

**OVERLAND PARK URBAN RENEWAL PLAN
URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FORMATION CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES
*DRAFT***

Meeting Date: September 15, 2005

Location: 9101 SE Sunnybrook Blvd., Clackamas, OR

Attendees & Distribution:

URPFURPFCAC Members in Attendance (“√”)

- √ David Bradley, Southgate CPO
- √ Greg DeGrazia, North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce
- Carl Grossman, Economic Development Commission
- Terry Hauck, Clackamas County Planning Commissioner
- √ Ron Wienenga, Johnson Creek Watershed Council
- √ Judy Kalias, Southgate CPO
- √ Charles Kupper, Spencer & Kupper
- √ Karen Liebert, Larry’s Restaurant
- David Mansfield, Property Owner
- √ Martha McLennan, NW Housing Alternatives (CC Land Trust)
- Peter Schraner, Euro Custom Cabinets
- Jim Smelser, JD Construction
- √ Norbert Loske, Overland Park Coalition Against Drug Crime
- √ Jerry Foy, Business Owner

Project Staff

- Barbara Cartmill, Clackamas County Development Agency
- √ Gary Cook, Clackamas County Development Agency
- √ Ellie Fiore, Parametrix
- √ Michael Harrison, Parametrix
- √ Ed Starkie, Urban Advisors
- √ Lori Phillips, Clackamas County Development Agency

Guests

- Patricia Holloway, Overland Park Neighborhood Watch
- Warren Mitchell, Overland Park Neighborhood Watch
- Brenda Pettit, Overland Park Neighborhood Watch
- Jim Pettit, Overland Park Neighborhood Watch

Prepared By: Ellie Fiore, Parametrix

Meeting Purpose:

The purpose of the meeting was to review financial analyses conducted by Charles Kupper and Ed Starkie, discuss the potential urban renewal projects and maximum indebtedness, finalize the Vision and Guiding Principles and district boundaries, and to prepare for the next URPFAC meeting.

Meeting Summary:

The Committee heard a report from market real estate analyst Ed Starkie about his analysis of potential redevelopment opportunities in Overland Park. The URPFAC also reviewed revenue projections and tax impact estimates prepared by Charles Kupper. The group also reviewed a sample renewal plan project category list and had a discussion about which projects to include in the plan. The Vision and Guiding Principles were finalized, however, the data needed to finalize the boundary discussion were not available by the start of the meeting. Lastly, the URPFAC decided on a format for their next meeting.

Discussion Points and Outcomes:

- 1) The URPFAC heard a presentation from Ed Starkie of Urban Advisors, who analyzed the development potential of the Overland Park area. Ed's analysis suggests that, due to higher-income households moving into the neighborhood and the availability of low-cost industrial land and buildings, opportunities for development and redevelopment exceed initial expectations. Ed suggested that industrial development could occur along Johnson Creek Boulevard, particularly with non-traditional industrial sector jobs. Ed pointed out that Overland Park has opportunities for infill development or larger-scale development if the County is able to assemble land. Although housing and land prices are rising rapidly, there are also opportunities to develop workforce (affordable) housing. The group discussed existing barriers to development, particularly limited road capacity and existing traffic problems. Ed suggested that industrial development is not likely to occur without careful planning and traffic improvements.
- 2) The Committee discussed urban renewal revenue projections and tax impact estimates. Charles presented projected revenues from tax increment financing (TIF), both with and without the area south of King Road being included in the urban renewal district. Charles pointed out that it is important to consider the present value of the projected revenue, since that figure represents the "true" amount of funding available for projects. Charles also pointed out that 40% of revenue would be generated in the last five years of the urban renewal plan. The late arrival of project funds is typical of urban renewal projects.
- 3) The group discussed whether to include the area south of King Road in the proposed urban renewal district. The County is conducting analyses to determine whether that area has any blighted conditions and is therefore in need of urban renewal projects. Some URPFAC members wanted to include the area so that traffic improvements at King Road and Fuller Road could be supported through TIF. This intersection lies between the proposed Overland Park urban renewal district and the Clackamas Town Center urban renewal district. *Outcome: Gary Cook will find out whether the intersection falls within the Clackamas Town Center urban renewal district, which would make it ineligible for inclusion in the Overland Park urban renewal district.*
- 4) The URPFAC reviewed the data on forgone taxes by jurisdiction. Under urban renewal, taxpayers don't experience an increase in taxes, but agencies forgo potential tax revenue. URPFAC members noted that much of the increased tax revenue would not occur without urban renewal-related investment. It was also pointed out that agencies' tax revenues wouldn't decrease with the creation of an urban renewal district; rather the agencies would take in less new tax revenue than the "theoretical maximum." Gary also pointed out that many urban renewal districts experience what is known as the "halo effect," where new development and reinvestment just outside urban renewal district boundaries create new revenue for taxing jurisdictions.

