



Rose Quarter Development Project

Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting #8

Tuesday – February 9, 2010 - 5 to 7:30 p.m.

Portland Development Commission

222 NW 5th Ave, Portland

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Meeting purpose

- **Debrief concept presentations event and public input**
- **Discuss concept short list eligibility**

Attendance

- **Sam Adams**, Mayor – City of Portland
- **Carolyn Briggs**, Lloyd District Association
- **Samuel Brooks**, Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs (OAME)
- **Andrew Colas**, National Association of Minority Contractors (NAMCO)
- **Daniel Deutsch**, Leftbank Project
- **Paul Falsetto**, American Institute of Architects
- **Traci Manning**, (alt. for Dean Gisvold) Central City Concern
- **Regina Hauser**, Natural Step Network
- **Philip A. Kalberer**, Kalberer Company
- **Lillian Karabaic**, Bicycle Transportation Alliance
- **Wade Lange**, Ashforth Pacific
- **Clint Lundmark**, Eliot Neighborhood Association
- **Will Macht**, Portland State University
- **Drew Mahalic**, Oregon Sports Authority
- **Sandra McDonough**, Portland Business Alliance
- **Rick Michaelson**, Urban Development Advocate
- **Marcus Mundy**, Urban League of Portland
- **Greg Phillips**, Portland Center Stage
- **Joseph Readdy**, American Institute of Architects
- **Jules Renaud**, Student – Winterhaven School
- **Alicia J. Rose**, Mississippi Studios and independent artist
- **Virginia Sewell**, Oregon Ballet Theatre
- **Rudy Soto**, PSU and Oregon National Guard
- **Tony Stacy**, One Wolf Soccer, Management and Development
- **Walter Valenta**, Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal District Advisory Cmte.
- **Cameron Vaughan-Tyler**, Portland Public Schools

Core Project Team

- **Amy Ruiz**, City of Portland, Mayor's Office
- **Karl Lisle**, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
- **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 welcomed the group and led introductions of the committee members and the audience. Sam noted the letter distributed at SAC meeting #7 that advocated revising the RFP process so that only the top-rated concept advances to the proposal phase. That issue will not be addressed at this meeting. Sam noted concerns about the existing operating agreement. He noted that the current agreement would very likely need to be modified regardless of which concept is selected. The City does have leverage when it comes to negotiating a development agreement. The task for this meeting is to address the concepts and ideas from the public discussion.

Rick Michaelson noted the need to discuss whether the facility would be operated as a private or public facility. Sam noted that form should follow function and that each proposer will need to demonstrate their ability to successfully operate the Coliseum while convincing the SAC and City Council that their proposal makes sense.

Vaughn summarized the agenda. The meeting will include a debrief of the Jan. 26 event and an attempt to shorten the list of concepts to discuss at the next meeting. Information has been sent to the SAC to inform the discussion. Input from staff as well as public comments gathered at the Jan. 26 event have also been made available.

Vaughn reiterated that the process is now shifting into decision-making mode. The SAC will be required to provide frank assessments of the concepts. Vaughn acknowledged the contributions from the public as part of this process.

MC Event Debrief

SAC perceptions – Sam asked the group for comments on the event.

- **Regina Hauser** said that she felt submitters may not have understood what is meant by Sustainability, or that that did not have time to explain. A green building is not necessarily sufficient, green uses are also important.
- **Alicia Rose** said she was surprised at the content and how there was a lot of variation on single ideas. Arts and other areas were underrepresented. There were some interesting structural ideas although some of the content was questionable.
- **Joseph Readdy** said that he was looking for concepts that would use the Coliseum as catalyst for the larger district. Sam noted that the call for concepts was specific to the Coliseum.
- **Walter Valenta** said that the event was exciting, like breathing life into the Coliseum itself. The ideas presented on simple boards outshone those with video and fancy presentations. There was a bit of tediousness by the end of the presentations, perhaps inevitably so. Spending time in the bowl felt sort of depressing.
- **Cameron Vaughn-Tyler** said that she liked being in the bowl as it gave her a chance to visualize the space. She acknowledged the preparation of the presenters. The experience was good and she appreciated the inclusion of the public.
- **Sandra McDonough** said that she enjoyed the creativity. If the concept ideas are representative of the general public, then there is an apparent need to draw people in for participatory activities that extend beyond spectator sports.
- **Sam Brooks** noted that the event was successful in gathering concepts regardless of their feasibility. The presentations were good and definitely thinking outside the box.

