



# Rose Quarter Development Project

## Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meeting #10

Tuesday – March 9, 2010 - 5 to 7:00 p.m.

Portland Development Commission

222 NW 5th Ave, Portland

## DRAFT Meeting Summary

### Meeting purpose

- Review component evaluation findings
- Develop aspirational statement
- Designate SAC spokesperson for Council hearing

### 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
- **Philip A. Kalberer**, Kalberer Company
- **Wade Lange**, Ashforth Pacific
- **Clint Lundmark**, Eliot Neighborhood Association
- **Will Macht**, Portland State University
- **Drew Mahalic**, Oregon Sports Authority
- **Rick Michaelson**, Urban Development Advocate
- **Marcus Mundy**, Urban League of Portland
- **Brian M. Owendoff**, Greenlight Greater Portland/CBRE
- **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
- **Cameron Vaughan-Tyler**, Portland Public Schools
- **Rick Williams**, Lloyd Transportation Management Association

### Core Project Team/Guests

- **Amy Ruiz**, City of Portland, Mayor's Office
- **Kia Selley**, Portland Development Commission
- **Kevin Brake**, Portland Development Commission
- **Nikolai Ursin**, Portland Development Commission
- **Dina Alexander**, Ball Janik
- **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. Kevin will review the findings from the online component evaluation. SAC members will be welcome to suggest additional components as needed. The component evaluation will lead into discussion of the Aspirational Statement. Proposer concerns about the existing operating agreement and the upcoming City Council meeting will also be addressed.

## Component Evaluation Results

Kevin explained the findings from the online component evaluation survey. All submitted concepts, even those moving into the RFP phase, were broken down into components that are represented in the matrix. Components are organized by category. Respondents were able to evaluate each component and provide additional comments as needed. Twenty-eight SAC members responded to the survey.

The summary notes components that received the highest ratings from the committee. The survey is intended as guidance for forming an Aspirational Statement. Teams responding to the RFP will be strongly encouraged to incorporate these elements into their proposals.

Some components were evenly divided between positive and negative responses. These components are noted in the report. Sam noted that all of the evaluation materials would be forwarded to City Council for consideration.

**Rick Michaelson** asked how components in the entertainment and fitness categories were differentiated. Kia explained that the categories were just organizational guides and that the components could be moved.

Kevin noted that the Sustainability components are only those that were represented in the submitted concepts. They are not intended to represent the complete range of sustainability options. There will be other sustainability requirements of the proposals.

Sam noted that improvements to the veterans' memorial received the highest level of support out of all of the concepts. Components such as Hotel, Affordable Housing, and Retail, gathered the most support in the "save for [the broader] Rose Quarter" category.

**SAC Impressions – Virginia Sewell** noted that it would be difficult to include both a symphony hall and a hockey rink in the same space. Kevin agreed that some of the components are mutually exclusive.

**Greg Phillips** noted the support for spectator sports, the veterans' memorial, sustainability, food, art and culture, and how each of these components leaves the bowl in place. Thus far there has been no justification for removing the bowl. Arts and culture elements are not the same as commercial entertainment and they aren't really compatible with uses in the Coliseum. It would be a stretch to add arts to the district in this way. While food elements may be feasible, other ideas like a jazz club just aren't compatible with the existing bowl.

**Rick Michaelson** suggested that it would be helpful if the components were categorized according to whether they *must* be included as a primary focus, *must* be included as a supporting activity, *may* be included, or should *not* be included.

**Regina Hauser** noted that the MARC concept does not include the bowl. **Greg Phillips** noted that the MARC team should be aware of the high costs of remove the bowl and that they should have private funding available to facilitate the removal. Sam noted that funding for the MARC is envisioned as entirely public. Some funding would come from a bond measure.

Kevin Brake advised that the group focus on the desirable components and keep the Aspirational Statement at a high level.

**Virginia Sewell** cautioned against providing redundant facilities or something that people may not use. Sam noted that proposers would be expected to provide some market justification for their concepts. The City will provide some assistance for the market analysis and will be fact checking market pitches after the proposals come back and before the subsequent SAC meeting. The three proposers will have to pick and choose between competing uses. They may choose not to pursue some of the components.

**Joseph Readdy** asked for clarification on the purpose of identifying the components. Sam suggested that the findings from the survey represent the sentiments of the SAC regarding the possible components to be incorporated into the proposer's overall plan for the MC.

**Dean Gisvold** suggested that more direction is needed as part of the RFP so the proposers know how to respond.

**Rick Michaelson** noted that the survey did not ask the SAC about whether the bowl could be removed.

Sam said that he was open to consolidating the component categories. **Rosemary Colliver** cautioned against generalizing and making the categories mutually exclusive. There must be consideration of how the components work together. If the Coliseum continues to serve only as a spectator facility, then it may continue to have problems generating 24/7 activities. Retail may be necessary to help bring people into the area. Sam noted that the survey findings recognize the existing use as a spectator venue and that the SAC has done a fairly good job of narrowing down the priority components. He suggested focusing on the components that the SAC is most passionate about.

