

## Appendix 2

---

### Summary Notes of Project Meetings



**McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting February 3, 2000**

The first meeting of the McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee was held from 4 to 6 p.m. on February 3, 2000 at the University of Portland. The following people attended:

**Committee Members and Alternates**

Neighboring Landowners and Industrial Users

- |                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| • Triangle Park/Zidell Marine     | Steve Shain   |
| • University of Portland          | Roy Heynderickx/Jim Kuffner   |
| • METRO Open Spaces               | Nancy Chase   |
| • Port of Portland                | Trey Harbert/Brian Campbell   |
| • Residential landowners on bluff | Alex Jones/Alison Montag/Tom<br>Finlayson/Mark Flatner/<br>Wm. Lowe |
| • Edgewater Condo Assn.           | Shirley Schiller  |

Community/Neighborhood Representatives and other Citizen Interests

- |                                      |                                   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| • Friends of North Beach             | Tom Kloster                       |
| • WAKE UP                            | Dave Soloos/Ron Hernandez         |
| • University Park Neighborhood Assn. | Cathy Crawford/Mark<br>Kirchmeier |
| • Cathedral Park Neighborhood Assn.  | Bev Wilson                        |
| • Trails- N. Peninsula/40 Mile Loop  | Pam Arden                         |
| • N. Portland Business Assn.         | Michael Fitz                      |

City of Portland

- |  |               |
|--|---------------|
| • City of Portland Bureaus             | Deborah Stein |
| • Portland Development Comm. Mike Ogan |               |

Facilitator

- |                          |                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| • Hallmark Pacific Group | Elaine Hallmark |
|--------------------------|-----------------|

**Resource People and Observers**

- |                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| • City of Portland Planning Bur. | Steve Kountz, Sallie Edmunds,<br>Lee Rahr |
| • DEQ                            | Bill Dana & Kevin Dana                    |
| • HEWM                           | Marcia Newlands                           |
| • Neighbor                       | Lihua Lennox                              |

It was noted that the property owner, Charlie McCormick has agreed to participate, but was suddenly sent on a business trip to Russia, so could not make this meeting.

### **Introductions and Overview**

Deborah Stein, Interim Director of the Portland Planning Bureau welcomed everyone, thanking them for their willingness to participate in this project. Following introductions by all, Bill Dana, Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality, manager of the superfund cleanup on the site, gave a brief overview of the site and the status of cleanup. He will be at the next meeting to go into more depth and answer more questions. DEQ and EPA completed all the investigative work and issued a Record of Decision on the proposed cleanup 1996, which was revised in 1998. Excavation of contaminated soils to a depth of 4 feet has been completed. There will be a two-foot cap of clean fill over any remaining contamination by the end of 2001. They are now in the planning phase of the groundwater and sediment cleanup. They are trying to prevent both from moving into the river. They will treat what they can, but will primarily work to contain it. Monitoring and extraction wells will likely remain on site for some time.

Steve Kountz, Project Manager for the Planning Bureau, gave a brief overview of the purpose and scope of the Reuse Planning Project, in which this Committee is being asked to participate. This is one of 10 EPA Superfund Redevelopment Initiative Projects, funded to help move to reuse of superfund sites. The Planning Bureau received a grant from EPA to conduct this reuse assessment. The Bureau will prepare a background report, engage the public in this advisory committee process and in other public forums, such as open houses, and will develop a recommendation on future site use configuration.

### **Review of Working Agreements**

The remainder of the meeting was spent discussing a set of working agreements for the Committee. The facilitator had prepared a draft for purposes of discussion. The Committee addressed the number of participants, who they represent, others who might be needed, and the role of various agencies in the process. Several neighbors from the bluff were in attendance as a result of a special letter from the City soliciting a representative from that area. Since this is not an organized neighborhood association, some discussion was held on how the residents should be represented and whether one or two representatives would be appropriate. Those in attendance will talk with each other and choose a spokesperson. It was made clear that anyone is welcome to attend the meetings, but for purposes of discussion and for being sure all the interests are represented in decisions, a designated spokesperson for each group is needed. Several groups have alternates, so that if one is not there the alternate will serve as the spokesperson. Elaine will work with people to firm up the representatives and missing interests.

Various agencies are assessing whether to be participants, having a voice in the consensus decisions, or simply to serve as resources to assist the group with information and technical resources as needed. There was discussion about getting information from other agencies not listed. It was agreed that any information needed will be requested from whatever source is available, and cooperation will be requested from any agency or organization needed to develop or implement a consensus recommendation.

The expected outcomes and decision-making process received much discussion. Deborah Stein clarified that the City has the responsibility to uphold its comprehensive

plan and zoning and is not entering this process with the preconceived idea of a zone change for the property. They do want to look at what would make sense and be realistic and acceptable given the variety of interests and the constraints of the site. Discussion clarified that consensus means a process in which all are interested in addressing everyone's needs to the extent possible so as to get a recommendation that all can live with and support or not block its implementation. A number of people made the point that if no consensus is reached, they would still like their work to count for something, and want to be sure their ideas will be conveyed to decision-makers. The City agreed to clarify its commitments as to the potential outcomes of the process and what they would commit to do with consensus and non-consensus recommendations in the next draft of the working agreements.

Elaine will incorporate the discussed clarifications into a revised draft of the working agreements for the next session. Any other suggested changes should be submitted to her before the next meeting. (She can be reached at 295-7898 (phone), 223-6520 (fax) or e-mail at [ehallmark@mediate.com](mailto:ehallmark@mediate.com).)

### **Next Steps**

Discussion on regular meeting times revealed that no time is good for everyone. The best time appeared to be the first and third Thursdays from 4 to 6 p.m. The next meeting will be held February 17, from 4 to 6 p.m. at the same meeting place - Teske Dining Room in the Commons Building at the University of Portland. (We will try meeting here again and see if the room is large enough for the group as time goes on.)

Steve Kountz distributed a tentative workplan based on meeting the first and third Thursdays of the month from now through June, outlining the expected information and discussion topics for the upcoming meetings.

**McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting February 17, 2000**

The second meeting of the McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee was held from 4 to 6 p.m. on February 17, 2000 at the University of Portland. The following people attended:

**Committee Members and Alternates**

Property Owner (of the site)

- McCormick & Baxter Charlie McCormick

Neighboring Landowners and Industrial Users

- University of Portland Roy Heynderickx
- METRO Open Spaces Nancy Chase
- Residential landowners on bluff Alex Jones/Alison Montag/Greg Babcock /Mark Flatner/Wm.Lowe

Community/Neighborhood Representatives and other Citizen Interests

- Friends of North Beach Tom Kloster
- WAKE UP Ron Hernandez
- University Park Neighborhood Assn. Cathy Crawford
- Cathedral Park Neighborhood Assn. Bev Wilson
- Trails- N. Peninsula/40 Mile Loop Pam Arden
- N. Portland Business Assn. Michael Fitz

City of Portland

- City of Portland Bureaus Deborah Stein
- Portland Development Comm. Mike Ogan

Facilitator

- Hallmark Pacific Group Elaine Hallmark

**Resource People and Observers**

- City of Portland Planning Bur. Steve Kountz, Sallie Edmunds, Lee Rahr
- DEQ Bill Dana
- Bur. of Environmental Services John O'Donovan
- Hahn & Associates Rob Ede, Gary Hahn (environmental consultants)

**Introductions and Overview**

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark welcomed the group and acknowledged the new seating arrangement with place cards at the table for each interest/organization represented. Individual names were not listed, as many groups have alternate representatives who may fill the seat from time to time. Following introductions by all, Elaine informed the group on the status of participants not present, as follows: Steve Shain, Triangle Park/Zidell was hoping to come for a portion of the meeting, but had let us know he had a conflicting meeting this date. The Port of Portland has requested to become a

“resource” to the group and will attend occasionally and when especially needed. They do not believe they need to be a part of the consensus. John Trumbull has agreed to be a representative for the Union Pacific Railroad, but had a conflict this meeting. We did not hear back about the regular representation of the Edgewater Homeowners’ Association. And we have so far been unable to obtain a representative from Willamette Riverkeepers or similar river interest group.

### **Review of Working Agreements**

The Committee reviewed the revised working agreements. The participation section reflected the clarifications given earlier. The residents of the bluff advised that they had not yet selected a representative or decided how to rotate “at the table”, but they would follow up, and will participate as we go along.

Section III on expected outcomes and decision-making process had been revised per the discussion at the previous meeting. Deborah Stein clarified that the City has the responsibility to uphold its comprehensive plan and zoning, and is not entering this process with the preconceived idea of a zone change for the property. They do want to look at what would make sense and be realistic and acceptable given the variety of interests and the constraints of the site. They are obligated to provide a report with some type of recommendation to EPA at the conclusion of this process, pursuant to the grant from EPA. She reviewed the new language in the Working Agreements and clarified the commitments of the City. The City will make a report to EPA. If the Committee reaches a consensus on a reuse recommendation, that recommendation will be the reuse recommendation the City puts forward in the report. If no consensus is reached, a Bureau of Planning recommendation will be included in the report, giving consideration to the differing perspectives of the Committee. If a consensus is reached to recommend a zone change the Planning Director agrees to initiate the process.