- 5) The group reviewed the draft Vision and Guiding Principles statement, which will be included in the urban renewal plan. Michael explained what modifications had been made. *Outcome: The group expressed satisfaction with the changes to the Vision and Guiding Principles.*
- 6) Charles led the committee through a discussion of potential urban renewal projects and project categories. The July URPFAC meeting and the August TAC meeting each yielded lists of desired projects for the Overland Park area. These lists were incorporated into a sample renewal plan of projects and project categories. Including a specific project in the urban renewal plan ensures that the urban renewal agency is authorized to fund the project, however, it is not a guarantee that the project will be funded. Including a project category allows the urban renewal agency to fund projects that fit within the general category.
- 7) Judy was concerned with the inclusion of parking structures and funding of public buildings in the plan. The group discussed the implications of keeping the draft parking language in the plan and the potential advantages / disadvantages of constructing new parking structures in the renewal area. It was mentioned that at the last URPFAC meeting, members of the public expressed concern about new parking structures and new employment related development adding to existing traffic problems. Charles stated that having parking structures in the plan, allows for flexibility without creating any obligations. Gary provided an overview of how the decision to proceed with an urban renewal project is made: Once the projects are listed in the plan, they will be included in a project timeline. Every two years, the list of proposed projects is reviewed by two bodies—the Budget Committee and the Board of Commissioners—in a process which is open to the public. There are multiple opportunities to incorporate public input into the process before any project, including parking garages, is approved. There is concern that parking garages are being proposed to support new, high-density housing; however, it is unlikely that housing would be constructed at a density that would make parking structures feasible. Generally, there was support for parking garages for transit, commercial and industrial uses. The URPFAC expressed a desire for specific language on parking structures and lots that reflected their interests and concerns, but specific language was not agreed upon at the meeting.
- 8) There was a brief discussion about parks, since three specific 3-5 acre neighborhood parks are included in the sample plan. Karen Liebert was concerned that these proposed parks are larger than what the neighborhood would like. A member of the committee supported the 3-5 acre park size, indicating that smaller parks are too expensive to maintain.
- 9) Members of the Overland Park Neighborhood Watch suggested that there might not be enough resident representation on the committee in general and that the CPO might not be the best representative for neighborhood residents. Michael stated that he was unaware that the Overland Park Neighborhood Watch had split off from the Overland Park Coalition Against Drug Crime, which is represented on the committee. There was a brief description of the role of the CPO and Gary indicated that the County relies heavily on CPOs as advisory bodies.
- 10) Patricia Holloway requested the financial analyses for the three potential boundary reductions that had been discussed to date in advance of the next URPFAC meeting. *Outcome: Charles will email the financial analyses to Patricia.*

- 11)** Martha commented that there was no project language about watershed improvements or other actions related to the natural environment. Ron indicated that he would like to provide language for plans and programs that are in the Watershed Action Plan.
Outcome: Water Quality Improvements will be added to the draft project list.
- 12)** Martha also inquired about whether assistance with street and sewer improvements would be covered by the plan. *Outcome: Charles indicated that it was included under Development and Redevelopment.*
- 13)** Michael presented multiple options for the structure of the September 21, 2005, URPFAC meeting, which will likely have many members of the public in attendance. The URPFAC expressed a unanimous desire to meet at their own table, while other members of the public will meet at other tables, with facilitators present at each table. Patricia expressed concern over the ability to properly document, and take into consideration, public input. Michael indicated meeting notes from the September 21st meeting will be prepared and will be available to the public, and that comment forms would be made available to track public input.