



January 12, 2010

Rose Quarter Stakeholder Advisory Committee
c/o Portland Development Commission
222 NW Davis Street
Portland, OR 97209

Dear Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members:

The SAC and PDC designed a highly innovative process to start discussion of re-use concepts for Memorial Coliseum. The results of the *Call for Concepts* have been truly astounding with over 80 submissions received from a vast variety of points of view and programming perspectives. Now the difficult process of sifting through these ideas begins.

Despite the huge number of ideas on the table, it has become clear that it will be extremely difficult for any publicly-spirited or community-based concept to compete with the Blazers' financial resources, media and political savvy and current legal rights in the Rose Quarter within the process as currently conceived. It's time for the Advisory Committee to act to balance out the process.

The following changes to the process would begin to level the playing field:

1. **The SAC should refine the criteria for evaluation of concepts.** Now that the nature and character of the concept proposals is known, the SAC should further refine its evaluation criteria with a eye toward clearly determining the responsiveness of the proposals to the Call for Concepts. Specifically, the SAC should determine whether a proposal is:
 - a. **For the Coliseum only or for the Rose Quarter as a whole.** Concepts should be separated out on this basis and evaluated on an "apples-to apples" basis. The guidelines of the *Call for Concepts* were focussed on concepts for Memorial Coliseum. Teams that submitted on this basis should not be judged against larger proposals for the Rose Quarter as a whole.
 - b. **A "Private" or "Public" Concept.** Public funds will likely be required for any repurposing or remodel of the Coliseum. As such, the public should be given a clear picture of who benefits from any future public investment in the Coliseum. Therefore, concepts should be specifically evaluated for the public benefits they will provide in relation to the proposed **private/for-profit** or **public/non-profit**

approach to use of the Coliseum. This will help assure that there is a clearer picture of the public and private benefits resulting from any future public investment in the Memorial Coliseum.

2. **The SAC should eliminate the RFP phase of the process.** It is clear that it will be all but impossible for any of the community-based or public/non-profit proposals to compete in an RFP process as currently conceived. In short, putting a community-based or “public” concept up against a “private,” profit-driven and corporate-based proposal will not be fair and should not be pursued. Community/non-profit teams should not be asked to undertake the difficult task of fund-raising and the substantial costs of responding to the RFP. Instead, the Committee should select what is the single best proposal for the Coliseum and recommend this single option to the City Council. After approval by the Council, the selected option should undergo 6-9 months of additional study, community input and development, and measured against established milestones, prior to coming back to the SAC and Council for approval.
3. **Immediately Modify the Memorial Coliseum Operating Agreement.** Continued use of the Coliseum as a spectator facility in some form will likely be necessary in order for the Coliseum to be financially viable going forward. However, any non-PAM proposal that proposes a spectator use as part of its program and operating revenue stream cannot move forward because PAM currently has the exclusive rights to operate spectator facilities in the Coliseum¹. The SAC should advocate for immediate re-negotiation of the terms of the Memorial Coliseum Operating Agreement in order to open the door for other concepts that include spectator facilities. If the agreement is not renegotiated, there is only one likely outcome—the Blazers will continue to control the Coliseum—and all the hard work of the concept proposers, the SAC and an expensive public process will have been for naught.

It is only through these steps, and perhaps others, that the Rose Quarter Development Process can be assured of being the type of fair and open process originally promised.

Your consideration of the foregoing is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
marcpdx.org



Douglas L. Oblatz, Sponsor

¹ Pursuant to Section 2.2.3 of the Memorial Coliseum Operating Agreement