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57th & Division Street Community Ownership Project
Planning Workshop, the capstone course for Portland State University’s Master of Urban and Regional Planning program, provides graduate students with professional planning experience. Student teams develop consulting contracts with clients for planning services that address local and regional issues and the students’ personal and professional interests. The Workshop provides experience in planning for constructive social and environmental change, while considering the planner’s ethical responsibility to serve the public interest.
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Community members of the Mt. Tabor and South Tabor neighborhoods
The HBU team members share an interest in land use, environmental planning and community development. Our focus throughout the project has been how to turn brownfields into community assets, not burdens, while developing a framework of community involvement and interaction.
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Clark holds a B.A. in Community Development and specializes in Land Use within the Master of Urban and Regional Planning program at PSU. He is currently Program Manager for the City of Portland Brownfield Program where he has spent the past four years. Related interest and experience includes economic development, and community advocacy around affordable housing and environmental justice.

**Stephen Shane**
Stephen has an academic background in Environmental Science with an emphasis in Ornithology. Prior to admission to the MURP program, he worked for many years as a wildlife biologist for both the public and private sectors in addition to working with the City of Portland’s Office of Planning and Development Review (now BDS) and Department of Transportation.

**Simone C. Wolter**
Simone’s interests lie in sustainable site and real estate development. To that end, she obtained the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Accreditation. Currently, she is the Brownfield Coordinator for the City of Gresham. She looks forward to working in city government as an interface between the city and the development world to expedite and implement sustainable building practices.
The 57th and Division Street Community Ownership Project

**INTRODUCTION**

The negative effects of a brownfield extends beyond the site itself. The presence of brownfields can have a ripple effect on the surrounding area in regards to property values and creating urban blight. The 57th and Division Community Ownership Project (DCOP) shows how a community initiated taking ownership of a blighted and underutilized property. With a concerted effort, the community group, led by a Steering Committee of the Mount Tabor and South Tabor Neighborhood Associations and the Atkinson Elementary School PTA initiated the process of addressing the environmental and financial constraints of redeveloping the site. Currently, they are working to give the community an asset they can be proud of: a cleaned up site and a community center. Our role, as HBU Consultants, was to organize public outreach and facilitate public interaction, to take the lead in researching opportunities and challenges, and to make recommendations for future development based on our research.

**THE CLIENT**

Our client is the 57th and Division Community Ownership Project (DCOP). The DCOP is a collaborative effort led by representatives from Mount Tabor and South Tabor Neighborhood Associations and Atkinson Elementary School PTA, who hold regular meetings to discuss current neighborhood planning issues and events. In a series of meetings with the neighborhood residents held in 2003/2004 the Client developed a vision for the neighborhoods that would embrace the demographic diversity, assist in bringing social services to the area and would try to reduce crime in the area.

Out of this vision came the concerted effort to obtain and redevelop the former gas station on 5633 SE Division Street. Because of the site’s former use as a gas station, it has soil contamination caused by leaking underground storage tanks. Therefore, it is considered a brownfield. Redeveloping this site will turn an underutilized, vacant property in a key location into an asset for the community. The Client needed us to focus on three main challenges:

**Challenge 1: The site is a “brownfield”**

The site has soil contamination that brings with it environmental constraints for redevelopment. Because of this it is labeled as a brownfield site, which means that prospective purchasers, owners and developers face complex regulatory requirements with unknown financial implications.

**Challenge 2: Redevelopment must benefit the community.**

The Mt. Tabor and South Tabor neighborhoods are adjacent to each other, but face different sets of challenges. How can the Client choose uses that are economically, socially and environmentally feasible? How can the Client ensure that as many people as possible are included in the visioning process?

**Challenge 3: The DCOP has limited funding.**

Conventional lending institutions are hesitant to loan money for the redevelopment of brownfields. How can a group of neighborhood residents muster the resources to accomplish acquisition, clean up, and redevelopment of the site?
As a result, we developed a sequence of project steps that would help to address each of these challenges:

- Identify available resources in the region that could assist the brownfield clean up and redevelopment.
- We ascertained what kind of future use the community desires on this site.
- We evaluated sources of data to develop recommendations on how the DCOP could proceed.

The following is a description of the approach we took to address the challenges in our scope of work.

Our approach to Challenge 1:

The site is a “brownfield”.
- Interviewed professionals in the brownfield redevelopment arena
- Conducted web based research
- Performed literature review
- Researched methods for liability protection through web based resources and interviews
- Researched methods for assessment, remediation and technical assistance

Our approach to Challenge 2:

Redevelopment must benefit the community.
- Developed and facilitated a design charrette
- Conducted a survey of community preferences and assets
- Attended public community meetings
- Analyzed current availability of services based on the community’s needs
- Conducted a site analysis to determine the feasibility of community preferences that comply with local land use and regulatory requirements

Our approach to Challenge 3:

The DCOP group has limited funding.
- Conducted web based research for community development funding
- Performed literature research of similar redevelopment projects
- Interviewed governmental and non-profit professionals with expertise in funding for community development projects

The result of this concerted effort is this document. It begins with a description of the site and its unique constraints and opportunities. Then, we evaluate the design charrette, survey results and current land use surrounding the site. Finally, we conclude with a list of recommendations.
This section describes the site configuration and condition.

**OWNERSHIP**

The most recent owner was forced to give up ownership in late 2004 when he was convicted for selling large quantities of pseudoephedrine for the purpose of making methamphetamine. Upon the conviction, the Federal Marshal took possession. The Federal Marshal now has the right to sell the property at market value in order to cover investigation costs.

The DCOP recognized this as an opportunity to work with the Federal Marshal to acquire the property. Currently, the DCOP is working to transfer the title through the federal Weed & Seed Program. The DCOP must reimburse the Federal Marshal for investigation costs of $6,000. One of the conditions of the Weed & Seed Program is that the title be transferred to a federally designated 501c3 non-profit organization.

Because the DCOP is not an official non-profit agency, they proposed that Southeast Uplift (SEUL), an official 501c3 organization, conduct the site acquisition and management. SEUL is a community based non-profit organization. On February 7, 2005 the Mt. Tabor Neighborhood Association (and also a SEUL board member) proposed the acquisition and redevelopment to the SEUL board. HBU Consultants presented funding opportunities for remediation and liability protection to the SEUL board in March 2005.

The Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Program (SEUL) was founded in 1968 as a non-profit coalition of 20 neighborhoods in Southeast and Northeast Portland south of Interstate 84 and provides free technical assistance in citizen participation, community development, organizing and urban planning. SEUL develops citizen leaders and supports neighborhood associations, business associations and residents with citizen participation services, community development/organizing and urban planning technical assistance.

The board delegated the decision to take ownership of the land and existing building from the Federal Government to the Executive Committee. This committee’s main concern is that current and future legal liability associated with the contamination will not compromise SEUL. SEUL will hold it on behalf of the community.

The DCOP has no funding at this time to pay off the $6,000 for site acquisition. In addition to the Federal Marshal’s bill, there is a tax lien on the property. The property consists of two tax lots. One tax lot lien is $9,000 and is scheduled for County foreclosure in the fall of 2005. The other tax lot lien is $11,000 and is scheduled to foreclose in 2006. For additional information on the process of foreclosure refer to page 34, Appendix B.

**SITE**

The site is comprised of two tax lots that total 14,050 sq ft. The larger lot, occupying roughly half of the street frontage, is on the northwest corner of SE 57th and Division Street. Both lots are paved. Two buildings are on site, one 1,112 sf building structure and one 50 sf shed. Both structures are functionally obsolete. The site is not landscaped except for street trees along 57th Avenue. To the west the site is abutted by Dairy Queen restaurant. To the north the site is bordered by residential single-family housing. Across 57th Avenue to the east is a multi-family building. To the south, across Division Street is Atkinson Elementary.

It has good traffic access because it is located on a major east-west arterial: Division Street. However, this also poses a difficulty, because this section of Division experiences traffic volumes of up to 7235 vehicles during a 24-hr interval. There is a cross walk at the corner of Atkinson Elementary and SE 57th with a new blinking signal and a repainted crosswalk. Furthermore, the site also has excellent access to public transit. The Tri-Met bus line # 4 stops at the corner of 58th and Division going east and west. The bus stop does not, however, provide shelter for waiting passengers. North-south access is available through line # 71 on Division and 52nd.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITION**

The site was used as a gas station up until 1992. Due to this historic use environmental investigation was required. The City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services performed and paid for a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) in November 2004 to determine the extent of contamination upon the request of the Federal Marshal.
This assessment identified four existing underground storage tanks and petroleum-contaminated soil. The assessment recommends further testing after the storage tanks have been removed from the site to establish the real extent of contamination. The current estimate of clean-up is approximately $200,000. However, further assessment is needed to determine if contamination has migrated underground off-site. If so, the clean-up costs will increase.

After 1992, the site was used as a grocery, deli and drive-through coffee shop. The retail use of the site ended in 2004, when the owner was arrested and convicted for selling pseudoephedrine from this site. This drug-related arrest led to a suspicion by members of the community that the building itself may also be contaminated. The building structure, dating back to 1960, is not contaminated.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment is historical research to determine prior uses of the property. If these uses are typically those that contribute to environmental contamination, then a Phase II ESA is warranted. A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment performs testing on soils and groundwater.

**ZONING**

The site is zoned CG (General Commercial), which encourages accommodating retail and service businesses, except where the site is adjacent to a transit street like SE Division Street (see next page). Transit street development is generally intended to be more pedestrian-friendly, with a stronger focus on using transit to access locations. The CG zone’s development standards promote attractive development, an open and pleasant street appearance, and compatibility with adjacent residential areas. It allows for a variety of uses, including community service use, small retail use and residential housing. These are likely to be the most applicable uses for the site.

The Bureau of Planning is currently proposing to change the zoning of this site from CG to CS (Storefront Commercial). The CS zone intends that new development will be compatible with the desired character of preserving and enhancing older commercial areas that have a storefront character. Development is oriented close to and focused toward the sidewalk so as to facilitate a pedestrian-friendly environment. This potential change in commercial designation should have little impact on development considerations for community use, residential housing, or small retail use on the site. Key zoning requirements of the CS zone that differ from the CG zone include no minimum building setback from the street lot line, no minimum landscape requirements, building coverage that must be at least 50% of the site area, and no required on-site parking.