**Virginia Sewell** suggested that the *performance spaces* and *live entertainment venue* components appeared to be the same thing. Educational components are good if they are accessible. Sam noted that the next phase would challenge proposers to incorporate the recommended components while incorporating others as they are able.

**Brian Owendoff** suggested designating components with 17 or more votes as part of the Aspirational Statement. The onus will be on the proposer to establish whether there is a market for the component or not and to tie into existing investments. **Marcus Mundy** noted that using a 17-vote threshold would mean that all of the educational components fail. Sam suggested maintaining some expectation that the proposals contribute an educational benefit and that support for youth would be worthwhile. **Andrew Colas** suggested that educational aspirations could be integrated with components throughout the facility. This would be particularly relevant to the Veterans' Memorial.

**Greg Philips** suggested that the SAC could recommend a focus on food, art, culture and entertainment in the non-bowl area, with a focus on spectator sports and *some* entertainment within the bowl. **Rick Michaelson** suggested that it would be a failure if the bowl were only to be used for spectator sports. He encouraged proposers to consider other uses as well.

**Daniel Deutsch** noted that it would be difficult to evaluate some of the components without knowing the scope of development within the district as a whole. Sam noted that it will be necessary to cover the same ground whether the process begins with the district or with the Coliseum. Subsequent work will also inform the thinking on the use of the Coliseum. **Daniel** said that he would not want to make a decision until complementary functions in the district are identified. Sam again noted the iterative nature of the process. Previous efforts may have failed

because they focused on a specific use for the Coliseum or the district without being flexible. **Daniel** suggested that knowing the status of the bowl could help resolve some issues.

**Regina Hauser** noted the desire to see the facility function as a whole and as a sustainable building that people use. The SAC wants to see flexibility and have a sense that the facility will adjust to a changing world.

**Philip Kalberer** noted SAC support for spectator facilities. Other popular components, such as sustainability and education, are supportive of those primary uses while others may not be compatible. Sam noted the mix of support for both design components and potential uses.

Sam asked for specific guidance on treatment of the bowl.

**Dean Gisvold** noted that it may not be possible to remove all or a portion of the bowl given the historic designation. Sam suggested keeping the legal obligations separate from what the community supports. It would not be completely impossible to eliminate the bowl.

**Tony Stacy** noted that veterans' groups were aware of the legal considerations regarding the bowl and they will be providing feedback to the SAC. He suggested that sports venues could be made multipurpose and able to be converted to support a range of events.

**Marcus Mundy** noted that removing the bowl should be a consideration if the removal would be expensive and the concept is dependent on public financing.

**Regina Hauser** suggested that restricting use of the bowl would effectively remove one of the proposals. **Daniel Deutsch** noted that the bowl should be a front and center issue and that if an option will create tension, it should be known.

**Paul Falsetto** noted that it would be useful for proposers to know about potential deal breakers. However, elements of buildings do change and he suggested that getting rid of the bowl wouldn't be a deal breaker. What is more important is what is visible inside the box and what the skin looks like from the outside.

**Rick Michaelson** said that it is important to protect the spirit and sense of the bowl even if it is partially removed. The "square around an oval" theme should be preserved.

**Greg Phillips** noted that while removing the bowl might facilitate the most creative way to use the box and activate the space during daylight and nighttime hours, using only public funds for that purpose seems unlikely.

**Sam Brooks** suggested that the final three proposers should have the right to propose what they believe will pencil out. The logic of removing the bowl will depend on their plan. Proposers should be free to take the list of compelling components and run with their ideas.

**Will Macht** noted that the programs within each proposal need to make operational sense without requiring operating subsidies. He suggested thinking in programmatic terms. If the bowl accommodates 12,000 people, then it would seem unwise to spend money to remove the capacity that has been largely responsible for generating income over past 10 years.

**Andrew Colas** noted that the MARC proposal was clear about their intent to remove the bowl and that the SAC had already affirmed that the MARC concept should move forward. **Rick Michaelson** noted that the concept could be modified based on the SAC recommendations.

Sam polled the group regarding their thoughts. The results:

- *Leave the bowl intact* – 4
- *Feel free to remove the bowl* – 6
- *In between* – 0
- *Let the proposals go forward* – 14

Sam reiterated Andrew Colas' suggestion that educational elements should be incorporated where logical into the components that had 17 or more votes. **Daniel Deutsch** advised also taking cost into consideration. **Wade Lange** asked whether the same suggestion could be applied to the sustainability elements. Sam noted that the support for educational components was less specific and more conceptual. The sustainability components were rated very high. The idea isn't to bolt on components but to add them where they make sense. **Paul Falsetto** suggested that the recommendation could include educational or *inspirational* elements.

