



Rose Quarter Development Project

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting #7

Tuesday – January 12, 2010 - 5 to 7 p.m.

Portland Development Commission

222 NW 5th Ave, Portland

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Meeting purpose

- Report on Veterans' Focus Group
- Review and discuss MC Concept evaluation and SAC recommendation process
- Review Public Presentation event plan
- **Review MC Energy & Water Use Report**

Attendance

- **Sam Adams**, Mayor – City of Portland
- **Samuel Brooks**, Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs (OAME)
- **Andrew Colas**, National Association of Minority Contractors (NAMCO)
- **Rosemary Colliver**, Tonkon Torp
- **Daniel Deutsch**, Leftbank Project
- **Paul Falsetto**, American Institute of Architects
- **Dean Gisvold**, Central City Concern
- **Regina Hauser**, Natural Step Network
- **Lillian Karabaic**, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
- **Wade Lange**, Ashforth Pacific
- **Clint Lundmark**, Eliot Neighborhood Association
- **Will Macht**, Portland State University
- **Sandra McDonough**, Portland Business Alliance
- **Rick Michaelson**, Urban Development Advocate
- **Marcus Mundy**, Urban League of Portland
- **Brian Owendoff**, Greenlight Greater Portland/Opus NW
- **Greg Phillips**, Portland Center Stage
- **Steve Rawley**, North Portland
- **Jules Renaud**, Student – Winterhaven School
- **Alicia J. Rose**, Mississippi Studios and independent artist
- **Virginia Sewell**, Oregon Ballet Theatre
- **Tony Stacy**, One Wolf Soccer, Management and Development
- **Walter Valenta**, Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal District Advisory Cmte.
- **Cameron Vaughan-Tyler**, Portland Public Schools
- **Rick Williams**, Lloyd Transportation Management Association

Core Project Team

- **Amy Ruiz**, City of Portland, Mayor's Office
- **Kia Selley**, Portland Development Commission
- **Kevin Brake**, Portland Development Commission
- **Nikolai Ursin**, Portland Development Commission
- **Vaughn Brown**, JLA Public Involvement
- **Kalin Schmoltdt**, JLA Public Involvement

(RL) Denotes items that will be added to the Response Log.

Opening

Call to Order / Meeting Purpose and Agenda – Chair Sam Adams called the meeting to order and led introductions. The meeting will include a report from the Veterans Focus Group, and discussion of the concept evaluation process and the Jan. 26 public event.

Sam reminded the group that this phase of the process will result in finding an idea for the use of Memorial Coliseum. Subsequent conversation will address the full district and may iteratively affect the initial thinking regarding the Coliseum.

Rick Michaelson asked how concepts that deal with elements outside of the Coliseum should be addressed. Sam said that those concepts would be noted, and addressed during the district planning phase, and it will be determined whether they are integral to the future of Memorial Coliseum.

Veterans' Focus Group Report

Sam Brooks said that the veterans appreciated the opportunity to convene a focus group of SAC members and others in order to form a recommendation. The group is planning to reconvene in the future. Sam thanked Elaine Cogan for facilitating the meeting. Sam said that the summary report accurately reflects what took place at the meeting. The objective of the group was to see veterans recognized, memorialized, and treated with respect, and to determine if the existing memorial is adequate as a memorial to all veterans of foreign wars. A summary of the group recommendations is included. Of note, the group indicated that they were against moving the memorial wall, though they were open to adding to it or adding other monuments within the district.

Harley Wedel explained that the group tried to address what veterans thought should be done at the location and discussed what the place represents. Harley described the origins of the facility and noted how it was originally intended to be shared for use by veterans. It eventually became almost impossible for veterans groups to use the facility due to scheduling conflicts and veterans groups no longer consider Portland for large scale conventions or activities. It is important to be able to host these types of groups and to tell the stories of those who did or did not return. It is important to emphasize the statewide loss of life for every war and conflict, though the WWII wall only represents those lost within a 12-mile radius. The memorial walls are like tombstones for those who may have no other physical marker of their sacrifice. Memorializing these veterans is the right thing to do. The focus group would like to meet again and review the memorial aspect of each concept. The proposed concepts should not offend those who are memorialized.

Walter Valenta asked how many people would be included if the memorial included the entire state. **Harley** said that he was developing the list and that it would be a large number. He noted several example commemorative sites.

Elaine Cogan remarked on the honor of facilitating the group and noted that the group had unanimously encouraged renaming the facility the "Veterans Memorial Coliseum."

Concept Evaluation and Recommendation Process

Evaluation Approach – Kia referred the group to the detailed process chart. The call for concepts closed last Friday on the anniversary of the dedication of the building in 1961. Summaries of the submittals are available at www.RQDev.org. The committee has been

provided with copies of the full applications as part of their materials. Staff will begin the process of sorting submittals into Full Concepts, Partial Concepts and Ideas. Full Concepts will use the entire building while Partial Concepts may only address certain parts of the building. Reuse Ideas were submitted through the concept application as well as through the Web site comment form. City staff will also begin to define which teams have demonstrated development experience and access to capital. Because this will be a public/private partnership, it will be necessary to show that all Full Concepts have an experienced developer behind them.