Properties immediately adjacent to the site are zoned for residential use with the exception of Atkinson and Franklin schools across the street, which are zoned IR (Institutional Use in a Residential zone), and a pedestrian pathway between the two schools zoned as OS (Open Space). Commercially zoned nodes exist at 60th Ave to the East, and 50th Ave. to the West. Land uses within a mile radius include institutional and commercial uses along the arterials and residential use in the neighborhood streets.
The 57th and Division Street Project - Site Analysis

Division Street Corridor Zoning

Intersection of Division St. and 50th. View looking West down Division St.

Drive Thru Wake Up Deli site. View from Atkinson Elementary.

Intersection of Division St. and 60th View looking East down Division St.

Mt. Tabor Sports building. Corner of Division St. and 60th.

Mixed retail building. Corner of Division St. and 50th.

View looking West down Division. From vantage point across the street from site.

Atkinson Elementary School. View from the Deli site.

Vision Auto Repair. Corner of Division St. and 60th.
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- Institutional
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It is difficult to assess all applicable development standards for a site without a specific proposal. However, some zoning requirements can be identified. A general overview of applicable site development standards is listed below. More specific code requirements can be found in the 200 Chapter of Title 33 of the Portland City Code:

**Setback requirements** for areas that abut residential zones allows commercial development that will maintain light, air, and the potential for privacy for adjacent residential zones. The setback requirements along transit streets and in Pedestrian Districts should create an environment that is inviting to pedestrians and transit users. For the CG zone, the minimum building setback from the street lot line is 5 feet and the maximum is 10 feet. The minimum setbacks for the adjoining residential zones would vary between 0 and 14 feet and would be contingent on the height of the proposed building wall and whether the setback is on the rear or the side of the building.

**Building limitations** state that a maximum building height is 45 feet. This would accommodate a four-story building with a flat roof design. Maximum coverage is 85% of the site – in this case, a building footprint of roughly 11,900 sq. ft.

**Landscaping** must be provided on at least 15 % of the site. However, up to one-third of the required landscaped area may be improved for active or passive recreational use or for use by pedestrians. Side and rear setbacks need to be landscaped 5 feet deep to the Code’s L3 standard. Any required landscaping, such as for required setbacks or parking lots, applies towards the landscaped area standard.

**Building entrances and glazing** requirements for transit streets require at least one main entrance to be within 25 feet and to face (or be at a 45 degree angle to) the transit street. Windows must be at least 50 percent of the length and 25 percent of the ground level wall area, in order to enhance a pedestrian-friendly environment by minimizing large blank walls.

The site is not located in a hazard, flood plain, or endangered species designated area.

**DIVISION STREET/MAIN STREET PROJECT**

The intent of the Bureau of Planning Division Green Street/Main Street project is to improve the livability and economic vitality of the SE Division Street corridor over the next 20 years. This collaborative effort between the City of Portland and the community will develop policies and strategies that create a pedestrian-friendly, commercial district that reflects and reinforces community values, including a focus on sustainable and green development. The redevelopment corridor will be between SE 11th and SE 60th Avenues.

The concept calls for a series of commercial nodes between SE 11th Avenue and SE 60th Avenue, generally around key intersections but also taking advantage of existing commercial sections of the street. Our site location across from Atkinson Elementary and Franklin High School is the second to last commercial node before one reaches the east end of the corridor.

Key features of the Main Street/Green Street project include:

- Improving access to transit
- Streetscape improvements to improve pedestrians and bicyclists safety
- Traffic flow improvements, including a new signal placement
- Incorporating sustainable stormwater treatment methods that minimize stormwater discharge into the City’s system
- Applying ‘green’ building techniques to new and existing structures
- Examining possible zoning changes consistent with the project’s goals
**Demographics**

The site is located on Division Street, which is the border between Mt. Tabor and South Tabor neighborhoods. Though the neighborhoods are connected geographically, and consist mostly of single-family homes, they differ demographically. The Mt. Tabor neighborhood, based around the popular 200-acre Mt. Tabor Park, tends to be more affluent and homogeneous. The South Tabor neighborhood displays demographics closer to Portland averages (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>% Below Poverty Level</th>
<th>% of Pop. is White</th>
<th>% of Pop. is Foreign Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Tabor</td>
<td>$47,250</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tabor</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland*</td>
<td>$39,016</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Census 2000, Figures for Portland are taken from the 2002 American Community Survey

The two neighborhoods have a similar percentage of Spanish-speaking residents. South Tabor has a larger number of Asian-speaking households, compared to Mt. Tabor. South Tabor also has a higher percentage of households that are identified as "linguistically isolated", meaning that all household members 14 years or older have some difficulty with English (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Asian speaking households</th>
<th>Linguistic Isolation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Tabor</td>
<td>9.13%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tabor</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Census 2000**

The Mt. Tabor Neighborhood Association is relatively well connected to its resi-
This section describes the process by which HBU Consultants determined the preferences and needs of the community for the future use of the site.

Prior To Our Involvement

The DCOP feels it is crucial to solicit public input and to build a sense of community ownership and responsibility for this project. To that end, 70 local residents came to the community meeting in November 2004 and voiced their concerns, needs and wishes for the use of the site. The emerging themes were a community space for public meetings and PTA events, a non-profit coffee shop or some mix of commercial and community uses.

The Design Charrette

To allow for a renewed public interest and involvement we facilitated a design charrette in April 2005. It was intended to give the DCOP some guidance on how the potential users envision the center.

The design charrette brought together thirty-five people from the surrounding neighborhoods. Two participants belonged to the South Tabor neighborhood, while 11 participants were from the Mt. Tabor neighborhood. Although some of the participants had attended the previous discussion about this site, the majority had not. Professionals also attended the charrette to assist in explaining design alternatives and to help brainstorm appropriate ideas: Mike Abbaté and Michelle Guthrie from Greenworks, an environmental design firm, Arianne Sperry from Portland Bureau of Planning, and Tom Liptan from Portland Bureau of Environmental Services.

After a PowerPoint presentation on sustainable building and landscaping design, the participants broke into four groups with one of us as a facilitator. Three groups pursued a collaborative group discussion and drawing effort. One group discussed ideas as a group, but each participant drew their own designs. After the design sessions all participants regrouped for debriefing and a Question and Answer session regarding their designs.

Although each group was supplied with a list of City code requirements and restrictions, groups generally did not incorporate code requirements such as setback and landscaping requirements, building mass, and transit street considerations into their designs. Given that the purpose of the charrette was to facilitate dialogue and exchange ideas, HBU Consultants did not force attention to code regulations.

Consistent with the goals of the charrette, each group sketched out their designs utilizing environmentally sustainable practices, considerations of solar gain, heat retention, building cooling, as well as sketching creative uses of open space. What follows is an in-detail discussion of the site designs. The graphic designs follow at the end of the public outreach section.

Future Use

Many recognized the importance of commercial or retail uses that could provide the building operation with an income stream. To this end, they considered a retail use that could provide a more informal meeting space. The primary retail use chosen by each table was a coffee shop. Other retail use ideas included a café, a brewpub and a restaurant. Many designs included residential use, but it was not defined whether that would be in the form of affordable housing, condominiums or market rate rentals.
DEALING WITH STORMWATER

A key area that each group focused on was on-site management of stormwater. Many participants liked the suggestion of using this ‘greywater’ to water gardens and to flush toilets. Other suggestions included on-site infiltration into the ground through bio-swales (Design 5), and green-roofs to absorb both water and pollutants (Designs 4 & 10). One of the more creative designs considered channeling the stormwater from 57th Avenue on to the property, where a quasi-riparian area, complete with native vegetation plantings, would bisect the site, filtering the water before putting it back into the municipal stormwater system on the north side of Division (Designs 7 & 8). Re-circulated water from on-site would be used during the dryer months to maintain the vegetation. A sitting area along this creek, with signs denoting the functional value of the effort, was mentioned as well (Design 1, 7 & 8). The general sentiment was that the water was a resource to use rather than a burden to discard. The Division Vision Coalition also supports these design considerations and will implement most of these technologies in the Division corridor to the west.

DEALING WITH PARKING

On-site parking was an issue for which participants had no clear preference. Each group voiced a concern about not only increased traffic in the area but also noted the goal of limiting the amount of vehicle miles traveled (at least to this site), citing air quality concerns. Others felt that despite these intentions, a sense of practicality must be injected into the project. Parking should be available to patrons of the businesses in the building, for the community members, for disabled transport (Design 2, 3, 5, 6, 9 & 10) and for parents picking up their children at Atkinson Elementary School (Design 1).

Parking is in short supply in this neighborhood. Increasing site activity without providing parking spaces, would exacerbate the overflow effect caused by visitors parking along the adjacent streets. It was also noted that businesses at the site likely need both delivery parking and vehicle access for garbage and recycling trucks (Design 10). Temporary parking for parents dropping off their schoolchildren was briefly discussed among several groups because this unused site is currently used for this purpose. However, it was generally felt that this should be dissuaded in the new design, due to safety concerns raised by encouraging more children to cross Division Street to meet their parents.

ENSURING PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

One of the key concerns at the workshop was pedestrian safety when crossing Division Street between the site and the schools on the south side of the street. Curb extensions and speed bumps were considered options in order to slow traffic in this area (Designs 1, 2, 5, 6 & 8). Curb extensions are currently also planned at certain key intersections further west on Division Street through the Division Vision Coalition efforts. Similar extensions in the 57th Avenue area would add a structural continuity to the corridor’s street improvements by linking efforts to slow traffic at key intersections on lower Division. Reconfiguring the existing crosswalks so that they match the pedestrian path that enters onto Division Street from Franklin High’s sports fields was also considered to be improvements toward creating a safer street environment in this area. Finally, the placement of a traffic signal at a new crosswalk (or locating a signal without moving a crosswalk) was recognized as a useful safety mechanism to adjust for expected increases in pedestrian traffic once redevelopment of the site occurs.

