



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #3
Draft Summary
April 22, 2013; 5:30 – 8:30 pm
1900 SW 4th Ave., Room 2500A

Members

Representative	Organization	Present
Blake Beanblossom	The Standard	Y
Doreen Binder	Transitions Projects	Y
Catherine Ciarlo	CH2M Hill	Y
Hermann Colas, Jr.	Colas Construction	Y
Ben Duncan	Multnomah County Health Equity Initiative	Y
Brian Emerick	Portland Historic Landmarks Commission	Y
Jessica Engelmann	Oregon Walks	Y
Jason Franklin	Portland State University	Y
Jeanne Galick	Willamette greenway advocate, South Portland resident	Y
Jim Gardner	South Portland Neighborhood Association	Y
Patricia Gardner	Pearl District Neighborhood Association	Y
Greg Goodman	Downtown Development Group	Y
Patrick Gortmaker	Old Town / Chinatown Community Association	N
Jodi Guetzloe-Parker	Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council	N
Sean Hubert	Central City Concern	N
Cori Jacobs	Downtown Retail Advocate	N
Michael Karnosh	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	Y
Nolan Lienhart	ZGF Architects	Y
Keith Liden	Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee	Y
Jeff Martens	CPUsage	Y
Marvin Mitchell	Julia West House; Downtown Neighborhood Association	Y
Anne Naito-Campbell	Civic activist and property owner	N
John Peterson	Melvin Mark Capital Group	Y
Dan Petrusich	Portland Business Alliance	Y
Steve Pinger	Northwest District Association	Y
Valeria Ramirez	Portland Opera	Y
Veronica Rinard	Travel Portland	Y
John Russell	Property owner and developer	Y
Bob Sallinger	Portland Audubon Society	Y
Katherine Schultz	GBD Architects, Planning and Sustainability Commission	Y
Mary Valeant	Goose Hollow Foothills League	Y
Karen Williams	Carroll Investments	Y
Jane Yang	NW Natural	Y

Alternates

Representative	Organization	Present
John Bradley	Northwest District Association	N
Dave Harrelson	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	N
Rick Michaelson	Alternate for John Russell	N
Lisa Frisch	Downtown Retail Advocate	Y
Martin Soloway	Central City Concern	Y
Kevin Myles	Alternate for Jeanne Galick	Y
Bing Sheldon	Alternate for John Russell	N
Carrie Richter	Portland Historic Landmarks Commission	N
Len Michon	South Portland Neighborhood Association	N

Project Team/Staff

Representative	Role	Organization	Present
Susan Anderson	Director	BPS, City of Portland	N
Joe Zehnder	Chief Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Steve Iwata	Central City Manager	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Karl Lisle	West Quadrant Project Manager	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Nicholas Starin	West Quadrant Project Planner	BPS, City of Portland	N
Elisa Hamblin	West Quadrant Project Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Mark Raggett	Urban Design Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Nan Stark	River Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Mauricio Leclerc	Transportation Planner	PBOT, City of Portland	Y
Sallie Edmunds	River Plan Project Manger	BPS, City of Portland	N
Troy Doss	SE Quadrant Project Manager	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Desiree Williams-Rajee	Equity Specialist	BPS, City of Portland	N
Lew Bowers	Central City Manager	PDC	Y
Kirstin Greene	Facilitator	Cogan Owens Cogan	Y
Alisha Morton	Facilitator Assistant	Cogan Owens Cogan	Y

Public

Jamila Carter

Roger Gertenrich

Caryl Gertenrich

Welcome and Announcements

Co-chair Karen Williams welcomed Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members and guests. She explained the different room layout for small group discussions.

Overview of Agenda

Kristin Greene, Facilitator, discussed tonight's agenda. She explained that members of the public are welcome to pull chair up to a table and listen during the small group discussions. She noted that public comment is welcome as long as SAC members are able to express their guidance as well.

Meeting 2 Recap

Elisa Hamblin, West Quadrant Project Planner, gave an update on items that we discussed at last meeting. She explained the email that she sent with multiple links is not required reading. One item that we had committee talk about was gentrification issues and if PDC had done any work on it. She also has a report available regarding Interstate Corridor and gentrification. If members would like it email her and she will get it to you.

ACTION: Approval of Meeting Summary

Kirstin asked if the group had any corrections or comments on the meeting summary.

Jeanne Galick: One thing that would be helpful is to include the topic headings in the summary so that comments can be taken into context.

Staff: Those should be in there, but we will review and make sure they are.