Participants all agreed to accept the new language and that of the following sections on procedures and facilitation. Participants present signed the document. Elaine will follow up with those missing to be sure they accept the document and will also sign it.

### **Participant Views and Questions about the Site**

The Committee took time to go around the room and hear the perspectives of each participant on what they are currently thinking they would like to see at the site and concerns or questions about the site. The following key points from the sharing were captured on the flip charts (similar items have been combined):

- ◆ An attractive industrial site
- ◆ Big playfield areas
- ◆ Unique piece of land
- ◆ If it remains industrial, have a viewpoint or interpretive site for education about what is going on

- ◆ Possible greenway around the site
- ◆ Rethink zoning while so much land along the river in this area is vacant
- ◆ Provide for people access to the river
- ◆ Housing is coming in further north along the river; don't rule it out here
- ◆ University of Portland expansion
- ◆ Maximize efficient use of land in the City; if give up industrial land, there is no way to replace it
- ◆ Trail - along the river or a "rails to trails" type of link from Edgewater to link with the 40 mile loop at the Springwater Trail in SE
- ◆ Provide for pedestrian recreation - link River to River for pedestrians
- ◆ Park area - nice to look at from above
- ◆ Concern about the remaining contamination and the amount of time people can spend on the site – working, living, recreating
- ◆ Have a dock - industrial products handled by barge to reduce traffic on the streets
- ◆ Be able to walk through the site
- ◆ Concern about industrial uses: air pollution, noise, cleanliness
- ◆ Consider aesthetics from above
- ◆ Transportation issues – trucks, pollution
- ◆ Open space - integrate neighborhoods with open space – mixed usage–trees, trails, things to help water quality
- ◆ Sports fields are needed, but consider impacts of lighting, traffic
- ◆ Industrial uses may bring new pollutants
- ◆ Noise and visual pollution concerns for University of Portland
- ◆ Traffic access may affect University activities
- ◆ River industrial property may be needed
- ◆ Connect Swan Island and Terminals 4 and 6
- ◆ Limit truck traffic from local streets
- ◆ Health concerns for neighbors
- ◆ Restore habitat for wildlife
- ◆ Aesthetics important for bluff residents – it becomes "our backyard"
- ◆ Change away from heavy industrial
- ◆ Traffic concerns to neighbors
- ◆ Limited useage (time periods) if industrial use
- ◆ Reclaim land as useable; reclaim some riverfront for people
- ◆ Light mixed use, with trails connecting
- ◆ Give back to the environment
- ◆ Pay back debt for the cleanup – requires some business use – i.e., golf park, University of Portland, commercial, attractive light industry; less desirable to go heavy industry with use of trucks

### **Project Workplan/Schedule**

Steve Kountz briefly reviewed the outline for future meetings, identifying the information and technical experts scheduled to come to the Committee. It was suggested that if Committee members had specific questions for any of those coming, they could get them to Steve in advance and he would be sure the technical expert would be prepared to address them. A handout of the schedule and of names and contact numbers for participants and staff were distributed.



### **Site Description, Contamination and Cleanup Constraints on Reuse**

Rob Ede of Hahn and Associates provided a background report on the site and presented an overview of the contamination, the cleanup and the constraints to reuse. Bill Dana from DEQ and John O'Donovan from the Bureau of Environmental Services participated and answered questions. Please refer to the written report for the information presented. The bottom line summarized by Bill Dana was that DEQ sees no use that would be absolutely prevented by the contamination onsite, although there may be increased costs of construction and some placement considerations for construction. No groundwater can be used (with limited exception). If residential uses were desired, the DEQ would have to do a further risk assessment and perhaps additional testing onsite to determine whether the cleanup is protective of human health given the periods of exposure for residential use. Additional cleanup could be required for such a use. There will be limitations on dredging and on excavating once the clean soil caps are in place.

Rob Ede will be available at the next meeting if there are further questions or clarifications needed once people have had a chance to review his report.

### **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held March 2 from 4 to 6 p.m. at the same meeting place - Teske Dining Room in the Commons Building at the University of Portland. The meeting topics will be informational presentations and discussion on:

- Mortgages, contamination liabilities, and other legal constraints
- Zoning and comprehensive plan requirements
- Availability of public services and utilities



The Committee agreed to a meeting schedule change, moving the meeting initially scheduled for April 6 to April 13 to accommodate schedules. It was also agreed to hold the April meetings at the Water Lab, which has a larger meeting space. The next meeting is still March 16 at the same location at the University of Portland. (Elaine will not be present to facilitate.)

### **Restrictions Due to Site Contamination - follow up with Rob Ede and DEQ**

Some time was spent with follow-up questions and discussion in relation to consultant Rob Ede's presentation about the site's conditions regarding contamination and clean-up. Questions focused on what kinds of additional construction requirements would apply to specific types of development on the site. Although construction costs may be increased, depending on the development, most kinds of development should be possible.

### **Contamination Liabilities and Other Legal Constraints**

Charles Landman, Legal Policy Advisor for DEQ presented information on the constraints on reuse of the site posed by the cleanup liability. Although the basic rule is that a purchaser of contaminated property who knows or should have known of the contamination is liable for the cleanup costs, DEQ and EPA have programs for insulating such a purchaser from the costs. The basic tool is a prospective purchaser agreement. Under the DEQ program, the agreement must provide a substantial benefit to the state and must not involve a prior owner or contributor to the pollution. Another tool, such as a consent decree, must be used if such a purchaser is to be protected from liability for contribution to other responsible parties for a share of the clean-up costs they incur. This is more difficult, but may be possible.

On this site, the State's costs are secured by a mortgage that is to cover all actual costs. The current amount is about \$3 million; \$3.5 million additional is estimated for the operation and maintenance needed over the next 30 years. EPA's costs are estimated to be about \$20 million, but they are not secured by a mortgage. Neither of these includes the potential costs from any liability for this property's contribution to the Portland Harbor cleanup, which will be difficult to assess until more is known about the harbor-wide contamination and clean-up project. Before the property can be put into use again, an agreement would need to be negotiated with DEQ to satisfy its mortgage. If the owner pays off the mortgage, the owner may do what it wants with the property. If a developer or a public entity were to "purchase" the property it would need to negotiate an agreement or pay off the mortgage. DEQ has an obligation to recover costs for the state, but it does not always recover all of its costs. DEQ can negotiate, and may waive some of its mortgage for an "important public purpose."

### **Zoning and Comprehensive Plan Requirements**

Steve Kountz gave an overview of the City's zoning requirements and comprehensive plan policies pertinent to reuse of the site. The primary message is that the site is zoned for heavy industrial use, and the comprehensive plan designates the area as industrial sanctuary. Changing that would require reasons that meet specified criteria in the zoning code.

### **Public Services and Utilities**

Steve Kountz also summarized the availability of public services to the site. A summary document was distributed. Some services may be difficult or expensive to provide, but can be made available. Transportation issues were raised. It was noted that discussion of transportation issues is one of the main agenda topics at the next meeting when the City's Office of Transportation will make a presentation.

### **Other Related Projects**

Steve also distributed an informational paper describing some related public and private planning projects, such as the Willamette River Greenway Plan Update, which may affect the site.

### **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held March 16 from 4 to 6 p.m. at the same meeting place - Teske Dining Room in the Commons Building at the University of Portland. The meeting topics will be informational presentations and discussion on:

- Transportation Analysis and needed improvements
- Market feasibility analysis for reuse

The next meeting will be the last of the background information/presentation meetings. Beginning in April, the Committee will discuss the implications of the information it has heard, develop criteria for reuse, and begin looking at possible options for reuse.

**McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting March 16, 2000**

The fourth meeting of the McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee was held from 4 to 6 p.m. on March 16, 2000 at the University of Portland. The following people attended:

**Committee Members and Alternates**

Neighboring Landowners and Industrial Users

- |                                   |                                      |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| • University of Portland          | Roy Heynderickx                      |
| • Residential landowners on bluff | Alison & Alex Jones,<br>Greg Babcock |

Community/Neighborhood Representatives and other Citizen Interests

- |                                     |                  |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| • Friends of North Beach            | Tom Kloster      |
| • WAKE UP                           | Ron Hernandez    |
| • Nancy Chase                       | Metro            |
| • Cathedral Park Neighborhood Assn. | Bev Wilson       |
| • N. Portland Business Assn.        | Michael Fitz     |
| • Shirley Schiller                  | Edgewater Condos |

City of Portland

- |                            |               |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| • City of Portland Bureaus | Deborah Stein |
|----------------------------|---------------|

Facilitator

- |                      |              |
|----------------------|--------------|
| • Bureau of Planning | Barbara Hart |
|----------------------|--------------|

**Resource People and Observers**

- |                                    |                           |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| • City of Portland Planning Bur.   | Steve Kountz and Lee Rahr |
| • Hahn and Associates Inc.         | Rob Ede                   |
| • City of Portland, Transportation | Laurel Wentworth          |
| • E.D. Hovee & Company             | Eric Hovee                |

**Introductions and Overview**

Facilitator Barbara Hart introduced herself and welcomed the group. Following introductions by all, Barbara asked for feedback on the March 2nd meeting summary. Nancy Chase from Metro stated that Joel Morten had attended in her absence on the March 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

**Follow-up Questions:**

A question was asked about who is going to sell the property, Charlie McCormick or DEQ. Steve Kountz stated that he will ask Jan Betz at the City Attorney's Office to clarify the matter. He added that, from what he has heard, the property owner and two lienholders, DEQ and U.S. Bank, would each need to agree to a sale of the property.