CHILD FRIENDLY

Most participants were concerned with how children were considered in the design and use of the property. Due to the location the site has a strong potential to act as a social nexus between Atkinson Elementary and the surrounding community. Many preferred that the project allow for child-oriented events and chances for parental interaction. This led to a discussion of child safety in relation to Division Street and a concern about balconies, easily opened windows, or water features on site or in the building.
**DIVISION STREET CONNECTIVITY**

There were mixed results in getting each group to consider the site in relation to SE Division Street. Some groups expanded their view beyond the site itself and looked at ways of increasing pedestrian safety along all of Division Street. Some discussed traffic-calming features, such as curb extensions and speed bumps and changing the existing school crossing light to a traffic signal.

**CONNECTIVITY WITH ADJACENT USES**

Opinions varied about developing the site as to create a connection to and from the adjacent Dairy Queen restaurant on the west. Some felt that creating a formal connection between the two sites would allow each to take advantage of the others’ patrons. Others, however, felt that the design should move forward without physically attempting to integrate this site with the Dairy Queen. Some participants expressed concern regarding high school students congregating in a community space, given the potential effect on the wider community. It was clear that these participants did not want to create a “hang out spot.”

**CREATING A FLEXIBLE & COMFORTABLE BUILDING SPACE**

Most participants oriented their buildings towards the south side of the street. Not only for reasons of warmth and light entering the building year round, but also to create a pedestrian-friendly development. Planter boxes, benches, art, differentiation of ground pavers, and designs incorporating water mentioned abundantly. Several participants also incorporated street-side plazas with benches and artistic elements that would help to incorporate the site to the street. The use and strategic placement of art was a predominant issue in the April 16th workshop, particularly considered in the context of being visible from SE Division St. Each of these features would reinforce the thematic and physical elements both in lower and in this mid-section of SE Division.

In general, ideas around the building itself revolved around increasing energy efficiency, minimizing ecological impact to the environment and creating an inspiring and adaptive space. Some ideas included photovoltaic electricity generation, energy efficient windows, heating/cooling system, and green building materials. Ideas such as movable walls, hidden storage spaces and an open floor plan were suggested as ways to keep the space flexible and usable for several different purposes. Structural flexibility would allow the space to serve a wide variety of uses from meeting space, to classes, to exercise space that might have unique spatial and equipment needs. Overall, the sketch drawings were not rendered with strong architectural detail but rather tended to reflect a desire for specific architectural elements: large windows that captured light, glass enclosed stairways to a 2nd floor that would be visible from Division Street (Design 10), open courtyard areas toward the center of the site with visual openings to the street (Design 2, 4 & 6) and buildings abutting the sidewalk (Design 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 & 10) and roll-up garage doors were prevalent in all designs so that more light could enter the building and integrate inside and outside when weather permits.

**CREATING OPEN SPACE**

Everyone felt it was important to design the entire site, as well as the building to impose as little imposition on the adjacent residents as possible. Any future development on the site will inevitably create noise, block out at least some light, increase parking demand, and change the view for the northern neighbor. Therefore, vegetation could be used to buffer sounds (Design 3 & 10). One design decided the building should encompass 4 stories on Division Street with a stepped back third and fourth level to accommodate the northern neighbors’ views (Design 5). Most designs favored two story buildings with a recessed third story.
INTERESTING IDEAS

One resident, who has children at Atkinson, drew a ‘Craftsman’ style house with wide stairs up to a large “front porch for the neighborhood.” Her attempt, she said, was to “blend in with the neighborhood” by making it “homey” (Design 9). Another interesting design consisted of three separate buildings spaced on different corners of the site (all but the northwest) with a 2nd floor straddling all three, and an L-shaped open walkway underneath (Design 6). Another group designed features around an L-shaped building along the west and north sides of the property, with an attached pedestrian plaza between the building and SE Division Street and on-site parking on the eastern side of the parcel (Design 2).

COMMUNITY SURVEY

A survey was handed to participants at the design charrette. It was intended to assess the effectiveness of our public outreach strategy and to conduct an asset inventory. The asset inventory elicited skills and resources within the community that may be useful in the future stages of this project.

SURVEY RESULTS

Of the 35 adults that showed up for the charrette, twenty-three of them filled out surveys after they completed the group work. Twenty-one of them who participated in the survey thought the workshop was a productive exercise. Nineteen respondents wanted to be kept informed of future progress with the development of the site. A copy of the survey is included in Appendix E.

SURVEY OUTREACH

The majority of workshop participants found out about this charrette through their neighborhood associations. Six participants indicated they found out about the meeting through a neighborhood contact and three of the nine responses that marked the ‘other’ option for this question indicated that they were contacted by e-mail, either individually or through a list serve. Both the Mt. Tabor and South Tabor Neighborhood Associations distributed information through email list serves, flyers and the Southeast Examiner, a local paper for southeast Portland. The flyers, created by us, were posted at local bulletin boards, such as at New Seasons Wild Oats and Stumptown. The workshop was mentioned at Atkinson Elementary PTA meetings, as well as on the PTA bulletin board at school and in the school’s weekly newsletter to parents. The charrette was also handed out at the April 2nd, 2005 Division Vision Coalition Open House at Richmond Elementary School.

NEIGHBORHOOD REPRESENTATION

Eleven participants were residents of the Mt. Tabor Neighborhood but only two came from the South Tabor Neighborhood. Outreach for the workshop may not have been as successful in South Tabor due to a larger ethnic community in that neighborhood that does not have strong English speaking and/or reading ability. They may also not feel as invested in the outcome of this site to the extent that Mt Tabor residents are, given that this site is within the Mt Tabor Neighborhood and is more easily accessed from the North. This site is separated from the South Tabor neighborhood by Atkinson Elementary School and Franklin High School sports grounds, Four participants were from the Richmond neighborhood with a fifth person living on the border of this neighborhood and the Mt. Tabor neighborhood. The Buckman and Montavilla neighborhoods were represented by one person each. Thirteen people had never been to discussions regarding this site while nine people had and one person did not respond to the question. Home proximity to the site was evenly mixed. Seven respondents lived within five blocks of the site, five lived within ten blocks of the site, three lived within fifteen blocks, and seven lived further than fifteen blocks from the site.

We asked respondents their ethnicity in order to try and get an estimate of how broadly we were reaching different audiences within both the Mt Tabor and South Tabor Neighborhood Associations. Only one person indicated they were of Hispanic descent, with the rest indicating Caucasian.
**Future Use**

When asked if they felt a community use was the best use for the site, twenty-one of the twenty-three survey respondents agreed. The other two popular choices were a coffee shop (the first or second choice for eight people) and some type of small food store (first or second choice for five people). Because these answers were self-generated on the survey, there is no specificity as to the type of food store that the residents were considering. Would a convenience store be considered a ‘food store’, for example? A coffee shop or food store may actually be under-represented given that five respondents indicated either ‘commercial’ or ‘retail’ as their first or second choice for use of the site. Other uses that came up as popular choices included a public meeting space (including for classrooms), as well as an open space incorporating a plaza or garden. Only one respondent indicated a preference for residential housing.

**Community Assets**

The survey revealed a broad skill set among the participants. Respondents had a choice of seven options, plus an "other" category where they could indicate the respective skills that they could bring to the project. These options included planning or code experience, manual labor skills, drawing, design, or construction skills. Respondents were instructed to list all that apply. Nine people indicated they had drafting or drawing skills, seven indicated a willingness to help out with manual labor, six had some background or knowledge with either planning or City Code regulations, and four had some construction experience.

**Summary Of The Charrette and Survey**

The participants were actively engaged and enthusiastic about the process. Many interesting ideas were generated regarding the use of the site and its design. Input gathered from this process allows us to draw some general considerations regarding the direction that the project should take in order to be responsive to the community.

- The people engaged in this process would like to see a community building use on the site, rather than a strictly commercial redevelopment. The use should be something more intensive than open space or a pocket park.
- The two uses that were most consistently mentioned were flexible community meeting space, and a coffee shop or small café to serve as a social nexus.
- There was strong consideration given to the impact on neighboring homes from traffic, parking and building design.
- There was strong support for “green” design features, particularly for creative mitigation or reuse of stormwater, and energy efficient building design. For further considerations regarding ‘green design’, please refer to page 37 - 39.
- The redevelopment should be integrated with street improvements on Division St. with special consideration of the placement and treatment of crosswalks for school children.
Current Site Configuration

Site Map: Former Drive Thru Wake Up Deli Site - 57th and Division

- Residence
- Former Drive Thru
- SE 56th Ave.
- SE Division St.
- Atkinson Elementary School
- Open space/Ball fields

Design Charrette Legend
- Building outline
- Streets, curbs, traffic flow
- Landscaping
- Special features (art, amenities)
- View corridors

Design Charrette Results
DCOP Project, 2005

Design 1

- 3 Floors
- Drop off/parking
- Gallery terrace
- Solar features through N-S building

Uses
- Childcare center
- Village level retail
- 1st floor retail
- Solar bulk stop
- Public square

Retail
- 1st floor

Dairy Queen

16 HBU Consultants
Design Charrette Results
DCOP Project, 2005
LOOKING FORWARD...

THE 57TH AND DIVISION STREET PROJECT - ASSESSMENT

Both the November meeting and the April design charrette revealed a preference for a community center, a coffee shop and some commercial use, such as retail or office/flex space. In order to understand whether the demand for these community voiced preferences is already met, we conducted an analysis of land use within a half mile radius. An interview with Doug Brenner, Community Centers & Aquatics Coordinator at Portland Parks and Recreation, revealed that pedestrians typically walk for about 10 minutes to a community center. Typically, a 10-minute walk equates to a half mile for normal walkers. Therefore, we analyzed the area within a half-mile radius.

Although the Portland Parks and Recreation long range Vision 2020 Plan acknowledges the lack of public community space and there are efforts underway to cite an inner southeast community center location, the reality is that Portland Parks does not have sufficient funding to support a new community center at this time. Therefore, the DCOP project will not be able to draw from Parks funding to support the meeting space.