Kirstin asked for any further comments by the end of the week at which point the meeting summary will be considered final and approved. Members did not express any other changes.

Charrette and Event Updates

Karl Lisle, West Quadrant Project Manager, gave an overview of current outreach efforts and the upcoming charrette in June. He said they are working on a schedule now and will have more information by the next meeting on May 20th.

Nolan Lienhart: Will the charrette be open to general public?

Staff: Yes.

The Pearl District

Karl gave an overview of the Pearl District. He explained that the goal of the small group discussions tonight is to review the information in the Reader and add to it. The PowerPoint Presentation will be posted on the West Quadrant website.

Bob Salinger: The city has 600 acre deficit in industrial lands. City is rapidly converting industrial lands and then saying we have a deficit. City is moving into the green fields to compensate for the loss of industrial lands. What is being done about this?

Patricia Gardner: We tried very hard to stay mixed use.

Staff: Any former industrial lands (now zoned mixed-use) in the study area were rezoned in the mid-1990s under a different regulatory framework and a different economic opportunities analysis.

Patricia Gardner, SAC member from Pearl District Neighborhood Association, gave a brief presentation on the Pearl District sub-area. She explained the media has a convenient story about the Pearl District which is simply not true. Patricia referred to a report that was done by PSU students and also gave some statistical data about the Pearl District:

- In 1990 there were 629 residents mostly concentrated in two apartment buildings.
- Now, as of 2010, there are 5,993 residents.
- Currently, 22% of current population is below poverty line.

- Average income in the Pearl District (only) is \$40,149.
- Average income in Portland is over \$50k.
- Average age in the Pearl is 25-34. A third is in this age range. They are coming in, meeting each other and having babies.
- In 2010, 5% of the Pearl District is children.

She explained that the Pearl District started construction in 1994. It is economically very diverse. There are over 1000 units of low income housing which is just under 25% of the housing. There is another family friendly housing unit that just got approved for development. We see ourselves as the answer to sprawl. We are helping to keep the UGB from needing to expand. You can build as tall as you want there – we have no height limit and we are all for it. The more people and jobs are put into the Pearl the more other neighborhoods can stay the same. We also see ourselves as part of the downtown core - our problems and our solutions are very urban.

Patricia then gave the answers to the questions on the handout.

Question 1: What do you like about the area and what would you like to change? We like density and we want more.

Question 2: How should this area relate to and what role should it play as part of the larger Central City? We have over 25 city blocks that are yet to be developed. 150 people/block. That's over 3000 units of housing not including jobs. I also rode my bicycle here.

Question 3: How should this area contribute to the long-range direction of the Central City as the center of innovation and exchange? We have the post office – keep your eyes on this. It is 10 city blocks. The post office potentially moving could put an urban university site there or a large corporation. It's right on the rail line. We are a mixed use neighborhood.

Question 4: Any other ideas or thoughts? We struggle with not developing only one bedroom units. There are incentives for developers to build family friendly units – 2-3 bedroom units. We have a lot of tall historic buildings that have all been renovated. This puts a lot of pressure on short buildings. We have a lot of green along the riverbank, but we don't necessarily have that place where we can "be". Centennial Mills is a core to that potential – urban reach to the river. We are advocating for this.

The group then broke out into small group discussions to answer/discuss each of the questions on the handout for the Pearl District.

Large Group Report Back and Questions

Each group then chose one SAC member to report back an overview of the small group discussion.

Jeff Martens: Our group, generally speaking, likes the Pearl District. We like the density and how easy it is to do things and get around. It is mixed use in the true sense. One thing we would like to see changed is that many businesses are not open in the evening – they close at 6 or 7 pm. We would like to encourage them to stay open later which is more convenient for those that work/live there. We like the opportunities for affordable housing. There is a bit of concerns that there seems to be a little bit of an identity crisis between industrial roots and development that is happening that is not industrial.

Blake Beanblossom: We were only able to get through questions one and two. We didn't all agree on everything. A comment theme was that Patricia's story is inspiring. The Pearl District is a special area that has a lot of momentum behind it. We would like to see this replicated in other

parts of town. We like the urbanity of the area. You feel safe walking around as lots of people also out and about. The North Pearl by the tracks not necessarily the case, but the popular streets have a great feel and are very comfortable. The train tracks by the River are a barrier that will be hard to overcome. One person suggested capping it but it might block views. We like the diversity of housing; the Pearl has more than fulfilled obligation for housing quotas. Density is really critical for maintaining UGB. Where do these kids go to school?