Addressing questions from the previous meeting, handouts were distributed with excerpts of an industrial lands inventory of Portland Harbor prepared by the Port of

Portland in 1997 and excerpts from the Portland Zoning Code citing conditional-use approval criteria for the Heavy Industrial zone.

**Transportation Analysis and Improvements (Laurel Wentworth, Portland Office of Transportation)**

Laurel Wentworth summarized the draft Transportation System Existing Conditions Report for the project, which was distributed at the meeting. The Portland Office of Transportation (PDOT) is currently working on a larger approach to transportation planning on the N. Peninsula, including the St. Johns Truck Study. As a condition of future development, PDOT will require that Zidell or the purchaser of the McCormick and Baxter site upgrade the access route to meet City standards. Traditionally, the developer pays for the improvement, but other sources such as a local improvement district or grant assistance may be available.

There are currently two ways to access the site, neither of which meet city engineering standards: the first is to use N. Portsmouth, N. McCosh and Van Houghten; the second is by using N. Edgewater and a driveway along the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way. Four access route options were evaluated. The following cost estimates for needed improvements to those routes were provided:

- Burlington to N. Van Houten via new river route, - \$11 million
- Willamette Blvd. to N. Van Houten via Edgewater (\$7.8 million)
- N. Van Houten to N. Basin Ave. via new river route (2 alternatives – \$67.7 & \$63.9 million)
- N. Van Houten Place/N. McCosh from Railroad to Portsmouth Ave.(\$5.3 million)

A question was asked about other off-site inadequacies in the transportation system. The St. Johns Truck Study is looking at various problem areas and potential improvements in the Peninsula area. Truck access must be allowed to the site, although improvements and route limitations can be required.

**Market Feasibility Analysis (Eric Hovee, E.D. Hovee & Co.)**

Eric Hovee summarized the draft Market Feasibility Overview report for the project, which was distributed at the meeting. A primary opportunity for reuse of this site is to reclaim an environmentally contaminated site for uses that meet both community and market expectations. The greatest challenge may be to identify a use and a redevelopment program that attracts an interest that is financially feasible.

Mr. Hovee presented a demographic and socioeconomic profile of North Portland. Metro forecasts relatively little growth in N. Portland and minimal changes in the income structure. It is a job rich community averaging 2.6 jobs per household. The community is perceived as blue collar. It was noted that the community is not just blue collar. Responding to comments that the lifestyle marketing data on affluent households appears inaccurate, Mr. Hovee explained that the data, purchased from one of a few national data firms that provide that type of information (CACI), may not be completely accurate because it is taken from the 1990 census. He added that out-of-state purchasers and investors generally use this or similar data, and it is valuable to see what information is available to them.

Three use scenarios were suggested as a basis for initial discussion. Scenario A proposes industrial reuse by more than one company or type of industry. Advantages of this scenario would be consistency with zoning and relatively high-paying employment. Disadvantage would be the infrastructure and financial constraints and compatibility issues with residential uses above the bluff.

Scenario B suggests mixed use development with live-work opportunities, including condominiums and townhouses, business park, retail, and possibly an urban resort. Advantages of this scenario would be supporting the region's 2040 goals for increased density and travel reduction and offering the highest land values to pay for infrastructure and property liens. Disadvantages would be the need for rezoning, investment in transportation, and possible land use incompatibility with the adjoining Zidell/Triangle Park site.

Scenario C suggests recreational open space, both active (ballfields) and passive (wildlife viewing) open space. The advantages are the minimal infrastructure costs and the likely desirability of open space along the Willamette River. The disadvantage would be lost opportunity for meeting regional 2040 objectives for employment and population density.

Market prices per acre were discussed for industrial lands in the metro area. Hovee stated as a result of infrastructure needs and the liens on the site, the property most likely has a negative value. Land banking was discussed as an alternative to the above uses. This may allow land prices to increase or demands to increase enough to recover cleanup costs. Interim banking could include recreation or institutional use of the site.

### **Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held April 13<sup>th</sup> from 4-6 p.m. at the BES Water Lab. The meeting topics will be:

- Understand the interests of the participants
- Develop criteria for reuse that would support consensus
- Develop a list of possible use-types to be considered

**McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting April 13, 2000**

The fifth meeting of the McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee was held from 4 to 6 p.m. on April 13, 2000 at the Bureau of Environmental Services' Water Pollution Lab. The following people attended:

**Committee Members and Alternates**

Neighboring Landowners and Industrial Users

- |                                   |                                     |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| • University of Portland          | Roy Heynderickx                     |
| • Triangle Park/Zidell            | Steve Shain                         |
| • Residential landowners on bluff | Alison Montag /Bill Lowe/Alex Jones |
| • METRO Open Spaces               | Nancy Chase                         |
| • Union Pacific Railroad          | John Trumbull                       |
| • Edgewater Condo Assn.           | Shirley Schiller                    |

Community/Neighborhood Representatives and other Citizen Interests

- |                                      |                |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| • Friends of North Beach             | Tom Kloster    |
| • WAKE UP                            | Ron Hernandez  |
| • University Park Neighborhood Assn. | Cathy Crawford |
| • Cathedral Park Neighborhood Assn.  | Bev Wilson     |
| • N. Portland Business Assn.         | Michael Fitz   |
| • Trails/Audubon                     | Pam Arden      |

City of Portland

- |  |               |
|--|---------------|
| • City of Portland Bureaus             | Deborah Stein |
| • Portland Development Comm. Mike Ogan |               |

Facilitator

- |                          |                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| • Hallmark Pacific Group | Elaine Hallmark |
|--------------------------|-----------------|

**Resource People and Observers**

- |                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| • City of Portland Planning Bur.  | Sallie Edmunds, Steve Kountz,<br>Lee Rahr |
| • City of Portland Parks Bur.     | George Lozovoy                            |
| • City of Portland Transportation | Laurel Wentworth                          |

**Introductions and Overview**

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark welcomed the group. Following introductions Bev Wilson commented that the meeting summary did not reflect the discussion at the prior meeting of taking into consideration what is next door to the site. She asked Steve Shain, since he was not present at the last meeting, whether the group was correct in saying there will be a barge facility on the Triangle Park property or should we say there may be a barge facility. Steve said the Triangle Park property will be used for industrial uses, which may include a barge building facility.



**Follow Up Questions Regarding Transportation Issues**

It was noted that both Laurel Wentworth from Portland Department of Transportation and John Trumbull from Union Pacific Railroad were present and willing to address questions remaining from the last meeting regarding various transportation issues. Some discussion followed regarding the burden of the first developer having to put in needed street improvements. Laurel pointed out that there are ways to have other property owners share costs (such as a public improvement district) or to get other funding, but generally the burden is on the developer. Mike Fitz suggested the group might want to recommend an exemption for public open spaces or recommend an urban renewal district. Mike Ogan pointed out that an urban renewal district is possible, but in a small area like this, there would be little benefit to raising funds.

**Open Spaces**

Nancy Chase spoke about using the property as open space. She said METRO would not likely be able to pay to purchase the property because the costs of restoring and maintaining it would be around \$20,000 per acre. New plantings would take 5 years of intensive planting and maintenance. Vegetative restoration would need to take place after the site is cleaned up. Otherwise, the site would be susceptible to takeover by blackberries and other undesirable, invasive plants. If just a trail area were dedicated, costs would be less. If it is just a greenway space around development, the costs would be borne by the developer.

Metro would like to avoid the costs of the street improvements. It might be “land banked” for a time and developed for public use later. METRO is land banking Willamette Cove until the Portland Harbor issues are addressed. It is a natural park for passive recreation. Other concerns about open space are the misuse by transients, motor bikes, etc. without lack of surveillance. Any decision would be a policy decision by the METRO Council. Mike Burton lives in the area and favors open space.

**Active Recreational Uses**

George Lozovoy of Portland Parks and Recreation described the considerations for active recreational uses of the site. There is a River Recreation Master Planning Process underway now. Use of this site would be factored into that process. It could be considered for active and passive uses and for programmed or unprogrammed activities. Questions to consider are whether it is appropriate to have a cultivated open space next to the river, with the maintenance that would require? Or could synthetic surfaces be used, which would allow year-round use and might give more protection to the cap over the contamination. The suggestion of a golf course or driving range was discussed, with some indications that it might be a positive use. A small course might fit, and examples have been successful elsewhere. George is not in charge of golf course development (John Zoller is), but he will get some further information. Ideas about this being an extension soccer field for the Delta Park fields was also thought to be a positive idea. Another idea was to use property for large indoor tennis, basketball or other sports courts, with large warehouse type buildings that would be well accommodated on the site.