There are four Parks community centers in Southeast Portland, (Sellwood, Woodstock, Mt. Scott, and Montavilla), which the bureau rates as “acceptable” to “barely adequate.” The closest of these is Mt. Scott Community Center, at 2.42 miles from the project site. The Vision 2020 plan also concludes that “residents of the Inner Southeast/Central Eastside Industrial District have long needed a full-service community center.” Neither of the two facilities located in closest proximity to the site offers any community meeting space.

A current and pressing need for community space in the area around the site was expressed by the DCOP members, who represent multiple local organizations. The groups that make up the DCOP coalition currently meet in a range of spaces, from the Southeast Uplift main office on SE Main St. (1.75 miles from the site), to Atkinson Elementary and other schools, to private homes. Each of these has drawbacks. Schools and religious facilities are the most readily available spaces, but these have scheduling conflicts, do not focus community activities in one location, and have primary missions that make the provision of community space a secondary consideration. It seems clear that if local organizations are dedicated to making use of space on the project site, and promoting it for use by other groups and classes, that community meeting space will be supportable, without significant competition within a half-mile walking distance, or beyond.

ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING SERVICES

This section evaluates the existing land uses surrounding the site in respect to the desired community needs.

COMMUNITY CENTERS

Although the Portland Parks and Recreation long range Vision 2020 Plan acknowledges the lack of public community space and there are efforts underway to cite an inner southeast community center location, the reality is that Portland Parks does not have sufficient funding to support a new community center at this time. Therefore, the DCOP project will not be able to draw from Parks funding to support the meeting space.

There are four Parks community centers in Southeast Portland, (Sellwood, Woodstock, Mt. Scott, and Montavilla), which the bureau rates as “acceptable” to “barely adequate.” The closest of these is Mt. Scott Community Center, at 2.42 miles from the project site. The Vision 2020 plan also concludes that “residents of the Inner Southeast/Central Eastside Industrial District have long needed a full-service community center.” Neither of the two facilities located in closest proximity to the site offers any community meeting space.

A current and pressing need for community space in the area around the site was expressed by the DCOP members, who represent multiple local organizations. The groups that make up the DCOP coalition currently meet in a range of spaces, from the

SOURCE: PORTLAND PARKS AND RECREATION
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COMMERCIAL ZONING AND KINDS OF BUSINESSES IN A 3 MILE RADIUS AROUND 57TH AND DIVISION *

* Data derived from the Oregon State Bureau of Labor Statistics.
In order to sustain a retail use that would in turn support the building operation and maintenance, it is necessary to identify and locate competing uses within a 1-mile radius. This 1-mile radius is used in a typical market analysis to identify competitors on a neighborhood scale. A typical pedestrian would walk roughly a quarter of a mile to get to a retail location such as a coffee shop. Therefore, a look at the market conditions within a mile radius is sufficient to cover the foot traffic and driving traffic that would support a small local coffee shop.

The land use map on the previous page shows an overview of commercial uses within a 1-mile radius of the site. Although the data already is highly condensed into simplified categories, the diversity of businesses in the Mount and South Tabor neighborhoods is evident.

At a total of 615 businesses are located within a 1-mile radius. Within a ½ mile radius there are 132 businesses and within a ¼ mile there are 31 businesses. Of these 31 businesses only four serve food and beverages. All four are full-service restaurants, including the Dairy Queen located next to the project site. There is however one café, roughly .3 miles away, at the intersection of 50th and Division St. Gramma Lucy’s Cafe comes closest to competing directly with a coffee shop at the site.

More so than other types of small businesses, coffee shops are able to operate in close proximity to other coffee shops. A study by the Small Business Development Center of coffee shop business on the West Coast states that “the ideal ratio of coffee shops to residents in a particular area is 1:10,000” The Mt. Tabor and South Tabor neighborhoods have a combined population of over 25,000 residents. Some live in closer proximity to commercial nodes at Hawthorne Blvd. or Powell Blvd. that offer competing options but this central location would still be convenient to residents from much of these neighborhoods.

The discussion above suggests that the area is underserved by the proposed commercial uses and services. The Mt. Tabor’s residential density, inherent purchasing power and the ease of access to the site would certainly warrant a success of these uses. The South Tabor neighborhood also offers the same residential density. However, it is questionable whether the area within a ¼ - ½ radius to the South, largely separated through the Elementary and High School grounds, would find the site as accessible.

If the site is to be purchased, the DCOP needs to raise $6,000 for the site acquisition and $20,000 for the tax liens. All redevelopment must comply with the State Department of Environmental Quality regulations in order to ensure environmental health. Should the tanks be removed then additional testing is required to ascertain the extent of the contamination below the tanks. The current zoning allows for the community-based preferences: a community center, coffee shop or retail. And the redevelopment will fall in step with Portland Bureau of Planning’s Green Street/Main Street program goals.

The people engaged in this process would like to see a community-building use on the site, rather than a strictly commercial redevelopment. The use should be something more intensive than open space or a pocket park. The two uses that were most consistently mentioned were flexible community meeting space, and a coffee shop or small café to serve as a social nexus. There was strong consideration given to the impact on neighboring homes from traffic, parking and building design. There was strong support for “green” design features, particularly for creative mitigation or reuse of stormwater, and energy efficient building design. The redevelopment should be integrated with street improvements on Division St. with special consideration of the placement and treatment of crosswalks for school children.

The community voiced preferences, such as the community center, a coffee shop and retail/commercial uses currently underserved in the community.
THE 57TH AND DIVISION STREET PROJECT - NEXT STEPS

This section describes the next steps that DCOP should undertake in order to make the project successful in the future.

RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS

The PSU team recommends that the DCOP community group pursue the following resources in order to realize their vision. All recommendations are based on our assessment of community needs, client’s needs, regulatory requirements, and site constraints. In depth explanations for the different resources mentioned below are outlined in Appendix A, B and C on pages 28 through 36.

STEP 1

SECURE LIABILITY PROTECTION BEFORE ACQUIRING THE SITE

The liability associated with owning and redeveloping a brownfield is a major concern for lenders, developers and property owners in general. This is also the case for Southeast Uplift, which had to decide whether or not to hold 5633 SE Division Street for the community group. There are a few areas of concern when dealing with liability:

1) Federal regulatory enforcement
2) State regulatory enforcement
3) Third party lawsuit

1) In order to comply with federal liability regulation:
Perform the ‘All Appropriate Inquiry’, as defined by EPA, before taking title to the site. According to the EPA, prospective purchasers performing ‘All Appropriate Inquiry’ (AAI) are deemed ‘Bona-Fide Prospective Purchasers’ and are relieved of immediate EPA regulatory enforcement for contamination they did not cause (see page 36).

Next Steps: Enter into a DEQ Prospective Purchaser Agreement

2) In order to comply with the state liability regulation:
Enter into a ‘Prospective Purchaser Agreement’ (PPA) with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). By entering into the PPA, the state ensures the prospective purchaser that they will not be held liable for contamination they did not cause (see page 36).

As of May 30th, 2005 HBU Consultants assisted DCOP to draft an application to enter into a Prospective Purchaser’s Agreement and attended a meeting with DCOP and DEQ to discuss the project. DEQ is waiving the application fees (approximately $2,000) and is drafting a PPA.

Next Steps: Now that a PPA application has been submitted, continue to work with the DEQ on the PPA process

3) In order to receive Third Party Protection:
HBU Consultants recommend that the DCOP formalize their organization by forming a Limited Liability Corporation (LLC) or partnership (LLP) (see page 36)

As of May 30, 2005 the DCOP is aware of this strategy, but has not initiated a formal process. The DEQ PPA manager suggests a formal organization into a limited liability entity.

Next Steps: Seek legal guidance on liability protection and third party law suits. Applications for a LLC or LLP status cost approximately $50 from the City of Portland Bureau of Licenses.

STEP 2

GAIN CONTROL OF THE SITE

The DCOP should continue on the current path toward site acquisition through the federal Weed & Seed program. This is the appropriate course of action even though there is a financial obligation associated with taking title, such as back taxes and the compensation for the Federal Marshal, which amounts to a total of $26,000. However, most available resources intended for site acquisition have affordable housing requirements. Although affordable housing has not been a preference voiced by the community, should DCOP not be able to raise funding for a redevelopment without an affordable housing component, DCOP should consider adding one. Please refer to STEP 5: Re-development Strategies for more information on affordable housing.
The generally accepted definition of affordability is for a household to pay no more than 30 percent of its annual income on housing. Families who pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing are considered cost burdened and may have difficulty affording necessities such as food, clothing, transportation and medical care. An estimated 12 million renter and homeowner households now pay more than 50 percent of their annual incomes for housing, and a family with one full-time worker earning the minimum wage cannot afford the local fair-market rent for a two-bedroom apartment anywhere in the United States.

--- HUD

STEP 3
CONDUCT FURTHER ASSESSMENT AND REMEDIATION

According to the Limited Phase II ESA provided by the City of Portland, additional environmental assessment is required to develop a remedial action plan and its cost. The preferred source of environmental assessment is detailed below.

The recommended combination of resources for further assessment and cleanup funding includes the Potentially Responsible Party (PRP), their insurance carrier and the State of Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECDD) Brownfield Cleanup Revolving Loan Fund (BCRLF) (see page 28).

We were able to broker a relationship between the Client and a local insurance archaeologist. As of May 30th, 2005 the Client and archaeologist are determining the possible obligations of the PRP or their insurance carrier.

It is also recommend that DCOP pursue State funding to work in concert with the PRP and/or insurance cost recovery. OECDD may use its BCRLF to give a direct grant in the sum of $50,000 to be used in cleanup. OECDD will only award the grant if additional funds are being leveraged. Should this strategy not prove successful, other viable sources for remediation and assessment are the City of Portland Brownfield Program and the Environmental Protection Agency. The Client’s needs are consistent with the programs’ purpose, target area, activity and availability of funding.

Next Steps for City funding: Complete an application to receive environmental site assessments. Contact the Program Manager at (503) 823-5863 or email through www.brownfield.org

Next steps for EPA funding: Complete a proposal for an EPA clean up funding. Proposals are due in Fall 2005.