- **Philip Kalberer** agreed that there were many creative out-of-box ideas. He suggested that while many of the ideas may not be appropriate for the Coliseum, they may be appropriate elsewhere. He commended the presenters for their time.
- **Rick Michaelson** said that while no single concept had it right, there were lots of good ideas. There needs to be a way to combine the good elements of the different concepts.
- **Virgina Sewell** agreed with Rick Michaelson regarding the need to use the components to influence a master plan. She also agreed that the arts were underrepresented and that sports were overrepresented. She enjoyed the event.
- **Drew Mahalic** said that he was generally pleased and impressed with the concepts. If done properly, the Rose Quarter can be the center and heart of the City. The better proposals had common themes, mostly involving sports. While the presentations were brief, there was enough information to gain focus on the leading proposals.
- **Traci Manning** said that she was struck by the energy and time from those involved. She expressed gratitude from the people of Portland and noted that it was good to see participation from the public. Many of the concepts were beautiful but expensive. The community will need to balance public benefit and cost. She was excited to see favorite details included in different proposals and she encouraged thinking about how to combine components.
- **Daniel Deutsch** said that he was pleased with that process and that he felt there is a good solution in amongst the 96. He said that he did not feel quite ready to evaluate much at this point.
- **Tony Stacy** said he was impressed with the ideas that came forward. The ideas indicate that residents are interested in a change. He said that he had received messages for the mayor and staff from veterans groups who appreciate the attention and who are feeling more like stakeholders. Tony also said that he would have liked to see more art and music concepts.
- **Carolyn Briggs** said that she was struck by how many of the presentations addressed areas outside the building. Private development along waterfront may not be in the public interest and there are concerns about how much private development might need to occur in order to make the building profitable. She liked the mix of combinable concepts, such as public places for markets, gardens, offices, and family sports.
- **Marcus Mundy** agreed that many of the concepts focused on the surrounding neighborhood. He said that he was looking towards community benefits and how to help vitality through jobs and training opportunities through whatever is built. Maintaining vibrancy is also an element of sustainability. He noted questions of how the facility would be used in off-hours and the non-busy season.
- **Clint Lundmark** commented that participation was amazing and it was fabulous to see the public that showed up. The reality of having to now make a selection is daunting.
- **Greg Philips** complimented staff for setting up a good event in a challenging venue. He acknowledged the passion of the presenters. While there was no concept that was totally successful, there were so many creative elements amongst the concepts that it looks like a hybrid concept could work.
- **Wade Lange** noted that he also had a sense of the applicants' passion. The group has difficult choices to make. If the passion can be maintained throughout the decision making process, the project will be successful.

- **Paul Falsetto** noted the passion of the presenters. The presentations breathed life into the written proposals. He was less interested in the proposals that focused on areas outside of the Coliseum or uses that could be accommodated elsewhere. He is more interested in long-term viable uses that contribute back to the city and add vibrancy to the area.
- **Andrew Colas** said that he felt the event went well given the short amount of time for presentations. Three presenters specifically mentioned cultural heritage. Moving forward, it will be important to acknowledge the past and the displacement that originally occurred when the Coliseum was built. Overall, it was a great event.
- **Will Macht** had four points: 1) The process constrained the SAC to think only inside the box of the Coliseum to the detriment of the Rose Quarter as a whole, rather than outside the box to the Rose Quarter as a whole. 2) Only two or three of the concepts were likely to be feasible from a development perspective. 3) A base-case scenario that includes basic and essential capital and programmatic improvements within the Coliseum was not represented but should be used against which to compare the concepts. 4) While almost all of the concepts would require public investment, very few acknowledged that, nor suggested the scale of public costs, or weighed them against public benefits.
- **Rudy Soto** felt the event was well coordinated. There was a great amount of public participation as well as the opportunity to ask questions of presenters. The presenters seemed impressed by the ideas of others and the event was a testament towards getting ideas on the table. At end of the day, only a very few of the concepts are feasible. The next step will involve asking tough questions, but not letting applicants feel deceived or like they wasted their time.

Public input findings – Vaughn noted that there were roughly 650 attendees who submitted about 150 comment cards. The cards asked respondents to list their 1st, 2nd and 3rd choice concepts. Comment respondents were also asked about which concept themes they liked. The SAC recommendation to City Council will allow the committee to address elements that may be missing from the selected concepts. The SAC aspirational statement will also have significant weight on the proposal process. The public also provided feedback on the Evaluation Criteria. Many comments noted that *all* of the criteria were important. The public findings are intended as a reference tool for the SAC. The event summary will be posted at www.RQDev.org following this meeting. Feedback from the public is only one component of the culling process.