George pointed out that programmed activities would likely need parking, but may or may not have to have permanent structures for rest rooms.

### **Discussion of Interests and Criteria for Reuse**

The discussion continued with various suggestions, questions and ideas. Some issues raised were:

The Division of State Lands may have a right to claim against the land for “submerged lands” because it is filled land. They can require a lease. Both Roy Heynderickx and Steve Shain said their organizations had had to deal with this.

The question was raised as to whether anything really needs to happen to this land in the near future? It may be best to just let it sit until the economic conditions become more favorable for its redevelopment. Perhaps a portion of it should be obtained for open space and the rest held for future development, to satisfy the need for open space along the river, demonstrate that the site can be safely used, and as some repayment for the public clean-up effort that has gone into it.

Mike Fitz suggested that it is time to take a Peninsula wide look at the infrastructure needs of the next few years. With the expected expansion of Rivergate, the Port’s likely building on Hayden Island, and the increased truck traffic over the St. John’s Bridge, there is a definite need for an alternative truck route through the peninsula.

Since there is no broker to work on development or marketing of this site, the idea of carving out a portion for public open space or recreational use and letting the rest await such a development got considerable discussion. City ownership of a portion of the site would show the City’s support for the site. Leaving the zoning as IH until or unless there is a specific proposal allows most uses except residential. No one knows if values would ever warrant the transportation related costs. Being reality based and sequencing the site’s reuse based on the market made sense to many. The most important concern reiterated by many, is traffic. Environmental concerns are also high.

Elaine distributed a summary of the interests/criteria from the group’s earlier work. The comments had been “grouped” under 9 general criteria. She asked the group to look at the summary and see if these 9 criteria correctly reflect the group’s thinking, and if met in a reuse proposal, would likely get the support of the group. She requested participants to bring back additions, corrections, etc. to the next meeting. It was noted that it was possible that no land use would indicate an economically viable use of the property at this point in time.

Steve Kountz distributed a map of the site, with some sketches of possible uses to scale at the side. The idea is to give people an idea of what would actually fit on the site. He suggested people take several copies and sketch out some of their ideas for our discussion next week.

**Next Steps**

The next meeting will be held April 20 from 4 to 6 p.m. at the BES Water Pollution Lab. There will be a discussion of the criteria for reuse options and development of some alternative reuse scenarios. The scenarios will then be further researched and presented at the public workshops.

**McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting April 20, 2000**

The sixth meeting of the McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee was held from 4 to 6 p.m. on April 20, 2000 at the Bureau of Environmental Services? Water Pollution Lab. The following people attended:

**Committee Members and Alternates**

Property Owner (of the site)

Neighboring Landowners and Industrial Users

- Residential landowners on bluff Alison Montag /Alex Jones/  
Greg Babcock
- Edgewater Condo Assn. Shirley Schiller

Community/Neighborhood Representatives and other Citizen Interests

- Friends of North Beach Tom Kloster
- WAKE UP Ron Hernandez
- University Park Neighborhood Assn. Cathy Crawford
- Cathedral Park Neighborhood Assn. Bev Wilson
- N. Portland Business Assn. Michael Fitz
- Trails/Audubon Pam Arden

City of Portland

- City of Portland Bureaus Deborah Stein

Facilitator

- Hallmark Pacific Group Elaine Hallmark

**Resource People and Observers**

- City of Portland Planning Bur. Steve Kountz, Lee Rahr
- City of Portland Transportation Laurel Wentworth

**Introductions and Overview**

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark welcomed the group and noted that Roy Heynderickx had gone home ill this afternoon; Steve Shain could not come because of Passover; and Charlie McCormick was still out of the country. Elaine explained that the bulk of the meeting is focused on discussion of possible reuse scenarios for the site, with the goal of developing three scenarios to have further developed and to present to the broader public for further input and feedback. A quick review of the updated summary of the Draft Reuse Criteria was planned, to be sure that everyone's criteria is included in some way, even if all do not agree with all of the criteria.

**Review Draft Reuse Criteria**

Steve Kountz presented an updated draft of reuse criteria that attempts to reflect the various interests that members of the Committee have raised so far in the process. It groups the criteria into 12 categories and provides some description of what is meant by each. The Committee reviewed the list together and made the following suggested changes:

1. In 'Minimize Traffic Impacts' add major Peninsula streets as well as neighborhood streets.
2. Instead of 'Recover Public Clean-up Costs' try to capture the idea of returning value on the public's financial investment in the clean-up. The idea is that the return of value may be in the form of a public benefit and continued use rather than in repayment of the full costs of clean-up. Make it clear the public is not interested in subsidizing a private investment. Some noted that the public may have received the benefit in terms of the protection to people's health and safety from the clean-up.
3. Under minimizing pollution, it was suggested to separate the concept of new uses minimizing air and water pollution or any recontamination from the concept of looking for reuses that are most consistent with protecting the clean-up and the cap and allowing for the monitoring and maintenance that will be required. The latter could be added as a separate criteria.
4. It was urged that the community need/identified market should not preclude the use of the site for future expansion of the University of Portland. The University is a good neighbor (even though its traffic often brings complaints). The neighborhood would like to see it stay and even expand activities into this area.
5. An additional suggested criteria was one that would prefer uses related to the river or taking advantage of the riverfront location.

### **Potential Reuse Scenarios**

The rest of the meeting was spent discussing potential scenarios. Several Committee members posted and described various scenarios which they had developed as ideas:

Cathy Crawford proposed a scenario of using the site for test gardens, which would require no improvements for facilities or services. She suggested they could be either public or private and could demonstrate the ability of various kinds of vegetation to further assist the clean up. They should be experimental or native plants requiring no fertilizer and no irrigation.

Bev Wilson presented three drawings of potential scenarios: 1) Passive & Active Recreation: contained a CSO swale along the railroad tracks, with a berm, then soccer fields. It had a greenway and path along the river, with a floating, self-contained ?Outhouse? for the public. It also suggested a viewing ramp with some interpretive signage to explain the industrial activities in the adjacent area. 2) Industrial Use: included vegetation along the riverbank to promote salmon and well designed, colorful industrial, warehouse-type buildings and a parking structure. Colorful flags with company logos in keeping with flags of ships were part of the decor. 3) A demonstration of water purification, creating drinking water from Willamette River water and raising salmon on the site. It also included a greenway path along the river, vegetation (willows) along the river bank, and an interpretive center in the shape of a salmon.

Tom Kloster presented four scenarios: 1) a nine-hole golf course with a 20 acre natural area with passive recreation, including a public viewing tower overlooking the river; 2) a public park connecting with Willamette Cove with 5 acres of picnic grounds, 4 soccer fields, 4 baseball fields, 15 acres of natural area and small scattered parking areas for cars; 3) a potential University of Portland expansion area with 12 residential buildings

for student housing, 4 educational buildings, 1 fieldhouse, 1 maintenance complex, 5 soccer fields, 3 baseball fields and a 15 acre park along the river front; 4) a "Host Neighborhood" showing a residential use of 120 homes with a 25 acre park with the idea of creating a whole neighborhood, not just some isolated housing units.

Steve Kountz presented four scenarios he had put together for consideration based on comments made at the last meeting: 1) Industrial "land banking" for future use, with a park dedication of a portion of the site; 2) a general industrial and office complex; 3) open space with a mix of passive recreation/open space and active recreation with a possible compatible commercial use such as a restaurant; and, 4) a mixed use showing townhouse/condominiums with supportive retail and service uses.

Mike Fitz proposed that it stay industrial in the "land banking" mode with nothing expected to be developed for a considerable period of time.

After discussion of the various possibilities around these and combinations of these ideas, the Committee agreed to have Steve Kountz ask for further refinement of four possible options to present at the upcoming public meetings, as follows:

**Common recommendations for all scenarios.** The Advisory Committee recommended including a riparian greenbelt along the riverfront and extension of the Willamette Greenway Trail across the site within all four scenarios.

**1. Open Space Demonstration Site.** A mix of open-space uses could be considered, such as: demonstration projects for fish and wildlife habitat restoration on a formerly contaminated riverfront site; "best practices" demonstration projects for riverbank treatment; botanical research on contamination tolerance of plants; bioremediation of lingering soil contamination through plants and trees that clean the soil; related interpretive and science educational facilities; public viewing tower; 2005 celebration facilities on a Lewis and Clark landing site.

**2. Recreation.** Potential recreational uses put forward include a golf learning center, soccer fields, indoor tennis or basketball courts, a canoe and kayak launching site, other programmed recreational activities, a riverfront park, and passive greenspace.

**3. Industrial "no change."** The site may be used consistent with existing "heavy industrial" zoning or land-banked until industrial land values cover property liens and development costs. Construction of a new street at the base of the bluff should be required for truck access. It must provide real viable access to the North and should consider connection with Terminal 4. Consider environmental protections and aesthetic enhancements, such as green roofs and flags. If land-banked, consider dedication of part of the large site for recreation or open space, to demonstrate safe use of the site and repay some of the public clean-up investment.