STEP 4
INTENSIFY MINORITY COMMUNITY OUTREACH

The participation in community outreach initiatives for this project has not been fully representative of the demographic profile of the Mt. Tabor and South Tabor Neighborhoods. In particular, we recommend further outreach to determine the desired community space needs and preferences of the English-as-a-second-language community in the area. We recommend the following resources for contacting this population:

- El Hispanic News
- The Asian Reporter
- Atkinson and Franklin school mailing lists
- Outreach through minority-owned or minority-serving businesses

Consider translating printed material that relates to DCOP efforts, because the South Tabor neighborhood is more linguistically challenged. It is also prudent to develop relationships with champions of your cause in the respective minority communities.

Next Steps: Contact the above mentioned resources. Solicit contacts through your email system for translators. Also consider minority activity, church and youth groups to facilitate communication between the neighborhood associations and in particular the DCOP project within the minority community.
STEP 5
Redevelopment Strategy

The greatest obstacle in this project is the current lack of funding. In order to acquire the site and redevelop it, the client will have to partner with and seek expertise from a number of agencies and groups. The results of public outreach, including the community meeting in November of 2004, the design charrette, and the community survey, document the public’s desire to see community meeting space and a small café or coffee shop use on the site. While the possibility of residential use was raised by a few charrette workgroups, it was not a major component of any designs or comments.

Based on research into available funding programs and examples of other community development projects, it is recommended that the development program incorporate an affordable housing element. Many affordable housing developments are carried out by Community Development Corporations (CDC), which receive federal funding and grants to pursue affordable housing projects. Community Development Corporations and government funding sources are largely geared towards the needs of low-income individuals and affordable housing in particular. While this funding for affordable housing is still very limited, the funding for non-housing community space in a middle-income area is essentially non-existent.

The recommended development concept incorporates affordable housing above community space, and a coffee shop. Furthermore, an innovative homeownership condo project integrated with community uses might set this project apart from other proposed projects. In order to accomplish this, the team recommends that the Client partner with a Community Development Corporation with expertise and knowledge of community-based development projects (see page 32).

In addition to serving the good of the community, an inclusion of affordable housing has other advantages. For instance, should the DCOP not be able to raise funds for obtaining the land as discussed in the previous section, then the County will most likely foreclose on the property. In that case the site will automatically be assessed first for viability for housing or open space. The DCOP could make a request to be granted the property for an affordable housing project that could include community space. If successful, ownership would be transferred, subject only to administrative fees. Second, if affordable housing should become a major focus of the project, then a CDC most likely will want to partner with you. Lastly, the presence of residents will keep the development vibrant and “activated” at all hours.

If possible, the client and CDC should examine using the Land Trust model to create the economies that will make affordable homeownership possible in the development. Currently, the Portland Community Land Trust is working on a 10-condo affordable homeownership project in Northeast Portland. Unlike affordable rental housing, this innovative model allows residents to build equity through ownership. Condos can serve a different population at an even more affordable level than single-family Land Trust properties. Due to the pride and stability of homeownership, a homeownership project may more easily gain neighbor support than an affordable multi-family rental.

The Land Trust model effectively splits ownership of a property in two. The land is owned in perpetuity by a non-profit Land Trust organization, while the structures and other improvements on the land are owned by a private owner, who maintains the right to sell to a new owner or pass the property to heirs.

Another advantage of the CDC/Land Trust approach is that it can create a management system that will remove the long-term responsibility of managing the property DCOP for which the DCOP may not have the expertise or resources. At the same time, the Land Trust ensures that the site will serve community needs in perpetuity.

Next Steps: Contact a CDC to discuss the possibility of partnering on this project to achieve joint goals of affordable housing and community space. Describe the nature of the site, funding alternatives for environmental work, and the proposed development program (see page 32).

Community Development Corporations are community-focused non-profit organizations that work to achieve a variety of goals related to self-empowerment and local solutions for low-income neighborhoods and individuals. Most established CDC’s are experienced in the issues related to acquiring and developing property for a community use, most often for affordable housing.
CASE STUDY: SENN’S DAIRY PARK

The Project:
Conversion of the former Senn’s Dairy site into a neighborhood park for the Parkrose neighborhood. The project was undertaken under the auspices of the CDBG “Target Area” program and the Portland Brownfield Showcase Program. Development of the park was accomplished with the help of community volunteers, local groups, donated expertise and some contracted services.

The Site:
The 1-acre site was foreclosed on by Multnomah County and, as required by statute, was first made available for use as public open space. The site previously had an underground storage tank for fuel. Though these tanks had been removed 10 years prior, the site still had significant brownfield risk, from tank leakage, the former manufacturing use on the site, and the remnants of the demolished structure in the soil. The site was transferred from Multnomah County to the City in 2000, prior to the assessment.

The assessment found no contamination, but a large amount of soil was excavated and removed from the site nonetheless.

Development:
Development of the park was accomplished over two years, with the help of community volunteers, local groups, donated expertise and some contracted services. The design was based on a large central lawn, surrounded by a walking path. The landscaping features native plants wherever possible, and large local boulders found on the site. Major systems include irrigation and a bio-swale.

Project Management:
Christine Charneski, Coordinator, Parkrose Target Area (The Target Area initiative was part of the Community Development Block Grant program, administered by Portland Bureau of Housing and Community Development)
SITE ASSESSMENT:
PORTLAND BROWNFIELD SHOWCASE PROGRAM: THE SHOWCASE PROGRAM FUNDED A LEVEL 1 AND LEVEL 2 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE.

SITE EXCAVATION AND REMEDIATION:
BROWNFIELD DEVELOPMENT, LLC. THIS CONTRACTOR DONATED SERVICES TO EXCAVATE AND REMOVE SOIL FROM THE SITE.

PARK DEVELOPMENT (LABOR, GRADING, PLANTING, LANDSCAPING, IRRIGATION, BIO-SWALLES):
NEIGHBORHOOD VOLUNTEERS, WORK PARTIES; ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE ACADEMY OF PARKROSE HIGH SCHOOL; INMATE WORK CREWS, MULTNOMAH CO. SHERIFF (SOME DONATED TIME, SOME PAID); COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK CREWS; BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA; COMMUNITY MEMBER WITH PARK DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE (CONTRACTED)

CHALLENGES:

THERE WERE SIGNIFICANT DELAYS AT ALMOST EVERY STEP OF THE PROCESS. THE LACK OF A MAIN CONTACT OR ADVOCATE IN THE PARKS DEPARTMENT LED TO A PIECEMEAL PROCESS FOR THE PROJECT COORDINATOR AND THE COMMUNITY. OFTEN DIFFERENT STAFF MEMBERS GAVE CONFlicting ANSWERS. IN SOME CASES, THIS CAUSED SIGNIFICANT EFFORT TO BE EXPENDED, ONLY TO BE DEEMED UNNECESSARY LATER. DELAYS CAUSED SOME OF THE COMMUNITY MEMBERS WHO WERE DEDICATED EARLY TO LOSE INTEREST AND PATIENCE WITH THE PROCESS.

LESSONS LEARNED:
ENSURE THAT THERE IS A STRONG COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR A PROJECT BEFORE UNDERTAKING IT. IDEALLY, A WELL-ORGANIZED AND SUPPORTED NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION OR SIMILAR GROUP WILL ALREADY EXIST. AS THESE PROJECTS TAKE PATIENCE, PERSEVERANCE, AND INVESTMENT IT IS CRITICAL THAT THE COMMUNITY VIEWS IT AS THEIR PROJECT.

RECOGNIZE THAT THE PROJECT MAY TAKE SOME TIME TO COMPLETE. SENN’S DAIRY PARK PROJECT TOOK MORE THAN THREE YEARS FROM PLANNING TO DEVELOPMENT. DURING THAT TIME, COMMUNITY MEMBERS, VOLUNTEERS, AGENCY STAFF AND OTHERS WILL HAVE TO BE KEPT ENGAGED IN THE PROCESS. REGULAR SUCCESSES OR MILESTONES CAN KEEP PARTNERS ENGAGED.

IF THE PROJECT RELIES HEAVILY ON THE SUPPORT OF A CITY DEPARTMENT OR OTHER AGENCY, MAKE SURE THE PROJECT HAS AN ADVOCATE ON STAFF WHO WILL WORK TO KEEP THE PROCESS MOVING. TRY TO ESTABLISH ONE STAFF CONTACT, RATHER THAN TRY TO NEGOTIATE AN UNFAMILIAR ORGANIZATION FROM THE OUTSIDE.
### Table 3: Overview of Brownfield Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Assessment and Financial Predevelopment Assistance</th>
<th>Environmental Remediation-Financial Assistance</th>
<th>Technical Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Of Housing and Urban Development (CBDG) (BEDI)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Administration*</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECDD)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University (OSU) - Technical Assistance to Brownfield Communities program(TAB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Portland Brownfield Program</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Development Commission (PDC) **</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gresham Brownfield Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas County Brownfield Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* **EDA** administers assistance programs for which brownfield projects are eligible but the programs are not brownfield specific

** PDC manages multiple programs for which brownfield projects are eligible but the programs are not brownfield specific

---

Assessment grants provide funding for a grant recipient to inventory, characterize, assess, and conduct cleanup and redevelopment planning and community involvement related to brownfield sites. -- EPA
Brownfield assessment, remediation and redevelopment are continually evolving. Incentives, funding and grants also change frequently. The sources below are current funding and assessment opportunities.

There are three main categories in which dollars for brownfield related activities are available:

1. Environmental Assessment and Predevelopment Funding
2. Environmental Remediation Funding
3. Technical Assistance

**Environmental Assessment And Predevelopment Funding**

**Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**
The Unites States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grants non-profit agencies, units of government, and tribes funding to provide environmental site assessments on property with real or perceived contamination

**The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)**
Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)
CDBG funds can be used for a wide range of activity including site acquisition, environmental assessment, cleanup and redevelopment. Locally, these funds are allocated to and administered by the City of Portland Bureau of Housing and Community Development (BHCD).

