

Cascade Bond Advisory Committee: Meeting Notes #9

Next Meeting
Thursday, June 23, 2011
6:00 – 8:30 pm
Dinner available 5:45 pm
Humboldt Gardens
5033 N. Vancouver Avenue,
Portland, Oregon

Meeting Date: May 26, 2011, 6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.

Meeting Location: Peninsula Park Community Center, 700 N. Rosa Parks Way, Portland, Oregon

Attending:

BAC Members: Algie Gatewood, Troy Jesse, Royce Mason, Margaret Mahoney, Kerri Melda, Ben Torres, Brian Murtagh, Isa Dean, Paula Barreto, Tom Markgraf, Justin Elardo, Derrick Foxworth, Sonja Grove, Mark Tellis, Guari Shanker Rajbaidya.

PCC Staff: Linda Degman, Rebecca Ocken, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk, Abraham Proctor, Kristen Watkins, Wing-Kit Chung, Randy McEwen.

Presenters: Will Dann, Nick Hodges and Becca Cavell, THA Architects

Guests: PCC Students: Doug Taylor
 Neighborhood: Herb Jenkins, Brian Rousseau, John Babatunde, Laurie Mason, Cheri McLaughlin (also a PCC faculty member), Paul Anthony
 Debbie Bischoff, City of Portland, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
 Denise C. McGriff, Portland Development Commission

Facilitators: THA Architects

Welcome:

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 pm. While members selected and ate their dinners, Gina Whitehill-Baziuk briefly explained that the BAC had a full agenda involving a series of activities led by THA. Due to the tight schedule, she asked members to continue dining while Will Dann introduced the first options' assessment work. Gina thanked the BAC members for their continued commitment and briefly outlined what was anticipated in these last two pre-summer meetings and in the fall.

Public Comment:

Gina welcomed new neighborhood guests and asked them to introduce themselves. No additional public comment was made at this time.

Meeting Agenda:

Will Dann, reviewed the goals for the meeting, as follows:

- Narrow number of draft options to six
- Ranking of preferred options
- Review and discuss comments from the Strategic Work Group on schemes
- Review plans for June and fall 2011

Option Rating Using Key Guiding Principles

Over the last few months the BAC and the internal college community have identified key elements in the **Guiding Principles** that were most important to them. These generally fell into three categories:

- I. Traffic and Parking
- II. Neighborhood Improvement
- III. Open Space and Campus Development

The BAC divided into 3 groups. Each group was assigned one of the above three categories to discuss in detail as they reviewed twelve campus build-out options.

Will Dann, THA Architects distributed an Options Matrix with columns for all the A1-E2 twelve Options.

I. The **Traffic, Parking, Service and Loading Group** was asked to assess each option for each of the following criteria:

- Parking convenience to Killingsworth (70% of PCC traffic uses Killingsworth to reach the college)
- Parking convenience to campus buildings
- Service and loading access to Student Center
- Safe and secure childcare drop-off

(It was explained that other important principles, such as the viability of an option to be a catalyst for redevelopment, would be assessed within one of the other categories.)

II. The **Neighborhood Improvement Group** was asked to assess each option for each of the following criteria:

- Avoids property acquisition and supports historic resource preservation
- Positive effect on existing local businesses
- Encourages future active use on Killingsworth
- Minimizes traffic and parking impacts on residences

III. The **Open Space and Campus Development Group** was asked to assess each option for each of the following criteria:

- Good location for student center
- Preserve flexibility for future development
- Classroom buildings are close to one another
- Children's play area location

In the first part of the narrowing exercise, BAC members were asked to assess each option, designating three, two, one or zero points for each criteria within their given group category. (Three points equating to the most beneficial and zero points equating to the worst.)

BAC members were asked to foster collaborative thinking and to keep in mind that ultimately with any selected option **the college will:**

- **design facilities that will inspire excellence in teaching and learning;**
- **improve sustainability and quality of the overall campus/community environment;**

- **promote the uniqueness of the neighborhood’s history, architecture, diverse culture and urban location; and**
- **support the commercial vitality of the Albina/Killingsworth commercial district.**

Committee members were informed that the college recently learned that there might be issues with regard to the ability of fire trucks to operate under an Option “A” parking solution scenario. Given that further assessment needs to be done to ensure a workable solution, members were asked to make sure that “A” Options were not the only options included in their rating and ranking exercise.

General Results:

Group I: Traffic, Parking Service and Loading

- “C” Options fail due to a poor parking location
 - “D” Options fail due to the parking being at the edge of the campus
 - “A” Option location strong from child care drop-off being away from Killingsworth
 - “A” Option location strong for parking convenience
- The group voiced considerable concerns about potential traffic issues resulting from the Killingsworth location and also felt that the process failed to address potential safety concerns adequately.