Concept Team Screening Process

Decision-making process reminder – Kevin reminded that the group that project team has begun to assess which concepts have teams on board that are capable of moving through the RFP process. The SAC may provide feedback on the team’s assessment. SAC members will be able to rate selected concepts based on the Evaluation Criteria using an online survey that will be available in the next week. Moving forward, each concept that doesn’t have a development team will be broken down into individual components that may be called out for consideration during the RFP process.

Recommendation content – Kevin noted that the team had not carried out extensive research on the qualifications of the teams. The list includes concepts that were received by the Jan. 29 deadline that use the entire building, and that indicate that they have a developer on board with access to capital.

Philip Kalberer asked about the “Rose Quarter Development Strategy Ideas” column. Kevin noted that the column denotes which concepts also take the larger district into consideration. Some of those concepts may be put on hold during this phase of the process. Philip expressed

concern that other concepts may have included broader Rose Quarter elements if they had known they would be considered.

Carolyn Briggs noted that some of the concepts relied on having hotels adjacent to the building. She asked how such concepts would be considered. Sam said that while those elements would not be considered at this time, the committee should be aware that the concepts won't be fully formed until a plan for the district is reached. Requiring an element outside of the building does not make for a better proposal. **Rick Michaelson** asked whether those concepts should lose credit or be disqualified. Sam said that the SAC would need to use their individual judgment. Several SAC members suggested removing the column from the matrix. Kevin said that input on the discussion draft was welcome.

Review SAC discussion draft matrix – Kevin asked whether the SAC felt any of the seven recommended concepts should not move forward for evaluation. He said that concepts without a developer will be broken down and considered for their components unless they are non-responsive and call for demolition or partial demolition of the building.

Virginia Sewell said that she thought *BOXPlayhouse* had a developer. Kia said that while the *BOXPlayhouse* concept team had consultants who have been involved in the development process, they have not demonstrated that they have a partner who has experience implementing projects and accessing capital. Verification of development experience and access to capital will be performed as part of the RFP process. The SAC will be charged with rating the final list of concepts using an online survey.

Daniel Deutsch said that he felt the *Natural History Museum* concept had a compelling case for why it is difficult to get access to capital. Their concept application does explain acquiring government funding. He questioned whether there should be different considerations for those types of project. Sam said that the SAC could add concepts to the list if they feel they are viable.

Next steps – Homework for Feb. 23 – Kevin noted subsequent slides which showed the concepts that were broken down into components. Many fell into specific categories. The different elements will be used by the SAC to formulate their aspirational statement. An online survey on the prospective concept list will be posted by the end of the week.

SAC Initial Screen

Vaughn noted that a short list of around three concepts will be invited to create more complex and detailed proposals. The purpose of the concept gathering phase was to generate enthusiasm and identify components that may not have been included in individual development proposals. Tonight, the SAC will look at some of the more developed concepts while weighing public and staff feedback.

Four concepts were included in both the staff recommendation and in the list of the top six rated concepts from the Coliseum Marketplace event. The *Natural History Museum* was not included in the staff recommendation and three of the staff recommended concepts were not rated in the public top six.

Virginia Sewell cautioned against putting too much weight on the public feedback.

Greg Phillips noted that the *Jewel in a Box* concept was an office use. He questioned whether to keep the concept on the list if the committee doesn't agree with that use. **Carolyn Briggs** noted that the *Jewel in a Box* concept does address daily uses of the building and she suggested that the concept represented a potentially viable non-sports use. Kia noted that the *Jewel in a Box* concept proposes to modify the inside of the building and would not maintain the facility as a flexible venue moving forward. Vaughn noted that components of the concept such as daily use could be included in the aspirational statement.

Traci Manning suggested that the MARC, Trail Blazers, and Community Cross Roads concepts would be favored by the SAC.

Greg Philips questioned whether the selected proposal would be required to adhere to the aspirational statement. He noted that he would be less inclined to advance a concept if the submitter isn't interested in being flexible. Sam said that proposers would need to be responsive to the aspirational statement and that the SAC will be able to tell whether they are including the recommended components.

Rick Michaelson asked if it would be possible to give a concept submitter the opportunity to reform an otherwise viable concept so that it does not affect the bowl. Sam noted that proposals would need to be responsive to the aspirational statement if it cites a need for the bowl.

Kia noted that there would be an opportunity for the SAC to invite a small group of concept submitters to the next meeting to respond to questions. Sam noted that more information about the RFP will be available at the next meeting.

