

OVERLAND PARK URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: July 27, 2005

Location: Sunnybrook Service Center, 9101 SE Sunnybrook Blvd., Clackamas, OR

Meeting Attendees (“√” if present) & Distribution:

- √ Barbara Cartmill, Clackamas County Development Agency
- √ Gary Cook, Clackamas County Development Agency
 - Jillian Detweiler, TriMet
 - Betty Dominguez, Oregon Housing & Community Services
 - Elaine Drakulich, North Clackamas School District #12
- √ John Gessner, Milwaukie Planning Department
- √ Kyle Gorman, Fire District #1
- √ Andrea Hall, Clackamas County Community Environment
- √ Michael Harrison, Parametrix
- √ Michelle Healy, North Clackamas Parks
- √ Charles Kupper, Spencer & Kupper
 - Ted Kyle, Clackamas County Water Environmental Services
 - Dave Paul, Assistant District Attorney
- √ Kevin Poppen, Clackamas County Sheriff's Office
 - Chuck Robbins, Clackamas County Community Development

Prepared By: Michael Harrison

Issue Date: August 12, 2005

Meeting Purpose:

Explain Clackamas County's interest in creating an urban renewal area in Overland Park, provide a briefing on urban renewal, review the outcome of stakeholder interviews, discuss project vision & guiding principles, and review proposed project boundaries.

Meeting Summary:

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting focused mostly on technical questions related to urban renewal, including how the district would impact the revenue of other taxing jurisdictions. Though unable to attend the TAC meeting, one member did suggest minor changes to the Vision & Guiding Principles. TAC members generally supported the project boundary as proposed. Discussions on the general merits of urban renewal and possible urban renewal projects were limited.

Discussion Points & Outcomes:

1) The TAC expressed a desire to share information with the Urban Renewal Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (URPCAC). *Outcome: TAC and URPCAC members may attend each other's meetings, and the meeting notes of each committee will be distributed to both committees.*

2) Committee members discussed the growing crime problems between 82nd Avenue and I-205 at Monterey. *Outcome: Barbara mentioned that any successful anti-crime programs/ strategies that are developed for Overland Park could be exported to other urban renewal districts if funding is available in the other urban renewal area plans.*

3) There was a discussion of the funding impacts Overland Park urban renewal would have on other taxing jurisdictions, including the Clackamas County Sheriff's Department. There was a question as to whether urban renewal funded programs could be as successful at reducing crime in Overland Park as existing Sheriff's Office programs. There was a mention that current programs in Overland Park, including the programs of the Clackamas County Sheriff, though helpful, were not completely solving the crime problem. *Outcome: Charles will provide information to the TAC and URPCAC showing how much money is expected to be diverted from the Clackamas County Sheriff's Office for urban renewal projects.*

4) There was a question as to whether 82nd Avenue should be included within the urban renewal area, as it may not be as distressed as some areas of Overland Park. *Outcome: The TAC was asked to continue to think about the project boundary, as more discussion on this topic will occur at the next TAC / URPCAC meetings. Charles also mentioned that we are able to calculate the revenue impacts if we were to remove specific areas from the proposed project boundary.*

5) Members wondered whether there was a connection between urban renewal and annexation. *Outcome: The committee was informed that nothing in the urban renewal process triggers or prevents annexation. Furthermore, as the proposed Overland Park Urban Renewal Area is expected to provide only modest improvements, as opposed to major neighborhood changes, it is unlikely that annexation will be influenced by an urban renewal decision. John offered to provide the committee a report on the historical issues associated with annexation in North Clackamas County.*

6) The committee discussed whether the creation of an urban renewal district would increase the rates of existing bonds used to pay for public facilities. *Outcome: Charles said it could potentially raise bond rates, however, only by "pennies, if it is even calculable", because bond rates are spread across the entire county.*

7) Members wondered whether property values would increase if an urban renewal district is created and, therefore, if urban renewal would drive low-income Overland Park residents from the neighborhood. *Outcome: Members were told that the Clackamas County Commission has made it clear that the projects funded by the urban renewal area are not intended to gentrify the Overland Park neighborhood, but to assist in maintaining community character.*

8) The committee discussed types of information that could be useful in further conversations. *Outcome: Kevin agreed to bring neighborhood crime statistics to the next TAC meeting. Kyle agreed to bring a map pinpointing needed fire safety improvements, such as fire hydrant locations. Michelle will bring information showing park deficiencies in the neighborhood. Barbara will make available census data for the neighborhood. Kevin and Andrea will bring data on contaminated houses. Barbara will ask Dave Paul for a Portland State University study on neighborhood perspectives.*

9) Though Jillian could not attend the TAC meeting, she emailed Barbara in advance of the meeting and suggested that education be added to the list of Guiding Principles. *Outcome: Education will appear in the next draft of the Guiding Principles document, to be finalized at the next TAC and URPAC meetings.*