Catherine Ciarlo: Everyone has already talked about how wonderful it is so we went for the issues / problems. Our discussion focused on families and schools. A community center would be great. Those who don't have cars in the district have troubles using community centers in other parts of the city. A senior center would also be great. There needs to be more places for people who live there to gather. There are concerns of access in to the district. It's hard to drive in the Pearl so we need to invest as much as we can to help people get around in other ways. There needs to be strong connection to the river, we'd like to bring urban to the river. We had a couple ideas about expanding creative schools into historic buildings. There is also a question about employment and whether there is or could be for employers that need larger floor plans.

Ben Duncan: We focused a lot on compatibility including the idea of industrial development and if it is compatible with families living in the area. We need to look at freight routes and access points that make it compatible with industrial development and how that works with alternative design. Use the street hierarchy to preserve mixed use. When looking at planned development and we need to consider how employment supports the growth and matches housing opportunities. We also need to consider land use goals for industrial development and how we see the vision for the Pearl. We would like to see increased safety for and use by pedestrians. There are issues with now with people blowing through stop signs. Will children really stay here? Air quality issues come with urban / density.

Brian Emerick: We agree with a lot that has been said. From a development perspective we are curious how did it get to be so vital? The mixed-use, diverse urban district and the historic areas create a sense of vitality with adaptive reuse. There are a lot of low rise buildings that are historic and we need to consider how we can protect them as development pressure intensifies and they may not be protected. The streetcar is very important as a connector in the neighborhood. Multi-modal transportation keeps it active. Is it competing with downtown and sucking energy from downtown? How do we keep both working? It also feels a little disconnected from the river right now.

Goose Hollow

Elisa Hamblin gave a presentation on the Goose Hollow sub-area. The PowerPoint Presentation will be posted to the West Quadrant website.

Mary Valeant, SAC Member from Goose Hollow Foothills League, said often seems like the Goose Hollow forgotten neighborhood. It is the one part of the city that doesn't look like anything has happened in this major development boom. Goose Hollow has the only public high school in the Central City in Lincoln High School. Mary suggests that before we put everything in the Pearl District we should look at other neighborhoods as well. We encourage development in Goose Hollow. We want grocery stores, housing, business etc. Connecting across Burnside and I-405 is also important. There is a lot of student housing in the neighborhood and this needs to be celebrated and improved. Goose Hollow needs urban restaurants with family and workforce housing. None of the teachers can afford to leave near where they teach.

The group then broke out into small group discussions to answer/discuss each of the questions on the handout for Goose Hollow.

Large Group Report Back and Questions

Each group then chose one SAC member to report back an overview of the small group discussion.

John Russell: – We talked about the contrast between Goose Hollow which has big super blocks and Pearl District where there is continuity and it's a joy to walk by. Goose Hollow isn't necessarily exciting to walk around. The MAC and Jeld-Wen Field definitely serve the city and are important. We think Goose Hollow's future is really residential. Most important thing to our group is that Lincoln High School has a chain link fence around a beautiful running track. It has the potential to do wonderful things for the neighborhood.

Joe Zehnder: Our table discussion was very similar to the last group. We noted a residential focus but with the observation with Jeld-Wen Field, The MAC and Lincoln High School. There are vast parts of Goose Hollow that you don't know how to get to because they are not integrated. Lightrail, vehicles and people pass through every day. The Pearl District is easy. In Goose Hollow you need a destination so you can understand how to get around. Jefferson Street and the role of it need to be discussed. Higher density residential is also an option and could be hooked into the west end – physically and energetically. We also discussed Jefferson Street as a gateway to downtown. We talked about capping the freeway. Something good / different could also happen with Lincoln. Redevelopment could be good.

Nolan Lienhart: One of the ideas that I had and the group agrees is there are three different areas of Goose Hollow – Northeast separated by Jeld-Wen, South of Lincoln and West. All three have a little different character. South and West have more residents. Northeast is more mixed use. We discussed the desire to have Lincoln go vertical, keeping the focus educational and creating open space. The neighborhood could also use a main street. Capping freeway is another interest to provide open space. This could increase open space and help meet City's goal for 30% tree canopy. A community center could be part of Lincoln High School redevelopment. We also discussed the idea of making better connections across Burnside and across freeway. Emphasizing the PSU connection and student housing is an important idea for this area. There is the potential for workforce housing since land values are a little lower than core downtown. We should emphasize the connections with Washington Park and bike / pedestrians. The neighborhood also could benefit from portals so that you know when you arrive.