**4. Mixed-use residential, commercial, and university facilities.** A mixed-use community could be developed with condominium/townhouse residential, university housing, offices, supportive retail and services, university science facilities, and a riverfront park. Resort lodging and a restaurant could be considered on part of the riverfront.

The discussions made clear that the Committee does not have a consensus on these potential reuses, but is interested in having them further refined and in getting further feedback on them from the broader public. The areas of most controversy were the suggested use for residential purposes and for heavy industrial purposes.

**Next Steps**

The next meeting will be May 4 from **6 to 8 p.m.** and will be a joint Committee meeting and public open house. The thought is that the first part of the evening would be used to review the work of the Advisory Committee so far and present the criteria and the four scenarios. The public would be asked for their feedback, and the Committee would listen. Some time would be saved for Committee discussion toward the end. Various approaches may be used, depending on the number of people from the public who attend. The meeting/open house will be held at the BES Water Lab.

There will be an additional open house on Tuesday, May 9<sup>th</sup> to give more members of the public a chance to comment on what has been developed so far.

May 18<sup>th</sup> from 4-6 p.m. will be the Committee's meeting to develop its draft recommendation, which will then be reviewed by the public on May 27 and in a joint meeting with the Committee on June 1. Finalization of the recommendations is expected at the June 15 meeting.

**Summary of Comments Received at Open Houses, May 4 and 9, 2000  
McCormick and Baxter Reuse Assessment Project**

The May 4<sup>th</sup> Open House was held from 6 to 8 p.m. at the Bureau of Environmental Services Water Pollution Lab, Bybee Room, 6543 N. Burlington. The May 9<sup>th</sup> Open House was held from 6 to 8 p.m. at the University of Portland, Buckley Center, Room 103.

The following people attended:

**Committee Members and Alternates**

Property Owner (of the site)

Neighboring Landowners and Industrial Users

- Residential landowners on bluff Alison and Alex Jones,  
Greg Babcock, Tom Finlayson
- University of Portland Dr. Roy Heyndrickx
- Edgewater Condo Association Keith Stangel

Community/Neighborhood Representatives and other Citizen Interests

- Friends of North Beach Tom Kloster
- WAKE UP Ron Hernandez
- University Park Neighborhood Assn. Cathy Crawford
- Cathedral Park Neighborhood Assn. Bev Wilson
- N. Portland Business Assn. Michael Fitz
- Trails/Audubon Pam Arden

Facilitator

- Hallmark Pacific Group Elaine Hallmark

City of Portland

- City of Portland Bureaus Sallie Edmunds
- Portland Development Commission Michael Ogan

**Resource People and Observers**

- City of Portland Planning Bureau Steve Kountz
- City of Portland Transportation Laurel Wentworth
- Residential neighbors Marc and Karen Crowder

**Questions and Comments on Site Opportunities and Constraints**

How would Edgewater Street be upgraded, if required? Laurel Wentworth drew a cross-section of the street constructed to City standards and described improvements for pavement widening, drainage, and a sidewalk on one side.

What will the City do to reduce traffic impacts on Willamette Boulevard residents? Laurel Wentworth explained that the Office of Transportation is currently looking at



traffic calming solutions on Willamette Boulevard, in response to neighborhood concerns.

Is a new riverfront street feasible with trains sharing the street in tight locations? The logic of the connection has merit and anything can be engineered, but the construction cost would be great. There are examples of passenger railroads sharing streets, such as MAX, but fewer freight train examples. Why would Union Pacific or the University of Portland consider such a proposal? The majority of the land around the base of the bluff at the University of Portland would pose problems for road construction.

### **Comments on Draft Reuse Criteria**

Crime and homeless use may become an issue if the site is land-banked or used for park and open space.

### **Questions and Comments on Recommended Reuse Scenarios**

I think the Committee is in agreement on recommending a greenway along the river.

The Committee should look separately at short- and long-term uses. No private use of the site appears feasible now. As a result, the least expensive may be the most viable.

A cruise ship terminal should be considered for the site. Resulting traffic would occur in peak and be minimal most of the time. Cruise ships, however, tend to dock at seawalls in active and attractive areas, like downtown. Recruiting cruise ships to come to Portland has been studied before and the lack of docking facilities has been cited as a constraint.

The University of Portland is concerned about land for expansion, but it is hard to have much excitement about this site because of the liens, access requirements, cleanup liability, DEQ restrictions, and other limitations. Ball fields may be realistic, but dorms and classrooms seem much less so. The University recently completed a ten-year plan. Others commented that the University should consider the site for long-term expansion, noting that the alternative of acquiring developed residential lots would be much more expensive.

Access roads are the Achilles heel of this property, for costs and neighborhood impacts. I don't think residential use is feasible because of past contamination. I think that open space is the way to go.

I still say this is an industrial site, and we should focus on a transportation fix for industrial use. Close Edgewater Street because it is too steep, and construct a new riverfront route between Terminal 4 and Swan Island. The road could be financed with urban renewal money. This area was industrial when people moved in, and the City needs industrial land. I disagree with housing here, not because of health concerns, but because this is industrial land.

Land-banking seems to be the most likely use.

The neighbors I've talked to would support either recreation, open space, or mixed residential. They would rather not have industry there.

Neighbors at Edgewater Condominiums are concerned about potential overuse of Edgewater Street.

**McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting May 18, 2000**

The eighth meeting of the McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee was held from 4 to 6 p.m. on May 18, 2000 at the University of Portland, Franz Hall, Room 214. The following people attended:

**Committee Members and Alternates**

Property Owner (of the site) Charlie McCormick

Neighboring Landowners and Industrial Users

- |                                  |                  |
|----------------------------------|------------------|
| ▪ University of Portland         | Roy Heynderickx  |
| ▪ Triangle Park/Zidell           | Steven Shain     |
| ▪ Residential landowner on bluff | Alex Jones       |
| ▪ Edgewater Condo Assn.          | Shirley Schiller |
| ▪ METRO                          | Nancy Chase      |

Community/Neighborhood Representatives and other Citizen Interests

- |                                     |               |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| ▪ WAKE UP                           | Ron Hernandez |
| ▪ Cathedral Park Neighborhood Assn. | Bev Wilson    |
| ▪ N. Portland Business Assn.        | Michael Fitz  |
| ▪ Trails/Audubon                    | Pam Arden     |

City of Portland

- |                            |               |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| ▪ City of Portland Bureaus | Deborah Stein |
|----------------------------|---------------|

Facilitator

- |                          |                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| ▪ Hallmark Pacific Group | Elaine Hallmark |
|--------------------------|-----------------|

**Resource People and Observers**

- |   |              |
|---|--------------|
| ▪ City of Portland Planning Bureau                              | Steve Kountz |
| ▪ City of Portland Office of Planning and<br>Development Review | Kate Green   |
| ▪ E.D. Hovee & Co.  | Eric Hovee   |

**Introductions and Overview**

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark welcomed the group. Following introductions by all, she reviewed the agenda and explained the handout of draft concepts for committee recommendations. Other meeting handouts included summary notes of the May 4 and 9 open houses, the Background Report for the project, and a market feasibility report prepared by E.D. Hovee & Co. on the proposed reuse scenarios.

**Zoning Questions**

Kate Green of the Office of Planning and Development Review answered questions about the uses allowed on the site under Heavy Industrial zoning and about other zoning requirements. Reviewing the uses in the four reuse scenarios proposed by the committee, she noted that open space, parks, golf courses, and a range of industrial uses and very limited commercial uses would be allowed within the Heavy Industrial

zone. Greenway overlay zoning on the site would require a land use review process for redevelopment of the site. Because the site also has a River Industrial overlay, new uses must be river-dependent or river-related unless the site is found to be unsuitable for such uses in a land use review. The mixed-use residential scenario would not be allowed unless the industrial zoning on the site is changed.

Changing the zoning to General Industrial would allow commercial uses of up to 25,000 square feet, but would not allow residential uses. Changing to the General Employment zoning would allow commercial up to 60,000 square feet. Housing could be allowed as a conditional use in this zone, with appropriate buffers. All zoning requires addressing the transportation and infrastructure needs of the particular use proposed.

### **Review Draft Concepts for Recommendation and Discuss Recommendations**

Elaine Hallmark reviewed the first sections of the handout on draft concepts for recommendation. Referring to the list of recommended uses in the handout, Steven Shain recommended striking the word 'some' before development and striking the recommendation for a cruise ship facility because of traffic impacts.

Bev Wilson suggested that the committee task should be to recommend the next use on the site, rather than a use in the long-range future. Eric Hovee, referring to his market feasibility report on the proposed reuse scenarios, noted that only the mixed-use residential scenario would provide adequate economic return in the short run to cover property liens and infrastructure costs. Steven Shain suggested adding to the recommendation that the City of Portland should help resolve the reuse obstacles on the site. He also suggested that the committee consider support for DEQ writing down its lien based on recommended uses.