Concept submitters have been invited to present their concepts at the Coliseum on Jan. 26. The event is an opportunity for the SAC to ask questions about the concepts. Because of the large response, the event may be divided to include slideshow presentations and a display gallery. SAC members should review the concept applications (distributed on CD at this meeting) and begin formulating questions. The event is also intended as a marketplace of ideas and is designed so that proposers with Partial Concepts can discuss their ideas and find qualified team members. Staff will be working with submitters who want to evolve their concepts or add new team members.

After Jan. 29 all partial concepts will need to have evolved into Full Concepts and have qualified development teams in order to proceed to the RFP process.

Rick Michaelson asked whether teams without qualified developers would be out of the process after Jan. 29. Kia explained that while they would not be invited to the RFP process, their ideas will be carried forward and the SAC could still recommend that those ideas be integrated into another concept. Sam noted that the competition of concept submittals would be treated separately from the competition of individual ideas.

Tony Stacy asked why the process involves competition if a group already has development rights. Sam noted that the City has the ability to make requests and negotiate as the landowner. The Blazers do have contractual rights, but they do not preclude the ability to move forward with partners or explore compelling ideas. Tony asked for details on the Coliseum operating agreement and whether it had been effectively amended by the city. Sam said that he would refer the question to City attorneys for a better answer. ^(RL)

Walter Valenta asked whether the concept submissions were now part of the public domain or whether they belonged to each submitter. Sam said that some of the ideas would only work with specific submitters, while others had intentionally offered their ideas up for public review. Some submitters would not like to see their ideas move forward without them, though the committee can request to advance specific ideas.

Rick Michaelson said that he liked the idea of the parallel concept and idea tracks. He said that it will be important to know whether a team has the ability to carry out the needed activities moving forward. He cautioned that the two tracks need to be kept distinct.

Kia explained that the SAC has two meetings scheduled in February to deliberate on the concept submittals. At the first meeting, the SAC will receive the concepts sorted into Full Concepts, Partial Concepts, and Ideas. The team will also attempt to note development experience. If development expertise cannot be demonstrated, Partial Concepts will become ideas. The SAC will also be asked to complete a concept evaluation matrix. The evaluation of the concept components will help produce a statement about emerging themes. Evaluation of the Full Concepts will result in a recommendation on who should be invited to the RFP process.

Brian Owendoff asked how many of the submitted concepts were Full Concepts. Kia said that it appears that there are less than 20.

The SAC recommendation will be sent to City Council with an SAC spokesperson. Council may finish their deliberations in one or two meetings. There will then be a short timeframe for the proposal process and the RFP is being framed so that it won't take many months. The process is time sensitive and there is concern about developing as much as possible before the URA sunsets. As with the concept application process, this timeframe may be extended if necessary.

Dean Gisvold said that it seemed important to know whether any of the Full Concepts will require modifying existing contracts. Sam said that he did not want any good ideas to be withheld because of the possible need for renegotiations. **Rick Michaelson** noted that all of the contracts would require some degree of renegotiation.

Virginia Sewell said that the economic impact criteria would be difficult to evaluate. Sam said that market research may help narrow the list after it gets smaller.

The committee provided suggestions for how to compile the matrix responses. Kia said that the team would be creating an online survey tool to compile the responses. Several committee members cautioned against structuring questions so that the findings may be skewed by *not* ranking certain concepts.

Virginia Sewell encouraged using specific objective criteria for consistency. Kia noted that there is little quantitative data provided in the applications and that the matrix isn't intended as a scientific exercise. Vaughn noted that it would be obvious in some cases whether the submitters adequately responded to the evaluation criteria questions.

Andrew Colas noted that the SAC had developed the Evaluation Criteria and that it was appropriate to use subjective reasoning on a common scale to determine how the perspectives of the group line up.

Will Macht suggested that it would be simpler and more fair to rank the proposals in each category. **Rick Michaelson** said he liked the use of words like "dislike" and "compelling."

Samuel Brooks noted that consistency would be important. He questioned whether any of the evaluation criteria should have more weight than another.

Daniel Deutsch said that he would be interested in seeing the cross-section of answers from the group as opposed to just averages.

Clint Lundmark noted that he liked the matrix as is. It can be tabulated in different ways as needed. Clint suggested using *not-applicable* instead of *zero* for non-answers.

Rosemary Colliver suggested adding a *non-responsive* option in addition to *compelling*, *neutral*, or *dislike*. **Andrew Colas** suggested that a non-response would seem to indicate an incomplete proposal. Kia said that some questions were not answered, and there were some calls for demolition. The team would try and develop a consistent approach to dealing with these questions.

Vaughn emphasized that the evaluation is intended to help generate discussion. Sam added that the SAC is allowed to lobby for low ranking ideas that they feel have merit. Sam requested

permission from the SAC for project staff to initially cull concepts from the list with the understanding that they may be added back in by request.