Dan Petrusich: We echo what was said by other groups. Goose Hollow as a couple different areas with different possibilities. The area North of Lincoln High School is a great opportunity for density. It doesn't need to just be residential. We can really learn from what the Pearl District did right. Connectivity is really important and has been discussed. Goose Hollow and the West End connection and going across Burnside are important. We see Lincoln High School as opportunity for innovation and growth. One thing that got brought up is the Oregonian (site). There is a great future opportunity for development there. I don't think they have any plans to relocate, but the site might come available some day and is an opportunity. Goose Hollow has been overlooked and probably cannot make easy connections through Jeld-Wen. There is opportunity for that through Lincoln High School. This is a completely different area (south of Lincoln). There are a lot of connections to PSU. Jefferson and Columbia could be a main street or opportunity for something like a 23rd Street. We discussed the streetcar and putting it up and

down Jefferson / Columbia. We also discussed zoning as an issue and probably why Goose Hollow has been overlooked and not developed. If we could fix that a lot of good things could happen.

Keith Liden: We talked about four main areas – connections, creating a there / there, open space / civic uses and residential. The connections include access to the Collins Circle MAX station, and possibility of a bicycle share space there. We could promote better connections to Washington Park. For the there/there we discussed building upon Collins Circle; encouraging Jeld-Wen to be more active more of the time; Jefferson as a possible retail street; Morrison and Yamhill present an opportunity for small business and a cultural focus and also the Oregonian site as an opportunity. For our open space discussion we talked about capping I-405; the use of Lincoln High School property as a park site and the addition of an elementary school. For residential we discussed the need for more density and that an elementary school could influence the type of residents that we are trying to attract - families.

South Waterfront

Troy Doss gave an overview of the South Waterfront sub-area. The PowerPoint presentation will be posted to the project website.

Jim Gardner, SAC member with South Portland Neighborhood Association, gave an overview of the South Waterfront sub-area. He said the characteristic that is dominant for South Waterfront is uniformity. The South Waterfront area used to be blank vacant land. The Pearl District has the mix of the new and the old. The South Waterfront is essentially built from ground zero in the middle of nowhere and no one had any reason to go to it until recently. What has happened has not necessarily been according to plan. Development has taken a much slower pace and so much less tax money generated. Many of the plans have not happened and won't for a while because there is no money. Another dominant characteristic is that it is still incomplete. There are far fewer residents and jobs than initially expected. If you're driving it's hard to get to – no one really knows how to get there. The South Waterfront is not going to feel like the Pearl and Goose Hollow ever. Demographically it's not going to be as diverse as we might want. It's all brand new, on expensive property and doesn't have benefit of mixed types of uses and age that the rest of downtown has.

Jim then gave the answers to the questions on the handout.

Question 1: What do you like about the area and what would you like to change? There needs to be better connections to downtown. What happens along Moody, Zidel property and the west side of Moody will be very critical in creating some type of link to downtown and the riverfront area. This is hindered by OHSU which has large block of property with a single use and will not generate TIF money. The Greenway badly needs to be finished. Residents in South Waterfront came partly on promise that the Greenway would be there and a pleasant connection to downtown.

Question 2: How should this area relate to and what role should it play as part of the larger Central City? It largely depends on how the connection happens to Central District of South Waterfront and downtown.

Question 3: How should this area contribute to the long-range direction of the Central City as the center of innovation and exchange? Clearly South Waterfront is going to be an education and research hub that could serve that role in supporting the Central City. It also could benefit from having better links to PSU. Streetcar helps in that connection but there needs to be better pedestrian / bike connection between PSU and South Waterfront.

Question 4: Any other ideas or thoughts? Frankly, I think we need to throw away the Urban Renewal Plan and create a new one based on the funding that we anticipate being available. Look at projects and prioritize based on funding projected.

The group then broke out into small group discussions to answer/discuss each of the questions on the handout for South Waterfront.

Large Group Report Back and Questions

Each group then chose one SAC member to report back an overview of the small group discussion.

Marvin Mitchell: The Greenway has gaps in it right now and the discontinuity is a real barrier. It would be really good to develop a temporary solution. We discussed the design plan and how it does not really work. There is a lack of variety of design which keeps it from reaching its potential. There is currently amazing support of bike use. We also discussed how successful parks and waterways are and what a success the Tram is which has attracting value. We also discussed how it is not complete.