Charlie McCormick stated that the McCormick & Baxter Company would like to repay the debts on the property and would favor maximizing land value to do that. Although we probably cannot repay the debts immediately, he said, we would like to do so over time and retain the title. He added that he expects the property value to appreciate over time, and at some point development could generate enough revenue to pay back the debts. Asked whether use of some of the land for recreation or open space would meet the company's mission, Charlie McCormick said that he does not know, but rent for temporary use may be able to pay interest on the debts.

Roy Heynderickx stated that he is in full agreement with the review criteria and would support industrial use that meets those criteria. Ron Hernandez suggested that the land could be in public use for perhaps ten years, like a working land-bank situation, and then reevaluated. Eric Hovee added that U.S. Bank might consider discounting their lien to meet Community Reinvestment Act requirements or as a public relations effort. Pam Arden stated that she is concerned about the idea of recommending that the public repay a private debt. Many agreed that an interim use would allow the Portland Harbor liability to be addressed, as well as work on resolving the infrastructure and lien obstacles to a permanent use.

Charlie McCormick said that a lease may be able to be structured in a way that is acceptable. Asked whether the company or DEQ is in the driver's seat for sale or use of

the land, he said that it could be argued either way, adding that DEQ staff have said that they would like to see a successful use of the site.

**Next Steps**

The committee discussed and decided to cancel the June 1 meeting, because many members could not attend. To make up for this cancellation, another committee meeting was scheduled for Thursday, June 29, 4-6 p.m. Thus, the last two committee meetings will be held on June 15 and 29, 4-6 p.m., at the Water Lab. Finalization of the committee recommendations is expected at the June 29 meeting. Pam Arden suggested that materials should be mailed to committee members a week before the meetings, because of problems accessing email documents and the lack of time to read materials. Steve Kountz announced that the Planning Commission will hold a briefing session on this project on May 23, 9 p.m., at 1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The upcoming open houses will be held on May 27, 10 a.m. to noon, and June 1, 6 to 8 p.m.—both at BES Water Lab.

**Summary of Public Comments Received, May 19 - June 8, 2000  
McCormick and Baxter Reuse Assessment Project**

**Lombard Street Fair**

Steve Kountz, Portland Bureau of Planning, staffed a table at the Lombard Street Fair held on May 21, noon to 4 p.m. Newsletters and other project materials were distributed, and the reuse scenarios proposed by the Advisory Committee were explained. Tom Guinan (8528 N. Tioga) commented that he would rather not see the site put back into industrial use and recommended consideration of residential zoning. Susan Landauer (7706 N. Hodge) commented that she would favor the mixed-use residential scenario.

**Public Open Houses**

Open houses on the project were held on May 27, 10 a.m. to noon, and June 1, 6 to 8 p.m. Both were held at the Bureau of Environmental Services Water Pollution Lab, Bybee Room, 6543 N. Burlington. The open houses were announced in a project newsletter and an Oregonian article (May 15, 2000: D3). Steve Kountz staffed each open house.

No one attended the May 27 open house. On June 1, one person attended, Ray Piltz (7209 N. Buchanan), the Land Use Chair of the St. Johns Neighborhood Association. He commented that he would favor construction of a truck route through the site, connecting Port of Portland Terminal 4 and Swan Island Industrial Park, in order to alleviate neighborhood impacts from the projected growth of truck traffic in North Portland. He added that industrial reuse make the most sense to him, but that residential use would also be acceptable.

**Other Contacts**

Gerry Gast, Associate Professor of Architecture at the University of Oregon, contacted Steve Kountz and offered to lend display materials from a recently completed student project by Santos Goicoechea for his masters degree. The project proposes designs for habitat restoration and an interpretive center on the nearby Lampros Steel site (directly north of Willamette Cove).

**McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting June 15, 2000**

The ninth meeting of the McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee was held from 4 to 6 p.m. on June 15, 2000 at the Bureau of Environmental Services Water Pollution Control Lab, Bybee Room, 6543 N. Burlington. The following people attended:

**Committee Members and Alternates**

Neighboring Landowners and Industrial Users

- |                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| ▪ University of Portland         | Roy Heynderickx                   |
| ▪ Triangle Park/Zidell           | Steven Shain                      |
| ▪ Residential landowner on bluff | Alex Jones<br>(at end of meeting) |
| ▪ Edgewater Condo Assn.          | Shirley Schiller                  |
| ▪ METRO                          | Nancy Chase                       |

Community/Neighborhood Representatives and other Citizen Interests

- |                                      |                |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| ▪ Cathedral Park Neighborhood Assn.  | Bev Wilson     |
| ▪ University Park Neighborhood Assn. | Cathy Crawford |
| ▪ N. Portland Business Assn.         | Michael Fitz   |
| ▪ Friends of North Beach             | Tom Kloster    |

City of Portland

- |                                   |               |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| ▪ City of Portland Bureaus        | Deborah Stein |
| ▪ Portland Development Commission | Michael Ogan  |

Facilitator

- |                          |                 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| ▪ Hallmark Pacific Group | Elaine Hallmark |
|--------------------------|-----------------|

**Resource People and Observers**

- |   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| ▪ City of Portland Planning Bureau          | Steve Kountz     |
| ▪ City of Portland Office of Transportation | Laurel Wentworth |
| ▪ Edgewater Condo Owner/resident            | Vi Finney        |

**Introductions and Overview**

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark welcomed the group and introduced the agenda. She noted that Charlie McCormick was called out of the country and could not attend this meeting. No changes were suggested to the summary notes of the May 18 committee meeting. Meeting handouts included the agenda, summary notes of the May 18 committee meeting, an amended draft (June 8) of concepts for recommendation, summary notes of public comments received, minutes of the May 23 Planning Commission meeting, transportation analysis of scenarios by Robert Bernstein, Metro's policy on right-of-way dedication, and summary notes of a June 6 meeting with Charlie McCormick.

### **Recommendations the group will support**

Members were referred to the draft concepts for recommendations that was partially reviewed at the prior meeting. Elaine pointed out that the portion that had not been discussed was that on the more specific 'short-term' uses to be recommended. She suggested that we go around the room with each person stating what s/he would like to see included in short term recommendations that s/he believes to be supported by a consensus of the Advisory Committee.

Steve Kountz pointed out the draft notes of a meeting held with Charlie McCormick on June 6. He reviewed the recommendations made by Charlie McCormick to consider a temporary lease for recreational use of the site with terms that would not give a benefit to McCormick & Baxter, as well as a follow up assessment to explore and facilitate such a lease.

Laurel Wentworth said that a low-key, casual open space use with minimal improvements would probably not trigger requirements to upgrade access streets, but other uses would. She said there is no specific trip threshold for requiring street improvements.

Bev Wilson recommended consideration of community gardens at the site, noting that they are in demand across the city. She emphasized a concern expressed in earlier meetings that the site should look more attractive than it does now, and she suggested that it should at least be reseeded.

Deborah Stein said that she liked the open space recommendations for restoration, a community garden, or an educational or interpretive center. Such use could be managed, she suggested, by a non-profit or a school or university.

Cathy Crawford objected to the interim lease idea, stating that the public shouldn't put further subsidy into a temporary use on a private site. She recommended that the site could be used for planting by a commercial nursery, with no sales on site.

Shirley Schiller said that she likes the natural area concept with a path along the river, adding that there should be a responsible caretaker for the site. She noted this could be a private volunteer caretaker.

Mike Fitz noted an obstacle to the gardening proposal: that plants grown on the site couldn't be used for human consumption because of heavy metals in the soil. On one hand, Mr. Fitz favors going along with the owner's intent to pay off the debt and supporting variances to excessive city infrastructure requirements, in order to make the use economically viable. On the other hand, he thinks that a future use should not be allowed to access Willamette Blvd. and another access route should be required, to prevent traffic impacts on the neighborhood. He warned against potential nuisance impacts from open space, such as a nude beach. He would go along with an interim public or low impact use, and added the suggestion of Oregon State University Forestry projects.



Nancy Chase said that too much energy in this process has been put on what's economically feasible and the owner's views. No public agency or private developer, she said, wants to invest in the site with substantial Portland Harbor liability being unknown. She favors a guaranteed buffer in perpetuity along the riverfront and trail easement, because of the substantial public investment in this site, with the owner maintaining the rest of the property. She said that it is highly unlikely that a road would be approved through the Metro site. She thinks the group should make a long-term recommendation based on transportation capacity. Without a strong recommendation, the property will stay in limbo.

Tom Kloster agreed with Nancy Chase. He said that the project has been too hemmed in by the owner's constraints. The public outreach in the process has been disappointing. He thinks that the neighborhood wants something to happen on this site. He pointed out prior residential development proposals on this and the adjacent site, urging that this project should look beyond the committee members' ideas. He suggested that the North Beach survey result should be added as an appendix to the recommendation. A landbanking recommendation, he thinks, is a copout, based on getting the owner an eventual profit. The project really should look at both this site and the Triangle Park site and recommend the best use for this area. He pointed out a German proposal to hold festivals on distressed sites, in order to raise funds for improvements and draw attention to the sites. Once the improvements are in and paid for by the events, the property is sold or put to the best permanent use the owner determines. Such sites are usually in public ownership.

