

## Cascade Bond Advisory Committee: Meeting Notes #8

**Next Meeting**  
**Thursday, May 26, 2011**  
**6:00 – 8:00 pm**  
*Dinner available 5:45 pm*  
**Peninsula Park Community Center**  
**700 N. Rosa Parks Way**  
**Portland, Oregon**

**See updated meeting schedule on last page**

- Meeting Date:** April 28, 2011, 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
- Meeting Location:** Peninsula Park Community Center, 700 N. Rosa Parks Way, Portland, Oregon
- Attending:**
- BAC Members:*** Brian Murtagh, Kerri Melda, Tom Markgraf, Royce Mason, Margaret Mahoney, Lisa Reed Guarnero, Mark Tellis, Paula Barreto, Justin Elardo, Derrick Foxworth and Sonja Grove
- PCC Staff:*** Linda Degman, Rebecca Ocken, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Christine Egan, Abe Proctor, Randy McEwen.
- Presenters:*** Will Dann and Nick Hodges, THA Architects
- Guests:*** Neighborhood: Kathleen Rowlands, Laurie Therrell  
 Agency: Paul Cathcart, Portland Public Schools
- Facilitators:*** Sharif Abdullah and Jeanne Nyquist, Innovative Growth Solutions, LLC

### **Welcome:**

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 pm. Abe Proctor welcomed the committee members, PCC staff and guests.

### **Public Comment:**

Kathleen Rowlands, a resident on N. Commercial Avenue, shared her concerns regarding traffic on N. Commercial Street. Ms. Rowlands explained that PCC service trucks, shuttle buses and student vehicles all use N. Commercial as a through-way for access to Cascade's north parking lot. She further explained that students and residents park on both sides of this narrow residential street, constricting traffic to nearly one lane. She cited three incidents over the past year when her family's and neighbor's vehicles sustained damage from sideswipes. She emphasized that N. Commercial is not adequate to handle the traffic volume. Ms. Rowlands suggested that a potential solution to relieve traffic on N. Commercial would be to site a parking structure in the north lot and use N. Kerby Avenue as an access to the lot. BAC members expressed their appreciation to Ms. Rowlands and invited her to participate in the meeting discussions.

## **Meeting Goals:**

Sharif Abdullah, facilitator, reviewed the goals for the meeting:

- Review stakeholder engagement activity and feedback
- Discuss Guiding Principles
- Identify pros and cons of modeling schemes

BAC members reviewed and approved meeting notes from the March 31, 2011 meeting.

## **Review of Stakeholder Engagement Activities:**

Christine Egan provided an overview of stakeholder engagement activities by reviewing the goals of stakeholder engagement:

- Understand stakeholder needs
- Engage a diversity of stakeholders
- Solicit public input at key decision points

Christine reviewed the stakeholder engagement process for the Cascade Campus bond project:

- Humboldt Voice Committee, a subcommittee of the Humboldt Neighborhood Association, began meeting with PCC District and campus staff every 6 weeks, beginning fall 2009.
- Cascade Campus Strategic Working Group (SWG), made up of PCC Cascade Campus faculty, staff and students, have been meeting regularly with PCC Bond Design Team to identify campus programming needs.
- Bond Project Staff conducted a Walk-About Survey and individual interviews with more than 70 residents, business owners and representatives from local non-profit organizations, educational facilities and faith-based groups between August and October 2010.
- The Bond Advisory Committee (BAC) was convened in November 2010, to consider the diverse needs and interests of stakeholders most affected by the projected development of the Cascade Campus.
- More than 25 people participated in a campus/community tour in January 2011, to orient BAC members and other interested stakeholders.

Christine reported that PCC staff and BAC members reached out to a broad range of stakeholders through targeted mailings and individual contacts, inviting interested parties to attend six open houses hosted April 19, 20 and 21, 2011. More than 190 people attended the events at Coffeehouse 5, the Asian Reporter, North Portland Library, Piedmont Church of Christ, Campus PSE Building and Campus Quad. Attendees were invited to explore their ideas using an innovative, hands-on, 3-D table-top model. Christine briefly summarized the range of interests raised by participants:

- Neighborhood and public safety – Concerns were expressed about campus security. Some suggested relocating Public Safety Office to center of campus or the Kanjaya block to enhance security.
- Parking – Some wondered if a parking garage is needed other than for peak periods, while others felt a parking garage is necessary and offered the following suggestions and observations:
  - Locate garage on Killingsworth – some felt this would be an advantage for traffic in the neighborhood, while others felt it would be an eyesore for the commercial district.
  - Locate garage near freeway to keep traffic out of the neighborhood.
  - Locate garage closer to MAX line.
  - Provide one parking structure to make security easier to handle.
  - Locate parking (garage/lots) within proximity of classrooms.
- Building locations – A number of opinions were expressed regarding building locations on campus:

- Student Center and Library – some felt the Student Center and Library should be combined and located in center of campus; while others felt current Library needs to be expanded and Student Center moved to Paragon block.
  - Academic Building needs southern exposure for child play area. Garage should be located close by for ease of pick up and drop off.
  - Telephone Exchange Building – some felt it should be preserved because of historical value, while others felt it should be removed to provide better freeway access.
- Street fronts should be active and 'walkable'.
  - More secure bicycle parking should be provided.
  - Consider providing pedestrian bridges across Killingsworth to connect campus with commercial district.
  - Maintain campus mall and green space.
  - Paragon Club site would make a great theatre space.

Sharif Abdullah asked the BAC for their insights on Christine's report. Derrick Foxworth stated that stakeholder comments validated many of the concepts that the BAC and SWG have been discussing, such as relocating Public Safety to a more central place on campus.

### **Guiding Principles:**

The BAC reviewed the Guiding Principles for the Cascade Campus Plan (drafted on 2-21-11) to guide their discussion on development options. BAC members observed that all of the guiding principles are important. They participated in a prioritization exercise highlighting the following guiding principles as top priority:

#### *Foster Collaborative Thinking*

- Provide a transparent planning and design process with opportunities for input
- Value the input received

#### *Design facilities that inspire excellence in teaching and learning*

- Serve the needs of Cascade's diverse student body
- Provide a sufficient number of classrooms to meet campus need
- Develop spaces that can be multi-purpose, flexible, and adaptable
- Provide a supportive and accessible environment for all
- Provide access to appropriate technology that is both flexible and adaptable

#### *Improve the sustainability and quality of the overall campus environment*

- Create an open, safe, and welcoming campus
- Utilize existing land resources efficiently while preserving flexibility for future campus needs
- Create external spaces that are inviting, well-lit, and safe at all times
- Celebrate Cascade as a neighborhood amenity while respecting the residential surroundings
- Find innovative and sustainable transportation and parking solutions

#### *Promote the uniqueness of the neighborhood's history, architecture, diverse culture, and urban location*

- Encourage a diversity of uses in the neighborhood to increase safety to the campus and the community
- Preserve and improve the commercial mixed-use corridors of both Killingsworth and Albina
- Create designated zones that retain active ground-floor use

#### *Support the commercial vitality of the Albina/Killingsworth commercial district*

- Make Cascade's presence in the neighborhood benefit those living and working in the districts that surround the campus
- Design new structures that interface with the neighborhood commercial corridors
- Catalyze opportunities to partner on neighborhood beautification and commercial efforts

**Preliminary Planning Schemes – Pros and Cons:**

The BAC divided into 3 groups. Will Dann, THA Architects, distributed copies of nine preliminary planning schemes and asked the table groups to select a total of 6 schemes (2 per table) to evaluate and identify pros and cons considering:

- Future expansion
- Traffic impact
- Phasing
- Service and Loading

**Table 1**  
**Options A-2 & C-1**  
 Paula Barreto  
 Kerri Melda  
 Laurie Terrell  
 Royce Mason  
 Kathleen Rowlands  
 Gina Whitehill-Baziuk

**Table 2**  
**Options B-2 & A-3**  
 Brian Murtagh  
 Abe Proctor  
 Margaret Mahoney  
 Mark Tellis  
 Rebecca Ocken

**Table 3**  
**Options C-2 & B-1**  
 Tom Markgraf  
 Derrick Foxworth  
 Justin Elardo  
 Lisa Reed Guarnero  
 Christine Egan

**Preliminary Scheme: A2** (Table 1)

*Comment: A2 is our first choice*

<b>Pros:</b>	<b>Cons:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased active use along Killingsworth Street w/parking, Student Center and active uses.</li> <li>• Location of new Academic Bldg. oriented to south</li> <li>• New Academic Bldg’s proximity to parking structure</li> <li>• Design of Library should retain visual of mall</li> <li>• Like northern buffer of surface parking and homes</li> <li>• Turn Moriarty into retail space or active bookstore</li> <li>• Future expansion, traffic impact, phasing and service and loading are all good</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual of 4-5 story building on commercial Killingsworth Street</li> </ul>