Sam noted Greg Phillips' suggestion about designating areas outside of the bowl as logical for food, culture, and arts, with sports and some entertainment uses focused in the bowl. He offered to share the suggestion.

**Daniel Deutsch** noted that a spectator facility could be flexible for multiple uses, though a symphonic or theatre space would be less flexible. He interpreted support for spectator uses as being less accommodating to music. **Greg Phillips** noted that a 7,000-12,000 seat venue would not be appropriate for many musical events.

**Virginia Sewell** cautioned against adding a theatre simply to address the arts. Proposers should discuss the needs of arts stakeholders and how they plan to address those needs.

**Greg Phillips** noted the need for a better facility for opera and ballet. This would free up the Keller for other uses, create arts venue in the Rose Quarter, and serve as economic engine. Such a use would require a specific space although none of the proposals include that. **Rick Michaelson** suggested that such uses may be included elsewhere in the Rose Quarter.

**Andrew Colas** noted that there was not the same degree of support for arts facilities in the Coliseum as for other uses.

Sam noted that a range of facilities would be considered for the district after the proposals come back. He suggested keeping alive the expectation that arts and culture will be incorporated where appropriate.

## **Public Comment**

**Harley Wedel** clarified that the veterans group was only interested in a statewide, not national memorial. Veterans and other service people have made their wishes known through the expectation list that was distributed to the SAC. He encouraged that those expectations be incorporated into the discussion. Sam noted that he will be meeting with the Veterans Group on Friday.

**Mike Gilliland**, an architect with the VMAAC group noted that he has wrestled questions about the current process. Some of the questions being raised pertain to the differences between an RFQ and an RFP. An RFQ would result in a proposal that qualifies for use in the Coliseum. An RFP would explain the program in detail. Bear in mind that the discussion of qualifying a group to come up with an idea is different than creating an actual biddable proposal. He suggested that each group come up with an answer to both of those situations.

## **SAC Recommendation**

Sam explained that staff will come up with a draft Aspirational Statement based on tonight's meeting and circulate to the SAC for review.

**Marcus Mundy** noted that there had not been much discussion of social equity. He encouraged that staff make sure it is a prominent part of the Aspirational Statement.

## Next Steps

**MC Operating Agreement** – Sam noted that two of the three finalists have raised questions about the operating agreement as a barrier to their proposals. He noted that even if the current operator is selected there will need to be modifications to the current agreement. There will be a meeting with each proposer to discuss the issue tomorrow. Sam expressed confidence that the Trail Blazers would make way for the selected entity if they are not selected as operator. In order to be more responsive to some of the concerns raised by two of the finalists, voluntary changes to the operating agreement would be sought before approaching City Council.

**Rick Michaelson** noted the importance of resolving the question before the RFP is issued. Sam said that the process may be delayed if necessary to address the questions. Hopefully a voluntary agreement will be reached before Thursday.

**Dean Gisvold** noted that PAM has development rights until 2023 and that it does not seem fair to ask proposers to enter into an expensive RFP process if they do not know the details. The Blazers have indicated in some newspaper articles that they would be unwilling to move away from the current agreement. Sam responded that the process would not be held hostage by any of the three finalists. While none of the proposers will get entirely what they want, hopefully they will each get something fair and workable. If any of the proposers are not able to acquire money for their architectural design services, then they shouldn't be a finalist. Some of the proposals have been in development for years. There are varying equities and inequities between the proposers.

**Philip Kalberer** commended the effort to renegotiate. He suggested that a level playing field might also include providing the stipend up front instead of after the RFPs are submitted. Kia noted that the guidelines surrounding the stipend are being developed. In the past, stipends have been provided based on the responsiveness to the proposal so that in effect PDC is buying the contents of the proposal. The goal is to be a good steward of public money. The stipend will be provided if the proposal is deemed responsive and PDC will work with proposers to make sure that they understand what is necessary to qualify.

**Greg Phillips** asked whether it would be unreasonable to ask that proposals not be completely dependent on public financing. Sam noted the original assumption that proposals would be public and private but suggested that fully public proposals would be acceptable so long as there is responsibility for potential losses and operations expenditures. Public proposals will also need to demonstrate public support if they require a vote. They must be demonstrably financially sustainable and should not put the general fund at risk.

**Nominate and confirm SAC members to present recommendation** – Kevin asked that the SAC self-nominate representatives to make the recommendation to City Council. This group may also be the group that reviews the RFP and responses. After discussion, Alicia J. Rose, Andrew Colas, and Tony Stacy were nominated to present the recommendation.

The SAC will be informed by 10am on Mar. 11 if the 2pm recommendation to City Council will or will not proceed. Additional testimony regarding the recommendation and a minority report may be submitted in writing or in person at the meeting.

## Close