Roy Heynderickx felt strongly that there would be no way to have an interim use with McCormick and Baxter retaining ownership and ultimately benefitting from the property's appreciation. He suggested looking at a conservation group or non-profit entity such as the Public Land Trust to take the land in the interim. He also thought it made sense to have the land in managed open space until such time as another use becomes feasible. He urged that the Committee's strongest recommendation be the set of criteria for any development of the site whether it be short term or long term.

Steve Shain commented that having a public process to plan for a single private owner's site is a little presumptuous. He said there should be public ownership of the site because of the public investment. He suggested a recommendation to move forward with getting the property into public ownership, and working with the City to solve the transportation and other obstacles to more intensive uses. He noted that the claim to rents from the Division of State Lands for the submersible portion of the site is another obstacle to development. He objected that investing in an interim use on a distressed site like this would be sending good money after bad. He said that there are major differences between this and the Triangle Park site, pointing out that the nearly completed risk assessment on the Triangle Park site has found minimal contamination risks. He added that Triangle Park is not asking for a comprehensive plan change on its site or to be part of a public process.

Mike Ogan said that PDC does not have a position on the future use of the site. He expressed concern that the city has many underutilized industrial sites, and a mechanism for interim non-industrial use of this site could create public expectations for such interim uses on other industrial lands. He suggested that, if land on this site

is taken out of the city's industrial land supply, that loss of land for growth of the city's employment base should be made up in other locations.

### **Next Steps**

Discussion among the Committee members seemed to point to eliminating the distinction between short term and long term uses, recognizing the fact that all uses are subject to change over time. Since there is only one meeting remaining to finalize the recommendations from the group, it was suggested that Elaine and Steve Kountz work on a draft recommendation to circulate before the meeting. The draft should include much of what had been previously reviewed in the "Concepts for Recommendations." Because private ownership is not likely to get the property into any active use, the draft should also include the recommendation to move the property into public ownership as soon as possible (recognizing negotiations will need to happen between the owner and the public entity—likely Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality--EPA and others). The recommended immediate use would be for some sort of managed open space while the public entity works to overcome the barriers to a more intensive use. These ideas will be reviewed with the full membership of the Committee and finalized or changed at the last meeting. Additionally members requested that the individual "designs" and ideas for use of the site be included in the appendix to the report.

The next and last Advisory Committee meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 11, 4-6 p.m., at the BES Water Lab, Bybee Room. The committee decided to cancel the meeting that had been scheduled for June 29, because most members would not be able to attend, and to meet instead on July 11. Steve will get materials out early so Committee members can review them in advance and come prepared to finalize them at the meeting. Bev Wilson agreed to help call Committee members to update them and urge them to attend the final meeting.

**Draft Meeting Summary  
Landscaping and Habitat Considerations on McCormick and Baxter Site  
July 6, 2000**

Participants in the meeting were Jeremy Buck and Jennifer Thompson of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bill Dana of the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, and Barb Grover and Steve Kountz of Portland Bureau of Planning. The meeting was held from 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the USFW, 2600 SE 98<sup>th</sup>.

Bill summarized DEQ's cleanup remedies on the site. He said that the EPA's Record of Decision allows flexibility in the design of the soil cap to vary the landscaping and, to some extent, the topography, if the site is going to be used as open space. He said that DEQ will soon be proposing a sediment cap design for review and comments by USFW and other agencies.

Steve explained the Planning Bureau's reuse assessment project for the site. He asked for comments and recommendations about landscaping on the site, the potential for habitat restoration, and contamination issues related to landscaping and habitat.

Jeremy cautioned that restoration along the shallow-water embayment area should be designed for stabilization, not to attract salmonids or birds, until more is known about the contamination risks there through monitoring. The primary risk of contamination harming wildlife, he expects, would be through direct exposure. He thinks that the upland portion of the site would be suitable for restoration, because of the cleanup work being done to prevent exposure.

Jeremy recommended that managing stormwater and any surface water to prevent erosion into contaminated areas should be an integral part of a restoration plan. Jennifer stated that any wetlands and streams restored or created on the site for fish and wildlife habitat should not be used for stormwater management. It would be best to create separate water features if needed for stormwater treatment so that the natural features are not impacted by poor water quality or flashy runoff conditions. She referred to BES wetland projects near Columbia Slough, some as shallow as six inches deep, that are providing effective habitat. She recommended considering restoration, if practical, of the historical water features, variations in topography, and vegetation.

Planting of native cottonwoods, willows, oaks, and conifers was discussed. Jeremy noted that trees planted now could take 20-30 years to become significant heron habitat, by which time contamination-related risks will presumably have subsided. Jennifer also suggested considering the planting regimen of grasses and wildflowers in the Oaks Bottom area, which has similarities to this site. If the end use of the site will be park or greenspace, Jennifer and Jeremy recommended incorporating a landscaping and restoration plan into the design of the soil and sediment caps.

Jeremy offered to prepare brief written recommendations on the site's potential for long-term habitat use and general landscaping recommendations to consider in the design of the soil and sediment caps.

**McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee  
Summary of Meeting July 11, 2000**

The tenth and last meeting of the McCormick and Baxter Site Reuse Advisory Committee was held from 4 to 6 p.m. on July 11, 2000 at the Bureau of Environmental Services Water Pollution Control Lab, Bybee Room, 6543 N. Burlington. The following people attended:

**Committee Members and Alternates**

**Property Owner**

- McCormick & Baxter Creosoting Co.                      Charlie McCormick

Neighboring Landowners and Industrial Users

- University of Portland    Roy Heynderickx
- Triangle Park/Zidell    Steven Shain
- Residential landowner on bluff                                   Tom Finlayson
- Edgewater Condo Assn.    Shirley Schiller
- METRO    Nancy Chase

Community/Neighborhood Representatives and other Citizen Interests

- Cathedral Park Neighborhood Assn.                            Bev Wilson
- University Park Neighborhood Assn.                           Cathy Crawford
- N. Portland Business Assn.                                        Michael Fitz
- 40 Mile Loop, Portland Audubon                                Pam Arden
- WAKE UP    Ron Hernandez

City of Portland

- City of Portland Bureaus    Deborah Stein
- Portland Development Commission                                Michael Ogan

Facilitator

- Hallmark Pacific Group    Elaine Hallmark

**Resource People and Observers**

- City of Portland Planning Bureau                                Steve Kountz
- Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality                            Charlie Landman
- Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality                            Bill Dana
- Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality                            Kevin Dana

**Introductions and Overview**

Facilitator Elaine Hallmark welcomed the group. Following introductions by all, Elaine reviewed the agenda and the draft document of committee recommendations. No changes were suggested to the summary notes of the June 15 committee meeting. Steve Kountz reviewed the proposed outline of the final report, and he pointed out the review draft of chapters 3 and 4 among the handouts. Other meeting handouts included the agenda, summary notes of the last committee meeting, an amended review draft of final

committee recommendations, and summary notes of a July 6 meeting with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service staff on landscaping and habitat considerations.

### **Final Consensus Recommendations**

Referring to the review draft of committee recommendations, Elaine asked that the discussion be focused on the 'Recommendation' section (page 2), beginning with the first paragraph. Suggestions were made to replace the term "productive use," which may be too limiting, to beneficial or positive use. Clarification was requested on when the "completion of the cleanup" will actually occur, and Bill Dana explained that the completion of the soil and sediment caps is expected within two years.

Several concerns were expressed about the second paragraph. Acquisition by a non-profit land trust was suggested as an acceptable alternative to public acquisition. Charlie Landman suggested striking the reference to DEQ, noting that it is not DEQ's role to be a long-term landowner or to act as a land use authority. He added, however, that DEQ would consider the Committee recommendations in their negotiations on the property.

Concerns were expressed about expecting the property owner to give up ownership. Charlie McCormick questioned whether taking steps to transfer title on the property is within the scope of the Committee's work, and he suggested instead that the Committee focus on consideration of an appropriate interim use. Suggestions were made to (1) move the second paragraph to the end and (2) replace the term 'commencement of negotiations' (to move the property into public ownership) with a more moderate recommendation, such as to explore, investigate, or consider this action. One of the reasons cited for moving the property into public ownership is that the public has already invested millions in the site, and it would probably already be in public ownership if not for the site's liabilities. Another reason cited is the awkwardness of making a land-use recommendation on a single private property. Other members expressed concern that a Committee recommendation that does not include the property owner would be of little practical value.

A new recommendation was suggested to include the site in the Interstate Urban Renewal District. Doing so could allow for public acquisition, design and use restrictions in development agreements, and assistance with infrastructure financing. Steve Kountz noted that, because the process to establish the Interstate Renewal District is so far along, inclusion in another district may be more feasible.

Elaine suggested moving on to the third and fourth paragraphs and then coming back to the second paragraph. An objection was made that the third paragraph implies a recommendation for intensive use of the site. Instead, it was suggested, the recommendation should not rule out open space as an acceptable long-term use. If the second paragraph is revised, the term "public entity" in the third paragraph should be replaced accordingly. Regarding the recommendation to address safety concerns, clarification was suggested that this should not mean fencing the site. It was suggested instead that active use of the trail as a public space should be encouraged, to provide informal surveillance of the site.

