Broadway Corridor Strategic Advisory Committee/Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting #2
Tuesday, June 30, 2015
1:30 PM – 4:30 PM

Meeting Summary

SAC Members in attendance: Peter Andrews, Ruth Adkins, Gus Baum (alt), Tom Cody, Erin Flynn, Patricia Gardner, Randy, Gragg, John Horvick, Marissa Madrigal, Tony Magliano, Will Naito, Sam Rodriguez, Carl Talton, Tom Manley, Sarah Stevenson (alt)

Members absent: Jillian Detweiler, Robin Rosenberg, Zack Fruchtengarten

TAC Members in Attendance: Karl Dinkelspiel, Mark Raggett, Allan Schmidt, Zef Wagner

Members absent: Sallie Edmunds, Judith Gray, Brett Horner, Alisa Kane, Tim Kurtz, Mauricio Leclerc, Art Pearce, Kia Selley, Javier Mena, Joe Zehnder

Consultants attending: Tom Brennan (Nelson/Nygaard), Candace Damon (HR&A), Abe Farkas (ECONorthwest), Kirstin Greene (Cogan Owens Greene), Charles Kelley (ZGF), Martin Leung (HR&A), Nolan Lienhart (ZGF), Greg Matto (ZGF), Brian McCarter (ZGF), Jessica Sheehan (SOM), Doug Voigt (SOM).

PDC Staff: Lisa Abuaf, Sarah Harpole, Anne Crispino-Taylor

Handouts: Meeting Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions
   Sarah Harpole, Kirstin Greene
   Sarah welcomed attendees from the two groups who would work together to discuss ideas for a broad-level strategic vision and identify high priorities. She explained that subsequent meetings will narrow the focus down specifically to development concepts for the Post Office site. Kirsten introduced the project partners.

2. Summary of SWOT Analysis from Charrette #1
   Nolan Lienhart
   Lisa Abuaf reminded the group that this phase of the process was a framework plan to include guiding principles and was not a design plan. Nolan summarized the SWOT analysis from Charrette 1 as follows:
   - Strengths:
     - Location and connectivity
     - Character and energy of nearby district
     - Size and configuration of USPS Site: Blank slate
     - Unique existing elements

This summary is PDC staff’s interpretation of the main points of discussion, including statements attributed directly to committee members, staff and the public, and is not intended to be a word-for-word transcription of the meeting.
• Weaknesses:
  o Barriers
  o District perceptions

• Opportunities:
  o Horizontal and vertical connections
  o Partnerships and sharing
  o District character, identity and activity

• Threats:
  o Obstacles to implementation
  o Community concerns regarding density and height
  o Failure to be inclusive
  o Expectations

Additional comments:
• Summary needs to be expanded to include a broader range of business opportunities.
• Emphasis seemed to be with corporate use and appeared economically driven rather than amenity driven.
• Project should not solve all of Portland’s problems, but should not make them worse, i.e. gentrification, homelessness, etc.
• Need to think about what the PDC/City controls today and to leverage the public benefit of the site. City/PDC cannot hold onto properties for perpetuity so there is a need to prioritize projects.
• Need to understand finances for development.
• Suggest developing the site in phases as opposed to all at once.
• Politics or political will are a threat to the project due to the short-term political cycle.
• Hoped for more high density and more flexibility with heights at the site.
• Hope the process will tie everything together and that the vision will stay true through to the technical process.

3. Guiding Principles
Doug Voigt / Candace Damon
Doug introduced the 5 Draft Guiding Principles:
  1. Provide access to high quality employment
  2. Leverage public benefits and regional assets
  3. Enhance connections and the public realm
  4. Advance sustainable urbanism
  5. Be strategic to balance financial feasibility with public amenity

The PowerPoint presentation provides examples of the above in other cities around the country. Some questions he asked the group to consider during the work session were: 1) How are projects accessible? 2) How do we deal with water, waste, and food? 3) How do we act strategically? There was also a suggestion for phasing and to think about opportunities missed (i.e. interim uses at the site) and to also be mindful of what we don’t want to see happen.

Candace suggested thinking about strategies for balancing financial feasibility to create private value to sustain public benefits, and asked what tools other than TIF could be brought to the table for development. A discussion about capacity for the site included an explanation of floor area ratio (FAR).
Also discussed was the correct balance of height and allowed density to financial stability, and to consider the appropriate density for the site.

Doug suggested considering a vision for creating new connections with North Park Blocks, and asked whether there was opportunity for a public facility such as a civic center at the gateway to the site. He also recommended uses on the north and south should strengthen and respect adjacent neighborhoods, and that the area should anchor with the downtown.

