

**OVERLAND PARK URBAN RENEWAL PLAN  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES**

**Meeting Date:** September 21, 2005

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

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

Committee Members:

- √ Jillian Detweiler, TriMet
- √ Betty Dominguez, Oregon Housing and Community Services
- √ Elaine Drakulich, North Clackamas School District #12
- √ John Gessner, Milwaukie Planning District
- √ Kyle Gorman, Fire District #1
- √ Andrea Hall, Clackamas County Water Environmental Services
- √ Michelle Healy, North Clackamas Parks
- √ Dave Paul, Clackamas County District Attorney’s Office
- Eric Rouse, Clackamas County Water Environmental Services
- √ Kevin Poppen, Clackamas County Sheriff’s Office
- Chuck Robbins, Clackamas County Community Development
- √ Nancy Newton, Assistant to the County Administrator

Staff:

- √ Barbara Cartmill, Clackamas County Development Agency
- √ Ellie Fiore, Parametrix
- √ Michael Harrison, Parametrix
- √ Charles Kupper, Spencer & Kupper

Guests: Judy Kolia, Southgate CPO

**Prepared By:** Ellie Fiore, Parametrix

**Meeting Purpose:** To finalize the project Vision & Guiding Principles and project boundary, and review and discuss the tax impacts, list of project categories, funding for project categories, and maximum indebtedness.

**Meeting Summary:** The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members supported the changes made to the Vision & Guiding Principles, reviewed the tax impacts on jurisdictions, and discussed the list of project categories. Clarification was provided on what types of projects would be authorized by the language in the list of project categories, and several specific new projects were suggested by TAC members. The TAC members also provided feedback on the draft funding allocation.

## **Discussion Points & Outcomes:**

### Vision & Guiding Principles

Michael Harrison presented changes to the Vision & Guiding Principles document. Changes included:

- The Guiding Principle, “reduction in crime,” was replaced with “improved public health and safety” to represent the broader set of health and safety issues facing area residents and businesses.
- The new Guiding Principle, “an improved natural environment,” was added to reflect the environmental challenges facing the area, including Johnson Creek flooding and pollution.
- The new Guiding Principle, “make the public improvements necessary to stimulate investment in the revitalization area,” was added to better reflect the importance of transportation and other infrastructure improvements to the success of the neighborhoods.
- The words, “the activities identified in Section X of the Revitalization Plan are intended to carry out the Vision and Guiding Principles above,” was added to directly tie the Vision & Guiding Principles document to the list of Revitalization Area project categories.

The TAC members indicated their support for the changes to the Vision & Guiding Principles.

### Project Boundary

Some TAC members perceived the area between King Road and Monroe Street to be less blighted than the rest of the neighborhoods, and wanted it removed from the boundary. Others preferred including it, however, did not object to removing that area from the revitalization area. After an analysis of demographic information, Project Manager Barbara Cartmill said there were indicators of more stability south of King Road and staff could support a recommendation of King Road to the Board.

### Tax Impacts on Jurisdictions

Charles Kupper presented a matrix showing the assessed value of properties within the proposed Revitalization Area, with the area south of King Road excluded from the project boundaries. The matrix showed the potential revenue forgone by jurisdictions that receive property tax proceeds from property within the proposed area. Charles made it clear that the potential revenue forgone by the North Clackamas School District will be off-set by a dollar for dollar increase in state revenue, in order to achieve the required per-student funding levels.

### List of Project Categories

Charles presented the list of project categories, which is the list of projects identified by the public, the CAC, and the TAC, formatted as they would likely appear in the Revitalization Plan. Charles explained that the Urban Renewal Plan authorizes types of projects that can be funded, but does not create a legal obligation to fund projects within each category.

