



City of Tigard

Tigard Triangle

Technical Advisory Committee

Tigard Triangle Implementation Project

Date: October 27, 2016
Time: 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm
Location: Public Works Auditorium (8777 SW Burnham St, Tigard)

Meeting Agenda:

3:00 p.m.	I. Welcome and Open House Update
3:10 p.m.	II. Tigard Triangle Urban Renewal Plan Overview + Q&A
3:40 p.m.	III. Tigard City Center Substantial Amendment Overview + Q&A
4:00 p.m.	IV. Streetscape Design Overview + Q&A
4:20 p.m.	V. Public Meeting Schedule and Next Steps
4:30 p.m.	VI. Meeting Close

Meeting Materials:

- Draft Urban Renewal Plan and Report (not attached)
- Mtg #3 Summary (attached)





Joint Tigard Triangle Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Citizen Advisory Council (CAC) Meeting

Meeting #3 – Summary

Monday, August 22, 2016, 6:00-8:00PM
City of Tigard Public Works Auditorium

CAC Members Present: John Boren, Citizen at Large; Calista Fitzgerald, Planning Commission; Scott Hancock, Library Board; Gary Jelinek, Planning Commission; Jim Long, Metzger, East Tigard, and Durham Citizen Participation Organization; Elise Shearer, Transportation Advisory Committee; Veronica Smith, Citizen-At-Large; David Walsh, City Center Advisory Committee; Dustin White, Citizen-at-Large

TAC Members Present: Joshua Brooking, ODOT; Buff Brown, City of Tigard; Lori Faha, City of Tigard; Steve Kelley, Washington County; Allen Kennedy, TVFR; Debi Mollahan, Tigard Chamber of Commerce; Carrie Pak, TVWD; Damon Reische, CWS; Aaron Rivera (Alternate), City of Tigard; Cassandra Ulven (Alternate), TVFR; Phil Wentz (Alternate), TTSD; Shannon Wilson (Alternate), CPAH; Jessica Woodruff, Reach

CAC Members Absent: Zack Dean, Youth Advisory Committee; John Goodhouse, City Council; Cathy Olson, Neighborhood Involvement Committee; Katen Patel, Triangle Property Owner

TAC Members Absent: Celina Baguiao, PCC; Kelly Betteridge, TriMet; Cheryl Caines, City of Tigard; Rachael Duke, CPAH; Chris Ford, Metro; Cara Fitzpatrick, City of Tigard; David Moore, TTSD; Mike McCarthy, City of Tigard

City Staff Present: Susan Shanks, Senior Planner; Hannah Holloway, Project Planning Assistant

Other Project Team Present: Nick Popenuk, Tiberius Solutions LLC; Elaine Howard, Elaine Howard Consulting LLC; Alex Dupey, MIG Inc.

Members of the Public Present: George Lampus, Property Owner

I. Welcome

Overview of meeting agenda

II. Financial Analysis Presentation

Nick Popenuk gave a presentation on his analysis of a 35-year Urban Renewal Plan with a 4.5% assumed growth rate.

- \$188M maximum indebtedness equates to \$94.5M in today's dollars.
- Amount of funds generated in the beginning are modest and increase significantly in later years.
- Plans with timelines shorter than 35 years could be more appealing to the public, but also mean less money for projects and less of a buffer against unforeseen market forces.
- Tables showing how funds could be distributed across project categories and over the life of the plan are included in the presentation slides and will be distributed after the meeting.

- Given the nature of an urban renewal plan and the many variables that affect project funding over time, it is important to understand what the community's priorities are for the first 5 years.
- Impacts to taxing districts can be both direct and indirect.

Susan Shanks explained the rationale behind the proposed project category allocations and opened the floor for discussion.

III. Discussion of Funding Allocation and Timing

Cassandra Ulven stated that she appreciates the specificity of Goals 2 and 3, and wishes Goal 4 were as explicit. Specifically, TVFR would like a better understanding of what is meant by "recreational facility." TVFR does not support spending urban renewal funding on projects that have not been shown to catalyze development and that are more appropriately funded by bonds, such as fire stations, city halls, and public recreation facilities. Overall, TVFR is comfortable with the proposed project category funding allocation.

Steve Kelley with Washington County noted that all of the transportation projects on the Urban Renewal Plan project list might not be on the city and county's Transportation System Plan project lists. He would like to reserve the right to review projects with city transportation staff.

Lori Faha suggested that the utility project category should clarify whether it is meant to fund just public or both public and private utility projects.

Carrie Pak suggested that the utility project category might be underfunded.

Cassandra Ulven would like to include language in the plan that requires an assessment of its effectiveness and the option to retire the plan if it does not perform as intended (as Beaverton and Milwaukie did with their plans).

Calista Fitzgerald suggested that the plan should prioritize catalyst projects that will help spur future development and interest in the Triangle.

Lori Faha responded that certain foundational projects might need to happen before others. For example, siting and creating stormwater facilities before improving streets is necessary since stormwater management has to happen with development and street improvements can lag behind development.

Elise Shearer noted that linking stormwater facilities to trail and parks projects would garner more excitement and support from the public during the vote.

Recommendation: 13 out of the 22 members present supported a 35-year plan duration.
5 members abstained from the vote (city and county staff).
3 members favored a shorter plan duration (TVFR and CPO-4M representatives).

IV. Action Items

- Send committee members the presentation slide show and table showing monetary impacts to taxing districts.
- Make the following changes to the Project List and Goals & Objectives:
 - Move parking projects to Goal 2 (Transportation) from Goal 4 (Public Spaces/Facilities) and adjust funding allocations accordingly.

Joint CAC and TAC Meeting #3 Summary
August 22, 2016

- Review Goal 2 (Transportation) project list with the County and revise as needed.
- Remove Goal 2 Project 4 per ODOT's request.
- Clarify that Goal 3 funding (Utilities) is meant for public utility projects. Clarify that private utility projects could potentially receive urban renewal funding either directly or indirectly through Goal 5 programs or partnerships if such assistance was in keeping with the district's overall goals and objectives.
- Re-evaluate the stormwater facility cost estimates, specifically the land acquisition assumptions.
- Add more specificity to the kinds of projects to be funded (and not funded) under Goal 4 (Public Spaces/Facilities) to increase transparency. Work directly with TVFR to address their concerns.
- Make the following changes to the Urban Renewal Plan:
 - Include language that addresses TVFR's desire to evaluate the plan at some future point and potentially limit its duration based on performance.
 - Modify the priorities for projects to be funded within the first 5 years to reflect committee member input regarding the desire to strategically acquire land for certain kinds of uses (e.g. stormwater facilities, parks, and housing), catalyze development through development assistance, and fund projects that would generate public interest and excitement in the area.

V. Next Steps

Both the CAC and TAC voted against convening a meeting in September.

The next CAC meeting will be on Monday, Oct 24 from 6-8 p.m. at the Quality Inn in Tigard.

The next TAC meeting of the TAC will be Thursday, Oct 27 from 3-5 p.m. at the City of Tigard's Public Works Auditorium. Both meetings will include a review and discussion of the draft Urban Renewal Plan.