4. Guiding Principles Work Session
Doug Voigt / Kirsten Greene
When reviewing the guiding principles the group was asked to consider if anything was missing and whether the principles, as outlined, seemed to fit. Other opportunities to consider were:
- Civic/Institutional uses
- Residences as well as employment
- Community center (i.e. PP&R) with a pool, music room, dance
- Grocery Store
- Residential for all income levels: high wage jobs bring twice the number of low wage jobs.
- There is a need for housing for all in the urban core: affordable may help to reduce homelessness.

5. Work Session Report Out
Doug Voigt, Kirstin Greene

Principle 1: Provide access to high quality employment
- What does “access” mean? Provide “reason” or “incentive” rather than “access”
- The site provides an opportunity for a large-scale business such as corporate tech company
- Large blocks such as this are missing in Portland – the site provides flexibility
- Cutting up the site into parcels may eliminate the flexibility for large employers
- Potential to develop a major attraction (i.e. museum)
- Potential for an incubator innovation economy
- Potential to create a world class place; don’t set bar too low
- Seek long term, sustainable tenants
- Need to compete with the suburbs on deal terms
- High quality conveys high income. Egalitarian City – we don’t want to become San Francisco
  - Create inclusivity/benefits for multiple age/income to provide opportunity for economic advancement, diversity of employers and an economic ladder
  - Need for family/workforce/low income housing
  - Provide healthy food options, medical care, places to grow up
  - Provide diverse employment representing all income levels

Principle 2: Leverage public benefits and regional assets
- Clarify goals of public benefit(s) i.e. attracting tenants? Broader public amenity?
- Include open space/green space
  - Schools, family housing can tie public spaces
  - Potential for new educational opportunities – i.e. education, culture, arts
  - Create a safe delineated space: i.e. a cycle/pedestrian track around the North Park Blocks, the Streetcar and the transit station
  - Potential for a creativity corridor within the North Park Blocks
• Consolidated multimodal hub at Union Station can encourage high quality employment:
  o Improve existing transit benefits: TriMet/Amtrak/Greyhound
  o Connect to Union Station and the Greyhound Station, which are currently under utilized
  o Connection of the Green Loop could be a regional asset and relieve transportation pressures
• Leverage: the Pearl; the river
• Create north/south connections

**Principle 3: Enhance connections and the public realm**

• Prioritize projects:
  o 1st, green loop
  o 2nd, Johnson extension
    ▪ Johnson is key connector to Union Station
  o 3rd,Hoyt – reuse
• Broadway Bridge – gateway to the site
  o Connections over and under the bridge
    ▪ Connection under Broadway bridgehead could be challenging – better to connect USPS site to Pearl and parks
  o Create building entrances along bridge
• Good to have permeability/walkability, but not at the expense of large lot flexibility
  o Boardwalk to Centennial Mills
  o Create “mini” loops to connect public spaces and that limit vehicle access
• Not enough access to the river
  o Create a pedestrian crossing over train tracks
  o Increase building heights to provide views of the river
• Opportunity for urban family housing
• Significant/exacting the North Park Blocks terminus
• Union Station – added value if connected to Greyhound site

**Principle 4: Advance sustainable urbanism**

• Determine the threshold for incremental development to balance uses
• Expand “water” area
• Promote renewable energy
• Provide opportunity for a field of solar panels
• Innovative heating/cooling, and waste reclamation processes
• Organize shared uses: housing/jobs
  o Water
  o Food
  o Energy
  o Waste
  o Power cycle
• Eco district
  o Incentive based district infrastructure i.e. goals rather than specific strategies, LEED plus
• Harmonize green industry and physical design
• Density can relieve pressure from the rest of the city
• Opportunity to examine a district parking solution
• Strategize how to set limits to vehicular development
Principle 5: Be strategic to balance financial feasibility with public amenity

- What kind of incentive is necessary to spur development?
- What are the financial tools available for development?
- What development costs will be city-born and what costs will be private?
- Need a deeper understanding of demographics of the area 10 to 20 years out
  - What do people need from their city?
  - What will Millennials need/want when this site gets developed?
- Big lots at the site provide potential for a larger footprint and a new kind of space
- Union Station is underutilized, opportunity for a train station with retail shops and restaurants.
- Completing the Green Loop will create better connectivity
- Need to define and provide access to public spaces
- As the North Park Blocks moves further north it narrows and becomes more commercial, this could create the opportunity for a pedestrian street with active uses – walking, biking, transit – to lower development costs/impact fees
- Fields Park provides an example of added value
  - Prioritizing and phasing can also add value

6. Next Steps / Closing Comments

*Kirstin Greene*

Next meetings will be Monday July 20, 2015 for TAC and Tuesday July 21, 2015 for SAC.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30

*Meeting summary prepared by Anne Crispino-Taylor, PDC Senior Administrative Coordinator, Central City*