Daniel Deutsch asked about the procedure for getting more information about a concept. Kia said that the team reserves the right to request more information from proposers. The Jan. 26 event will offer some opportunities to fill information gaps.

Virginia Sewell requested the opportunity to pose questions to concept submitters. Kia said that questions may be asked of concept submitters as part of the RFP process.

Rick Michaelson noted that there is value in evaluating individual components as well as full concepts.

Kevin reiterated that the project is currently in a transition phase from study mode to implementation mode. He encouraged the group to look back through the online project library and get well versed in relevant documents such as the Vision, legal rights and Veterans Focus Group meeting summary.

MC Renovation Snapshot – The Renovation Snapshot is an executive summary of the Coliseum Baseline Conditions report that has been prepared in response to questions about what needs to be done in order to retain existing conditions as a spectator facility. The snapshot discusses deferred maintenance and base-case improvements, as well as items that may increase the marketability of the venue. The summary notes city revenue and expense history, parking fees, ticket tax, and repairs and improvements. Cost estimates include approximately \$33 million in soft costs. Kevin requested that any feedback on the document be submitted in writing by the end of the week.

Tony Stacy asked whether it made sense to obtain a list of city owned equipment assets used in the Coliseum. Sam suggested that Dave Logsdon would know. ^(RL)

Sustainability Baseline – A Sustainability Baseline had been prepared in response to Regina Hauser's request. The Baseline summary notes the current situation and potential savings that may result from improvements.

Regina Hauser noted that the findings would seem to indicate that there is a water leak.

Public Presentation Event Plan

Event Format and Schedule – The team is currently coordinating the Jan. 26 event and looking for feedback. Presenters will be allowed a specific number of slides and amount of time. Presenters will also be able to participate in a poster gallery. The event may be about 3.5 hours. The plan is to use the southwest corner of the Coliseum concourse for the poster gallery and either the Georgia Pacific room or the Coliseum bowl for the presentations.

Presenters' Guidance – Vaughn noted that SAC members may have a limited amount of time to ask questions of the presenters. The goal is to make the presentations as useful as possible. The SAC may provide feedback on what the presenters should address. The SAC is also encouraged to get the word out about the event. An event teaser video is available to share on the project Web site.

Public Comment

Doug Oblatz noted a letter distributed to the committee. He noted that it was difficult to summarize proposals with less than 2,000 characters. While he was impressed by the success of the process and the passion of the proposers, there is concern about fairness and the process moving forward, particularly for those concepts characterized as community-based or non-profit. The letter recommends advancing only those concepts that specifically address the Coliseum. Submitters who did not address the full Rose Quarter should not be penalized. The letter recommends dividing the concepts into private, for-profit proposals, and non-profit, public proposals. The letter recommends eliminating the RFP phase because of the difficulty of non-profits competing against for-profit proposals. The letter also requests modifications to the existing operating agreement to allow a clear path for proposals that have a spectator component. Sam reiterated that this phase is only evaluating use of Memorial Coliseum.

Trudy Reusser reemphasized the findings from the Veterans Focus Group. The group agreed with the first two items but was in total opposition to moving the memorial. She also reiterated that the building itself is part of the memorial. The memorial is not just the wall.

James Arling introduced himself as a Major General and Chief of Chaplains for the National Defense Force of the United States. He noted prior references to the Coliseum chapel, which has fallen into disuse. He noted that he received letters from Iraq and many from the Oregon National Guard who are concerned with veterans' activities. When veterans return they will need council, and the Veterans Administration is not equipped to handle the problems that have arisen. Using the chapel as intended can help returning veterans to become better productive citizens for Portland and Oregon.

George Ager introduced himself as a WWII submarine force veteran. He polled the group to see how many patriots were present. He described a patriot as someone who loves, honors, and is willing to fight for their country. He has worked in the Coliseum for seven years. He noted his goal of getting the memorial wall into a space where people can see it throughout the day.

Brian Parrot said that he has been involved in renting the Coliseum 58 times. He congratulated the Mayor and the group for bringing the project together. He noted that the Coliseum is a competitive asset and that there are talented event promoters who could make the venue profitable if they were invited to fill open dates. He noted the possibility of bringing in a tennis event, or people from the USCA in Russia. He noted that the building is well maintained. **Rick Michaelson** asked what kind of seating Brian has used. Brian noted that having 10,000+ seats makes the venue competitive for the Davis Cup. The venue would not be competitive with less.

Gil Frey paid tribute to Brian Parrott who previously testified in 1992 on the construction of the Rose Garden. He said that they should not tear down the building and put in parking. Gil noted that a mention in the Oregonian had had claimed that the building is losing money. The building has an unhappy image that is getting worse. Gil noted that the Davis Cup happened in 1981 and that the event brought the very first factory from Japan to the area outside of Tanasbourne. Gil noted the money generated from the Davis Cup.

Andrew Colas asked how the information from George Ager would be reconciled with the Veterans Focus Group recommendation. Sam noted the group's support for leaving the memorial where it is, but asked that the issue continue to be discussed. Sam also asked that the veterans group review potential services as mentioned by James Arling to see if there are any that make sense for that location.

Close