In the fourth paragraph, consideration for rezoning from heavy to light industrial use was discussed. Steve pointed out the finding in the traffic report that light industry tends to generate far more traffic than heavy industry. He added that an earlier draft listed light industry as an acceptable use, which was revised to “industry with minimal truck traffic, nuisances, pollution, and aesthetic impacts.” Committee members suggested a strong recommendation that future uses should be in keeping with the reuse criteria. Charlie Landman noted that, if a steel mill was proposed on the site, he sees nothing in the current draft recommending that it should not be allowed. Deborah Stein noted that city zoning regulations are designed to apply to multiple properties, and she suggested exploring the use of private deed restrictions as a more practical option for establishing specific limitations on a single property.

The discussion focused again on the recommendation in the second paragraph on moving the property into public ownership. Charlie McCormick noted that public ownership would not necessarily result in beneficial use, adding that PDC and the Port of Portland have approached him in the past about specific heavy industrial proposals that the Committee would find unacceptable.

Incorporating various ideas that had been discussed, Elaine suggested replacing the second paragraph with a final paragraph recommending to “explore” certain actions: restricting the use of the property to meet the reuse criteria; public or non-profit ownership; and inclusion in an urban renewal district. These ideas continued to be discussed but were not opposed.

### **Wrap Up**

The Committee members agreed by consensus to the recommendations as drafted, subject to the changes discussed. It was also agreed that the final wording of the changes will be worked out through mailings and/or phone calls to each Committee member. Elaine asked the Committee members whether or not they would like to sign the final recommendations and incorporate the signature page in the final report, and it was agreed to do so.

Elaine congratulated and thanked the Committee for their hard work and a successful outcome to the project.



differing views of the Committee. The Committee had met ten times and had not been able to reach a final consensus on the overall recommendation, largely revolving around long term versus short term commitment to open space or recreational uses of all or part of the property.

### **Recap of Progress Since Last Meeting**

Steve Kountz reviewed the progress and discussions that had occurred since the group last met as a whole in June 2000, with a small group follow up meeting in the summer. He had sent an update in November 2000, reporting that discussions were ongoing between METRO and the property owner regarding some type of long term dedication of the property to open space or recreational uses. Since no agreement on the issue of whether to recommend a permanent dedication to those uses appeared to be emerging, the City then developed its recommendation. The City wanted the Committee to review the draft recommendation and give further input before it is submitted. Of course, if a consensus could be reached, the recommendation could still be changed to reflect the consensus.

Steve reported that since the group's last meetings, the City's Parks 2020 Plan has come out. It lists the McCormick & Baxter site as a desired park location and cites the need for more parks in the North Portland area. Steve has met with Parks and confirmed that they are still interested in full ownership of the property for development as a park. Parks and DEQ staff have reviewed Charlie McCormick's proposal for a long-term lease with various options for the longer term, and commented that they did not think it would be feasible. The City has learned that getting the property through condemnation, hopefully a 'friendly condemnation' to which the property owner would agree (rather than just a negotiated agreement), would protect the City from future liability for the Portland Harbor clean up or any other preexisting pollution originating at this site. The City would hope to work with DEQ and EPA to forgive the debt in exchange for public use of the property, and to work with the McCormick & Baxter Co. to acknowledge their repayment by their agreement to public ownership and dedication of the land to benefit the people of the City. The City might consider reserving a part of the property for future development, as some had suggested, compatible with the criteria developed by this Committee.

Steve Kountz reported that Steve Shain, who had a conflict and could not attend the meeting, had asked him to report that Triangle Park/Zidell supported the concept of public ownership of the property, but would like them to acknowledge that access should be by way of Van Houten Place.

### **Review of draft City Recommendation**

Steve Kountz then reviewed briefly the City's draft recommendations, which had been distributed in advance. The five parts of the recommendation are summarized as:

1. Use all or most of the site for park and active recreation; rehabilitate and use riverfront as greenway, river access and trail. Consider small portion of site for redevelopment.



2. Transfer ownership of site to City or Metro for public purposes, considering use of eminent domain for acquisition to protect from liability for hazardous substances.
3. Consider the use of the site as park and greenway as mitigation for environmental damages under the Portland Harbor Superfund project, and as reimbursement for DEQ and EPA clean up costs on the site.
4. Design recommendations for final soil cap, bank and landscaping in completion of the clean up.
5. Manage the site to provide for security, safety, landscaping and general maintenance, encouraging public use, as opposed to fencing the site for security.

Steve noted that a site visit is set up to begin to address # 4, design recommendations.

### **Comments and Discussion**

Questions arose about the status of the clean up and whether any of this could happen before the Harbor cleanup is complete. Kevin Parrett, the new Project Manager for DEQ, gave an update on the clean up status. Three remedies need to be completed:

1. Barrier wall between the site and the River is in preliminary design and moving to final design. It is expected to be completed by Fall.
2. Sediment capping under water can only be done during certain 'windows of opportunity' when it will not harm the salmon migrations. There is a window in December, which they are hoping to make, but if not, it cannot be done until next Summer.
3. Upland soil cap will be done as soon as the design is completed. This is where the future use planning is important. If the land use requires certain bank design elements, that could be factored into the remedy.

He noted that there will be some kind of ground water treatment system on the site. Security will be an issue for that as well as for the clean cap, which needs to be protected from future contamination. Questions came up about the limits to exposure and potential residential use. Kevin will verify, but he believes the current remedy will protect against all exposures as long as the cap is maintained.

Charlie McCormick supported the best use as sports fields, not just open space. He noted problems with safety related to Willamette Cove. He does not see why 1/3 of the site should be carved out for development. He would urge moving the development of the park into sports fields ahead of the 10 - 12 years Bureau of Parks anticipates, and do it as quickly as possible. He noted they had always used Edgewater Street for access and said it is simpler than entering through Van Houten. He still recommends the long term no-cost lease approach, which could give some possibility of re-paying the clean up costs, although deferred for now, and would give the City a chance to see if the recreational use was important enough to keep it permanently.

Each person then gave their comments, going around the room. The comments are summarized and combined here as follows.

- Generally supportive of the recreational uses and natural areas, including

trails

- Supportive of getting the property into use as quickly as possible
- Security concerns are important. Avoid more problems by having more active use, people coming through it regularly.
- Concerns about traffic for the sports fields, night activities, lighting, etc. Will require careful design and planning. Some kind of mitigation may be required for light pollution, noise, traffic. The Astronomers' Club would help regarding lighting. See Greg Babock.
- Concerns about "taking" the property against the owner's wishes. Urge working out an appropriate agreement with owner. Respect property owner's rights. Possibly give him the right to buy it back in future, paying for improvements, etc. Lease plan might allow for future needs of University, which neighbors see as growing. Problem is that once developed as parks, no one would let it get converted.
- Problem is the infrastructure required: road improvement and sewers and other amenities.
- Neighbors find it an exciting plan. Increased density in the area means more need for parks and access to river. No need to go into water - like beaches. See it like Willamette Park, above the water.
- Sports enthusiasts see need for as many ball fields as possible. Recommend against saving a portion of the property for redevelopment. Much pressure for more space for soccer in particular. Some would see the 20 year lease idea as feasible (some say 30, 50 or 100 years); others would want permanent dedication to support investment in development of sports fields. Sports fields are a benefit to the surrounding business community. Fields can operate without lights. 1995 bond issue to build soccer fields?could not find land available.
- Include in recommendation to work in partnership with Willamette Cove. Continue the trails/paths and tie in adjacent properties. Provide amenities for pedestrians, bikers and joggers.
- Tie Cathedral Park to Swan Island with walkways and eventually to East ~~Shore~~ Bank Promenade. Consider use of the barrier wall as a raised walkway.
- Some neighbors concerned about use of Van Houten, some with use of Edgewater, for access. University would not support a soccer fields complex if all access was through Van Houten.
- Concerns regarding maintenance, garbage problems, etc.

- Would have to be funded by City Council even to maintain the property while Parks looking for the money to develop it. Wonderful opportunity for the City. Many ideas about public/private partnerships and volunteers to do maintenance and even to get the fields developed. Consider grant funds for Lewis and Clark heritage site.
- Look at tax increment financing to benefit park development. Should not have to develop part of property to pay for the park. Others say Parks should pay system development charges.

### **Next Steps**

Steve Kountz and Deborah Stein reported that they will be meeting with Parks to discuss this further, and will meet with PDOT (transportation) to explore further the street costs and what could be done in the interim. They will also work with DEQ about recommendations for the design of the final site soil cap and landscaping.

They acknowledged that it was clear at this meeting that although there is much support for some of the concepts, there is no clear consensus on exactly how to move it forward. Therefore, the City will move forward to develop a final report and recommendations. The report will be distributed to all members of the Committee, and will be submitted to City Council.

Deborah and Steve thanked everyone for all their hard work and their continued interest, and agreed to keep them informed as things move along.

