Envision Tomorrow can factor in all costs associated with development to a certain degree. Assumptions are required – and although you won't get a bank loan based on these numbers, it is a powerful tool to help planning understand financial feasibility and to help the community envision alternative futures for Barbur. Dave Unsworth asked whether any work on particular sites had been done. Jay noted that several "focus areas" had been identified, which will be evaluated in a charrette process to determine feasible "bookends" and then taken out to the public in March or April.

Marianne inquired whether the tool took older residential properties into consideration. CJ noted that the tool primarily focused on commercial and multi family redevelopment potential, but vacant single family infill sites also get identified. The life expectancy of commercial buildings is much less than single dwellings, and so they have more opportunity. Chris Yake wondered if the pro forma included SDC or ½ street improvement costs. CJ responded that the model could include those costs.

Judith Gray noted that the tool seemed to start with a building and build up a place from there. Will the team go back and look at the site specific results and how large of an area is

the analysis intended to cover? CJ noted that the scenario builder starts getting at the details of the place. Jay noted that we're focused on 7 areas, so this will keep it more manageable to field check the results of the Envision work.

### **Needs, Opportunities, and Constraints Discussion**

CJ gave the group an overview of the Needs Opportunities and Constraints (NOC) findings from the consultant team. Marianne Fitzgerald mentioned that the I-5 access which often goes into neighborhood streets, not direct onto Barbur should be noted as an issue that needs to be addressed. Crista Gardner noted that the NOC seems to have skipped the visioning step, and cautioned against being so specific. Jay responded that this work helps us to identify the areas to focus our visioning efforts on. Dave Unsworth added that the Envision tool helps tell the story of how you get here (to these focus places). John Gillam noted that the vision, alternatives development, and analysis can happen concurrently. It is a good way to ground community members on specific examples – rather than talking about planning and design theory.

Lidwien Rahman noted that the lack of connections from the adjacent neighborhoods is a constraint. In terms of opportunities, in addition to PCC, there are Lewis and Clark, Wilson High School, and Fulton Community Center, Dave Unsworth cautioned that the enrollment figures are somewhat misleading in terms of actual trips to schools, and that they should be looked at a bit differently. Chris Yake agreed, noting the difference between daily student attendance and total enrollment at PCC Sylvania. Chris is working on teasing out how many students typically are on campus on a given day.

With respect to the four urban prototypes, Lidwien noted that ODOT could not support the concept of a main street on Barbur. Policy 1.B of the Oregon Highway Plan does not allow for long stretches of main street on a state highway, nor will ODOT support creation of new STA's (Special Transportation Areas). Dave Unsworth flagged this (the function of Barbur) as one of the biggest fundamental issues for the Barbur Concept Plan and SW corridor, and needs a full airing. Malu Wilkinson reiterated that while I-5 function is not up for debate, the function of Barbur is certainly on the table. Marianne Fitzgerald noted that we need to be looking at the I-5 accesses, to which Malu concurred.

Chris Yake cited his reluctance for the parallel main street, noting Milwaukie and Tigard as examples where the downtowns become hidden and forgotten, or used as a cut through. He also wondered about the feasibility of redeveloping the Barbur park and ride lot since it is at 100% utilization. Some discussion followed about the origin of the users, pointing out that the next park and ride is in zone 3 as opposed to zone 2. Crista Gardner mentioned that Trimet has the usage data that we could check. Lidwien Rahman also noted that the Park and Ride facility, as well as the area at SW 26<sup>th</sup> are under design for stormwater facility enhancements. Anything that is put there will need to replace the stormwater benefits of those projects. Jay noted that these sites have only been flagged as "opportunities" it remains to be seen what will emerge as the best use/development for these areas.

### **Wrap Up and Next Steps**

The next TAG meeting is scheduled for March 7, when we will discuss preliminary alternatives for the different focus areas.

Meeting adjourned 11:05 am

**TAG Members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Present?</b>
Shannon Axtell	Natural Resources and Infrastructure	No
Kristin Cooper	Land Use Implementation	Yes
Ann Debbautt	Land Use	Yes
Marianne Fitzgerald	Public Involvement	Yes
Crista Gardner	Transportation	Yes
John Gillam	Transportation Planning	Yes
Judith Gray	Land Use / Transportation	Yes
Allan Schmidt	Parks and Recreation	Yes
Lidwien Rahman	Transportation	Yes
David Sheern	Housing	Yes
Amin Wahab	Natural Resources and Infrastructure	Yes
Jeri Williams	Public Involvement	No
Malu Wilkinson	Land Use	Yes
Dave Unsworth	Transit	Yes
Chris Yake	Transit Oriented Development	Yes
Moriah McSharry McGrath	Health	Yes

**Staff and Consultants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present?</b>
Jay Sugnet	Portland Planning and Sustainability	Yes
Morgan Tracy	Portland Planning and Sustainability	Yes
Joan Frederiksen	Portland Planning and Sustainability	Yes
Deborah Stein	Portland Planning and Sustainability	Yes
Glen Bolen/ C.J Gabbe	Fregonese Associates	No/Yes

**Guests**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Name</b>
None Present		