Mark Raggett: As a group we had an agreement with newness of the district which is a good thing in some cases. The South Waterfront does not have as much connectivity with other areas. It is interestingly cut off from the rest of the city. We talked about the design of the towers which look good but some feel are too tall. A grocery store is needed down there as you cannot have a functioning neighborhood without the food source. If we want to encourage families to live there, is a school needed? If so, where would it go? And how do we phase this to get these amenities in faster. We agree the mix of OHSU employment and innovation and residential component is compelling. Barnes Landing Slip could be an opportunity for open space, as place to get access to river and shallow water habitat. The connection south to Sellwood and the new Sellwood Bridge is important. The Springwater Corridor connection on the east side is also important. Streetcar extension is great for the area. The park was really nice and good to orient around and could be an opportunity for cafes etc.

John Peterson: We agree with everything that has been said. We thought it was great that OHSU stayed in town rather than go to Hillsboro. Collaboration with PSU and health sciences and tie to education district is important. South Waterfront is a different kind of place which is ok but it feels like a suburb or brand new place. It is a wonderful blank canvas and we need to capitalize on the business opportunities for the area. Restaurants are starting to gain critical mass. We have heard interest from grocers coming in. The area needs better connections with North and South Greenway, bicycles, and Ross Island. There also needs to be a better mix of housing over time. The street orientation needs to take into account how to access the river at RiverPlace.

Karen Williams: We agree South Waterfront is a transportation island. Connectivity is the big issue for the South Waterfront. Commercial activity washes in and out of the Pearl District with ease. For our purposes, because it is so undeveloped, we need to think not about precise prescriptions but think about its functionality as a whole in terms of land use planning. We are planning with a blank slate rather than making modifications to an existing environment. There is an opportunity to do something bold. It may not be a place in the city where everyone participates now, but in the future it could become a source of pride for the whole city. Accelerating development of the parks and Greenway are important. The Schnitzer land donation to OHSU and tax exempt status creates a serious funding issue.

Patricia Gardner: South Waterfront represents one of the best opportunities in the city for greenway natural resource restoration; this should be a priority. There are a lot of parks down there and it needs to be looked at from an equity point of view. If there are only a limited number of parks built in the Central City, should they all be in one or two districts? We discussed South Waterfront as a “cul-du-sac”. The area needs to be connected as much as possible. The River is a major opportunity; water taxis came up. Instead of bike share we could have kayak share. South Waterfront has incredible opportunities and is a work in progress. We need to create connections to the west side and across the river. There are a lot of ways to leverage connections with the streetcar coming to the east side. It has unique habitat opportunities and we shouldn't lose those. The architecture should be crazy – it is new, why not be bold? Then you would have a more unique place – more distinctive. Because of the way the land meets the river this is the place that you can teach people about the connection. We are a river city. This is also something London has been doing. There is so much habitat on Ross Island that we need bird friendly building design. This needs to be in our code. Up to one third of the greenway is taken up with concrete for the bikeway, this should be looked at. Most challenging thing is the view corridor inhibiting FAR and height. If we are looking 20 years from now, should we be building so short? The buildings in South Waterfront might seem tall to you, but they're not really so tall. Opportunity to stop sprawl and we should look at it seriously.

Public Comment

Dr. Roger Gertenrich: I am delighted by the conversation today. I feel very comfortable with you and your progress. I am going to present to you a project that I have been working on with a few other seniors. I am advocating for an Outdoor Maritime Display dedicated to Portland ship building past and present. The display would be sited along the Willamette River Greenway generally in the area between the Ross Island Bridge (Zidell corporation site) and the Marquam Bridge. This project meets the Central City goals of connecting the downtown to the historic waterfront and it enhances the Willamette River's vibrancy, access and activities. The project could be in one of the pods of the Greenway, such as under the Ross Island Bridge. [Roger provided written testimony outlining this project in further detail along with the support that he has for the project.]

Carol Gertenrich: I am South Waterfront resident. Being on water is good for the soul and I love living down there. We have a preschool that we are very proud of. The streetcar is a real asset to people living down there. We have young through older people living down there.

Closing Remarks:

Ben Duncan: I really enjoyed this format, energy and vibrancy tonight and enjoyed interacting with other members.

Bob Salinger: How will this process integrate with other processes like canopy plans / overlay plans etc. When do those come into the process? I worry about a disconnect with the other plans and big vision goals.

Karen Williams: If you'd like to chat after the meeting; we could bring you up to speed from the first two meetings.

Katherine Schultz thanked SAC, members of the public and staff for the discussion tonight. She echoed Ben's comments about tonight's format.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.