Sam Brooks noted that the group should consider the ability of the concept developers to implement each proposal. **Rick Michaelson** noted that each of the groups consider themselves capable. Sam Adams asked whether anyone was familiar with the cited list of developers.

- **OregonXperience, Clark Realty Capitol:** No one was familiar with this developer.
- **Portland Action Sports Complex, Beam Development:** Portland developer who has worked with PDC.
- **VMAAC, David Tacheny:** No one was familiar with this developer.
- **Trail Blazers and Winterhawks Concept, Cordish Company:** Developer has worked with PDC, responsible for the Live! developments.
- **Jewel in a Box, Kevin Kavenaugh:** Developer responsible for the Rocket Building and other 3-4 story developments in Portland.
- **MARC, Doug Oblatz:** Experience on public projects and working with PDC.
- **Rose Quarter Community Crossroads, Nick Sauvia:** Non-profit developer, work on affordable housing projects.

Virginia Sewell noted that it would be difficult to assess how many of the concepts provided redundant facilities. Sam said that it would be possible to conduct a market analysis after shortening the concept list. Proposals will also need to establish need. It may be possible to conduct independent market analysis on up to five proposals.

Will Macht asked why the Trail Blazers were not listed as a developer for their concept. Kia explained that only the most nationally recognized developer on each team was listed. Will noted that the Blazers have access to capital, though he questioned whether they would use it.

Wade Lange expressed concern about removing any of the concepts too quickly. Kia noted that the group would also be able to evaluate the list using the online survey.

Sam asked the SAC to participate in a straw poll and help narrow the list for further evaluation. He instructed each SAC member to list their top three concepts. Sam shared the findings:

1. *Trail Blazers and Winterhawks Concept*
2. *Memorial Athletic and Recreation Complex (MARC)*
3. *Vision Into Action: Community Crossroads*
4. *Veterans Memorial Arts and Athletic Center (VMAAC)*
5. *Portland Action Sports*
6. *Natural History Museum*
7. *Jewel in a Box*
8. *OregonXperience*

Sam reiterated how other ideas may come from the non-viable concepts. SAC members will be able to rank the concepts online this week. The poll will help inform who should attend the next meeting. Kia noted that the evaluation between meetings will provide data on how the SAC feels, but the online evaluation will not be final.

Kia announced that two concepts – *BOXPlayhouse* and *Activeeation* – have now indicated that they have development experience and that they wish to be considered. It is up to the SAC whether they should allow *BOXPlayhouse* and *Activeeation* to proceed since the new information was submitted after the deadline. The Natural History Museum met the Jan. 29 deadline for updating their team composition, but does not have a developer on board with access to capital. With permission from the SAC, Sam invited representatives of these three concepts to testify regarding the improvements to their teams:

- **BOXPlayhouse** the contact for the concept apologized for missing the deadline. He said that both a funding source and developer are in hand. The developer, JMI, put together the San Diego stadium and several surrounding uses. They are currently involved in training exercises in Phoenix, and are helping develop the new Knight Center in Eugene. They bring expertise and funding sources to the team.
- **Activeeation:** Will Swanson noted that CSA is onboard as architect, partnered with Windham and Hyatt. CSA has been a developer for the Philadelphia Eagles stadium. The team designer works with Nike and other local clients. Will noted that there has been short notice for this project. The information submitted on Jan. 29 had listed CSA as architect/developer. CSA is a partner with Hyatt and Windham although they are not a developer themselves. Over \$1 billion in funding is available through multiple sources. A partner has access to \$800 million in funding. D.A. Davidson in Bend has \$150 million. San Diego based Bank of Internet has \$100 million available. Will has letters of interest from four banks. Will said that concept would benefit the community and local businesses. Will represents IronWill designs. He has owned several businesses and worked for several banks.
- **Museum of Natural and Cultural History:** Gina Ronning is a PSU Student. The museum concept team does not have funding in the same way the other groups do. There are qualified team members. She noted that the HOP: Heart of Portland concept merged with the Museum concept prior to Jan. 29. They have experience with proposals dealing with the Olympics and other projects. Also on the team is the president of one of the nation's largest roofing companies who has experience working with developers. She noted that the concept is taking longer to get people on board. Because it is a non-profit concept, funding would come from different public funding resources and grants. Gina noted that they do not feel there has been adequate time to explain the viability of their concept.

Clint Lundmark noted that the comment log reflects a lot of public support for the Action Sports complex. The comment log should also be considered as the SAC deliberates.