**Brownfield Economic Development Initiative (BEDI)**
Section 108 –guaranteed loan program allows a CDBG entitlement community to borrow up to 5 times its block grant allocation for use on an eligible project. This loan is collateralized with the block grant itself

**INTERNET LINKS**

- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
  - [www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov)
  - [www.epa.gov/swerosps/bf/index.html](http://www.epa.gov/swerosps/bf/index.html)
- Portland Bureau of Housing & Community Development
  - [www.portlandonline.com/bhcd/](http://www.portlandonline.com/bhcd/)
- Brownfield Economic Development Initiative
- Department of Environmental Quality
  - [www.deq.state.or.us/wmc/cleanup/bm0.htm](http://www.deq.state.or.us/wmc/cleanup/bm0.htm)
- Oregon Economic and Community Development Department
  - [www.econ.state.or.us/](http://www.econ.state.or.us/)
- Brownfield Cleanup and Revolving Loan Fund
  - [www.epa.gov/brownfields/rlflst.htm](http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/rlflst.htm)
- Portland Brownfield Program
  - [www.brownfield.org (currently under construction)](http://www.brownfield.org)
- EPA Assessment Grants
  - [www.epa.gov/brownfields/assessment_grants.htm](http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/assessment_grants.htm)
- Portland Development Commission
  - [www.pdc.us](http://www.pdc.us)
### CITY OF GRESHAM

www.ci.gresham.or.us/departments/cedd/bia/industrial/brownfields.asp

### CLACKAMAS COUNTY

www.co.clackamas.or.us/dtd/business/assist/tool_advantage.htm

### TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO BROWNFIELDS COMMUNITIES

www.tosc.oregonstate.edu/TAB/about/index.htm

---

### INTERNET LINKS

**INTERNET LINKS**

**City of Gresham**

www.ci.gresham.or.us/departments/cedd/bia/industrial/brownfields.asp

**Clackamas County**

www.co.clackamas.or.us/dtd/business/assist/tool_advantage.htm

**Technical Assistance to Brownfields Communities**

www.tosc.oregonstate.edu/TAB/about/index.htm

---

### ENvironmental Remediation FUNDING

**Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)**

DEQ receives EPA brownfield assessment funding (described above) to provide assessments on eligible properties throughout the State of Oregon. These funds are used to provide Phase I and II environmental site assessments.

**Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECDD)**

OECDD administers two loan programs that can be used to provide environmental assessments but only if part of a cleanup action. Please see “Environmental Remediation” section below.

**City of Portland Brownfield Program**

The City of Portland Brownfield Program provides Phase I and II environmental site assessments on eligible properties. Technical Assistance is also available. www.brownfield.org (Please note: Website currently under reconstruction)

**Portland Development Commission (PDC)**

PDC administers a number of programs that can be applied to a brownfield project. However, these programs are not brownfield specific

**City of Gresham**

The City of Gresham administers an EPA capitalized brownfield assessment grant. This grant funding is used to provide environmental assessments and technical assistance for brownfield properties within the City of Gresham.

**Clackamas County**

Clackamas County administers an EPA capitalized brownfield assessment grant. This grant funding is used to provide environmental assessments and technical assistance for brownfield properties within Clackamas County.

**Environmental Remediation Funding**

**Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grants brownfield remediation funds to non-profit agencies, units of government and tribes.

**The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)**

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)

Brownfield Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) (as described above).
Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECDD)
OECDD administers two loan programs that can be used to provide environmental remedia-
tion.

Portland Development Commission (PDC)
PDC administers a number of grant and loan programs that can be applied to a brownfield project. However, these programs are not brownfield specific.

Insurance Archaeology
A relatively new trend in cost recovery for brownfield cleanup is called Insurance Archaeology. This practice involves historical research specific to the businesses responsible for the contamination and their insurance policies held during the time of polluting activity. If policies that existed at the time of contamination can be found, it is very possible that the insurance company is still responsible for satisfying claims and paying for cleanup. This strategy is not applicable to every project. There are well-defined parameters for projects that can utilize this potential resource.

Responsible Party
Another potential source of cleanup funding is the party who contaminated the property. Again, this is not a viable option for many sites for several reasons. Many sites are overcoming environmental impacts that occurred several decades ago by individuals or businesses that are no longer living or operating. Even in cases where the responsible party can be found, there is no assurance they have the financial capability to fund assessment or reme-
diation of the brownfield, willingly or otherwise.

Special Interest and Philanthropic Groups
Because the brownfield funding sources are in constant flux it is worthwhile to consider piggy-backing on other programs that could have the same desired result. If the applicable site is located close to a former rail line, perhaps applying for a grant through a special interest group such as “Rails to Trails” may be an opportunity to secure funding for one phase of the redevelopment that can leverage other funding sources.

Technical Assistance
Oregon State University (OSU)
Oregon State University provides technical assistance through the Technical Assistance to Brownfield Communities (TAB) program.

City of Portland, City of Gresham and Clackamas County
These programs provide technical assistance on brownfield redevelopment projects.
The greatest obstacle facing a community group that wishes to reclaim a blighted property in their neighborhood will be the scarcity of funding to take control of the site, and turn it into what the community envisions. There are no easy answers to how a community can cover the cost of the site and redevelopment. A successful community group will likely need some combination of multiple funding sources; donated expertise, labor and capital; and partnership with other agencies and organizations in the community. The following list of potential resources and strategies can serve as a point from which to embark on building a local coalition.

**Community Development Corporations**

A community group’s best resource in pursuing a community ownership project is likely to be a local Community Development Corporation (CDC). CDC’s are community-focused non-profit organizations that work to achieve a variety of goals related to self-empowerment and local solutions for low-income neighborhoods and individuals. Most established CDC’s are experienced in the issues related to acquiring and developing property for a community use, most often for affordable housing.

As of Spring 2005, there are 19 individual CDC’s in Portland, all members of the Community Development Network association. Affordable housing tends to be the central concern of CDC’s, but not exclusively. Land Trust projects often involve a CDC partner, to tap into development and deal-making experience as well as funding (see “The Land Trust Model” below). CDC’s draw funding from a wide range of sources, including donations, foundation grants, government grants, tax credits, private financing, and fees for services. In order to accomplish the average development project, CDC’s have to coordinate seven or more public and private sources of financing. Because of this, projects require a high level of organization and knowledge, as well as patience and perseverance.

Government funding for affordable housing and other community projects is increasingly tight, making the Community Development world more competitive. Recently Portland had over 30 CDC’s in operation, now reduced to 19. For inexperienced groups seeking to draw on similar sources of funding to accomplish a development project, it is advisable to partner with a CDC. The community group should approach a prospective CDC partner with a well thought-out project, and expect to be an active partner in moving the project through completion, including investing time, labor and possibly funding. The proposed project should address the CDC’s mission, which almost always means housing, creating jobs for, or serving low-income individuals.
Federal HOME and Community Development Block Grants

The federal government, through the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), offers four formula grant programs that are administered on a local level. Locally, these funds are allocated to the City of Portland Bureau of Housing and Community Development (BHCD), which administers the program in Portland, Gresham, and Multnomah County. The four grant programs are:

- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
- HOME Investment Partnership (HOME)
- Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG)
- Housing Opportunity for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA)

The broadest and largest programs are the CDBG and the HOME programs. The ESG and HOPWA programs might be of interest for some community groups seeking to help these populations, and this funding can be less competitive due to its specialized nature.

The CDBG program can be used for housing, public services, community facilities, public improvements, economic development, and community revitalization. The HOME program is for building affordable housing, supporting nonprofits who work in affordable housing, and providing other assistance to those involved in developing affordable housing.

As with all awarded local jurisdictions, the Portland is required to prepare a Consolidated Plan every five years that outlines how the funding will be put to use. The adopted Plan for 2005-2010 sets the following three priorities, in descending order from that which will be the highest funded to that which will be the least funded:

Priority 1:
Increase the range of households affordable to households with income below 50% of the area’s Median Family Income

Priority 2:
Prevent and end homelessness

Priority 3:
Assist adults and youth to improve their economic condition

Funding for individual projects is awarded by BHCD through multiple application processes for different types of projects, including the Economic Opportunity Initiative, Homebuyer Financial Assistance, and Community Initiative grants. BHCD support for housing, training, and job creation, takes a wide range of forms, and a variety of project types are eligible for funding.

The programs each have different eligible and ineligible uses, however all share the mission of serving low-income individuals and areas. The Block Grants also have strict requirements for the organization of groups who receive awards. For this reason, community groups that wish to access this funding should consider partnering with a Community Development Corporation that is familiar with the process (see Community Development Corporations above).

Community Development Financial Institutions

Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) are specialized financial institutions that work in market niches that have not been adequately served by traditional financial institutions. There are more than 500 CDFIs in the United States, with at least one in every state. The primary mission of CDFIs is to promote economic development in struggling areas, both urban and rural, that are underserved by traditional financial institutions. CDFIs are playing a critical role in building a healthier economy by providing these communities with the access to capital that they so sorely need.

CDFIs provide an array of financial services in their target areas, including mortgage financing for home buyers, financing for the rehabilitation of rental housing, financing for the building and rehabilitation of community facilities, commercial loans to small- and micro-enterprise businesses, and financial services needed by low-income households and businesses in the target areas. CDFIs include:

- Community Development Banks, which provide needed capital to help rebuild economically distressed communities through targeted lending and investment.
- Community Development Credit Unions, which provide affordable credit and financial services to low-income and minority communities.
- Community Development Loan Funds, which typically raise capital from socially responsible investors at below-market rates and then re-lend the money to nonprofits that build housing and community facili
ties in struggling urban and rural areas.

- Community Development Venture Capital Funds, which provide start-up capital for real estate and new business development in economically distressed areas.

- Microenterprise Loan Funds, which provide loans and technical assistance to low-income people starting very small businesses

The federal government also has a CDFI Fund, which was created in 1994 to expand the availability of credit, investment capital, and financial services in distressed urban and rural communities. The CDFI Fund provides relatively small infusions of capital to institutions that serve distressed communities and low-income individuals. The Fund’s activities leverage private-sector investments from banks, foundations, and other funding sources. By stimulating the creation and expansion of diverse community development financial institutions (CDFIs) and by providing incentives to traditional banks and thrifts, the Fund’s investments work toward building private markets, creating healthy local tax revenues, and empowering residents.