Group II: Neighborhood Improvement

- “D” Options fail – they require property acquisition
 - “B” Options place parking too close to residences
 - “C” Options place parking too close to residences
- Positive effect/Street activation are closely related; for instance the positive effect on the neighborhood is impacted by the parking solution location and how it services businesses.
Having childcare distanced from Killingsworth is desirable

Group III: Open Space, Campus Development

- “A” Options and “C” Options leave most space for future development
- Most group members favored decoupling the Student Center and the Library
- Preservation of the central green space axis is important
- “B” Options place child care too close to Killingsworth

In the second part of the narrowing exercise, BAC members in their groups were asked to RANK the twelve Options. In this exercise BAC members were asked to take all things into consideration, to weight areas they thought were more important than other areas, and eliminate six (6) Options. They were then asked to rank the remaining six (6) options from 1 to 6 with 1 being most favored and 6 being least favored.

- Group I: Traffic, Parking Service and Loading – # 1 choice A2; #2 choice E1 and B2,**
- Group II: Neighborhood Improvement – # 1 choice A2; #2 choice A3; #3 choice A1**
- Group III: Open Space, Campus Development – #1 choice A4; #2 choice A3; #3 choice E1**

In general there was little support for “B” Options, very little support for “C” Options with any of the groups, and no support for “D” Options.

THA compared the results of the rating and ranking with that of the SWG (internal campus Stakeholder Working Group). There was a considerable amount of overlap. Both committees eliminated B1, C1, C2, and D2. The BAC committee also eliminated B3 and E2 while the SWG eliminated A1 and B2.

To complete the exercise and comparison, THA provided a broad brush relative cost overlay for each of the options. (It is important to keep in mind that this was a very preliminary cost premium assessment that took into account elements such as displaced parking, required acquisition or housing demolition, phasing premiums, and additional renovation.) Accordingly each Option received either one \$; two \$\$, or three \$\$\$ to indicate lesser to greater relative cost. The six preferred Options identified by the BAC had the following overall relative cost rating: A1 = \$; A-2 = \$\$\$; A3 = \$\$; A4 = \$; B2 = \$\$\$; E1 = \$

NOTE: A matrix with the complete results of the committee’s ratings and rankings is included as an attachment.

Group membership					
Group I: Traffic, Parking Service and Loading		Group II: Neighborhood Improvement		Group III: Open Space, Campus Development	
Gina Whitehill-Baziuk	Scribe	Abe Proctor	Scribe	Rebecca Ocken	Scribe
Brian Murtagh	Neighbor	Algie Gatewood	Campus	Guari Shanker Rajbaidya	Neighbor
Tom Markgraf	Neighbor	Ben Torres	Business	Justin Elardo	Faculty
Royce Mason	Business	Isa Dean	Neighbor	Derrick Foxworth	PCC Public Safety
Mark Tellis	Non Profit	Troy Jesse	Faculty	Doug Taylor	Student
Sonja Grove	Faculty	Margaret Mahoney	Non Profit	Paula Barreto	Student
Kerri Melda	Neighbor				

Wrap Up and Discussion:

BAC member Brian Murtagh raised the question of whether the committee needed a final document that identified committee/community priorities as the Bond Program moves into final design and construction. While he felt that the committee had created good ideas and options, he felt that once the committee completed its work there was no "insurance" that the final results would reflect the work that had been done. He also stated that he felt there needed to be further discussion about issues such as the parking garage, whether it was a good idea or not and if there were other alternatives.

BAC member Tom Markgraf did not agree with the concerns raised. He felt that the committee had covered a great deal of ground in a very efficient and thorough manner and that the committee's concerns and priorities were identified and acknowledged.

Isa Dean, Kerri Melda and other members thought it might be helpful to better understand the process following the June BAC meeting.

Gina Whitehill-Baziuk explained that at the June meeting THA will provide more context, dimension and insight into the top six options identified by the BAC, SWG and Executive Committee. Further conversation on priorities, TDM and other issues will surround a conversation where the BAC will hopefully further narrow the options down to 3 or 4. Over the summer months, THA will thoroughly assess the viability, cost, pluses and minuses of each of the narrowed options. The BAC will be asked to reconvene in the fall to review all of these findings and make a preferred alternative recommendation to the Cascade Executive Committee. It is hoped that members of the BAC will be willing to continue working with the College during the next Phase.

Randy McEwen stated the College wanted to be respectful of community members' time. It is for this reason that BAC member commitment as written in the original committee purpose and charge asked for a commitment of ten meetings. Randy emphasized that the College would welcome further involvement and commitment by committee members in the next Phase.

Meeting Note Errata:

- The April meeting notes were corrected to include BAC member Justin Elardo as present.

Future Meeting Dates:

- June 23, 2011, 6 – 8:30 pm, Humboldt Gardens, 5033 N. Vancouver Avenue, Portland, Oregon

Adjourned: Meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Recorder: Abe Proctor