**Preliminary Scheme: C-1** (Table 1)

<b>Pros:</b>	<b>Cons:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service loading is okay</li> <li>• Future expansion is okay if parking structure is in north lot</li> <li>• Phasing is okay</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking structure on north lot near residents</li> <li>• Causes traffic through neighborhood</li> <li>• Doesn’t address active space on Killingsworth</li> <li>• Don’t like stand-alone Library</li> <li>• Causes conflicts with neighbors</li> </ul>

**Preliminary Scheme: A-3** (Table 2)

*Comment: We like A-2 the best*

<b>Pros:</b>	<b>Cons:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defines north edge of campus</li> <li>• South facing courtyard to new Academic Bldg.</li> <li>• Prefer parking on Killingsworth over internal location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not as much street activation</li> <li>• Removing Student Center distresses internal space</li> <li>• Wide open space needs a backdrop</li> </ul>

**Preliminary Scheme: B-2** (Table 2)

<b>Pros:</b>	<b>Cons:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Center on Killingsworth Street</li> <li>• Street activation is good</li> <li>• Coupling of Student Center and Library – good retail edge, Library helps define mall</li> <li>• Parking garage location might split traffic better and alleviate congestion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Academic Bldg. location does not bridge campus well in Phase 1</li> <li>• Childcare location is poor – access and lacks protection</li> <li>• Safety may be an issue with internal parking garage location</li> </ul>

**Preliminary Scheme: B-1** (Table 3)

*Comments: We like this option*

<b>Pros:</b>	<b>Cons:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easy for students and staff to park, drop kids off - get them to daycare, then go to work/classes</li> <li>• New Academic Bldg. provides quiet zone near neighborhood – safer for kids</li> <li>• Doesn't affect traffic for new Academic Bldg./lot orientation</li> <li>• Having Student Center in heart of campus is good</li> <li>• Existing architecture of Library – open design, aesthetic view, nice "green" break on Killingsworth</li> <li>• Less impact on neighbors as lot is not deep in neighborhood</li> <li>• Location of parking lot helps maintain street grid for ingress/egress</li> <li>• Provides safety for pedestrians</li> <li>• Maintains street grid on Mississippi and Albina</li> <li>• Garage closer to MAX line</li> <li>• Southern exposure for childcare playground</li> <li>• Put Public Safety in Paragon site</li> <li>• Creates campus gateway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like open mall, but not effective use of space – needs to be some function for mall</li> </ul>

**Preliminary Scheme: C-2** (Table 3)

*Comment: We don't like this option*

<b>Pros:</b>	<b>Cons:</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pull out Library/Student Center to activate Killingsworth</li> <li>• Student Center in heart of campus</li> <li>• Existing architecture of Library</li> <li>• Switching Student Center and Library (if Library kept intact)</li> <li>• Good 'soft zone' for kids in New Academic Bldg. – also provides quiet zone in neighborhood</li> <li>• Southern exposure for New Academic Bldg. – courtyard for childcare</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking structure is too far from campus academic buildings – lacks convenience to existing classrooms</li> <li>• Potential bottleneck at Albina/Killingsworth to get into parking structure</li> <li>• Neighbors exposed to parking structure on 2 sides</li> <li>• Childcare / New Academic Building adjacent to Cascadian Terrace apts. – potential for problems</li> </ul>

**Discussion:**

Following presentation of pros and cons by table groups, the BAC held a general discussion of the options.

- Option C-1: Most members do not like this option, but there was not agreement on a proposal to eliminate it from further consideration.

- Option B-3: Some members noted that this option has a 'fatal flaw' in that it locates the childcare center on Killingsworth Street, which compromises safety. This option was unanimously eliminated.
- Option D-1: Concern was expressed that PCC does not own land for the parking structure in this option. Some members felt that PCC should retain the Telephone Exchange Building. This option was unanimously eliminated.
- Option A-2: Received the most favorable comments.

**Next Steps:**

- **The next BAC meeting will be May 26, 6:00 – 8:00 pm at the Peninsula Park Community Center.** The BAC will narrow the options to 3-6 at this meeting. The final BAC meeting will be June 23, location to be determined.
- THA will work throughout the summer to flesh out options and develop cost estimates.
- The BAC will be reconvened in the fall to review options and final recommendations.

**Adjourned:** The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 pm.

*Submitted by: Jeanne Nyquist, Recorder*