**FEDERAL WEED AND SEED PROGRAM**

Certain Brownfield sites with a crime-related history may be eligible for funding through the Weed and Seed program. The program is part of the Community Capacity Development Office (CCDO) under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. Its mission is to work with local communities to design strategies for deterring crime, promoting economic growth, and enhancing quality of life. CCDO enables communities to develop solutions to public safety problems and to strengthen leadership to implement and sustain those solutions.

Unlike an outright grant program, Operation Weed and Seed is a strategy which aims to prevent, control, and reduce violent crime, drug abuse, and gang activity in targeted high-crime neighborhoods across the country. Weed and Seed sites range in size from several neighborhood blocks to 15 square miles. Resources will be dedicated to economic development activities designed to strengthen legitimate community institutions and improve public services in the target areas.

The strategy involves a two-pronged approach: law enforcement agencies and prosecutors cooperate in “weeding out” criminals who participate in violent crime and drug abuse, attempting to prevent their return to the targeted area; and “seeding” brings human services to the area, encompassing prevention, intervention, treatment, and neighborhood revitalization. There are several organizational steps that are helpful in applying for Weed and Seed grants. These are listed below:

1) Organize and Convene a Steering Committee. Convene regular Steering Committee meetings - include the US Attorney or US Attorney’s Office designated liaison. Contact the CCDO Program Manager for your state with any questions concerning the development of your strategy. Program managers can assist with Steering Committee development, as well. Sites have reported to CCDO that meetings commenced in the evenings within or near the target area are most productive and well-attended.

2) Request from CCDO an Implementation Manual. This resource walks the Steering Committee through the Strategy Implementation procedure.

3) Review Official Recognition Guidelines and Recognition. These 2004 guidelines may be used for planning purposes. New guidelines are issued every spring.

4) Submit complete application by late October. Communities that develop a Weed and Seed strategy in coordination with their U.S. Attorneys Office may submit an application for Official Recognition (OR) to CCDO.
If the site is designated as Officially Recognized, it may receive preference in discretionary funding from participating federal agencies; priority for participating in federally sponsored training and technical assistance; use of the Weed and Seed logo; eligibility to attend national CCDIO training conferences, and eligibility to apply for Department of Justice Weed and Seed funds, pending the availability of funds.

Given the rapid growth of interest in the program, the provision of DOJ funding to additional sites may be limited based on a consideration of factors such as the seriousness of the crime problem in a site, the site’s capacity to implement the program, coordination with related federal initiatives and other related factors.

**County Tax Foreclosed Real Property**

A range of real estate types may become the property of the county through tax foreclosure proceedings. Known brownfield sites in particular may be susceptible to foreclosure, as the cost of environmental remediation makes the property unviable for a straightforward redevelopment. As the cost of remediation limits the opportunity for a profitable use for the owner or any prospective buyer, abandonment can become the owner’s best economic choice. In Oregon, property is generally subject to foreclosure after taxes are delinquent for three years. Multnomah County has a distinctive system for disposing of tax foreclosed properties. The property is first available to the former owner for repurchase for not less than the cost of taxes owed, interest and charges. If the owner does not repurchase the property, it is then assessed for suitability as public open space, and for its suitability for construction of affordable housing. The appropriate properties are made available first to government agencies for use as open space, and then to qualified non-profit corporations for use as affordable housing. Interested agencies may make a request for the property, to be approved by the Board of County Commissioners. If approved, ownership is transferred to the agency, subject to an administrative charge, but with no sales price. Remaining marketable properties are sold at public auction once per year, generally in the fall.

**The Land Trust Model**

The Land Trust model effectively splits ownership of a property in two. The land is owned in perpetuity by a non-profit Land Trust organization, while the structures and other improvements on the land are owned by a private owner, who maintains the right to sell to a new owner or pass the property to heirs. This model provides great economies for the building’s owner or developer, because they do not have to pay for the land, which commonly makes up 25-30% of a property’s value.

Currently, this model is overwhelmingly used for affordable homeownership projects. The Land Trust organization is established with a mission to help provide affordable housing opportunities. Through donations, grants and other funds, the Land Trust takes ownership of a parcel and rehabilitates the home or develops new housing on the site. The Land Trust often partners with Community Development Corporations or other agencies for development funding and expertise. The home is sold to an income-qualified family minus the cost of the land, making the home significantly more affordable than market-rate housing. The homeowner is able to use and improve the home as they wish. Technically, the owner is signed to a 99-year “ground lease” with the Land Trust. At the end of the 99-years, the owner or heir may renew the lease. If the owner sells the home to a new income-qualified family, the sale price is generally set by a formula in the ground lease. The owner keeps a set percentage of the appreciation in the home, and the Land Trust may subtract the rest from the new sales price. (Another growing use of the Land Trust model is nature conservation, in which case the Land Trust purchases open space with the intent of never developing it.)

The Land Trust model may be applicable to community groups who take ownership of a brownfield site. By partnering with or donating the site to a Land Trust, the community group can ensure that the land will always be reserved for a community use. The developer of the brownfield site (be it a non-profit or commercial developer) can then take advantage of the cost-free land to make the development more economically viable. If the community group merely donated the land to the developer, rather than a Land Trust, the community might effectively lose control of the future of the site. Another benefit is that Land Trusts are established to own and manage land in perpetuity. Community and neighborhood groups with limited resources and expertise may find this difficult.

As mentioned, this model is most commonly used in urban areas for affordable housing projects. However there is no reason that it cannot be applied to other types of mixed-use or even commercial uses, as long as
such uses serve the community-focused mission of the Land Trust. Non-profit Land Trusts have limited staff resources, and commonly partner with one or more other agencies to accomplish projects. Community groups approaching a Land Trust should have a well thought-out project, and expect to be an active partner in moving the project through completion, including investing time, labor and possibly funding.

The Institute for Community Economics was the originator of the Community Land Trust (CLT) model, and now promotes and provides funding to a national network of CLTs. The ICE offers technical assistance, and operates a revolving loan fund for Land Trusts: “Funds from the RLF are commonly used to finance land acquisition and the acquisition, construction and rehabilitation of housing. Other frequent uses include the acquisition of office space or other property by a nonprofit community service organization.”

LIABILITY PROTECTION

One reason brownfield properties have been left abandoned and underutilized is because developers and lenders are wary of the legal liability associated with owning, and developing polluted property. This risk extends to regulatory enforcement, third party lawsuits and the financial burden of assessment, cleanup and monitoring. To help alleviate this perception of risk, there are a few laws in place to make brownfields more attractive and viable development opportunities.

In 2001, US Congress passed the Brownfield Small Business Liability Relief Act. Under this act Congress stipulates that prospective purchasers of brownfield properties will not be subject to EPA regulatory enforcement action if certain steps are taken prior to purchase. First, the purchaser must perform what EPA is calling All Appropriate Inquiry (AAI). AAI is a version of due diligence specific to the environmental condition of the site. By performing AAI, EPA grants the person Bona Fide Prospective Purchaser status that protects them from EPA action. However, this does not protect the purchaser from regulatory enforcement from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. The DEQ also takes steps to make developers comfortable with purchasing brownfields. DEQ issues Prospective Purchaser Agreements (PPA) through an application process. Once granted, a PPA protects the purchaser from DEQ regulatory enforcement action and maintains the legal obligation for cleanup on the seller or polluter. There are steps a purchaser can take to protect themselves from a lawsuit over a situation they did not cause. One such mechanism is a series of clauses in the Purchase Agreement called Indemnification, Hold Harmless, and Damage clauses. All three of these stipulate that any financial or legal burden imposed upon the purchaser is the responsibility of the seller or polluter.

Another way to shield oneself from liability is to form a Limited Liability Corporation (LLC; or partnership – LLP). An LLC protects the individual investor and/or developer from lawsuits that can only pursue action against the title-holding LLC or LLP. LLCs are also used to protect investors/developers from lending institution foreclosure actions should the project fail financially.
Building Sustainably

The November meeting and the design charrette focused on sustainable building design. This guide is to assist the DCOP in the future when they begin developing the site and building.

A holistic and sustainable building design takes into account what uses and natural characteristics are around the site and what the real needs are of the future inhabitants. This design concept also favors materials that are good for the environment, such as materials that avoid using hard to replace natural resources, and creates a comfortable building that can increase inhabitants’ productivity. With a small upfront cost of 1-1.5% of the total development costs, a sustainable building will reduce long term operating costs, which means more money in the organization’s pocket. Typical areas in which these reduced operating costs occur are in water consumption (heating and cooling, energy consumption and waste reduction).

We have put together a list of considerations that you will want to think about while you are in all stages of planning your project (pre-design, design, construction and post occupancy):

- Site Design
- Curbing Energy Use
- Curbing Water Consumption
- Material Choice, Recycling and Construction Waste Management

Things to Think About

Careful combinations of design strategies are very effective. Buildings are complex systems of interacting elements. Intelligent green design considers the effects of one or more elements on the others, and on the building as a whole. A careful combination of several reinforcing strategies, such as harvesting free natural light, keeping solar heat gain at bay, using free natural ventilation can save resources and money – both during construction and operation. Making the building the right shape and pointing it in the right direction can cut total energy use by 30-40% at no extra cost. Avoiding bulldozing protects soil vitality and water absorption capacity. This means the building’s long axis should face the street.

Build to adapt and to last. Buildings designed to adapt to changing uses over 50 to 100 years will reduce long-term costs. Robust interior walls designed to be moved, and mechanical and electrical systems that make changes easy, save materials and money when tenant improvements or renovations occur.

Site Design

Create a landscaping design before construction begins. Utilize the neighborhood’s gardeners! Make the landscaping design a community development project. Give preference to native plants and trees that are appropriate for the amount of sun and water that naturally falls on the site. Transplant and donate mature trees, they are too valuable to just cut down. Establishing new vegetation can be costly, labor and time intensive. Make sure everybody working on the site understands why you want that area protected. Capture rainfall to supplement the building’s water needs like flushing toilets and landscape irrigation during the summer. Stormwater tanks can be placed under parking spaces or be integrated into the building.