Tony Stacy said that the Museum of Natural & Cultural History concept could be worth closer examination with the right partnership.

Greg Philips said that while some of the concepts focus on sports and entertainment, there is another sector of the public that also loves the arts, culture and food. The best concept will enable both uses. He suggested the idea of a concert hall within the box – a home for Portland Opera and Portland Ballet as anchor tenants. The facility could be rimmed with food purveyors. The facility could be the home for the Portland Jazz Festival and honor the traditions of the

area. A single use, whether a museum or sports venue, will not be inclusive of the whole community. The facility has the potential to bring tourists from the whole area. So long as each of the concepts are open to this possibility, they should move forward. The VMAAC concept as well as others may be open to this.

Lillian Karabaic noted that the *Jewel in a Box* concept is also supportive of more diverse uses, such as for arts and restaurants.

Sam suggested that the SAC vote online to determine the fifth “wildcard” concept. The SAC should come prepared to ask questions of the selected concepts. He suggested that the non-panelist concept submitters also show up at the next meeting in case the SAC has questions.

Andrew Colas questioned whether the SAC would be able to discuss visions for the whole district at the next meeting. **Greg Philips** said that he liked the focus on the Coliseum. He suggested that the Coliseum use could serve to activate the whole community and help create the district. **Regina Hauser** questioned the exclusive focus on the building. Sam noted that previous discussions have resulted in spreading the conversation too thinly over the district. Kia noted that while the process is not looking for a broader Rose Quarter developer at this time, an MOU is in place to address other areas in the district in the future.

Sam reminded the group that the process is iterative and there will be the opportunity to push the eventual proposer on what happens in the rest of the Rose Quarter. Sam confirmed that the discussion would remain focused on the Coliseum. The SAC will rank the concepts online and become educated about the recommended concepts so they can ask questions. The SAC will vote online on the wildcard concept.

Carolyn Briggs requested the ability to submit online questions for the concept submitters.

Kia noted that the SAC should use their concept application CDs as well as the PDF addenda provided through email as tools for evaluating the concepts.

Marcus Mundy questioned how much influence the SAC really has over the chosen concepts. Sam said that the final product will be a combination of what the SAC recommends, what concept elements are marketable and proven, and what the proposers think. The proposers will either need to convince the SAC how the aspirations will happen or why they won't work.

Public Comment

Harley Wiedel noted that he had provided buttons to the SAC members in hopes that there would be discussion of the veterans memorial. He noted that the building is a memorial, and yet there has been no constructive discussion of the memorial yet. Sam noted that a number of the proposals do include improvements to veterans' services or the memorial and that while it may not have been specifically mentioned tonight, it remains the *Veterans Memorial Coliseum*. **Sam Brooks** noted that the Veterans Focus Group has asked to meet with the selected concepts and discuss their plans for the memorial.

Trudy Reusser noted that her team proposal, the Veterans Memorial Coliseum Upgrade, included the elements suggested by Greg Philips. She said that the current decisions seem premature and that questions haven't been answered. She noted that it was presented that there was no benefit to the community in reducing the seating capacity of the Coliseum bowl. She noted that any efforts to resize the bowl should be thoroughly justified.

Gary Marsake noted that while the process is open and transparent, there is still the perception that the process is weighted towards a predetermined outcome. It is imperative to find ways collaborative ways to make the Rose Quarter a hub of community activity. The project should serve as a model for community development. While there may never be agreement on a single

concept, it is important to engage those who have responded to the call for concepts so that they can continue to influence the public outcome. Gary suggested building a committee similar to the SAC that would advise the selected development teams regarding elements of the project. It will be important to ensure that the creative concepts aren't left behind. The timeline seems to penalize community driven concepts that may need more time and guidance. He suggested making the next stage open to concepts that have demonstrated broad community support.

Will Swanson said that he wanted to address the constant day and night use of the facility. He suggested that it is important for all potential projects to honor veterans, enhance the memorial, and maintain the sports theme for the entire district. Visitors will need to come and stay, though the area is currently not easily accessible by foot. He encouraged that the SAC be mindful of how their thoughts are ultimately incorporated.

Gil Frey joked that the process is taking too long and that it could have been finished a long time ago. He noted that he was selected for the Veterans Focus Group and that he felt intimidated. He was able to speak for two minutes on 27 questions. One question: "What are the ideal attributes of a veterans' memorial in Portland?" was particularly intimidating and required him to summarize his response in no more than three words even though it was a deep and serious question.

Close