Charles asked TAC members if they had specific types of projects they would like to see included in the Revitalization Plan. TAC members discussed Charles' question, and had the following questions and comments:

- John Gessner suggested flood hazard reduction along the Johnson Creek floodplain, particularly for repeatedly damaged properties, be referenced in the list of project categories.
- Nancy Newton asked if the current list of project categories would allow for the funding of the assembling of land for development. Barbara Cartmill said “yes,” the Revitalization Plan would authorize land acquisition for that purpose.
- Kyle Gorman noted that developers generally request the ability to build narrower streets and that narrow streets can be a problem for fire response.
- Michael Harrison asked if crime prevention and community programs were adequately captured in the list of project categories. Dave Paul responded that any removal of blight helps to reduce crime, and felt that the draft document adequately addressed crime concerns he has heard expressed by the community.
- John Gessner asked whether types of projects could be funded if they were not included on the list of project categories. Charles explained that types of projects not included on the list of project categories could only be funded if the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners amended the Revitalization Plan. However, the project categories that have been listed are fairly general, so most projects designed to ease blight in the area could be authorized.
- Betty Dominguez noted that housing and housing affordability were not specifically mentioned in the list of project categories. Charles Kupper suggested adding housing to the list of project categories, and Betty suggested that “workforce housing” is a better name for “affordable housing.” Nancy Newton indicated that the County Board of Commissioners are committed to protecting workforce housing from gentrification.
- Jillian Detweiler suggested including specific language about structured parking for a future Fuller Road Park and Ride on the list of project categories.

- John Gessner suggested adding the replacement of the Johnson Creek bridges at Bell and Linwood to the list of project categories, and ensuring that the replacement bridges could accommodate pedestrian and bike access.
- Kyle Gorman suggested adding the installation of sprinklers in new development to the list of project categories. After some discussion, Barbara suggested drafting language to support the installation of sprinkler systems for multi-family housing and commercial development.
- Michelle Healy noted that there are three park projects in the list of project categories that come from the existing North Clackamas Parks' Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Michelle suggested adding a project that would expand the size of the existing Mill Park. Barbara indicated that there was enough flexibility in the list of project categories to accomplish Michelle's goals. However, it was agreed that the language in the list of project categories would be changed to ensure flexibility in funding park projects.
- Kyle Gorman wanted to ensure that satellite facilities for police, fire, and emergency medical responders could be funded by the Urban Renewal Plan. Dave Paul added that satellite police or fire facilities should include community meeting space. Barbara Cartmill indicated that the list of project categories would allow for the funding of satellite facilities with community meeting space.

#### Revenue Projections

Charles Kupper presented his revenue estimate based on project needs. Charles estimated roughly \$50 million in funding, adjusted for inflation, could be generated. Conservative revenue projections indicate levy collection for this amount could be up to 25 years. As assessed value is added, the time involved could be less due to increment being collected sooner. John Gessner asked how larger economic trends would impact estimated revenues. Charles indicated that the estimate was fairly conservative, and long term projections would absorb economic fluctuation.

#### Revenue Allocation

Barbara Cartmill and Charles Kupper presented a draft funding plan for project categories, based on public input and experience in other urban renewal areas, and asked TAC members to provide their feedback.

The TAC questioned how urban renewal would fund sewer connections. Charles and Barbara indicated that the revenue was for facilitating the development of a sewer program, and that some funds could also go towards a hardship grant program for those connecting to the sewer. Charles and Barbara made it clear that the revenue identified was not enough to cover the capital costs of sewerage the entire neighborhood. John Gessner indicated that he felt that sewer projects should be a high priority in the plan.

The TAC was asked about their impressions of the preliminary funding allocations.

- Jillian Detweiler felt that the amount of funding for sewers was too small and suggested reallocating street improvement money to sewers.
- Michelle Healy felt that parks funding was reasonable.
- Elaine Drakulich indicated that the community facilities funding was too low for the construction of a community center.
- Kevin Poppen suggested funding fewer projects so that more money was available for the projects that are of highest priority. Kevin emphasized the need for active recreation opportunities for youth as well as a need for installing curbs and sidewalks.
- Kyle Gorman stated that public health and safety seemed to be very important to the community and should be well funded. Kyle also suggested that it was important to maintain a range of housing options and seconded the need for active recreational opportunities for youth.
- Betty Dominguez mentioned that other grants and revolving loan funds can be combined with urban renewal funds for housing and commercial development. Betty indicated that multiple funding sources are useful to the success of bigger mixed-use development projects.
- Dave Paul was generally satisfied with the draft funding allocation, but cautioned that some street improvements, like street furniture, may be a target for graffiti. Dave felt that maintenance costs should be considered before projects are built.
- Andrea Hall was satisfied with the draft funding allocation.