Curb Energy Use

Appropriate windows, doors and skylights are critical to retaining heat and cooling while letting in light. Make sure your building is fitted with appropriate windows, doors and skylights. Look for the Energy Star Logo. Commercial and multi-family projects can obtain technical assistance through the Commercial Windows Initiative through the Northwest Energy Alliance. This initiative may also be able to find financial incentives as well. Learn how to choose the right light for the buildings’ need at the Earth Advantage Center. Learn more about commercial daylighting at the Betterbricks Daylighting Guide.
lighting Lab.
Consider natural ventilation, geothermal, passive solar and active solar heating and cooling, instead of or in addition to mechanic heating and cooling systems. Learn more about available options and technologies through Portland General Electric. Consider purchasing energy from renewable sources such as wind and solar or programs that restore and offset natural habitat loss. Take it a step further and purchase Green Tags to offset the burning of fossil fuels for everyday energy and transportation use.

**CURB WATER USE**
Use state of the art water conserving fixtures, fittings and appliances, which can reduce water consumption by 30%. Design the landscape with native plants to reduce or eliminate irrigation requirements. Read about Xeriscape and how to design a landscape with native plants. Permaculture incorporates landscaping with food production and resource conservation. Consider an alternative to a traditional lawn. Ecoturf is designed to be green year round and needs no summer watering after it is established. If irrigation is needed use high efficiency irrigation technology such as drip irrigation that distributes water right to the plants roots.

**RECYCLING AND CONSTRUCTION WASTE REDUCTION**
Avoid large tipping fees by identifying the composition and quantities of waste generated on your project during construction. The Metro Construction Toolkit can help identify what is recyclable and provides a lot of other technical assistance. Find out who will take the construction and demolition waste. A careful extraction of drywall, dimensional lumber, doors, windows, panels, lighting fixtures, plumbing fixtures, for instance, could be donated to Habitat for Humanity or The Rebuilding Center.

**MATERIAL CHOICE**
Give preference to materials with recycled content or which have been reused. The Green Seal Program certifies products that promote environmentally responsible production and purchasing. Information on sustainably managed and harvested wood products can be found through the Forest Stewardship Council. Climate Cool evaluates products based on impacts on the greenhouse emissions.

Identify opportunities to incorporate salvaged materials into the building design and research potential material suppliers. Consider salvage materials such as beams and posts, flooring, paneling, doors and frames, cabinetry and furniture, brick, and decorative items. Portland’s unique Rebuilding Center has a host of materials. Also consider rapidly renewable materials for interior finishes, such as bamboo flooring, wool carpet, strawboard, cotton batt insulation, linoleum flooring, poplar OSB, sunflower seed board, and wheat grass cabinetry.
### INTERNET LINKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Roofs</td>
<td><a href="http://www.greenroofs.com/Greenroofs101/applications">www.greenroofs.com/Greenroofs101/applications</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Advantage Center</td>
<td><a href="http://www.earthadvantage.com/NationalCenter/about.asp">www.earthadvantage.com/NationalCenter/about.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database of State Incentives for Renewable Energy</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dsireusa.org/">www.dsireusa.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland General Electric</td>
<td><a href="http://www.portlandgeneral.com">www.portlandgeneral.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xeriscape</td>
<td><a href="http://www.xeriscape.org/xeriscape.html">www.xeriscape.org/xeriscape.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permaculture</td>
<td><a href="http://www.attra.org/attra-pub/perma.html#/intro">www.attra.org/attra-pub/perma.html#/intro</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecoturf</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ci.seattle.wa.us/util/Services/Yard/Natural_Lawn_&amp;_Garden_Care">www.ci.seattle.wa.us/util/Services/Yard/Natural_Lawn_&amp;_Garden_Care</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion &amp; Stormwater control manual</td>
<td><a href="http://www.portlandonline.com">www.portlandonline.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greywater usage:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.greywater.com">www.greywater.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.graywater.net">www.graywater.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Cycle Assessment</td>
<td><a href="http://www.epa.gov/ORD/NRMRL/lcaccess/lca101.htm">www.epa.gov/ORD/NRMRL/lcaccess/lca101.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat For Humanity</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pdxrestore.org">www.pdxrestore.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rebuilding Store</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rebuildingcenter.org">www.rebuildingcenter.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Green’ Material Databases</td>
<td><a href="http://www.greenseal.org">www.greenseal.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.fscus.org">www.fscus.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.climateneutral.com">www.climateneutral.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.green-rated.org">www.green-rated.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ecohaus.com">www.ecohaus.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.greenresourcecenter.org">www.greenresourcecenter.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Wood</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fscus.org">www.fscus.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.certifiedwood.org">www.certifiedwood.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Recycling Assistance</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cityofportland.org">www.cityofportland.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Exchange Networks</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wrain.org">www.wrain.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.scrapaction.org">www.scrapaction.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.govlink.org/hazwaste/business/imex">www.govlink.org/hazwaste/business/imex</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat For Humanity</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pdxrestore.org">www.pdxrestore.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rebuilding Store</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rebuildingcenter.org">www.rebuildingcenter.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Green’ Material Databases</td>
<td><a href="http://www.greenseal.org">www.greenseal.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.fscus.org">www.fscus.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.climateneutral.com">www.climateneutral.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.green-rated.org">www.green-rated.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ecohaus.com">www.ecohaus.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.greenresourcecenter.org">www.greenresourcecenter.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Wood</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fscus.org">www.fscus.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.certifiedwood.org">www.certifiedwood.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Recycling Assistance</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cityofportland.org">www.cityofportland.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Exchange Networks</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wrain.org">www.wrain.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.scrapaction.org">www.scrapaction.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.govlink.org/hazwaste/business/imex">www.govlink.org/hazwaste/business/imex</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E - SURVEY RESULTS

SE 57 & DIVISION COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP PROJECT
ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN CHARRETTE
ATKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL APRIL 16, 2005

THANK YOU FOR CONTRIBUTING TO THIS ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN CHARRETTE FOR THE FUTURE SITE DEVELOPMENT AT 5633 SE DIVISION ST. YOUR EFFORT IS APPRECIATED! TO FURTHER CLARIFY COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES AND TO GUIDE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT ON THE SITE, THE COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP PROJECT - WHICH CONSISTS OF THE MT. TABOR AND SOUTH TABOR NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS IN ADDITION TO ATKINSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND SOUTHEAST UPLIFT - WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR FILLING IN YOUR RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONS BELOW.

THANK YOU IN ADVANCE AND HAVE FUN! N=23 (35 PARTICIPANTS)
PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:

1) HOW DID YOU FIND OUT ABOUT THIS WORKSHOP?
   A. 13% Posted flyer
   B. 26% Neighborhood Association meeting/contact
   C. 0% Phone or house call
   D. 4% Newspaper
   E. 13% Friend
   F. 39% Other
   No answer 1

2) HAVE YOU ATTENDED PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THIS SITE?
   A. 39% Yes
   B. 56% No
   No answer 1

3) WHAT NEIGHBORHOOD ARE YOU A MEMBER OF?
   A. 48% Mt. Tabor N.A.
   B. 9% South Tabor N.A.
   C. Other
   2%
   D. 2 unanswered; 1 w/ BES; 2/DVC

4) DO YOU LIVE:
   A. 30% within 5 blocks of the site
   B. 21% within 10 blocks of the site
   C. 13% within 15 blocks of the site
   D. 30% further away

5) DO YOU FEEL A COMMUNITY-BASED USE IS THE BEST USE FOR THIS SITE?
   A. 97% Yes
   B. 4% No
   No answer 1

6) DO YOU HAVE CHILDREN THAT ATTEND EITHER ATKINSON ELEMENTARY OR FRANKLIN HIGH?
   A. 17% Yes
   B. 82% No

7) IN ORDER OF PREFERENCE, PLEASE LIST THREE TYPES OF USES OR ACTIVITIES THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE OCCUR AT THIS SITE.
   A. Community space/center (10 votes for main preference)
   B. Coffee shop (5 votes for 2nd preference)
   C. Community space/ open area or plaza (both with 5 votes 3rd preference)

8) WOULD YOU LIKE TO BE KEPT INFORMED OF THE PROGRESS OF THIS PROJECT?
   83% Yes

9) ARE YOU WILLING TO INCLUDE YOUR NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION ON A LIST OF POTENTIAL VOLUNTEERS FOR THIS EFFORT? PLEASE INCLUDE THAT HERE.

10) WHAT SKILLS OR EXPERTISE DO YOU POSSESS THAT WOULD HELP MOVE THE PROJECT TOWARD COMPLETION? PLEASE LIST ALL THAT APPLY AND ANY LICENSES OR CERTIFICATIONS YOU MIGHT HAVE IN YOUR AREA OF EXPERTISE.
    A. 16% Construction
    B. 36% Design or drafting skill background or knowledge
    C. 4% Knowledge of law and/or site acquisition
    D. 24% Planning/code compliance
    E. 8% Small business owner
    F. 28% Manual labor/landscaping
    G. 4% Plumbing/Electrical
    H. 12% Other

11) WE ARE INTERESTED IN KNOWING TO WHAT EXTENT THE WORKSHOP REPRESENTS THE COMMUNITY AT LARGE. IF INCLINED, WOULD YOU INDICATE YOUR ETHNICITY?
    A. 78% Caucasian
    B. 4% Hispanic/Latino
    C. 0% Vietnamese
    D. 0% Russian
    E. 0% Other

12) WAS THIS WORKSHOP PRODUCTIVE? PLEASE GIVE US YOUR GENERAL COMMENTS:
    97% Yes
    8% No response

THANK YOU. IF YOU ARE RETURNING THIS SURVEY AT A LATER TIME, PLEASE DO SO BY MAY 1, 2005 TO PAUL LEISTNER AT PAUL.LEISTNER@MTTABORPDX.ORG OR THE PSU WORKING GROUP AFFILIATED WITH THIS PROJECT, SIMONE WOLTER AT SCWOLTER@PDX.EDU.