

CLACKAMAS REGIONAL CENTER COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY: August 1, 2012

Committee members present: Doug Bean, Dennis Curtis, Matt Ellington, Shelly Parini, Martha Waldemar and Cyndi Lewis-Wolfram.

Committee members not in attendance: Jim Gersbach, Anna Geller, Jennifer Harding, Patricia Holloway, Joe Krumm, Susan Lehr, Bill Monahan and Jason Tuck.

Guests present: None

Staff: Dan Johnson, David Queener and Lori Phillips

Minutes by: Lori Phillips

Dan Johnson called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

1. Review Agenda, Previous Minutes, and Correspondence

The Agenda was approved as presented. The previous meeting summary (6/20/12) was approved as written. There was no correspondence.

2. Completed Projects and UR Funding

Dave handed out a list of Urban Renewal projects for the Clackamas Regional Center area, including their year of completion. He explained the projects and noted that while all had some form of assistance from urban renewal funding, it varied in amount and method -- some were infrastructure improvements while others were development agreements or sale of land. Often these projects allowed opportunities to leverage UR funds to gain state or federal funds. Dave handed out a pie graph that shows how the approximately \$110 million in UR funds invested to date has been utilized for the various types of projects.

Dennis asked about the total assessed value in the County in 1980 and now. Staff will get that figure.

Doug asked for the amount of money spent for each project type. Dan stated that it was difficult to specify a monetary amount because some of the \$110 million for redevelopment was facilitated by selling Agency property at a reduced value to promote a higher and better use of the site. There is only limited data available on the market value of these properties at the time of disposition.

3. Return on Investment

An updated *Return on Investment* summary was circulated. The original version estimated \$142 million of private investment directly related to UR projects; the updated estimate is \$162 million.

Dave explained the *Return on Investment* and how current assessed value takes into account areas in the original boundary that were removed over the years when all projects within that area were completed. This added revenue to the tax roles for use by overlapping taxing districts.

Approximately \$110 million in urban renewal funds resulted in \$162 million of development directly related to UR projects. These urban renewal funds also leveraged an additional \$194 million of public investment from partnering with other agencies to complete projects. Approximately \$602 million in other private development, indirectly related to UR, has also occurred within the district. All of these public and private projects created jobs, both directly and indirectly.

There have been approximately 2,303 new dwelling units -- condos, apartments, retirement facilities, affordable housing, etc -- built in since 1980. Cyndi asked if that takes into account

houses removed for development. Dan will see if we can calculate a net increase in residential units.

4. Remaining Projects

Dave said the *Remaining Projects* list originated from a much larger list of needs within the Clackamas Regional Center. It is a compilation of State, County and UR projects within the district boundary that are consistent with the UR Plan goals and project lists. As discussed, there was never an intent to meet all needs under the urban renewal plan. This information should be helpful when the discussion turns to highlighting project types and areas of focus. The estimated costs are rough estimates. Dan said there is a desire to look at other incentives, such as façade improvements and other small business incentives.

5. Work Program Development

Dan handed out a draft Work Plan Schedule and Evaluation Criteria for consideration.

Development of the work program would be framed around three key components:

- Project Type: The district has a plan and in that plan are specific types of projects.
- Areas of Need: These can take a number of different forms; geographic, program, etc.
- Evaluation Criteria: Establishing criteria related to the Return on Investment discussion. What objectives do we want to reach with the investment of these remaining dollars?

Staff will work with the committee to refine or clarify the emphasis in these areas. Once consensus is reached and vetted with the community, staff will develop a draft work program of projects which achieve these objectives, which would then be returned to the committee for review and refinement.

Shelly said she would like to see some type of social values in the criteria. Dan said that while there are specific purposes for the use of these dedicated funds there is a focus on maximizing benefit, we want to make sure the projects touch on as many objectives, such as the health of a community, as we can.

In response to a question, Dan stated that the boundary of the plan area will not change, but issues with intersections that benefit the Eagle Landing project and others east of the freeway may be part of future discussions.

Matt asked why widening 82nd Avenue on the list. Dan said it's a prime project where we might partner with ODOT to get improvements of mutual benefit. Dennis suggested that we focus on projects that build off what has already been completed and also consider projects that might meet the goals, but at a lesser cost.

Cyndi said it is important to let the community know about the process, schedule and opportunities to provide input. Dan said staff is working on opportunities to spread the word, but is also looking to each committee member to bring information back and forth with the constituents they represent.

The schedule provides the following:

- Meetings through September to develop final recommendations related to evaluation criteria, project types and areas
- Open house and update to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) in October
- Meetings in November to discuss feedback from the community and BCC, and review and refine draft work program,
- Open house in November to present work program to community

- Meetings in December to refine work program recommendations based on community input and draft final recommendations for presentation to BCC.

Dan reminded the committee about the consensus criteria discussed at earlier meetings, and the 1-5 rating for project proposals:

- 1 = Unqualified yes
- 2 = Proposal is acceptable
- 3 = I can live with the proposal, but I am not enthusiastic about it
- 4 = I do not fully agree and need to register my view; however, I choose not to block the proposal
- 5 = I disagree and wish to stand in the way of the proposal being adopted

Everyone agreed with the proposed work program. Dan said there will be time for questions prior to any vote. Shelly suggested the 1-5 ranking system also be used at the open houses as it would be good to know why the community voted a certain way.

Doug asked if there is a risk of prioritizing a project without knowing what other funds might be available for leveraging or partnering. Dan said that if we budget funds for a project and are able to leverage other funds to reduce our commitment, funds saved can be reallocated to another project.

We intend to check with the working group regularly to assess where we are and move forward with the highest and best opportunities. The goal is to complete all of the projects within five years.

Dave said this group will be prioritizing both types of projects and which projects should be completed first. Shelly asked for a clarification on evaluation of project types -- does that mean a design type or a specific project? Dan said it will be both.

6. Evaluation Criteria

We are researching how other jurisdictions measure and evaluate projects. Dan explained the three areas proposed for evaluation when considering a project: Economic Growth, Health and Vitality, and Functionality. There was discussion about how each category might be weighted to give an accurate and balanced evaluation.

Matt said the group needs to look at why the Urban Renewal Plan was established to ensure any recommendations are consistent with the specific goals and objectives outlined in the Plan.

Staff will refine the evaluation criteria and incorporate the objectives within the UR and CRC plans.

7. Meeting Protocol

There were suggestions to split this group into two committees; a business focus group and a technical advisory committee. Committee members agreed to keep the group together because the diversity and varied perspectives are valued, and try to add a few more business representatives.

Dan asked about setting aside time at the end of the meetings for comments with the caveat that written comments can be submitted at any time. Group members agreed that this is a working group -- not a public meeting -- that will not be taking any testimony. The open houses are designed for public comment and questions.

The consensus of the committee was to allow 5-10 minutes at the end of each meeting for general discussion (which could include public comment, at the discretion of the facilitator) and continue to provide the opportunity for written comment.

Next meeting: August 29, at 8 am at the Aquatic Park.
The meeting adjourned at 9:43 a.m.